

Spring 2019

The Effects of Self-Esteem and Mood on the Perception of Others

Sydney Wirkkala

Central Washington University, sydney.wirkkala@cwu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wirkkala, Sydney, "The Effects of Self-Esteem and Mood on the Perception of Others" (2019). *All Master's Theses*. 1194.

<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/1194>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@cwu.edu.

THE EFFECTS OF SELF-ESTEEM AND MOOD
ON THE PERCEPTION OF OTHERS

A Thesis

Presented to

The Graduate Faculty

Central Washington University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

Experimental Psychology

by

Sydney Wirkkala

June 2019

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Graduate Studies

We hereby approve the thesis of

Sydney Wirkkala

Candidate for the degree of Master of Science

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

Dr. Mary Radeke, Committee Chair

Dr. Tonya Buchanan

Dr. Anthony Stahelski

Dean of Graduate Studies

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF SELF-ESTEEM AND MOOD ON THE PERCEPTION OF OTHERS

by

Sydney Wirkkala

June 2019

The purpose of the current experiment was to examine the role that self-esteem and mood have on judgment formation regarding strangers. Mood has been shown to play an important role in judgments such that being in a positive mood has been shown to result in more positive judgments (Forgas & Bower, 1987; Forgas, Bower, & Krantz, 1983). It has also been shown that having a higher self-esteem can lead to more positive judgments about the self as well as others (Brown & Mankowski, 1993; Sanna, Turley-Ames, & Meier, 1999). Few studies have examined the interaction of self-esteem and mood on judgment formation regarding strangers. In this experiment, participants had their self-esteem assessed through the Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale, and then had their mood manipulated by watching a video clip that pertained to either a positive, neutral, or negative mood. Participants then rated unknown individuals in two text-based scenarios and a trait scenario in terms of likability, competence, trustworthiness, ambitiousness, and enthusiasm as well as rated themselves on the same traits. While no significant main effect of mood was found, there was a

significant main effect of self-esteem for the trait scenario, such that participants with high self-esteem made more positive judgments than individuals with low self-esteem. This finding supports previous research on self-esteem and judgments. No significant interaction was found between self-esteem and mood. These results support the idea that how one feels about the self may influence the interpretation of events involving strangers.

Keywords: self-esteem, self, mood, mood-induction, judgments, perceptions

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to thank the chair of my committee, Dr. Mary Radeke for all the help she has provided me with. I am eternally grateful for all her guidance.

Second, I would like to thank the members of my committee Dr. Tonya Buchanan and Dr. Anthony Stahelski for the feedback they have given me during the process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW	1
	Social Comparison, Self-Concept, and Judgments.....	1
	Self-Esteem and Judgments	3
	Mood and Judgments.....	5
	Mood and Self-Esteem on Judgments	8
	Current Study.....	10
II	METHOD.....	12
	Participants	12
	Measures/Materials.....	13
	Procedure	18
III	RESULTS.....	20
	Factor Analysis for Dependent Variable Traits	20
	Text Scenario One	21
	Text Scenario Two.....	22
	Trait Scenario.....	22
	Self and Other Ratings.....	23
IV	DISCUSSION	25
	Limitations and Future Research	31
V	CONCLUSION.....	37
	REFERENCES	38
	APPENDIXES.....	42
	Appendix A—Sona Description and Informed Consent	42
	Appendix B—Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale.....	44
	Appendix C—Mood Induction Film Clips.....	47
	Appendix D—Text Scenario One.....	48
	Appendix E—Text Scenario Two.....	51

Appendix F—Trait Scenario.....	53
Appendix G—Self-Ratings.....	56
Appendix H—PANAS.....	58
Appendix I—Debriefing Statement.....	61

\

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Table of Correlations for Self and Other Ratings.....	25
2	Table of Correlations for Reported Positive Mood and Judgments of Others.....	28

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this research was to examine the ways in which an individual's self-esteem and current mood affect perceptions of others. Since mood may depend on one's self-esteem (Wessman & Ricks, 1966), it is important to examine whether these two factors interact with one another during the formation of perceptions and how perceptions may be influenced by these two factors.

Self-esteem, or the way individuals view themselves, plays a prominent role in how we live our lives; it influences how we make decisions and how we engage with others. Many psychologists, including Festinger and Rogers, have examined the relationship between the self and others, and the importance of having a positive self-concept. Festinger (1954) constructed the social comparison theory, which proposes that individuals gain a sense of self-worth from how others view them on certain aspects of their personality, while Rogers (1951) stressed the importance of having a positive self-concept in the climb towards actualization and fulfillment.

Social Comparison, Self-Concept, and Judgments

Self-concept refers to the perceptions one has regarding certain aspects of themselves (Shavelson, Hubner, & Stanton, 1976) and may be influenced by comparisons to others. In a multiple-part experiment conducted by Wolff, Helm,

Zimmermann, Nagy, and Möller (2018), participants' verbal and analytical self-concept was assessed through feedback. Participants were given feedback regarding their performance on a task such that they were told they either performed better (downward comparison) or worse (upward comparison) in relation to others on the task. Results indicated that social comparison had a significant effect on participants' self-concept of their verbal and analytical ability, which suggests that comparing oneself to others has a strong influence on one's self-concept.

One's self-concept may also influence the judgments or perceptions that are made regarding others. Ross, Greene, and House (1977) investigated individuals' self-concepts and their judgments about others. In the experiment, participants were presented with a series of character traits, personal views, and scenarios that involved doing something out of the norm and were asked to estimate how they believed a typical individual would respond as well as how they would respond to the situation. The researchers found that participants believed others would respond similarly to themselves on the traits, personal views, and scenarios (Ross et al., 1977). This suggests that individuals believe others hold similar views and opinions as themselves (even though this isn't always the case) in what is known as the False Consensus Effect (Ross et al., 1977).

Cho and Knowles (2012) found a relationship between self-concept and judgments of others as well. The researchers manipulated the self-concept of meticulousness in participants and measured their subsequent judgments of in-

group members who were other students at the university. Meticulousness was manipulated by randomly assigning participants to one of two conditions that primed them with either high or low meticulousness. These conditions asked participants to write about a time they had behaved in either a meticulous or non-meticulous way, depending on which condition they were assigned to.

Meticulousness was chosen in order to exclude any self-presentational effects as it was seen that most individuals rated themselves as neutral on the trait before the experiment. Cho and Knowles (2012) found that participants in the high meticulousness group regarded themselves as having a higher level of meticulousness and judged in-group members as being highly meticulous as well. This suggests that perceptions of others may be a result of our own self-perceptions or self-concept.

Self-Esteem and Judgments

While self-concept refers to the perceptions one has regarding their identity, self-esteem refers to the general feelings or value that one places on themselves (Coetzee, Martins, Basson, & Muller, 2006). Although self-esteem tends to fluctuate during adolescence when the individual attempts to forge their identity, it remains relatively stable throughout adulthood (Trzesniewski, Donnellan, & Robins, 2003). Many factors may influence one's self-esteem, such as academic achievement and socio-economic status (Rosenberg & Pearlin, 1978; Baker, Beer, & Beer, 1991).

Morse and Gergen (1970) examined the stability of self-esteem as a result of social comparisons that are made in a competing or non-competing situation

with a socially desirable or undesirable other. In the experiment, the self-esteem of job applicants was measured after applicants were led to believe they would be competing with another applicant for the same job (or not competing) where the other individual had either socially desirable traits or socially undesirable traits. Encountering the socially desirable applicant resulted in a drop in participants' own self-esteem while encountering the socially undesirable applicant resulted in a rise in self-esteem, regardless of whether participants believed they were competing with the applicant for the same job or not (Morse & Gergen, 1970). These results indicate that self-esteem may be dependent on environmental factors such as other people who may act as a model for comparison. It might be the case that the opposite is also true; that the way we view our environment may be a product of our own feelings toward ourselves.

