

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

2010

The relationship between self-monitoring, self-promotion, and agentic traits in leadership

Sabrina Regina Wilhelm

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wilhelm, Sabrina Regina, "The relationship between self-monitoring, self-promotion, and agentic traits in leadership" (2010). *Theses Digitization Project*. 3826.
<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/3826>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF-MONITORING,
SELF-PROMOTION, AND AGENTIC
TRAITS IN LEADERSHIP

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science
in
Psychology:
Industrial/Organizational

by
Sabrina Regina Wilhelm

June 2010

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF-MONITORING,
SELF-PROMOTION, AND AGENTIC
TRAITS IN LEADERSHIP

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Sabrina Regina Wilhelm
June 2010

Approved by:




Dr. Mark Agars, Chair, Psychology

5/17/2010
Date



Dr. Robert Cramer



Dr. Janelle Gilbert

ABSTRACT

Leadership was examined by exploring self-monitoring, self-promotion, agentic traits, and gender role expectation behaviors among female employees. Participants were all working women with a variety of occupations. Recruitment of participants was taken primarily on the campuses of California State University, San Bernardino and the University of California, Riverside. Participants were students, as well as the family members, friends, and coworkers of students. There was a total of 91 participants. All participants were asked to complete a leadership survey packet that consisted of a demographics survey, Self-Monitoring Scale, Impression Management by Association Scale (self-promotion scale), and Personal Attributes Questionnaire, as well as a Leader Behaviors scale. It was hypothesized that female employees who are high self-monitors and self-promoters will display leadership behaviors in the workplace. It was further hypothesized that there will be an interaction effect between self-monitoring and self-promotion. Lastly, it was hypothesized that women with agentic characteristics that are inconsistent with their gender role expectation will display leadership behaviors in the workplace. Correlational and hierarchical multiple regression

procedures were utilized to test the hypotheses. Results indicated that self-promotion is the only independent variable that is related to leader behaviors. Future implications and research are also discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| ABSTRACT | iii |
| LIST OF TABLES | vi |
| CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Self-Monitoring | 6 |
| Self-Promotion | 8 |
| Gender Role Expectations | 10 |
| Leadership | 15 |
| CHAPTER TWO: METHODS | |
| Participants | 21 |
| Procedure | 22 |
| Materials | 23 |
| CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS | 28 |
| CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION | 33 |
| Conclusion | 48 |
| APPENDIX A: DEMOGRAPHICS SURVEY | 50 |
| APPENDIX B: SELF-MONITORING SCALE | 52 |
| APPENDIX C: SELF-PROMOTION | 57 |
| APPENDIX D: PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES QUESTIONNAIRE | 62 |
| APPENDIX E: LEADER BEHAVIOR SCALE | 69 |
| REFERENCES | 75 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1. Bivariate Correlation of Self-Monitoring, Gender Roles, and Self-Promotion Variables on Leader Behavior | 29 |
| Table 2. Hierarchical Regression of Self-monitoring and Self-Promotion Variables on Leader Behavior | 31 |

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

One path researchers have shown to foster leadership is how well an individual demonstrates self-presentational techniques (Leary, 1989). Three underlying behavioral traits of self-presentation, which may be related to leadership, are self-monitoring, self-promotion, and agentic traits. These behavioral traits are important to leadership because managers desire to select employees that have the "image" and the "presentation" that high self-monitors and high self-promoters emulate (Douglas, 1983; Rudman, 1998). Employees who utilized self-presentational techniques in the workplace may be more likely to advance into leadership positions, such as managers and chief corporate executives. Moreover, there are many positive individual outcomes associated with high self-monitoring and high self-promotion behaviors. For example, researchers have found that employees who have demonstrated high self-monitoring and high self-promotion behaviors achieve greater job performance ratings by their superiors and receive more job promotions which enable these employees to become leaders (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994).

Researchers have also found that women are less likely to become leaders in the workplace. According to Catalyst, a nonprofit research foundation, only 12 women hold the position of chief executive in the 500 largest companies in the United States (Farrell, 2007). Clearly, women are underrepresented in leadership positions in the workplace. One of the contributing factors that cause women to be underrepresented in leadership positions may be the behavioral traits they demonstrate in the workplace. Women tend to be low self-monitors and low self-promoters, whereas men tend to be high self-monitors and high self-promoters (Ellis, 1988). A second contributing factor that may cause women to be underrepresented in leadership positions is the influence of gender role expectations. Women tend to not demonstrate the same agentic traits that men typically demonstrate, such as aggressiveness and dominance (Eagly & Karau, 2002), which has been associated with the behaviors of a leader (Forsyth, Schlenker, Leary, & McCown, 1985). Women are expected instead, to engage in communal traits (that typically men do not demonstrate) such as friendliness and concern for others (Eagly & Karau, 2002), which are not associated with the behaviors of a leader (Eagly, 2007). Guadagno and Cialdini (2007) explain that gender role

expectations may often account for gender differences in self-monitoring and self-promotion behaviors among female and male employees. Douglas (1983) and Rudman (1998) further explain that self-monitoring and self-promotion are important behavioral traits for leadership demonstrated through social interaction. If women engaged in greater levels of self-monitoring and self-promotion, and in agentic traits, then perhaps they would be just as likely as men to advance into leadership positions in the workplace.

Self-monitoring is the ability an individual has to appropriately adjust to situational or social cues (Snyder, 1974). Self-monitoring aids individuals who desire to become leaders in many ways. High self-monitors, more often than low self-monitors, utilize situational or social cues to become leaders. Typically men are more likely to be high self-monitors than women whereas women are more likely than men to be low self-monitors (Ellis, 1988). The purpose of high self-monitoring is to achieve a good impression and likeability among managers, coworkers, and customers in order to achieve greater job success. Consequently, high self-monitors typically have more job success in occupations that require frequent social interactions such as a salesperson (Fine & Schumann,

1992). In addition, high self-monitors are able to change their social climate and control social interactions to result in favorable outcomes for them so they are more likely to demonstrate leader behaviors in many ways. For example, at board meetings high self-monitors will adjust either their behaviors according to other people's behavior to gain control in social interactions by displaying enthusiasm or caution at critical times. This will allow the high self-monitor to stand out among his or her coworkers and to demonstrate assertiveness, an agentic trait that managers tend to look for in a leader. Consequently, employees who are high self-monitors will receive more opportunities to become leaders (Zaccaro, Foti, & Kenny, 1991).

Another proposition of the present study is that women who engage in more self-promotion to showcase their achievements in the workplace will increase their likelihood of becoming leaders. Self-promotion is the process of convincing others that one's accomplishments are more positive than others originally believed (Lee, Quigley, Nesler, Corbett, & Tedeschi, 1999). The purpose of self-promotion in the workplace is for employees to showcase their abilities and accomplishments to gain better job positions (Johnson, 2003; Schlenker, 1980).

Moreover, self-promotion helps aid individuals who desire to become leaders. For example, in job interviews self-promoters were found to be rated more positively than those interviewees who did not engage in self-promotion (Fuller, 2005). This means that if employees desire to acquire a leadership position, the likelihood of receiving one increases if they engage in self-promotion behaviors more often.

Researchers have also found that men and women engage in self-monitoring and self-promotion differently because they follow their own gender role expectations (Guadagno & Cialdini, 2007; Ritter & Yoder, 2004). Gender role expectations are the conventional beliefs that men and women should conform to certain roles within a society. For example, a woman is expected to be a caregiver to her children while her husband is expected to be the breadwinner for the family. These gender role expectations are demonstrated through behavioral traits that are typically different for men and women (Eagly & Karau, 1991). Behavioral traits based on gender role expectations are referred to as agentic and communal traits (Eagly & Karau, 1991). Agentic traits can be defined as individual characteristics that include a male behaving more independent, assertive, and dominant due to his gender

role expectations (Eagly & Karau, 1991). These traits inspire men, more often than women, to engage in high self-monitoring and self-promotion in the workplace. Women often have communal traits. Communal traits can be defined as individual characteristics that include behaving more friendly, displaying concern for others, and harmonizing due to gender role expectations (Eagly & Karau, 1991). These traits deter women from engaging in high self-monitoring and high self-promotion behaviors to showcase their accomplishments at work. Hence, gender roles expectations lead women to remain modest and solidify their relationships with their coworkers (Rudman, 1998). To begin, an overview of the key concepts is presented.

