Self-Awareness and Self-Consciousness: A Review from a Social Psychology Perspective

Özfarkındalık ve Özbilinç: Sosyal Psikoloji Bakış Açısıyla Bir Derleme

Hanzade Aslan Yılmaz[1]

[1]Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Muğla

ABSTRACT

The terms of self-awareness and self-consciousness, which have been mentioned under various different names for centuries, they are also studied experimentally in social psychology. Within the concept of this study, the information about descriptions, raised theories, suggested concepts, significant studies and adjusted scales on these terms are reviewed from the perspective of social psychology. Although there are various different descriptions of these terms under various disciplines and a wide range of relevant literature, this study is approached only from the perspective of social psychology and limited with the most efficient studies included in the published social psychology literature. The review shall be an enlightening source for the researchers studying on social psychology and the self-concept and is concluded with suggestions on further research interests.

Key words: Self, self-awareness, self-consciousness

ÖZ

Pek çok alanda yüzyıllardır farklı isimler altında söz edilmiş olan özfarkındalık ve özbilinç kavramları hakkında söylenenlerin temelleri asırlar öncesine dayanmasına rağmen sosyal psikolojide de deneysel çalışmalar yapıldığı görülmektedir. Bu çalışmada bu kavramlar hakkında sosyal psikoloji bakış açısıyla yapılmış tanımlar, geliştirilmiş kuramlar, öne sürülen kavramlar, yapılan önemli çalışmalar ile geliştirilen ve uyarlanan ölçekler hakkında bilgiler derlenmiştir. Bu kavramlar farklı disiplinlerde farklı tanımlanmakta ve bu konudaki literatürün kapsamı geniş olsa da, bu çalışmada konu sadece sosyal psikoloji bakış açısından ele alınmış ve sosyal psikoloji literatürü genelindeki yayınlarda en etkili olmuş çalışmalarla sınırlı tutulmuştur. Derleme, sosyal psikoloji ve benlik konularında çalışan araştırmacılara ışık tutacak olup, gelecekteki araştırma alanları hakkında öneriler ile tamamlanmıştır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Benlik, özfarkındalık, özbilinç

Introduction

Although the grounds of self-awareness and self-consciousness concepts were laid centuries ago (Smith 2020), the science of psychology has also focused on these terms within the last century. We can observe that the terms of self-awareness and self-consciousness are used in close relation with each other in literature. In this study, it has mainly been reviewed how self-awareness and self-consciousness were defined within the concept of social psychology and details about the researches on these terms. Due to various different descriptions of self-awareness and self-consciousness terms under various disciplines as well as the wide scope of relevant literature, the topic was reviewed only from the perspective of social psychology and limited to the most effective studies among general publications in social psychology literature. The use of these terms in other disciplines were only exemplified. Mainly, the information about Objective Self-Awareness Theory developed by Duval and Wicklund (1972), the researches made by Fenigstein et al. (1975) within the scope of private self-consciousness and public self-consciousness and the contributions of other theoreticians to those theories were reviewed. The relations of some other approaches and studies such as attribution, deindividuation, intercultural variations with those terms were also mentioned.

The included literary works in this study were selected by doing literary search in social psychology researches and raised theories. Highlighted approaches and contributions, suggestions and alternative comments of other scientists to these approaches were also presented. Developed tools for measurement of those concepts were mentioned. Relevant enlightening researches were presented.

Address for Correspondence: Hanzade Aslan Yılmaz, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University Faculty of Letters, Department of Psychology, Muğla, Turkiye

E-mail: hanzadeaslan@mu.edu.tr **Received:** 28.11.2021 **Accepted:** 18.04.2022

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3748-8076

As the studies on self-awareness and self-consciousness terms are very rare in our country, the publications on their relations with social psychological concepts are in minute amount as well. This study aims to present a perspective about how those terms are defined, researched and measured in the field of social psychology in the world. Since there is no similar review study found in our country, it is considered to provide contribution to relevant literature and the researchers with similar purpose.

Definitions of Self-Awareness and Self-Consciousness

Self-awareness was described in the Psychology Dictionary of American Psychological Association (APA 2020) as "*self-focused attention or knowledge*". The same dictionary (APA 2020) described *self-focus* as "*the direction of conscious attention on oneself and one's thoughts, needs, desires, and emotions*", whereas it is stated the term should be defined differently dependent on continuous repetition of the behavior. In this reference, it was defined that "*Trait self-focus refers to a chronic habit or pattern of self-consciousness, whereas state self-focus refers to objective self-awareness.*"

Now the terms of self-consciousness and objective self-awareness come into question. The same dictionary described *self-consciousness* (APA 2020) as a personality trait which represents being able to make self-reflection (APA 2020), whereas *objective self-awareness* was described as a necessary part of self-regulation and "*a reflective state of self-focused attention in which a person evaluates himself or herself and attempts to attain correctness and consistency in beliefs and behaviors*" (APA 2020).

The term of objective self-awareness originates from the "*Objective Self-Awareness Theory*" developed by Duval and Wicklund in 1972, in which social psychology was highlighted and the individual considers himself or herself as an object. Wicklund (1975) described objective self-awareness as "*self-focused attention*". Objective self-awareness is the opposite of subjective self-awareness, in which the attention is focused outside (Silvia and Duval 2001).

There are also other descriptions made for self-awareness and self-consciousness terms. Mead (1934) described self-consciousness as a person's perception of himself/herself as an object. Buss (1980, as cited in Edelmann 1981) described self-consciousness as a trait and, self-awareness as a state and, stated that both have two aspects: private (private self-consciousness) which is experienced by oneself, and public (public self-consciousness) which can be observed outside.