When an individual receives negative feedback from others, which may be the case with individuals with low self-esteem, they tend to rate others more negatively than those who receive positive feedback from others. In an experiment conducted by Steiner (1968), participants made self-evaluations on character traits and then rated the average person on the same traits. Participants were then presented with bogus evaluations that were either more favorable or less favorable than the evaluations they gave themselves. Participants then re-rated the average person that they were asked to rate prior to the bogus feedback they were given. Researchers found that those given lowered (more negative) feedback projected their self-evaluations onto the average person more than those

given raised feedback. This indicates that the way that others view us may have an effect on the judgments that we make regarding others.

In a study by Baldwin and Wesley (1996), participants' mortality was primed and their self-esteem was measured, while likability ratings for positive and negative targets (individuals) in three scenarios were measured. It was found that when participants were in the control condition (not primed with mortality), low self-esteem participants gave lower likability ratings overall compared to high self-esteem participants. When primed with mortality salience, high self-esteem participants made more polarized or extreme judgments towards positive and negative targets compared to low self-esteem participants. This suggests that in normal conditions, low self-esteem participants may judge individuals more negatively than those with high self-esteem.

Mood and Judgments

Our emotional state or mood may influence perceptions that we have about ourselves. Detweiler-Bedell, Detweiler-Bedell, and Salovey (2006) examined the influence of framing and mood on the subsequent judgments participants made on their personal success. Participants were asked to complete an object identification task followed by an autobiographical mood-induction procedure in which they were asked to recall either a happy event in their life or a sad event (to induce a happy or sad mood, respectively). They were then asked to complete a questionnaire that either asked about their performance on the identification task compared to other participants (self-focused framing) or how they believed others had performed on the task without thinking about their own

performance (other-focused framing). Results indicated that those in a positive mood experienced greater perceptions of personal success compared to those in a negative mood when in the self-focused framing condition. On the other hand, when asked to only think about how others responded (other-focused framing) mood had no effect on participants' judgments. This suggests that in a positive mood, comparing oneself to others can result in more positive judgments towards the self.

In a multiple-part study, Forgas, Bower, and Krantz (1984) observed the effect of mood on judgments made regarding the recall of individuals' own social behavior and the social behavior of others. In this experiment, participants were placed in different conditions of interactions for an interview with a partner (another participant) and the interviewer (the researcher). The formality of the interview setting and the intimacy of the interaction were manipulated and the interview was video-recorded. Participants were later asked to think about a positive or negative experience from their past in order to induce a positive or negative mood. After the mood-induction was completed, participants watched the playback of the interview and were asked to make judgments and rate the interview in terms of their own behavior as well as their partner's behavior. Results indicated that more positive than negative actions were interpreted when individuals were in a positive mood, regardless of the level of formality or intimacy of the interaction. Participants in a positive mood interpreted more positive actions and fewer negative actions in their partner, while the opposite was true for those in a negative mood. When in a negative mood, more negative

actions of others were identified, however, this effect was greater for interpretations of the self (Forgas et al., 1984). This suggests that being in a negative mood has a greater effect on the way we view ourselves than it does on the way we view others, such that we may be harder on ourselves than others.

Bilderbeck, Atkinson, Geddes, Goodwin, and Harmer (2017) examined the effect of mood on judgments of facial expressions with participants diagnosed with Bipolar disorder. Bipolar disorder is a mood disorder that is characterized by manic or hypomanic episodes (in which the individual may experience elation and increased energy) and depressive episodes (in which the individual experiences an extremely negative mood state; American Psychiatric Association, 2013). The researchers found that individuals with Bipolar disorder who scored higher on a depression inventory (with greater symptoms of depression) were less accurate at identifying happy facial expressions than those who scored lower on the inventory, while participants with greater instability of manic symptoms were faster at correctly responding to fearful, sad and angry faces (with shorter reaction times). This indicates that extreme moods in the form of depression and mania, which are related to negative and positive mood states, have an effect on judgments made regarding facial expressions (Bilderbeck et al., 2017).

Forgas and Bower (1987) also examined how mood influences judgments of others. In their experiment, mood was manipulated such that participants were either in a happy or sad mood state. Participants were then presented with a description of different characters, or unknown individuals with different attributes and physical characteristics. Participants were asked to rate each

character on traits such as how likable, intelligent, and happy they believed the character to be. Results indicated that participants in the happy mood made more positive judgments about the characters than those in the negative mood (Forgas & Bower, 1987).

Together, this research suggests that we may be driven by our emotions, as they guide our perceptions and may eventually influence the decisions we make regarding others.

Mood and Self-Esteem on Judgments

Self-esteem can influence one's mood state. Those with high self-esteem tend to be in more positive mood states compared to those with low self-esteem (Wessman & Ricks, 1966). Previous research also suggests that low self-esteem individuals are more likely to experience symptoms of depression (for example, negative mood states; Tennen & Herzberger, 1987; Beck, 1967) than those with higher self-esteem.

Previous research has examined the effects of both self-esteem and mood together on judgments of situations and self-evaluations. In a study conducted by Brown and Mankowski (1993), participants' self-esteem was examined and mood was manipulated to see if mood and self-esteem played a role in self-evaluations. Using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale, participants were categorized into either high or low self-esteem conditions and randomly assigned to a positive, negative, or neutral mood condition. Participants were then asked to rate themselves on certain traits considered positive (e.g., kind) or negative (e.g. foolish). Results indicated that low and high self-esteem participants did not differ in their self-

evaluations in the positive mood condition and only differed slightly in the neutral mood condition, with low self-esteem participants responding slightly more modestly than high self-esteem participants. However, in the negative mood condition, low self-esteem participants showed significantly lower self-evaluations than high self-esteem participants (Brown et al., 1993). This suggests that self-esteem and mood interact when evaluations are made, such that being in a positive mood may result in positive judgments when one's self-esteem is low.

Similarly, Sanna, Turley-Ames, and Meier (1999) examined the self-esteem and mood of participants and their subsequent counterfactual thoughts about hypothetical scenarios. High self-esteem and low self-esteem participants were placed in a positive or negative mood condition and were asked to read scenarios about certain situations. Participants were then instructed to list counterfactuals (i.e., different factors they believed would have made the hypothetical situation better (upward counterfactual) or worse (downward counterfactual)). Participants with high self-esteem displayed more downward counterfactuals than upward, while participants with low self-esteem displayed more upward counterfactuals than downward. In other words, individuals with high self-esteem generated more items about what could have happened to make the hypothetical situation worse (as opposed to better) while those with low self-esteem generated more items about what could have happened to make the situation better. Both high and low self-esteem participants in the positive mood condition generated more downward counterfactuals than upward counterfactuals, however in the negative mood condition, low self-esteem participants generated

more upward than downward counterfactuals while high self-esteem participants generated more downward than upward counterfactuals (Sanna et al., 1999). This suggests that an individual's mood state may have a greater effect on judgment formation than one's self-esteem.