Self-Monitoring

Researchers have found that an individual's self-monitoring behavior plays an important role in the work context (Snyder, 1974). In fact, there has been a renaissance in I-O psychology concerning the relevance of personality characteristics for predicting work-related attitudes, behaviors, and performance outcomes including those related to self-monitoring (Day & Schleicher, 2006). Moreover, being aware of self-monitoring techniques is

especially helpful in explaining how employees use such behaviors to receive positive individual outcomes such as job promotions (Zaccaro et al., 1991). Consequently, self-monitoring is one factor that researchers can use to understand the leadership process (Cronshaw & Ellis, 1991; Ellis, Adamson, Deszca, & Cawsey, 1998; Singh, Kumra, & Vinnicombe, 2004).

High self-monitors create positive individual outcomes by controlling social interactions. Researchers have found that in many different types of social interactions, high self-monitors are perceived more favorably than low self-monitors (Douglas, 1983). High self-monitors are found to be more competent by job interviewers (Levine & Feldman, 2002), and are evaluated more positively in job interviews (Fuller, 2005) than low self-monitors. In part, these findings are due to the fact that high self-monitors demonstrate their sense of self-awareness by adjusting their mood, body language, and word choices to create a "good" impression on others (Snyder & Copeland, 1989). Low self-monitors tend not to do this, relying instead on their personal characteristics and relying on their words and actions to create a good impression (Kilduff & Day, 1994). Consequently, high self-monitors have been found to achieve better job

performance, and are more likely to be offered job promotions than low self-monitors (Hogan et al., 1994). For example, this has been demonstrated among sales associates who utilize customer cues to guide their behavior to make more sales (Fine & Schumann, 1992). Ultimately, high self-monitors can achieve greater on-the-job success than low self-monitors, especially in occupations or job types that require frequent social interactions (Ickes, Holloway, Stinson, & Hoodenpyle, 2006).

Self-Promotion

Self-promotion is the process of convincing others that one's accomplishments are more positive than others originally believed (Lee et al., 1999). The importance of self-promotion in the workplace is for employees to boast about their abilities and accomplishments to gain better job positions (Johnson, 2003; Schlenker, 1980). Furthermore, self-promotion aids individuals who desire to become leaders. For example, in job interviews self-promoters were rated more positively than those interviewees who did not engage in self-promotion (Fuller, 2005).

Researchers have found evidence that self-promotion benefits an individual during job interviews by leading to more positive interview ratings (Dawson, 2006; Fuller, 2005). If female employees utilize self-promotion as male employees often do, then they may be perceived as more competent. Perhaps, if more female employees participated in self-promotion this could help women advance into more leadership positions. According to the China Market Research Group, which conducts interviews with numerous female job candidates who are American, European and Chinese women, found that the women felt that "if they worked hard and showed they were valuable to the company, they would get promoted. They also said they feared they could be fired if they appeared too pushy, especially in a downturn" (Rein, 2009, p. 1). Furthermore, it has been proposed that one of the best practices for advancing women in business is to utilize self-promotion more often in the workplace, in order to attain higher-level job positions (Schindler, 2007). Consequently, the present study examined self-promotion in relationship with self-monitoring and gender role expectation, in order to investigate the presence of leader behaviors among female employees in the workplace.

Gender Role Expectations

Gender role expectations are present in both the behavioral traits of men and women when they engage in self-monitoring and self-promotion (Guadagno & Cialdini, 2007). Specifically, research has shown that women are less likely to utilize these behaviors to aid them in attaining leadership positions (Ritter & Yoder, 2004; Rudman, 1998). Hence, gender role expectations may account for gender differences in self-monitoring and self-promotion behaviors among female and male employees. Researchers theorized that men and women follow certain gender role expectations because they desire to behave consistently or congruently with what they have been taught since early childhood (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Researchers refer to this theory as role congruity (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Based on role congruity theory, employees are likely to behave consistently or congruently with gender role expectations for men and women (i.e., agentic and communal traits) (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Gender role expectations influence individuals to remain consistent with their gender roles. These expectations lead to gender differences in self-monitoring and self-promotion. Societal conventions expect that women will be low self-monitors and low self-promoters and that men will be

high self-monitors and high self-promoters (Garland & Beard, 1979; Guadagno & Cialdini, 2007; Ritter & Yoder, 2004).

In addition, gender role expectations have a carry-over effect in the workplace when gender role expectations influence female employees to be more like followers than like leaders. This is because women are expected to engage in communal traits such as friendliness and concern for others which are consistent with their gender role expectation. However, these traits have not always been associated with behaviors of a leader (Eagly, 2007). Moreover, women are also influenced by gender role expectations to not utilize agentic traits, unlike men (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Conversely, men who are also influenced to consistently behave according to gender role expectations engage in agentic traits such as aggressiveness and independence, which have been associated with the behaviors of a leader (Eagly & Karau, 2002). These gender differences may help to both explain why more men than women become leaders, and to provide some explanation for the existence of the glass ceiling.

Furthermore, males are more likely to display agentic traits than females (Garland & Beard, 1979), and high self-monitors with agentic traits tend to emerge as

leaders more than low self-monitors with communal traits. However, women can also be high self-monitors (Flynn & Ames, 2006). Perhaps, one reason researchers find that women are not as likely as men to be high self-monitors is because of the interaction of gender role expectations and the work environment. In performance contexts, such as the workplace, gender role expectations are strong and lead to gender differences in self-monitoring (Ellis, 1988). In fact, researchers have consistently found that the workplace context and the gender of an employee affect his or her self-monitoring behaviors (Eagly & Karau, 2002):

Gender role expectations resulting in gender differences have also been found in self-promotion. Female employees are less likely to engage in self-promotion than men (Miller, Cooke, Tsang, & Morgan, 1992). This is, in part, because women's gender role expectation is to follow communal traits such as friendliness, and concern for others. These communal traits, based on gender role expectations, influence female employees who use self-promotions not to self-promote their accomplishments but rather to solidify working relationships. Consequently, this stands in opposition to helping them advance into leadership positions (Eagly, 1987; Nelson, 1978). Conversely, male employees who conform to their

gender role expectation demonstrate agentic traits such as independence and dominance, and will engage more often in self-promotion (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Furthermore, according to researchers, other agentic traits such as independence and competence are perceived by others to enhance their leadership abilities (Forsyth et al., 1985). Given the importance of these factors, the present study investigated how self-monitoring, self-promotion, and gender role expectations relate to leadership behavior in women.

Consequently, one way female employees may mitigate the impact of gender expectations on the likelihood of advancement into positions of leadership is to engage in high self-monitoring and high self-promotion behaviors. High self-monitoring behaviors allow female employees to cultivate self-awareness concerning how their observable behaviors are influencing other employee's perceptions of them either as followers or as leaders. These behaviors can also be helpful for female employees in adjusting their own behaviors to be in better alignment with behaviors that employees expect from their leaders. As a result, female employees who engage in high self-monitoring might also receive more job promotions,

and engage more frequently and directly in leader behaviors.

Researchers, however, have found that men and women engage in self-promotion according to their gender role expectations, which are demonstrated through their behavioral traits (Guadagno & Cialdini, 2007; Ritter & Yoder, 2004). Men and women generally possess different behavioral traits (i.e. agentic versus communal) based on gender role expectations (Eagly & Karau, 1991). Agentic traits, due to the societal gender role expectations of males, can be defined as individual characteristics that include an individual behaving more independently, assertively, and dominantly (Eagly & Karau, 1991). These traits inspire men more often than women to engage in self-promotion in the workplace. Due to gender role expectations women have communal traits. Communal traits can be defined as individual characteristics that include behaving more friendly, considerately (i.e. concern for others, and harmoniously; Eagly & Karau, 1991). These traits inspire women to refrain from self-promotion that showcases their accomplishments at work. Instead, the majority of women work to solidify their relationships with their coworkers (Eagly, 1987; Nelson, 1978; Rudman, 1998).

Furthermore, women tend to utilize methods other than self-promotion to acquire job advancement, such as relying on their job performance and organizational commitment in the workplace (Singh et al., 2004). This means that female employees allow their job performance and commitment to speak for itself. One negative consequence of this approach is that managers may not notice a female employee's hard work if she does not engage in self-promotion. Some female employees believe that their demonstration of hard work and commitment will be sufficient for job promotions. Unfortunately, because women are less likely to use self-promotion they may be consistently at a disadvantage relative to men (Rudman, 1998). There is clearly a gender difference between how male and female employees behave in the workplace when attempting to acquire job advancement, and these differences may impact women's advancement into leadership positions.

