

PERSONALITY CORRELATES OF SELF MONITORING BEHAVIOR - AN EMPIRICAL STUDY

Beena S. Saji

Abstract

Self-monitoring helps individuals to move higher up in their careers faster through regulating ones own behavior according to the situations, persons and events. The present study conducted on 103 graduate students is an attempt to understand the relationship between personality Type (Myers Briggs Type indicator) as measured using Jung Typology test (Kerbel and Feivishevsky, 1994), and self-monitoring behavior, (Snyder, 1974). Results from the data indicate a positive and significant relationship between the personality type extroversion and self-monitoring behavior. The negative correlations inferred from the study were between self-monitoring and the personality types, intuition (N), Introversion (I), and Judgment Type (J). The present article is an attempt to understand the personality dimensions affecting self monitoring behavior which is directed towards the success of an individual in an organization.

Key words : *self-monitoring behavior, Myer's Brigg's personality typology, introversion- extroversion, sensing- intuition, Thinking- feeling and Perceiving- Judging.*

Introduction

Psychologists and Management experts are seeking to find the most important ingredient of performance and success. Self-monitoring is a personality trait that has got great attention in the recent years. In this study, the investigator attempts to correlate it with some of the very important personality types- established by Jung and further developed by Myers and Briggs. Personality is the sum total of all the traits that an individual possess and that which affects the ways in which he interacts with the world. The importance of personality in work situations has been proved by several theories and literature on Personality job fit by many researchers and writers.

The present study attempt to understand the personality correlates of self monitoring behavior.

The interest in self monitoring behavior is timely as this behavior is getting people ahead in the organizations. People who are likely to sense and adapt to environmental cues in a timely and effective manner tend to move faster in their careers than others. Recent research provides strong evidence that people who are high self monitors, that is are highly flexible in adjusting their behavior according to situations are much more likely to emerge as leaders in groups than low self monitors (Dobbins, et al, 1990) .

Hence managers of tomorrow would be benefited by an understanding and awareness into those personality dimensions that help or hinder self monitoring behavior in them.

The present research is focusing on the eight personality types as measured by Jung typology test (based on Myers Brigg's personality type) and its relationship with self-monitoring behavior. Self-monitoring relates to the regulation of one's behavior to the demands of a given situation in order to effectively monitor image projected to others (Snyder, 1987). Self-monitoring is an individual's ability to adjust his behavior to external environment and situational factors (Robbins, 2001).

Self-monitoring Behavior

Self-monitoring relates to the regulation of one's behavior to the demands of a given situation in order to effectively monitor image projected to others (Snyder, 1987).

Individuals high in self-monitoring show considerable adaptability in adjusting their behavior to external situations. This may be due to the fact that they are highly sensitive to the external cues. Robbins (1998) in his book Organization Behavior says the reason for this may be their ability to having striking contradictions between their private persona and public personality. Low self-monitors will not be able to disguise this way. Low self-monitors will tend

to display their true dispositions and attitudes in every situation; hence there is high behavioral consistency between what they are and what they do.

Research revealed that high self-monitors are both more skilled at controlling their expressive behaviors to conform to situational requirements and better able to pose their emotions than low self-monitors (Friedman, Miller Herring, 1991, Snyder, 1974). Low self-monitors on the other hand are believed to lack the ability to easily adapt their behavior in response to changes in situational demands (Snyder, 1987). Low self-monitoring individuals are more future oriented when it comes to love relationships than high self-monitoring individuals. (Snyder and Simpson, 1984) It has also been proved that high self-monitoring managers tend to be more mobile in their careers and receive more promotions in the article " Do Chameleons get ahead? – The effect of self monitoring on managerial careers" (Kilduff and Day, 1994). This study highlights the importance of self monitoring behavior for career success.

Osborn and Field (1998) conducted a study that used a situational panel interview to investigate the association between applicant introversion-extraversion, self-monitoring and performance.

They found a positive relationship between applicants' self-monitoring behavior and performance. The study also emphasizes the role of personality types- introversion or extroversion on the self-monitoring behavior exhibited by the participants. The study proves that personality factors affect self-monitoring and also this will affect the performance of the individuals.