Current Study

Previous research has demonstrated the effects of self-esteem and mood on judgments of the self and others, suggesting that those in a positive mood and with a higher level of self-esteem make more positive judgments than those in a negative mood and with a lower self-esteem. Despite this, only a few studies have explored the interaction between self-esteem and mood during judgment formation. The aim of this research was to examine the effects of self-esteem and current mood on the perception of others using hypothetical scenarios in which participants were asked to rate how likable, trustworthy, competent, ambitious, and enthusiastic the individual in the scenario seems. This research is important because individuals are constantly surrounded by unknown others and make decisions on who to interact with. One's internal feelings, such as mood and self-esteem, can influence the judgments that are made that may influence these interactions. Based on the literature, the following was predicted:

1) Participants with higher self-esteem will rate an unfamiliar individual as being more likable, trustworthy, competent, ambitious, and enthusiastic than those with lower self-esteem

2) Participants in a positive mood will rate individuals as being more likable, trustworthy, competent, ambitious, and enthusiastic than those in a neutral or negative mood, and finally

3) Participants who are in a negative mood but have a higher self-esteem will rate individuals higher in these traits than those in a positive mood with a lower self-esteem.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Participants

A total of 564 participants completed the experiment on Qualtrics. One hundred and thirty of the participants had to be excluded from the experiment due to an error in the way that the survey was set up, such that the mood condition of participants could not be identified during the data analyses phase. Because of this, the study needed to be set up differently on Qualtrics before more participants could be collected. Seventeen participants had to be excluded for failing to complete the survey, and 36 participants had to be excluded for incorrectly responding to the attention check. As a result, 381 participants were included in the final analysis, 75.3% self-identified as female and 24.7% identified as male. The majority of participants were between the ages of 18 and 22 years of age (84.8%). Participants were students enrolled in Psychology courses at Central Washington University and were recruited via the Sona System. The Sona System, an online bulletin board for research participant recruitment, allows researchers access to a convenience sample for laboratory and online survey research (see Appendix A for Sona description). Individuals were required to be at least 18 years of age or older, fluent in the English language, and have access to working headphones to participate. Participants were eligible to receive extra credit in their Psychology classes for participation.

Measures/Materials

Self-esteem measurement. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) was used to assess self-esteem levels and categorize individuals into the high, medium, or low self-esteem conditions. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale includes ten items with questions including “I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others” and “At times I think I am no good at all” (Rosenberg, 1965; See Appendix B). Each statement uses a 4-point Likert scale (from 0 = “Strongly Disagree” to 3 = “Strongly Agree”). Five of the items are positively oriented, while the other five items are negatively oriented. Items that are negatively oriented are reverse scored and scores are tabulated by adding up the points from each statement.

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale was chosen due to its popularity in many psychological experiments that assess self-esteem and subsequent mental health and due to its high reliability and construct validity (internal consistency of .77 to .88; Rosenberg, 1965). An alpha coefficient of .90 was found when conducting Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the scale in the current experiment. Initially, participants who scored in the 0- to 10-point range were categorized into the low self-esteem group while those in the 11- to 20-point range were categorized into the medium self-esteem group and those in the 21- to 30-point range into the high self-esteem group. However, during a review of the data it was discovered that the number of participants in the low self-esteem group was too small for the analysis compared to the medium and high self-esteem group. To combat this, a new division of self-esteem was created such that participants who

scored between 0-15 were considered for low-medium self-esteem and those that scored between 16-30 on the scale were considered for the medium-high self-esteem group. This was done because previous research suggests that individuals who score below 15 are considered to have low self-esteem, and a “normal” level of self-esteem lies within the 15-25-point range (Rosenberg, 1965).

Mood induction. Mood was induced through the use of positive, negative, and neutral film clips. The use of film clips has been shown to be highly effective in eliciting both positive and negative moods (Westermann, Spies, Stahl, & Hesse, 1996). Participants were randomly assigned to one of the three mood conditions (i.e., positive, negative, or neutral). Film clip selections for the three mood conditions included a clip of the café scene from *When Harry Met Sally* (i.e., positive mood condition), a screensaver of abstract shapes (i.e., neutral mood condition), and a scene from *Bambi* in which a mother deer dies (i.e., negative mood condition). These film clips have been used in a previous experiment that demonstrated the effectiveness of each film clip in eliciting the desired mood, with the *When Harry Met Sally* clip eliciting a mean rating of 5.54 (on a 0 to 8 scale) for the target mood of amusement and a 93.1 hit rate, and the *Bambi* clip eliciting a mean rating of 5.35 for the target mood of sadness and a 76.4 hit rate. The hit rate in this study refers to the percentage of subjects that indicated they had felt the target emotion at least one point more intensely than any of the other nontarget emotions. The neutral mood clip did not have a mean target rating or hit rate (Gross & Levenson, 1995; See Appendix C).

Text-based scenarios. Participants were presented with two vignettes or stories that described an individual in an ambiguous scenario. The text-based scenarios were used in a previous study involving participants' judgments on themselves and their peers (Savitsky, Epley, & Gilovich, 2001) and were modified to fit the current experiment such that the vignette framed the individual in a neutral light. For the first text scenario, the sentence "they had accidentally placed a library book in their backpack and forgot to check it out" was omitted in the current study to make the scenario appear more neutral. The second text scenario was written similar to how it was described in Savitsky et al. (2001)'s experiment, although it may have been worded slightly different as Savitsky et al. (2001) did not include the direct wording used in their study. (See Appendix D and E for scenario one and two).

Trait-based scenario. A trait-based scenario was included to examine how participants would judge an individual who had been described as having many different traits. This was included as another way to examine judgments, particularly those regarding personality traits of others. In the trait-based scenario, participants were presented with a trait scenario that described an individual with ten personality attributes (Anderson, 1968). Participants in Anderson's (1968) experiment were presented with a list of 555 words used to describe individuals and were asked to rate the degree of likability they perceived an individual with each attribute to be. In the current study, the five highest rated attributes and the five lowest rated attributes (rated in terms of likability) were selected (Anderson, 1968; See Appendix F). The top five attributes included; Sincere, Understanding,

Loyal, Truthful, and Intelligent, while the bottom five attributes included; Mean, Obnoxious, Greedy, Conceited, and Narrow-Minded. When selecting the highest and lowest-rated attributes from Anderson's (1968) list for the trait-based scenario, attributes that were similar to the traits used for the dependent measurement (such as trustworthy) were disregarded. Attributes were also disregarded if they were synonyms or antonyms of the top five and bottom five attributes (for example, including "sincere" meant disregarding "honest" and "insincere" for the list).

Trait measurement. After reading the two text-based scenarios and the trait-based scenario, participants rated the individuals presented in each scenario on likability, competence, trustworthiness, ambitiousness, and enthusiasm using a 5-point Likert scale (from 1 = "Very Unlikable, Very Incompetent, Very Untrustworthy, Very Unambitious, and Very Unenthusiastic" to 5 = "Very Likable, Very Competent, Very Trustworthy, Very Ambitious, and Very Enthusiastic"). These five traits chosen have been used in a previous study that measured first impression judgments made after viewing faces (Willis & Todorov, 2006).

Self-ratings. Participants were then instructed to rate themselves on the five traits of likability, competence, trustworthiness, ambitiousness, and enthusiasm on the same 5-point Likert scale that they rated the unknown individuals in each scenario on (See Appendix G).

Mood assessment. The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) was used to assess the effectiveness of the mood induction task on eliciting a

positive or negative mood. The PANAS consists of two mood scales (i.e., one for positive and one for negative mood) containing 20 items measured using a 5-point Likert scale. The PANAS has been shown to have high reliability in its measurement of mood, with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .86 - .90 for the positive scale and .84 - .87 for the negative scale (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988; See Appendix H). Cronbach alpha coefficients were conducted for both scales in the current experiment, where a coefficient of .87 for the positive scale was generated and .86 for the negative scale was generated.

