Frankenberger, Susanne

The Influence of Social Exclusion on Self-perceived Physical Attractiveness.

Thesis
to obtain the Diploma of Science
(Mag. rer.nat.)

expertise and mentoring
Prof. Dr. Nilüfer Aydin
Institute of Psychology
Karl-Franzens-University Graz

2013
Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 3

THEORETICAL PART 5

Research on social exclusion 5
 Terms and definitions 5
 Theories 6
 Need-to-belong theory 6
 Sociometer-theory 7
 Ostracism-model 8
 Research on the consequences of social exclusion 9

Self-esteem 12
 Definition 12
 Research on self-esteem 13
 Self evaluation maintenance model (SEM) 13
 Psychological effects of self-esteem 14
 Gender differences in self-esteem 15

Physical attractiveness 16
 Introduction on the topic of physical attractiveness 16
 Self-ratings of attractiveness 17
 Interpersonal and intrapersonal effects of physical attractiveness 18

Relationship of attractiveness and self-esteem 20

Gender differences in the meaning of attractiveness 21

The connection of social exclusion and self-rated physical attractiveness 21

Hypotheses 22

METHOD 24

Participants and design 24
Susanne Frankenberger

### Materials and procedure

**Essay**-Task and manipulation check  
Measures  
Global self-esteem  
Need-to-belong  
Positive and negative Affect  
Need-Threat  
Self-rated physical attractiveness  
State Self-Esteem  
Order of Scales

### RESULTS

- Manipulation check  
- Testing the Hypothesis  
  - Effect of social exclusion on self-rated physical attractiveness and state self-esteem  
  - Effect of social exclusion and sex on self-rated physical attractiveness  
  - Effect of social exclusion and sex on state self-esteem  
  - Influence of the need-to-belong and the global self-esteem on the dependent variables  
- Correlation of global self-esteem and self-rated physical attractiveness  
- Correlation of the dependent variables  
- Correlation of the Covariates and the dependent variables  
- Gender differences in self-esteem

### DISCUSSION

### ABSTRACT

### ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

### REFERENCES

### APPENDIX
Introduction

In recent years one can see beauty, notably youthfulness and thinness, being a big issue in society and a growing problem of different eating disorders, particularly among females, seems to result from it (e.g. Nagel & Jones, 1992). In general, we can say adults, adolescents, and also children seem to be very dissatisfied with the way they look. Everyone wants to look better and to be more attractive. For example the Economist (2003) illustrates the importance of beauty and the impact of the drive to be attractive on society and the industries.

It is supposed that many of them, especially dissatisfied with their bodies and the way they look, are people who are not very well integrated into social life (see Levine, 2012). One could say lots of the people affected by eating disorders are outsiders, as well. For example Lacey, Phil, Coker, and Birtchnell (1986) asked bulimic girls about factors that cause and maintain bulimia and it could be revealed that a lack of relationship is a crucial factor for developing bulimia. Besides, McVey, Pepler, Davis, Flett, and Abdollel (2002) could reveal high importance of social acceptance was significantly correlated with reports of high levels of disordered eating in adolescent girls. Hence, one could suppose that social life, especially connectedness, are highly associated with the development and maintenance of eating disorders. Accordingly, in order to cope with eating disorders, loneliness as an influencing factor should be further analysed, also because a lack of relationships is known to be a cause for discomfort and distress in general (e.g. Baumeister & Leary, 1995).

Loneliness itself is an important topic because it affects most individuals once in a while and a long-term feeling of loneliness can have severe consequences on an individual’s well-being (cf. Cacioppo, Hawkley, & Bernston, 2003). Feelings of loneliness are often caused by social exclusion, which is part of our daily lives. Most individuals find themselves, in some way, in a state of social exclusion, in some time. As a child, one was maybe not accepted as a co-player, or in school, one was not accepted as a team mate in school sports, or grownup on the job, or in private life. There are lots of situations one can find oneself in a state of social exclusion once in a while. Because of the severe consequences social exclusion can have social psychologists have put a focus on this topic and research could show various negative effects of social exclusion (Williams, 2007).

Because both topics physical attractiveness and social exclusion seem to be present in our daily lives it may be interesting if and in what extent social exclusion and self-perceived
physical attractiveness are linked up. The present study focuses on this question and tries to reveal the influence of social exclusion on self-perceived physical attractiveness.

If a connection between social exclusion and self-perceived physical attractiveness can be found it could, as well, provide future directions for therapy of eating disorders, as it is known that body-image and self-perceived physical attractiveness are linked to developing and maintaining eating disorders (e.g. Cash & Deagle, 1997).

If it can be found that social exclusion leads to lower self-rated physical attractiveness one could probably assume that frequent social exclusion furthermore could possibly lead to a potential risk of eating disorders. Evident buffers against social exclusion could, if there is a connection between social exclusion and self-perceived physical attractiveness, be utilised as buffers against eating disorders.
Theoretical Part

Research on social exclusion

Terms and definitions

When discussing social exclusion three different terms have to be defined: ostracism, social exclusion, and rejection. However, research, up until now, does not answer the question if these terms describe different phenomena or if they can be used as synonyms, even if consequences of all three kinds of behaviours are found to be similar (Williams, 2007).

Williams (2007) defines ostracism (Ancient Greek: ὀστρακισμός, ostrakismos) as being ignored and excluded from individuals or groups. In this definition the ostracised person is aware of the reasons for being ostracised and the negative intentions of the other individual or the group. It is stated that “Ostracism is often operationalized as a process that is characterized as an unfolding sequence of responses endured while being ignored and excluded” (p. 429) and is found not only within human beings, but also in most of social species, for example lions or bees.

Social exclusion, according to Williams (2007), is the state of being separated from others. One is “excluded, alone or isolated” (p. 429). The reasons for the exclusion can be obvious or not obvious for the excluded individual.

The term rejection means, according to Williams (2007), the intentional rejection of an individual. The rejected individual is not accepted by another individual or group.

As mentioned above, the terms ostracism, rejection, and social exclusion cannot easily be distinguished and often mean the same phenomena and lead to the same consequences (Williams, 2007). For this diploma thesis the terms ostracism, rejection, and social exclusion are treated as synonyms. Starting from now the term social exclusion will be used to name that kind of behaviour. At this point, before reviewing research on consequences of social exclusion, the following theories, dealing with social exclusion, must be mentioned: the need-to-belong theory (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), the sociometer-theory (Leary, Tambor, Terdal, & Downs, 1995), and Williams’ ostracism-model (Williams, 2009).
Theories

Need-to-belong theory

In 1995, Baumeister and Leary presented their need-to-belong theory, which principally says that human beings have “the need to form and maintain strong, stable interpersonal relationships” (p. 497). In Maslow’s (1954) motivational hierarchy the needs “belonging – love”, which are quite similar to the need-to-belong described by Baumeister and Leary, were considered in the middle already, as can be seen in Figure 1. Also Bowlby’s (1969) attachment theory states that individuals have a need to form and maintain positive relationships to others.

![Maslow's Motivational Hierarchy](image)

Fig 1: Maslow’s (1954) Motivational Hierarchy

In 1995, Baumeister and Leary introduced their need-to-belong theory which introduces the satisfaction of these belongingness needs as essential for an individual’s well-being. Baumeister and Leary state that the fulfilling of two basic criteria is required for satisfying the need-to-belong: on the one hand relationships with others must be frequent and pleasant; on the other hand, these relationships must be stable and positive at times. Roughly one can say for satisfying the need-to-belong, described by Baumeister and Leary, human beings need relationships of a minimum of quantity and a minimum of quality. According to Baumeister and Leary, these necessary relationships can be had with any human beings and furthermore, lost relationships can partially be replaced by others as well. However, it is mentioned that long-term relationships can fulfil belongingness needs better than short-term relationships, because it is hypothesised that longer lasting relationships have more quality than shorter
relationships. Interactions with strangers can only partially satisfy the need-to-belong, because what is really desired from human beings are long term relationships with a minimum of quality. However, interactions with strangers are said to be positive, because they are at the beginning of forming new, longer lasting bonds with others.

A lack of relationship and, hence, a lack of belonging leads, according to Baumeister and Leary (1995), to negative effects on cognitions and emotions. Furthermore a lack of belonging has a negative effect on well-being and physical and psychological health. Consequences of a lack of belonging may be several problems, such as maladjustment and behavioural or psychological pathology.

To keep relationships stable and positive, so that the need-to-belong is satisfied, it is essential to behave in a way that positive relationships can be kept alive. One has to know what kind of behaviour strengthens relationships and which kind of behaviours will break relationships. Researchers had theorised an instrument for measuring one’s inclusionary state, and hence, gives individuals the chance to adapt one’s behaviour in a way that one is accepted and integrated by others. This measurement instrument is described in the sociometer-theory (Leary, Haupt, Strausser, & Chokel, 1998; Leary et al., 1995).

**Sociometer-theory**

In psychological research the self-esteem motive is under special observation. It is obvious that people try to keep their self-esteem high and act in a way so that their self-esteem is protected (Tesser, 1988). Also the question what the function of the self-esteem motive is, is often discussed, but the answer has not been clarified, yet (Leary et al., 1995). The sociometer-theory (Leary et al., 1998; Leary et al., 1995) tries to give an adequate answer on that question.

Self-esteem, according to sociometer-theory (Leary et al. 1998; Leary et al., 1995), functions as a sociometer. It measures the inclusionary state of human beings. If someone is socially well included one’s self-esteem will be high and if someone’s inclusionary state is low, one’s self-esteem will be low, too. The lowered self-esteem functions as a sign of the need to behave in a way that will change one’s inclusionary state in a more positive direction, so that the uncomfortable state of low self-esteem will change in a more comfortable state of higher self-esteem.

As explained previously, human beings have the drive to form positive social bonds (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), so the self-esteem as a sociometer plays an important role for
psychological and physiological well-being. According to Leary et al. (1998) and Leary et al. (1995), the self-esteem system operates automatically and as a sociometer helps human beings to maintain social inclusion and consequently stay psychologically and physically comfortable. If social inclusion cannot be maintained or restored it has severe consequences on human beings. Some of them are explained in the ostracism-model (Williams, 1997, 2001, 2009; Williams & Zadro, 2005), in which the effects of social exclusion are put into a time frame.

