

# THE INTERNAL STRUCTURES AND EXTERNAL IMPLICATIONS OF TWO SELF-MONITORING SCALES\*

Jason C. Chan

詹志禹\*\*

## 摘 要

史耐德 (Snyder) 的自我監控量表在社會心理學界廣為研究者所採用，但也有很多研究指出其信度與效度大有問題，雷、渥二氏 (Lennox & Wolfe) 的自我監控量表則是一個更新的嚐試。本研究以183個大學生為樣本所做的結果發現，史耐德的量表含有三個主成份，且其關係矛盾，與下列四個效標的相關極不一致：觀點取替、內外控傾向、人際關係的滿足感、及人際關係的挫折感。雷、渥二氏的量表本含有二個主成份，在本研究中完全被複製出來，且與上述四個效標的關係頗為一致。雷、渥二氏的量表似乎比史耐德的量表較具有信度與效度。

## Abstract

Selected psychometric characteristic of selfmonitoring scales by Snyder (1974) and by Lennox and Wolfe (1984) were compared using data from 183 college students. Three components were discovered in Snyder's scale and were found to have contradictory relationships with the following four criteria: perspective-taking, locus of control, satisfaction with interpersonal relationships. The original two factors in Lennox and Wolfe's scale were well replicated in the current study and were found to have compatible relationships with the four criteria. Lennox and Wolfe's scale appeared to be a better alternative to Snyder's scale.

## Introduction

The study of self-monitoring was popularized in part by Snyder's (1974) Self-Monitoring Scale (SSMS). However, Snyder's scale was shown to be multidimensional

---

\* The author wishes to thank Dr. Thomas Oakland for his helpful suggestions and comments.

\*\*作者為本校教育系副教授

and to exhibit some validity problems (e.g., Briggs, Cheek, & Buss, 1980; Cheek & Briggs, 1981). Lennox & Wolfe (1984) proposed a new measure of self-monitoring (LWSMS). The current study compared the two scales in terms of reliability and validity estimates.

Snyder (1974) originally proposed the following five components of self-monitoring: concern with appropriateness of self-presentation, attention to information of social comparison, ability to modify self-presentation, use of this ability in particular situations, and cross-situational variability of social behavior. However, later studies had difficulty replicating SSMS's five components. For example, Gabrenya and Arkin (1980) found four stable factors: theatrical acting ability, sociability/social anxiety, other-directedness, and speaking ability. Briggs, Cheek, and Buss (1980) discovered three factors: acting, extraversion, and other-directedness. Furnham and Capon's (1983) study yielded four factors, of which three were roughly corresponding to the first, third, and fifth component proposed by Snyder (1974) but the remaining one was not interpretable. Sparacino, Ronchi, Bigley, Flesch, and Kuhn (1983) discovered only two factors: acting/extraversion and other-directedness. Gangestad and Snyder (1985) also found three factors which were similar to the three factors reported by Briggs, Cheek, and Buss (1980). However, Gangestad and Snyder renamed the three factors as expressive self-control, social stage presence, and other-directed self-presentation. Using confirmatory factor analysis and a large sample of 1,113 subjects, Hoyle and Lennox (1991) compared five first- and second-order measurement models suggested by previous factor analyses. They found that none of their five models was acceptable. They strongly questioned the construct validity of the SSMS and suggested cautions in the use of this measure.

Most of the above studies showed that the SSMS factors were quite independent and sometimes even produced contradictory significant correlations with an external criterion. For example, Briggs, Cheek, and Buss (1980) found that shyness correlated positively with the other-directedness factor and correlated negatively with the acting and the extraversion factors. They also found that self-esteem correlated positively with the extraversion factor but negatively with the other-directedness factor. In a further study, Cheek and Briggs (1981) found that trait anxiety correlated positively with the other-directedness factor but negatively with the extraversion factor. They also found a correlation of .65 between social self-confidence and the extraversion factor and a correlation of  $-.32$  between social self-confidence and the other-directedness factor. Sparacino, Ronchi, Bigley, Flesch, and Kuhn (1983) showed that, among their subjects who did not take antihypertensive medication, the

## The Internal Structures and External Implications of Two Self-Monitoring Scales

acting/extraversion factor was significantly decreasing with age while the other-directedness factor was significantly increasing with age. These findings indicated that the construct validity of the self-monitoring scale was not clearly defined or understood.

