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Abstract

Misrepresentation is a concern across many social contexts such as in job interviews, courtroom cases, courting romantic partners or in learning situations. Though thousands of studies have been conducted on misrepresentation, many difficulties continue to arise. Amongst the problematic issues regarding the study of misrepresentation is knowing definitively when it is in fact occurring; where the truth is unknown or unclear.

We have developed a shortened version of a vocabulary overclaiming task that reliably reveals the tendency of people to misrepresent their personal knowledge overclaiming The “word knowledge task” (WKT) was used in a series of studies to assess overclaiming as a misrepresentation of personal knowledge, its conceptual nature and factors that may influence the tendency to overclaim.

In study 1, a vocabulary list was generated to challenge the knowledge of 248 participants. Panel selected vocabulary words were presented one at a time while participants indicated whether they “knew or used” each of the words by giving a “yes” or “no” response. Following the presented list of vocabulary words, a surprise definition task was administered to determine overclaimingthe accuracy of their claims. Overclaiming was defined as missing or bogus definitions to words individuals had claimed to know. This procedure produced reliable measures of overclaiming in over 90 percent of all participants. Forty-five participants were assessed for the potential relationship between overclaiming and social desirability responding. We hypothesized that individuals with a higher tendency toward social desirability would produce more overclaiming but the relationship between SDRS and overclaiming was not significant.

In study 1, participants were asked if they “knew or used” each presented word. Consequently, study 2 examined the possibility that the results were affected by instructional ambiguity. In addition, study 2 determined if overclaiming was related to self-esteem or influenced by social norms. To examine instruction ambiguity, participants were given two word knowledge tasks. First, individuals were asked, as in study one, yes or no, if they “knew or used” each word Participants were then administered the Rosenberg Self-esteem scale, followed by a second set of words where the participant was asked, “yes” or “no”, if they could “define or provide a synonym for each word in WKT-2. They were then given a surprise definition task for both sets of words. The results from study 2 indicated a significant effect for instruction, overclaiming scores increased when participants were specifically asked if they could “define” the listed words. Increased overclaiming with more explicit instructions reduces the likelihood that overclaiming was purely the result of misunderstanding instructions or misestimating one’s knowledge. Study 2 also examined the role of social norms on overclaiming. Participants in a high norm condition were told that most college students know 75 percent of the words, while participants in the low norm condition were told that college students know only 25 percent of the words. Participants in the high norm condition had significantly higher overclaiming scores. The observation that overclaiming scores change with social norm manipulations may suggest that overclaiming reflects misrepresentation. On the other hand, the relationship between overclaiming and self-esteem scores was not significant.

Study 3 examined the effects of ego threat on overclaiming.  Participants were administered two word knowledge tasks before and after they were given false feedback on an intellectual test intended to induce ego threat. Participants who received poor performance feedback had increased overclaiming scores compared to control participants. This result suggests that overclaiming may be a coping mechanism to deal with ego threats, provides further support that overclaiming is about misrepresentation rather than misunderstanding or over estimation of personal knowledge. Study 3 also assessed the relationship of overclaiming to narcissism and Big5 personality attributes. The neuroticism subscale of the big5 inventory was significantly related to overclaiming, otherwise there were no other significant correlations. Future studies should attempt to determine personality factors and other predictors of overclaiming.

Effects of anxiety

Misestimation/overconfidence of word knowledge? ( automatic processing?)

Does overclaiming reflect impression management/faking or intentional misrepresentation
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Individuals may misrepresent themselves or behave deceptively for a variety of reasons; whether it be to avoid punishment, manipulate others, help others, maintain self-esteem, or portray themselves in a desirable manner refs. Some people misrepresent to influence or impact others, some to protect themselves, and others to promote themselves (Morris, Sperry, Levine, Debey, Serota, n.d.).

Individuals encounter misrepresentations every day in the form of jokes, white lies, financial scams, politics, and more.. Some misrepresentation may be unbeknownst to the self and be self-deception refs. (Abe, 2011). Intentional misrepresentation is Lying, and lying is a common occurrence. On average people will lie once out of every five times they interact with another person (DePaulo, Kashy, Kirkendol, Wyer, & Epstein, 1996). In a study of everyday lies it was found that college students told an average of two lies per day, while other community members told an average of one lie per day (Depaulo, Kashy, Kirkendol, & Wyer, 1996).

White lies are another type of deceptive behavior, described as small acts of purposeful deceit, usually with the intention of presenting yourself in a more favorable manner to another person (Griffith, Lee, Peterson, & Zickar, 2011). White lies are common in new relationships, including romantic attachments, friendships, and professional correspondence, as they are often utilized when trying to make a good first impression (Griffith et al., 2011). Griffith and colleagues (2017) found that the personal traits of self-monitoring, self-esteem, narcissism, impulsivity, integrity, and locus of control factored into the number of white lies, or “overclaiming” behavior, that a person portrayed.

Overclaiming, occurs when a person misrepresents or misestimates their personal knowledge (Dunlop et al., 2017). The measure of overclaiming has been mostly a concern for personality inventory and job application assessments and has been interpreted as a measure of self-enhancement bias (Paulhus). While overclaiming on personality tests continues to be a serious concern. According to Rosse et al. (1998), overclaiming on personality assessment as part of the selection process has a significant effect on hiring decisions. Many job applicants engage in overclaiming or deceptive impression management during job interviews (Carlson et al., 2011). Overclaiming may be used to put a better light on a situation, to justify an action, to reassure others, or for our self-protection (Indvik & Johnson, 2009). Employees may overclaiming "to avoid embarrassment, project a more favorable image, increase social desirability" (Burgoon et al., 1996), relieve stress at work, out of greed, or to evade work. (Carlson et al., 2011). Research has indicated that overclaiming occurs in up to 30% to 50% of cases involving actual job applicants (Griffith, Chmielowski, & Yoshita, 2007). Yet, the overclaiming game seems to exist across the spectrum of human behaviors. Refs?

Yet the nature of overclaiming may be less clear than imagined. For example, misrepresentation ( faking or lying) mislearning, misunderstanding, misestimation of knowledge, confusion with feelings of knowing, confidence or certainty.

The present study used a modification of the vocabulary overclaiming task to study “overclaiming” across a series of four studies. In preliminary assessments our shortened version of the VOC task produced highly reliable outcomes.

STUDY 1

The objective of study 1 was to assess the reliability of the our modified VOT(which we refer to as the “word-knowledge task” (WKT)) , as a measure of deceptive misrepresentation (overclaiming). We also hypothesized that participants with higher levels of socially desirability responding (Ref) would answer more deceptively on the WKT because social dersirability responding often leads to deceptive misrepresention/self-enhancement of oneself (Mortel, 2008).

Individuals with narcissistic characteristics also tend to self enhance (e.g., protect or increase positive self-esteem; Leary, 2007). Researchers suggest that individuals with narcissistic traits tend to over report positive characteristics in line with egotistic values while underreporting psychopathology or other negative characteristics (Campbell et al., 2002). Thus, we attempted to determine the relationship between narcissism and overclaiming. We observed narcissistic tendencies (NPQ) in a subset of participants as they related to overclaiming. We hypothesized that individuals who displayed higher narcissistic qualities would have higher overclaiming scores.

**Method**

**Participants**

Two hundred and fourty-eight participants (137 females, 111 males) were included in the initial assessment.  The mean age of participants was 25.4 with a standard deviation of 10.5. Participants were randomly selected from various locations in Wilmington, North Carolina: including the University of North Carolina Wilmington (UNCW) campus, downtown Wilmington, and local malls. Socioeconomic status, race, religious affiliation, and education level were not considered in the process of participant selection. To assure anonymity, the participants were asked to provide a code name. A subset of participants (N = 213) were also assessed for narcissism (NPQ scale (Raskin & Terry, 1988), and a second subset of participants (N = 45) were assessed for social desirability responding using SDRS (Marlowe & Crowne, 1960).

**Materials**

 **The “Word Knowledge Task.”** A word knowledge task (WKT) was administered to assess overclaiming of word knowledge. The WKT involved a list of 21 panel selected vocabulary words that were intended to challenge the vocabulary skills of college students. It was important that these words were sufficiently difficult, otherwise overclaiming would not occur, yet we wanted to avoid words that were overly challenging so that people would not be likely to identify the purpose of the task. The WKT included two portions. The first portion (WKT-Yes/no) involved “yes or no” responses, while the second portion (WKT-test) required participants to write definitions or synonyms. The first word presented was “Plagiarize” because we assumed almost all participants would know this word, thus reducing demand characteristics for the task.

**Narcissistic Personality Questionnaire (NPQ).** The NPQ is based upon the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) developed by Raskin and Hall in 1979 (Raskin & Terry, 1988).  The NPQ consisted of 40 pairs of statements.  Each pair consisted of one statement that reflected narcissistic tendencies.  The NPQ was administered as an assessment of “self-knowledge” and participants were instructed to choose the statement that best aligned with their view of themselves.

|  |
| --- |
| Table 1*List of words used for the word knowledge task.*1. Plagiarize2. Caveat3. Inept4. Serendipity5. Transient6. Enigma7. Pugnacious8. Coalesce9. Facetious10.  Intrepid11.  Bigotry12.  Somnolent13.  Accolade14. Euphemism15.  Levity16.  Mundane17.  Egregious18.  Obfuscate19.  Flagrant20.  Plethora21. Autophobia |

**Social Desirability Response Scale(SDRS)**

The SDRS (Marlowe & Crowne, 1960) was used to determine if social desirability was significantly related to one’s tendency to overclaiming knowledge. The SDRS assessment consisted of 33 true or false questions that indicated participants’ tendency to respond in a manner viewed as socially palatable. Examples of these questions include: “no matter who I’m talking to, I’m always a good listener,” and “I never resent being asked to return a favor”.

**Procedure**

Participants were randomly selected by researchers across various locations in Wilmington, NC region. Researchers approached individuals and introduced themselves as psychology students studying “self-knowledge”. Individuals were told the assessment would take about 10 minutes. After agreeing to engage in the self-knowledge assessment, the participants were asked to create a code name to ensure anonymity and provide their age and gender at the top of each assessment.

Words on the WKT were read aloud one at a time and the participant was asked, “ to indicate if they knew or used the following word. Participants “yes or no responses were recorded on the WKT-yes/no response sheets

One subset of Participants were then administered the SDRS (n=45) and a different subset was administered the NPQ (n=213). The WKT-test then provided participants a chance to prove their knowledge of the previously listed words by providing brief definitions or synonyms. Participants were instructed that “there was no need to guess” on the WKT-test to help insure that bogus responses were indeed acts of overclaiming.

**Results**

The participants' word knowledge overclaiming was scored for each word on a one or two point scale. If, If the participant replied “yes” to knowledge of a word, but did not provide any definition or synonym one (overclaiming) point was awarded . If the participant had indicated “yes” they knew the word yet produced a clearly bogus definition, they were given two (overclaiming) points. Points were totaled to produce a "overclaiming score". If one responded by saying “no” they did not know the word, no points were assigned for a correct or incorrect definition. The total possible overclaiming score was 40 points. Three people declined to participate and another two were excluded due to incomplete responses.

The mean total overclaiming score was 10.93 with a standard deviation of 5.86 (see Figure 1). The mean overclaiming score for the participants who were women was 10.33 with a standard deviation of 5.30. For men, the mean overclaiming score was 11.50 with a standard deviation of 6.41 Overclaiming score did not differ significantly across gender.



Figure 1 shows the relatively normal distribution of overclaiming scores. The lowest overclaiming score was 0 (n=6/2.4%), The highest overclaiming score was 27 (n=1), the median score was 8.0 (n=25 ) and the modal overclaiming score was 5 (n= 29) The mean number of correctly defined words was 12.392, Std=4.096)

The SDRS assessment measured levels of one’s tendency to respond in ways that are assumed to be socially desirable (Marlowe & Crowne, 1960). Standardized scoring was used to determine whether responses, either “true” or “false”, leaned towards the spectrum of social desirability. One point was given to participants who responded with the socially desirable response. The maximum possible SDRS score was 33. The mean score for SDRS was 14.57 with a standard deviation 4.85. SDRS did not differ across gender. For women, the mean SDRS score was 13.85 with a standard deviation of 4.95. The mean SDRS score for men was 15.23 with a standard deviation of 4.78.

