

## RESEARCH REPORTS

# Self-Monitoring Personality at Work: A Meta-Analytic Investigation of Construct Validity

David V. Day  
Pennsylvania State University

Deidra J. Schleicher  
University of Tulsa

Amy L. Unckless  
Towers Perrin

Nathan J. Hiller  
Pennsylvania State University

The validity of self-monitoring personality in organizational settings was examined. Meta-analyses were conducted (136 samples; total  $N = 23,191$ ) investigating the relationship between self-monitoring personality and work-related variables, as well as the reliability of various self-monitoring measures. Results suggest that self-monitoring has relevance for understanding many organizational concerns, including job performance and leadership emergence. Sample-weighted mean differences favoring male respondents were also noted, suggesting that the sex-related effects for self-monitoring may partially explain noted disparities between men and women at higher organizational levels (i.e., the glass ceiling). Theory building and additional research are needed to better understand the construct-related inferences about self-monitoring personality, especially in terms of the performance, leadership, and attitudes of those at top organizational levels.

The Self-Monitoring (SM) Scale (Gangestad & Snyder, 1985; Snyder, 1974) is one of the most widely used personality measures for research purposes (Briggs & Cheek, 1988). An underlying assumption of the SM construct is that people differ in the extent to which they *monitor* (observe, regulate, and control) the public appearances of *self* that they display in social settings and interpersonal relationships (Snyder, 1987). High self-monitors tend to monitor and control the images that they present to better fit with the social climate around them. Low self-monitors tend to be true to themselves and display more consistent behavior across various social contexts; they value congruence between who they are and what they do, regardless of situational demands.

Snyder (1972, 1974) developed the original 25-item SM Scale, which was subsequently shortened to 18 items (Gangestad &

Snyder, 1985). Others have revised the measure for special purposes or have used it as a template for variants of the scale (e.g., Lennox & Wolfe, 1984). Although Snyder's scale has its critics on issues such as dimensionality (e.g., Briggs, Cheek, & Buss, 1980) and its use as a discrete class variable (Miller & Thayer, 1989), the enduring popularity of the scale suggests that it assesses a construct of theoretical and applied interest. Because of its social and interpersonal focus, SM should be especially relevant to understanding those attitudes, behaviors, and outcomes that constitute the primary criterion domains in organizational settings (Binning & Barrett, 1989).

At the core of the SM construct are individual differences in the propensity for impression management involving the construction of positive social appearances (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). A goal of impression management is to positively influence evaluations of oneself and to win approval from others, making it especially appropriate for work-related settings. Employment decisions often depend on an impression that is formed about an individual (Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). A primary purpose of the present study was to use meta-analytic techniques to examine the potential of SM for explaining and predicting individual attitudes, behaviors, and performance in organizations, that is, to examine its validity in organizational settings.

The present purpose and the chosen analytic technique differ from a recent empirical reappraisal of the SM literature. A main focus of Gangestad and Snyder's (2000) study was on conducting a structural framework analysis to understand whether SM is a unitary phenomenon. Relationships between SM and criteria such as expressive control and behavioral variability were examined. A key conclusion was that Snyder's SM Scales (Gangestad & Snyder, 1985; Snyder, 1974) reflect a conceptually meaningful dimen-

---

David V. Day and Nathan J. Hiller, Department of Psychology, Pennsylvania State University; Deidra J. Schleicher, Department of Psychology, University of Tulsa; Amy L. Unckless, Towers Perrin, New York, New York.

An earlier version of this study was presented at the 11th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, April 1996, San Diego, California. This research was supported by a grant from the Research and Graduate Studies Office, College of Liberal Arts, Pennsylvania State University.

We thank Brian Katz, Amy-Nicole Salvaggio, Lauren Stein, and Renee Williams for their help with article identification and coding. David V. Day and Deidra J. Schleicher contributed equally to this article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to David V. Day, Department of Psychology, Pennsylvania State University, 126 Bruce V. Moore Building, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802-3101. E-mail: dvd1@psu.edu

sion, and that dimension is SM personality. The evidence does not suggest that the scale better represents separate dimensions of extraversion, acting, and other-directedness (cf. Briggs et al., 1980). For these reasons, we examined SM as a unitary construct in the present meta-analyses. However, because no organizational criteria were included in Gangestad and Snyder's (2000) study, important questions regarding SM in organizational settings have yet to be addressed. Validation in organizational contexts is essentially a process of accumulating various types of empirical and judgmental evidence to support an inferential network of psychological constructs and their operational measures (Binning & Barrett, 1989). The following sections review several lines of evidence used in the present study to support a construct-related validity inference for SM personality.

### Validity of SM

#### *Reliability*

In evaluations of the psychometric underpinnings of a construct, estimates of measurement reliability can provide evidence regarding how well scale items or components model an underlying construct (Anastasi, 1986). Although Snyder (1987) reported internal consistency estimates of .66 and .70 for the original and revised SM Scales, respectively, there have been no more recent published estimates based on the cumulative data. Nor have there been any comparisons of the reliability estimates of Snyder's SM Scales (Gangestad & Snyder, 1985; Snyder, 1974) with other widely used SM instruments. For these reasons, we computed meta-analytic reliability estimates as part of the present study. In addition, there are possible construct-related differences associated with how SM is measured. Thus, we examined scale length and item scoring format as between-study moderators of reliability and validity.

#### *Work-Related Criteria*

We conceptualized the criterion domain in this study by using multiple outcome measures, consistent with recommendations that personality variables be examined against a variety of construct-relevant criteria (Hogan, Hogan, & Roberts, 1996). Conceptualizing the criterion domain in broad terms as compared with a narrow focus solely on performance outcomes is more descriptive of how individual employees contribute to the broader organizational mission (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Although organizational criterion domains are often value judgments determined by key stakeholders (Fiske, 1951), job performance, leadership ability, and thoughts and feelings about the job and the organization arguably comprise the most prevalent employee-related concerns in work settings. Accordingly, the present meta-analysis summarizes relations between SM and each of these organizational outcomes.

In terms of job performance and advancement, the concern for the appropriateness of social behavior displayed by high self-monitors makes them interpersonally competent (Snyder, 1987). Holland (1985) suggested that interpersonal competence plays a prominent role in vocational achievement. Although previous research has suggested that SM has positive effects on job performance (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1982), it is less clear why high

self-monitors show superior performance. The effect may be due to high self-monitors' ability to more effectively manage impressions than low self-monitors. If due primarily to impression management, then the positive correlation between SM and measures of work performance should be higher when measured subjectively (e.g., ratings) than when performance is indexed objectively. We explored this possibility through moderator analyses. Another possible explanation for a relationship between SM and work performance is that it is due partly to a third variable such as problem-solving ability. For this reason, we examined the relationship between SM and various ability measures in this study.

An expected link with leadership stems from the notion that the same social style that makes it likely for high self-monitors to initiate conversations (Ickes & Barnes, 1977) may lead them to facilitate rewarding interactions with group members, thus promoting their emergence as leaders (Snyder, 1987). High self-monitors also are more other-directed than low self-monitors, which may help them discern the needs of other group members and gain their acceptance by appropriately responding to them. As such, SM may be related to leadership by means of referent power (J. R. P. French & Raven, 1960).

Regarding job attitudes, the image consciousness of high self-monitors makes them more likely than low self-monitors to use their jobs as a way of projecting a desirable self-image (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000), thus resulting in an expected positive relationship between job involvement and SM. However, this tendency would also contribute to high self-monitors feeling relatively unconstrained about pursuing more prestigious job opportunities (Kilduff & Day, 1994). One of the more interesting and robust findings associated with SM concerns its link with lower levels of interpersonal commitment and less stable social bonds (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). Given that the people make the place (Schneider, 1987), we expected that SM would be negatively related to organizational commitment. Because of high self-monitors' need for structure and dislike of ambiguity (Snyder & Gangestad, 1982), they should also report greater levels of perceived role stressors (ambiguity and conflict) than low self-monitors. Contrary to other job attitudes, there is no reason to expect an aggregate relationship between SM and job satisfaction; therefore, we examined these effects as an exploratory analysis.