Snyder (1979) described a high self-monitor as one who "is particularly sensitive to the expression and self-presentation of relevant others" (p.89) and who utilizes this information as a guide to regulating self-presentation. Adopting this narrower definition, Lennox and Wolfe (1984) developed a new measure of self-monitoring which included two positively correlated subscales: sensitivity to expressive behavior of others and ability to modify self-presentation. Using this new scale, Larkin (1987) found that: 1) Students perceived their best teachers, in contrast to their worst teachers, as significantly higher in self-monitoring, and 2) High self-monitors rated themselves significantly more capable than low self-monitors to adjust their teaching style to fit different needs of students. Larkin was unable to replicate the first result with SSMS. More detailed analyses of the data found the best teachers, in contrast to the worst teachers, to be perceived significantly higher in the extraversion factor but lower in the other-directedness factor. In a study of leadership, Ellis (1988) found significant relationships between self-monitoring and three measures of leadership only for male subjects. Ellis also found that Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) scale had a much stronger power of predicting leadership than did either the long version or the short version of the SSMS (Snyder, 1974 1987). Again, when Ellis (1988) analyzed the components of SSMS, he found that measures of leadership correlated positively with the extraversion and with the acting factor but correlated negatively or had no relationship with the other-directedness factor.

Despite the findings about the multidimensionality and differential validity of components in SSMS, Snyder still preferred to regard "self-monitoring as a whole" (Gangestad & Snyder, 1985; Snyder, 1987; Snyder & Gangestad, 1986). Basically, Snyder argued and demonstrated that the common variance of those components found in SSMS was self-monitoring and that the unique variance of those components was mathematically possible to have opposite correlations with an external criterion. However, Snyder's tendency to regard SSMS as a whole ignored the differential function of the components, blurred the meaning of the construct, and produced confusing results.

The current study tried first to decompose two self-monitoring scales into parts and then to explore the external implications of these components according to four criterion variables: perspective-taking (Davis, 1980), locus of control (Nowicki & Strickland, 1973), satisfaction with interpersonal relationships, and frustration

from interpersonal relationships (Grubb, Chan, and Rogers, 1989). This four criterion variables were selected according to the meaning and possible components of self-monitoring. First of all, it seems reasonable to expect that high self-monitoring positively correlate with perspective-taking tendencies because high self-monitoring implies sensitivity to the expression and the self-presentation of relevant others. Secondly, high self-monitoring implies the tendency to utilize interpersonal information as a guide to regulating self-presentation, which may lead high self-monitors to feel that they can control their own behaviors and their social environments. Therefore, high self-monitors should have stronger feelings of control, i.e., the tendency of internal control as measured by Nowicki & Strickland' (1973) scale, than low self-monitors. Finally, persons high in self-monitoring should be more satisfied with and less frustrated from interpersonal relationships as a consequence of feelings of control.

## **Methodology**

### **Subjects**

One hundred eighty three students at a major state university in the southwestern United States participated in this study as part of their course requirements. Most were between the ages 17 and 21; 57 percent were females. There were 16 freshmen, 27 sophomores, 50 juniors, 59 seniors, 23 graduates and 8 non-matriculated students.

### **Measures**

*SSMS*. The original version of Snyder's (1974) Self-Monitoring Scale was composed of 25 items, among which 18 items constituted a newer version (Snyder, 1987). The current study converted the original "true/false" response format into 7-point Likert-format scales ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." This conversion was intended to improve the scale's suitability for using factor analysis. The scale's reliability and validity constituted the major focus of this study.

*LWSMS*. Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) Self-Monitoring Scale includes two subscales: sensitivity to expressive behavior of others (6 items) and ability to modify self-presentation (7 items). The current study also converted the original 6-point format into 7-point format with descriptors ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." This scale's reliability and validity also constituted a major focus of this study.

## The Internal Structures and External Implications of Two Self-Monitoring Scales

*The Perspective-Taking Scale.* Perspective-Taking was measured through one subtest of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1980). This subtest was composed of 7 items and utilized a 5-point response scale. In order to have consistent format in one study, all 5-point scales were transformed into 7-point scales with descriptors ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” Among the 7 items, two were negatively worded. The  $\alpha$  reliability coefficient reported by Davis (1980) was .75 and .78 for males and females respectively. It was .75 in the current sample. The validity of this measure was well confirmed (Davis, 1983).