 A simple regression was used to assess the relationship to overclaiming score and SDRS but results were not significant. Another simple regression was used to assess the relationship between overclaiming to score on the NPQ. The results were not significant.

**Discussion**

1. WKT produces reliable results. Not different between gender, small std, the vast majority everyone overclaimingd? We may need to assess overclaiming by number of unknown words.because if all words are known then there is little room for overclaiming
2. Produces a relatively normal distribution
3. refs. We anticipate a logical relationship between narcissism, social desr , and other personality characteristics. Yet these factors were not significantly related to overclaiming.? Why NOT? We will continue in our studies to seek other personality factors that may predict overclaiming. For example, individuals with fragile self-esteem may engage in self-enhancement tactics as a way to defend against a threat to their self worth. (Griffith, 2011).

.

Overall, study 1 clearly identifies the WKT was a reliable measure of overclaiming in over 90% of participants and the distribution of overclaiming scores exhibited a normal distribution suggesting that overclaiming is a ubiquitous phenomenon in this task. Narcissism and SDRS were not significantly correlated with overclaiming scores, which differs from interpretations described by Paulhus et al., 2003; Ziegler et al., 2013; who suggest that overclaiming is a form of self-enhancement. We also did not observe gender differences in these results which conflicts with “male hubris” effects described by others (see Furnham, Hosoe, & Tang, 2002).

The identification of personality characteristics that predict overclaiming scores continues to be of interest. Therefore in our second study we measured the potential relationship of overclaiming to self-esteem (ref).

**STUDY 2**

It is possible that overclaiming scores in study 1 were partially the result of vague or ambiguous instructions. The instructions asked participants if they “Knew or used” each word. This may have created a sense of knowing that was unanchored to actual knowledge and thus precipitated greater overclaiming on the WKT-test. Studies on the effects of verbal instruction clearly suggest such a possibility (eg.. Taylor, Meisinger, and Floyd, 2016).

Therefore, in study 2, two word knowledge tasks were administered each with different instructions. Researchers randomly assigned which word list each participant received first, however, the first list was always paired with the standard instructions used in study 1, to indicate if participants “knew or used” the words. The second word list was always paired with more explicit instructions: “could you provide a brief definition or synonym?” for each word presented.. We expected participants to have reduced overclaiming scores for words when given the more explicit instructions.

Study 2 also examined the effects of norm conditions (high or low) on tendencies to overclaiming word knowledge.

research on conformity and social

influence commonly assumes that in regard to attitudes

and opinions, people seek similarity and conformity rather

than distinctiveness (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004; Marks,

1984). Individuals align their opinion with the opinion of

others with respect to different judgments, including

abstract art (Tafarodi, Kang, & Milne, 2002), different

social issues (Wood, Pool, Leck, & Purvis, 1996), and even

lines’ length (Asch, 1951).

Norms distinguish a variety of behaviors that are socially appropriate or inappropriate given the situation

e.g., Brown,

1986, 2012; Dunning, Meyerowitz, & Holzberg, 1989),.

Of course, the domain of prejudice is not the only domain in which people see themselves

more favourably than they see others. A wide body of research on the better-than-average

effect (Alicke, 1985; Brown, 1986) suggests that most people believe that they are better

than the average others on a wide variety of traits including interpersonal skills,

competence, morality, intelligence, and imagination (Brown, 1986, 2012; Dunning,

Heath, & Suls, 2004). Moreover, research on unrealistic comparative optimism suggests

that most people think that they are more likely to experience positive outcomes and less

likely to experience negative outcomes than are others (see Shepperd, Klein, Waters, &

Weinstein, 2013 for a recent review)
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Since social norms establish “good” and “bad” behaviors/responses, anticipation of negative evaluations may influence individuals to behave deceptively or otherwise misrepresent themselves (Levine & Anders, 2000). We predicted that conformity to social norms would play a role in participants overclaiming knowledge. The logic in this prediction was that when introduced to a high normative standard, participants would overclaiming more knowledge to appear compatible with this social norm

.

Study 2 also examined the potential correlation between overclaiming and self-esteem. Studies have found that people with high self-competence (which entails high levels of self-esteem) are less likely to engage in self-deceptive enhancement (Mar et al., 2006). Therefore we reasoned that participants with low levels of self-esteem would engage in more overclaiming than participants with greater levels of self-esteem. (Mar, DeYoung, Higgins, & Peterson, 2006).

**Method**

**Participants**

Fifty participants (29 females and 21 males) were randomly selected from various locations in Wilmington, North Carolina. Twenty-three participants were assigned to a high norm condition, while 27 participants were assigned to a low norm condition. Socioeconomic status, race, religious affiliation, and education level were not considered in the process of participant selection.

**Materials**

Participants were administered two versions of the WKT in order to examine the influence of different instructions on overclaiming. The WKT-1 and the WKT-2 (see Table 2) were identical in principle to the task described in study 1, but consisted of different words that had been selected based on the same criteria as was used in the selection of WKT-1 words.

**Table 2.** Words administered in the WKT-2

|  |
| --- |
| Word Knowledge Task 2 |
| Plagiarize | Somnolent |
| Caveat | Accolade |
| Inept | Euphemism |
| Serendipity | Levity |
| Transient | Mundane |
| Enigma | Egregious |
| Pugnacious | Obfuscate |
| Coalesce | Flagrant |
| Facetious | Plethora |
| Intrepid | Autophobia |
| Bigotry |  |

The SES assessment ref consisted of 10 likert type items with instructions to indicate how strongly the participant agreed or disagreed with the listed statements. The items all reflected concepts of self-esteem and each statement included four answer choices (strongly agree = SA, agree = A, disagree = D, and strongly disagree = SD) that best represented participants’ general feelings about themselves.

**Procedure**

Participants were blind to their random assignment to a high norm condition or a low norm condition. The participants in the high norm condition were told that on average most people knew 75% of the words on our word lists, while the participants in the low norm condition were lead to believe that on average college students knew only 25% of the words. It was expected that if social norms played a role in overclaiming then participants in the high norm condition would have higher overclaiming scores.

Study two also examined the possibility that overclaiming scores might be the result of instructional ambiguity. Therefore while the first set of words in the word knowledge task asked participants to identify if they did or did not *know or use* each word, for the second set of words, participants were explicitly asked (yes or no) whether they could *define or provide a synonym for each of*  the presented words.

Following WKT-1, participants were given the SES, followed by WKT-2 and then the word knowledge task “test” where they were asked to give a brief definition or synonym for both WKT-1 and WKT-2 lists of words. Participants were instructed that there was no need to guess on this portion of the task. Two separate “overclaiming scores” were established for the change of instructions between the first list and the second list.

**Results**

Overclaiming was scored as described for study 1. The mean overclaiming score for the WKT-1 words with the “know/use” instructions, (“overclaiming 1”), was 6.76 with a standard deviation of 5.63. The second list of words with the “definition/synonym” instructions, (“overclaiming 2”), produced an average overclaiming score of 7.46 with a standard deviation of 4.61.. It was determined that changing instructions had a significant effect on overclaiming (f (1, 47) = 5.08, p= 0.03) in that overclaiming scores increased when given more explicit instructions in WKT-2. (Figure 2) .

 To determine the effect of norm and instruction conditions across overclaiming score 1 and 2, a mixed design ANOVA was used. Participants in the high norm condition overclaimingd significantly more than participants in the low norm condition (F=) However, there was also a significant interaction, such that the effect of norm only occurred for overclaiming score 1 (f (1, 47) = 5.08, p= 0.02) but not overclaiming score 2 (f (1, 46)= 4.26,



p= 0.46).



Figure 2…..

The mean SES score was 32.51 points with a standard deviation of 5.68. The mean SES score for females was 31.79 with a standard deviation of 5.31, and male participants mean SES score was 33.48 with a standard deviation of 6.15. The mean SES score for participants assigned to the high norm condition compared to participants in the low norm condition group had a mean SES score and standard deviations that were not significantly different. Potential gender differences across both overclaiming score 1 and overclaiming score 2 were assessed with unpaired t-tests. It was determined that there were not no significant differences .

A simple regression was used to assess the relationship of self-esteem scores to overclaiming scores. The results indicated there was not a significant relationship between SES scores and overclaiming score 1 or overclaiming score 2

**Discussion**

The results from study 2 indicated that participants actually overclaimingd more on the second word knowledge task when they were given more explicit instructions. The observation that overclaiming scores were not reduced with more explicit instructions suggests that overclaiming was not a result of instructional ambiguity. However, we did not anticipate that overclaiming score would significantly increase at test two. It is possible that this increase in overclaiming scores could be the result of ego depletion (Baumeister, 1998). Ego-depletion studies suggest that utilization of self-control has an energy cost and depletes cognitive resources. When making decisions, responding actively and engaging in self-control we rely on this limited resource that may be temporarily depleted” (Baumeister et al, 2000) In the state of ego-depletion, executive cognitive processes may function less optimally and rely on passive, automatic processes such as routines, rituals, over generalizations and stereotyping (Baumeister et al, 2000). Thus, in this context, the results of Study 2 suggest that overclaiming may at least in some instances be an automatic process. Automaticity of overclaiming responses are consistent with Holtgraves (YEAR) who found that social desirability responding is likely to be automatic, and Hsu et al. Year who reported quicker responses when overclaiming ? than when responding truthfully. (Holden, Fekken, and Jackson,1985) Given this information, participants’ engagement across the span of our procedures may have led them to respond more automatically in WKT 2 than in WKT 1. If overclaiming is an automatic response then this could explain the increase in overclaiming from test 1 to test 2.

Study 2 demonstrated that social norms had a significant effect on overclaiming scores. Participants in the high norm conditions had significantly higher overclaiming scores than participants in the low norm condition. Info on influence of norms?

An alternative explanation for “overclaiming” in the WKT is that participants have simply mislearned word knowledge. Consequently when asked to define words they unintentionally provide incorrect responses. This would be logically different from overclaiming in the sense we are inferring. However, the influence of norms in study 2 suggests that misrepresentation and not mislearning/misunderstanding is the most parsimonious interpretation of “overclaiming scores.” Though mislearning may certainly play a role in such results, it is difficult to explain why mislearning or misunderstanding of knowledge should be influenced by the social norm manipulation in this study.

We are interested in determining other psychological attributes that will predict the tendency to overclaiming. However, we failed to find a meaningful relationship between self-esteem and overclaiming in study 2. Literature on Overclaiming and self-esteem?

An overall desire to feel happy, the desire to maintain or

enhance self-esteem, defined as ‘‘confidence and satisfaction about

oneself’’, and a reduction in anxiety about the uncertainty

associated with future life outcomes, all result in self-positivity

bias [1]. An important feature of self-positivity bias is that people

tend to evaluate themselves more positively than third-party

observers do [2]. In fact, people judge the self as more positive (or

less negative) than they do others on a range of dimensions, such as

social skills, achievement, or health [2]. This self-positivity-bias has

been termed as ‘‘better-than-average’’ effect when traits are

concerned [3]. Self-esteem has been linked to a general self-enhancement bias

derived from self-ratings of traits representing the Five Factor

Model (FFM) [8]. High self-esteem has been found to be related

positively to perceiving the self as better than average on both

communal and agentic traits [9]. The tendency for individuals to

evaluate the self in more favorable terms than they evaluated

people in general was particularly pronounced among those with

high self-esteem [10].

 Likewise, study 1 failed to reveal relationships between overclaiming and narcissism or social desirability scores. Study 3 attempted to identify the effects of ego-threat (ref) on overclaiming, and additionally examined the relationship of overclaiming to“the Big 5” personality attributes.

STUDY 3

 When ego is threatened, there is an inclination for defensive reaction refs vulnerable

and sensitive to ego threats—any event that calls into question

one’s positive self-image (vanDellen, Campbell, Hoyle, &

Bradfield, 2011). As a result, narcissistic individuals utilize various

self-regulatory strategies, both intrapersonal and interpersonal,

in order to neutralize such threatening information

(Campbell & Foster, 2007; Hepper, Gramzow, & Sedikides,

2010;Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001).