Sound checks. Two sound checks were included in the study before the mood-induction video clips in order to ensure participants' sound was adequate and working properly in order for the mood-induction videos to be successful. Participants were presented with an audio of a spoken word and then asked to respond by clicking the response that pertained to the word that was presented. Participants who responded correctly to the two trials were taken to the mood-induction video. Participants who responded incorrectly to the two trials were taken to the end of the survey and were not included in the data analyses.

Attention check. In between the two text-based scenarios and the trait-scenario, participants were presented with a statement to make sure they were paying attention and responding carefully to the survey (as opposed to clicking through aimlessly). The statement asked participants "If you are reading this, please select 'Strongly Agree'". This was used to filter out participants who responded incorrectly to ensure that only those who were carefully reading and responding were being included in the data analysis.

Survey platform. Participants completed the study on Qualtrics. The survey automatically randomized the assignment of the positive, negative, and neutral mood induction.

Procedure

Participants completed the experiment online using Qualtrics. Participants were first asked demographic questions regarding their gender and age. Participants then completed the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) in which they were given a self-esteem score to later place them into a self-esteem category during data analysis. Participants' scores were withheld in order to keep them blind to the nature of the experiment. After completing the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, participants were prompted to make sure their volume was turned up to an appropriate level to be able to hear audio. They were then presented with two audio trials. In these audio trials, a word was spoken and participants were asked to indicate which word was spoken out of three possible words. If participants answered both trials incorrectly, the survey advanced to the last page where participants were thanked for their participation and the survey ended. After the audio trails, participants were randomly assigned to one of the three mood-induction conditions where they were presented with a film clip pertaining to either a positive, neutral, or negative mood. Following the mood-induction video clip, participants were instructed to read the two text-based scenarios and the trait scenario, and to rate the three unknown individuals in each of the scenarios in terms of likability, competence, trustworthiness, ambitiousness, and enthusiasm using a 5-point Likert scale. In between the two text-based scenarios

and the trait scenario, an attention check was included to make sure participants were paying attention and responding carefully. After reading and rating the subjects presented in the text-based and trait scenarios, participants were asked to rate themselves in terms of the same traits of likability, competence, trustworthiness, ambitiousness, and enthusiasm using the same 5-point Likert scale that was used for rating the individuals in the scenarios. After this, participants completed the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) to assess whether the mood-induction task was successful in producing the desired mood. To conclude the experiment, participants were debriefed on the nature and purpose of the experiment (see appendix I). In total, the experiment took participants approximately 15-33 minutes to complete.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The purpose of the current study was to examine how self-esteem and mood may influence the judgments of strangers in two text scenarios and one trait scenario. It was predicted that individuals with high self-esteem would make more overall positive judgments compared to those with low self-esteem. It was also predicted that individuals in a positive mood would make more positive judgments about others in the three scenarios compared to those in the neutral and negative mood. Finally, it was predicted that those in a negative mood with high self-esteem would make more positive judgments than those in a positive mood with low self-esteem.

Factor Analysis for Dependent Variable Traits

Since it was hypothesized that participants with high self-esteem in a positive mood would make more positive judgments overall compared to those with low self-esteem in a negative mood, a principle components factor analysis was conducted to examine whether the five dependent variable traits of likability, competence, trustworthiness, ambitiousness, and enthusiasm could be combined into one overarching dependent variable of overall positivity. A two-factor solution for all three scenarios appeared as a result of combining the five dependent variable indices. Eigen values for the first and second component made up 34.21% and 21.59% of the overall observed variability for text scenario one, 46.45% and 21.44% for text scenario two, and 36.05% and 22.32% for the trait scenario. All five indices loaded onto the first component with a value greater

than .41 for all three scenarios. Because of this, the five indices of likability, competence, trustworthiness, ambitiousness, and enthusiasm were combined into one overall component of “overall positivity” with higher scores indicating higher ratings on overall positivity.

Three analyses were conducted to examine the influence of self-esteem (low-medium vs. medium-high) and mood (positive vs. neutral vs. negative) on the judgments of overall positivity for each scenario (text scenario one, text scenario two, and trait scenario; 2 X 3 ANOVA’s) using the new variables created from the principle components analysis. A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was not conducted because the three scenarios were substantially different from each other in context.

Text Scenario One

“Imagine you are in your campus library working on a research project. When the time comes to leave, you spot someone gather up their materials and place them in their backpack. Just before reaching the exit doors, however, they pass through the security gates and trigger a loud alarm. Everyone in the area immediately turns to look at them, and the librarian shouts that they must return to the circulation desk. Several library workers are quickly dispatched to make sure they don’t exit the building.”

For the first text scenario, the main effect of mood on judgments was non-significant, $F(2, 375) = .01, p = .99 \eta_p^2 = .00$ indicating that being in a positive ($M = -.05, SD = .09$), neutral ($M = -.03, SD = .10$) or negative mood ($M = -.03, SD = .11$) did not influence the way participants rated the unknown individual in the

scenario. The main effect of self-esteem was also non-significant, $F(1, 375) = 2.07, p = .15, \eta_p^2 = .01$ indicating that participants in the low-medium self-esteem group ($M = -.12, SD = .10$) did not differ compared to those in the medium-high self-esteem group ($M = .05, SD = .06$). Finally, the interaction between self-esteem and mood was non-significant, $F(2, 375) = 1.08, p = .34, \eta_p^2 = .01$.

Text Scenario Two

“Imagine you are hosting a dinner party. One guest in particular arrived empty handed without a gift to offer you while everyone else in attendance had provided a gift. The guest did not mention the absence of a gift or the presence of gifts from other guests.”

For the second text scenario, the main effect of mood on judgments was non-significant, $F(2, 375) = .34, p = .71, \eta_p^2 = .00$ indicating that participants in a positive ($M = -.09, SD = .09$), neutral ($M = .01, SD = .10$) and negative mood ($M = .00, SD = .11$) did not differ in their judgments on the individual in the scenario. The main effect of self-esteem was also non-significant, $F(1, 375) = 1.16, p = .28, \eta_p^2 = .00$ indicating that participants in the low-medium self-esteem condition ($M = -.09, SD = .10$) did not differ from those in the medium-high self-esteem condition ($M = .03, SD = .06$). Finally, the interaction between mood and self-esteem was non-significant, $F(2, 375) = 1.85, p = .16, \eta_p^2 = .01$.

Trait Scenario

“Alex has been described as having many traits. A few of these traits are: Conceited, Greedy, Intelligent, Loyal, Mean, Narrow-Minded, Obnoxious, Sincere, Truthful, Understanding.”

For the trait scenario, the main effect of mood on judgments was non-significant, $F(2, 375) = 1.18, p = .31, \eta_p^2 = .01$, meaning that individuals in the positive mood ($M = -.12, SD = .09$) did not differ from those in the neutral ($M = .05, SD = .10$) and those in the negative ($M = -.14, SD = .10$) condition. The main effect of self-esteem, however, was significant, $F(1, 375) = 8.93, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .02$ indicating that individuals in the low-medium self-esteem condition ($M = -.24, SD = .09$) made significantly less positive judgments than those in the medium-high self-esteem condition ($M = .10, SD = .06$). The interaction between mood and self-esteem was non-significant, $F(2, 375) = 2.67, p = .07, \eta_p^2 = .01$.

Self and Other-Ratings

Although the current experiment's aim was to see how participants judged others on certain traits, it was questioned whether any similarities were present between how participants rated the individuals in the three scenarios and how they rated themselves on the same traits. Participants' self-ratings on the five dependent variable traits of likability, competence, trustworthiness, ambitiousness, and enthusiasm were compared to their ratings of others in each scenario for the same five dependent variable traits. No factor analysis was conducted for the five dependent variable traits since this was a secondary analysis and the aim was to see how participants judged themselves and others on the same personality traits. To examine these relationships, Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficients were conducted.