#### *Demographic Correlates*

Validity issues are often complicated by legal concerns related to possible adverse impact against members of protected classes. With regard to potential linkages with key demographic variables, we expected a negative relationship between SM and age. Older individuals are more likely to behave in accordance with their own attitudes and beliefs, and younger individuals are more likely to be especially attentive to social cues in adjusting their behavior (Reifman, Klein, & Murphy, 1989). In terms of potential sex differences, it has been proposed that women are more likely to express their true feelings in interpersonal contexts rather than monitor their behavior to fit in a given situation (Rosenthal & DePaulo, 1979a). Thus, we expected that the SM effect size associated with sex would favor male respondents. Although race would be another relevant demographic variable to consider, insufficient studies exist on its relationship with SM. Therefore, we did not include race as a demographic variable in this study.

## Method

### Literature Search

The studies in the present meta-analysis were identified through computerized database searches and manual reviews of abstracts in applied psychology and management journals targeting post-1974 years (Snyder, 1974) through July 2000. Articles were identified through the PsycLIT (1975–1984) and PsycINFO (1984–2000) electronic databases by using the keyword *self-monitoring*. Because we believe that many studies report a relationship between SM and criterion variables without mentioning such a relationship in the abstract, a search of the *Social Sciences Citation Index* was also conducted on several prominent SM articles (Gangestad & Snyder, 1985; Lennox & Wolfe, 1984; Snyder, 1974; Snyder & Gangestad, 1986). The search for relevant articles was limited to published studies. This decision was made because many studies include SM without mentioning the variable in the title or the abstract. Thus, a search of conference programs and dissertation abstracts would likely result in an incomplete and unrepresentative sample of unpublished papers.

Several criteria were imposed on identified studies: (a) SM personality was measured; (b) an effect size for the zero-order relationship between SM and an organizational correlate or demographic variable could be calculated, or a reliability estimate was reported for the SM scale; and (c) the relationship was included in at least three other studies. The final criterion was necessary to ensure that the number of studies for each meta-analysis was adequate for drawing generalizable conclusions. No quality of study criterion was imposed, other than that indirectly implied in the published requirement. These inclusion criteria yielded 123 usable articles. Eleven studies contained 2 samples and one included 3 samples, resulting in a total of 136 independent samples. The total sample size across studies was 23,191.

### Self-Monitoring

There are several forms of the SM Scale, including the 25-item version (Snyder, 1974), the 18-item version (Gangestad & Snyder, 1985), and a 13-item scale developed by Lennox and Wolfe (1984). Across organizational criteria and reliability analyses, 69 samples reported results for the 25-item scale, 34 samples reported results for the 18-item scale, 14 samples reported results for the 13-item scale, and 19 samples reported results for “other” study-specific SM scales or did not report scale length. Most studies ( $k = 90$ ) adopted a true–false scoring system for scale items, although some studies ( $k = 37$ ) used continuous scoring. The remainder ( $k = 9$ ) did not report the scoring format. A total of 93 samples were identified that reported a full-scale internal consistency reliability estimate for an SM measure.

### Work-Related Criteria

*Job performance and advancement.* Twenty-eight samples reported a relationship between SM and indicators of job performance and advancement. Most data ( $k = 25$ ) were collected in field settings. Outcome variables included objective (e.g., sales volume, number of promotions;  $k = 12$ ) and subjective (ratings;  $k = 16$ ) measures. The objective–subjective distinction was examined as a potential moderator.

*Ability.* The relationship between ability and SM was examined in 10 samples. Ability measures included problem-solving performance ( $k = 2$ ), school performance (grade point average;  $k = 1$ ), cognitive ability or intelligence ( $k = 6$ ), and skill level ( $k = 1$ ).

*Leadership.* Twenty-three samples examined the relationship between SM and leadership behavior and emergence. Leadership ratings were made by targets (i.e., self;  $k = 8$ ), group members ( $k = 12$ ), or observers ( $k = 3$ ). Ratings source was examined as a potential moderator.

*Organizational commitment.* Fifteen samples estimated a relationship between SM and organizational commitment. Studies included attitudinal

( $k = 6$ ) and behavioral ( $k = 9$ ) commitment, which was examined as a potential between-study moderator. Attitudinal commitment was assessed with the Affective Commitment Scale (Meyer & Allen, 1984) or with Mowday, Steers, and Porter’s (1979) or Hrebiniak and Alutto’s (1972) commitment scale. Behavioral indices of commitment included tenure–retention ( $k = 8$ ) and turnover ( $k = 1$ ; reverse coded).

*Role stressors.* Separate meta-analyses investigated the relationship between SM and role ambiguity ( $k = 5$ ) and role conflict ( $k = 5$ ). All samples measured the role stressor constructs by using Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman’s (1970) scales.

*Job satisfaction.* Six samples examined the relationship between SM and job satisfaction. Several scales were used to measure satisfaction, including Hackman and Oldham’s (1974) scale, the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969), and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawes, England, & Lofquist, 1967).

*Job involvement.* Four samples examined the relationship between SM and job involvement. Two samples used the Job Involvement subscale of the Jenkins Activity Survey (C. Jenkins, Zyzarski, & Rosenman, 1979), one sample used Lodahl and Kejner’s (1964) scale, and one sample used a perceptions of involvement self-report scale created for the study (Zahry & Tosi, 1989).

### Demographic Variables: Age and Sex

Thirteen samples reported correlations between age and SM. Twenty-six samples reported correlations between SM and sex, but six of these samples did not report the direction of the relationship (i.e., whether men or women scored higher on SM). Attempts were made to contact the authors of those studies. Only one author responded with the needed information regarding the direction of the relationships, thus resulting in a final  $k$  of 21 for sex. Effects were coded so that a positive correlation meant a higher SM score for men.

The following study-specific information was coded and used for corrections formulas or as between-study moderators whenever feasible: (a) properties of the SM scale (scale length, scoring type, reliability), (b) characteristics of the sample (sample size), (c) research setting (lab vs. field), and (d) measurement information for criterion variables (measurement instrument, criterion reliability). All studies were coded by two independent raters, and disagreements were resolved through discussion among the authors.

### Computation and Analysis of Effect Sizes

Only one effect size from each sample was included in each meta-analysis. In cases in which a study reported relationships between SM and two or more dependent variables that were part of the same construct, the effect sizes were averaged. Analyses were conducted using the DSTAT meta-analytic program (Johnson, 1989), which calculates effect sizes and homogeneity statistics according to formulas proposed by Hedges and Olkin (1985). DSTAT converts correlations to  $d$  statistics and corrects them for sampling error before computing an overall effect size.

Each effect size was corrected for the SM scale reliability reported in that specific study. If a study did not report reliability of the SM scale, the effect size was corrected using the meta-analytic reliability estimate from the present study for the particular SM scale type that was used. Measurement reliability of the criterion constructs was incorporated into the correction formula only for those constructs in which 75% of the studies reported criterion reliability. The only constructs meeting this requirement were role conflict and role ambiguity (which both reported criterion reliability in 100% of the studies) and job satisfaction (which

reported criterion reliability in more than 80% of studies). Thus, we were able to estimate population correlations for those three constructs.