*Satisfaction with Interpersonal Relationships.* This measure was constructed by P. Grubb (Grubb, Chan, & Regers, 1989) to assess general positive feelings (e.g. satisfaction, well being, and joyfulness) in interpersonal relationships. Its 11 items utilize a 7-point response scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” High scores indicate high satisfaction. The  $\alpha$  reliability coefficient was .80 in the current sample.

*Frustration from Interpersonal Relationships.* This measure, also constructed by P. Grubb (Grubb, Chan, and Rogers, 1989), assesses one’s degree of frustration from interpersonal relationships. Its 5 items utilize a 7-point response scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” High scores indicate high frustration. The  $\alpha$  reliability coefficient was .80 in the current sample.

*Locus of Control.* The well known Nowicki-Strickland’s (1973) locus of control scale was employed. This measure contains 40 items and utilizes a 2-point (yes/no) response scale. Isolated from the above five measures, of which items were randomly mixed together, this measure was distinctively put in one separate section of a booklet. High scores on this measure indicate an external locus of control. The  $\alpha$  reliability coefficient observed in the current sample was .80.

### Procedures

Two versions of booklets with different sequences of items were designed. Subjects were told that they would be asked questions about different aspects of their relationships with other people and about things they believe. No significant difference was found with respect to scores from the two versions of booklets.

## Results

### Internal Structure of SSMS

Principal component analysis was applied to the 25-item version of SSMS. The

first ten eigenvalues were 4.23, 2.90, 1.90, 1.44, 1.41, 1.20, 1.10, 1.06, 0.93, and 0.87. It seemed obvious that an “elbow” occurred between 1.90 and 1.44. Therefore, three components were retained and rotated by the equamax method. The three components explained only 36% of the total variance, which indicated that itmes in SSMS were rather heterogeneous. The rotated factor pattern is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Factor Pattern of SSMS (25 items)

Items	Factor Pattern		
	I	II	III
<i>Component I (Acting)</i>			
8. I would probably make a good actor.	.72	.01	-.19
20. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting (R) <sup>1</sup> .	.69	-.05	-.09
12. In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention (R).	.69	.19	.18
23. I feel a bit awkward in company and do not show up quite so well as I should (R).	.62	.21	.40
22. At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going (R).	.62	.28	.05
18. I have considered being an entertainer.	.55	-.18	.23
1. I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people (R).	.52	-.07	.06
21. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situation (R).	.44	-.15	-.01
3. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like (R).	.42	-.27	.19
14. I am not particularly good at making other people like me (R).	.41	.11	.33
4. I can only argue for ideas which I already believe (R).	.29	.12	-.02
<i>Component II (Pleasing)</i>			
19. In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else.	.06	.73	.20
17. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor (R.)	-.07	.63	-.08

The Internal Structures and External Implications of Two Self-Monitoring Scales

Table 1 (continued)

Items	Factor Pattern		
	I	II	III
25 I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.	.05	.54	.31
15. Even if I am not enjoying myself, I often pretend to be having a good time.	.07	.54	.16
7. When I am uncertain how to act in a social situation, I look to the behavior of others for cues.	.18	.45	-.10
11. I laugh more when I watch a comedy with others than when alone.	-.10	.40	.17
5.* I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information.	-.39	-.49	.38
<i>Component III (Masking)</i>			
2. I am not always the person I appear to be.	.08	.06	.62
13. My behavior is usually an expression of my true inner feelings, attitudes, and beliefs (R).	.06	.06	.56
24. In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons.	.04	.26	.56
6. I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for the right end.)	-.34	.01	.54
10. I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people.	-.35	.32	.40
9. *I rarely seek advice of my friends to choose movies, books, or music (R).	-.23	.09	-.37
10. *I sometimes appear to others to be experiencing deeper emotions than I actually am.	.01	.16	.17

Note: Items with an (R) sign were recoded in direction of high self-monitoring. Items precede by a "\*" sign was deleted from the component thereafter.