Leadership

Leadership is operationally defined as the process an individual goes through to demonstrate observable behaviors that will help him or her become a leader (Eby, Cader, & Noble, 2003). Researchers have conducted a very

large number of studies seeking to identify leadership behaviors. Early longitudinal studies on managers found that intelligence and dominance are consistent predictors of leadership (Bentz, 1990; Howard & Bray, 1988). More recently, it was found that dominance, general self-efficacy, and self-monitoring are associated with both leadership, and leadership effectiveness (Foti & Hauenstein, 2007). The present study focuses on how self-monitoring, self-promotion, and gender role expectations relate to leadership.

Early researchers who studied the behaviors of leaders primarily examined the individual characteristics or innate traits of those in leadership positions (Garland & Beard, 1979). Many researchers believed that leaders were endowed with certain innate traits; this is known as the trait approach (Salter, 2003). However, other researchers believe that traits alone could not be perceived as reliable predictors for leadership behavior (Stogdill, 1948). These researchers also believed that the trait approach failed to completely identify a "leader personality" (Borgatta, Couch, & Bales, 1954). Another approach, known as the behavioral approach, has been utilized by many researchers to study leadership (e.g. Eby et al., 2003). Inasmuch, individuals who desire to become

leaders are able to learn the behavioral traits associated with leaders (Greenleaf, 2002). This means that employees do not have to be born leaders or have innate traits. Researchers who have utilized the behavioral approach have found that high self-monitors are more likely to become leaders than low self-monitors (Kilduff & Day, 1994).

One particular issue associated with leadership is how female employees can increase their chances to become leaders. According to a 2005 survey by Catalyst, a nonprofit research foundation, women hold only 28% of top-level executive positions (Farrell, 2007). Moreover, Catalyst, found that only 12 women hold the position of chief executive in the United States among the 500 largest companies (Farrell, 2007). Clearly, there is a disparity here: women appear less likely than men to attain positions of leadership in the workplace. However, if women utilized self-monitoring, self-promotion, and agentic behaviors, then perhaps, they would be just as likely as men to attain leadership positions.

One can infer from the literature that if women engaged in high self-monitoring, self-promotion, and utilized agentic traits in the workplace as their male counterparts do, then they might increase their chances of becoming leaders. Women would need to be more reflective

and adjust their behaviors according to others' social cues by engaging in self-monitoring and by displaying agentic traits. Women would also need to utilize self-promotion by being more vocal in presenting ideas, by expressing their contributions to their organization more frequently, and by emphasizing and highlighting their achievements. If women engaged in high self-monitoring and high self-promotion as well as in displaying agentic traits, then these behaviors may change the current statistics, which indicate that women are less likely than men to become leaders in the workplace.

Several researchers have offered many suggestions for future research on leadership. From the previous research it was found that high self-monitors were frequently perceived as leaders within work groups (Zaccaro et al., 1991). It was also found that self-promotion is one of the best practices that advancing women can utilize to become leaders in the workplace (Rudman, 1998). Researchers have suggested that future study should be conducted on the ways in which to interpret the observable behaviors of high self-monitors and how the actions demonstrated by the high self-monitors relate to leader behaviors (Eagly & Karau, 1991). In response, the current study is an attempt to provide a greater understanding of the behaviors

leaders utilize through the examination of self-monitoring, self-promotion, and gender role expectations. This study will attempt to answer the research question: Is there a significant correlation between high self-monitoring, high self-promotion and agentic behaviors. For women who demonstrate leader behaviors in the workplace?

Specifically, the study tested the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Female employees who are high self-monitors will display more leadership behaviors than low self-monitors.

Hypothesis 2: Female employees who are high self-promoters will display more leadership behaviors than low self-promoters.

Hypothesis 3: There will be an interaction between self-promotion and self-monitoring accounting for leadership behaviors. Specifically, the relationship between self-promotion on leadership behavior will be dependent on high self-monitoring. For low self-monitors, there will be no relationship between self-promotion.

Hypothesis 4: Female employees who possess higher levels of agentic characteristics will

demonstrate a higher number of leader behaviors than female employees with lower levels of agentic characteristics.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODS

Participants

Participants were 91 working women. All participants were from a variety of occupations including government, education, retail, service, manufacturing and other jobs. The participants were from the following job levels including 47.5% employees, 37.7% managers, 11.5% supervisors, and 4.9% others. Recruitment of participants took place primarily on the campuses of California State University, San Bernardino and the University of California, Riverside. Participants were students from psychology courses, and represented a variety of majors. Participants were also the family members, friends, and coworkers of students. The snowball technique was the method that students at CSUSB used for recruitment. The snowball technique was to be employed by the students from CSUSB who were willing to distribute leadership survey packets out to their family members, friends, and coworkers who were working women. The participant's average age was 45 years old. The sample consisted of 75.4% White (Caucasian, NonHispanic), 14.8% Hispanic

American, 6.6% Black (African American), and 1.6% Asian American and Native American.

All participants were given a leadership packet and asked to complete it. Students were compensated by being given extra credit for turning in completed survey packets. Ninety one participants were acquired for a medium effect size at power = .80 for $\alpha = .05$. The power analysis conformed to Cohen (1992; *A Power Primer*). Each female participant was required to be a full-time employee who had at least two years of work experience, and who was at least 18 years old. The ethical standards for the treatment of research participants advocated by the American Psychological Association (2001) were followed.

Procedure

The participants were given a leadership packet containing five surveys including a demographics survey, a Self-Monitoring Scale, an Impression Management by Association Scale (self-promotion scale), a Personal Attributes Questionnaire (gender role expectation scale), and a Leader Behaviors scale. The combined surveys consisted of 86 items. It took the participants approximately 15-20 minutes to complete this packet.

Materials

The leadership packet contained five tests including a demographics survey, a Self-Monitoring Scale, an Impression Management by Association Scale, a Personal Attributes Questionnaire, and a Leader Behaviors scale. The demographics survey includes a fill in the blank questionnaire for participants to complete. This questionnaire asked for a participant's age, ethnicity, job tenure, job level, and type of organization in which the participant works. The Self-Monitoring Scale developed by Snyder (1974) was utilized to detect a participant's level of self-monitoring. This scale has 25-items that solicit the participant's reactions to different situations. Participants answered true or false to each statement to indicate whether the statement reflects their self-monitoring behaviors. If a participant answered with more true or mostly true answers to the statements then this would indicate the participant is a high self-monitor. If a participant answered with mostly false or not usually true to the statements this would indicate the participant is a low self-monitor. Snyder (1987) reported internal consistency estimates of .66 and .70 for this scale. Results from another study yielded reliabilities for this scale ($\alpha = .71$) (Day, Schleicher,

Unckless, & Hiller, 2002). The current study found the reliabilities for this scale ($\alpha = .80$).

Impression Management by Association Scale (IMAS) developed by Cialdini (1989) was used to measure participant's self-promotion style through impression management tactics in the workplace. The instrument measures participant's self-promotion behaviors including boasting, burying, blaring, and blurring. Boasting refers to an employee who "strives to receive credit for another's success or capitalize on his or her association with a high performing group in an effort to secure a strong performance appraisal or a promotion" (Cialdini, 1989, p. 49). Burying refers to an employee who behaves in a way to avoid others who perform poorly in the workplace (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001). Blaring refers to employees who distance themselves publicly from those employees who perform poorly (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001). The employee's goal in this situation is "blaring the connections" that one has with poor performing employees. Lastly, Blurring refers to employees who try to enhance the perception others have about them by associating with high performing employees (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001). Participants answered 12 descriptive statements on a 5-point Likert-type scale with (0) never do it, (1) rarely do it, (2) occasionally

do it, (3) often do it, (4) nearly always do it. This scale was to be used to detect a participant's type of self-promotion behavior that she would typically engage in, as well as how frequently the behavior was displayed. The alpha reliability for the IMAS has been found to be .86 (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001). The current study found reliabilities for this scale ($\alpha = .94$).

A Personal Attributes Questionnaire developed by Spence, Helmreich, and Strap (1974) was utilized to detect a participant's perceptions on gender role attributes, specifically agentic and communal traits. This survey is a self-report questionnaire that includes 24 descriptive items that consist of characteristics (adjective traits). Each participant was to choose a letter that corresponds with her personality. For example, if a participant was responding to the characteristic "aggressiveness," the participant would choose a letter ranging from A to E as it corresponds to their personality. In this case, the letters A to E would be: A = not at all aggressive, B = a little aggressive, C = somewhat aggressive, D = pretty aggressive, and E = very aggressive. Based on the participants' letter choice their personality would be defined in terms of mostly agentic or communal traits. The PAQ has adequate internal consistency with an alpha

coefficient = .85 (Burnett, Anderson, & Heppner, 1995). The current study found reliabilities for this scale ($\alpha = .80$).