DSTAT also calculates homogeneity statistics ( $Q$ ). A significant  $Q$  statistic indicates that the overall mean effect size inadequately describes all effects, indicating possible moderators. Because the formulas for homogeneity of effect sizes are inappropriate for disattenuated (i.e., corrected) effect sizes, the  $Q$  statistics associated with the correlations corrected for measurement reliability are not reported. It is common for overall effect sizes to be heterogeneous (Hedges, 1987), which may be due to statistical artifacts or other factors such as statistical outliers. Some researchers have advocated the removal of outliers in an attempt to achieve homogeneity of effect sizes and obtain a more reliable estimate of the true population effect (e.g., Huffcutt & Arthur, 1995). Both outlier and categorical moderator analyses were done to examine potential sources of heterogeneity.

Outlier analyses were conducted by ordering the effect sizes in each meta-analysis with regard to their deviations from the mean effect size and then sequentially eliminating the largest outlier until the overall  $Q$  statistic was nonsignificant or until 20% of the studies had been removed (see Hedges & Olkin, 1985, pp. 256–257). When homogeneity can be achieved by removing 20% or fewer of the outliers, the overall effect size calculated from the remaining studies is thought to better represent the population distribution of effects, as compared with the mean effect size based on all studies.

Theoretical and measurement scale moderators were also examined when sufficient samples ( $k > 2$ ) existed in each moderator category. A between-class goodness-of-fit statistic ( $Q_b$ ) is used to test the hypothesis that the average effect size differs across classes of a moderator variable. Within-class homogeneity statistics ( $Q_w$ ) are computed to assess the extent to which the moderator is successful at reducing effect heterogeneity within classes of a moderator. If a categorical moderator completely fits the data, then the between-class effect is significant but the within-class effect is nonsignificant.

## Results and Discussion

The overall effect sizes (see Table 1) were calculated for the eight work-related correlates and the two demographic correlates of SM, as well as the internal consistency estimates for the SM scale (see Table 2). Outlier and moderator analyses are summarized in Tables 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

### Reliability

The overall sample-weighted reliability ( $k = 93$ ; total  $N = 19,065$ ) was .74. Outlier analysis was unsuccessful in attaining homogeneity. Moderator analyses were conducted on the reliabilities using type of scale and type of item scoring as between-class categorical variables (see Table 2). Results indicated higher average reliabilities for Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) 13-item scale ( $\alpha = .81$ ) as well as for the "other" category ( $\alpha = .80$ ) than for either Snyder's (1974) 25-item scale ( $\alpha = .71$ ) or Gangestad and Snyder's (1985) revised 18-item scale ( $\alpha = .73$ ). We also found that SM scales using continuous scoring had higher scale reliability ( $\alpha = .77$ ) than those using dichotomous scoring ( $\alpha = .72$ ).

### Work-Related Criteria

*Job performance and advancement.* The mean sample-weighted correlation between SM and measures of job performance and advancement was .09 ( $k = 28$ ). Outlier analysis was unsuccessful at rendering the effects homogeneous (see Table 3). A significant between-class relationship was found for measurement instrument (see Table 4), although all of the within-class effects were also significantly heterogeneous, indicating that unexplained variance remained between study outcomes after differences in measurement instrument were accounted for. The same general finding applied to scoring format, with the within-class effects having substantially more heterogeneity than between-class effects (see Table 5). The between-class effect sizes for the research-setting moderator model were homogeneous (see Table 6); thus, the hypothesized model did not fit the data.

Table 1  
Summary of Sample and Effect Sizes

Variable	$k$	$N$	$d_+$	95% CI for $d_+$		$r$	Corrected $r$
				Lower	Upper		
Demographic correlates							
Age	13	2,240	-0.13	-0.19	-0.07	-.07	-.08
Sex	21	2,921	0.22	0.17	0.27	.11	.13
Work-related correlates							
Job performance-advancement	28	3,069	0.18	0.13	0.23	.09	.10
Ability	10	1,244	0.11	0.03	0.19	.06	.07
Leadership	23	2,777	0.37	0.32	0.43	.18	.21
Organizational commitment	15	1,878	-0.23	-0.29	-0.16	-.11	-.13
Role conflict	5	628	0.25	0.14	0.36	.12	.17
Role ambiguity	5	628	0.35	0.24	0.46	.17	.24
Job satisfaction	6	631	-0.09	-0.20	0.02	-.04	-.07
Job involvement	4	326	0.36	0.21	0.52	.18	.22

*Note.* Significant effects are indicated by confidence intervals (CIs) that exclude zero.  $k$  = number of samples;  $N$  = total number of individuals across  $k$ ;  $d_+$  = mean sample-weighted effect size;  $r$  = mean sample-weighted correlation; Corrected  $r$  = mean correlation corrected for measurement unreliability (only correlations associated with role conflict and role ambiguity were corrected for criterion unreliability).

Table 2  
Summary of Moderator Analyses for Self-Monitoring Reliability

Moderator	$Q_B$	$k$	$\alpha$	$Q_W$
Scale length	388.78**			
25 items		44	.71 <sub>a</sub>	426.31**
18 items		27	.73 <sub>b</sub>	258.80**
13 items		13	.81 <sub>c</sub>	110.75**
Other		9	.80 <sub>c</sub>	134.49**
Scoring format	112.43**			
True–false		63	.72 <sub>b</sub>	732.07**
Continuous (Likert)		29	.77 <sub>d</sub>	437.80**

Note. Average reliability estimates with different subscripts are significantly different based on nonoverlapping 95% confidence intervals. Significance of  $Q$  statistics indicates rejection of the homogeneity hypothesis.  $Q_B$  = between-classes goodness-of-fit statistic;  $k$  = number of samples;  $\alpha$  = mean sample-weighted reliability estimate;  $Q_W$  = homogeneity of effect sizes within each class.

\*\* $p < .01$ .

Adequate study numbers existed to examine the potential theoretical moderator of objective versus subjective performance indices (see Table 7). Results demonstrated that the categorical moderator model was significant, but the within-class effect sizes were also significantly heterogeneous. Nonetheless, the mean sample-weighted correlation was significantly higher for subjective (.15) than for objective (.03) measures of job performance and advancement. These findings suggest that high self-monitors may be adept at influencing performance ratings of themselves through the use of impression management tactics (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). It is also possible that subjective success measures take into account more interpersonal or contextual information, which is particularly well-suited for high self-monitors given their noted strengths at interpersonal relations. It also cannot be ruled out that the objective indices had poorer reliability, greater contamination, or larger deficiencies than the subjective ratings.

**Ability.** The mean sample-weighted correlation across 10 studies assessing the relationship between SM and ability measures was .06. The overall effect was rendered homogeneous through the removal of two outliers (20%), with a slightly smaller revised correlation (.05). These results show a small but robust relationship between SM and ability, suggesting that the noted relationship between SM and work performance may be partially attributable to ability differences between high and low self-monitors. The scale-type moderator model completely fit the data (see Table 4), with the 18-item scale yielding a larger average weighted effect than the 25-item scale. The research-setting moderator model did not fit the data (see Table 6).

**Leadership.** A total of 23 samples were identified that assessed the relationship between SM and leadership behaviors (mean sample-weighted  $r = .18$ ). Outlier analysis successfully reduced effect heterogeneity by removing three outliers (13%), with a slightly larger revised estimate ( $r = .19$ ). Adequate study numbers existed in each moderator category to examine the source of leadership ratings, research setting, as well as scale type and scoring format.

Results indicated that the moderator model associated with rating source fit the data somewhat well (see Table 7), with the correlation between SM and outside observers' ratings of leader-

ship larger than the correlations for group members' ratings and self-ratings. The moderator analysis for research setting resulted in a significant between-class effect, but the within-class effects were also heterogeneous, indicating a partial model fit (Table 6). The average correlation associated with laboratory studies was larger than that for field studies. Type of scale and scoring format were also investigated as possible moderators. Results for scale type (Table 4) indicated a significant between-class effect and a significant within-class effect only for the 25-item category. The strongest effect was found for the 18-item scale, which was also associated with homogeneous within-class effect sizes. The scoring-format moderator model also fit the data fairly well in that the between-class effect was significant, as was the within-class effect for the true–false category (Table 5). Overall, true–false scoring formats showed stronger correlations than did continuous scoring.