Results indicated that for competence, there was a significant positive correlation for the trait scenario, $r = .15, p < .01$. For trustworthiness, there was a

significant positive correlation for text scenario two, $r = .16, p < .01$. For ambitiousness, a significant negative correlation for text scenario one was found, $r = -.11, p < .05$ and a significant positive correlation for the trait scenario was found, $r = .13, p < .01$. Last, for enthusiasm, a significant positive correlation for text scenario two was found, $r = .12, p < .05$ as well as for the trait scenario, $r = .11, p < .05$ (see Table 1). The negative correlation for ambitiousness may have been due to the way individuals interpreted “ambitious”. In other words, it is possible that the word “ambitious” was seen as a negative trait, as this is often thought of as a competitive quality. These results may indicate that for some traits, individuals view others similarly to how they view themselves, although it is important to note that for the significant correlations, the relationship is small and that any significant correlations may have been due to an inflated alpha.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The aim of this experiment was to examine the role of self-esteem and mood on the perception of others in three scenarios. It was predicted that those in a positive mood would make more positive judgments than those in a negative mood, and that those with high self-esteem would make more positive judgments than those with low self-esteem. It was also predicted that those in a negative

Table 1

Table of Correlations for Self and Other Ratings

Dependent Variable Traits	Text Scenario		Trait
	One	Text Scenario Two	Scenario
1. Likability	.00	.08	.07
2. Competence	.07	.04	0.15**
3. Trustworthiness	.01	.16**	.03
4. Ambitiousness	-.11*	.01	.13**
5. Enthusiasm	.00	.12*	.11*

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

mood with high self-esteem would make more positive judgments than those in a positive mood with low self-esteem. The first hypothesis, that those in a positive mood would make more positive judgments, was not supported, as a non-

significant effect of mood was found for all three scenarios. This suggests that, in the current experiment, one's mood state does not have an effect on judgments about others, which is contrary to what previous studies have found regarding mood and judgments of the self and others (Forgas & Bower, 1987; Forgas, Bower, & Krantz, 1984). Since no significant main effect for mood was found, an additional one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to examine how participants in the three mood conditions scored on the positive scale and the negative scale of the PANAS. Results indicated no significant difference between how participants in each mood condition scored on the positive scale, $F(2, 378) = .48, p = .62$. This indicates that participants in the positive ($M = 29.74, SD = 7.36$), neutral ($M = 30.02, SD = 7.59$), and the negative mood condition ($M = 30.67, SD = 8.15$) did not differ in their scores on the positive scale of the PANAS. There was also no significant difference between how participants in each mood condition scored on the negative scale, $F(2, 378) = .49, p = .62$, indicating that those in the positive ($M = 21.77, SD = 7.61$), neutral ($M = 22.52, SD = 7.90$) and negative mood condition ($M = 21.62, SD = 7.79$) did not differ on the negative scale of the PANAS. This suggests that the mood-induction videos were unsuccessful at eliciting the desired mood state, which may explain why no main effect of mood was found.

Since the mood-induction videos were ineffective in eliciting the desired mood state, a supplementary analysis was conducted to examine participants' reported mood state from the PANAS on their judgments about others. The PANAS consists of two scales, a positive and a negative scale. Higher scores on

the positive scale indicate a greater positive mood, while higher scores on the negative scale indicate a greater negative mood. In order to examine the relationship between participants' reported mood and their judgments of others in the three scenarios, Pearson's product-moment correlations were conducted on participants' overall mood score and their judgments for each dependent variable (likability, competence, trustworthiness, ambitiousness, and enthusiasm). To gather one overall mood score from the two scales of the PANAS, participants' scores on the negative scale were reverse-scored and the mean of the two scores (the positive score and the reverse-score from the negative scale) was calculated to generate one overall mood score, with a higher score indicating a greater positive mood (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Results indicated that for likability, there was a significant positive correlation between participants' mood and their ratings for the trait scenario, $r = .12, p < .05$; for competence, a significant positive correlation was found for text scenario one, $r = .12, p < .05$; for trustworthiness, a significant positive correlation was found for the trait scenario, $r = .12, p < .05$; and for enthusiasm, a significant positive correlation was found for the trait scenario, $r = .11, p < .05$ (see Table 2). These results indicate a relationship between positive mood and ratings of others on likability, competence, trustworthiness, and enthusiasm. In other words, the greater positive mood participants were in, the higher they rated the individuals in the previous indicated scenarios on likability, competence, trustworthiness, and enthusiasm, although the relationship is small.

Table 2

Table of Correlations for Reported Positive Mood and Judgments of Others

Dependent Variable Ratings	Text Scenario		Trait
	One	Text Scenario Two	Scenario
1. Likability	0.05	0.05	0.12*
2. Competence	.12*	0.03	0.06
3. Trustworthiness	0.08	0	.12*
4. Ambitiousness	-0.04	-0.01	0.04
5. Enthusiasm	0.03	0.06	.11*

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

There was no significant main effect of self-esteem for the first and second text scenario. One possibility for this may be due to the fact that the two text scenarios were modified from Savitsky, Epley, and Gilovich (2001)'s experiment to fit the current experiment. The first text scenario involving the library incident was slightly reworded to appear more neutral. The sentence "they had accidentally placed a library book in their backpack and forgot to check it out" was omitted. The second text scenario, the social gathering faux-pas that was also used in Savitsky et al. (2001)'s experiment asked participants to imagine that they

were hosting a dinner party in which one of the guests arrived empty-handed. The scenario was created based on the description in Savitsky et al. (2001)'s experiment but may have been worded slightly different, since Savitsky et al. (2001) did not include the direct wording that was used in their study. Altering the neutrality of the first text scenario and the possibility of slight wording differences in the second scenario may have resulted in scenarios that were too objective and may be why no significant effect of self-esteem was discovered for the two text scenarios.

While no significant main effect for self-esteem was found for the first and second text scenario, there was a significant main effect of self-esteem for the trait scenario. Individuals with higher self-esteem rated the individual in the trait scenario significantly more positively than those with lower self-esteem. This finding indicates that one's self-esteem may influence the way perceptions are made about others in the environment. Previous research supports this idea, as Sanna, Turley-Ames, and Meier (1999) found that participants with low self-esteem in a negative mood formulated more upward counterfactuals regarding situations, or a "glass half-empty" perspective (i.e., things that could have made the situation better), while those with high self-esteem in a negative mood generated more downward counterfactuals (i.e., things that could have made the situation worse). This indicates that when one is in a negative mood, self-esteem can act as a moderator in judging situations.

The last hypothesis, that participants in a negative mood with high self-esteem would make more positive judgments than those in a positive mood with

low self-esteem, was not supported. All three of the scenarios resulted in a non-significant interaction between self-esteem and mood. Interestingly enough, previous research has suggested that self-esteem may influence one's mood (Wessman & Ricks, 1966), which may explain why no interaction was found. In other words, it may be the case that individuals with high self-esteem were already in a positive mood because of their high self-esteem, and that the mood manipulation was not successful in eliciting opposing mood states. In order to examine whether this was the case, a supplementary Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to examine the effects of self-esteem (low-medium vs. medium-high) on the reported mood states for the positive scale and negative scale of the PANAS. Using Pillai's trace, there was a significant effect of self-esteem on scores for both the positive and negative scale of the PANAS, $V = 0.25$, $F(2, 378) = 61.95$, $p < .01$. Separate univariate ANOVAs indicated that there was a significant effect of self-esteem on scores for the positive scale of the PANAS, $F(1, 379) = 70.03$, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .16$ indicating that those in the medium-high self-esteem group had significantly higher scores on the positive scale ($M = 32.13$, $SD = 6.93$) than those in the low-medium self-esteem group ($M = 25.52$, $SD = 7.39$). There was also a significant effect of self-esteem on scores for the negative scale of the PANAS, $F(1, 379) = 35.55$, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$ indicating that those in the low-medium self-esteem condition scored higher on the negative scale ($M = 25.43$, $SD = 8.42$) than those in the medium-high self-esteem condition ($M = 20.49$, $SD = 6.96$). This finding is consistent with previous research that

suggests a relationship between low self-esteem and negative mood states (Wessman & Ricks, 1966).