The first component seems to measure an acting or impression-management ability; the second component seems to measure tendencies to please other people; and finally, the third component seems to measure a sense of lack of self-integrity. These three components were labeled "acting", "pleasing", and "masking" respectively.

Efforts were made to avoid excluding any item from any component. However, for items #5 and #9 to be included in the 2nd the 3rd components, they should have had positive loadings on these two components respectively according to their meaning, i.e., their original direction in SSMS. In addition, item #10 had very low loadings on every component. Therefore, items #5, #9, and #10 were all excluded from subsequent analyses.

The labeling and the scoring (summing up the raw scores instead of obtaining the factor scores) of the three components were made to be consistent with the direction of SSMS. The intercorrelations among the three components were  $r_{12}=.14$ ,  $r_{13}=.07$ , and  $r_{23}=.32$ . The  $\alpha$  reliability coefficient for the three components were .78, .64, and .59 respectively, compared to .63 for the complete 25-item version and .72 for the 18-item version.

### **Internal Structure of LWSMS**

Principal component analysis also was applied to LWSMS. The first five eigenvalues were 4.90, 1.62, 1.02, 0.87, and 0.77. An "elbow" was judged to occur between 1.62 and 1.02. Therefore, two components were retained and rotated by the equamax method. The two components explained 50% of the total variance. The rotated factor pattern confirmed Lennox and Wolfe's results very well and was presented in Table 2. The original 7 items in Lennox and Wolfe's subscale of "ability to modify self-presentation" formed the first component, whereas the 6 items in their subscale of "sensitivity to expressive behavior of others" formed the second component in the current study.

When subscale scores were computed from summing up raw scores across items, the correlation among the two components were  $r=.51$ . The  $\alpha$  reliability coefficient for the two components were .81 and .79 respectively, compared to .85 for the complete 13-item scale.

### **External Implications of SSMS**

Perspective-taking, locus of control, satisfaction with interpersonal relationships, and frustration from interpersonal relationships were respectively regressed on the three components of SSMS found in Table 1. Raw and standardized regression coefficients as well as the results of t-test for the estimated parameters were presented in Table 3.

Significant regression weights for different components in SSMS were found



The Internal Structures and External Implications of Two Self-Monitoring Scales

Table 2: Factor Pattern of LWSMS

Items	Factor I	Pattern III
<i>Component I (Ability to modify self-presentation)</i>		
1. In social situations, I have the ability to alter my behavior if I feel that something else is called for.	.68	.26
2. I have the ability to control the way I come across to people, depending on the impression I wish to give them.	.53	.45
3. When I feel that the image I am portraying isn't working, I can readily change it to something that does.	.63	.16
4. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations (R).	.78	.03
5. I have found that I can adjust my behavior to meet the requirements of any situation I find myself in.	.79	.20
6. Even when it might be to my advantage, I have difficulty putting up a good front (R).	.46	.07
7. Once I know what the situation calls for, it's easy for me to regulate my actions accordingly.	.72	.32
<i>Component II (Sensitivity to expressive behavior of others)</i>		
8. I am often able to read people's true emotions correctly through their eyes.	.18	.79
9. In conversations, I am sensitive to even the slightest change in the facial expression of the person I'm conversing with.	.22	.59
10. My powers of intuition are quite good when it comes to understanding others' emotions and motives.	.21	.70
11. I can usually tell when others consider a joke to be in bad taste, even though they may laugh convincingly.	.05	.66
12. I can usually tell when I've said something inappropriate by reading it in the listener's eyes.	.14	.71
13. If someone is lying to me, I usually know it at once from that person's manner of expression.	.22	.62

Note: The scoring of item 4 and 6 was reversed.

Table 3: Regression of Four Dependent Variables on the Three Components of SSMS

	Raw Weight <sup>2</sup>	t-Value (DF=1)	Standardized Estimate
(DV <sup>1</sup> : Perspective-Taking)			
Acting	.10 (.05)	1.99*	.15
Pleasing	-.15 (.10)	-1.48	-.12
Masking	-.23 (.11)	-2.14*	-.17
(DV: Locus of Control)			
Acting	-.14 (.03)	-4.74**	-.34
Pleasing	.10 (.06)	1.55	.11
Masking	.10 (.06)	1.55	.11
(DV: Satisfaction)			
Acting	.31 (.07)	4.37**	.30
Pleasing	.22 (.15)	1.46	.10
Masking	-.89 (.16)	-5.73**	-.41
(DV: Frustration)			
Acting	-.20 (.03)	-5.81**	-.37
Pleasing	.02 (.07)	.31	.02
Masking	.47 (.07)	6.56**	.43

<sup>1</sup>DV=Dependent Variable. <sup>2</sup>Intercepts were not reported and standard errors of the parameters were in parentheses.