**Ostracism-model**

The ostracism-model (Williams, 1997, 2001, 2009; Williams & Zadro, 2005) describes four basic social needs: belonging, self-esteem, control, and meaningful existence. If these basic needs are threatened in any way individuals react in the following stages:

The immediate reactions (reflexive stage) are hurt feelings. Ostracism, at this stage is felt as pain. The ostracised individual reacts with negative mood and physical arousal, or even shows aggression and feels sad (Williams, 1997, 2001, 2009; Williams & Zadro, 2005).

If the threat continues the next level will be the short term reactions/coping (reflective stage), which are characterised by compensation strategies. The ostracised individual thinks about the meaning and relevance of the experienced ostracism. Ostracism by strangers is rated with lower relevance, ostracism by close or important others is rated as more relevant. Dependent on this relevance the individual wants to cope with the ostracism. The individual tries to be reaccepted and reintegrated again. Strategies can be different. One can try to think about close relationships to regain social comfort, or try to change behaviour in a way that may help to find reintegration and acceptance (Williams, 1997, 2001, 2009; Williams & Zadro, 2005).

If ostracism, and thus the need-threat, continues the resources for coping will be depleted after a while. If the excluded individual is not able to change his inclusionary state in a positive direction, the consequences are long-term reactions (resignation), which will finally end up in acceptance of the situation. The excluded person after a while will feel helpless, worthless, and even desperate (Williams, 1997, 2001, 2009; Williams & Zadro, 2005).

The ostracism-model shows how social exclusion impacts well-being and because of the huge influence the threat of belongingness needs can have on an individual’s psychological and physiological well-being, researchers try to find out what detailed consequences social exclusion has on individuals. The most important findings are summarized in the following.
Research on the consequences of social exclusion

Williams and Nida (2011) state that “for humans, ostracism over a long period of time is a form of social death” (pp.72). This is kind of a hard statement, but summarises the various interpersonal and intrapersonal consequences of social exclusion quite well.

In his review Williams (2007) explains four basic responses to social exclusion: fight, flight, freeze, and tend-and-befriend. A possible fight reaction could be the derogation of the excluding persons. Flight means avoiding situations where social exclusion is possible, and therefore avoiding social situations so that social inclusion is not possible, at all. But the negative consequence is that flight will, as a consequence, lead to social isolation. Freeze means cognitive, emotional reactions, which are lethargic. Tend-and-befriend are socially compensation strategies, which involve pro-social, group-oriented behaviours to strengthen ongoing relationships, which avoid a lack of relationship and social exclusion. These responses, according to Williams, are moderated by several individual differences.

Downey, Mougios, Ayduk, London, and Hoda (2004), for example, introduce the term of rejection sensitivity as a moderator. Rejection sensitivity is the grade in which rejection is sensed. Downey et al. distinguish individuals who score high in rejection sensitivity and individuals who score low in rejection sensitivity. Individuals, who score high in rejection sensitivity, “tend to chronically expect rejection, to see it, when it may not be happening and to respond to it hostilely” (Williams, 2007, p.436). Other moderators can be sex, cultural background and the relevance of the excluding group or person.

Self-esteem is a moderator for consequences of social exclusion, as well (Williams, 2007). But researchers, by now, differ if people with high self-esteem or people with low self-esteem react stronger on social exclusion. Proven is the fact that state self-esteem is lower after social exclusion than before or without social exclusion (Leary et al., 1995; Leary et al., 1998). Also Leary, Cottrell, and Phillips (2001) found effects of acceptance on state-self-esteem. Participants in studies felt better about themselves after acceptance than after rejection. It was found that individuals in general evaluate themselves better after inclusion, than after exclusion (Buckley, Winkel, & Leary, 2004), which can be seen related to the declines in self-esteem after social exclusion for example found by Leary et al. (1995). In the study by Baumeister and Gailliot (2007) questionnaire measures revealed that participants with stronger social ties had higher self-esteem. Furthermore, self-esteem, in general, depends on how accepted one feels (Leary & Mac Donald, 2003). In addition, Williams and Nida (2011)
report that self-reports of belonging, self-esteem, control and meaningful existence show the negative effect of social exclusion. Also Zadro, Williams, & Richardson (2004) found lower levels of belonging, meaningful existence and control in excluded individuals.

The negative effects of social exclusion on self-esteem can be explained by the threat on the need-to-belong (Baumeister & Leary, 1995) and they can also be explained with sociometer-theory (Leary et al., 1995; Leary et al., 1998), explained before. Leary et al. (1995) state that individuals change their feelings about themselves in relation to the acceptance or rejection they experience.

Social exclusion, in general, has implications on physical and emotional well-being (Williams, 2001) and causes anxiety, depression, loneliness, and feelings of isolation, as well as increased levels of stress. (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Gardner, Picket, & Brewer, 2000; Leary, 1990; Williams, Cheung, & Choi, 2000).

The intensity of the feelings of excluded individuals is similar to the intensity of feeling physical pain (Williams, 2007). Furthermore social exclusion is said to cause cognitive impairments (Baumeister, Twenge, & Nuss, 2002).

Twenge, Catanese, & Baumeister (2003) found that individuals who find themselves in a situation of social exclusion enter a defensive state of cognitive deconstruction, the *deconstructed state*, which is characterized by distorted time perception, less orientation toward the future, less ability to delay gratification, meaninglessness in life, lethargy and avoided self-awareness. Furthermore they found a lack of emotion, whereas other researchers, like Williams et al. (2000), found strong emotional responses after experiencing social exclusion. Twenge et al. (2003) explain this discrepancy, within research on changes of emotion after social exclusion, with the difference between the exclusionary conditions and state that situations which are less traumatic (e. g. situations in which individuals do not meet their rejecters personally) may lead to emotional responses to the exclusion, whereas more traumatic situations may lead to producing the defensive response of numbness and hence, a lack of emotion. Also DeWall and Baumeister (2006) confirmed the lack of emotional responses and, in addition to it, found that social exclusion causes a reduction in sensitivity to pain.

Also DeWall et al. (2011) found no difference between excluded and included individuals in their self reports of mood after acute exclusion, but could find differences in implicit measures of emotion. For excluded individuals positive emotion words became more cognitively accessible. As a consequence, DeWall et al. state that repeated social exclusion
leads to strong emotional responses, like Williams et al. (2000) found, whereas acute social exclusion leads to emotional detachment, like Twenge et al. (2003) found. Social exclusion, according to DeWall et al., leads to an automatic emotion regulation process. Positive emotions become more accessible than negative emotions, which serves as a mechanism of protection against the negative experience of social exclusion. This regulation processes are related to positive mental health, according to De Wall et al.

Social exclusion also causes self-defeating behaviour, like making high-risk choices, selecting less health-enhancing behaviour, procrastinating more and practicing less for an upcoming important test (Twenge et al., 2002).

Besides these psychological effects, there could also be found some physiological effects, for example, it could be shown that excluded individuals show increased blood pressure (e.g. Stroud et al., 2000, as cited in Williams, 2007; Zadro, 2004; as cited in Williams, 2007). There could further be found effects of social exclusion which are similar to the effects of feeling physical pain. Eisenberger, Liebermann, & Williams (2003) revealed that social exclusion is associated with increased activation of the dorsal anterior cingulate cortex, which is related to physical pain and distress, and the right ventral prefrontal cortex, which is involved in the regulation of pain and distress. With this, Eisenberger et al. could show that brain activation processes, while experiencing social exclusion, are similar to brain activation processes, while feeling physical pain.

Social exclusion not only leads to intrapersonal consequences, but also causes several interpersonal consequences. Like, Twenge, Baumeister, DeWall, Ciarocco, and Bartels (2007) found, socially excluded individuals are less likely to behave prosocially, like donating money, or volunteering. According to Twenge, Baumeister, Tice, and Stucke (2001), excluded individuals, furthermore, tend to behave more aggressively than socially included individuals. However, excluded individuals desire to reconnect with others to satisfy their need-to-belong (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Gardner, et al., 2000) and therefore desire to get in contact with new friends, increase their preference for working with others and even view others as nicer and friendlier (Maner, DeWall, Baumeister, & Schaller, 2007).

The conclusion one can draw is that social exclusion for individuals is strongly aversive and has severe consequences. Summarised, one can say individuals suffer from social exclusion, also because of their lowered self-esteem, as explained above. Self-esteem on the other hand is a central motive in psychology and findings on that topic will be discussed in the following.
Self-esteem

Definition

Before defining self-esteem, one should define the term self-concept, which has to be clearly distinguished from the term self-esteem. The self-concept is a structure of knowledge and beliefs of oneself. It stores all the information one has about oneself, like sex, appearance, names, likes, dislikes, interests, and so on (Werth & Mayer, 2008). Self-esteem, on the other hand, is the evaluation system, which holds the information if one is worthy or not. Self-esteem, in general, is summarized as the evaluation of oneself (cf. Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 2008, Baumeister, 1998).

Coopersmith (1967) gives a classic definition of self-esteem:

The evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself: it expresses an attitude of approval and indicates the extent to which an individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful and worthy. In short, self-esteem is a personal judgment of the worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds towards himself. (pp. 4–5, as cited in Heatherton & Wyland, 2003)

Another important distinction is the distinction between trait self-esteem and state self-esteem. Trait self-esteem means the level of self-esteem one has in general. The trait-self esteem can also be termed as global self-esteem. The way someone evaluates oneself over time, not dependent from situations, is the global- or trait self-esteem. It is the average degree of self-esteem one has. State self-esteem, contrary to that, fluctuates when situations and environments are changing, it is the way someone evaluates oneself in a special situation. State self-esteem has to be clearly distinguished from mood. State self-esteem and trait self-esteem are highly connected (Heatherton & Polivy, 1991). In general one can say that human beings try to keep their self-esteem high, also explained by Tesser in 1988.
Research on self-esteem

Self evaluation maintenance model (SEM)

Tesser (1988) postulates that individuals try to maintain or even try to increase their self-evaluation. Individuals tend to behave in a way that is thought to help maintaining or increasing self-evaluations. He also explains that our self-evaluation is dependent on other individuals who can change one’s self-evaluation in a negative or positive way. He describes two different processes which are important for the self-evaluations: The reflection process and the comparison process. The reflection process is the process in which one evaluates oneself because of close others. Tesser illustrates this process with a close other, who is an excellent concert pianist. Because of the closeness to this excellent concert pianist one may evaluate oneself better, as well, only because one is close to someone who seems to be excellent. Tesser mentions, at this point, the bask in reflected glory effect (Cialdini et al., 1976) which describes the tendency of individuals to associate themselves with success of other persons to increase their own self-esteem.