Although it was not a part of the experiment's primary analysis, Pearson's product-moment correlations were computed to see if there was a relationship between how participants rated others on overall positivity and their self-ratings. There were significant correlations between how participants rated themselves and how they rated the other individuals for some of the scenarios for competence, trustworthiness, ambitiousness, and enthusiasm. This indicates that self-evaluations may be similar to evaluations of others. It is interesting, however, that there was a negative correlation for ambitiousness on text scenario one, indicating that individuals who rated the individual as more ambitious rated themselves as less ambitious. One explanation for this could be due to how "ambitiousness" was interpreted, such that it may have been viewed as a negative trait instead of a positive trait, as ambitiousness may be associated with competitiveness. It is important to note, however, that participants were asked to rate themselves on the five dependent variable traits after they had already rated the individuals in the three scenarios, and this was not counterbalanced. Because of this, it is possible that a priming effect occurred such that participants were thinking about the five traits before being asked to rate themselves and this could have affected the ratings participants gave themselves.

Limitations and Future Research

While efforts were made to reduce potential threats to validity, some issues became apparent that may have influenced the non-significant results that

were found. To begin, since many analyses were conducted with an alpha level of .05, it is possible that a familywise error rate occurred. In other words, any significant results that were found may have been due to the inflated alpha, resulting in a Type 1 error, or a false positive.

Additionally, when sample sizes are unequal in each experimental condition, this influences the power needed to find significant results and may make any results that were found difficult to generalize to the population as a whole (Vanhove, 2015). Even after changing the self-esteem groups from three to two in order to accommodate for the small number of low self-esteem participants, the resulting two self-esteem conditions still had unequal numbers of participants. Since participants' self-esteem was not manipulated and randomized, but was instead measured, there was a larger number of participants in the medium-high self-esteem group ($N = 266$) than in the low-medium self-esteem group ($N = 115$). One explanation for this could be due to the convenience sample that was collected. Participants were collected through the Central Washington University Sona System, which means that only students enrolled in Psychology classes at Central Washington University participated in the experiment. This may be why such a small number of low self-esteem participants were found, as the sample mainly consisted of 18-22-year old college students and self-esteem has been found to be higher for those who have a higher socio-economic status and higher education level (i.e., college students; Rosenberg & Pearlin, 1978; Baker, Beer, & Beer, 1991). Future research should include a larger sample that is a closer representation to the population as a whole. Instead of taking a convenience

sample, a stratified random sample with greater variability in age, socio-economic status, and education level could be collected to counteract any convenience effects that may have occurred as a result of using the university's Sona System for participant recruitment.

Next, it is possible that the mood induction videos did not elicit the desired mood that they were intended to. Previous research indicates that mood induction clips are generally effective for eliciting desired mood states (Westermann, Spies, Stahl, & Hesse, 1996), however, the video clips used in the current experiment may have been ineffective in eliciting a positive or negative mood because the clips were previously used to elicit an amused and sad mood (Gross & Levenson, 1995). Although amusement is often considered a subcategory of a positive mood while sadness may be considered a subcategory of a negative mood (Shiota, Neufeld, Danvers, Osborne, Sng, & Yee, 2014), it is possible that using a video clip pertaining to a "happy" mood may have been more effective at eliciting a positive mood than the "amused" video clip that was used in the current experiment. Likewise, it is possible that the video clip used to elicit sadness was ineffective in eliciting a negative mood, and a different clip pertaining to a different form of a negative mood (e.g., anger, disgust) would have been more effective in eliciting a negative mood. It is also possible that the mood-induction videos were ineffective because the videos used were taken from an experiment conducted over twenty years ago. The mood-induction videos may not have been as effective as they had previously been when they were used in 1995.

Similarly, it is possible that the mood-induction videos were unsuccessful because the study was conducted online. Participants could have completed the study on a computer or mobile device from any location, and this lack of control over where and when participants completed the study could have influenced the non-significant effect of mood that was found. Although the study's instruction page on the Sona System indicated that headphones were required and two audio checks were included to filter out participants who were unable to hear the audio, it is possible that participants turned the sound off once they got to the mood-induction videos, or that they were in a noisy environment while completing the study.

Another issue in the experiment could have resulted from the trait scenario. Participants read about an individual with ten attributes (five positive and five negative) and were then instructed to rate the individual in terms of the five dependent variable traits of likability, competence, trustworthiness, ambitiousness, and enthusiasm. It is possible that reading about an individual with certain attributes in a scenario and then rating the individual on traits may have confused participants. Rating a set of attributes with different traits could have been difficult for participants due to the extreme similarities between the attributes and the traits. For example, one of the positive attributes of the individual in the scenario was "truthful" while one of the dependent variable traits that participants rated the individual on was "trustworthy". These two words, although technically different, are extremely similar in context, and may go hand in hand with each other. On the other hand, the individual in the trait scenario was

also given negative attributes such as “greedy” and “mean”. These attributes could have resulted in the individual being perceived as non-trustworthy, even though they were also given the attribute of “truthful”. This could have puzzled participants on how to respond to the scenario. Future research should focus on different ways to examine judgments that do not involve rating an individual on very similar domains, which was the case with the current experiment.

Finally, participants were making judgments by rating unknown individuals in vignettes and it is possible that any judgments made do not translate to the real world. In other words, it is possible that the use of the vignettes to determine participants’ judgments about individuals is not applicable to how judgments are made in real life situations. Although vignettes, or short narratives involving a hypothetical situation, are popular in qualitative research to assess beliefs and attitudes, there may be an incongruence in the way that participants respond to the vignette and the way they would respond to a similar situation happening in front of them (Hughes, 1998). Since participants have time to read over the vignette and are not being faced with the situation in their real life, participants may be disconnected from the situation in the vignette, which may result in more favorable or unfavorable ratings. Despite this, vignettes have their advantages in psychological research and should not be entirely dismissed as invalid, as previous research has shown that responses to vignettes are similar to responses to the same real-life situations when the vignettes are believable and relevant to the participants that are responding to them (Hughes, 1998). In the current experiment, the vignettes were chosen so that participants were likely to

have encountered the situation or could see themselves being involved in the situation (one vignette involved being in a library and the other involved a social gathering). The vignettes were also designed to be ambiguous to allow participants' mood and self-esteem to play a role in the interpretation of the event. Even so, future research could simulate different situations in a lab setting with confederates to see how judgments are made during in-person interactions.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This study examined the effects of self-esteem and mood on the perception of unknown others, or strangers. Results from the experiment may suggest that the way individuals feel about themselves, or their self-esteem, may have an impact during judgment formation. Future research should expand upon this area of social psychology, since individuals are constantly being exposed to different types of people and situations, and perceptions can influence the decisions one makes about whether to engage with a situation or an individual. If one's feelings toward themselves can be increased, then this may open up new windows of opportunity when engaging with others.