Wiekens (2009) stated that description of self-awareness is complicated in consideration of the difficulties in defining both the self and awareness terms. Wiekens (2009) also stated that social psychologists use the terms self-awareness and self-consciousness in the same meaning, however in general social psychology literature, self-awareness is referred as the state of self-consciousness in an individual moment (state), whereas self-consciousness is referred as a trait. Wiekens (2009) mentioned

that most of the social psychologists consider awareness as a state which is possessed and experienced by every person. Wiekens (2009) stated that although these two terms are replaced with each other in social psychology, self-consciousness requires both the states of awareness and wakefulness and could not be used in place of each other in other disciplines. As suggested by Scheier and Carver (1983), Wiekens (2009) also stated that the terms of consciousness and attention could not be used in place of each other and although attention is a significant factor in consciousness, these two terms differ from each other. Wiekens (2009) pointed that self-awareness term as defined by the social psychologists is used as self-consciousness by the neurologists.

Theoretic Approaches on Self-Awareness and Self-Consciousness

Gibbons (1990) summarized the results of Objective Self-Awareness Theory (1972) raised by Duval and Wicklund as follows:

"   1. … *conformity behavior should increase when an individual is self-focused and in the presence of a group.*

2. … *attributions of responsibility for behavior should be more internal when attention is focused on the self.*

3. …*Perceived inconsistency between an attitude … and a behavior comprises a within-self discrepancy and, therefore, is likely to be acted upon when attention is self-focused; thus, attitude-behavior or attitude-attitude consistency often becomes a goal of a self-focused person.*

4. …*The attention of others induces a state of self-focus, … leads to an increase in attempts at behavioral improvement. Such behavior may appear as social facilitation or amplification….*"

Wicklund (1975) stated that self-focus is followed by self-evaluation, therefore the person realizes insufficiencies in the self, since he/she faces with his/her own reflection, which should lead to a negative impact and the person should try to decrease this difference or should show avoidant behavior. On the other hand Wicklund (1975) mentioned that sometimes such impact might be positive, rather than negative. If the person likes that state of objective self-awareness, he/she should be willing to be in states of increased objective self-awareness (Wicklund 1975).

Hull and Levy (1979) developed a model in criticism of Objective Self-Awareness Theory raised by Duval and Wicklund (1972). Hull and Levy (1979) claimed that self-awareness is not relevant to self-evaluation, but is relevant to existence of self-related factors in the environment and do not increase inner attribution. Gibbons (1990) stated that the study of Hull and Levy (1979) was not commonly supported in literature, however provided a perspective for self-attention studies rather than the criticism towards Duval and Wicklund's (1972) theory and had a significant role in model of Carver and Scheier (1981). According to Gibbons (1990), this model is based on the model of Duval and Wicklund (1972), however there are some differences: This model is relevant to self-regulation and claims that a person

continuously compares the self with a standard (reference point), however these standards may refer to more than one element of the self, have a hierarchic structure and may contradict with each other. For instance, a lower standard like pleasure shall dominate behavior at the first stage, in comparison with a higher standard like goals. According to Gibbons (1990) this theory claims that self-directed attention activates the scheme towards the self, furthermore states that the behavior is not directed by distinguishing true-ideal self differentiation, but directed by evaluation of whether eliminating this difference is possible or not.

In terms of self-consciousness, the approaches of Fenigstein et al. are highlighted (Fenigstein et al. 1975). Those theoreticians defined self-consciousness as direction of attention inward or outward, whereas described self-awareness as self-attention. They mentioned private and public dimensions of self-consciousness. They defined *private self-consciousness* as thinking of the person about the self, whereas described *public self-consciousness* as evaluation of the self as a social stimulus (Fenigstein et al. 1975). Buss (1980, as cited in Edelmann 1981) put a theory about self-consciousness in his book called "*Self-Consciousness and Social Anxiety*". Buss (1980, as cited in Edelmann 1981) considered self-consciousness as a trait and self-awareness as a state and mentioned about private and public components of both. He also stated four types of social anxiety such as embarrassment, shame, audience anxiety and shyness.

Another approach to self-awareness is about social impact. Mostly the symbolic interactionists named George Herbert Mead and Charles Horton Cooley focused on the effects of social impacts on the self. Ellis and Holmes (1982) stated that the symbolic interactionists considered self-awareness as being established with the feedbacks from the social environment. Symbolic interactionists defended the opinion of "*reflective appraisal*". According to this opinion, a person makes his/her own self-appraisal depending on the perception of the others (Budak 2000).

Gallup (1998), on the other hand, provided a new point of view with self-consciousness concept on Mead's opinion about the self after long years. Gallup (1998) took the opinion of Mead (1934) which was "*the knowledge of self presupposes knowledge of others*" and claimed that "*knowledge of mental states in others presupposes knowledge of mental states in one's self*". Gallup (1998) supported that a person could deduce others' experiences by self-awareness and thought that well-known expression of Descartes could be reversely said as "*I am therefore I think*".

According to the modern approach of Eurich (2018), there are two types of self-awareness. Eurich (2018) is an organizational psychologist who deeply studied on self-awareness concept and stated that there are two types of self-awareness as internal and external, which has no relation with each other. She defined internal self-awareness as capability to understand the components about the self, whereas external self-awareness as capability to understand the others' perception about himself/herself. Eurich (2018) separated the leaders in 4 groups: *The*

introspectors have high internal self-awareness but low external self-awareness, *the awares* have high self-awareness both internally and externally, *the seekers* have low self-awareness both internally and externally and *the pleasers* have low internal self-awareness and high external self-awareness.

Decades ago, in 1955, Luft and Ingham also suggested a model which was similar to Eurich's (2018) model (as cited in Hoffman-Miller 2019). This model is called as the "Johari Window" (Luft and Ingham 1955, as cited in Hoffman-Miller 2019) and has been used to increase self-awareness in order to improve interpersonal relationships. This model is established on the known or the unknown information about ourselves, by ourself or the others. There are 4 components of this model: *open area* (traits of a person which are known by both the self and the others), *hidden area* (traits of a person which are known by the self, but not by the others), *blind area* (traits of a person which are unknown by the self, but known by the others), *unknown area* (traits of a person which are unknown by both the self and the others).