Tesser (1988), on the other hand, states that comparison processes may also lead to decreased self-evaluations, because in comparison to an outstanding other, one will evaluate oneself less well, because compared to an excellent or outstanding other, oneself seems to be less worthy. Of special importance is, according to Tesser, the grade of closeness to the other person. The closer the other person is, the bigger the influence, the other has one one´s self evaluation, is. Others, to whom we hold closer relationships, have a stronger effect on our self-evaluations than others, to whom we hold weaker relationships.

Also Dauenheimer (1996, as cited in Dauenheimer, Stahlberg, Frey, & Petersen, E, 2002) states that individuals try to keep their self-esteem high and therefore try to find new information that supports positive self-evaluations. According to that, decreases in self-esteem have effects on information processing and self evaluations. Individuals seem to remember positive information about themselves better than negative information, to antagonise decreases in self-esteem (see D’Argembeau, Comblain, & van der Linden, 2005).

Talking about positive self-esteem and self-evaluations, one also has to mention the above-average effect (e.g. Kruger & Dunning, 1999; as cited in Dauenheimer et al., 2002), which is the affinity of individuals to evaluate themselves as extraordinary and above average. The downward comparison model (Wills, 1981), can also be seen in relation to that. This model states that people make downward comparisons for self-enhancement. However, holding
self-esteem high is of special importance, because self-esteem has various consequences on one’s well-being, as will be explained now.

*Psychological effects of self-esteem*

High self-esteem is, generally, said to be positively correlated with mental health and has several positive effects on one’s well-being (e.g. Jahoda, 1958; Taylor & Brown, 1988). This may be a result of productive coping strategies that individuals, high in self esteem, posses (Harter, 1990). Harter also found that high self-esteem is related to enhanced motivation and positive emotions. Individuals low in self esteem, otherwise, according to Harter, are at a higher risk for many emotional and behavioural disorders, like anxiety, suicidality, delinquency, conduct disorders, and eating disorders. A huge amount of research could further find a positive correlation between low self-esteem and depression, whereas high self-esteem seems to be a protective factor against depression (e.g. Allgood-Merten, Lewinsohn, & Hops, 1990; Harter, 1990; Quatman & Watson, 2001).

In addition, many studies found, that low self-esteem individuals experience negative emotions more often than high self-esteem individuals (e.g. Taylor & Brown, 1988; White, 1981). It was also found that people low in self-esteem evaluate themselves as a less valuable interaction partner, than people with high self-esteem (see Leary et al., 1995).

Furthermore, in 2001 Robins, Tracy, Trzesniewski, Gosling, and Potter found evidence for a correlation of self-esteem and personality traits. High self-esteem individuals were emotionally stable, extraverted, conscientious, and were agreeable and open to experience, whereas low self-esteem individuals were not.

Consistent with the findings that social exclusion has negative consequences for individual’s self-esteem, Baumeister & Gailliot, 2007 found that self-esteem is dependent on ones attachment to groups, as well as world-views and ideals someone believes in. It seems to be clear that high self-esteem is important for an individual’s well-being, but one also has to note that there are some differences between males and females, concerning self-esteem.
**Gender differences in self-esteem**

Before explaining gender differences in self-esteem, the terms *sex* and *gender* have to be distinguished. *Sex* refers to the biological and physiological characteristics that define men and women, whereas *gender* refers to the socially constructed roles that society considers appropriate for men and women. The constructed roles come along with expectations about behaviours, activities, or attributes (American Psychological Association, 2011).

Sex and gender in psychological research are in the focus of psychological research on many topics. Psychological research tries to find out if there are differences between the sexes and also for the self-esteem motive, researchers were interested in differences between the sexes. The differences found are described in the following.

The first conspicuous difference is that male individuals in general score higher on self-esteem tasks than women (Quatman & Watson, 2001). Self confidence itself is even stereotyped as a masculine characteristic (e.g. Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972; Ruble, 1983; Spence, Helmreich, & Strapp, 1975). Furthermore, women show a stronger effect on self-esteem after rejection than men. For women’s self-esteem social acceptance seems to be more important than for men’s self-esteem (Cross & Madson, 1997; Josephs, Markus, & Tafarodi, 1992). At least women have other styles of social connectedness. Women tend to have more intimate relationships whereas men tend to form relationships within larger groups (Baumeister & Sommers, 1997).

Quatman and Watson (2001) could also find differences in the domains of self-esteem could also confirm these differences for children and adolescents.

The differences found are often seen as a consequence of the different gender roles (cf. Kling, Hyde, Showers, & Buswell, 1999; Quatman & Watson, 2001) or factors like different treatment and expectations in school (e.g. Orenstein, 1994 as cited in Kling et al., 1999), or even violence against women (Koss, 1990). The difference between male and female self-esteem can, according to Block and Robins (1993), also be ascribed to processes in childhood and adolescence, because adolescence is a critical stage for the development of self-esteem and in this stage, boys’ self-esteem increases whereas girls’ self-esteem declines.

A domain of self-esteem that has been found to especially differ between females and males is appearance. For females, appearance is more important for self-esteem, than for males, so concerns about ones physical attractiveness and body are a greater influence factor for self-esteem for females, than for males (Pliner, Chaiken, & Flett, 1990; Allgood-Merten et
Appearance and physical attractiveness has always been a concern for human beings (e.g. Eco, 2006) and it is not a wonder that psychological research has also put a focus on attractiveness and how it affects social life and well-being.

**Physical attractiveness**

*Introduction on the topic of physical attractiveness*

For this study physical attractiveness is defined as “the physical features one has”, as adopted from Asendorpf (2009, p. 63). First, there have to be mentioned some theories which try to explain why some people are rated as more physical attractive than others.

The first theory, mentioned here, is, that social consensus defines physical attractiveness and, for it, the face is in special importance for attractiveness-ratings (Berscheid & Walster, 1974).

Asendorpf (2009) explains two theories why some faces seem to be more attractive than others, independent from cultures. Attractive rated faces are average faces or symmetric faces. Asendorpf explains that artificial average faces, evolved from mixing lots of different faces, are rated as especially attractive and are more symmetric than one individual face. It is mentioned that symmetries seem to be healthier than asymmetries that supports the theory, what seems to be healthy seems to be attractive.

The theory of healthiness as a factor for attractiveness ratings can also be found in what kind of bodies are rated as attractive. The statement of healthiness as factor for physical attractiveness is fostered in the evolutionary theory of attractiveness (Wade & Cooper, 1999). Evolutionary theory mainly states that for attractiveness ratings it is important for how healthy and reproductive one is judged to be. It is assumed, that attractiveness ratings are based on beliefs of health and reproductive fitness (Wade & Cooper, 1999).

Another factor involved in attractiveness ratings of women is the mothering potential. The higher the potential is evaluated, the more attractive women are judged. For women the waist-to-hip-ratio is especially important for physical attractiveness. The waist-to-hip-ratio is correlated with endocrines, which are important for fertility and the mothering potential. A smaller waist-to-hip-ratio is seen as more attractive than a larger waist-to-hip-ratio (Wade & Cooper, 1999). As cited in Wade & Cooper, 1999; Wiggins, Wiggins & Conger, 1968, found
that women who have small hips, small waists, medium to small buttocks, and medium legs are considered more attractive.

To sum up, attractiveness factors for women are mainly a small waist size, high cheekbones, large breasts, smaller noses, and bigger eyes. The waist size, cheekbones, breasts and noses are meant to be related to fertility and health. Bigger eyes stand for youth and thus for fitness, as the eyes get smaller with age (see Wade, 2000).

Also for men fertility seems to be important for how attractive they are rated. The more dominant, healthy, and fertile men seem to be the more attractive they are rated by others. The faces of men are important for their attractiveness-ratings but also body parts which are seen in relationship with testosterone are especially important. Muscular bodies as well as striking masculine faces indicate high levels of testosterone and are, as a consequence, seen as physically attractive (Wade, 2000).

In evolutionary theory it is also postulated that what is normal is attractive, what can be ascribed to the assumption that average individuals are seen as not mutated. The population wants to be stable and healthy and individuals with extreme characteristics are seen as a risk for stability, so they are not chosen as partners. Extreme characteristics, like long noses etc. fall, in evolutionary theory, victim to selection (Barash, 1982; Grammer, 1993; Symons, 1979 as cited in Müller, 1993).

Müller (1993) also describes a cognitive theory. This theory says that prototypes are rated attractive, just because they are prototypes and are as such, familiar, and because of that are easily processed.

The scheme of childlike characteristics is often mentioned when talking about attractiveness. It is said, that what appears childlike is rated as attractive (Lorenz, 1966, as cited in Schuster, 1993).

One’s physical attractiveness is not only rated by others, but also by oneself.

**Self-ratings of attractiveness**

To mention first, it was found that sources for self-ratings of physical attractiveness differ between men and women. For men the face is the best indicator of self-rating-scores of physical attractiveness. For women, compared to men, the body-image is the best predictor for self-ratings of physical attractiveness (Wade, 2000, Wade & Cooper, 1999). Wade & Cooper, 1999, furthermore, found that for women physical attractiveness self-ratings are
predicted by feelings about appearance and beliefs about health, this effect was not found for men.

It also has to be mentioned that research showed that the relationship of self-ratings of physical attractiveness and ratings of physical attractiveness by others are small (Berscheid & Walster, 1974, Feingold, 1992). Feingold (1992) found a correlation coefficient of about .24 between physical attractiveness rated by others and self-rated physical attractiveness. People, in general, tend to rate themselves more physical attractive than they actually are (Diener, Wolsic, & Fujita, 1995). Men show a greater tendency to do so than women (Gabriel, Critelli, & Ee, 1994).

