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Description of Measure

Purpose
To evaluate respondent’s tendency to give socially desirable responses.

Conceptual Organization
The Socially Desirable Response Set Measure (SDRS-5) contains 5 items assessing the degree to which self-report responses may be influenced by social desirability.

Item Origin/Selection Process
The items were drawn from the Marlowe-Crowne (MC) Form A (Reynolds, 1982), an 11-item short form measure developed from the 33-item Marlowe-Crowne Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). Ten of the 11 items were used in correlation analyses. The five items with the highest item-to-total correlations were selected for the SDRS-5 (Hays, Hayashi, & Stewart, 1989).

LONGSCAN modified the answer sets at age 12, utilizing a 4 point response set rather than the original 5 points, and modifying the response options from Definitely True –Definitely False, to Strongly Agree-Strongly Disagree.

Materials
A-CASI delivery system.

Time Required
1 minute

Administration Method
A-CASI

Scoring

Score Types
Respondents rank each item on a 4-point scale ranging from ‘1 = Strongly Disagree’, to ‘4 = Strongly Agree’. Because only the most extreme response is considered indicative of socially desirable responding, the responses should be dichotomized in scoring. This will minimize incorrect classifications of borderline responses as socially desirable. Hays, Hayashi, and Stewart (1989) linearly transformed scale scores to a 0-100 distribution so that they could be interpreted directly as proportions of the total possible score.

Score Interpretation
A higher total score indicates more socially desirable answers.

Norms and/or Comparative Data

The authors tested the instrument on a sample of 614 outpatients (mean age = 37 years; 56% female) who were participating in pilot studies for the Medical Outcome Study, and later validated it with 3,058 participants in the Medical Outcome Study (mean age: 47 years, 62% female). The mean scale
score in the first study, based on the 0-100 linear transformation of scores (see Score Types above), was 17.66 and the cross-validation sample score was 35.80 (Hays, Hayashi, & Stewart, 1989). The scale was more recently used in a patient adherence to treatment study (DiMatteo et al., 1993).

**Psychometric Support**

**Reliability**
Internal consistency reliability of the scale was acceptable for the two Hays studies (Cronbach’s alpha = .66 and .68 respectively) (Hays, Hayashi, & Stewart, 1989). The reliability is nearly as high as the MC Form A (Reynolds, 1982) and approached lower bound estimates for the full 33-item Marlowe-Crown scale (Crino et al., 1983).

**LONGSCAN Use**

**Data Points**
Ages 12

**Respondent**
Caregiver

**Form Version and Mnemonic**
Age 12: SDEC

**Rationale**
Having a measure of respondents' tendency to provide socially desirable responses is useful for assessing the validity of participants' response sets. A socially desirable response set can be used as a control variable in multivariate statistical analyses. Because of the length of LONGSCAN’s battery of measures for caregivers, the brevity of the SDRS-5 made it a feasible measure to use.

**Administration and Scoring Notes**
LONGSCAN modified the answer set slightly at age 12, utilizing a 4 point response set instead of the original 5 point set, and modifying the response options from Definitely True – Definitely False, to Strongly Agree–Strongly Disagree. Scoring follows the author’s procedure of dichotomizing the response values so as to maximize the validity of the measure and is as follows:

- Item 1: 4 = 1, all other values = 0
- Item 2: 1 = 1, all other values = 0
- Item 3: 1 = 1, all other values = 0
- Item 4: 1 = 1, all other values = 0
- Item 5: 4 = 1, all other values = 0

LONGSCAN did not linearly transform scores to the 1 to 100 distribution developed by Hays et al. (1989). Thus, total scores on the measure range from 0 to 5.

**Results**

**Descriptive Statistics**
For descriptive statistics of the Age 8 Social Desirability scores, please refer to the 2nd volume of the LONGSCAN Measures Manuals (Hunter et al., 2003). Table 1 highlights the Social Desirability
mean scores and score frequency by gender and site at the Age 12 interview. The average total score was 1.4 for the entire LONGSCAN sample, indicating that respondents did not tend to give notably socially desirable responses, thus lending credibility to the validity of participants’ response sets as a whole.

Table 1. Age 12 Caregiver Social Desirability Score by Site and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Site</th>
<th>Total Score M (SD)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1.4 (1.6)</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>45.7 (421)</td>
<td>16.5 (152)</td>
<td>14.4 (133)</td>
<td>8.9 (82)</td>
<td>7.9 (73)</td>
<td>6.6 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.4 (1.6)</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>22.2 (205)</td>
<td>9.2 (85)</td>
<td>7.9 (73)</td>
<td>3.7 (34)</td>
<td>3.7 (34)</td>
<td>3.5 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.4 (1.6)</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>23.4 (216)</td>
<td>7.3 (67)</td>
<td>6.5 (60)</td>
<td>5.2 (48)</td>
<td>4.2 (39)</td>
<td>3.1 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1.4 (1.5)</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>8.3 (77)</td>
<td>4.3 (40)</td>
<td>2.3 (21)</td>
<td>2.3 (21)</td>
<td>1.9 (18)</td>
<td>0.8 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>1.6 (1.7)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>7.3 (67)</td>
<td>2.1 (19)</td>
<td>3.0 (28)</td>
<td>1.8 (17)</td>
<td>1.6 (15)</td>
<td>1.6 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>0.9 (1.4)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>11.3 (104)</td>
<td>2.8 (26)</td>
<td>1.5 (14)</td>
<td>1.8 (17)</td>
<td>0.8 (7)</td>
<td>0.5 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>1.5 (1.7)</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>9.3 (86)</td>
<td>4.1 (38)</td>
<td>4.2 (39)</td>
<td>1.3 (12)</td>
<td>2.5 (23)</td>
<td>1.9 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>1.4 (1.6)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>9.4 (87)</td>
<td>3.1 (29)</td>
<td>3.4 (31)</td>
<td>1.6 (15)</td>
<td>1.1 (10)</td>
<td>1.7 (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on data received at the Coordinating Center through October ’08.

Reliability
Internal reliability of the total score was good for the LONGSCAN sample (Cronbach’s alpha = .77).
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