. Therefore, the hypothesis of study 3 was that ego threat would increase deception in the form of overclaiming word knowledge. Study 3 used false feedback on an intellectual quiz and social comparisons to produce high or low ego threat. .

Study 3 also attempted to determine the relationship between the tendency to overclaiming and big 5 personality traits

Personality is often understood in terms of the five-factor model of personality

traits (McCrae & John, 1992). Neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness,

openness, and conscientiousness are known as the Big Five. Personality

traits linked with emotional expressivity, such as extraversion and openness,

are of particular interest when exploring possible explanations for individual

differences in the left cheek bias. Extraversion is a largely interpersonal dimension,

referring to the quantity and intensity of preferred interactions, the need

for stimulation, and the capacity for joy (Widiger & Costa, 2013). People high in

trait extraversion are often described as cheerful, enthusiastic, optimistic, sociable,

and warm (McCrae & John, 1992). Critically, extraverted people also tend

to be facially and gesturally expressive, with positive emotionality a core component

of the trait (McCrae & John, 1992). As trait extraversion is concerned

with warm interpersonal interactions and social exchanges that are high in

emotionality, people high in trait extraversion are likely to have more experience

with, and thus exhibit greater sensitivity to, facial expressions of

emotion. Research is consistent: trait extraversion correlates highly with

emotional intelligence and emotion perception ability (Ciarrochi, Chan, &

Caputi, 2000; Siegling, Furnham, & Petrides, 2015). Thus, one may anticipate

that people higher in trait extraversion may be more likely to show a left

cheek bias for emotion perception.

A second personality variable linked with emotional expressivity is openness.

Openness involves the active pursuit and appreciation of new experiences

(Widiger & Costa, 2013), with open people described as being

creative, having intellectual interests, differentiated emotions, and unconventional

values (McCrae & John, 1992). Importantly for the present investigation,

higher levels of trait openness are associated with higher levels of emotional

intelligence (Day & Carroll, 2004; Lopes, Salovey, & Straus, 2003; Siegling et al.,

2015). People higher in trait openness thus show greater sensitivity for, and

attention to, emotional cues (Fiori & Antonakis, 2012), and greater accuracy

in identifying facial expressions (Matsumoto et al., 2000). As people high in

trait openness have greater sensitivity to the expression of emotion, they

may be more likely to exhibit a left cheek preference for emotion perception.

Though the majority of people offer the left cheek to express emotion (e.g.,

Nicholls et al., 1999; Nicholls, Clode, et al., 2002) and perceive left cheek poses

as more emotionally expressive (e.g., Harris & Lindell, 2011; Nicholls,
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Wolfgang, et al., 2002), explanation for the significant minority who do not

exhibit the left cheek bias is needed. Given the greater emotional sensitivity

associated with personality traits including extraversion and openness, the

present study was designed to determine whether the Big Five personality

traits predict individual differences in the left cheek bias. We measured

male and female participants’ Big Five personality traits using the NEO-Five

Factor Personality Inventory (NEO-FFI) (Costa & McCrae, 1992),

. Highly conscientious individuals are described as accountable and observant of rules ([Costa & McCrae, 1989](http://web.a.ebscohost.com.liblink.uncw.edu/ehost/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=2f2f54ee-cc72-4ed2-9742-bec4f6373a4b%2540sessionmgr4006&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%253d%253d" \l "c7)). Therefore, conscientious individuals should be more prone to honesty and less inclined to overclaiming (McFarland and Ryan, 2000). Study 3 sought to determine the relationship between conscientiousness and the WKT performance using the big-5 personality assessment (REF). what about other Big 5 factors?

 Openness, extroversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, …how could these relate to overclaiming?

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants consisted of 3 males and 20 females (*n* = 23). The mean age was 23.5, (std=4.6). The sample was comprised of junior and senior level University of North Carolina Wilmington (UNCW) psychology students who received class credit for participation in a study of “self-knowledge and perceptions.”.

**Materials**

**Confederates.** Fourteen confederates, students from the research team itself, acted as participants to help create ego threat conditions.

**Self-rated student performance pretest.** Because our ego threat procedures might not have any influence on people with low expectations of their abilities, a pretest survey was constructed to determine how the participants would self-rate their academic performance as a psychology major. Participants were instructed to circle one of the five answer choices.  Choice A stated, “I am an 'A' student in psychology,” choice B stated, “I am a 'B' student in psychology,” and so on.

**Word knowledge task 1 (WKT-1).** The WKT-1 was identical to that described for study 1,

**Ego Threat/Intelectual quiz.**The research team compiled a list of 10 questions that were derived from psychology knowledge.  There were two different forms of this psychology quiz: a hard quiz and an easy quiz.  The hard quiz was given in the high threat condition to induce ego threat. It consisted of questions that were very difficult and/or questions with no right answer.  The easy quiz was given to participants in the low threat condition. Provide examples or table

**Big Five Personality Inventory. (Ref)** The Big Five Personality Inventory (Big-5) was given to all participants.  It defines five dimensions: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience.  Costa and McCrae 1980’s (Rammstedt & John, 2007).   The Big-5 is a likert-type ten question survey, Statements such as “……” are presented and  participants were instructed to circle the response that best reflected a description of their personality, where 1 = disagree strongly and 5 = agree strongly..

**The Word knowledge task 2 (WTK-2).** The WKT-2 survey was identical to that described for Study 2.

 **Word knowledge task: Definitions (WKT-D).** The WKT-D was identical to that of studies 1 and 2.

**Procedure**

Participants were first administered a pretest assessment that instructed them indicate their current student grade average as a psychology major. The pretest was intended to help identify individual differences that could potentially affect our ego threat procedure. A primary researcher then introduced the WKT-1 and began presenting each word from the WKT-1, as described in study 1.

The participants then received the “intellectual quiz” and were given 5 minutes to complete them ( see Table XX). While research assistants appeared to be scoring the psychology quizzes, the participants completed the Big 5 personality assessment. Participants’ scores from the intellectual quizzes were then collectively projected on a projection screen by code name for all to see. In the high threat condition, participants would be presented with scores that ranged from 50-60 percent correct, along with confederate scores that were substantially higher. In the low threat condition participants scores ranged from 80-90% , while confederates received substantially lower scores.

Participants were instructed to find their code name from the score list, and to write the score they saw on the top of their subsequent yes/no WKT-2 response forms. This helped insure that they noticed their low scores. After seeing their scores, another slide was shown to suggest a low or high academic performance level associated with their scores (see Table 3). The difficult quiz and the presentation of the poor results on the intellectual quiz were collectively meant to produce ego threat.

After participants saw their scores on the psychology knowledge quiz, the WKT-2 was administered. Participants were given the same instructions as for the WKT-1.

The last task completed was the WKT-D.  Participants were instructed to define or provide a synonym all 42 words from WKT-1 and WKT-2, as described for study 2

A debriefing session then concluded each test session. Participants were asked to share any special knowledge they may have had about this study, and were asked to guess at the purpose of the study.  Participants debriefed and given contact information if they wished to follow up on the results of this study.

**Results**

A repeated measures ANOVA was used to assess the effectiveness of ego threat condition on changes from overclaiming score 1 to overclaiming score 2, (Overclaiming score 1: *M* = 7.3, *SD* = 4.1; Overclaiming score 2: *M* = 8.0, *SD* = 5.2). There was a significant main effect of threat condition (F = 8.6, DF = 1, 21, p = 0.008), and there was a significant interaction such that people in the low threat condition decreased scores from overclaiming score 1 to overclaiming score 2.  People in the high threat condition increased from overclaiming score 1 to overclaiming score 2 (F = 8.1, DF = 1, 21, p = 0.009).



There are five individual scores associated with the Big-5 survey that correspond to….. A simple regression was run on overclaiming score 1, overclaiming score 2, , and each factor measured by the Big 5.  None of these assessments were significant except for the relationship between overclaiming score 2 and the Big 5 neuroticism trait (r= 0.426, F = 4.66, DF = 1, 21, p = 0.043).

There were 9 people who reported as an A student, 13 people reported as a B student, and 1 person reported as a C student.  This one person who reported being a “C” student was in the high threat condition, and their score went up more dramatically (overclaiming score 1: 11 to overclaiming score 2: 22).

A potential concern in these results was that participant knowledge of the words selected for WKT-2 were fundamentally different than words in WKT-1. Several factors associated with the differences in word lists might influence overclaiming. Certainly, correctly knowing a greater number of words would diminish any tendency to overclaiming. Likewise, the tendency to overclaiming might be diminished if a participant was more honest at the onset; word knowledge claiming (yes/no) portion of the task and expressed knowledge for a smaller number of words. To determine if there may have been a fundamental difference of correct knowledge or of claimed knowledge on WKT-1 vs WKT-2 a repeated measures ANOVA was used that assessed potential differences in the numbers of both correctly defined words and the number of claimed words.



**Discussion**

The research team studied the effect of ego threat on deception, while considering the Big-5. It was predicted that participants in a high ego threat condition would have an increase in overclaiming change score, measured from WKT-1 and WKT-2 surveys.  The hypothesis was supported; high ego threat increased overclaiming score change.  There was a significant interaction between condition and overclaiming score change, suggesting that not only does a high ego threat increase overclaiming, but also that ego affirmation decreases overclaiming. BIG % neuroticism literature point this out in results too.

Neuroticism is typically defined as the tendency to experience

frequent and intense negative emotions in response to various

sources of stress. While the emotions considered within the purview

of this trait include the range of negative affect (e.g., fear,

irritability, anger, and sadness), the greatest focus has been on the

experience of anxious and depressive mood. The perception that

the world is a dangerous and threatening place also accompanies

this exaggerated negative emotionality, along with beliefs about

one’s lack of agency to handle challenging events. Manifestations

of this trait may include heightened focus on criticism, either

self-generated or from others, as confirming a general sense of

inadequacy and perceptions of lack of control over salient events

(Barlow, 2002; Barlow, Sauer-Zavala, Carl, Bullis, & Ellard,

2014; Clark & Watson, 2008; Eysenck, 1947; Goldberg, 1993).

More important, these interacting vulnerabilities

were originally described as part of an etiological model

for trait anxiety and emotional disorders more generally (Barlow,

2000, 2002), suggesting that a neurotic temperament may be a

necessary component for the development of a range of psychological

conditions. In fact, all the temporal covariance among the

*Diagnostic and Statistical Manual for Mental Disorders* (*DSM*;

American Psychiatric Association, 2013) constructs of depression

and several anxiety disorders can be accounted for by neuroticism

(Brown, 2007).

In fact, a number of longitudinal studies

have controlled for the periodic occurrence of anxious or depressive

symptoms and still found neuroticism to act independently in

predicting anxiety and mood (Lahey, 2009; Spijker, de Graaf,

Oldehinkel, Nolen, & Ormel, 2007).

It is possible that ego threat manipulation produced its effect by increasing social anxiety. Additionally, the link between neuroticism and anxiety refs informed study 4 which attempted to examine the effects of anxiety on overclaiming.

Study 4

Studies have shown that undergraduate college students who lie frequently are likely to have higher anxiety levels than their peers (Chiu, Hong, & Chiu, 2016). People who are socially anxious may lack the self-confidence needed to tell the truth about their beliefs and feelings (Kashy & DePaulo, 1996). It was found that those who have high anxiety told lies mostly to make themselves appear better than what the truth would reveal to boost self-esteem (Chiu, Hong, & Chiu, 2016). Research conducted by Ennis, Vrij, and Chance (2008) sought to study how anxiety, specifically attachment anxiety, affects the frequency of lying to both strangers and close friends. Those who have attachment anxiety are preoccupied with intimacy, are dependent on others, and have an intense fear that they will be abandoned by those who are close to them (Ennis, Vrij & Chance, 2008). Ennis, Vrij and Chance (2008) predicted that there would be a positive correlation between those with attachment anxiety and lying, so that highly anxious people will present themselves in the best light Although lying to strangers, close friends, and romantic partners all held their own, unique patterns of deception all were affected by anxiety (Ennis et al., 2008).

In a recent study 71.4% of college student participants had low to medium scores on the Social Anxiety Spectrum Self-Report questionnaire (Dell’Osso et al., 2016), and 63% of college students report a fear of public speaking alone (Ferreira Marinho, Medeiros, Gama, & Caldas Teixeira, 2017).