Self-rated physical attractiveness and of course physical attractiveness rated by others have several interpersonal and intrapersonal consequences.

**Interpersonal and intrapersonal effects of physical attractiveness**

It seems like more physical attractive individuals are better off in social life. Asendorp (2009) explains that physical attractiveness makes social contacts easier, because interaction partners react more positively to attractive persons. That makes social life for attractive persons easier and hinders loneliness. But on the other hand Asendorp says that, if contact is not wanted, attractiveness can also be seen as annoying. A model, worth mentioning on this topic, is the *Expectancy model* which says that people’s expectations towards others are influenced by characteristics which are theoretically not related to the actual character of the person (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968). However, Feingold found only little support for the expectancy model, even if sociability, dominance, general mental health, opposite-sex popularity, and intelligence were stereotypically associated with physical attractiveness in Feingold’s meta-analysis. The expectancy model is, in return, related to the *Halo-effect* (Thorndike, 1920), which mainly is the effect that if people have to judge others they choose striking characteristics of the others to make general judgment. In case of physical attractiveness people will mainly judge more attractive individuals better than less attractive individuals (Dion, 1986). Also in our daily lives we can often observe that individuals are judged simply by their appearance. Niketta (1993) cites, to accentuate, Mc Arthur (1982): “Judging a book by its cover” (p. 149).

In this context one has to mention the attractiveness stereotype: In their paper “what’s beautiful is good”, Dion, Berscheid, & Walster (1972) described the found effect, that physical attractive individuals are evaluated more positively than less physical attractive
individuals. Physical attractive individuals were ascribed more socially desired characteristics, than less attractive individuals. Furthermore participants expected physical attractive individuals to experience greater overall happiness, obtain more prestigious jobs, have better marriages, and, in general, expected them to live a more satisfying life in general. Feingold (1992) reports that physical attractive people were rated as "more sociable, dominant, sexually warm, mentally healthy, intelligent, and socially skilled than unattractive people" (p. 304). Langlois et al. (2000), besides, confirmed in their meta-analysis, that raters agree about physical attractiveness, independent from cultures. More attractive individuals, even children, are, according to Langlois et al. (2000), judged more positive than less attractive individuals, even if the person, who judged them, knows the individual. Furthermore, persons, even children, who are more attractive, are treated more positive than less attractive persons, also by persons who know them. However, additional information about another person can modify the attractiveness stereotypes (Niketta, 1993).

However, more attractive women are seen as more egoistic and more pavonine as less attractive women, if judged by other women (Dermer & Thiel, 1975). The conclusion that women evaluate less attractive women better than more attractive women is said to be a consequence of the social competition, women are confronted with in their daily lives (Dermer & Thiel, 1975). So, it is not yet clear if attractiveness stereotypes only have positive consequences.

The attractiveness stereotype can also be transferred to partners, in the form, that men with attractive women by their sides are evaluated as more positive, than men with less attractive women at their sides (Bar-Tal & Saxe, 1976; Hartnett & Elder, 1973; Meiners & Sheposh, 1977; Sigall & Landy, 1974; as cited in Niketta, 1993).

Besides the effects physical attractiveness has on social life, there are also some intrapersonal effects of physical attractiveness. Feingold (1992), for instance, reports that self-rated physical attractiveness is positively correlated with extraversion, mental health and social comfort. Furthermore he could find that different personality dimensions (e.g. dominance, emotional stability, and self-esteem) were unrelated to physical attractiveness, rated by others, but positively correlated with self-rated physical attractiveness. Furthermore, attractive individuals reported lower feelings of loneliness and social anxiety (Feingold, 1992). Physical attractiveness in general has effects on subjective well-being (Diener et al., 1995) and happiness, even if the relation between happiness and physical attractiveness is only weak (Campbell, Converse, & Rogers, 1976, as cited in Diener et al.).
There can even be found positive correlations of personal efficacy and self rated attractiveness (Bogaert & Hafer, 2009). Furthermore a study by Judge, Hurst, and Simon (2009) could reveal positive correlations of physical attractiveness and core self-evaluations, which for example contains self-esteem. Self-esteem, by itself, as documented in literature, is in relation to physical attractiveness.

Relationship of attractiveness and self-esteem

On the one hand, persons with higher self-esteem rate themselves more attractive, on the other hand more attractive people score higher on self-esteem (Feingold, 1992). Feingold also introduces the self-esteem model, which states that self-perceptions of physical attractiveness are determined by global self-esteem. Feingold explains that people who have high global self-esteem also feel physical attractive and the other way round. This model is in analogy with the theory of multidimensional self-esteem, introduced by Shavelson, Hubner, and Stanton in 1976, which includes appearance as a factor of self-esteem. Also in a scale to measure global self-esteem, introduced by Schütz and Sellin (Multidimensionale Selbstwert Skala, MSWS, 2006), physical attractiveness is a facet of the global self-esteem. But also self-esteem and physical attractiveness are related. Svaldi, Zimmermann, and Naumann (2012), for instance, revealed that people showed higher dissatisfaction with their bodies, after manipulation of their self-esteem.

Lerner, Karabenick and Stuart (1973) found a positive correlation between satisfaction with one’s own body and feelings of one’s own worth, which was higher for women, than for men. Krantz, Andrews, & Friedberg (1985), furthermore, reported positive correlations between self-esteem and perceptions of the own physical attractiveness in children. Garcia (1998) could also reveal a positive correlation between self-esteem and self-perception of physical attractiveness.

Nell & Ashton (1996) found, in their study, that self-perceptions of one’s appearance as well as body survey ratings are correlated with self-esteem, however women scored lower overall. The study could also reveal that the relation of physical attractiveness and self-esteem was higher for men than for women. Differences in the meaning of attractiveness between males and females have been revealed several times before.
Gender differences in the meaning of attractiveness

Everyone knows the term “the fair sex” and “the stronger sex”, which in their meaning indicate the difference in attractiveness between women and men. If one has a look around in society, it is evident, that for women being pretty seems to be more important than for men. The other way round, it is even expected from women to be pretty (cf. Engländer, Groiß, Schennach, & Sowinski, 2002).

Not only, as explained before, for women appearance is more important for their own self-esteem, than for men (Pliner et al., 1990; Allgood-Merten et al., 1990, Quatman & Watson, 2001, Wade, 2000), but also for men attractiveness of their partners is more important than for women (e.g. Berscheid, Dion, Walster, E., & Walster, 1971).

Feingold (1992), for instance, found that the correlation of self-rated physical attractiveness with self-esteem, intelligence, and current sexual experience were larger for women than for men, whereas the correlation of self-rated physical attractiveness with opposite sex popularity, number of sex partners, and global sexual experience was higher for men than for women.

Different explanations for the difference in the importance of physical attractiveness between men and women are given. First, physical attractiveness is part of the stereotype of women, second, women have to balance a lack of resources, and third, attractiveness, for women, is a signal for fertility (cf. Sieverding, 1993). After illustrating several findings of research on physical attractiveness, self-rated or rated by others, it seems obvious that physical attractiveness has several implications for social life, as well as intrapersonal. The same one can say about social exclusion. An interesting question is in what extent social exclusion and self-rated physical attractiveness are connected.

The connection of social exclusion and self-rated physical attractiveness

Several studies could reveal that individual’s self-esteem depends on how accepted the individual feels and that self-esteem after social inclusion is higher than self-esteem after social exclusion (Baumeister & Gailliot, 2007; Buckley et al., 2004; Leary et al., 2001; Leary et al., 1998; Leary & MacDonald, 2003; Leary et al., 1995). Self-esteem in turn is linked to self-rated attractiveness, as for example Pozzebon, Visser, Bogaert (2012) could show. In their study participants who scored high in body-esteem, self objectification, and self-esteem had a higher self-rated physical attractiveness than participants who scored low on these
scales. Svaldi et al. (2012), in addition, revealed that participants showed higher dissatisfaction with their bodies, after manipulation of their self-esteem.

Furthermore, studies could show that a lack of social acceptance is positively correlated with developing eating disorders (Lacey et al., 1986; Levine, 2012; McVey et al., 2002). The study by Duemm, Adams, & Keating (2003) revealed that different social fears, like internalized societal pressures, need for approval and fear of social rejection can be seen as influencing factors for developing bulimia, because of resulting self-perceived body dissatisfaction.

These findings lead to the assumption that social exclusion may have a negative effect on self-perceived attractiveness, which will be tested in this study. The aim of the present study is to prove the negative influence of social exclusion on self-rated physical attractiveness and besides the negative effect of social exclusion on state self-esteem. The following hypotheses have been put forward:

**Hypotheses**

(1) Participants in the exclusion condition will rate themselves less attractive than participants in the inclusion condition after manipulation.

(1a) The negative influence of social exclusion on self-ratings of attractiveness is supposed to be higher within women than within men, because, as explained above, physical attractiveness is a stronger concern for women than for men.

(1b) It is supposed that the need-to-belong influences effects of social exclusion on the self-rated physical attractiveness. This is assumed because the measurement of the need to belong contains items dealing with the need for social inclusion.

(1c) Also the global self-esteem is supposed to influence the effects of social exclusion on self-rated physical attractiveness.

(2) Participants in the exclusion condition show lower self-esteem after manipulation than participants in the inclusion condition, as proven before by several researchers, as for example Williams and Nida, 2011.

(2a) The effect is supposed to be higher for excluded women than for excluded men, because women are more orientated into groups than men (Cross & Madson, 1997; Josephs et al., 1992).
(2b) It is supposed that the general need-to-belong influences these effects. This is assumed because the measurement of the need-to-belong contains items dealing with the need for social inclusion.

(1c) Also the global self-esteem is supposed to influence the effects of social exclusion.

(3) Self-rated physical attractiveness is correlated to global self-esteem, because attractiveness is a domain of global self-esteem (e.g. MSWS, Schütz & Sellin, 2006) and as such is supposed to be highly correlated to global self-esteem.