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

to have reversed valence for the same criteria (Table 3). First, the acting component was positively associated but the masking component was negatively associated with perspective-taking. Second, the acting component was associated with internal control, while the combination of the pleasing and the masking components was associated with external control ( $F_{(2,175)}=3.39, p < .05$ ). Third, decreasing scores on the acting component and increasing scores on the masking component tended to decrease the satisfaction with interpersonal relationships. Fourth, decreasing scores on the acting component and increasing scores on the masking component tended to increase frustration. In conclusion, the acting component had a most positive impact, the masking component had a most negative impact, and the pleasing component fell in the middle.

### External Implications of LWSMS

The same four dependent variables also were regressed on the two components of LWSMS found in Table 2. Raw and standardized regression coefficients as well as the results of t-test for the estimated parameters are presented in Table 4. The pattern of significance indicates that the two components in LWSMS are fairly compatible with respect to the four criteria investigated. The first component, sensitivity to expressive behavior of others, was positively associated with perspective-taking and with satisfaction in interpersonal relationship. The second component, ability to modify self-presentation, was positively associated with internal control and with decreasing frustration from interpersonal relationships.

Table 4: Regression of Four Dependent Variables on the Two Components of LWSMS

	Raw Weight <sup>2</sup>	t-Value (DF=1)	Standardized Estimate
(DV <sup>1</sup> : Perspective-Taking)			
Sensitivity	.32 (.11)	2.99**	.26
Modifiability	-.05 (.09)	-0.52	-.05
(DV: Locus of Control)			
Sensitivity	.00 (.07)	.03	.00
Modifiability	-.14 (.06)	-2.30*	-.20
(DV: Satisfaction)			
Sensitivity	.33 (.16)	2.00*	.17
Modifiability	.20 (.14)	1.38	.12
(DV: Frustration)			
Sensitivity	-.02 (.08)	-0.26	-.02
Modifiability	-.14 (.07)	-2.00*	-.17

<sup>1</sup>DV=Dependent Variable. <sup>2</sup>Intercepts were not reported and standard errors of the parameters were in the parentheses.

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

### Self-Monitoring as a Whole

Correlations between the total score of each self-monitoring scale and the four external criteria were examined after ignoring the differential functioning of components in self-monitoring (Table 5). In this context, the magnitude of the correlations should be noted while their valence should be ignored because multiple correlations always are positive. Regarding SSMS, the total scores from either the 25 items or the 18 items correlated with the four criteria much lower than did the weighted linear combination of the three components of SSMS (i.e., the regression equation found in Table 3). In contrast, correlations between the total scores from Lennox and Wolfe's 13 items and the four criteria were very similar to the correlations between the weighted linear combination of the two components of LWSMS and the four criteria (i.e., the regression equation found in Table 4). The contradictory functions of items in SSMS seemingly canceled out one another in the process of summation so that the total scores disguised the differential functions of the different components.

Table 5: Simple and Multiple Correlations between Two Self-Monitoring Scales and Four Criteria

	PT <sup>3</sup>	LC <sup>4</sup>	SAT <sup>5</sup>	FRU <sup>6</sup>
SSMS (25 items)	-.01	-.16*	.06	-.06
SSMS (18 items)	.03	-.24**	.10	-.12
Regression Equation of components in SSMS <sup>1</sup>	.28**	.39**	.47**	.56**
LWSMS (13 items)	.18*	-.18*	.25**	-.17*
Regression Equation of components in LWSMS <sup>2</sup>	.24**	.20*	.25**	.18*

<sup>1</sup>Regression equation came from Table 3. Entries in this row are multiple correlations, which are always positive. <sup>2</sup>Regression equation come from Table 4. Entries in this row are multiple correlations, which are always positive. <sup>3</sup>Perspective-Taking. <sup>4</sup>Locus of Control. <sup>5</sup>Satisfaction with Interpersonal Relationships. <sup>6</sup>Frustration from Interpersonal Relationships.