Newen and Wogeley (2003) suggested another approach about self-consciousness. Newen and Wogeley (2003) supported the theory and observations of Piaget and expressed that the relationships of a person established with the self and the outer world forms a base for self-consciousness.

Studies on Self-Awareness and Self-Consciousness

Fenigstein et al. (1975) stated that self-awareness was used as a positively effective tool in various types of therapy. Although self-awareness was considered in philosophic and therapeutic approach and, therapeutic benefits were used in the past, it has also been one of the research topics of social psychology as well within the last century (Fenigstein et al. 1975). The experimental studies on the concept have gone back to about 60 years (Silvia and Duval 2001). Fenigstein et al. (1975) stated that previous approaches did not highlight individual differences between people; some people spend more time on their own feelings, thoughts, plans etc., however some people could not understand themselves or how they look, due to their lower self-consciousness.

Carver (1975) mentioned that Objective Self-Awareness Theory was a new approach towards attitude-behavior incompatibility, which has been studied in social psychology for a long time. Carver (1975) stated that according to the Objective Self-Awareness Theory when the attitude is apparent and compatible with the situation and, the person has self-awareness, then there is attitude-behavior consistency. Carver (1975) expressed that in comparison of the individuals with objective self-awareness, the ones with higher self-awareness should have higher behavior-attitude consistency, whereas the ones with lower self-awareness should have lower behavior-attitude consistency, although the attitude was apparent. Carver (1975) also stated that apparency of attitude is not sufficient for attitude-behavior consistency and the person should also have self-awareness.

Duval and Wicklund (1972) claimed in their theory that the attention is directed either internally or externally and the focus could quickly change between these two. The awareness may increase under conditions like presence of a mirror or hearing voice of the self, whereas awareness may decrease with a distracting stimulus (Duval and Wicklund 1972). According to Wicklund (1975), situations of deindividuation (such as being a member of a group avoiding individual differences) also may decrease objective self-awareness.

Wicklund (1975) defended that objective self-awareness was decreased by diverging from the self, due to negative comments received from the others (such as peer bullying), whereas the attention was directed more to the part of personality which was negatively commented, in case of a variable increasing objective self-awareness, such as presence of a mirror. The author claimed that a person tries to become distant from the object which creates self-awareness or tries to go towards distracting factors, in order to get out of an unpleasant situation, whereas in case eliminating objective self-awareness is not possible, the person should try to eliminate his/her conflictive trait by putting his/her another trait forward. Gibbons and Wicklund (1976) stated that the researches made on Objective Self-Awareness Theory presents that the self-criticism arising from the divergence between the ideal self and true self results in decreasing self-respect and upcoming efforts to decrease this divergence, whereas results in avoiding situations causing internal self-focus, in case this divergence is significant.

On the other hand, the behavior of avoiding self-awareness is not always applicable and the person may use self-awareness in his/her own benefit in some cases. In fact, Wicklund (1975) commented that sometimes this process could have positive results rather than negatives and in case of a pleasant situation, the person might be enthusiastic about objective self-awareness, which was supported by Mischel et al. (1973) that success might lead the persons to search for other positive components of the self. Greenberg and Musham (1981) also presented that a person might use the benefits of a stimulus causing self-focus not only when there is a conflict between the self and behavior, but also when attitude-behavior is consistent. Ickes et al. (1973) also remarked the relationship between self-directed attention and self-respect and, stated that in case of negative feedback self-attention might decrease self-respect, whereas in case of positive feedback it has an increasing effect.

Avoiding self-awareness or use of self-awareness in one's own benefit may also be expressed with attribution, which is one of the basic terms in social psychology. Buss and Scheier (1976) concluded that private self-consciousness was a significant determinant of self-attribution (and public self-consciousness was not a significant determinant of self-attribution). Accordingly, a person with a higher private self-consciousness makes much more internal attribution in comparison with a one with lower private self-consciousness (Buss and Scheier 1976). Buss and Scheier (1976) stated that this result was significant for the studies about attribution and the only personal trait, which had impact on attribution, was the focus of control according to

the literature. Silvia and Duval (2001) reviewed the studies of Duval and Wicklund (1972) on Objective Self-Awareness Theory, mentioned their comments about tendency of person to avoid conflicts faced in case of comparison of the self with his/her own standards and concluded these as a result of the study: If a person considers the conflicts between himself/herself and his/her standards as reducible, he/she makes internal attribution to failure and tries to change the self; however if he/she considers the conflicts as not reducible, he/she makes external attribution and avoids self-awareness. The determined standards here are the behaviors and attitudes which are accepted as suitable by the person and, failure means inconvenience with those standards. Silvia and Duval (2001) also expressed that there was another study (Dana et al. 1997) presenting that in case of conflict, the person evaluates the standard as negative and prefers to change the standard rather than changing himself/herself. Similarly, Heatherton and Baumeister (1991) mentioned that, the persons with binge eating disorder had higher ideal self-images and they thought that meeting these standards was difficult. The researchers presented that binge eating disorder was used as an escape method from self-awareness by the person, in order to avoid unpleasant results of the comparison between the ideal self and the true self. Morin (2011) made an addition to Silvia and Duval's (2001) model and mentioned the "*escape*" factor. According to Morin (2011), the most common escape method from self-awareness is watching TV. The researcher also stated the other examples of escape methods as alcohol and drugs use and over eating behavior. Moskalenko and Heine (2003) also mentioned that watching TV could diverge the person from his/her incompatible standards.