(3a) Correlation is supposed to be higher for women than for men because appearance is more important for women’s self esteem, than for men’s, as for example Pliner et al., 1990 and Allgood-Merten et al., 1990 found out.

(4) Men have higher global self-esteem than women.
Method

Participants and design

50 women (age: $M=25$ years, $SD=8.4$, ranging from 18 to 61 years old) and 50 men (age: $M=29$ years; $SD=10.4$, ranging from 18 to 71 years old) participated in an online study. 82 participants were students and 18 employees. Participants were randomly assigned to either the exclusion or the inclusion condition. 50 persons were assigned to the exclusion condition (25 female and 25 male) and 50 persons were assigned to the inclusion condition (25 female and 25 male). Hence, the design of the analysis is 2 (exclusion vs. inclusion) by 2 (female vs. male) factorial design.

Materials and procedure

An online questionnaire was created with Lime Survey. The questionnaire contained different scales to survey characteristics and attitudes which seemed to be important to test hypothesis, introduced above. Scales will be specified subsequently. The questionnaire was sent out via different mailing lists and addressees were asked to fill it out voluntary. At the beginning of the questionnaire an instruction was presented which included some information about the data privacy and the voluntary aspect. Next, participants had to state their sex. Age, education, profession, nationality, and the number of siblings they have, were asked about, too. This information is not of particular interest for the hypothesis, but had been asked in case they could be of interest later on.

Essay-Task and manipulation check

For manipulation of social exclusion one can find different paradigms, for example Cyberball or the future-alone prognosis paradigm (Williams, 2007). In this study the essay-task was used because it seemed to be the best way to manipulate exclusion or inclusion in an online study. The essay task was used in previous research and it is supposed to be a good way for manipulating social exclusion (Gardner et al., 2000; Williams, 2007). Chen, Williams, Fitness, & Newton (2008) even proved that social pain can be easily provoked by thoughts. This finding strengthens the assumption that social exclusion can be manipulated adequate by writing an essay about previous exclusion experiences.
After being assigned to either the exclusion or the inclusion condition, people had to write an essay about a situation of their past. People in the exclusion condition had to write about a situation in their life where they felt excluded and not valued from a group or a person. People in the inclusion condition had to write about a situation in their lives where they felt important and valued in a group or for a person. Instruction was given in German and there was no time or length limit for this task.

As people continued with the questionnaire there were two questions, serving as a manipulation check (“how excluded did you feel in the situation?”, “how aversive did you experience the situation?”), which had to be answered on a scale form 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much). Cronbachs Alpha for these two items, serving as a manipulation check was .87.

**Measures**

**Global self-esteem**

To survey the global self-esteem, participants had to fill out the multidimensional self-esteem scale (Multidimensionale Selbstwertskala, MSWS, Schütz & Sellin, 2006). The MSWS is a self-description scale for surveying global self-esteem, which for this study, is defined as the overall evaluation of oneself. Altogether, the MSWS consists of 32 statements, which have to be judged by a 7-stage-response format, ranging from either 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much) or 1 (never) to 7 (always).

The MSWS has a hierarchic composition and can be divided in to two subscales: the general self-esteem (22 items) and the body-related self-esteem (10 items). The general self-esteem can further be divided into emotional self-esteem (7 items), social self-esteem – relating to critique (5 items), social self-esteem – relating to contact (5 items) and performance self-esteem (5 items). The body-related self-esteem can further be divided into self-esteem – relating to physical attractiveness (5 items) and self-esteem – relating to athleticism (5 items).

Reliability and Validity were satisfying in previous samples. In the representative sample Schütz and Sellin (2006) found Cronbachs Alpha between .75 and .87 for Subscales and Cronbachs Alpha between .85 and .93 for superior scales. Cronbachs Alpha in this study was between .75 and 94. For exact data for superior scales and subscales see table 1.
Table 1: Reliability Analysis MSWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>number of items</th>
<th>Cronbachs α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSWS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superior scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general self esteem</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body based self esteem</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subscales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotional self esteem</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social self esteem contact</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social self esteem critique</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social self esteem performance</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self esteem physical attractiveness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self esteem athleticism</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Need-to-belong**

The need-to-belong scale, presented here, is a modified version of the scale, proposed by Kelly (1999, cited by Leary et al., 2006). The scale, used in the present study, consists of ten items which measure individual differences in the need for social inclusion. It assesses a person’s desire to create or maintain interpersonal connections. The measure assesses the desire to be accepted by others, seek opportunities to belong to social groups, and react negatively to social exclusion. Items are scored on a 7-stage-response format, ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much). The scale was translated into German for this study. Cronbachs Alpha for the German version was .83.

**Positive and negative Affect**

People had to answer the Brunstein-affect-scale (1993) for assessing current feelings after the exclusion manipulation. The scale consists of eight adjectives to assess elated mood and depressed mood. The four adjectives describing elated mood are: “happy”, “joyful”, “pleased”, and “confident”. The four adjectives describing depressed mood are: “sad”, “depressed”, “frustrated”, and “anxious”.

All of these adjectives were presented in German and participants indicated the extent in which they are feeling these moods at the moment with a 7-stage-response format ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much). Cronbachs Alpha for the German version of the Scale elated mood in this study was .89 and for depressed mood Cronbachs Alpha was .85.
Need-Threat

To assess the current need-threat, the need-threat-scale (van Beest & Williams, 2006) was presented. The scale consists of 20 items. The four subscales are enquiring current states of belonging, self-esteem, meaningful existence, and control. Every subscale consists of five items. The items of the subscale belonging assess how included one felt in a special situation. The subscale self-esteem asks about feelings of oneself in a special situation. In the subscale meaningful existence, participants have to reveal if they felt important in a given situation. The subscale control deals with feelings of control and personal influence in situations.

The need-threat-scale for this study was translated into German and the item “I felt the other players interacted with me a lot” of the original scale was left out because it didn’t fit in the experimental design, because in this study people didn’t play Cyberball or any other game, but had to write an essay. Items were scored on a 7-stage-response format, ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much) and Cronbachs Alpha in this study was between .81 and .95 for the Subscales. For exact data see table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Reliability Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need threat scale general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need-threat-belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need-threat-self esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need-threat-meaningful existence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need-threat-control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-rated physical attractiveness

To measure the self-rated physical attractiveness people were asked to rate the following statements on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much): “At the moment I feel attractive”, “at the moment I am satisfied with my body”, “at the moment I am satisfied with the look of my face”, “actually I am happy when I see myself in the mirror”, “I think I am good-looking”. To measure attractiveness-self-esteem there were five statements, which had to be rated on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much).

The statements were: “my self-esteem doesn’t depend on I feel attractive or not”, “my self-esteem is influenced by how attractive I find, my own face is”, “my self-esteem suffers from feeling unattractive”, “my self-esteem is independent from the way I think about the look of
my body” and “if I think I look attractive, I feel good”. These statements were presented in German. Cronbachs Alpha for the self-rating of attractiveness was .90 and for the attractiveness-self-esteem scale Cronbachs Alpha was .82.

State Self-Esteem

State self-esteem was assessed by the State Self-Esteem Scale (Heatherton & Polivy, 1991). The Scale consists of 20 Items of self-assessments of current self-esteem. Subscales are performance self-esteem (7 items), social self-esteem (7 items), and appearance self-esteem (6 items). Statements and had to be evaluated on a 7-stage-response format ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much). The state self-esteem scale was, for this study, translated into German and Cronbachs Alpha for the Scales were between .78 and .91. For exact data see table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>number of items</th>
<th>Cronbachs α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSES</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSES-performance</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSES-social</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSES-appearance</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Order of Scales

1) Instruction
2) Personal Data
3) MSWS
4) Need to belong scale
5) Allocation to the conditions
6) Essay Task
7) Manipulation Check
8) Brunstein Affect Scale
9) Need Threat Scale
10) Self-rating of attractiveness
11) SSES
12) Attractiveness Self Esteem Scale
Results

Manipulation check

Participants in the exclusion condition reported higher feelings of exclusion and unpleasantness ($M=5.4$, $SD=1.4$) than participants in the inclusion condition ($M=1.7$, $SD=1.2$), $t(98)=14.0$, $p=.00$, $d=2.8$. For elated mood and depressed mood there could have been found no significant effect, both $p>.93$.

Testing the Hypothesis

Effect of social exclusion on self-rated physical attractiveness and state self-esteem

In order to test if there is any statistical effect of social exclusion on self-rated physical attractiveness and state self-esteem, two-factor-analysis-of-variance was calculated. Normal distribution for all dependent variables in all partial samples was given. Homogeneity of Variances was tested with Levene-Test and showed no significant results. For all means and standard deviations see table 6.

Effect of social exclusion and sex on self-rated physical attractiveness

No significant main effect of sex on the self-rating of attractiveness could be found, $p=.16$. Neither did the inclusionary state (exclusion vs. inclusion) show an effect on the self-rated physical attractiveness, $p=.57$, nor could there be found a significant interaction of sex and the inclusionary state, $p=.30$.

Effect of social exclusion and sex on state self-esteem

For state self-esteem there could also be found no significant effect of sex, $p=.08$. There could neither be found an effect of the inclusionary state (exclusion vs. inclusion) on state self-esteem, $p=.71$, nor could there be found a significant interaction effect of sex and the inclusionary state, $p=.26$. 
Influence of the need-to-belong and the global self-esteem on the dependent variables

For controlling the influence of the need-to-belong and the global self-esteem on the dependent variables, analysis of covariance was calculated.

The analysis revealed that only the effect of the global self-esteem on the dependent variables is significant (attractiveness rating: $F(1, 94) =63.37, p=.00$; state self-esteem: $F(1, 94) =161.02, p=.00$).

The need-to-belong does neither show an effect on the self-rated physical attractiveness, $p=46$, nor on state self-esteem, $p=48$.

Furthermore, after calculating analysis of covariance, for the self-rated physical attractiveness, there could neither be found a main effect of the exclusionary state, $p=.13$, nor could there be found a main effect of sex, $p=.91$ or an interaction effect sex and social exclusion, $p=.71$.