Eysenck, Derakshan, Santos, and Calvo (2007) state that anxiety is an aversive motivational and emotional state of being that occurs in threatening situations. State anxiety, more specifically, is defined as the level of currently experienced anxiety, and is produced by an interaction of a person’s trait anxiety, and their circumstantial stress (Eysenck et al., 2007). Studies have found that high anxiety is one psychological characteristic correlated with higher levels of daily lying behavior (Chiu 2016).

 The purpose of study 4 was to determine if anxiety has an effect on ”overclaiming” as measured by the WKT.

**Participants and Setting**

 Participants were recruited for this study through the UNCW participant recruitment tool for class credit. The study was advertised as a study of self-knowledge and self-perception. A total of 25 students participated in this study; 14 of which were randomly assigned to the experimental or anxiety group and 11 of which were randomly assigned to the control group. The group consisted of 9 males and 16 females; the mean age was 20.200 (*SD* = 3.055) and ranged from 18 to 33 years old.

**Measures**

The Word Knowledge Tasks (WKT-1 and WKT-2) as described for study 2 and 3 were used in this study as a measure of deceptive behavior.

 The State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI; Spielberger, Gorsuch, Lushene, Vagg, & Jacobs, 1983) is a measure to test both state and trait anxiety in a person. This measure includes 40 statements to which participants respond on a 4 point Likert scale of agreement ranging from “Not at all” to “Very much so.” Higher STAI scores reflect a person in a more anxious state, while lower scores show less anxiety.

**Procedure**

The first task completed by participants was the yes/no portion of the WKT 1. Participants were then exposed to an anxiety or control manipulation.

The anxiety condition involved a composite of procedures intended to induce a mild anxiety state ( Gerrards-Hess, Spies and Hesse, 1994). Participants were first required to rate their concern for each of ten common sources of anxiety on a 7 point scale (where 1 was no concern and 7 was extreme concern). These topics included spiders, small places, snakes, drowning, vomiting, clowns, germs, public speaking, loneliness, needles, and falling. (see Lane and Gullone, 1999). Participants then chose one of their most highly rated items and were given five minutes to read an associated article relating to the chosen topic ( see Table XX). The articles were all of similar length and were all accompanied by a salient image intended to help induce anxiety. Participants were then provided another five minutes to write a summary of half a page to a full page of the article. By implied suggestion Participants in the experimental condition were also given the notion that they may have to present their summary to a research panel ( though this did not happen).

The control condition involved a similar procedure, however, the topics presented were about “common interests” instead of ”concerns”, and they were instructed to rate the items in terms of interest rather than concern, and to pick the topic that they found to be of most interest. These topics included “books, work, fashion, sports, investment, romance, shopping, family, art, parties, and food.” Similar to the experimental participants, control participants then read an associated article and wrote a summary. There was no implied suggestion that their summary would be presented to anyone.

Immediately after the task, participants were given the STAI as a validity check for the anxiety induction procedure. The WKT 2 was then administered. Finally, the participants provided the WKT-D and were asked to provide a brief definition or synonym for the words that they knew as described for studies 1-3. .

Participants were debriefed and given contact information for questions.

**Results**

The difference in STAI scores across condition were evaluated using a basic ANOVA. The mean STAI score for the anxiety condition was 101.857, with a standard deviation of 18.888. The mean STAI score for the control condition was 77.364, with a standard deviation of 31.583. The ANOVA comparing STAI scores across conditions resulted in an F-Value of 5.817 (df=1, 23, p= 0.0243. There was significantly higher anxiety reported by participants in the experimental condition. The anxiety induction procedure used in the study was apparently effective in increasing anxiety levels in the experimental group ( see Figure XX).



**Figure XX.** STAI scores indicate that the anxiety induction procedure was effective.

An ANOVA was used to examine differences across condition for scores on the WKT-1. Participants in the anxiety condition had a significantly higher overclaiming score compared to the control condition prior to the anxiety manipulation( See Figure XXX F= 7.572 (df=1, 23) p=0.0114). The mean overclaiming score for the control condition was 3.909, with a standard deviation of 1.973. The mean overclaiming score for the experimental condition was 6.857, with a standard deviation of 3.085.

**Figure XX.** WKT-1 scores among anxiety and control conditions indicating preexisting overclaiming behavior before the anxiety manipulation.

An ANOVA was also used to examine overclaiming behavior across conditions in the WKT-2, after the anxiety manipulation. This ANOVA resulted in an F-Value of 18.421 and a degrees of freedom of (1, 23), with a P-value of .0003. The mean level of overclaiming behavior for the control condition was 4.545, with a standard deviation of 2.622. The mean level of overclaiming behavior for the experimental condition was 10.643, with a standard deviation of 4.088.



**Figure 3.** WKT-2 scores indicating overclaiming behavior across anxiety and control conditions after the anxiety manipulation.

A Repeated Measures ANOVA was used to analyze changes across overclaiming scores before and after the anxiety manipulation. Results indicated a significant effect of anxiety on the change of overclaimings score across WKT-1 to WKT-2 (see Figure XX F=5.817 (df= 1, 23), p=0.0243), and a significant interaction such that overclaiming change score increased only for participants in the anxiety condition *F* (1,23) = 6.858, *p* = .0153.

****

**Figure XXX.** Changes in overclaiming scores among anxiety and control conditions taken before and after the anxiety manipulation, indicating an interaction between anxiety and overclaiming behaviors.

**Gender**

An ANOVA was also conducted to see if there were any differences in gender. An ANOVA was run between gender and WKT 1, WKT 2, and STAI. For WKT 1, males had a mean score of 5.222 (*SD* = 2.898) and females had a mean score of 5.750 (*SD* = 2.490). For WKT 2, males had a mean score of 8.222 (*SD* = 6.610) and females had a mean score of 7.813 (*SD* = 3.111). On the STAI, males had a mean score of 93.111 (*SD* = 25.659), while females had a mean score of 89.938 (*SD* = 29.420). No significant differences were found.

**Discussion**

We theorized that having the participants read and report on their highest rated fears, along with the threat of public presentations, would increase anxiety. The effectiveness of this anxiety induction procedure was supported by the results fromthe STAI (Spielberger, Gorsuch, Lushene, Vagg, & Jacobs, 1983); The anxiety condition scored significantly higher on the STA-I than did the control group. It was hypothesized that the anxiety induction procedure would increase the participants overclaiming score on the WKT, while a difference would not be seen in the control group. Participants in the anxiety group scored significantly higher on both WKT 1 and WKT 2 as compared to the control group. The anxiety group did have a higher overclaiming score than the control group during WKT 1, which suggests that the anxiety group consisted of participants higher levels of anxiety before the anxiety induction procedure. However, only participants in the anxiety condition demonstrated significant increases of overclaiming between WKT 1 and WKT 2;overclaiming scores for the control group did not change. Previous correlational research has shown that undergraduate college students who have high anxiety levels lie more frequently than their peers (Chiu, Hong, & Chiu, 2016). This present study provides support for a causal connection between anxiety and lying.

Despite the moral stigma associated with lying, studies have shown that lying is common (DePaulo, Kashy, Kirkendol, Wyer, & Epstein, 1996). This present study supports the idea that lying is wide-spread in our society, as every participant engaged in some amount of overclaiming on the WKT.

 feelings of certainty,

mislearning

Dunlop and colleagues (2017) showing that overclaiming was more often used in people with more time in the formal education system, such as college students.

**General Discussion**

The WKT used in these studies was a modified version of the VOC T ( Ackerman et al, 2014) , and produced a robust and reliable assessment of deception in the form of overclaiming. Our simple assessment showed clear instances of overclaiming in participants across all studies. The WKT required participants to indicate either a yes or no response and then gave participants the opportunity to prove their response was truthful by introducing a surprise test asking participants to provide a definition of the listed words. Overclaiming instances were easily detected when participants indicated that “yes” they did know a word, but later could not provide a legitimate definition. A downside of this assessment is that sometimes bogus definitions contain information that may have been partially correct. In those cases we used a panel to determine if those definitions were truly bogus as opposed to poorly expressed knowledge.

It seems likely that the WKT can produce results with any reasonably challenging set of words. Therefore, it is easy to apply. Although overclaiming tests ( Paulhus et al) have been successful at assessing self-enhancement biases, the test involves foils that may be obvious. high IQ participants were able to distinguish real items from foils, even in topics which they expressed little interest. In contrast, the WKT has no foils, therefore less obvious potential demand characteristics. The WKT may provide robust measures of overclaiming because participants go beyond passive familiarity responses, and must provide clearly bogus responses to receive overclaiming points.

Paulhus et al. argued that overclaiming is related to impression management and narcissim. The over-claiming index correlated positively with measures of self-presentation, the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Paulhus & Goldberg, 2008; Paulhaus & Williams, 2002; Paulus et al., 2003, Tracy et al., 2009), Self-Deceptive Enhancement (Paulhus et al., 2003, Randall & Fernandes, 1991), and global self-reports of knowledge (Paulhus & Bruce1990). It seems that the overclaiming index reveals significant individual variations when all respondents are measured in the same context. However, in the present study we failed to find any signficant relationships between overclaiming and narcissism scores, social desirability scores, self-esteem scores, and Big-5 personality scores with the exception of neuroticism scores. It is possible that narcissism is only relevant when information was of personal value to participants. For example, Paulhus reported that correlations with narcissism were significant only for topics that the respondent valued (Nathanson & Paulhus, 2005). It stands to reason that people do not invest their egos in knowledge about topics that are irrelevant (or in opposition) to their identities (Ackerman, 2000). Yet, it remains unclear why narcissism was not related to overclaiming in the WKT. the associations between overclaiming bias and any kind of narcissism were smaller than in many previous studies. The narcissism-overclaiming link revisited.
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Paulhus was concerned about memory bias and the possibility of people believing they have a memory when they do not, and consequently analyzed standard measures of memory bias. Because individuals may vary in knowledge, overclaiming occurs because individuals vary in the “feeling of knowing”. It appears that for some, everything seems familiar. Results concluded that individuals with high OCT exaggeration scores also showed a *global memory bias? What does this mean exactly?.* In regression analyses, however, narcissism showed association with knowledge exaggeration after controlling for memory bias. In sum, over-claiming includes a motivational component (narcissism) and a cognitive component (memory bias).

In the current study, we were also concerned that overclaiming may, in some instances, reflect mislearning of word meanings. In this case, overclaiming would not be related to a global memory bias, but could in fact be related to poor memory function (mislearning). However, it stands to reason that if overclaiming involves mislearning of word knowledge, then the influence of social norms or ego threats should be negligible. Since overclaiming increased in the WKT, under conditions of high social norming or high ego threat, mislearning is a less likely explanation of our results.

 Study 3 found a significant relationship between neuroticism and overclaiming scores. Neuroticism is known to be heavily associated with anxiety. Is it possible that anxiety provoking situations/anxious prone individuals overclaiming more than individuals who display care-free attitudes?

-(dishonesty & trust)

Certainty

Familiarity- **Strategic and Automatic Memory Processes**

The potential familiarity-related difficulties that arise during the

correction of misinformation may be explained from a dualprocessing

perspective. Dual-process theories of memory assume a

dichotomy between automatic memory processes, which include

familiarity, and strategic memory processes such as recollection

and output monitoring (cf. Brown & Warburton, 2006; Diana,

Yonelinas, & Ranganath, 2007; Rugg & Curran, 2007; Yonelinas,

2002; Yonelinas & Jacoby, 2012; Zimmer & Ecker, 2010). Familiarity

is thought to be a fast, context-free automatic process that

allows for the rapid recognition of previously encountered information.

Recollection, by contrast, is a slower process thought to

allow for the retrieval of contextual details, such as the information’s

source, its spatiotemporal encoding context, or its veracity.

Familiarity and knowing- Connor, Balota and Neely, 1992

Confidence and overconfidence- (Dunning,

Griffin, Milojkovic, & Ross, 1990; Dunning, Heath, & Suls,

2004; Fischhoff, Slovic, & Lichtenstein, 1977; Moore & Healy,

2008; Russo & Schoemaker, 1992; Vallone, Griffin, Lin, & Ross,

1990)…. Research shows that the costs associated with overconfident

judgments are broad and substantive. Overconfidence leads to an

overabundance of risk-taking (Hayward, Shepherd, & Griffin,

2006).