A similar example of escape behavior was presented in the comments of Franzoi (1983) about the self and self-consciousness. Franzoi (1983) stated that people have a tendency of perverting self-knowledge in order to protect existing self-concept and such a cognitive bias is more commonly seen in people with lower private self-consciousness, although it is a natural process. Similarly, Silvia and Philips (2013) highlighted the question of whether conscious awareness of the self is necessary or not for self-evaluation in the studies about self-awareness. The researchers stated that Objective Self-Awareness Theory defined self-evaluation process as unintentional and quick and they tested the opinion of comparing the self automatically with the standards, in case of attention was directed towards the self. Silvia and Philips (2013) defended that conscious awareness of the self is not required in order to direct attention to the self and stated that there was no direct proof in literature regarding automatic running of self-evaluation process. According to the results of their research, they stated that automatically comparison of the self with the standards was possible and this resulted from direction of attention to the self, not dependent on self-awareness causing unintentional self-evaluation. On the other hand, Eurich (2018) stated that people did not make correct estimations about their own self-awareness. In studies performed with managers, Eurich (2018) mentioned that those people had over-optimistic attitude about their self-awareness,

many of them could not correctly evaluate it and searched for the answers emotionally due to unconscious mind process, although introspection was effective.

Such processes of knowledge about the self were also reviewed from the perspective of social behavior. In parallel to Wicklund's (1975) opinion about deindividuation, Diener (1977) also stated that people in a group lose self-awareness and face deindividuation. Although other theoreticians also reviewed deindividuation, Diener (1977) mentioned the relation of this term with self-awareness and self-regulation dependent on the definitions in literature. Diener (1977) referred to the studies about aggression (Carver 1974, Scheier 1974) and expressed that socially accepted behavior decreased with self-awareness, however increased, if such negative behavior was supported by the group. Diener (1979) stated that there is a negative correlation between self-awareness and behavioral disinhibition, and this supports the Objective Self-Awareness Theory. There are also other researchers supporting this viewpoint. For instance, Le Bon (1960) mentioned that a person loses his/her individuality and individual consciousness in the crowd. Festinger et al. (1952) also pointed the same situation as "*deindividuation*". According to this view, when people are included in a group, they care for being a group rather than being an individual.

Abrahams and Brown (1989) stated that self-awareness theoreticians described group behavior with loss of self-regulation, reduction of responsibility and behavioral disinhibition, however Social Identity Theory had a different point of view. Abrahams and Brown (1989) pointed that self-directed attention formalizes the group behavior. In this study, it was stated that the persons with higher private self-consciousness cared more about social identity, inter-group loyalty and distinctiveness, whereas the persons with higher public self-consciousness behaved in a more socially accepted manner. The study of Doherty and Schlenker (1991) about the relation of strategic self-presentation and self-consciousness shows that the persons with higher public self-consciousness care more about their impression on the others and behave more in socially approved and less in unapproved manner.

Zimbardo (1970) also pointed about deindividuation and corresponded deindividuation with internal and external factors. Zimbardo (1970) defined deindividuation with some input variables (the whole of surrounded conditions, feelings and behaviors). According to Zimbardo (1970), being "*anonymous*" and deindividuation decrease self-evaluation and self-consciousness, and results in ignoring others' evaluations.

In consideration of Zimbardo's (1970) Deindividuation and Duval and Wicklund's (1972) Objective Self-Awareness Theory, Diener and Walbom (1976) predicted that transgressive behavior might decrease in case of self-awareness. Diener and Wallbom (1976) stated that those two theories have similarities in consideration of self-awareness, that Zimbardo's (1970) theory highlighted the freedom in behaviors which is in consequence of the internal deindividuation caused by an external effect (e.g. anonimity), whereas Duval and Wicklund's (1972) theory highlighted that

existence of self-awareness resulted in normative behavior and, integration of these two theories was possible. As a result of this study, it was presented that cheating in the exam behavior increased in case self-awareness decreased. The researchers (Diener and Wallbom 1976) showed that self-consciousness might occur in either presence or absence of other people and a person might lose self-consciousness even outside a group.

In consideration of the studies about self-consciousness and self-awareness, we can see that objects like mirror or camera are used. In parallel to Wicklund's (1975) opinion that presence of a mirror might increase objective self-awareness, use of mirror was one of the methods used in self-awareness and self-consciousness studies. Vallacher (1978) showed that the persons with increased objective self-awareness in experimental environment presented less discriminative behavior.

Mirror is also used in some researches made on animals. Gallup (1977) and Meddin (1979) showed that the chimpanzees have self concept. Gallup (1982) stated that only human, orangutans and chimpanzees could recognize themselves in mirror; other kinds of monkeys or even gorillas saw their reflection as other congenerics. According to the definition of self-awareness in APA's Psychology Dictionary (American Psychological Association, n.d.b), the issue of self-awareness for creatures other than human has been debated. In the same reference it is stated that, in mirror tests for the animals to recognize themselves from their reflection, the chimpanzees, gorillas and orangutans had positive results. Monat (2017) stated that some researchers related self-awareness with presence of a complicated neural network, and for this reason, humans have higher and animals have lower self-awareness, whereas the animals like mosquitos have none.

Use of mirror is also seen in in intercultural studies. Heine et al. (2008) showed that Northern Americans criticized themselves more and cheated less in presence of a mirror, however for Japanese participants presence of a mirror did not make any difference. Northern Americans evaluated themselves better in comparison with the Japanese. The results were interpreted as Japanese people evaluated themselves in consideration of the others' perspective. The researchers reminded that most of the studies on social psychology were performed in Northern America, therefore cultural variations should be taken into consideration in social psychology studies. Gudykunst et al. (1985) stated that in comparison of USA, Japan and Korea, The Americans got higher points than Japanese in public self-consciousness, the Japanese got higher points than Koreans in private self-consciousness and the Americans got lower points than both Japanese and Koreans in social anxiety. In consideration of the mirror studies on Japanese culture, Narita and Ishii (2020) made a research on the impacts of their own voice of Japanese people on their self-directed attention and concluded that there was a partial impact.