Twenty descriptive statements were utilized in the final scale in the leadership survey packet. This scale is a general leadership behaviors scale created by the researcher to capture a participant's leadership behaviors. This scale is modeled after Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter's (1990) leadership scale that measures both transformational and transactional leader behaviors. The alpha reliabilities for this scale ranged from .78 to .92. The Leader Behaviors scale implemented in the current study utilized the six transformational leader behaviors (Podsakoff et al., 1990). The six components of transformational leader behaviors includes: identifying and articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model, fostering the acceptance of group goals, high performance expectations, providing individualized support, and intellectual stimulation (Podsakoff et al.). These six components of transformational leader behaviors were modeled after the items on the current study's Leader Behaviors scale. For example, the transformational leader behavior "identifying and articulating a vision" is related to the current

Leader Behaviors scale item "I act with purpose or with a vision in mind when completing tasks."

Participants read each descriptive statement and circled a number from 0 to 4 on a 5-point Likert scale indicating (0) not at all, (1) once in awhile, (2) sometimes, (3) fairly often, and (4) frequently, if not always. These numbers represented the frequency a participant had engaged in a leader behavior. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .86.

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Prior to conducting the primarily analyses, descriptives, and bivariate correlations were examined for self-monitoring, self-promotion, gender roles, and leader behaviors (see Table 1). All study variables were examined through SPSS for missing values, and violations of univariate and multivariate normality. Of the 93 cases that were initially collected, three cases were missing items from both self-monitoring and gender roles. These three cases were excluded. Examination of the skewness and kurtosis values revealed univariate normality. There were no univariate outliers. For the multivariate analysis, the outliers were identified using a Mahalanobis distance. Using the χ^2 (df = 3) value of 16.226 to determine the cutoff for outliers, it was determined that there were no multivariate outliers. No multicollinearity or singularity was found. The standards of evaluation for normality are based on Tabachnick and Fidell (2001).

Table 1. Bivariate Correlation of Self-Monitoring, Gender Roles, and Self-Promotion Variables on Leader Behavior

| Independent variables | Leader behavior | Self-monitoring | Gender Roles | Self-promotion |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Leader behavior | ---- | | | |
| Self-monitoring | .077 | ---- | | |
| Gender Roles | -.197 | -.002 | ---- | |
| Self-promotion | -.319** | -.225* | -.152 | ---- |

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The first three hypotheses were tested through a series of hierarchical multiple regression analyses. It was predicted by Hypothesis 1 that female employees who were high self-monitors would demonstrate more leader behaviors than low self-monitors in the workplace. It was predicted by Hypothesis 2 that high self-promoters would demonstrate more leader behaviors than low self-promoters in the workplace. And it was predicted by Hypothesis 3 that there would be an interaction between self-monitoring and self-promotion on leader behaviors. The predictor variables were standardized in order to fit the scales and to provide a common metric to be used to more easily interpret results. An interaction term was created in order to test the product between self-monitoring and self-promotion. In each analysis, predictor variables were

entered in two steps. In the first step, self-monitoring and self-promotion were entered as predictors of leader behaviors. In the second step, the interaction term was added. Regression results for each step are presented in Table 2, which indicates unstandardized and standardized regression coefficients with standard error and t-scores. Overall, model 1 was significant, $F(2, 87) = 5.741$, $p < .05$, for the predictors including self-monitoring and self-promoting on leader behaviors. It was found that 12% of the variance of leader behaviors was explained by self-monitoring and self-promotion, $R^2 = .117$. Moreover, it was found that only self-promotion was significant, $\beta = -.34$, $p < .05$, in a model that also contains self-monitoring, $\beta = .000$, $p > .05$. Model 2 was also found to be significant, $F(3, 86) = 4.376$, $p < .05$, in a model that contains the interaction of self-monitoring and self-promotion. It was also found that 1.6% of the variance of leader behaviors was explained by the interaction of self-monitoring and self-promotion, $\Delta R^2 = .016$. However, self-promotion was the only predictor variable revealed as significant, $\beta = -.33$, $p < .05$, whereas, self-monitoring $\beta = -.00$, $p > .05$ and the interaction term (selfmonXselfprom), $\beta = .13$, $p > .05$, was not significant. Specifically, greater self-promotion was

associated with greater leader behaviors among female employees. Hypotheses 1 and 3 were not supported. Hypothesis 2 was supported by results that indicated, as predicted, female employees who were high self-promoters displayed more leader behaviors.

Table 2. Hierarchical Regression of Self-monitoring and Self-Promotion Variables on Leader Behavior

| Independent variables | <i>B</i> | <i>SE B</i> | β | <i>t</i> |
|------------------------|----------|-------------|---------|----------|
| Step 1 Self-monitoring | .000 | .069 | .000 | .005 |
| Self-promotion | -.226 | .068 | -.341 | -3.301* |
| Step 2 Self-monitoring | -.006 | .068 | -.009 | -.083 |
| Self-promotion | -.218 | .068 | -.330 | -3.183* |
| selfmonXselfprom | .078 | .062 | .127 | 1.254 |

*Significant at *t* (89), *p* < .05.

$R^2 = .12$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .02$ for Step 2, *n* = 93; **p* < .05

Hypothesis 4 predicted that women with agentic traits would be related to leader behaviors. Hypothesis 4 was tested by conducting a bivariate correlation presented in Table 1. The correlation table revealed, $r = -.20$, a nonsignificant correlation for agentic traits as measured by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire and leader behavior. One may infer that there may be a significant correlation between agentic traits (due to the direction of the sign) and leader behavior, if there was a larger

sample size, with more power than was collected. This will be discussed further in the next section. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was not supported. From these results it is clear that self-promotion is the only predictor in this study that can be associated with leader behaviors for female employees in the workplace.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

The disparity between the number of men and women who have attained positions of leadership in the workplace is obvious, if not shocking. Farrell (2007) reported that only 12 women hold the position of chief executives in the United States among the 500 largest companies. Investigating the reasons for this disparity as well as evaluating potential resources to diminish it was the primary purpose of this study. The three individual variables evaluated in the current study were self-monitoring, self-promotion, and agentic traits. In this study, self-monitoring was investigated because it has been found that individuals who adjust their affective states to social cues are to be perceived as possessing leader behaviors (Zaccaro et al., 1991). Self-monitoring is important to study because it relates to an employee's ability to behave in accordance with what is socially acceptable in the workplace, and to behave according to what is desirable as a leader. It is important to look at the individual differences in an employee's ability to either remain true to their feelings (as low self-monitors) or behave as "chameleons" (as high

self-monitors) to get ahead. In Kilduff and Day's (1994) study it was found that "the chameleon-like high self-monitors were more likely to get ahead than true-to-themselves low self-monitors, to change employers, move locations, and achieve cross-company promotions" (p. 1047). In addition, another study revealed that sex-related effects for self-monitoring may provide some explanation for the disparity between men and women in acquiring leadership positions (Ellis, 1988).

Self-promotion is the act of convincing others that one's accomplishments are more positive than others originally believed (Lee et al., 1999). This variable was examined in order to see if female workers, who engaged in a greater frequency of self-promotion would demonstrate a greater number of leader behaviors. Female employees who engage in self-promotion showcase their abilities and accomplishments in a greater light so that they may afford greater recognition and consideration for leadership roles (Schindler, 2007). Several researchers have found that job candidates who utilize self-promotion in interviews were perceived as more favorable than low self-promoters (Dawson, 2006; Fuller, 2005). However, it was also found that there are gender differences in how women utilize self-promotion. Female employees were also revealed to

engage in self-promotion less often than male employees, and therefore, lose out on job opportunities .(Rudman, 1998). In the present study, the researcher examined self-promotion to find out if women in the workplace, who used self-promotion tactics in greater frequency demonstrated leader behaviors.

The final variable examined was agentic traits. The importance of agentic traits is found within the roles women play in society. According to Eagly and Karau (2002) women are perceived as less favorable than men in leadership roles. These researchers explain that women are not as favorable as men in leadership roles because women do not behave according to masculine behavioral stereotypes (i.e. engage in agentic traits in the workplace) but instead possess communal traits including friendliness and a concern for others. Eagly and Karau also explain that because women do not conform in the workplace to the male stereotypes, women experience prejudice. These researchers purport that the workplace promotes agentic traits such as aggressiveness, and dominance, which are more desirable as leader behaviors and which are typically more prevalent in men than in women. This study explored agentic traits among the female participants to see if such traits are related to the

display of leader behaviors in women. It was the overall purpose of this study to investigate the relationship of these variables to the demonstration of leader behaviors among women so that the disparity between men and women in the workplace may be reduced.