Popular culture suggests that beginners are pervasively plagued

by overconfidence, and even predicts the specific time-course and

psychology underlying that overconfidence. According to the popular

“four stages of competence” model, widely discussed on the

Internet (e.g., Adams, 2017; Pateros, 2017; Wikipedia, 2017),

beginners show a great deal of error and overconfidence that

dissipates as they acquire a complex skill. At first, people are naïve

about their deficits and are best described as “unconscious incom-
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petents,” not having adequate awareness of just how unskilled they

are. In the academic literature, this would be described as the

Dunning-Kruger effect (Dunning, 2011; Kruger & Dunning,

1999), a situation in which people are so unskilled they lack the

very expertise necessary to recognize their shortcomings.

The pervasiveness of overconfidence is somewhat puzzling.

Individuals not only tend to have positive self-perceptions, they

often believe they are more talented and competent than others,

even when they are not (for reviews, see Alicke & Govorun, 2005;

Dunning, Heath, & Suls, 2004). To mention just a few examples,

individuals tend to overplace their occupational abilities (Haun,

Zeringue, Leach, & Foley, 2000), social skills (Swann & Gill,

1997), and physical talents relative to those of others (Dunning,

Meyerowitz, & Holzberg, 1989; for exceptions, see Kruger &

Burrus, 2004; Moore & Small, 2007).

People might simply be unable to accurately assess their own

competence and arrive at biased self-views from fairly mundane

judgment processes. For example, biased self-views can arise

simply because people are more likely to attend to success than

failure (Miller & Ross, 1975), because they may lack the competence

to understand their own incompetence (Kruger & Dunning,

1999), and because they may hold idiosyncratic definitions of

success or ability (Dunning et al., 1989; Santos-Pinto & Sobel,

2005).

A third possibility, which has received little empirical attention,

is that overconfidence provides the individual with *social* benefits.

A number of scholars have theorized that biased self-perceptions

may help the individual succeed socially (Alexander, 1987; Krebs

& Denton, 1997; Leary, 2007; Trivers, 1985; von Hippel & Trivers,

2011; Waldman, 1994). More specifically, these theories propose

that overly positive self-views help individuals convince

others that they are more capable than they actually are. Therefore,

this account posits overconfidence to be a motivated bias. However,

unlike previous theories, it proposes that overconfidence is

motivated by the desire for social success in addition to the desire

for psychological benefits such as higher self-esteem.

Taken as a whole, our results present a programmatic and

replicable pattern of overconfidence among beginners. That said,

we hasten to add that this work must stand as only a first comment

on the issue. There are many aspects of learning that may change

or augment the conclusions we reach here—and these aspects are

worthwhile candidates for further research.

Sanchez and Dunning, 2018

How accurate are the explanations we offer ourselves for the things we do and the choices we

make? As Moore and Haggard pointed out [1], this was a question famously tackled by Nisbett

and Wilson (1977) in their seminal article ªTelling more than we can know: Verbal reports on

mental processesº [2].

The question of the confidence–accuracy relationship

has far-reaching theoretical implications.

It places fundamental constraints on our

understanding of how metacognition works, including

whether people can directly access the

contents of their minds, or, alternatively,

whether memory strength is inferred on the

basis of usually accurate but possibly misleading

cues (Schwartz, 1994).

Kurdi, Alexander J. Diaz, Caroline A. Wilmuth, Michael C. Friedman,

and Mahzarin R. Banaji, 2018

results demonstrate that subjective confidence judgments are

made on the basis of inferential processes in the course of which spontaneous accessibility

is mistaken for memory strength.

FEELINGS OF KNOWING (FOK)

Importantly, people can often discriminate between

questions for which answers are known but are temporarily inaccessible

and questions for which answers are not known (Leonesio

& Nelson, 1990; Morson, Moulin, & Souchay, 2015). The research

on metamemory aspects of remembering has repeatedly addressed

the issue of the basis of people’s conviction that certain inaccessible

information is stored in memory—that is, their *feeling of*

*knowing*—revealing that both the feeling of familiarity elicited by

a memory question (Metcalfe, Schwartz, & Joaquim, 1993;

Schwartz & Metcalfe, 1992) and any partial, incomplete, and

sometimes even incorrect information about a sought-after target

that comes to mind in the process of retrieval (Koriat, 1993, 1995)

are relevant in this respect.

False memory

Confabulation

Self-deception

Self-awareness

Griffith et. al (2011) discusses personality correlates such as impulsivity (or reactive responding), that should be considered when identifying forms of overclaiming. It is possible that individuals who participate in reactive responding may begin a task with no intent to overclaiming, where as participants with high levels of impulsivity might react to item content but lack a logical strategy for overclaiming. Individuals with lower self-control find themselves in situations where they cannot resist such impulses to overclaiming. (Baumeister, Heatherton, & Tice, 1994). Regarding the present study, participants high in impulsivity might reflect greater occurrences of overclaiming.

Though we did not find a significant relationship between overclaiming and conscientiousness, this trait may still be a personality correlate that reflects a disposition to act vigilantly (Barrick & Mount, 1991), and the option to overclaiming is opposing to one’s true standing on the trait (Snell et al., 1999), a negative relationship between conscientiousness and overclaiming might be anticipated (Komar, Brown, Komar, & Robie, 2008).

OVERCLAIMING AS FAKING/DECEPTION

In the current study we argue that overclaiming is also a common form of deception, that often occurs in social relationships ref? For example, individuals may enhance their personal characteristics in order to attract a potential mate. Males may overclaiming by identifying themselves as accomplished and trustworthy, and females often misrepresent their physical attributes (Dussault et al., 2003). Cooper et al. (2014) determined that up to 67% of women overclaiming orgasms to alleviate feelings of anxiety, self-consciousness, and physiological abnormality (Cooper et al. 2014). (Academics)...

Most people think they are highly intuitive about when they are being deceived, when in reality, we are not very good at spotting deception signals (Lock, 2004). Moreover, cues to deception may be inconsistent and unreliable. Hundreds of laboratory studies have shown that human accuracy is slightly better than chance, as participants correctly distinguish between truths and lies only about 55 percent of the time. This success rate holds true for groups that range from students to law enforcement officers (Lock, 2004). Meissner and Kassin (2002) found that law enforcement investigators were more confident than university students in detecting deceit, but they were actually not significantly better.

In general, The differences in cues associated with deception and truth telling vary from individual to individual (Lock, 2004). A study conducted by Bond (2006?) asked more than 2,000 people from about 60 countries, "how can you tell when people are lying?" Across each diverse nation, the number one answer was the same: liars avert their gaze. This is the most prevalent stereotype about deception, yet studies have shown it is not meaningfully correlated with lying at all. Likewise, liars do not shift around in their seat or clear their throats, etc. any more than truth tellers do (Lock, 2004).  Even polygraphs may not be accurate. “Polygraph Cues” to deceit (such as increased heart rate and anxiety) may also be prevalent in truth tellers during high stake situations. If someone is being interrogated and facing potential jail time, they may be nervous even if they are innocent. (REF) Forensic applications of polygraph techniques rely primarily on the control or comparison question test (CQT) (Iacono, 2008). Yet, the CQT has been found to have a weak theoretical foundation, making it unlikely that it can be as accurate as polygraph proponents claim. CQT results cannot demonstrate evidence of either deception or truthfulness. In the absence of insight into brain mechanisms that underlie deception, it may be difficult to develop a valid lie detector (Iacono, 2008).

Another major problem in laboratory studies of deception is that there is always a chance participants are dishonest about their lies (Kashy & DePaulo, 1996). Many previous studies have simply relied on questionnaires or diaries (DePaulo et al., 1996). Though these methods have been somewhat useful, a more concrete measure of deception would be valuable. The overclaiming task ( Paulhus, Harms, Bruce, & Lysy, 2003; Ziegler, Kemper, & Rammstedt, 2013) may represent such a measure. The OCT utilizes knowledge “foils” to determine when a participant is claiming knowledge that they can not possess. The OCT produces reliable results and a significant proportion of participants claim knowledge of at least one foil (Anderson et al., 1984; Pannone, 1984; Dwight and Donovan, 2003).

However, the length of the overclaiming test and its use of “tempting foils” has been criticized by some. Claiming of foil items may depend on salience and similarity to real items. The vocabulary overclaiming task (VOT; Ackerman et al, 2004) has been used to avoid the pitfalls associated with “foils.” The VOT asks participants to indicate if the know each of 150 words and in a surprise test later asks them to provide definitions for claimed words. An overclaiming score is then developed based on word knowledge claims that are not supported by definition responses.

 A study by Garret, Lazzaro, and Sharot (2016) tested dishonestly escalation and its underlying mechanism by combining brain imaging with a behavioral task in which participants were given repeated opportunities to overclaiming. The results suggest that repeated small lies may have paved the way for larger lies over time, especially if under self-serving conditions. In other words, the brain adapts to dishonesty. Thus, it is possible that participants in study 2 overclaimingd more across overclaiming 2 (define instructions) because of adaption to overclaiming. Perhaps future studies should test for self-serving biases to predict overclaiming.

On the other hand, not all human behavior involves planful or deliberate control by the self. Recent studies have shown that a great deal of human behavior is influenced by automatic or nonconscious processes (Barg, 1994 & 1997). A concept known as ego depletion describes a temporary decrease in the self's capacity to engage in volitional action (including controlling the environment, controlling the self, making choices, and initiating action) caused by prior exercise of volition. The core idea behind ego depletion is that the self's acts of volition draw on some limited resource, resembling strength or energy, such that one act of volition will have a depleting effect on the volitions that follow and typically seem to promote greater reliance on automatic responses (Baumiester, 1998). In Study 2, overclaiming increased across overclaiming score 1 (know/use instructions), but not overclaiming score 2 (define instructions). These results were unexpected because we hypothesized that a more direct use of instruction could reveal some overclaiming instances might have been due to ambiguous instructions. However, our findings indicated contrasting results. Alternatively, the increases in overclaiming score across repetitive assessments in our study might represent the effects of ego depletion. It is possible that previous active responses in the WKT expended participants’ cognitive energy, resulting in reliance of automatic responses which may promote overclaiming. If overclaiming as a form of deception is largely an automatic response that increases with ego depletion, it suggests one reason why people may engage in deception even when they do not necessarily intend to.

* Dishonesty as the control process/elaborative lies
* Dishonesty and learning/ social costs- distrust, suspicion
* Overclaiming in academic environments- reduction in learning efficacy?

the **overclaiming** method also adds a unique element to scholastic testing, namely, a measure of knowledge self-enhancement. Paulhus, Delroy L.. University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada, dpaulhus@psych.ubc.ca
Dubois, Patrick J, 2014

Schooling without learning: Thirty years of cheating in high school. By: Schab, Fred, Adolescence, 00018449, 19911201, Vol. 26, Issue 104

A survey instrument, developed in 1968 and administered to 1,629 high school students in 1969. 1,100 students in 1979, and 1,291 students in 1989, asked them to respond to items regarding the following: (1) the amount of cheating believed going on, (2) who was most guilty, (3) reasons given for cheating, (4) the courses in which most cheating occurred, (5) how to punish cheaters and by whom, (6) beliefs regarding dishonesty in society, and (7) confessions of their own dishonest behaviors in school. Between 1969 and 1989, student responses reflected increasingly pessimistic opinions about dishonesty in school and society. Fear of failure remained the most common reason for cheating. Math and science were the courses in which cheating most often occurred.



-overclaiming was predicted to relate to various personality attributes that theoretically should lead to misrepresentation/distortion. In our study, we attempted to determine the relationship of overclaiming to : narc, SDRS, SES, etc. yet we did not find significant relationships. Why not? (Past studies have found a relationship between overclaiming and narcissism…and gender)

-distribution of our overclaiming scores… it is normal..therefore, relatedness to other variables is facilitated

-what is overclaiming related to?

- does overclaiming predict other measures of personality and behavior

Self esteem, narcissism, self-enhancement bias?