**Work-related attitudes.** Results indicated a mean sample-weighted correlation of  $-.11$  across 15 samples investigating organizational commitment. The effects were made homogeneous through the removal of three outliers (20%), with the average correlation becoming somewhat stronger ( $-.14$ ; see Table 3). The moderator model for scale type failed to demonstrate a significant between-class effect (Table 4), indicating that the hypothesized moderator model did not fit the data. The moderator model for scoring format provided a somewhat better fit to the data; however, the within-class effects were more heterogeneous than the between-class effect (Table 5). Sufficient numbers of studies were available to examine the relationship strength between SM and organizational commitment measured as an attitude or a behavior. Results indicated that the hypothesized moderator model fit the data fairly well, with a significant between-class effect and a homogeneous set of effect sizes for the attitude category (Table 7). The correlation was estimated to be twice as strong when commitment was measured as a behavior as compared with when it was measured as an attitude.

The mean sample-weighted correlation between SM and role conflict ( $k = 5$ ) was .12; the sample-weighted correlation for role ambiguity ( $k = 5$ ) was .17. The 95% confidence intervals for each

Table 3  
Summary of Outlier Analyses Results

Relationship	$Q$	Number removed	% of $k$	Revised $r$
Age	78.48**	4	31	
Sex	67.21**	4	19	.12
Job performance–advancement	135.05**	11	39	
Leadership	86.10**	3	13	.19
Ability	23.53**	2	20	.05
Organizational commitment	56.84**	3	20	–.14
Role conflict	28.36**	3	60	
Role ambiguity	1.78	0	0	.17
Job satisfaction	26.84**	2	33	
Job involvement	10.25*	1	25	

Note. Revised  $r$  values were calculated for analyses in which homogeneity was achieved through removal of 20% or fewer outliers.  $Q$  = homogeneity statistic; Number removed = number of outliers removed before achieving a homogeneous effect size; % of  $k$  = percentage of total studies that were removed.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

Table 4  
Summary of Moderator Analyses for Scale Type

Variable and moderator	$Q_B$	$k$	$r$	$Q_W$	95% CI for $d_+$	
					Lower	Upper
Age	57.99**					
25-item scale		5	-.13	11.79*	-0.35	-0.18
18-item scale		4	-.19	7.01	-0.55	-0.24
13-item scale		3	.13	1.69	0.11	0.43
Sex	11.34**					
25-item scale		11	.11	39.47**	0.15	0.30
18-item scale		8	.14	15.42	0.20	0.36
13-item scale		2	.00	0.98	-0.13	0.15
Job performance-advancement	19.05**					
25-item scale		11	.03	57.11**	-0.03	0.14
18-item scale		9	.10	29.37**	0.12	0.28
13-item scale		5	.19	14.15*	0.24	0.52
Other		3	.15	15.37*	0.15	0.45
Ability	8.72*					
25-item scale		7	.04	12.94	-0.03	0.20
18-item scale		2	.13	1.86	0.12	0.38
Leadership	17.15**					
25-item scale		11	.20	55.17**	0.32	0.49
18-item scale		6	.24	3.91	0.39	0.61
13-item scale		5	.12	9.87	0.16	0.33
Organizational commitment	1.80					
25-item scale		8	-.13	31.18**	-0.36	-0.17
18-item scale		5	-.11	23.25**	-0.32	-0.12
13-item scale		2	-.07	0.61	-0.31	0.03

Note. Moderator analyses were conducted only for those constructs with two or more effect sizes per category. Significance of  $Q$  statistics indicates rejection of the homogeneity hypothesis.  $Q_B$  = between-classes goodness-of-fit statistic;  $k$  = number of studies in each analysis;  $r$  = mean sample-weighted correlation;  $Q_W$  = homogeneity of effect sizes within each class; 95% confidence interval (CI) for  $d_+$  = lower and upper bound estimates for effect size estimates.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

Table 5  
Summary of Moderator Analyses for Scoring Format

Variable and moderator	$Q_B$	$k$	$r$	$Q_W$	95% CI for $d_+$	
					Lower	Upper
Age	18.55**					
True-false scoring		10	-.10	59.09**	-0.27	-0.14
Continuous scoring		3	.05	0.85	-0.02	0.22
Sex	5.94*					
True-false scoring		18	.12	58.03**	0.19	0.30
Continuous scoring		3	.03	3.24	-0.07	0.20
Job performance-advancement	4.18*					
True-false scoring		14	.07	74.48**	0.07	0.20
Continuous scoring		14	.12	56.39**	0.17	0.31
Leadership	9.59**					
True-false scoring		18	.21	68.72**	0.36	0.49
Continuous scoring		5	.12	7.79	0.14	0.34
Organizational commitment	2.36*					
True-false scoring		10	-.12	37.76**	-0.32	-0.18
Continuous scoring		5	-.06	16.72**	-0.27	0.04
Job satisfaction	13.11**					
True-false scoring		3	.06	3.75	-0.04	0.28
Continuous scoring		3	-.14	9.99*	-0.45	-0.13

Note. Moderator analyses were conducted only for those constructs with two or more effect sizes per category. Significance of  $Q$  statistics indicates rejection of the homogeneity hypothesis.  $Q_B$  = between-classes goodness-of-fit statistic;  $k$  = number of studies in each analysis;  $r$  = mean sample-weighted correlation;  $Q_W$  = homogeneity of effect sizes within each class; 95% confidence interval (CI) for  $d_+$  = lower and upper bound estimates for effect size estimates.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

Table 6  
Summary of Moderator Analyses for Research Setting

Variable and moderator	$Q_B$	$k$	$r$	$Q_W$	95% CI for $d_+$	
					Lower	Upper
Sex	6.03*					
Field setting		9	.07	21.40*	0.07	0.22
Lab setting		12	.14	39.77**	0.21	0.35
Job performance–advancement	2.19					
Field setting		25	.09	127.81**	0.12	0.22
Lab setting		3	.16	5.05	0.13	0.49
Ability	2.43					
Field setting		4	.02	12.57*	−0.09	0.16
Lab setting		6	.08	8.53	0.06	0.26
Leadership	5.91*					
Field setting		10	.15	20.71*	0.24	0.39
Lab setting		13	.22	59.48**	0.37	0.52
Job satisfaction	0.15					
Field setting		4	−.05	6.54	−0.22	0.03
Lab setting		2	−.02	20.15**	−0.31	0.23
Job involvement	7.14**					
Field setting		2	.09	2.42	−0.02	0.39
Lab setting		2	.29	0.69	0.37	0.85

Note. Moderator analyses were conducted only for those constructs with two or more effect sizes per category. Significance of  $Q$  statistics indicates rejection of the homogeneity hypothesis.  $Q_B$  = between-classes goodness-of-fit statistic;  $k$  = number of studies in each analysis;  $r$  = mean sample-weighted correlation;  $Q_W$  = homogeneity of effect sizes within each class; 95% confidence interval (CI) for  $d_+$  = lower and upper bound estimates for effect size estimates.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

of these effects excluded zero but overlapped, indicating that SM did not show differential relationships with these two stressors. Results support the hypothesis that high self-monitors likely experience greater role stress than low self-monitors. The effects associated with role conflict could not be rendered homogeneous through the removal of outliers (Table 3), and too few studies were available for appropriate moderator analyses. The role ambiguity effects were homogeneous (see Table 3).