The inclusionary state did neither have an effect on the state self-esteem, $p=.46$, nor did sex show a main effect on state self-esteem, $p=.53$. An interaction of sex and the inclusionary state was not found, $p=.29$.

Correlation of global self-esteem and self-rated physical attractiveness

For female and male participants, self-rated physical attractiveness and global self-esteem are significantly correlated (female: $r=.63, p=.00$, male: $r=.70, p=.000$).

To test if there is a statistical difference between the correlations Cohen’s $z$ was calculated and showed that there is no statistical difference between the correlation of women and the correlation of men ($z_{emp}=1.0$, $z_{krit}=1.96$, $z_{emp}<z_{krit}$).

Correlation of the dependent variables

Pearson correlations of the dependent variables state self-esteem and self-rating of physical attractiveness revealed a correlation coefficient of $r=.72, p=.00$. Separated for females the correlation coefficient was $r=.71, p=.00$ and separated for males the correlation coefficient was $r=.71, p=.00$. 
Correlation of the Covariates and the dependent variables

For a better clarity, results of the Correlations of Covariates and the dependent variables self-rated physical attractiveness and state self-esteem for males and females are displayed in table 4. For correlation coefficients within the four partial samples see table 5.

Table 4: Correlation of dependent variables and covariates in the partial samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>attractiveness</th>
<th>SSes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>excluded females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to belong</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>global SE</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>included females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to belong</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>global SE</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.86**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excluded males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to belong</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>global SE</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>included males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to belong</td>
<td>-.49*</td>
<td>-.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>global SE</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.92**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **shows significance on .01-Niveau, *shows significance on .05-Niveau

Table 5: Correlation of dependent variables and covariates in the partial samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>attractiveness</th>
<th>SSes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to belong</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>global SE</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to belong</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>global SE</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to belong</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global SE</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **shows significance on .01-Niveau, *shows significance on .05-Niveau
Gender differences in self-esteem

For testing the hypothesis, that men have higher scores on self-esteem, T-Test was executed. Normal distribution was given for all dependent variables and the condition of homogeneity of variance was fulfilled, too.

The results show that men have significantly higher global self-esteem $t(98) = -1.78$, $p = 0.018$, $d = 0.13$. The T-test, further, revealed that on the Need-to-belong scale women score higher, than men, $t(98) = 3.24$, $p = 0.00$, $d = 0.65$. See table 7 for means and standard deviations.

Table 6: Means and standard deviations (in parentheses) of dependent variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exclusion</th>
<th></th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (n=25)</td>
<td>Male (n=25)</td>
<td>total (n=50)</td>
<td>Female (n=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractiveness-rating</td>
<td>4.93(1.1)</td>
<td>5.02(1.13)</td>
<td>4.97(1.11)</td>
<td>4.54(1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSES</td>
<td>5.01(.90)</td>
<td>5.13(1.07)</td>
<td>5.07(.98)</td>
<td>4.86(.89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Means and standard deviations (in parentheses), concerning the sex differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>female total (n=50)</th>
<th>male total (n=50)</th>
<th>total (n=100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attractiveness-rating</td>
<td>4.74(1.17)</td>
<td>5.07(1.21)</td>
<td>4.90(1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global self-esteem</td>
<td>4.60(.84)</td>
<td>5.04(1.03)</td>
<td>4.82(.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSES</td>
<td>4.94(.89)</td>
<td>5.28(1.03)</td>
<td>5.11(.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to belong</td>
<td>4.49(.97)</td>
<td>3.80(1.14)</td>
<td>4.15(.11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

The aim of the current study was to investigate whether social exclusion would lead to lower self-rated physical attractiveness. It was hypothesised that socially excluded individuals rate themselves less attractive than socially included individuals. For this study hypothesis could not be confirmed. Analysis showed that social exclusion has no significant effect on self-rated physical attractiveness.

The explanation one can give for present results may be found in a theory mentioned in literature: the self-evaluation maintenance model (Tesser, 1988). The self-evaluation maintenance model states that individuals are motivated to hold their own self-esteem levels high and it was found that individuals, to maintain self-esteem high, remember positive facts about themselves better than negative ones (see D’Argembeau et al., 2005). As participants in this study thought about experiencing social exclusion in the past their self-esteem was, probably, threatened and, probably, to antagonise this effect of lowering self-esteem, participants, subconsciously, overestimated their own attractiveness. The idea is that holding positive feelings about oneself present helps handling the social exclusion experience and as a consequence helps satisfying the need-to-belong. In this case positive information of the own attractiveness was made salient because of the self-rating of attractiveness, participants had to respond.

There is another theory which, possibly, provides an explanation for present results. Literature says that, as a consequence of experiencing social exclusion, individuals try to change their behaviour in a way that facilitates being reintegrated into the group or being accepted by others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). As known, being attractive is a socially desired characteristic and some even say “what is beautiful is good” (e.g. Dion et al., 1972; Lemay, Clark, & Greenberg, 2010). Lemay et al. (2010) furthermore confirmed that people desire to form and maintain close social bonds with attractive targets. Accordingly, an explanation for the present results could be that excluded individuals try to bring out their amenities to feel less excluded or to have the feeling that, because of their socially desirable traits (in this case especially physical attractiveness, because it was made salient before), they are able to get reintegrated again, or at least are able to form new relationships which help them to feel comfortable even after thinking about being excluded in the past.

Also the downward-comparison-model, which says that people make downward comparisons to self-enhance (Wills, 1981), could offer an explanation for present results.
Because of the threat to state self-esteem after a social exclusion experience, or in this case rethinking such an experience of social exclusion, individuals try to antagonise the negative effect of social exclusion and try to increase their self-esteem. As mentioned above, individuals in general try to have high self-esteem (Tesser, 1988). To increase their self-esteem participants, possibly, compared themselves to less attractive persons, what made them think better about themselves and, as a consequence, helps maintaining high self-esteem. The self-rated attractiveness, in this case, would not show a negative effect of social exclusion.

There is one more explanation for the finding that participants of the exclusion condition and participants of the inclusion condition did not differ in their self-rated physical attractiveness. The results could be a consequence of automatic regulation processes, previously described by DeWall et al. (2011). DeWall et al. found that for excluded individuals positive emotion words became more cognitively accessible. An implicit measure of emotions revealed that positive emotions become more accessible than negative emotions, which serves as a mechanism of protection against the negative experience of social exclusion. The emotion regulation process could even be transferred to the self-rated physical-attractiveness. The positive self-evaluation could, possibly, serve as a protective shield. For future studies it would be an idea to do implicit measures of self-rated physical attractiveness.

However, also the hypothesized effect of social exclusion on state self-esteem could not be found. Analysis showed no significant effect of social exclusion on state self-esteem scores, even if previous research could show that social exclusion has negative effects on self-esteem measures and that individuals in general rate themselves better after inclusion than after exclusion (Buckley et al., 2004; Leary et al., 2001; Leary et al., 1998; Leary et al., 1995). The conclusion one can draw is that the reason why there could neither be found an effect of social exclusion on self-rated physical attractiveness, nor on state-self-esteem is simply because the manipulation of the unsatisfying inclusionary state manipulation. Another manipulation of inclusionary state (e.g. cyber ball paradigm, future-alone paradigm, or get acquainted paradigm) could, probably, have delivered effects of social exclusion on state self-esteem as well as on the self-rating of physical attractiveness. Another hint for the failing of the exclusion manipulation is that there is no difference in the elated and depressed moods between the excluded and the included individuals, even if DeWall et al. (2011) could neither
find differences in measures of emotion between excluded and included participants. It remains unclear if the manipulation of the inclusionary state did work or not.

Considering that this was an online study one can also suppose that some of the participants did not take participating too seriously and as a consequence did not think intensely enough about being excluded in the past. Also the questionnaire was quite long and so maybe a lack of motivation could have lead to the unsatisfying results of the study. It could further not be controlled if participants were alone, when filling out the questionnaire, or where they filled out the questionnaire. Others could have served as a buffer of social exclusion. Gardner, Picket, and Knowles (2005) described possible buffers against social exclusion, like photographs, that are able to decrease or compensate the consequences of social exclusion. Gardner et al. (2005) in general draw the conclusion that “social snacks” or “social shield” can temporally satisfy the need-to-belong. For future studies such confounding variables, as buffers, should definitely be controlled. A possibility would have been to advise participants to fill out the form when no one else is present to assure that others cannot serve as buffers against social exclusion. Other buffers, like photographs, cannot easily be eliminated and for online studies are problematic. Also if participants filled out the form in their homes, where they felt comfortable and homelike, reduced effect of social exclusion could be a possible consequence. For future online studies, concerning social exclusion, it could be an advantage to ask about where the questionnaire was filled out and if others were around. Also questions about surrounding stuff, like mentioned photographs, could be an advantage. On the other hand such questions could even call the attention on buffers and even strengthen the buffering effect.

For future research it could be an alternative to do dependent sample design in online studies. The idea is to first test participants in a neutral or even inclusionary condition, and, some time later, in an exclusionary condition to control interpersonal differences. This design could maybe also diminish the effect of the environment, if one has to fill out both of the forms in the same place. Dependent sample design, however, poses other problems, like a lack of motivation, if tested a second time or learning effects. It is supposed that for manipulation of social exclusion laboratory testing works best.

The hypothesized effect of sex on the self-rating of attractiveness and state self-esteem could neither be confirmed. Also there could not be found an interaction of social exclusion and sex on state self-esteem and self-rated physical attractiveness. Possibly, males and
females are not different in their visible reactions to social exclusion, but only in their coping strategies, which should further be investigated in future studies.