\*  $p < .50$ . \*\*  $p < .01$

## Discussion

Regarding SSMS, the acting and pleasing components found in the current study were similar to the acting/extraversion and other-directedness factors frequently reported in the literature. The masking component was similar to the "cross-situational variability of social behavior" proposed by Snyder (1974) and found by Furnham and Capon (1983). The multidimensionality of SSMS was confirmed.

In agreement with findings in the literature, the current study also found that different components in SSMS had contradictory implications. In contrast with people who scored lower, those with higher scores on the acting component were more internally controlled, reporting higher perspective-taking tendencies, less frustration with interpersonal relationships, and more satisfaction with interpersonal relationships. By contrast, people with higher scores on the masking component were found to have lower perspective-taking tendency and to be more frustrated from and less satisfied with interpersonal relationships. The pleasing component was not associated with any of the four criteria. Total scores on the 18-item or 25-item versions of SSMS tended to disguise the relationships between self-monitoring and the four criteria. These total scores reflected a composite of highly heterogeneous elements. Researchers using the popular SSMS should be aware of the contradictory functions implied by the scale's components. Unexpected or confusing results are very likely to emerge if these heterogeneous components are not considered individually.

When evaluated from methodological and psychometric perspectives, the LWSMS seemed to be a better alternative to the SSMS. Its original two components were rediscovered and found to have a higher reliability than does the SSMS. In addition, these two components did not have contradictory implications with respect to the four criteria mentioned above. Because these two components correlated highly with each other, predictions from the total score of the 13 items were quite consistent with those from the components. Future studies related with self-monitoring should not completely rely on SSMS and should consider LWSMS as a tenable alternative.

Finally, based on the results from a non-random sample of 183 college students, the above conclusions should be adopted cautiously. Factor analyses are sensitive to sampling fluctuations especially when factor loadings are low and factor structures are not clear. Nevertheless, the problem of random fluctuation in current study should not be too seriously; Otherwise, the resulting factor pattern of LWSMS may not be so in agreement with Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) results.

### References

- Briggs, S. R., Cheek, J. M., & Buss, A. H. (1980). An analysis of the self-monitoring scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 679-686.
- Cheek, J. M., & Briggs, S. R. (1981). Self-consciousness, self-monitoring, and aspects of identity. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles.
- Davis, M. H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *Catalog of Selected Document in Psychology*, 10(4), 85.
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 113-126.
- Ellis, R. J. (1988). Self-monitoring and leadership emergence in groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 14, 681-693.
- Furnham, A. & Capon, M. (1983). Social skills and self-monitoring processes. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 4, 171-178.
- Gabrenya, W. K., Jr., & Arkin, R. M. (1980). Self-monitoring scale: factor structure and correlates. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 6, 13-22.
- Gangestad, S. & Snyder, M. (1985). "To carve nature at its joints": On the existence of discrete classes in personality. *Psychological Review*, 92, 317-349.
- Grubb, P. D., Chan, J. C., and Rogers, D. L. (1989). Behavioral and cognitive outcomes of perceived interpersonal power and attention to social information: An identity negotiation analysis. Paper presented in the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans.
- Hoyle, R. H. & Lennox, R. D. (1991). Latent structure of self-monitoring. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 26, 511-540.
- Lennox, R. D. & Wolfe, R. N. (1984). Revision of the self-monitoring scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 1349-1364.
- Larkin, J. E. (1987). Are good teachers perceived as high self-monitors? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 13, 64-72.
- Nowicki, S., & Strickland, B. R. (1973). A locus of control scale for children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 40, 148-151.
- Snyder, M. (1974). The self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30, 526-537.
- Snyder, M. (1979). Self-monitoring processes. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 12). New York: Academic Press.
- Snyder, M. (1987). Public appearances, private realities: The psychology of self-monitoring. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Snyder, M. & Gangestad, S. (1986). On the nature of self-monitoring: matters of assessment, matters of validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 125-139.
- Sparacino, J., Ronchi, D., Bigley, T. K., Flesch, A. L., & Kuhn, J. W. (1983). Self-monitoring and blood pressure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 365-375.