Consequently, the overconfident egoism associated

with SDE may contaminate measures of self-esteem (Baumeister

et al., 2003). This is not to say that people who score high on

SDE give falsely inflated reports of their self-esteem, but rather that

their self-esteem may be high due to overconfidence and willful

ignorance of personal shortcomings or errors.

In either case, the conflation of self-esteem and self-deception

presents a problem for research on both constructs

The bias toward assessment of self-liking in

the RSES may render Rosenberg’s (1965) scale vulnerable to

contamination with self-deception. Self-Liking and Self-Competence Separate

Self-Evaluation From Self-Deception:

Associations With Personality, Ability, and

Achievement

Raymond A. Mar and Colin G. DeYoung, 2006

Self-deception?

Self-deception is most frequently measured by the well-validated

Self-Deceptive Enhancement (SDE) subscale of the Balanced Inventory

of Desirable Responding (BIDR; Paulhus, 1991), which taps an

overconfident, egoistic variety of self-deception (Paulhus & John,

1998). This measure has been associated with a number of apparently

maladaptive behaviors, including decreased ability to accommodate

anomaly during categorization (Peterson et al., 2002) and

failure to modulate responses in the face of changing reward contingencies

(Peterson et al., 2003). It is also associated with negative

physiological and social outcomes: men high in self-deception show

markers of decreased health (Linden, Chambers, Maurice, & Lenz,

1993), and people who interact with, or observe interactions with,

self-deceivers tend to evaluate them negatively, either immediately or

over time (Bonanno, Field, Kovacevik, & Kaltman, 2002; Frenkel-

Brunswick, 1939; Paulhus, 1998; see also Robins & Paulhus, 2001).

Notably, these negative social outcomes are very similar to those

reported by Heatherton and Vohs (2000) in individuals with high

self-esteem. In the same vein, SDE, like self-esteem, has been associated

with self-enhancement (Paulhus & John, 1998) and is associated

with a similar cognitive bias away from negative self-relevant

information (Shane & Peterson, 2004). Like the RSES, SDE correlates

positively with measures of narcissism (Paulhus, 1998) and a

factor analysis of mental health measures revealed that both

self-esteem and defensive positivity (a composite variable of positive

self-distortions) load on the same factor (Compton, Smith, Cornish,

& Qualls, 1996). Not surprisingly, SDE and the RSES are

positively correlated (rs4.45; e.g., Greenwald & Farnham, 2000;

Robins, Hendin et al., 2001).

The personality correlates of SDE, by contrast, have been reported

in only a handful of studies. Self-Deceptive Enhancement typically

correlates moderately with Emotional Stability and

Conscientiousness (mean N-weighted rs across four studies5.42

and .34, respectively, [total N5964]), less powerfully with Extraversion

(mean r5.22), and weakly with Agreeableness and Openness

(mean rs5.12 and .19, respectively; Barrick & Mount, 1996;

Meston, Heiman, Trapnell, & Paulhus, 1998; Reid-Seiser & Fritzsche,

2001; Sto¨ ber, Dette, & Musch, 2002).

The personality correlates of SDE, by contrast, have been reported

in only a handful of studies. Self-Deceptive Enhancement typically

correlates moderately with Emotional Stability and

Conscientiousness (mean N-weighted rs across four studies5.42

and .34, respectively, [total N5964]), less powerfully with Extraversion

(mean r5.22), and weakly with Agreeableness and Openness

(mean rs5.12 and .19, respectively; Barrick & Mount, 1996;

Meston, Heiman, Trapnell, & Paulhus, 1998; Reid-Seiser & Fritzsche,

2001; Sto¨ ber, Dette, & Musch, 2002).

Self-Deceptive

Enhancement (SDE) subscale of the BIDR (Paulhus, 1991), which

includes items like ‘‘I am a completely rational person’’ and ‘‘I never

regret my decisions.’’ Personality was assessed with the Big Five Inventory

(BFI; John & Srivastava, 1999), a well-validated, 44-item

instrument.

-overclaiming may impede effective learning\*\*\* does learning require/relate to self honesty?

-lit. On learning effectiveness and overclaiming in the classroom?

-would WKT performance be of any predictive value for classroom/work performance.

Previous studies have indicated that deception is more likely to occur in high-stakes situations than in low-stakes situations. Sjöberg (2015) found that overclaiming varied based on the expected severity of the consequences, where high stake situations are likely associated with more overclaiming. Thus, participants may have had lower incidence of overclaiming in our low-stake situations compared to a scenario such as an important job interview. We predict that if we increased stakes, greater instances of overclaiming would be present.

Deception can even occur on a subconscious level (self-deception refs). The concept of self-deception presumes that responders aspire to maximize self-worth, retain a positive self-image, and reduce cognitive conflict, which may result from alterations between reality, self-perceptions, and social norms. (Krumpal, 2013 see also Dunning and Kruger, etc..).

\*more notes:

-how we derived words from WKT..how many…(speak to this issue again in results (see Table 1). E.g. How many words on average were correctly defined? Certainly different collections of words could produce different outcomes right? Discussion/Also any number of words?)

-derive a % that people overclaiming

Distinguishing what we know from what we do not know is not as clear cut as it seems. Dunning (2014) wrote “We are all confident idiots”, speaking to the fact that we as humans often overestimate our abilities and knowledge. We may also “confabulate”, or mix details of facts and fiction in certain situations that reflect some intentional misrepresentation refs..

 also, across all data where we used WKT-1 and WKT-2 there are no differences across overclaiming scores.

NOTES FOR CONSIDERATION

Overclaiming the desire to learn
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**Ackerman? Moreover, the VOC-T-accuracy index had a meaningful correlation with age in both validation studies. All in all, the psychometric properties can be regarded as sufficient to recommend the VOC-T for research purposes.**

Self-deception?

Confabulation?

APPENDICES

Please answer the following questions as accurately as you can. You will have 5 minutes to complete this test.

1. Which of the following is a type of cell that produces the myelin sheaths that cover axons? A) Satellite cells B) Astrocytes C) Microglia D) Shwann cells E) Endothelial cells
2. Long term potentiation is widely assumed to be associated with A) Parkinson’s disease B) Amnesia C)Epilepsy D)Emotion E)Sexuality
3. Strategies to improve thinking include A) Mnemonic devices. B) Kinesthesis C) Paradigms D) Nootropic drugs
4. “Gamblers” are reinforced on which type of schedule? A) Fixed ratio B) Fixed interval C) A probability ratio D) Delayed slow reinforcement
5. Which of the following is best associated with thirst? A)The Hippocampus  B) The Pons C) The mammillary bodies D)The kidneys
6. Who started the first US psychology lab and the American Journal of Psychology? A) William James B) Hall C) Clarke Hull D) BF Skinner
7. Where is the Pineal gland located? A) Above the thalamus B)Next to the thalamus C)Above the cerebellum D) Below the cerebellum
8. Which of the following interacts with GABA ? A) Marijuana B) Morphine C) Cocaine D) Alcohol E) Nicotine F) Prozac
9. When do children lose the ability to discriminate non-native phonemes? A) 8 months B) 12 months C) 18 months D) 24 months E) 30 months
10. Which of the following types of cognitive abilities typically declines in late life? A) Creativity B) Processing speed C) Vocabulary D) Mathematics E) Episodic memory

Please answer the following questions as accurately as you can. You will have 5 minutes to complete this test.

1. If Variable “X” increase as Variable “Y” increases a correlation is said to be
2. Negative B) Nonexistent C) Positive D)Reverted E) Concentrated
3. Who said personality is composed of ego, ID, supergo?
4. Skinner B) Freud C) Pavlov D) Kohlberg
5. What is the placebo effect?
6. A type of bacteria that lives in the brain. B) An effect based on expectations C) A substance/treatment that affects serotonin. D) A type of brain scan.
7. Researchers conditioned “Little Albert” to fear:
8. Snakes by sounding a loud noise when the snake appeared. B) Milk by flashing lights when milk appeared. C) Vultures by flashing lights when the vulture appeared. D) White rats by sounding a loud noise when the rat appeared.
9. What is An Independent variable?
10. An event that has not occurred B) A variable that is manipulated. C) A variable that is unchangeable. D) A tax exemption
11. Who invented the Skinner box?

 A. Harry Harlow B. Mary Ainsworth C. B.F Skinner D. Pablo Escobar

1. Who is associated with the theory of natural selection?
2. Darwin B) Freud C) Maslow D) Ainsworth
3. What psychologist is famous for establishing the idea of classical conditioning?
4. Freud B) Pavlov C) Wells D) Popper

9. What neurotransmitter is associated with “pleasure” and “reward”? A) Acetylcholine

B) Endorphins C) Glutamate D) Norepinephrine

10. What happened to Phineas Gage? A) An Iron rod was driven through his frontal lobe

B) He became exceptionally smart C) “Schizophrenia” D) A bullet went through his ears

Please indicate how you feel about your performance as a Psychology major by circling the best statement below:

1. I am an “A” student in psychology
2. I am a “B” student in psychology
3. I am a “C” student in psychology
4. I am a “D” student in psychology
5. I am failing in psychology

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percent correct | Academic knowledge level |
| 100 | Graduate level |
| 90 | College senior |
| 80 | College junior |
| 70 | College sophomore |
| 60 | College freshman |
| 50 or lower | High school level |

No matter the type of lie, deception can have detrimental effects on any relationship. The truth of the matter is that we do not like being deceived. Ref? When deception is detected, some previously established trust might deteriorate ref?.

Dunlop and colleagues (2017) found that more accounts of overclaiming were associated with people who were open to new experiences, and with people who had larger amounts of formal education.

In addition, there have been assertions made that, on average, men tend to overestimate their abilities, and women tend to underestimate their abilities — a phenomenon referred to as “male hubris/female humility” (e.g., see Furnham, Hosoe, & Tang, 2002).

these kinds of measures have been endorsed as providing an accurate representation of an individual's propensity toward selfenhancement (e.g., see Paulhus et al., 2003; Ziegler et al., 2013).

Whipple noted the following from the sample of 70 college students: Average amount of overestimation… 4.37 (10.9%) Number of students overestimating… 59 Number of students underestimating… 10 Number of students neither over- nor underestimating… 1 Largest overestimation… 18 Largest underestimation… 4 (Whipple, 1908, p. 97). These results indicated that 84% of the college students overestimated their actual vocabulary knowledge, 25% underestimated their knowledge, and only one student correctly defined the same number of items judged to be known. However, as Whipple also noted, 25% of the students overestimated their knowledge by 5% or more, and 15% of the students overestimated by 10% or more. Whipple also mentioned gender differences, but did not make any conclusions regarding such differences, because of the relatively small sample size.

Since lying is a fact of everyday life, more specifically social life, it is obvious that those who are more social will lie more often than those who are introverted (Kashy & DePaulo, 1996). Lying, in the case of extremely sociable people, can be seen as a practiced, habituated behavior (Kashy & DePaulo, 1996). Telling frequent lies may also originate from a person’s lack of communication skills, lack of intimacy, or even unhappiness rather than his/her intention to be conniving or devious (DePaulo et al., 1996).  People who lie are more likely to be extroverted and narcissistic, have low self-esteem or be lonely, and have high stress levels (Chiu, Hong, & Chiu, 2016).

Those who are self-conscious lie more than those who are less socially aware of the impressions they make on other people; self-conscious people are also more likely to tell self-centered lies to manage how they are viewed by others (Kashy & DePaulo, 1996). People who have high levels of the personality trait Machiavellianism are more likely to tell lies that are manipulative (Kashy & DePaulo, 1996).  These people tend to be exploitative, care very little for following moral norms, and act only in ways that are self-serving (Kashy & DePaulo, 1996). Machiavellians believe they are successful liars and are self-aware that they lie more than the average person (Kashy & DePaulo, 1996). Machiavellianism is not only strongly correlated with one’s lying behavior but is a strong predictor of how often a person will lie (Kashy & DePaulo, 1996).

Dussault et al. (2003) found a strong association between Machiavellian tendencies and the use of deceptive mating strategies. Likewise, Wilson et al. (1996) observed that individuals scoring high on the Machiavellian scale were also more willing to engage in deceptive behaviors than individuals with lower scores.
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Table 2. Summary of results for the repeated measures ANOVAs for each of the time windows examined.