The mean sample-weighted correlation between SM and job satisfaction ( $k = 6$ ) was  $-.04$ . The 95% confidence interval estimates around the average effect included zero. Outlier analysis could not successfully reduce effect heterogeneity (Table 3). The moderator model based on scoring format indicated a significant between-class difference, although the within-class effect sizes were heterogeneous for the continuous-scoring category (Table 5). Results indicated a significant negative correlation ( $-.14$ ) when

Table 7  
Summary of Additional Moderator Analyses

Variable and moderator	$Q_B$	$k$	$r$	$Q_W$	95% CI for $d_+$	
					Lower	Upper
Job performance–advancement	23.29**					
Objective rating		12	.03	64.30**	−0.01	0.13
Subjective rating		16	.15	47.46*	0.24	0.38
Leadership	9.12*					
Self-rating		8	.21	51.74**	0.35	0.52
Group member rating		12	.15	24.39*	0.23	0.38
Outside observer rating		3	.27	0.86	0.36	0.76
Organizational commitment	5.02*					
Attitude		6	−.07	6.97	−0.24	−0.05
Behavior		9	−.14	44.85**	−0.38	−0.21

Note. Moderator analyses were conducted only for those constructs with two or more effect sizes per category. Significance of  $Q$  statistics indicates rejection of the homogeneity hypothesis.  $Q_B$  = between-classes goodness-of-fit statistic;  $k$  = number of studies in each analysis;  $r$  = mean sample-weighted correlation;  $Q_W$  = homogeneity of effect sizes within each class; 95% confidence interval (CI) for  $d_+$  = lower and upper bound estimates for effect size estimates.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

continuous scoring was used but a nonsignificant positive effect (.06) when true-false scoring was used. Research setting was examined as a possible moderator; however, the moderator model did not fit the data (Table 6).

The mean sample-weighted correlation with job involvement ( $k = 4$ ) was .18. Outlier analysis could not successfully reduce effect heterogeneity. The only possible moderator model that could be examined was for research setting. Results indicated that this hypothesized model completely fit the data (Table 6). Results from laboratory studies ( $r = .29$ ) demonstrated larger effects between SM and job involvement than did field studies ( $r = .09$ ).

### *Demographic Correlates*

The mean sample-weighted correlation between SM and age ( $k = 13$ ) was  $-.07$ . Removal of four outliers (31% of total studies) was needed to render the effects homogeneous (see Table 3); thus, a revised correlation with outliers removed was not computed. A moderator analysis comparing the 25-item, 18-item, and 13-item scales produced significant results (see Table 4), as did comparing scoring formats (see Table 5). The within-class effect was also significant for the 25-item class but not for the 18-item or the 13-item version, indicating that the hypothesized moderator classes partially fit the data. Similar results were noted regarding the true-false moderator class. All confidence intervals excluded zero, indicating significant age-related differences in SM (except for the continuous-scoring-format class). For Snyder's scales (Gangestad & Snyder, 1985; Snyder, 1974), older respondents tended to be lower self-monitors, whereas for Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) scale, older respondents tended to be higher self-monitors. There is no ready explanation for the directional differences for the correlations with age between the two scale types. One caveat is that comparisons were based on small numbers of studies within each moderator class and may have been susceptible to second-order sampling error.

The mean sample-weighted correlation between SM and respondent sex was estimated as .11, with men showing higher average SM scores than women. Outlier analysis was successful (see Table 3) in removing four studies (19%) to render the effect homogeneous. The revised correlation was .12. The scale-length moderator model partially fit the data (see Table 4) in that the between-class effects were heterogeneous and the within-class effects for the 18-item and 13-item versions were homogeneous. However, the within-class effect sizes for the 25-item scale were heterogeneous, suggesting additional possible moderators for that category. The confidence intervals for the 25- and 18-item scales excluded zero, whereas the confidence interval for the 13-item version included zero. In a similar manner, the scoring-format moderator model partially fit the data (see Table 5), with true-false scoring demonstrating a higher average correlation (.12) than continuous scoring (.03). Moderator analyses based on research site indicated that laboratory studies showed a larger correlation (.14) between SM and sex than did field studies (.07), but the within-class effects were more heterogeneous than the between-class effects (see Table 6).

### *Summary*

Results of the relations between SM and organizational criteria, except for job satisfaction, demonstrated generally good empirical

prediction. Taken together, the results suggest that SM is significantly related to work-related outcomes associated with job performance and advancement, ability, leadership behavior and emergence, and several work-related attitudes. High self-monitors (vs. low self-monitors) are likely to be younger and male, to be more involved in their jobs, and to perform at a higher level and are more likely to emerge as a leader. High self-monitors are also likely to experience more role stress and show less commitment to their organizations as compared with low self-monitors.

### *Conclusion and Implications*

The foundation of SM personality is that people differ in the extent to which they observe, regulate, and control the appearances of self displayed in social settings and interpersonal relationships (Snyder, 1987). A central question in the present study involves the relevance of SM personality in organizational contexts: Do differences in the monitoring and display of self have work-related implications? In terms of the psychometric properties of the various scales used to assess SM, reliability analyses indicate that all of the scale types demonstrate respectable levels of internal consistency reliability. The findings also suggest that Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) scale shows higher reliability than either of Snyder's scales (Gangestad & Snyder, 1985; Snyder, 1974). This finding is noteworthy given that Lennox and Wolfe's scale is shorter than Snyder's scales. Results of the moderator analyses for scale type, scoring format, and research setting did not resolve questions regarding the most appropriate way to measure SM. These findings suggest that it makes little difference empirically which particular SM scale or scoring type is used for predicting organizational criteria. Results are more clear-cut in suggesting that if high internal consistency is desired, the 13-item scale (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984) is more reliable than either the 25-item version (Snyder, 1974) or the 18-item version (Gangestad & Snyder, 1985).

Despite the relatively small average effect size estimates, the findings with regard to sex may help shed light on the noted disparities between men and women at top organizational levels (Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995). As shown through computer simulations, relatively trivial effect sizes associated with sex differences in promotion can have detrimental effects on the career progress of women (Martell, Lane, & Emrich, 1996). As little as 1% of the variance in performance appraisal ratings associated with bias against women was shown to result in 35% of the highest level positions being filled by women, as compared with 50% for an unbiased appraisal system. Thus, even a "little bias can hurt women a lot" (Martell et al., 1996, p. 158). SM surely is not the sole cause of sex-related disparities in organizations, but the present results suggest that differences in performance ratings and leadership emergence between high and low self-monitors may have harmful effects on women's progress when considered across all organizational levels.

The present results indicate that high self-monitors tend to receive better performance ratings and more promotions than low self-monitors and are more likely to emerge as leaders. Extending these findings across organizational hierarchies suggests that high self-monitors should be overrepresented among those in upper-level management positions. It has been argued that progression into middle management may be a function mainly of likability

and perceived ability to work with senior management (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). For these reasons, high self-monitors appear to have a competitive advantage in promotional tournaments; however, there has been no research devoted to understanding or predicting the performance and leadership effectiveness of high self-monitors in top-level positions.

Organizational scholars have noted that leadership varies qualitatively across organizational levels. A systems perspective is critical for success at top echelons, whereas human relations skills contribute more to success at middle levels (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Because of their variability in attitudes and behavior, attention to others' expectations, and lower commitment, high self-monitors may be less likely than low self-monitors to adopt firm strategic positions or communicate a consistent vision on key issues. The traits and behaviors associated with SM may contribute to high self-monitors' disproportionate rise to the top of corporate or political ladders, but more needs to be known about their effectiveness in those top-level positions. Theory building and additional research are needed to better develop these leadership-specific inferences about the SM construct. Nonetheless, results of the present meta-analyses suggest that SM personality appears to play a pivotal role in shaping who succeeds in organizations and emerges into leadership roles and in contributing to important work-related attitudes. Thus, it is concluded that the SM personality construct has relevance (i.e., validity) in organizations. Researchers and theorists are encouraged to further consider how SM helps shape who succeeds and leads in organizations.