Another idea, concerning sex differences, is that maybe women are affected by different forms of exclusion than men are. It could possibly be that men react more strongly to exclusion that threatens their state, as for an example not have been chosen in a football team, or not have been asked to be an important part in a group, like a team-leader. It is supposable that women react more to kind of an emotional exclusion, like thinking someone else does not like them. In this study participants had to write an essay about situations in which they had the feeling they weren´t accepted from others or didn’t feel like an important part of a group or felt not accepted or important for someone else. The situation was chosen by the participants themselves. It is supposed that women, when thinking of being excluded, think about way different situations than men. If one has a look at essays at hand, one can see that female participants write essays about situations in which they had the feelings of not being popular in a circle of friends or acquaintances or colleagues. Men, on the other hand, mainly wrote about situations where their work or their performance wasn’t appreciated. For future studies it could be proposed to examine the different types of exclusion and how they affect females and males differently. What supports this thought is the finding that males and females have different priorities in the domains of self-esteem (e.g. Kling et al., 1999) and furthermore women and men have different styles of social connectedness. Women are more likely to form close intimate bonds, whereas men tend to have larger, less intimate circles of friends (Baumeister & Sommers, 1997). These facts strengthen the view that in case of social exclusion gender differences have to be further explored in future.

Another assumption which could not have been confirmed is that the need-to-belong does influence effects of social exclusion. The proposed covariate need-to-belong did not show an effect on the dependent variables, which could also be a consequence of the unsatisfying exclusion manipulation. Concerning the need-to-belong, in this study, there could be revealed that women score higher on the need-to-belong-scale than do men which is in accord to previous findings, that females are more group-orientated than males and that women’s self-esteem is more dependent on interpersonal attachments than men’s (e.g. Cross & Madson, 1997; Josephs et al., 1992).

Global self-esteem, in contrast to the need-to-belong, did have a significant effect on the dependent variables, which is not a surprise as state self-esteem and global self-esteem are highly related to each other (e.g. Heatherton & Polivy, 1991).
Correlations of attractiveness ratings and global self-esteem, for both, females and males were moderate to high positive. This seems to be logical, as attractiveness is said to be a domain of self-esteem measures (e.g. Heatherton & Polivy, 1991, Schütz & Sellin, 2006). Besides the fact that self-rated physical attractiveness and global self-esteem are correlated, it was further hypothesized, that the correlation of attractiveness and global self-esteem is higher for women, than for men, because for females attractiveness is a more important domain for self-esteem than for males (cf. Pliner et al., 1990; Allgood-Merten et al., 1990). Statistical comparison could not confirm differences. This could be a result of changes in society. Some authors in the past also supposed that with changing gender stereotypes, the difference in the importance of attractiveness between the sexes will decrease. For example Bar-Tal & Saxe (1976) stated: “What was true 20 or even 10 years ago, may no longer be true” (p131).

Even in our everyday lives we can see, women´s and men´s desired characteristics merging more and more. For example, on “girls-day” different organizations promote strong girls or girls in “men’s domains” etc. (www.girlsday.info). But not only for women men’s desirable characteristics are getting more and more important. The reverse can also be true, as for example parental leave is promoted more and more for men, to make it easier for women to get into business again, whereas for their grandmothers or even mothers, their own business was irrelevant. In general one can see changes in society concerning family lives, in a way that fathers are more and more responsible for childcare (e.g. Lewis, 2013).

These changes can also be seen in the topic of attractiveness. For example if one has a close look at TV-advertisements, one can see a growing amount of advertisement promoting cosmetics for men, for example special shampoos or facial crèmes. Cosmetics for men are finding a ready market and sales volume steadily increases (e.g. Höller, 2010). Consequently, one should definitely have in mind that for men attractiveness is a growing concern and because of that it maybe that the hypothesized differences between male and female participants in the correlation of attractiveness rating and self-esteem diminishes more and more. For future research it would be interesting to explore if gender stereotypes actually change. If changes can be found it would further be interesting to explore if previous found differences in the domains of self-esteem diminish, as well.

The finding that there is no difference between males and females in the correlation of self-rated attractiveness and global self-esteem may also been have caused by moderators. Kling et al. (1990), for example, found some moderators of gender differences in self-esteem, as age,
country, ethnicity, etc. This can possibly be transferred to the correlation of attractiveness and global self-esteem, too. So, for future designs, one should definitely, observe possible moderators for gender differences. Anyway, differences in the importance of the own appearance should be considered in future studies.

Hypothesis concerning gender differences in global self-esteem could be confirmed. The study revealed males have significant higher self-esteem than females. Differences between the sexes in the extent of self-esteem and the domains of self-esteem were found in several studies before (cf. Kling et al., 1999; Quatman & Watson, 2001). Results that males score higher on self-esteem could, for this study, be replicated, even if the difference is not too big (half of a standard deviation). Differences in global self-esteem have previously been explained as a consequence of the different gender roles (cf. Kling et al., 1999; Quatman & Watson, 2001), factors like different treatment and expectations in school (e.g. Orenstein, 1994 as cited in Kling et al., 1999), or to processes in childhood and adolescence (Block & Robins, 1993). These explanations seem to be quite logical, even if, as mentioned above, it should definitely be examined if differences between females and males, within society, change over time. It is possible that new views about gender are developing even if traditional views continue to exist (cf. Rendtorff, 2003). If gender stereotypes are changing it may also affect differences in self-esteem between the sexes and possibly in a few years gender differences in self-esteem will diminish more and more or even will disappear. For future research it is strongly recommended to investigate if or to what extent gender differences are diminishing and in which domains in life the diminishing is especially demonstrative.

The conclusion one can draw, after displaying results of the present study, is that it could not be clarified if social exclusion has effects on self-perceived attractiveness. Further research on that topic is necessary. Even if this study could not show the previously documented negative effect of social exclusion on state self-esteem measures (Buckley et al., 2004; Leary et al., 2001; Leary et al., 1998; Leary et al., 1995) one can assume that this effect exists and the results of this study could be considered as a consequence of the lack of the exclusion manipulation.

Also the link between loneliness and eating disorders, mentioned in the beginning should still be observed. After displaying the results of the study one could consider, being lonely is not a determinant of developing eating disorders, because it does not affect self-perceived attractiveness. Research has proven different, for example Lacey et al. (1986). For coping with self-doubt, dissatisfaction with oneself, and the resulting psychological problems one
should definitely have the inclusionary state as a determinant of well-being in mind. It could be proposed to involve strategies for coping with social exclusion in therapy for patients with eating disorders.
Abstract

The present study investigated whether social exclusion would lead individuals to rate themselves less attractive and, besides, tried to replicate findings that state self-esteem is lowered by social exclusion. Self-rated physical attractiveness is hypothesized to be correlated with global self-esteem and correlation was hypothesized to be higher for women than for men. Men are also assumed to have higher global self-esteem than women. 100 persons were tested in an online study to test hypothesis. Half of the participants were randomly assigned to the exclusion condition and half of them were assigned to the inclusion condition. Results did neither show hypothesised effects of social exclusion on self-rated physical attractiveness, nor could there be found an effect of social exclusion on state self-esteem. Results are basically ascribed to a lack of the manipulation of the inclusionary state, but also there are discussed some theories, which may be in relation with found results. Hypothesised positive correlation of global self-esteem and self-rated physical attractiveness could have been confirmed, even if the hypothesized difference between females and males, concerning the strength of the correlation could not be confirmed. The hypothesised difference between males and females concerning the global self-esteem could have been confirmed. Males scored higher on global self-esteem than females. This difference has been found in research several times before and is ascribed to different gender roles as well as to processes in childhood and adolescence which may explain gender differences in global self-esteem. Another finding was that females scored higher on the need-to-belong scale, which is ascribed to the different styles women and men have within their social connectedness. The explanatory power of the study is said to be low and implications for future studies, concerning social exclusion and physical attractiveness are discussed.
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Appendix

Questionnaire / Fragebogen

Instruktion
Lieber Untersuchungsteilnehmerin / Lieber Untersuchungsteilnehmer,

vielen Dank, dass Sie sich dazu bereit erklärt haben, an meiner Untersuchung teilzunehmen, welche sich damit beschäftigt, wie verschiedene Alltagssituationen auf uns wirken und wie wir mit diesen umgehen.

Im ersten Teil des Fragebogens geben Sie bitte einige Daten zu Ihrer Person an. Im Anschluss daran sind einige Fragen formuliert, die Sie mittels einer Skala beantworten können. Lesen Sie alle Fragen aufmerksam durch und lassen Sie keine Frage aus.

Es gibt keine richtigen oder falschen Antworten. Antworten Sie immer so, wie es für Sie persönlich am besten zutrifft. Überlegen Sie nicht, welche Antworten den besten Eindruck machen. Wählen Sie immer nur eine Antwortmöglichkeit. Fällt es Ihnen schwer, so entscheiden Sie sich für diejenige Antwortalternative, die Ihrer Einstellung am ehesten entspricht.


Alle Angaben werden selbstverständlich strikt anonym ausgewertet. Ihre Daten werden nicht für kommerzielle, sondern nur für rein wissenschaftliche Zwecke verwendet.

Bei Fragen zur Untersuchung oder sollten Sie an den Ergebnissen der Untersuchung interessiert sein, können Sie sich jederzeit an mich wenden (susanne.frankenberger@edu.uni-graz.at).

Noch einmal vielen herzlichen Dank für Ihr Mitwirken!
Zunächst bitte ich Sie darum, einige Angaben zu Ihrer Person zu machen.