The results indicated that Hypotheses 1, 3, and 4 were not supported. Specifically, neither self-monitoring nor agentic traits were found to predict leader behaviors in women. Further, there was no interaction between self-promotion and self-monitoring in their effect on leadership behaviors. These findings are surprising in that they suggest that women who are high self-monitors do not display increased leadership behaviors in the workplace. It also suggests that women may not as readily conform to the behaviors of their male coworkers while they are in the workplace. Although unexpected, this result is consistent with Eagly and Karau (2002)'s finding that women may experience less prejudice against them for demonstrating communal traits, rather than agentic traits, because of its congruence with their gender role expectations in the workplace. The current findings do not follow the literature that suggests employees who are high self-monitors and possess agentic traits would be more

often associated with leader behaviors (Eagly & Karau, 1991; Zaccaro et al., 1991).

One possible explanation to why the current findings did not follow the literature may be due to female employees receiving negative attention from using high self-monitoring and agentic trait behaviors. It has been reported that there is a "less favorable evaluation of women's (than men's) agentic behavior" (Eagly & Karau, 2002, p. 583). Perhaps, female employees may have been influenced by the workplace to conform to their gender role expectations when demonstrating communal traits such as being acquiescent and the follower type of employees, who are more comfortable being dependent on the instructions of others than they are in demonstrating agentic traits.

Women may have also been socially conditioned so that they feel out of place when taking on the role of leaders in the workplace. Moreover, this may also imply that the work climate may reflect a greater capacity for male dominated behaviors (agentic traits) to be gender specific to men only. That is to say, perhaps, our society may not fully accept women demonstrating leader behaviors in the workplace.

Furthermore, gender role expectations may have discouraged women who have agentic traits. These women may have continually been confronted with the opinions of others who find that agentic traits in a woman is out of place, odd, or even a disruption of the work day (Rudman, 1998; Schindler, 2007). Perhaps, for some individuals who are more traditional in their viewpoints concerning gender role expectation women are perceived as inferior to males in the workplace environment like in some individuals' home environment (Toussaint, 1993). According to Ritter and Yoder (2004), role theory predicts that "women will be less likely than men to emerge as leaders when expectations for the leader role are incongruent with gender stereotypes" (p. 187). This suggests that it is important to recognize how our society is constructed and how our own upbringing has influenced our own perceptions and attitudes as well as our responses towards female employees and the role they play. Lastly, another explanation why self-monitoring and agentic traits may have not been supported is because the Leader Behaviors scale was found to have been overrepresented with items that related to self-promotion. This means that self-promotion had an unfair advantage over the other independent variables which did not result in yielding

significant results for self-monitoring and agentic traits. These are all possible explanations concerning why Hypotheses 1, 3, and 4 were not supported in the current study.

Results did support Hypothesis 2. Self-promotion was found to predict leader behaviors among women. This finding is meaningful because it can be used to support the idea that self-promotion is helpful to female employees who desire career advancement into leadership positions. As to why self-promotion appears to have succeeded when self-monitoring and agentic traits have failed, perhaps is because of the fact that self-promotion does not appear to directly come into conflict with the gender role expectations of women (Schindler, 2007). Women can still remain ostensibly congruent to their gender roles while boasting, burying, blaring, and blurring, while at the same time subtly advancing into a position of leadership, where they would then most likely display leader behaviors. Another explanation is that "the answer lies in the kind of pressure toward cognitive consistency...or balance theory...[when] persons often strive to perceive positively associated things as similar to maintain cognitive harmony" (Cialdini & Richardson, 1990, p. 407). This means that if female employees more

often engage in boasting in the workplace, about having a positive connection with a favorable employee such as the CEO or top executives in the company, then these female employees may also be perceived as having a high regard due to their association with the favorable employee. This is to say, because the female employee mentions their association with a favorable employee, in an interaction with another coworker, this would cause their coworker to "experience balance-type pressures to view the [female employee] favorably as well" (Cialdini & Richardson, 1990, p. 407). Female employees in this case may be more likely to engage in leader behaviors because they have been positively regarded in the past through participating in networking. This may further suggest how female employees remain consistent with their gender role expectations by being perceived to follow their communal traits. A female employee may show her concern for her coworker's work-related problem by revealing information to this coworker that she knows a manager that may be able to resolve the coworker's problem. On the other hand, female employees may also disassociate with coworkers who are poor performers. In this case, female employees would separate themselves from the poor performing coworkers so as not to be connected with someone who may potentially be

fired. Furthermore, male employees may also use self-promotion to remain consistent with their gender role expectations by being perceived to follow their agentic traits. A male employee may dominate work-related conversations by informing his coworkers about his recent successes with clients. In this case, his coworkers may flock to him to be associated with his accomplishments. Successful male employees may then be recommended or considered more readily as likely candidates for leadership positions. Given both gender role circumstances, one may generalize the two situations. The female employee may be perceived as a potential leader that is more resourceful and caring, whereas the male employee may be perceived as a potential leader that is more independent and aggressive. It seems that, for both genders, self-promotion would help increase their chances to become a leader in the workplace; however, each gender may be perceived differently by their subordinates due to their own gender role expectations.

This finding relates to the current study because it shows that female employees may use self-promotion to demonstrate leader behaviors in the workplace. In addition, it shows that female employees, like male employees, may utilize self-promotion as their own

behavioral trait to either associate or disassociate with other employees to gain favor with their coworkers. Perhaps, female employees who use self-promotion will be perceived as more well-liked and respected in the office. This finding may also suggest that female employees who use self-promotion are able to gain social capital in the workplace like men do to improve their likelihood to acquire leadership positions.

Another possible explanation why self-promotion has been shown to be significant (and neither self-monitoring nor agentic traits) is due to the Leader Behaviors scale. The Leader Behaviors scale was found to have 58.3% of its items to positively correspond to self-promotion. For example, "I have been praised/rewarded for my collaboration with others" could be interpreted as a form of soliciting self-promotion. It could have been the case that participants may have answered the items in the Leader Behavior scale in this frame of mind. Although this was not the intention of the Leader Behaviors scale it could be inferred in this way for the participants. In addition, different results may have been rendered if the Leader Behavior scale was not so closely related to self-promotion especially among various employees' levels including managers, employees, supervisors, and others.

Perhaps, self-monitoring or agentic traits would have been found to have significance if the Leader Behaviors scale had more items that reflected other leader behaviors that associated with high self-monitoring and agentic traits.

Furthermore, a final explanation to why female employees may utilize self-promotion as it relates to leader behaviors is because our society has shifted to support a woman's education and more opportunities to be empowered as well as to more often speak up for themselves and express their opinions and ideas in the workplace and within the home (Panteli & Pen, 2010). Although women may not have become high self-monitors or possess agentic traits women are working on learning to inform others about their accomplishments and accept recognition for it (Schindler, 2007). More and more women are relying less on job performance and organizational commitment for advancement (Singh et al., 2004) and instead work hard and show how valuable they are to the company through self-promotion to demonstrate their leader behaviors to receive job promotions (Rein, 2009; Rudman, 1998).

While interesting and informative, the current study is limited in its applicability to working women in professional organizations. One limitation of this study is a small sample size. Certain relationships, especially

between agentic traits and leader behaviors as predicted by Hypothesis 4 may have been supported if there was a greater sample size, with more power. The relationship was modest, and in the positive direction. Another limitation to this study is that all the data were collected by participants who provided self-reports for every scale. This was problematic for the current study because participants could have easily reported the best possible answers that sounded the most pleasing to the researcher. Although the participants were anonymous, much richer data could have been collected by using another means of collection. In addition, the Leader Behaviors scale could have been more clearly represented to reflect myriad leader behaviors instead of being possibly perceived as most often capturing self-promotion behaviors. Perhaps, future research could gather data on self-monitoring, self-promotion, and agentic traits by using a fuller range of leader behaviors in a scale as well as including an observational method or utilizing job performance evaluations. These alternative data collecting methods may produce more authentic real-world data that reveals how female employees are perceived for their behavioral traits in the workplace. In addition, another limitation to this study is that the majority of the participants represented

mostly worked in the field of education (78.7%), whereas the next closest represented occupation was service jobs (9.8%). Perhaps the hypotheses were not as strongly supported due to workers representing a single industry. It is possible that educators may not need to engage in self-monitoring or display agentic traits as much as other occupations do. In the field of education there are different levels of leadership advancement. This is to say, participants who are teachers may not feel the need to possess agentic traits when they are instructing students. Furthermore, in the education environment it may be more beneficial to demonstrate communal traits in order to be in alignment with the educational system's mission statement of helping and providing students with proper education. Self-promotion may also have been used for educators to showcase their accomplishments (i.e. classroom test scores) to avoid losing their jobs especially during the current economic recession and state budget cuts to the field of education. If participants were from a different work context such as in the fields of business related to insurance, marketing, finance, then perhaps, results would have been more consistent with expectations.