David (1971) stated that the people, who are trying to adapt to a new culture, diverge from their familiar behavior and attitude and, mainly the similarities between the familiar culture and the new culture lead to success in adaptation. David (1971) suggested that intercultural interaction might not necessarily increase

self-awareness and it is possible that negative stereotypes are applicable for the new culture. He defended that as interaction with and relevant knowledge about the new culture increase, self-awareness of the person also increases accordingly. David (1971) recommended to "*sojourn to a dissimilar culture for a period of more than one year*" for the person, who wants to improve self-awareness.

The studies in the field of social psychology including all aforementioned studies remind us the importance of the environment that we are surrounded by. Accordingly, Dijksterhuis and Van Knippenberg (2000) asked an important question about social psychology: "*How does our social environment influence our own functioning?*" Dijksterhuis and Van Knippenberg (2000) stated that there are studies indicating that social perceptions have impact on public behavior and social interactions activate social stereotypes. According to Baumeister and Sommer (1977, as cited in Dijksterhuis and Van Knippenberg 2000), the consciousness disconnects the bond between the impact and automatic reactions. Dijksterhuis and Van Knippenberg (2000) mentioned that focusing of attention on the self, in other words self-awareness, recoveres the behavior from preparatory impact (priming). They showed us in their study that direction of attention to the self eliminates our automatic behavior resulting from stereotype effect, whereas provides evaluation of alternative behavior. Bargh and Chartrand (1999) expressed that conscious regulation of emotions, decisions and behaviors is a limited state and applicable only for short periods; however automatic behaviors are much quicker and easier. Actually, this opinion is based on the concept of "*ego depletion*". This opinion was suggested by Baumeister et al. (1998) and supported by over 600 studies (Inzlicht and Friese 2019). This opinion suggests that willpower has a limit and the volitive behaviors such as decision-making, self-regulation etc. uses this common resource. For instance, a person demonstrating willpower against an attractive option, might give up more quickly for the following task. Bargh and Chartrand (1999) stated that the automatic behaviors, that the person is not interested in their source, occur as if pushed by a button, and the purpose of those automatic behaviors is to serve us in the best way, in conformance with our past goals and in consideration of our preferences and tendencies. Wiekens (2009) mentioned that consciousness decreases in automatic behaviors and the consciousness might even be more complicating in performance of these tasks.

About altruistic behavior, there is a study indicating that brightness of the ambient light increases public self-consciousness, which supports voluntary behavior in favour of community (Esteky et al. 2020). An older study of Smith and Shaffer (1986) about helping behavior indicated that public self-consciousness did not increase, as far as not supporting the impression in presence of the others. Van Bommel et al. (2012) showed that increase of public self-awareness in social environment reverses bystander effect.

There are also some studies about our basic biases. For instance, a study indicating that higher self-awareness is effective on correctly understanding other people (Abbate et al. 2016) showed that other people's opinions are better estimated in case of higher self-awareness and false consensus beliefs are decreased. The study of Vorauer and Ross (1999) also showed that as self-awareness increases, the feelings of transparency increases.

About adaptation behavior, Froming and Carver (1981) indicated that private self-consciousness has inverse correlation, whereas public self-consciousness has linear correlation with adaptation. This finding was also verified by the study of Tunnell (1984). Wiekens and Stapel (2008) indicated that in case a person's opinion was not normative, presence of a mirror caused normative behavior, however the people putting ticks on the words about the self (such as "I", "me", etc.) on a text, behaved in conformance to their own opinion.

In consideration of more recent researches, there are also updated studies about self-consciousness and self-awareness. The study of Chao and Yu (2021) indicated that playing online games have negative impact on self-consciousness of adolescents. The study performed by Khan et al. (2022) about generational identity construction by fake luxury consumption showed that public self-consciousness provided contribution to generational identities of y-generation. Kuhn (2022) also made studies on online meeting media like Zoom, which were more commonly used due to Covid 19 pandemic conditions, in which a person could see himself/ herself on the screen. Kuhn's (2022) study showed that frequency of the persons with higher self-consciousness to see themselves in the online meetings caused negative attitude towards the meeting. However a person knowing that he/she could be viewed from the front camera of the PC, in other words a person with higher self-awareness, had lower responding behavior to the violent comments on the internet in the same way (Sohn et al. 2019).

The studies made on these terms in Turkey are in minute amount. The study of Aslan-Yılmaz (2019) analyzed self-consciousness in romantic relationships within the framework of Investment Model. This study indicates that relationship investment and quality of alternatives are predicted by style consciousness positively, whereas relationship satisfaction and quality of alternatives are predicted by internal self-awareness positively.

Although it is not directly related to social psychology theories, theoretic approach developed by Fenigstein et al. (1975) is also inspected under some of the studies held in Turkey. Alkal et al. (2019) performed an experimental study on improvement of self-consciousness dimensions, which was applied together with a psycho-training programme and indicated that the training programme supported private and public self-consciousness of the attendees. In the study of Çelik and Çetin (2014) about the impacts of self-consciousness on solution of interpersonal conflicts showed the impacts of internal self-awareness, style consciousness, appearance consciousness and social anxiety on constructive and positive solution of conflicts. Sarı et al. (2017) stated that self-consciousness is predictive on vocational outcome expectations and they reported positive relation between these two variables. Yurtkoru and Taştan (2018) reviewed the impacts

of self-consciousness on positive future expectations and showed the impacts of private self-consciousness, public self-consciousness and social anxiety on the dimensions of positive future expectations. Şimşek et al. (2013) indicated that private self-consciousness has positive correlation with self-rumination.