## References

References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in the meta-analysis.

- \*Aaker, L. L. (1999). The malleable self: The role of self-expression in persuasion. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *36*, 45–57.
- \*Abraham, R. (1998). Emotional dissonance in organizations: Antecedents, consequences, and moderators. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, *124*, 229–246.
- \*Ahmed, S. M., Garg, R., & Braimoh, G. (1986). Psychometric properties of Snyder's self-monitoring of expressive behavior scale. *Perceptual & Motor Skills*, *63*, 495–500.
- \*Ajzen, I., Timko, C., & White, J. B. (1982). Self-monitoring and the attitude-behavior relation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *42*, 426–435.
- \*Allen, J. J. (1986). A developmental approach to self-monitoring behavior. *Communication Monographs*, *53*, 277–288.
- Anastasi, A. (1986). Evolving concepts of test validation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *37*, 1–15.
- \*Anderson, L. R. (1987). Self-monitoring and performance in nontraditional occupations. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *8*, 85–96.
- \*Anderson, L. R. (1991). Test-retest reliability of the revised Self-Monitoring Scale over a two-year period. *Psychological Reports*, *68*, 1057–1058.
- \*Anderson, L. R., & McLenigan, M. (1987). Sex differences in the relationship between self-monitoring and leader behavior. *Small Group Behavior*, *18*, 147–167.
- \*Anderson, L. R., & Thacker, J. (1985). Self-monitoring and sex as related to assessment center ratings and job performance. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *6*, 345–361.
- \*Anderson, L. R., & Tolson, J. (1989). Group members' self-monitoring as a possible neutralizer of leadership. *Small Group Behavior*, *20*, 24–36.
- \*Ayman, R., & Chemers, M. M. (1991). The effect of leadership match on subordinate satisfaction in Mexican organizations: Some moderating influences of self-monitoring. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *40*, 299–314.
- \*Barber, A. E., Hollenbeck, J. R., Tower, S. L., & Phillips, J. M. (1994). The effects of interview focus on recruitment effectiveness: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*, 886–896.
- \*Beers, M. J., Lassiter, G. D., & Flannery, B. C. (1997). Individual differences in person memory: Self-monitoring and the recall of consistent and inconsistent behavior. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, *12*, 811–820.
- \*Bell, R. A., & Daly, J. A. (1984). The affinity-seeking function of communication. *Communication Monographs*, *51*, 91–115.
- \*Bell, S. S., Holbrook, M. B., & Solomon, M. R. (1991). Combining esthetic and social value to explain preferences for product styles with the incorporation of personality and ensemble effects. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, *6*, 243–274.
- Binning, J. F., & Barrett, G. V. (1989). Validity of personnel decisions: A conceptual analysis of the inferential and evidential bases. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *74*, 478–494.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, W. C. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- \*Brandt, D. R., Miller, G. R., & Hocking, J. E. (1980). Effects of self-monitoring and familiarity on deception detection. *Communication Quarterly*, *28*, 3–10.
- Briggs, S. R., & Cheek, J. M. (1988). On the nature of self-monitoring: Problems with assessment, problems with validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 663–678.
- \*Briggs, S. R., Cheek, J. M., & Buss, A. H. (1980). An analysis of the Self-Monitoring Scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *38*, 679–686.
- \*Brookings, J. B., Flood, S., Hessinger, B., Kuhls, J., Miller, W. E., & Wright, T. (1982). Moderator variable analysis of the relationship between self- and peer-trait ratings. *Psychological Reports*, *50*, 621–622.
- \*Burkhardt, M. E. (1994). Social interaction effects following a technological change: A longitudinal investigation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*, 869–898.
- \*Caldwell, D. F., & O'Reilly, C. A., III. (1982). Boundary spanning and individual performance: The impact of self-monitoring. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *67*, 124–127.
- \*Caldwell, D. F., & O'Reilly, C. A., III. (1985). Personality characteristics and self-monitoring. *Psychological Reports*, *57*, 103–110.
- \*Carson, A. D., & Mowesian, R. (1993). Self-monitoring and private self-consciousness: Relations to Holland's vocational personality types. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *42*, 212–222.
- \*Celuch, K., & Slama, M. (1995). "Getting along" and "getting ahead" as motives for self-presentation: Their impact on advertising effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *25*, 1700–1713.
- \*Church, A. H. (1997). Managerial self-awareness in high-performing individuals in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*, 281–292.
- \*Clinton, M., & Anderson, L. R. (1999). Social and emotional loneliness: Gender differences and relationships with self-monitoring and perceived control. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *25*, 61–77.
- \*Covell, K., Dion, K. L., & Dion, K. K. (1994). Gender differences in evaluations of tobacco and alcohol advertisements. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, *26*, 404–420.
- \*Cronshaw, S. F., & Ellis, R. J. (1991). A process investigation of self-monitoring and leader emergence. *Small Group Research*, *22*, 403–420.
- \*Cunningham, M. R., Wong, D. T., & Barbee, A. P. (1994). Self-presentation dynamics on overt integrity tests: Experimental studies of the Reid Report. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*, 643–658.
- \*Daly, J. A., Vangelisti, A. L., & Daughton, S. M. (1987). The nature of