The present study did not specifically examine female employees who were in leadership positions. Nevertheless, this study served to create an awareness of how female employees may be able to engage in behaviors such as high self-monitoring, self-promotion and agentic traits to demonstrate leader behaviors. The study did acquire participants who were at the following job levels: 47.5% employees, 37.7% managers, 11.5% supervisors, and 4.9% others. A future follow up study could be conducted primarily on female employees who are currently employed as leaders; specifically top executives and managers, as well as CEOs, to examine the significance of high self-monitoring, self-promotion, and agentic traits. This study may then provide evidence of how female employees who are already in leadership positions may demonstrate self-monitoring, self-promotion, and agentic traits to advance. Results from this study could then be utilized to help develop training programs for female employees to improve their leader behaviors in order to follow this path. In addition, women may look to other women who are top executives and managers, as well as CEOs, as mentors for guidance on attaining leadership positions. Perhaps, a female employee networking system could also be established to assist more female employees to climb the

ladder to reach leadership positions when there is support and assistance at the top.

There are several future studies worth considering. A future research study that would be insightful and interesting is how the current societal trends for gender role expectations has helped and hindered women in the workplace to demonstrate both leader behaviors and acquire leader positions. Some variables that would be interesting to study are female employee's job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and tenure to find out if gender role expectations lead to an increase or a decrease in female employees getting leader positions. In addition, another future research study could be conducted on how the education of women in other countries (besides the United States) relates to female employees demonstrating leader behaviors in the workplace. This study would be interesting to conduct because the researcher could take into consideration how female employees worldwide may be perceived in relation to their gender role expectations according to their countries norms and values of education for women which may results in leadership roles at work. Lastly, researchers may conduct a future research study on employees who demonstrate androgynous behavior characteristics as it relates to leader behaviors. The

researcher could look at how female employees have stepped out of their gender role expectations to take on a more masculine/feminine behavioral traits such as a female employee who is caring to her team members but also very aggressive when competing for clients in the workplace. The mix of both male and female gender role traits would be interesting to study to see what type of leader would emerge and how this individual is perceived by her teammates.

Conclusion

The current study revealed that self-promotion is associated with leader behaviors that are likely to assist female employees obtain leadership positions in the workplace. Self-promotion may be utilized by women to gain recognition for their work effort on assignments and projects. In addition, self-promotion is an effective method to enhance an employee's marketability through social interaction. For example, female employees who engage in self-promotion to communicate their work-related accomplishments during board meetings or through daily interactions with their coworkers create a greater sense of awareness about how their work performance contributes to their value in the workplace. Female employees who

engage in self-promotion may also gain recognition and the interest of potential mentors which may then lead to possible networking and job opportunities that may not have been presented to women before. Additionally, female employees who inform their coworkers about how they possess the necessary leadership skills and abilities like their male coworkers do may also increase the likelihood to pave the way for themselves and other women to become leaders. Although this study has found support for self-promotion related to leader behaviors for female employees in the workplace, additional work remains to further understand the influencing processes that promote leader behaviors (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Flynn & Ames, 2006; Ritter & Yoder, 2004). Hopefully, with the finding that self-promotion is related to leader behaviors, and with additional future research, the disparity between men and women in leadership positions will significantly diminish.

APPENDIX A
DEMOGRAPHICS SURVEY

Demographics Information

Please provide the following information. These questions will help me describe the population of people who participated in this study. All information is anonymous.
Thank you for your participation.

1. Age:

2. Ethnicity:

- ☐ a. Asian-American
- ☐ b. Black (African-American)
- ☐ c. Hispanic-American
- ☐ d. Native American
- ☐ e. White (Caucasian, Non-Hispanic)
- ☐ f. Other

3. Please indicate the length of time you have worked in your present organization (or the organization you are referencing in your answers):

Years

Months

4. Please select the job level which best represents the level of your current job:

- ☐ a. Employee
- ☐ b. Supervisor
- ☐ c. Manager
- ☐ d. Other

5. Please indicate the type of organization in which you work (pick the type that best describes your organization):

- ☐ a. Manufacturing
- ☐ b. Service
- ☐ c. Government
- ☐ d. Retail
- ☐ e. Education
- ☐ f. Other

APPENDIX B
SELF-MONITORING SCALE

Self-monitoring

Instructions: The statements below concern your personal reactions to a number of different situations. No two statements are exactly alike, so consider each statement carefully before answering. If a statement is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you please choose true. If a statement is FALSE or NOT USUALLY TRUE as applied to you please choose false.

1. I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people.

- ☐ True
☐ False

2. My behavior is usually an expression of my true inner feelings, attitudes, and beliefs.

- ☐ True
☐ False

3. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like.

- ☐ True
☐ False

4. I can only argue for ideas which I already believe.

- ☐ True
☐ False

5. I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information.

- ☐ True
☐ False

6. I put on a show to impress or entertain people.

- ☐ True
☐ False

7. When I am uncertain how to act in a social situation, I look to the behavior of others for cues.

- ☐ True
☐ False

8. I would probably make a good actor.

- ☐ True
☐ False

9. I rarely seek the advice of my friends to choose movies, books, or music.

- ☐ True
☐ False

10. I sometimes appear to others to be experiencing deeper emotions than I actually am.

- ☐ True
☐ False

11. I laugh more when I watch a comedy with others than when alone.

- ☐ True
☐ False

12. In groups of people, I am rarely the center of attention.

- ☐ True
☐ False

13. In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons.

- ☐ True
☐ False

14. I am not particularly good at making other people like me.

- ☐ True
☐ False

15. Even if I am not enjoying myself, I often pretend to be having a good time.

- ☐ True
☐ False

16. I am not always the person I appear to be.

- ☐ True
☐ False

17. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor.

- ☐ True
☐ False

18. I have considered being an entertainer.

- ☐ True
☐ False

19. In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else.

- ☐ True
☐ False

20. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting.

- ☐ True
☐ False

21. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.

- ☐ True
☐ False

22. At a party, I let others keep the jokes and stories going.

- ☐ True
☐ False

23. I feel a bit awkward in company and do not show up quite as well as I should.

- ☐ True
☐ False

24. I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end).

☐ True

☐ False

25. I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.

☐ True

☐ False

APPENDIX C
SELF-PROMOTION

Self-promotion

Instructions: Twelve descriptive statements are listed below. Indicate how frequently each statement fits you. Please answer all items on this answer sheet by marking the answer that most likely describes you.

1. I make sure my supervisor knows I am not like poor performers in the office.

- ☐ Never do it
- ☐ Rarely do it
- ☐ Occasionally do it
- ☐ Often do it
- ☐ Nearly always do it

2. I receive compliments from my supervisor on good work which someone else did.

- ☐ Never do it
- ☐ Rarely do it
- ☐ Occasionally do it
- ☐ Often do it
- ☐ Nearly always do it

3. I let others know that I am friends with people in informative or powerful departments.

- ☐ Never do it
- ☐ Rarely do it
- ☐ Occasionally do it
- ☐ Often do it
- ☐ Nearly always do it

4. When my peers has a major problem with his or her work, I try to disassociate from him or her so that others will not think I am involved.

- ☐ Never do it
- ☐ Rarely do it
- ☐ Occasionally do it
- ☐ Often do it
- ☐ Nearly always do it

5. When my boss discusses a problem with me brought on by a troublemaker, I make sure he or she knows I am nothing like the troublemaker.

- ☐ Never do it
- ☐ Rarely do it
- ☐ Occasionally do it
- ☐ Often do it
- ☐ Nearly always do it

6. I just smile and nod if ever complimented at work for which another group is responsible.

- ☐ Never do it
- ☐ Rarely do it
- ☐ Occasionally do it
- ☐ Often do it
- ☐ Nearly always do it

7. I let others know about my friendships with superiors in my organization.

- ☐ Never do it
- ☐ Rarely do it
- ☐ Occasionally do it
- ☐ Often do it
- ☐ Nearly always do it

8. I try to disconnect myself from unproductive employees in the office, even though some of them are my friends.

- ☐ Never do it
- ☐ Rarely do it
- ☐ Occasionally do it
- ☐ Often do it
- ☐ Nearly always do it

9. When someone else does a poor job, I let others know I maintain a higher level of performance.

- ☐ Never do it
- ☐ Rarely do it
- ☐ Occasionally do it
- ☐ Often do it
- ☐ Nearly always do it

10. When others ask me about my relationships with a successful person in the organization, I do not let on that we barely know each other.