Time(ms)

Electrode

location

Valence

6self-relevance

Valence

6self-relevance6group

Electrode location

6valence6self-relevance

F p F p F p F p

N1 latency 8.35 0.01 0.32 ns 0.41 ns 0.32 ns

N1 amplitude 8.91 0.01 4.66 0.04 0.02 ns 0.47 ns

P2 latency 1.79 ns 2.58 ns 8.57 0.009 1.33 ns

P2 amplitude 4.22 0.03 0.45 ns 0.00 ns 0.37 ns

300–500 1.75 ns 0.11 ns 3.37 ns 1.09 ns

500–700 4.07 0.04 0.16 ns 3.5 ns 4.26 0.02

700–1000 0.18 ns 4.76 0.04 0.12 ns 3.13 0.03

ns: no significant.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0081169.t002
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Everyone experiences feelings of fear, anxiety, or nervousness at some point in his/her life. Although fear and anxiety are separate psychological entities, behaviorally they are very similar (Sah, 2017). Fear is a biological response to an immediate threat, whereas anxiety is a mood state triggered by the anticipation of a possible threat in the future (Sah, 2017). Phobias are characterized by the feeling of intense anxiety in the presence of a feared object or situation, along with physiological symptoms such as sweating, tachycardia, and tightness in the chest (Warnke, 2014). Most people’s fears, like a fear of spiders or germs or heights, do not rise to the level of severity that would warrant a diagnosis of a phobic disorder; however, many of the same symptoms arise when they are presented with the feared stimuli (Warnke, 2014). The fear of public speaking is very common, and again, most do not rise to the level of meeting the diagnostic criteria for social anxiety disorder (SAD) awk (Dell’Osso et al., 2016). Symptoms of SAD include extreme fear of performing in front of other people and can extend to the severity of being afraid of just being observed in public (Dell’Osso et al., 2016). The prevalence rate for SAD can range anywhere from 1.9% to 13.7% in the general population (Dell’Osso et al., 2016). Many more college students have social anxiety on the lower end of the spectrum, are still fearful of public speaking SS, but do not rise to the impairment needed to be diagnosed with SAD (Dell’Osso et al., 2016).



Robie

*Wilfrid Laurier University*

Shawn Komar and Douglas J. Brown, 2010

Items were anchored by a 5-point Likert-type scale (*disagree strongly* to *agree strongly*) for both the personality and impression management items. At the top of every page of the combined per- sonality/impression management inventory was a bolded stem that read, “I see myself as someone who …”

***I am a person who…***

International Personality Item Pool Impression Management Scale

+ keyed Would never take things that aren’t mine.

Would never cheat on my taxes.

Believe there is never an excuse for lying. Always admit it when I make a mistake. Rarely talk about sex.

Return extra change when a cashier makes a mistake. Try to follow the rules.

Easily resist temptations. Tell the truth.

Rarely overindulge.

– keyed Have sometimes had to tell a lie.

Use swear words.

Use flattery to get ahead.

Am not always what I appear to be. Break rules.

Cheat to get ahead.

Don’t always practice what I preach. Misuse power.

Get back at others.

Am likely to show off if I get the chance.

*Job interviews*

Impression management (or social desirability) scales are included in more than 80% of commer- cial personality inventories, and the vast majority of applied psychologists working in selection and assessment advocate their use when interpreting the results of personality tests (Goffin & Christiansen, 2003). Although the validity of impression management scales has been repeatedly called into question (cf. Burns & Christiansen, 2006; Kurtz et al., 2008; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1998), it appears that they are still used quite often in the selection process. Therefore, it is impor- tant to study the antecedents of impression management in a overclaiming context.

*Malingering and overclaiming*

However, Mittenberg, Patton, Canyock, and

Condit (2002) reported findings that malingering occurred

more often in the public service setting than in the forensic

setting. For example, they found that malingering comprised

of 30%of disability evaluations,29%of personal injury evaluations,

only 19% of criminal evaluations, and 8% of medical

cases.LeBourgeois (2007) remarkedthat this finding is consistent

with studies of base rates of malingering during mental

health evaluations.Yates,Nordquist, and Schultz-Ross (1996)

noted that 13% of patients presenting to the emergency room

for psychiatric symptomswere foundtobefeigning symptoms

but nonewere diagnosed as malingering.Of these 59 patients,

almost half were identified as feigning symptoms in order to

obtain food or shelter.

Garriga (2007) reported that malingering costs the United

States insurance industry approximately $150 billion a year.

These factors suggest that providers need to be adept at assessing

for malingering as part of any differential diagnosis when

evaluating patients during the clinical interview.

malingering as the “intentional production

of false or grossly exaggerated physical or psychological

symptoms, motivated by external incentives such as avoiding

military duty, avoiding work, obtaining financial compensation,

evading criminal prosecution, or obtaining drugs” (p. 739). *DSM–*

*IV–R* draws a clear distinction between malingering and another

volitional condition, fictitious disorders, the former being motivated

by external incentives and the latter by internal incentives

and desire to adopt the sick role. Although nothing in *DSM–IV–R*

indicates that malingering is a taxon, diagnostic systems (Regier,

2007) and lay observers (Haslam & Giosan, 2002) generally conceive

of mental disorders, and by analogy, efforts to simulate and

exaggerate mental illness, in categorical terms. Consequently, professionals

are sometimes tempted to view malingering and genuine

disorders as both categorical and mutually exclusive. The *DSM–*

*IV–R* specification of gross exaggeration clearly indicates that

lower levels of exaggeration do exist but should not be used to

categorize malingering (Rogers, 2008a). Rogers (1997) identified

three levels of malingering: mild (mostly exaggeration; minor role

for diagnosis or intervention), moderate (gross exaggeration and

fabrication but often focused on a few critical symptoms), and severe (extensive and severe fabrications overshadow exaggerations).

A similar model was proposed by Walters, White, and

Greene (1988).

an interview-based measure of malingering like

the Structured Interview of Reported Symptoms (SIRS: Rogers,

Bagby, & Dickens, 1992), lead us to question these results as well.

The SIRS is an extensively researched and well-validated measure

of malingering that has served as the criterion measure in

more than a dozen investigations of feigned psychopathology

against which the MMPI–2, Personality Assessment Inventory

(PAI; Morey, 2007), and other more specialized measures have

been validated (Rogers, 2008b). The SIRS was rationally constructed

through a systematic analysis of different detection strategies,

tested with known-groups and simulation studies, and consists
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KNOWING and CERTAINTY

The research

on metamemory aspects of remembering has repeatedly addressed

the issue of the basis of people’s conviction that certain inaccessible

information is stored in memory—that is, their *feeling of*

*knowing*—revealing that both the feeling of familiarity elicited by

a memory question (Metcalfe, Schwartz, & Joaquim, 1993;

Schwartz & Metcalfe, 1992) and any partial, incomplete, and

sometimes even incorrect information about a sought-after target

that comes to mind in the process of retrieval (Koriat, 1993, 1995)

are relevant in this respect. In the present study we investigated

whether the feeling that inaccessible information is nevertheless

available in memory is shaped also by factors that are different

from both the memory question that is asked and the partial

information associated with what is to be retrieved. Specifically,
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Individuals are

overconfident when they believe they are more competent than

objective measures indicate, or when they think they are better

than others to a greater extent than they actually are.

Overconfidence is therefore different from self-presentation and

impression management, which involve deliberate attempts to

present oneself in a positive light (Baumeister, 1982; Goffman,

1959; Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Paulhus, 1984). Self-presentation

and impression management involve modifying one’s overt social

behaviors, often consciously and deliberately. Individuals who

manage their impressions might or might not believe the impression

they are trying to convey to others. In contrast, overconfidence

is a genuine yet flawed perception of one’s own abilities

(see von Hippel & Trivers, 2011). Overconfidence can persist even

when the stakes are high and aligned to reward accuracy (Ehrlinger,

Johnson, Banner, Dunning, & Kruger, 2008; Hoelzl &

Rustichini, 2005; Williams & Gilovich, 2008).

So why would individuals form overly positive judgments of

their abilities? Scholars have mostly offered two explanations. The

first explanation posits a motivated bias: Individuals are driven to

be confident because it provides them with psychological benefits

(Dunning, Leuenberger, & Sherman, 1995; Kunda, 1987). For mental health (Taylor & Brown, 1988), and task motivation and

persistence (Pajares, 1996). The second explanation highlights the

cognitive processes that may sometimes produce directional biases.

People might simply be unable to accurately assess their own

competence and arrive at biased self-views from fairly mundane

judgment processes. For example, biased self-views can arise

simply because people are more likely to attend to success than

failure (Miller & Ross, 1975), because they may lack the competence

to understand their own incompetence (Kruger & Dunning,

1999), and because they may hold idiosyncratic definitions of

success or ability (Dunning et al., 1989; Santos-Pinto & Sobel,

2005).

A third possibility, which has received little empirical attention,

is that overconfidence provides the individual with *social* benefits.

A number of scholars have theorized that biased self-perceptions

may help the individual succeed socially (Alexander, 1987; Krebs

& Denton, 1997; Leary, 2007; Trivers, 1985; von Hippel & Trivers,

2011; Waldman, 1994). More specifically, these theories propose

that overly positive self-views help individuals convince

others that they are more capable than they actually are. Therefore,

this account posits overconfidence to be a motivated bias.

example, self-confidence can improve self-esteem (Alicke, 1985),

overconfidence would ideally be measured

by comparing self-perceptions to operational criteria—that

is, unambiguous, concrete indices of ability. For example, an ideal

measure of task ability would involve test scores, and a measure of

scholastic ability would involve grades (cf. Paulhus, Harms,

Bruce, & Lysy, 2003). The use of operational criteria directly

assesses the accuracy of self-perceptions of competence and thus is

standard practice in the overconfidence literature (e.g., Krueger &

Mueller, 2002; Kruger & Dunning, 1999; Larrick et al., 2007;

Moore & Healy, 2008).

status comes with a host of social benefits,

including respect, influence, and social support (Berger et al.,

1972; Blau, 1964; Ellis, 1994; Griskevicius et al., 2010; Gruenfeld

& Tiedens, 2010). Correspondingly, many theorists have argued

that the desire for higher status is a fundamental driver of human

behavior (Barkow, 1975; Buss, 1999; Hogan, 1983; Maslow,

1943). However, even if the desire for status is pervasive, there are

also differences across individuals in the degree to which they

want higher status (Jackson, 1999; Josephs, Sellers, Newman, &

Mehta, 2006; Schmid Mast, Hall, & Schmid, 2010; Smith, Wigboldus,

& Dijksterhuis, 2008). Some individuals desire status more

than others. This inter-individual variation allows for testing the

association between the desire for status and overconfidence.

Based on previous research on overconfidence, we used a geography

knowledge task (Ehrlinger & Dunning, 2003). We first

measured participants’ overconfidence by having them complete

the geography task individually and compared their self-perceived

performance to their actual performance (e.g., Ackerman, Beier, &

Bowen, 2002; Ames & Kammrath, 2004; R. Jones, Panda, &

Desbiens, 2008; Krueger & Mueller, 2002; Kruger & Dunning,

1999; Larrick et al., 2007; Moore & Small, 2007). We then paired

participants in dyads, wherein they worked on the same geography

task together. Based on the status literature, we collected peerassessments

of competence and status after the dyadic interaction

(e.g., Anderson & Kilduff, 2009; Bales, Strodtbeck, Mills, &

Roseborough, 1951; Berger et al., 1972; Driskell & Mullen, 1990;

Ridgeway, 1987).

participants were asked (a) how they compared to the other

participants in the study on their general knowledge of U.S.

geography, and (b) how their task scores compared to those of

other participants. Both questions were rated on a scale from 1 (*I’m*

*at the very bottom; worse than 99% of the people in this study*) to

100 (*I’m at the very top; better than 99% of the people in this*

*study*). These two items correlated, *r*(74) \_ .92, *p* \_ .01, and were

combined to measure self-perceived percentile rank.

As many scholars recommend, we measured overconfidence by

regressing participants’ actual performance onto their selfevaluations

and retaining the residuals of the self-evaluations (J.

Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003; Cronbach & Furby, 1970;

DuBois, 1957; John & Robins, 1994).2 The residual score captures

the variability in self-perceived rank after the variance predicted

by actual rank has been removed.

**Partner-rated competence.** After participants worked in dyads,

they ranked their partner’s U.S. geographic knowledge relative

to other participants’ (using the same percentile rank scale).

Participants also rated the accuracy of their partner’s knowledge of

U.S. geography on a Likert-style item, on a scale from 1 (*Not at all*

*accurate*) to 7 (*Very accurate*). These two items correlated with

each other, *r*(74) \_ .52, *p* \_ .001, \_ \_ .69, and were standardized

and combined to form a measure of partner-rated task competence.

**Status.** Previous theoretical conceptions of status in groups

have identified status as involving respect, influence, leadership,

and perceived contributions to the group’s decisions (e.g., Anderson

et al., 2006; Bales et al., 1951; Berger et al., 1972; B. P. Cohen

& Zhou, 1991). While these components can be conceptually

Therefore, in this study, each participant

rated the degree to which his or her partner deserved respect and

admiration, had influence over the decisions, led the decision-making

process, and contributed to the decisions. Each of these four items was

rated on a scale from 1 (*Disagree strongly*) to 7 (*Agree strongly*).

These four items correlated together (\_\_.87), so we combined them

into one measure of status (*M* \_ 4.88, *SD* \_ 1.36).

IFCHER AND ZARGHAMEE, (

Overconfidence

has been identified among clinical psychologists,

physicians, nurses, investment bankers,

engineers, entrepreneurs, lawyers,

negotiators, and managers (Barber & Odean,

2001). Further, Barberis and Thaler (2003)

claim expertise actually exacerbates overconfidence.

Indeed, many of the conditions faced by

experts—for example, abstractly defined goals,

and decisions that are low in frequency or produce

noisy feedback—are exactly ones that

have been linked to biased and overconfident

decision-making (Malmendier & Tate, 2005).

2014) Beliefs are an important facet of standard

utility theory. A systematic deviation from standard

economic theory about beliefs is overconfidence,

defined as the “overestimat[ion] of

[one’s own] performance in tasks requiring ability,

including the precision of [one’s own] information”

(DellaVigna, 2009). Overconfidence

has been shown to be prevalent among the general

public as well as investors, managers, and

other important economic actors often considered

too experienced to be subject to behavioral

deviations from rational choice (Barber &

Odean, 2001). The overconfidence of various

economic agents—CEOs, investors, and employees—

has been critical in explaining the

following phenomena: company underperformance,

attractiveness of stock options to employees,

overtrading, and gender differences in

competitiveness (Barber & Odean, 2001;

Croson & Gneezy, 2009; Malmendier & Tate,

2005; Oyer & Schaefer, 2005).

Given the far-reaching and significant implications

of overconfidence, identifying its determinants

and whether it is subject to manipulation

is important. A noteworthy determinant of

economic behavior that has been identified in

psychological and economic experiments is the

decision maker’s affect (or mood). For example,

anger and mild positive affect (or good mood)

have both been shown to significantly decrease

perceived risk, although fear and sadness have

both been shown to increase it (Johnson &

Tversky, 1983; Lerner & Keltner, 2001).

Vinky Sharma and Moonis Shakeel, 2015

Overconfidence is the

tendency of people to overestimate the accuracy of their

knowledge. There is a substantial literature in psychology,

which suggests that, people are apparently overconfident

about their own knowledge (Keren, 1991; Yates,

1990). This behavior is particularly observed in students,

where they tend to overestimate their grades. Psychologists

have also long known that people, in general,

and students, in particular, tend to overestimate their

abilities. In an educational context, this tendency toward

overconfidence is exacerbated among the people who

exhibit the lowest skill in recognizing their own incompetence

(Kruger & Dunning, 1999).

men being more overconfident than women in a wide

variety of domains related to mathematics, science, and

technology (Niederle & Vesterlund, 2007; O’Laughlin

& Brubaker, 1998; Pajares & Miller, 1994). In addition,

men more often initiate unprovoked attacks and

wars than by women because men are more overconfident

about their expectations of success in conflict

(Johnson et al., 2006).

The most pervasive finding in the body of literature on

overconfidence is that individuals are overconfident across

a wide variety of tasks (Fischhoff & Slovic, 1980), response

modes (Fischhoff, Slovic, & Lichtenstien, 1977), subject

populations (Philips and Wright, 1977), and contexts (e.g.,

banking, engineering, clinical psychology). Notably, the

overconfidence bias does not vary as a function of intelligence

or other personality measures, though the results

relating to expertise are maximized and mixed.

In an attempt to reconcile the two different viewpoints,

some researchers have suggested that cognitive and motivational

aspects may be operating concurrently. Pyszcynski,

Greenberg, and LaPrelle (1985), for example, argued that

an extensive information search that occurs after a failure

experience may be a reaction to self-threat, and motivates

the individual to find information consistent with a selfserving

attribution. The individual would only engage in

the extensive information search, however, if he or she

expected to confirm a self-serving conclusion. In this situation,

elements of both motivational and information-processing

theory are used to account for self-serving bias.

Primary data were collected from postgraduate management

students with the help of a structured questionnaire, which

contained three questions, wherein question 1 was designed

to capture overconfidence and question 2 for capturing SAB.

Question 3 was incorporated to validate their claims.

The first question was regarding how they rate themselves

on their ability to understand management courses. The

responses were taken using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging

from 1 (highly able) to 5 (highly unable). The second

question was about their grade perception (good or bad).

This particular question was divided into two parts: if the

student thinks that the grades that he or she has scored are

good then, they would fill part (a) or else part (b). The third

question was about their actual grade earned (or cumulative

grade point average [CGPA]). The data were collected over a period of two years (2012

and 2013; i.e., for two different master of business administration

batches). Thus, the sample size was 320 management

students.

The results imply that majority of the students considered

themselves to be highly able. Almost equal numbers of

male and female students thought the same. However, more

of the male students seemed to be modest relative to the

female students. A negligible number of students underrated

themselves. This can further be supported by comparing

their ability with their grade perception or by

comparing their ability perception with their actual grades.

The analysis depicts that almost half of the sample size

considered their grades to be bad. Wherein from this it can

be deduced that there are two observations; first, that these

students have actually scored good grades but this may not correspond to their actual ability to understand management

courses. Second, that these students have actually scored

bad grades, which depicts that they are overestimating the

accuracy of their knowledge (i.e., overconfidence). It is

also observed that more of the female students have a tendency

of being overconfident.

While comparing ability to understand management

courses with the actual grades of the students, it was again

substantiated that management students are overconfident.

As a majority of the students who rated their ability to

understand was high, a major chunk of the students actually

scored the lowest grades, ranging between 4.1 and 6.

It was also observed that there exists a SAB among management

students. However, gender-wise breakup of the

students those who displayed SAB depicted that more

female (almost double) students portrayed SAB specifically

when bad grades were scored. On the other hand, when

good grades were scored by female students, this percentage

declined to the percentage of male students, which

increased in this case. Therefore, it can be said that in case

of female students when something bad happens to them

SAB becomes more prominent.

UNDERCONFIDENCE?
number of “Nos” with good definitions?

Western methods of

education (i.e., constructive approach) result in the recruitment

of more arguments than do Asian methods (i.e., direct

instruction approach). The more arguments he or she

recruits, the more a person is in doubt about any decision.

*HUMILITY*

Krumrei-Mancuso and Steven V. Rouse, 2016

Humility is often classified as a virtue (e.g., Exline et al., 2004).

The term virtue can bring morality to mind; however, virtues can

have an intellectual rather than moral dimension (Baehr, 2011).

Thus, whereas humility could be considered a moral virtue that

promotes being a person of good character, IH can be classified as

an epistemic virtue that promotes being a good knower (e.g.,

Brady & Pritchard, 2003; Paul & Elder, 2001; Stafford, 2010).

The 73 items retained from pilot testing were administered.

The items assessed both intrapersonal and interpersonal forms

of IH, including thoughts and behaviors, and were inclusive of

positively and negatively worded phrases. All items were rated

on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 D strongly disagree to

5 D strongly agree.

73. I feel small when others disagree with me on topics that are close to my heart.a 0.82 0.12 ¡0.09 ¡0.09 0.65

50. When someone contradicts my most important beliefs, it feels like a personal attack.a 0.80 ¡0.07 0.01 0.12 0.69

49. When someone disagrees with ideas that are important to me, it feels as though I’m being attacked.a 0.78 0.01 0.04 0.04 0.67

53. I tend to feel threatened when others disagree with me on topics that are close to my heart.a 0.77 ¡0.12 0.07 0.08 0.61

68. When someone disagrees with ideas that are important to me, it makes me feel insignificant.a 0.75 0.10 ¡0.03 ¡0.12 0.56

28. I am open to revising my important beliefs in the face of new information. 0.03 0.77 ¡0.04 ¡0.01 0.56

26. I am willing to change my position on an important issue in the face of good reasons. 0.02 0.73 ¡0.01 0.00 0.53

29. I am willing to change my opinions on the basis of compelling reason. 0.08 0.69 ¡0.02 ¡0.04 0.49

25. I have at times changed opinions that were important to me, when someone showed me I was wrong. ¡0.07 0.61 0.06 0.04 0.41

33. I’m willing to change my mind once it’s made up about an important topic. ¡0.01 0.49 0.05 0.14 0.33

61. I can respect others, even if I disagree with them in important ways. 0.02 ¡0.19 0.84 0.01 0.56

47. I can have great respect for someone, even when we don’t see eye-to-eye on important topics. 0.02 ¡0.02 0.82 ¡0.08 0.62

39. Even when I disagree with others, I can recognize that they have sound points. ¡0.05 0.18 0.64 ¡0.05 0.54

65. I am willing to hear others out, even if I disagree with them. 0.06 0.21 0.56 ¡0.09 0.51

45. I welcome different ways of thinking about important topics. ¡0.02 0.25 0.47 0.10 0.50

34. I respect that there are ways of making important decisions that are different from the way I make decisions. ¡0.06 0.19 0.46 0.10 0.39

1. My ideas are usually better than other people’s ideas.a 0.02 ¡0.11 ¡0.02 0.68 0.42

3. For the most part, others have more to learn from me than I have to learn from them.a ¡0.09 0.08 ¡0.06 0.66 0.41

9. When I am really confident in a belief, there is very little chance that belief is wrong.a 0.01 ¡0.05 0.15 0.59 0.43

24. On important topics, I am not likely to be swayed by the viewpoints of others.a 0.06 0.06 ¡0.06 0.50 0.26

21. I’d rather rely on my own knowledge about most topics than turn to others for expertise.a ¡0.04 0.14 ¡0.06 0.46 0.24

41. Listening to perspectives of others seldom changes my important opinions.a

*Self-serving Bias)/self-attribution bias*

One possibility that tilt attribution is the cognitive

factors, suggesting that self-serving bias stems

mainly from certain tendencies in the way people process

social information (Ross, 1977). In contrast,

another explanation emphasizes the role of motivation.

This explanation suggests that the self-serving bias

stems from people’s need to protect and enhance their

self-esteem or related desire to look good to others

(Greenberg, Pyszczynski, & Solomon, 1983).

Overconfidence has been explained by variety of ways,

ranging from a tendency to favor positive above negative

evidence (Koriat, Linchtenstein, & Fischhoff, 1980) or confirmatory

bias (Rabin & Schrag, 1990) to a lack of complete,

immediate, and accurate feedback (Arkes, 2001).

People often appear overconfident for questions where they

possess a self-declared expertise (Heath & Tversky, 1991).

Camerer and Lovallo (1991) also found strong evidence of

overconfidence in an experimental market entry game. An

overconfident person, whose average probability judgment

exceed the proportions of items he or she answers correctly

(Yates, Lee, & Shinotsuka, 1996), tends to makes decision

based on faulty assumptions, resulting in less than optimal

decisions (Lee at al., 1995). In the same way students, in

particular, often exhibit overconfident grade expectations

and tend to overestimate the actual course grade at the completion

of a course (Nowell & Alston, 2007).