Measurement of Self-Awareness and Self-Consciousness

The Scale of Self-Consciousness was formed by Fenigstein et al. (1975) and includes private self-consciousness, public self-consciousness and social anxiety sub-scales. The self-consciousness scale of Fenigstein et al. (1975) was also adapted to various languages. For instance the Slovenian version (Avsec and Bajec 2006), the Dutch version (Vleeming and Engelse 1981) and the German version (Heinemann 1979) have 3-dimensions as private self-consciousness, public self-consciousness and social anxiety similar to the original version. Scheier and Carver (1985) updated the scale in order to provide easier understanding by the people other than university students and determined three dimensions as private self-consciousness, public self-consciousness and social anxiety as in the original scale. In revision of Takishima-Lacasa et al. (2014) which is suitable for children, there are also three sub-dimensions as public self-consciousness, private self-consciousness and social anxiety.

In some studies (Buss 1980, Burnkrant and Page 1984, Piliavin and Charng 1988, Rugancı 1995, Anderson et al. 1996, Cramer 2000, Nystedt and Ljurgberg 2002) private self-consciousness is divided into two factors as *self-reflectiveness* and *internal self-awareness*.

In some studies (Mittal and Balasubramanian 1987, Watson et al. 1996) both public and private self-consciousness have two separate factors. In those scales, private self-consciousness is divided into self-reflection and internal state awareness, whereas public self-consciousness is divided into *style consciousness* and *appearance consciousness* sub-scales. The revised version of the scale by Mittal and Balasubramanian (1987) is adapted to Turkish by Akın et al. (2007) and this version also has the same structure.

Conclusion

In review of self-consciousness and self-awareness from the perspective of social psychology, it is observed that those terms are the main subject of many significant studies. Both terms are in close relation with each other and most of the related studies are performed within the framework of Duval and Wicklund's (1972) Objective Self-Awareness Theory and Fenigstein et al.'s (1975) private self-consciousness and public self-consciousness approach.

In the studies about the self, it is important for the reader that the definitions should be made according to the relevant discipline and, there are differences in the viewpoints about the definitions of the terms in various disciplines. For instance, in revision of some examples out of social psychology field, we can observe that lack of self-awareness may be related to damage

of the frontal lobe of the brain (Gillen 2009) or the processes such as sleeping, awakening and brain zones are reviewed in order to understand consciousness (as cited in Wiekens 2009). Self-consciousness and self-awareness are the main subjects of many studies in the field of social psychology and should lead direction of many studies related to social psychology together with improvement of technology. For instance, the impacts of Facebook use on self-awareness are being studied (Gonzales and Hancock 2011, Chiou and Lee 2013). We can observe new uses of self-consciousness term together with developing technology. For instance, Chella et al. (2020) suggested a model in purpose of developing self-awareness in robots via self-talk. There are some studies combining self-awareness and self-consciousness with technology (Holland 2003, Chella and Manzotti 2007, Kuipers 2008, Bringsjord et al. 2015).

Understanding and studying of self-consciousness and self-awareness terms should provide contribution to social psychology field. For instance, although there are some studies in social psychology literature about the impacts of these terms on interpersonal relationships, there are no studies in our Turkish culture or intercultural studies. Better understanding of those terms individually should positively support prevention of prejudgment and discrimination, embracing altruistic behavior and a sustainable life. These terms may also contribute to improvement of business life or education; thus there are some studies in our country in the fields of education and administrative sciences, even if not in social psychology. Similar studies may be projected from the perspective of leadership or group behavior in the field of social psychology. Especially more recent studies in the world indicate that those terms are used in many fields relevant to social psychology. Self-awareness and self-consciousness should continue to present many study fields to the researchers in the future as well.

References

Abbate CS, Boca S, Gendolla, GHE (2016) Self-awareness, perspective-taking, and egocentrism. Self Identity, 15:371–380.

Abrahams D, Brown R (1989) Self-consciousness and social identity: self-regulation as a group member. Soc Psychol Q, 52:311-318.

Akın A, Abacı R, Öveç Ü (2007) Öz-bilinç Ölçeği'nin Türkçe formunun yapı geçerliği ve güvenirliği. Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences, 40:257-276.

Alkal A, Akça MŞ, Korkmaz O (2019) Öz bilinç psiko-eğitim programının üniversite öğrencilerinin öz bilinç düzeylerine etkisi. Electronic Journal of Social Sciences, 18:569-582.

APA (2020) American Psychological Association (APA) Dictionary of Psychology. Available from https://dictionary.apa.org/objective-self-awareness (Accessed 20.10.2020)

Anderson EM, Bohon LM, Berrigan LP (1996) Factor structure of the Private

Self-Consciousness Scale. J Pers Assess, 66:144-152.

Aslan-Yılmaz H (2019) Romantik ilişkilerde izlenim ayarlamacılığı ve özbilinç : Yatırım Modeli üzerine bir inceleme. Uludağ Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 20:391-423.

Avsec A, Bajec B (2006) Validation of Slovene version of the Self-Consciousness Scale. Horizons of Psychology, 15:7-22.

Bargh JA, Chartrand TL (1999) The unbearable automaticity of being. Am Psychol, 54:462-479.

Baumeister RF, Bratslavsky E, Muraven M, Tice DM (1998) Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? J Pers Soc Psychol, 74:1252–1265.

Baumeister RF, Sommer, KL (1997) Consciousness, free choice, and automaticity. In Advances in Social Cognition (Ed. RS Wyer, Jr.):75-81. Mahwah, NJ, Erlbaum.

Bringsjord S, Licato J, Govindarajulu NS, Ghosh R, Sen A (2015) Real robots that pass human tests of self-consciousness. Proceedings of the 24th IEEE International Symposium on Robot and Human Interactive Communication (RO-MAN): 498-504. Kobe, Japan.

Bunkrant RE, Page TJ (1984) A modification of the Fenigstein, Scheier, and Buss Self-Consciousness Scale. J Pers Assess, 48:629-637.

Buss AH (1980) Self-Consciousness and Social Anxiety. Oxford, W.H. Freeman.

Buss DM, Scheier MF (1976) Self-consciousness, self-awareness, and self-attribution. J Res Pers, 10, 463-468.