- ☐ Never do it
- ☐ Rarely do it
- ☐ Occasionally do it
- ☐ Often do it
- ☐ Nearly always do it

11. I bring up past experiences with well-known previous employees to make others aware of my competence.

- ☐ Never do it
- ☐ Rarely do it
- ☐ Occasionally do it
- ☐ Often do it
- ☐ Nearly always do it

12. When a peer develops a negative reputation, I try to disassociate from him or her.

- ☐ Never do it
- ☐ Rarely do it
- ☐ Occasionally do it
- ☐ Often do it
- ☐ Nearly always do it

APPENDIX D

PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES QUESTIONNAIRE

Personal Attributes Questionnaire

Please read the instructions below. All the instructions are the same for each item including only one characteristic. Be careful for items that have two characteristics the instructions are different for these items.

1. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. For example, for the characteristic artistic you would choose Not at all if you have no artistic ability, somewhat artistic ability, fair amount artistic ability, pretty good artistic ability, or very high artistic ability.

Aggressive Not at all aggressive Very aggressive

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

2. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. For example, for the characteristic artistic you would choose Not at all if you have no artistic ability, somewhat artistic ability, fair amount artistic ability, pretty good artistic ability, or very high artistic ability.

Independence Not at all independent Very independent

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

3. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. For example, for the characteristic artistic you would choose Not at all if you have no artistic ability, somewhat artistic ability, fair amount artistic ability, pretty good artistic ability, or very high artistic ability.

Emotional Not at all emotional Very emotional

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

4. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. In this case are you a person who is more submissive or dominant? Please indicate on the scale if you are more submissive or more dominant.

Submissive/Dominant Very submissive Very dominant

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

5. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. For example, for the characteristic artistic you would choose Not at all if you have no artistic ability, somewhat artistic ability, fair amount artistic ability, pretty good artistic ability, or very high artistic ability.

Excitable in a major crisis Not at all Excitable in a major crisis Very excitable in a major crisis

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

6. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. In this case are you a person who is more passive or active? Please indicate on the scale if you are more passive or more active.

Passive/Active Very passive Very active

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

7. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. For example, for the characteristic artistic you would choose Not at all if you have no artistic ability, somewhat artistic ability, fair amount artistic ability, pretty good artistic ability, or very high artistic ability.

Devoted to self/to others Not at all able to devote self completely to others Able to devote self completely to others

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

8. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. In this case are you a person who is more rough or gentle? Please indicate on the scale if you are more rough or more gentle.

Rough/Gentle Very rough Very gentle

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

9. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. For example, for the characteristic artistic you would choose Not at all if you have no artistic ability, somewhat artistic ability, fair amount artistic ability, pretty good artistic ability, or very high artistic ability.

Helpful to others Not at all helpful to others Very helpful to others

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

10. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. For example, for the characteristic artistic you would choose Not at all if you have no artistic ability, somewhat artistic ability, fair amount artistic ability, pretty good artistic ability, or very high artistic ability.

Competitive Not at all competitive Very competitive

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

11. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. In this case are you a person who is more home oriented or worldly? Please indicate on the scale if you are more home oriented or more worldly.

Home oriented/Worldly Very home oriented Very worldly

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

12. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. For example, for the characteristic artistic you would choose Not at all if you have no artistic ability, somewhat artistic ability, fair amount artistic ability, pretty good artistic ability, or very high artistic ability.

Kind Not at all kind Very kind

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

13. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. For example, for the characteristic artistic you would choose Not at all if you have no artistic ability, somewhat artistic ability, fair amount artistic ability, pretty good artistic ability, or very high artistic ability.

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Indifferent to others approval | | | | | | Highly needful of others approval |
| Need for approval of others | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

14. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. For example, for the characteristic artistic you would choose Not at all if you have no artistic ability, somewhat artistic ability, fair amount artistic ability, pretty good artistic ability, or very high artistic ability.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| | Feelings not easily hurt | | | | | | Feelings easily hurt |
| Feelings easily hurt | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

15. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. For example, for the characteristic artistic you would choose Not at all if you have no artistic ability, somewhat artistic ability, fair amount artistic ability, pretty good artistic ability, or very high artistic ability.

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | Not at all aware of feelings of others | | | | | | Very aware of feelings of others |
| Awareness of feelings of others | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

16. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. For example, for the characteristic artistic you would choose Not at all if you have no artistic ability, somewhat artistic ability, fair amount artistic ability, pretty good artistic ability, or very high artistic ability.

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|
| | Can make decisions easily | | | | | | Has difficulty making decisions |
| Making decisions | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

17. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. For example, for the characteristic artistic you would choose Not at all if you have no artistic ability, somewhat artistic ability, fair amount artistic ability, pretty good artistic ability, or very high artistic ability.

Persistence Gives up very easily ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Never gives up easily

18. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. For example, for the characteristic artistic you would choose Not at all if you have no artistic ability, somewhat artistic ability, fair amount artistic ability, pretty good artistic ability, or very high artistic ability.

Crier Never cries ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Cries very easily

19. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. For example, for the characteristic artistic you would choose Not at all if you have no artistic ability, somewhat artistic ability, fair amount artistic ability, pretty good artistic ability, or very high artistic ability.

Self-confidence Not at all self-confident ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Very self-confident

20. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. In this case are you a person who feels more inferior or superior? Please indicate on the scale if you feel more inferior or more superior.

Inferior/ Superior Feels very inferior ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Feels superior

21. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. For example, for the characteristic artistic you would choose Not at all if you have no artistic ability, somewhat artistic ability, fair amount artistic ability, pretty good artistic ability, or very high artistic ability.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|
| | Not at all understanding of others | | | | | | Very understanding of others |
| Understanding of others | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

22. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. In this case are you a person who is more cold or warm? Please indicate on the scale if you are a person who is more cold or more warm.

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| | Very cold in relations with others | | | | | | Very warm in relations with others |
| Cold/Warm | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

23. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. In this case are you a person who feels very little time for security or very strong need for security? Please indicate on the scale if you are a person who feels very little time for security or a very strong need for security.

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Very little time for security | | | | | | Very strong need for security |
| Security need | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

24. Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of characteristics, with answers. You are to choose the answer that best describes you. In this case are you a person who feels you go to pieces under pressure or stands up well under pressure? Please indicate on the scale if you are a person who feels you go to pieces under pressure or stands up well under pressure.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Goes to pieces under pressure | | | | | | Stands up well under pressure |
| Pressure | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

APPENDIX E
LEADER BEHAVIOR SCALE

Leader Behaviors

Instructions: Twenty descriptive statements are listed below. Indicate how frequently each statement fits you. Please answer all items on this answer sheet by marking the answer that most likely describes you.

1. I am often referred to as the leader in a small group.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

2. I enjoy initiating structure to complete tasks.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

3. I make decisions with respect to its future implications/outcomes.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

4. I act with purpose or with a vision in mind when completing tasks.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

5. I inspire confidence in others.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

6. I am good at motivating others.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

7. I believe in treating others with respect and equality.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

8. I know when to be assertative at the appropriate time.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

9. I have been praised/rewarded for my collaboration with others.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

10. I am often chosen to act as a mediator when my coworkers are in conflict with each other.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

11. I feel comfortable delegating tasks to others.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

12. I enjoy being a problem-solver.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

13. I am described by others as having "grace under pressure."

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

14. I can be persuasive in arguments.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

15. I am easily able to provide new insights and ideas to contribute to a project/task.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

16. I like to engage in setting goals or action plans.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

17. I believe that I serve as a role model to my coworkers.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly Often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

18. I am empathetic to others.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

19. I am often asked by my coworker to be the spokesperson of the group.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

20. I have a good rapport with my superiors.

- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ Once in a while
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Fairly often
- ☐ Frequently, if not always

REFERENCES

- American Psychological Association. (2001). Ethical standards for the reporting and publishing of scientific information. In *Publication manual of American Psychological Association* (pp. 387-396). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Anderson, R. L., & Blanchard, N. P. (1982). Sex differences in task and social-emotional behavior. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 3(2), 109-139.
- Andrews, M. C., & Kacmar, K. M. (2001). Impression management by association: Construction and validation of a scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 142-161.
- Bentz, V. J. (1990). Contextual issues in predicting high-level leadership performance: Contextual richness as a criterion consideration in personality research with executives. In K. E. Clark, & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 131-143). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Borgatta, E. F., Bales, R. F., & Couch, A. S. (1954). Some findings relevant to the great man theory of leadership. *American Sociological Review*, 19, 755-759.