- correlates of conversational sensitivity. *Human Communication Research*, 14, 167–202.
- \*Davis, J. D. (1978). When boy meets girl: Sex roles and the negotiation of intimacy in an acquaintance exercise. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 684–692.
- \*Deluga, R. J. (1991). The relationship of upward-influencing behavior with subordinate-impression management characteristics. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 21, 1145–1160.
- \*Dobbins, G. H., Farh, J., & Werbel, J. D. (1993). The influence of self-monitoring on inflation of grade-point averages for research and selection purposes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23, 321–334.
- \*Dobbins, G. H., Long, W. S., Dedrick, E. J., & Clemons, T. C. (1990). The role of self-monitoring and gender on leader emergence: A laboratory and field study. *Journal of Management*, 16, 609–618.
- \*Douglas, W. (1983). Scripts and self-monitoring: When does being a high self-monitor really make a difference? *Human Communication Research*, 10, 81–96.
- \*Dubinsky, A. J., & Hartley, S. W. (1986). Antecedents of retail salesperson performance: A path-analytic perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 14, 253–268.
- \*Dubinsky, A. J., & Hartley, S. W. (1987). A path-analytic study of a model of salesperson performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 14, 36–46.
- \*Dubinsky, A. J., Hartley, S. W., & Yammarino, F. J. (1985). Boundary spanners and self-monitoring: An extended view. *Psychological Reports*, 57, 287–294.
- \*Eichenhofer, D., Gerstein, L., Valutis, W., & Jankowski, J. (1987). Effects of anxiety on self-monitoring. *Psychological Reports*, 61, 831–836.
- \*Ellis, R. J. (1988). Self-monitoring and leadership emergence in groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 14, 681–693.
- \*Ellis, R. J., & Cronshaw, S. F. (1992). Self-monitoring and leader emergence: A test of moderator effects. *Small Group Research*, 23, 113–129.
- \*Emmons, R. A. (1984). Factor analysis and construct validity of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48, 291–300.
- \*Fandt, P. M., & Ferris, G. R. (1990). The management of information and impressions: When employees behave opportunistically. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 45, 140–158.
- \*Farmer, S. M., Maslyn, J. M., Fedor, D. B., & Goodman, J. S. (1997). Putting upward influence strategies in context. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 17–42.
- Fiske, D. W. (1951). Values, theories, and the criterion problem. *Personnel Psychology*, 4, 93–98.
- \*Fox, M. L., & Dwyer, D. J. (1995). Stressful job demands and worker health: An investigation of the effects of self-monitoring. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25, 1973–1995.
- \*Frazier, R. B., & Fatis, M. (1980). Sex differences in self-monitoring. *Psychological Reports*, 47, 597–598.
- \*French, C., & Schuldberg, D. (1994). Anhedonia and the intentional communication of emotion. *Perceptual & Motor Skills*, 79, 1075–1088.
- French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. H. (1960). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), *Group dynamics: Research and theory* (2nd ed., pp. 607–623). New York: Row, Peterson.
- \*Friedman, H. S., DiMatteo, R. M., & Taranta, A. (1980). A study of the relationship between individual differences in nonverbal expressiveness and factors of personality and social interaction. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 14, 351–364.
- \*Furnham, A. (1989). Personality correlates of self-monitoring: The relationships between extraversion, neuroticism, Type A behavior and Snyder's self-monitoring construct. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 10, 35–42.
- Gangestad, S., & Snyder, M. (1985). "To carve nature at its joints": On the existence of discrete classes in personality. *Psychological Review*, 92, 317–349.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Snyder, M. (2000). Self-monitoring: Appraisal and reappraisal. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 530–555.
- \*Garland, H., & Beard, J. F. (1979). The relationship between self-monitoring and leader emergence across two task situations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64, 72–76.
- Glass Ceiling Commission. (1995). *Good for business: Making full use of the nation's human capital*. Washington, DC: Author.
- \*Goldsmith, R. E. (1987). Self-monitoring and innovativeness. *Psychological Reports*, 60, 1017–1018.
- \*Graziano, W. G., & Bryant, W. H. M. (1998). Self-monitoring and the self-attribution of positive emotions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 250–261.
- \*Graziano, W. G., Leone, C., Musser, L. M., & Lautenschlager, G. J. (1987). Self-monitoring in children: A differential approach to social development. *Developmental Psychology*, 23, 571–576.
- \*Guarino, A., Michael, W. B., & Hocesvar, D. (1998). Self-monitoring and student integration of community college students. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 138, 754–757.
- \*Gudykunst, W. B. (1985). The influence of cultural similarity, type of relationship, and self-monitoring on uncertainty reduction processes. *Communication Monographs*, 52, 203–217.
- \*Gudykunst, W. B., Nishida, T., & Schmidt, K. L. (1989). The influence of cultural, relational, and personality factors on uncertainty reduction processes. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 53, 13–29.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1974). *The Job Diagnostic Survey: An instrument for diagnosing the motivational potential of jobs* (Tech. Rep. No. 4). New Haven, CT: Yale University, Department of Administrative Sciences.
- \*Haferkamp, C. J. (1992). Orientations to conflict: Gender, attributions, resolution strategies, and self-monitoring. *Current Psychology: Research and Reviews*, 10, 227–240.
- \*Hall, R. J., Workman, J. W., & Marchioro, C. A. (1998). Sex, task, and behavioral flexibility effects on leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 74, 1–32.
- \*Hamid, P. N. (1994). Self-monitoring, locus of control, and social encounters of Chinese and New Zealand students. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 25, 353–368.
- \*Head, T. C. (1998). Roles of self-monitoring and situational ambiguity in the social information-processing model. *Psychological Reports*, 83, 1447–1453.
- Hedges, L. V. (1987). How hard is hard science, how soft is soft science? The empirical cumulativeness or research. *American Psychologist*, 42, 443–455.
- Hedges, L. V., & Olkin, I. (1985). *Statistical methods for meta-analysis*. New York: Academic Press.
- \*Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. S. (1988). Lovers wear rose colored glasses. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5, 161–183.
- \*Hjelle, L. A., & Bernard, M. (1994). Private self-consciousness and the retest reliability of self-reports. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 28, 52–67.
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist*, 49, 493–504.
- Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Roberts, B. W. (1996). Personality measurement and employment decisions: Questions and answers. *American Psychologist*, 51, 469–477.
- Holland, J. L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of careers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- \*Horn, E. M., Collier, W. G., Oxford, J. A., Bond, C. F., Jr., & Dansereau, D. F. (1998). Individual differences in dyadic cooperative learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90, 153–161.
- \*Howells, G. N., & Fishfader, V. L. (1995). Personality assessment of

- adolescents: An analysis of the Junior Self-Monitoring Scale. *Psychological Reports*, 76, 575–578.
- \*Hoyle, R. H., & Lennox, R. D. (1991). Latent structure of self-monitoring. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 26, 511–540.
- Hrebiniak, L. G., & Alutto, J. A. (1972). Personal and role-related factors in the development of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 555–573.
- Huffcutt, A. I., & Arthur, W., Jr. (1995). Development of a new outlier statistic for meta-analytic data. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 327–334.
- Ickes, W. J., & Barnes, R. D. (1977). The role of sex and self-monitoring in unstructured dyadic interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 315–330.
- \*James, K., & Cropanzano, R. (1994). Dispositional group loyalty and individual action for the benefit of an ingroup: Experimental and correlational evidence. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 60, 179–205.
- \*James, M. R. (1986). Verbal reinforcement and self-monitoring inclinations. *Journal of Music Therapy*, 23, 182–193.
- \*James, M. R. (1988). Self-monitoring inclination and adolescent clients with chemical dependency. *Journal of Music Therapy*, 25, 94–102.
- Jenkins, C., Zyzanski, S., & Rosenman, R. (1979). *Jenkins Activity Survey manual*. New York: Psychological Corporation.
- \*Jenkins, J. M. (1993). Self-monitoring and turnover: The impact of personality on intent to leave. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 83–91.
- \*John, O. P., Cheek, J. M., & Klohnen, E. C. (1996). On the nature of self-monitoring: Construct explication with Q-sort ratings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 763–776.
- Johnson, B. T. (1989). *Software for the meta-analytic review of research literature*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- \*Jordon, J. M., & Roloff, M. E. (1997). Planning skills and negotiator goal accomplishment: The relationship between self-monitoring and plan generation, plan enactment, and plan consequences. *Communication Research*, 24, 31–63.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- \*Kent, R. L., & Moss, S. E. (1990). Self-monitoring as a predictor of leader emergence. *Psychological Reports*, 66, 875–881.
- \*Kilduff, M. (1992). The friendship network as a decision-making resource: Dispositional moderators of social influences on organizational choice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 168–180.
- \*Kilduff, M., & Day, D. V. (1994). Do chameleons get ahead? The effects of self-monitoring on managerial careers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 1047–1060.
- \*Kolligan, J., Jr., & Sternberg, R. J. (1991). Perceived fraudulence in young adults: Is there an “imposter syndrome?” *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 56, 308–326.
- \*Kring, A. M., Smith, D. A., & Neale, J. M. (1994). Individual differences in dispositional expressiveness: Development and validation of the Emotional Expressivity Scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, 934–949.
- \*Kristiansen, C. M., & Zanna, M. P. (1988). Justifying attitudes by appealing to values: A functional perspective. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 27, 247–256.
- \*Kuptsch, C., Kleinmann, M., & Koller, O. (1998). The chameleon effect in assessment centers: The influence of cross-situational behavioral consistency on the convergent validity of assessment centers. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 13, 103–116.
- \*Lapsley, D. K., Jackson, S., Rice, K., & Shadid, G. E. (1988). Self-monitoring and the “new look” at the imaginary audience and personal fable: An ego-developmental analysis. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 3, 17–31.
- \*Larkin, J. E., & Pines, H. A. (1994). Affective consequences of self-monitoring style in a job interview setting. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 297–310.
- \*Lassk, F. G., Kennedy, K. N., Powell, C. M., & Lagace, R. R. (1992). Psychological adaptiveness and sales managers’ job performance. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 7, 611–620.
- \*Lennox, R. D., & Wolfe, R. N. (1984). Revision of the Self-Monitoring Scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 1349–1364.
- \*Leone, C., & Corte, V. (1994). Concern for self-presentation and self-congruence: Self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and social conflicts. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 22, 305–312.
- Lodahl, T. M., & Kejner, M. (1964). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49, 24–33.
- \*Long, W. S., Long, E. J., & Dobbins, G. H. (1998). Correlates of satisfaction with a peer evaluation system: Investigation of performance levels and individual differences. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 12, 299–312.
- Martell, R. F., Lane, D. M., & Emrich, C. (1996). Male–female differences: A computer simulation. *American Psychologist*, 51, 157–158.
- \*McCrae, R. R. (1993). Moderated analyses of longitudinal personality stability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 577–585.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the “side-bet theory” of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 372–378.
- \*Miller, M. L., & Thayer, J. F. (1988). On the nature of self-monitoring: Relationships with adjustment and identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 14, 544–553.
- Miller, M. L., & Thayer, J. F. (1989). On the existence of discrete classes in personality: Is self-monitoring the correct joint to carve? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 143–155.
- \*Morrison, K. A. (1997a). How franchise job satisfaction and personality affect performance, organizational commitment, franchisor relations, and intention to remain. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 39–67.
- \*Morrison, K. A. (1997b). Personality correlates of the five-factor model for a sample of business owners/managers: Associations with scores on self-monitoring, Type A behavior, locus of control, and subjective well-being. *Psychological Reports*, 80, 255–272.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224–247.
- \*Mullen, E. J., & Noe, R. A. (1999). The mentoring information exchange: When do mentors seek information from their protégés? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 233–242.
- \*Murrell, A., & Mingrone, M. (1994). Correlates of temporal perspective. *Perceptual & Motor Skills*, 78, 1331–1334.
- \*Parkinson, B. (1991). Emotional stylists: Strategies on expressive management among trainee hairdressers. *Cognition and Emotion*, 5, 419–434.
- \*Paulhus, D. L., & Martin, C. L. (1988). Functional flexibility: A new conception of interpersonal flexibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 88–101.
- \*Pledger, L. M. (1992). Development of self-monitoring behavior from early to late adolescence. *Adolescence*, 27, 329–338.
- \*Prislin, R., & Kovrija, N. (1992). Predicting behavior of high and low self-monitors: An application of the theory of planned behavior. *Psychological Reports*, 70, 1131–1138.
- \*Reifman, A., Klein, J. G., & Murphy, S. T. (1989). Self-monitoring and age. *Psychology and Aging*, 4, 2245–2246.
- \*Richards, P. S. (1994). Religious devoutness, impression management, and personality functioning in college students. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 28, 14–26.
- Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 150–163.
- \*Ronchi, D., & Sparacino, J. (1982). Density of dormitory living and