REFERENCES

- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Anderson, N. (1968). Likableness ratings of 555 personality-trait words. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 9(3), 272-279.
- Baker, K., Beer, J., & Beer, J. (1991). Self-esteem, alcoholism, sensation seeking, GPA, and differential aptitude test scores of high school students in an honor society. *Psychological Reports*, 69, 1147-1150.
- Baldwin, M., & Wesley, R. (1996). Effects of existential anxiety and self-esteem on the perception of others. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 18(1), 75-95.
- Beck, A. (1967). *Depression: clinical, experimental, and theoretical aspects*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Bilderbeck, A., Atkinson, L., Geddes, J., Goodwin, G., & Harmer, C. (2017). The effects of medication and current mood upon facial emotion recognition: Findings from a large bipolar disorder cohort study. *Journal of Psychopharmacology*, 31(3), 320-326.
- Brown, J., & Mankowski, T. (1993). Self-esteem, mood, and self-evaluation: Changes in mood and the way you see you. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64(3), 421-430.
- Cho, J., & Knowles, E. (2012). I'm like you and you're like me: Social projection and self-stereotyping both help explain self-other correspondence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(3), 444-456.

- Detweiler-Bedell, B., Detweiler-Bedell, J., & Salovey, P. (2006). Mood-congruent perceptions of success depend on self-other framing. *Cognition and Emotion*, 20(2), 196-216.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison process. *Human Relations*, 7, 117-140.
- Forgas, J., & Bower, G. (1987). Mood effects on person-perception judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(1), 53-60.
- Forgas, J., Bower, G., & Krantz, S. (1984). The influence of mood on perceptions of social interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 20, 497-513.
- Gross, J., & Levenson, R. (1995). Emotion elicitation using films. *Cognition and Emotion*, 9(1), 87-108.
- Hughes, R. (1998). Considering the vignette technique and its application to a study of drug injecting and HIV risk and safer behaviour. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 20(3), 381-400.
- Morse, S., & Gergen, K. (1970). Social comparison, self-consistency, and the concept of self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 16, 148-156.
- Rogers, C. (1951). *Client-centered therapy*. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale* [Measurement Instrument]. Retrieved from <https://www.wwnorton.com/college/psych/psychsci/media/rosenberg.htm>
- Rosenberg, M., & Pearlman, L. (1978). Social class and self-esteem among children and adults. *American Journal of Sociology*, 84, 53-57.

- Ross, L., Greene, D., & House, P. (1977). The “false consensus effect”: An egocentric bias in social perception and attribution processes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 15*, 279-301.
- Sanna, L., Turley-Ames, K., & Meier, S. (1999). Mood, self-esteem, and simulated alternatives: Thought-provoking affective influences on counterfactual direction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*(4), 543-558.
- Savitsky, K., Epley, N., & Gilovich, T. (2001). Do others judge us as harshly as we think? Overestimating the impact of our failures, shortcomings, and mishaps. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*(1), 44-56.
- Shavelson, R., Hubner, J., & Stanton, G. (1976). Self-concept: Validation of construct interpretations. *Review of Educational Research, 46*(3), 407-441.
- Shiota, M., Neufeld, S., Danvers, A., Osborne, E., Sng, O., & Yee, C. (2014). Positive emotion differentiation: A functional approach. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 8*(3), 104-117.
- Steiner, I. (1968). Reactions to adverse and favorable evaluations of one’s self. *Journal of Personality, 36*, 553-563.
- Tennen, H., & Herzberger, S. (1987). Depression, self-esteem, and the absence of self-protected attributional biases. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(1), 72-80.
- Trzesnieski, K., Donnellan, M. & Robins, R. (2003). Stability of self-esteem across the life span. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(1), 205-220.

- Vanhove, J. (2015, November 2). Causes and consequences of unequal sample sizes. [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://janhove.github.io/design/2015/11/02/unequal-sample-sized>
- Watson, D., Clark, L., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Psychology, 54*(6), 1063-1070.
- Wessman, A., & Ricks, D. (1966). *Mood and personality*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- Westermann, R., Spies, K., Stahl, G., & Hesse, F. (1996). Relative effectiveness and validity of mood induction procedures: A meta-analysis. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 26*, 557-580.
- Willis, J., & Todorov, A. (2006). First impressions: Making up your mind after a 100-ms exposure to a face. *Psychological Science, 17*(7), 592-598.
- Wolff, F., Helm, F., Zimmermann, F., Nagy, G., & Möller, J. (2018). On the effects of social, temporal, and dimensional comparisons on academic self-concept. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 110*(7), 1005-1025.

Appendix A: Sona Description

This study's aim is to examine questions regarding the self, others, and mood. Individuals who are 18 years or older with sufficient hearing and vision may participate. Individuals must have access to working headphones in order to participate and must complete the study on a computer (no mobile devices). Participants will be asked questions regarding their mood, as well as how they feel about themselves and others. Participants will also be asked to provide demographic information. This study should take approximately 20-40 minutes to complete.

Informed Consent

Welcome!

Purpose of the study:

The purpose of this study is to examine self-esteem, mood, and the perception of others. This research is being done to learn more about how judgments are made regarding others.

Directions:

This survey will take approximately 20-40 minutes to complete. You will be eligible to earn 2 points on the SONA system for this survey. You will be asked to respond to questions regarding your age and gender. You will then be asked to answer questions regarding views you have about yourself, your mood, and views you have about others. You will also be asked to watch a short video clip.

You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study.

What are the risks or discomforts of the study?

Possible risks or discomforts associated with this study may be; fatigue, boredom, the sensation of having been asked some questions repeatedly, and emotional discomfort or sadness that may result from watching an unpleasant video clip. Please be sure to allow approximately 20-40 minutes to take this survey.

Are there benefits to being in the study?

There are no known benefits to the participant resulting from this research.

What are your options if you do not want to be in the study?

You do not have to join this study. If you do not join, it will not affect your grade in any class or any of your privileges as a CWU student.

If you do not want to continue the survey, please mark the "I do not agree" box below.

Will you be given extra credit in your class if you join this study?

If you agree to participate in this study you will earn 2 credit points via the SONA system. Some

instructors give extra credit to students who take part in a study. If your instructor has allowed you to earn extra credit by participating in research, your extra credit points will be posted to the SONA system and are emailed to your professor at the end of the quarter in which the extra credit is earned.

Can you leave the study early?

You can agree to be in the study now and change your mind later. Leaving this study early will not affect your standing at CWU in any way. However, if you decide to leave the study after you have answered some of the survey questions, the questions you have already answered will be used in this study.

What information about you will be kept private, and what information may be given out?

Your IP (Internet Protocol) address will be recorded in order to prevent participants from taking this survey more than once. Your name will not be recorded for this survey. The SONA system will award points but your instructors will not be informed of the specific studies in which you participated. Only members of the research team will have access to the data generated by this survey. Your age and gender will not be linked to your personal information (Name, IP address). The information obtained from this study may be used in future research. However, just as with this study, your personal information (Name, IP address) will not be linked to your responses in this survey. **To protect your privacy when using a public computer, please clear the cache (history) then close the browser before leaving the computer.**

What is the Human Subjects Review Council (HSRC) and how does it protect you?

This study has been reviewed and approved by the CWU Human Subjects Review Council. You may contact the HSRC if you have questions about your rights as a participant or if you think you have not been treated fairly. The HSRC office number is (509) 963-3115.

What should you do if you have questions about the study?

Email the principal investigator, Sydney Wirkkala, at Sydney.Wirkkala@cwu.edu. This contact information will be repeated at the end of this survey.

Reasonable and appropriate safeguards have been used in the creation of the web-based survey to maximize the confidentiality and security of your responses; however, when using information technology, it is never possible to guarantee complete privacy.