- Burnett, W. J., Anderson, P. W., Heppner, P. P. (1995). Gender roles and self-esteem: A consideration of environmental factors. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 73, 323-326.
- Carli, L. (1982). Are women more social and men more task-oriented? A meta-analytic review of sex differences in group interaction, reward allocation, coalition formation, and cooperation in the Prisoner's Dilemma Game, Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts.
- Cialdini, B. R. (1989). Indirect tactics of image management: Beyond basking. In R. A. Giacalone, & P. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Impression management in the organization* (pp. 45-56). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cialdini, B. R., & Richardson, D. K. (1990). Two indirect tactics of image management: Basking and blasting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39(3), 406-415.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155-159.
- Cronshaw, S. F., & Ellis, R. J. (1991). A process investigation of self-monitoring and leader emergence. *Small Group Research*, 22(4), 403-420.

- Dawson, C. R. (2006). The influence of impression management of structured interview ratings and job performance. [Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 66(9-B), 5130.
- Day, D. V., & Schleicher, D. J. (2006). Self-monitoring at work: A motive-based perspective. *Journal of Personality*, 74(3), 685-713.
- Day, D. V., Schleicher, D. J., Unckless, A. L., & Hiller, N. J. (2002). Self-monitoring personality at work: A meta-analytic investigation of construct validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 390-401.
- Douglas, W. (1983). Scripts and self-monitoring: When does being a high self-monitor really make a difference? *Human Communication Research*, 10, 81-96.
- Eagly, A. (1987). Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (1991). Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 685-710.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109, 573-598.

- Eby, L. T., Cader, J., & Noble, C. L. (2003). Why do high self-monitors emerge as leaders in small groups? A comparative analysis of the behaviors of high versus low self-monitors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33*(7), 1457-1479.
- Ellis, R. J. (1988). Self-monitoring and leadership emergence in groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 14*, 681-693.
- Ellis, R. J., Adamson, R.S., Deszca, G., & Cawsey, T. F. (1998). Self-monitoring and leadership emergence. *Small Group Behavior, 19*(3), 312-324.
- Farrell, M. (2007). Shattering the glass ceiling-web 2.0 style. *Forbes.com*. Retrieved February 15, 2008, from <http://www.forbes.com/entrepreneurs/humanresources/2007/05/22/mclennan-xerox-ebay>
- Fine, L. M., & Schumann, D. W. (1992). The nature and role of salesperson perceptions: The interactive effects of salespersons/customer personalities *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 1*(3), 285-296.
- Flynn, F. J., & Ames, D. R. (2006). What's good for the goose may not be as good for the gander: The benefits of self-monitoring for men and women in task groups and dyadic conflicts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(2), 272-281.

- Forsyth, D. R., Schlenker, B. R., Leary, M. R. & McCown, N. E. (1985). Self-presentational determinants of sex differences in leadership behavior. *Small Group Behavior*, 16, 197-210.
- Foti, R. J., & Hauenstein, N. M. A. (2007). Pattern and variable approaches in leadership emergence and effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92(2), 347-355.
- Fuller, J. A. (2005). The impact of impression management on interviewer judgments of applicant personality and suitability for the job.[Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 65(9-B), 4881.
- Garland, H., & Beard, J. F. (1979). Relationship between self-monitoring and leader emergence across two task situations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64(1), 72-76.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant Leadership* (Rev. ed.). Paulist Press: New York/Mahwah, N.J.
- Guadagno, R. E., & Cialdini, R. B. (2007). Gender differences in impression management in organizations: A qualitative review. *Sex Roles*, 56(7-8), 483-494.

- Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologists*, 49(6), 493-504.
- Howard, A., & Bray, D. W. (1988). Managerial lives in transition: Advancing age and changing times. New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Hudson, F. M. (1999). *The handbook of coaching: A comprehensive resource guide for managers, executives, consultants, and human resource professionals*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ickes, W., Holloway, R., Stinson, L., & Hoodenpyle, T. (2006). Self-monitoring in social interaction: The centrality of self-affect. *Journal of Personality*, 74, 659-684.
- Johnson, M. B. (2003). The relationship between self-monitoring and successful ingratiation. [Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Science and Engineering*, 63(11-B), 5568.
- Jones, D. W., & Rudd, R. D. (2007). Transactional, transformational, or laissez-faire leadership: An assessment of collage of agriculture academic program leaders (deans) leadership styles. *Proceedings of the 2007 AAAE Research Conference*, 34, 520-530.

- Jones, E. E. & Pittman, T. S. (1982). "Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation," in Suls, J. (Ed.), *Psychological Perspectives on the Self*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 231-263.
- Kilduff, M., & Day, D. V. (1994). Do chameleons get ahead? The effects of self-monitoring on managerial careers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 1047-1060.
- Kilpatrick, D. G., & Smith, A. D. (1974). Validation of the spence-helmreich attitudes towards women scale. *Psychological Reports*, 35(1, Pt 2), 461-462.
- Kohguchi, H., Sakata, K., & Kurokawa, M. (2005). Effects of leadership by managing supervisors and union leaders within corporate structures.
- Leary, M.R. (1989). Self-presentatation processes in leadership emergence and effectiveness. In R.A. Giacalone, & P. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Impression management in the organization* (pp. 363-374). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawerence Earlbaum Chapter citation.
- Lee, S., Quigley, B. M., Nesler, M. S., Corbett, A. B., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1999). Development of a self-presentation tactics scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 26, 701-722.

- Levine, S. P., & Feldman, R. S. (2002). Women and men's nonverbal behavior and self-monitoring in a job interview setting. *Applied Human Resources Management, 7*(1-2), 1-14.
- McHugh, M. C., & Frieze, I. H. (1997). The measurement of gender-role attitudes self-monitoring and trait-based variance in leadership: An investigation of leader flexibility across multiple group situations a review and commentary. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*(1), 1-16.
- Miller, L. G, Cooke, L. L., Tsang, J., & Morgan, F. (1992). Should I brag? Nature and impact of positive and boastful disclosures for women and men. *Human Communication Research, 18*, 364-399.
- Nelson, K. (1978). Modesty socialization in sexual identity: The transition from infant to girl or boy. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 39* (2-A), 760.
- Parks, J. B., & Robertson, M. A. (2004). Attitudes toward women mediate the gender effect on attitudes toward sexist language. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28*, 233-239.

- Podsakoff, M. P., MacKenzie, B. S., Moorman, H. R., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on follower's trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Rein, S. (2009, December 11). Why men don't promote women more. *Forbes*, Retrieved January 14, 2010, from <http://www.forbes.com/2009/12/11/women-job-promotion-leadership-careers-rein.html>
- Ritter, B. A., & Yoder, J. D. (2004). Gender differences in leader emergence persist even for dominant women: An updated confirmation of role congruity theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28(3), 187-193.
- Rudman, L.A. (1998). Self-Promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counter stereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(3), 629-645.
- Salter, C. (2003). A study of the correlation between the motives of female high self monitors and emergent leadership: A literature review. *Advancing Women in Leadership Journal*. Self-monitoring Scale. Retrieved March 25, 2008 from <http://pubpages.unh.edu/~ckb/SELFMON2.html>

- Schindler, E. (2007, December 12). The executive woman's guide to self-promotion. *CIO*, Retrieved January 14, 2010, from http://www.cio.com/article/165150/The_Executive_Woman_s_Guide_to_Self_Promotion_page=1
- Schlenker, B. (1980). *Impression management: The self concept, social identity, and interpersonal relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Singh, V., Kumra, S. & Vinnicombe, S. (2002). Gender and impression management: Playing the promotion game. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 37, 77-89.
- Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30(4), 526-537.
- Snyder, M. (1987). *Public appearances/private realities*. New York: Freeman.
- Snyder, M., & Copeland, J. (1989). Self-monitoring processes in organizational settings. In: *Impression management in the organization*. Giacalone, Robert A.; Rosenfeld, Paul; Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, 7-19.

- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25, 35-71.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L.S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th Ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Toussaint, J. (1993). The glass ceiling. *Feminism and Women Studies*. Retrieved April 27, 2010, from <http://feminism.eserver.org/workplace/wages/>
- 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(2), 308-315.