- stress: Mediating effects of sex, self-monitoring, and environmental affective qualities. *Perceptual & Motor Skills*, 55, 759–770.
- Rosenthal, R., & DePaulo, B. M. (1979a). Sex differences in accommodation in nonverbal communication. In R. Rosenthal (Ed.), *Skill in nonverbal communication: Individual differences* (pp. 68–103). Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain.
- \*Rosenthal, R., & DePaulo, B. M. (1979b). Sex differences in eavesdropping on nonverbal cues. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 273–285.
- \*Rosnow, R. L., Skleder, A. A., Jaeger, M. E., & Rind, B. (1994). Intelligence and the epistemics of interpersonal acumen: Testing some implications of Gardner's theory. *Intelligence*, 19, 93–116.
- \*Rotenberg, K. J., Hewlett, M. G., & Siegart, C. M. (1998). Principled moral reasoning and self-monitoring as predictors of jury functioning. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 20, 167–173.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 437–453.
- \*Sharp, M. J., & Getz, J. G. (1996). Substance use as impression management. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 60–67.
- \*Simpson, J. A. (1987). The dissolution of romantic relationships: Factors involved in relationship stability and emotional distress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 683–692.
- \*Slugoski, B. R., Lalljee, M., Lamb, R., & Ginsburg, G. P. (1993). Attribution in conversational context: Effect of mutual knowledge on explanation-giving. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 219–238.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Snyder, M. (1972). Individual differences and the self-control of expressive behavior (Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1972). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 33, 4533A–4534A.
- Snyder, M. (1974). The self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30, 526–537.
- Snyder, M. (1987). *Public appearances/private realities: The psychology of self-monitoring*. New York: Freeman.
- Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S. (1982). Choosing social situations: Two investigations of self-monitoring processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 123–135.
- Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S. (1986). On the nature of self-monitoring: Matters of assessment, matters of validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 125–139.
- \*Sosik, J. J., & Dworakivsky, A. C. (1998). Self-concept based aspects of the charismatic leader: More than meets the eye. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9, 503–526.
- \*Sparacino, J., Ronchi, D., Bigley, T. K., Flesch, A. L., & Kuhn, J. W. (1983). Self-monitoring and blood pressure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 365–375.
- \*Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (1994). Inconsistent self-views in the control identity model. *Social Science Research*, 23, 236–262.
- \*Sullivan, L. A., & Harnish, R. J. (1990). Body image: Differences between high and low self-monitoring males and females. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 24, 291–302.
- \*Sypher, B. D., & Sypher, H. E. (1983). Perceptions of communication ability: Self-monitoring in an organizational setting. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 9, 297–304.
- \*Sypher, B. D., & Zorn, T. E. (1986). Communication-related abilities and upward mobility: A longitudinal investigation. *Human Communication Research*, 12, 420–431.
- \*Tardy, C. H., & Hosman, L. A. (1982). Self-monitoring and self-disclosure flexibility: A research note. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 46, 92–97.
- Tedeschi, J. T., & Melburg, V. (1984). Impression management and influence in the organization. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 3, 31–58.
- \*Thompson, T., & LeFevre, C. (1999). Implications of manipulating anticipatory attributions on the strategy use of defensive pessimists and strategic optimists. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 26, 887–904.
- \*Trubisky, P., Ting-Toomey, S., & Lin, S. L. (1991). The influence of individualism–collectivism and self-monitoring on conflict styles. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 15, 65–84.
- \*Turban, D. B., & Dougherty, T. W. (1994). Role of protégé personality in receipt of mentoring and career success. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 688–702.
- \*Tziner, A., & Murphy, K. R. (1999). Additional evidence of attitudinal influences in performance appraisal. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 13, 407–419.
- \*Warech, M. A., Smither, J. W., Reilly, R. R., Millsap, R. E., & Reilly, S. P. (1998). Self-monitoring and 360-degree ratings. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9, 449–473.
- \*Watson, W. E., & Behnke, R. R. (1990). Group identification, independence, and self-monitoring characteristics as predictors of leaderless group discussion performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 20, 1423–1431.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawes, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center.
- \*Wharton, A. S. (1993). The affective consequences of service work. *Work and Occupations*, 20, 205–232.
- \*Wong, N. Y. (1988). Effect of self-monitoring and reinforcement on problem solving performance. *Educational Psychology*, 8, 153–159.
- \*Wymer, W. E., & Penner, L. A. (1985). Moderator variables and different types of predictability: Do you have a match? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 1002–1015.
- \*Younger, J. C., & Pliner, P. (1976). Obese–normal differences in the self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 10, 112–115.
- \*Zaccaro, S. J., Foti, R. J., & Kenny, D. A. (1991). Self-monitoring and trait-based variance in leadership: An investigation of leader flexibility across multiple group situations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 308–315.
- \*Zahrly, J., & Tosi, H. (1989). The differential effect of organizational induction process on early work role adjustment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10, 59–74.
- \*Zweigenhaft, R. L., & Cody, M. L. (1993). The self-monitoring of Black students on a predominantly White campus. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 133, 5–10.

Received December 13, 2000

Revision received April 30, 2001

Accepted May 6, 2001 ■