Geschlecht  
- [ ] männlich  
- [ ] weiblich

Alter  
[ ] _____ Jahre

Höchste abgeschlossene Ausbildung  
- [ ] Hauptschulabschluss  
- [ ] Abgeschlossene Berufsausbildung  
- [ ] Hochschulreife  
- [ ] Hochschulabschluss

Beruf/Studienrichtung  
[ ]

Staatsangehörigkeit  
[ ]

Haben sie Geschwister?  
- [ ] ja  
- [ ] Nein

Wenn ja, wie viele?  
[ ]
Im nachfolgenden Block, sind Fragen aufgeführt, die persönliche Einstellungen und Eigenschaften betreffen. Geben Sie für jede Aussage an, inwieweit sie im Allgemeinen auf sie zutrifft.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gar nicht</th>
<th>sehr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Zweifeln Sie an sich selbst?</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Haben Sie das Gefühl, dass es keinen Bereich in Ihrem Leben gibt, indem Sie gut sind?</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Haben Sie eine positive Einstellung zu sich selbst?</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Empfinden Sie Angst oder Beklemmung, wenn Sie alleine einen Raum betreten, in dem schon andere Leute sind, die sich unterhalten?</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Haben Sie im Kontakt mit anderen Schwierigkeiten, den passenden Gesprächsstoff zu finden?</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Wie sehr machen Sie sich Gedanken darüber, ob andere Leute Sie als Versager ansehen?</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Wie sehr beschäftigt oder beunruhigt es Sie, wenn Sie sich vorstellen, dass andere vielleicht eine negative Meinung von Ihnen haben?</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sind Sie mit Ihren Leistungen im Beruf zufrieden?</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Zweifeln Sie an Ihren fachlichen Fähigkeiten?</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Haben Sie das Gefühl, dass die meisten Ihrer Bekannten attraktiver sind als Sie selbst?</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frage</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Wie sicher sind Sie sich, dass Sie für gut aussehend gehalten werden?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Wenn es bei sportlichen Aktivitäten auf Koordination ankommt – machen Sie sich Sorgen darüber, dass Sie schlecht abschneiden könnten?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sind Sie der Meinung, dass Sie gut tanzen können oder begabt sind für Freizeitaktivitäten, bei denen es auf die Koordination ankommt?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Wie nervös werden Sie, wenn Ihnen andere beim Sport zuschauen?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sind Sie zufrieden mit Ihren sportlichen Fähigkeiten?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Wie häufig glauben Sie, dass Sie ein nutzloser Mensch sind?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Wie häufig sind Sie so unzufrieden mit sich, dass Sie sich fragen, ob Sie ein wertvoller Mensch sind?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Wie häufig können Sie sich selbst nicht leiden?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Wie häufig fühlen Sie sich gehemmt?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Wie häufig sind Sie mit sich zufrieden?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. Fühlen Sie sich häufig unwohl in Ihrer Haut, wenn Sie neue Leute kennenlernen?

22. Wie häufig macht Ihnen Schüchternheit zu schaffen?

23. Wie häufig machen Sie sich Gedanken darüber, dass jemand Ihre Arbeit kritisieren könnte?

24. Wie häufig machen Sie sich Gedanken darüber, ob andere gerne mit Ihnen zusammen sind?

25. Wie häufig machen Sie sich Sorgen darüber, was andere von Ihnen denken?

26. Wie häufig haben Sie das Gefühl, wirklich gute Arbeit geleistet zu haben, nachdem Sie eine Arbeit abgeschlossen haben?

27. Wie häufig sind Sie überzeugt von den Leistungen, die Sie in ihrer Arbeit erbracht haben?

28. Wie häufig haben Sie das Gefühl, dass Sie anspruchsvollen Aufgaben nicht gewachsen sind?

29. Wie häufig schämen Sie sich wegen Ihres Aussehens oder Ihrer Figur?

30. Wie häufig wünschen Sie sich, besser auszusehen?

31. Wie häufig fühlen Sie sich attraktiv?

32. Wie häufig haben Sie schon das Gefühl gehabt, dass andere Ihnen sportlich überlegen sind?
Im nächsten Block sind Aussagen formuliert, welche Ihren Umgang mit anderen Personen betreffen. Bitte entscheiden Sie wieder auf einer Skala von 1(gar nicht) bis 7(sehr), inwieweit jede Aussage im Allgemeinen auf Sie zutrifft.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gar nicht</th>
<th>sehr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Wenn mich andere nicht akzeptieren wollen, macht mir das nichts aus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ich versuche stets Dinge zu vermeiden, die andere dazu bringen würden mich abzulehnen oder auszugrenzen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ich sorge mich selten darum, ob sich andere etwas aus mir machen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ich muss das Gefühl haben, dass es Personen gibt, an die ich mich in schweren Zeiten wenden kann.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ich will, dass andere mich akzeptieren.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ich mag es nicht, alleine zu sein.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Es macht mir nichts aus, längere Zeit von meinen Freunden getrennt zu sein.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ich habe ein starkes Bedürfnis dazu zu gehören.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Es macht mir viel aus, wenn andere mich nicht in ihre Pläne einweihen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Meine Gefühle sind leicht verletzt, wenn andere mich nicht akzeptieren.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Zuteilung zu den Bedingungen:**

Denken sie nun bitte an eine Zahl zwischen eins und zehn.

Ist diese Zahl kleiner als 5?

☐ ja  ☐ Nein

---

**Bedingungen:**

(ja) (Essay – Exklusionsbedingung)

Liebe Untersuchungsteilnehmerin/Lieber Untersuchungsteilnehmer,
erinnern Sie sich nun an eine Situation in Ihrem Leben, in der Sie sich als Person nicht
geschätzt fühlten und in der Sie das Gefühl hatten, aus einer Gruppe oder von einer Person
bewusst ausgeschlossen worden zu sein. Denken Sie kurz über die Situation nach und
beschreiben Sie diese Situation in einigen Sätzen.

(Oder:)

(nein) (Essay – Inklusionsbedingung)

Liebe Untersuchungsteilnehmerin/Lieber Untersuchungsteilnehmer,
erinnern Sie sich nun an eine Situation in ihrem Leben, in der Sie sich als Person geschätzt
fühlten und in der Sie das Gefühl hatten, ein wichtiger Teil einer Gruppe zu sein bzw. wichtig
für eine Person zu sein. Denken Sie kurz über die Situation nach und beschreiben Sie diese
Situation in einigen Sätzen.
WIEDER FÜR ALLE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frage</th>
<th>Gar nicht</th>
<th>sehr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Wie ausgeschlossen haben sie sich in der Situation gefühlt?</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Als wie unangenehm haben sie die Situation empfunden?</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Es folgen nun Adjektive, die Gefühlszustände beschreiben, bitte geben sie für jedes Adjektiv auf einer 7-stufigen Skala von 1(gar nicht) bis 7(sehr) an, inwieweit das jeweilige Adjektiv ihr derzeitiges Befinden beschreibt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjektiv</th>
<th>Gar nicht</th>
<th>sehr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. glücklich</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. frustriert</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. traurig</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. erfreut</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. niedergeschlagen</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. zufrieden</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Als nächstes folgen Aussagen, welche sich auf die Situation beziehen, welche Sie sich soeben vorgestellt haben. Für die Bewertung der Aussagen steht Ihnen wieder eine 7-stufige Skala zur Verfügung. Geben sie an, inwieweit die Aussagen auf ihr Befinden in der beschriebenen Situation zutreffend sind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aussage</th>
<th>Gar nicht</th>
<th>sehr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ich fühlte mich alleine.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ich fühlte mich zurückgewiesen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ich fühlte mich wie ein Außenseiter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ich fühlte mich zugehörig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ich fühlte mich gut.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mein Selbstwert war hoch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ich fühlte mich gemocht.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ich fühlte mich unsicher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ich war zufrieden.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ich fühlte mich unsichtbar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ich fühlte mich bedeutungslos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ich fühlte mich, als würde ich nicht existieren.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ich fühlte mich wichtig.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ich fühlte mich nützlich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ich fühlte mich mächtig.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ich denke, ich hatte Kontrolle über die Situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ich denke, ich hatte die Möglichkeit etwas zu verändern.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ich denke, ich konnte die Situation nicht beeinflussen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ich hatte das Gefühl, die anderen haben alles entschieden.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Es folgen nun noch Aussagen dazu, wie Sie sich im Moment selbst einschätzen. Sie haben für die Einschätzung eine Skala von 1(gar nicht) bis 7(sehr) zur Verfügung.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Momentan fühlte ich mich attraktiv.</th>
<th>Gar nicht</th>
<th>sehr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Im Moment bin ich mit meinem Körper zufrieden.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Im Moment bin ich mit dem Aussehen meines Gesichts zufrieden.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ich empfinde mich als gutaussehend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. Ich bin zufrieden mit meinen Fähigkeiten. | Gar nicht | sehr |
| 2. Ich mache mir Gedanken darüber, wie ich vor anderen Leuten da stehe |           |      |
| 3. Im Moment bin ich mit dem Aussehen meines Körpers zufrieden. |           |      |
| 4. Ich bin frustriert über meine Leistungsfähigkeit. |           |      |
| 5. Ich denke, dass ich Probleme damit habe, Dinge, die ich lese zu verstehen. |           |      |
6. Ich denke, dass andere mich respektieren und bewundern.

7. Ich bin mit meinem Gewicht unzufrieden.

8. Ich fühle mich selbstbewusst.

9. Ich fühle mich gleich intelligent im Vergleich zu anderen.

10. Ich bin unzufrieden mit mir selbst.

11. Ich fühle mich gut.


13. Ich mache mir Gedanken darüber, was andere Leute über mich denken.


15. Im Moment fühle ich mich anderen unterlegen.

16. Ich fühle mich unattraktiv.

17. Ich mache mir Sorgen darüber, welchen Eindruck ich bei anderen hinterlasse.


19. Ich glaube, ich schneide im Vergleich zu anderen
häufig schlechter ab.

20. Ich bin besorgt darüber, dumm auszusehen. 

Bitte beantworten sie zum Schluss noch die nachfolgenden Fragen, für die Ihnen wieder eine 7-Stufige Skala (von 1/ich stimme überhaupt nicht zu – 7/ich stimme voll und ganz zu) zur Verfügung steht.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Ich stimme überhaupt nicht zu</th>
<th>2 = Ich stimme größtenteils zu</th>
<th>3 = Ich stimme eher nicht zu</th>
<th>4 = Neutral</th>
<th>5 = Ich stimme eher zu</th>
<th>6 = Ich stimme größtenteils zu</th>
<th>7 = Ich stimme voll und ganz zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mein Selbstwertgefühl hängt nicht davon ab, ob ich mich attraktiv fühle oder nicht.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mein Selbstwertgefühl wird davon beeinflusst, für wie attraktiv ich mein Gesicht oder meine Gesichtszüge halte.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mein Selbstwertgefühl leidet darunter, wenn ich denke, dass ich nicht gut aussehe.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mein Selbstwertgefühl ist unabhängig davon, wie ich das Aussehen meines Körpers finde.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wenn ich denke, dass ich attraktiv aussehe, fühle ich mich gut.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vielen Dank für Ihre Teilnahme!