Carver CS (1974) Facilitation of physical aggression through objective self-awareness. J Exp Soc Psychol, 10:365-70.

Carver CS (1975) Physical aggression as a function of objective self-awareness and attitudes toward punishment. J Exp Soc Psychol, 11:510-519.

Carver CS, Scheier MF (1981) Attention and self-regulation: a control-theory approach to human behavior. New York, Springer-Verlag.

Chao C-M, Yu T-K (2021) Internet use and adolescents' physical and mental health: the mediating role of self-consciousness and peer relationships. Int J Ment Health Addict, August 2021:1-18.

Chella A, Manzotti R (2007) Artificial Consciousness. Exeter, Imprint Academic.

Chella A, Pipitone A, Morin A, Racy F (2020) Developing self-awareness in robots via inner speech. Front Robot AI, 7:16.

Chiou W, Lee C (2013) Enactment of one-to-many communication may induce self-focused attention that leads to diminished perspective taking: the case of Facebook. Judgm Decis Mak, 8:372-380.

Cramer KM (2000) Comparing the relative fit of various factor models of the Self-Consciousness Scale in two independent samples. J Pers Assess, 75:295-307.

Çelik DA, Çetin F (2014) The role of mindfulness and self-consciousness on interpersonal conflict resolution approaches. Research Journal of Business and Management, 1:29-38.

Dana ER, Lalwani N, Duval TS (1997) Objective self-awareness and focus of attention following awareness of self-standard discrepancies: changing self or changing standards of correctness. J Soc Clin Psychol, 16:359–380.

David KH (1971) Culture shock and the development of self-awareness. J Contemp Psychother, 4:44–48.

Diener E (1977) Deindividuation: causes and consequences. Soc Behav Pers, 5:143–155.

Diener E (1979) Deindividuation, self-awareness, and disinhibition. J Pers Soc Psychol, 3:1160- 1171.

Diener E, Wallbom M (1976) Effects of self-awareness on antinormative behavior. J Res Pers, 10:107-111.

Dijksterhuis A, Van Knippenberg A (2000) Behavioral indecision: effects of self-focus on automatic behavior. Soc Cogn, 18:55–74.

Doherty K, Schlenker KD (1991) Self-consciousness and strategic self-presentation. J Pers, 59:1-18.

Duval TS, Wicklund RA (1972) A Theory of Objective Self-Awareness. New York, Academic Press.

Edelmann, RJ (1981) Self-consciousness and social anxiety (Book Review). Br J Psychol, 72:515-516.

Ellis RJ, Holmes JG (1982) Focus of attention and self-evaluation in social interaction. J Pers Soc Psychol, 43:67–77.

Esteky S, Wooten DB, Bos MW (2020) Illuminating illumination: understanding the influence of ambient lighting on prosocial behaviors. J Environ Psychol, 68:1-12.

Eurich T (2018) What self-awareness really is (and how to cultivate it). Harvard Business Review Digital Articles, April 23:1–9.

Fenigstein A, Scheier MF, Buss AH (1975) Public and private self-consciousness: assessment and theory. J Consult Clin Psychol, 43:522-527.

Festinger L, Pepitone A, Newcomb T (1952) Some consequences of deindividuation in a group. J Abnorm Soc Psychol, 47:382-389.

Franzoi SL (1983) Self-concept differences as a function of private self-consciousness and social anxiety. J Res Pers, 17:275-287.

Froming WJ, Carver CS (1981) Divergent influences of private and public self-consciousness in a compliance paradigm. J Res Pers, 15:159–171.

Gallup GG (1977) Self recognition in primates: a comparative approach to the bidirectional properties of consciousness. Am Psychol, 32:329–338.

Gallup GG (1982) Self-awareness and the emergence of mind in primates. Am J Primatol, 2:2237-2248.

Gallup GG (1998) Self-awareness and the evolution of social intelligence. Behav Processes, 42:239–247.

Gibbons FX (1990) Self-attention and behavior: a review and theoretical update. Adv Exp Soc Psychol, 23:249–303.

Gibbons FX, Wicklund RA (1976) Selective exposure to self. J Res Pers, 10:98-106.

Gillen G (2009) Self-awareness and insight: foundations for intervention. In Cognitive and Perceptual Rehabilitation (Ed. G Gillen): 67-108. Missouri, Mosby.

Greenberg J, Musham C (1981) Avoiding and seeking self-focused attention. J Res Pers, 15:191-200.

Gudykunst WB, Yang S, Nishida T (1987) Cultural differences in self-consciousness and self-monitoring. Communic Res, 14:7-34.

Gonzales AL, Hancock JT (2011) Mirror, mirror on my Facebook wall: effects of exposure to Facebook on self-esteem. Cyberpsychol Behav Soc Netw, 14:79-83.

Heatherton TF, Baumeister RF (1991) Binge eating as escape from self-awareness. Psychol Bull, 110:86–108.

Heine SJ, Takemoto T, Moskalenko S, Lasaleta J, Henrich J (2008) Mirrors in the head: cultural variation in objective self-awareness. Pers Soc Psychol Bull, 34:879–887.

Heinemann W (1979) The assessment of private and public self-consciousness: a German replication. Eur J Soc Psychol, 9:331-337.

Hull JG, Levy AS (1979) The organizational functions of the self: an alternative to the Duval and Wicklund model of self-awareness. J Pers Soc Psychol, 37:756-768.

Hoffman-Miller PM (2019) Johari Window. Salem Press Encyclopedia. Hackencack,NJ, Salem Press.

Holland O (ed.) (2003) Machine consciousness. New York, Imprint Academic.

Ickes WJ, Wicklund RA, Ferris CB (1973) Objective self-awareness and self-esteem. J Exp Soc Psychol, 9:202–219.

Inzlicht M, Friese M (2019) The past, present, and future of ego depletion. Soc Psychol, 50:370–378.