If you agree to participate in this Assessment, please mark the "I agree to participate" box below.

- I agree to participate
- I do not agree to participate

Appendix B: Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement.

I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

I am able to do things as well as most other people.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

I take a positive attitude toward myself.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

I wish I could have more respect for myself.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

I certainly feel useless at times.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

At times I think I am no good at all.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Appendix C: Mood Induction Film Clips

Positive Mood: *Katz's Delicatessen* – in “*When Harry Met Sally*”.

YouTube. Length: 2.53 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F-bsf2x-aeE>

Neutral Mood: *More Bubbles*. YouTube. Length: 2.05

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Uwf1m-9rHeY&t=35s>

Negative Mood: *Bambi's Mom Dies*. YouTube. Length: 2.15

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-eHr-9_6hCg

Appendix D: Text Scenario One

You will now be presented with some hypothetical scenarios and personality characteristics. Please read each carefully. You will be asked some questions regarding the scenarios and characteristics.

Text Scenario One:

Please read the following scenario:

Imagine you are in your campus library working on a research project. When the time comes to leave, you spot someone gather up their materials and place them in their backpack. Just before reaching the exit doors, however, they pass through the security gates and trigger a loud alarm. Everyone in the area immediately turns to look at them, and the librarian shouts that they must return to the circulation desk. Several library workers are quickly dispatched to make sure they don't exit the building

Do you view the individual in the scenario as...

- Very Incompetent
- Slightly Incompetent
- Neither Incompetent nor Competent
- Slightly Competent
- Very Competent

Do you view the individual in the scenario as...

- Very Unlikable
- Slightly Unlikable
- Neither Unlikable nor Likable
- Slightly Likable
- Very Likable

Do you view the individual in the scenario as...

- Very Unenthusiastic
- Slightly Unenthusiastic
- Neither Unenthusiastic nor Enthusiastic
- Slightly Enthusiastic
- Very Enthusiastic

Do you view the individual in the scenario as...

- Very Untrustworthy
- Slightly Untrustworthy
- Neither Untrustworthy nor Trustworthy
- Slightly Trustworthy
- Very Trustworthy

Do you view the individual in the scenario as...

- Very Unambitious
- Slightly Unambitious
- Neither Unambitious nor Ambitious
- Slightly Ambitious
- Very Ambitious

Appendix E: Text Scenario Two

Text Scenario Two:

Please read the following scenario:

Imagine you are hosting a dinner party. One guest in particular arrived empty handed without a gift to offer you while everyone else in attendance had provided a gift. The guest did not mention the absence of a gift or the presence of gifts from other guests.

Do you view the individual in the scenario as...

- Very Incompetent
- Slightly Incompetent
- Neither Incompetent nor Competent
- Slightly Competent
- Very Competent

Do you view the individual in the scenario as...

- Very Unlikable
- Slightly Unlikable
- Neither Unlikable nor Likable
- Slightly Likable
- Very Likable

Do you view the individual in the scenario as...

- Very Unenthusiastic
- Slightly Unenthusiastic
- Neither Unenthusiastic nor Enthusiastic
- Slightly Enthusiastic
- Very Enthusiastic

Do you view the individual in the scenario as...

- Very Untrustworthy
- Slightly Untrustworthy
- Neither Untrustworthy nor Trustworthy
- Slightly Trustworthy
- Very Trustworthy

Do you view the individual in the scenario as...

- Very Unambitious
- Slightly Unambitious
- Neither Unambitious nor Ambitious
- Slightly Ambitious
- Very Ambitious

Appendix F: Trait Scenario

Alex has been described as having many traits. A few of these traits are:

Conceited, Greedy, Intelligent, Loyal, Mean, Narrow-Minded, Obnoxious, Sincere, Truthful, Understanding.

Do you view Alex as:

- Very Incompetent
- Slightly Incompetent
- Neither Incompetent nor Competent
- Slightly Competent
- Very Competent

Alex's Traits: Conceited, Greedy, Intelligent, Loyal, Mean, Narrow-Minded, Obnoxious, Sincere, Truthful, and Understanding

Do you view Alex as:

- Very Unlikable
- Slightly Unlikable
- Neither Unlikable nor Likable
- Slightly Likable
- Very Likable

Alex's Traits: Conceited, Greedy, Intelligent, Loyal, Mean, Narrow-Minded, Obnoxious, Sincere, Truthful, and Understanding

Do you view Alex as:

- Very Unenthusiastic
- Slightly Unenthusiastic
- Neither Unenthusiastic nor Enthusiastic
- Slightly Enthusiastic
- Very Enthusiastic

Alex's Traits: Conceited, Greedy, Intelligent, Loyal, Mean, Narrow-Minded, Obnoxious, Sincere, Truthful, and Understanding

Do you view Alex as:

- Very Untrustworthy
- Slightly Untrustworthy
- Neither Untrustworthy nor Trustworthy
- Slightly Trustworthy
- Very Trustworthy

Alex's Traits: Conceited, Greedy, Intelligent, Loyal, Mean, Narrow-Minded, Obnoxious, Sincere, Truthful, and Understanding

Do you view Alex as:

- Very Unambitious
- Slightly Unambitious
- Neither Unambitious nor Ambitious
- Slightly Ambitious
- Very Ambitious

Appendix G: Self-Ratings

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following traits in terms of your own personality.

How Competent do you think you are?

- Very Incompetent
- Slightly Incompetent
- Neither Incompetent nor Competent
- Slightly Competent
- Very Competent

How Likable do you think you are?

- Very Unlikable
- Slightly Unlikable
- Neither Unlikable nor Likable
- Slightly Likable
- Very Likable

How Enthusiastic do you think you are?

- Very Unenthusiastic
- Slightly Unenthusiastic
- Neither Unenthusiastic nor Enthusiastic
- Slightly Enthusiastic

Very Enthusiastic

How Trustworthy do you think you are?

Very Untrustworthy

Slightly Untrustworthy

Neither Untrustworthy nor Trustworthy

Slightly Trustworthy

Very Trustworthy

How Ambitious do you think you are?

Very Unambitious

Slightly Unambitious

Neither Unambitious nor Ambitious

Slightly Ambitious

Very Ambitious

Appendix H: PANAS

You will be asked to complete the following scale. This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions.

Indicate to what extent you feel this way right now, that is, at the present moment OR indicate the extent you have felt this way over the past week.

	Very slightly or Not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
Interested	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Distressed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Excited	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upset	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Strong	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Guilty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Scared	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hostile	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enthusiastic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Proud	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Irritable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Alert	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ashamed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Inspired	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Nervous	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Determined

Attentive

Jittery

Active

Afraid

Appendix I: Debriefing Statement

Thank you for participating in this experiment. In this experiment, you were asked questions regarding your feelings about yourself, as well as your emotional state. You were then instructed to watch a short video clip pertaining to either a positive, negative, or neutral mood and to read text-based and trait scenarios and rate the individuals presented in the scenarios in terms of likability, competency, ambitiousness, trustworthiness, and enthusiasm. The purpose of this study was to examine how self-esteem and mood may influence the way individuals make judgments about unknown individuals.

Due to the ongoing nature of this experiment, it is asked that you keep any details about the study confidential and don't reveal any information about the study to anyone, including those currently participating or who may participate in the future. These details could influence the performance of future participants and affect the nature of the study.

If you have further questions regarding the experiment or your rights as a research participant, please contact Sydney Wirkkala at Sydney.Wirkkala@cwu.edu. If you experienced any emotional discomfort as a result of this experiment and would like professional assistance, please call the CWU Student Counseling Clinic at (509) 963-391.