Khan S, Fazili AI, Bashir I (2022) Constructing generational identity through counterfeit luxury consumption. Journal of Product and Brand Management, 31:415-437.

Kuhn KM (2022) The constant mirror: self-view and attitudes to virtual meetings. Comput Human Behav, 128:1-7.

Kuipers B (2008) Drinking from the firehose of experience. Artific Intell Med, 44:55–70.

Le Bon G (1960) The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind. New York, Viking Press.

Luft J, Ingham H (1955) The Johari Window, a graphic model of interpersonal awareness. Proceedings of the Western Training Laboratory in Group Development. Los Angeles, University of California.

Mead GH (1934) Mind, Self and society from the Stand-Point of a Social Behaviorist. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Meddin J (1979) Chimpanzees, symbols, and the reflective self. Soc Psychol Q, 42:99-109.

Mittal B, Balasubramanian, SK (1987) Testing the dimensionality of the self-consciousness scales. J Pers Assess, 51:53–68.

Monat JP (2017) The emergence of humanity's self-awareness. Futures, 86:27-35.

Morin A (2011) Self-awareness part 1: definition, measures, effects, functions, and antecedents. Soc Personal Psychol Compass, 5:807–823.

Moskalenko S, Heine SJ (2003) Watching your troubles away: television viewing as a stimulus for subjective self-awareness. Pers Soc Psychol Bull, 29:76-85.

Narita A, Ishii K (2020) My voice capturing my attention to myself: the effects of objective self-awareness on Japanese people. Front Psychol, 11:1596. .

Newen A, Vogeley K (2003) Self-representation: searching for a neural signature of self-consciousness. Conscious Cogn, 12:529–543.

Nystedt L, Ljungberg A (2002) Facets of private and public self-consciousness: construct and discriminant validity. Eur J Pers, 16:143-159.

Piliavin JA, Charng HW (1988) What is the factorial structure of the private and public self-consciousness scales? Pers Soc Psychol Bull, 14:587-595.

Prentice-Dunn S, Rogers RW (1982). Effects of public and private self-awareness on deindividuation and aggression. J Pers Soc Psychol, 43:503–513.

Rugancı RN (1995) Private and public self-consciousness subscales of the Fenigstein, Scheier and Buss Self-consciousness Scale: A Turkish translation. Pers Individ Dif, 18:279-282.

Sarı SV, Kabadayı F, Şahin M (2017) Mesleki sonuç beklentisinin açıklanması: Öz-aşkınlık, öz-bilinç ve öz-kontrol /öz-yönetim. Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi, 7:145-159

Scheier MF, Carver CS (1985) The self-consciousness scale: a revised version for use with general populations. J Appl Soc Psychol, 15:687-699.

Scheier MF, Fenigstein A, Buss AH (1974) Self-awareness and physical aggression. J Exp Soc Psychol, 10:264-73.

Silvia PJ, Duval, TS (2001) Objective Self-Awareness Theory: recent progress and enduring problems. Pers Soc Psychol Rev, 5:230–241.

Silvia PJ, Phillips AN (2013) Self-awareness without awareness? Implicit self-focused attention and behavioral self-regulation. Self Identity, 12:114-127.

Smith JD, Shaffer DR (1986) Self-consciousness, self-reported altruism, and helping behavior. Soc Behav Pers, 14:215-220.

Sohn S, Chung HC, Park N (2019) Private self-awareness and aggression in computer-mediated communication: abusive user comments on online news articles. Int J Hum Comput Interact, 35:1160-1169.

Şimşek Ö, Ceylandağ A, Akcan G (2013) The need for absolute truth and self-rumination as basic suppressors in the relationship between private self-consciousness and mental health. J Gen Psychol, 140:294-310.

Smith J (2020) Self-Consciousness. In The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2020 Edition) (Ed EN Zalta) Available from https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2020/entries/self-consciousness/ (Accessed 20.10.2020)

Takishima-Lacasa JY, Higa-McMillan CK, Ebesutani C, Smith RL, Chorpita BF (2014) Self-consciousness and social anxiety in youth: the revised self-consciousness scales for children. Psychol Assess, 26:1292-1306.

Tunnell, G (1984) The discrepancy between private and public selves: public self-consciousness and its correlates. J Pers Assess, 48:549-555.

Vallacher R (1978) Objective self awareness and the perception of others. Pers Soc Psychol Bull, 4:63–67.

Van Bommel M, Van Prooijen J-W, Va Lange PAM, Elffers H (2012) Be aware to care: public self-awareness leads to a reversal of the bystander effect. J Exp Soc Psychol, 48:926-930.

Vleeming RG, Engelse JA (1981) Assessment of private and public self-sonsciousness: a Dutch replication. J Pers Assess, 45:385-389.

Vorauer JD, Ross M (1999) Self-awareness and feeling transparent: failing to suppress one's self. J Exp Soc Psychol, 35:415-440.

Watson PJ, Morris RJ, Ramsey A, Hickman SE (1996) Further contrasts between self-reflectiveness and internal state awareness factors of private self-consciousness. J Psychol, 130:183–192.

Wicklund RA (1975) Objective self-awareness. Adv Exp Soc Psychol, 8:233–275.

Wiekens CJ (2009) Self-awareness. (Doctoral thesis) Tilburg, Tilburg University.

Wiekens CJ, Stapel DA(2008) The mirror and i: When private opinions are in conflict with public norms. J Exp Soc Psychol, 44:1160-1166.

Yurtkoru S, Taştan S (2018) Öz-bilinç algısının olumlu gelecek beklentisine etkisi: pozitif psikoloji ve kaynak odaklı yaklaşım arka planı ile bir değerlendirme. İşletme Bilimi Dergisi, 6:1-24.

Zimbardo P (1970). The human choice: individuation, reason, and order versus deindividuation, impulse, and chaos. In 1969 Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (Eds WJ Arnold, D Levine):237-307. Lincoln, NE, University of Nebraska Press.