Sosik, Potosky and Jung Dong (2002) used longitudinal outsource field data to examine core aspects of the adaptive self-regulation model in terms of linkages between self-monitoring, discrepancy in manager match-to-position, 5 measures of leadership, and manager performance. At Time 1, 64 superiors of focal managers rated the managers' matches to their positions within the organization; at Time 3, they rated the managers' performance. At Time 2, the 64 focal managers completed a measure of self-monitoring, and 192 subordinates rated the focal managers' leadership behaviors. Self-monitoring was positively associated with all 5 leadership behaviors.

Miller (2001) in her study concluded that there is high correlation between performance appraisal satisfaction and self-monitoring behavior.

Sarah and Robert (2002) in their study examined the nonverbal displays of men and women in mock interviews. The nonverbal behavior of the most successful applicants differed from the non-

verbal behavior of unsuccessful participants. They found that high self-monitors were perceived as less anxious by judges and more competent by interviewers and as happier by both judges and by interviewers as compared to low self-monitors. Researchers have demonstrated that people who are skilled at encoding emotion and those individuals who are high self-monitors are evaluated more positively than people who are low self-monitors (Riggio, Friedman, 1986).

Mehra, Kilduff and Brass (2001) in their study examined how different personality types benefit from social networks in the organizations as measured using sociometry method. He found that low self-monitors were found to be located centrally in the homogeneous groups in the network and high self-monitors who have spent longer years in the organization were found to be in strategically advantageous network positions where they occupy centrally in between positions. The high self-monitor likes to have one friend for tennis, another for basket ball, a third for football depending on the expertise of the partner, whereas low self-monitors always choose their partners based on long term friendship and likeability. Baron (1989) in his study cites that high self-monitors are more likely than low self-monitors to solve conflicts through collaboration and compromise. From the above it is clear that high self-monitors relative to low self-monitors will tend to develop friendship relations at work with distinctly different people, whereas low self-monitors tend to occupy relatively homogeneous social worlds.

The above studies throw light to the fact that there are personality dimensions, which affect the self-monitoring behavior. This study is an attempt to find out those personality factors, which has high correlation with self-monitoring behavior on individuals.

The personality measurement tool for the study is Jung Typology test, a test based on Myers Briggs Type indicator which captures the four dimensions of Jungian typology- introversion- extroversion, sensing- intuition, Thinking- feeling and finally Perceiving- Judging. There are sixteen personality types in Myers Briggs Type indicator.

Myers Briggs type

Isabel Briggs Myers and her mother, Katharine Cook Briggs, developed the Myers Briggs type Indicative instrument. Their aim was to create a tool to indicate, validate, and put to practical use C.G. Jung's work on psychological types. Jung (1875-1961) was a Swiss psychiatrist whose book *Psychological Types* was an outgrowth of his efforts to understand individual differences among people. Jung assumed that every individual uses all four core processes- sensing, intuition, thinking and feeling—but differs in the priority given to each process. According to the theory one pole of each of the four preferences is preferred over the other pole in MBTI types. The MBTI type indicator includes Extroversion, introversion, thinking- feeling, sensing- intuitive, perceiving- and judging and tried to analyse as to which end of the pole do the individual belongs to to determine his personality type. Jung and Myers suggested that personality type is determined both by heredity as well as environment. Environment factors can foster development of each person's natural preferences, or it can discourage their natural bent by reinforcing activities that are less satisfying and less motivating. As we grow older we may try to develop our least preferred processes although in the younger ages we will be focusing on our most dominant processes. For example a person born with an introvert orientation may during his adult years during his work life may realize the importance of developing some amount of extroversion and may develop the same. The basic preferred ways of directing ones energy, gathering information, organizing oneself, and decision making may at one point of time will certainly be oriented towards one pole and this is what is measured using Myers Briggs Type indicator.

The Myer's Briggs Type indicator has come out with 16 personality types. It is all based on four preferences, like where primarily do human beings direct their energy, how do humans process information, how do human beings prefer to make decisions and how do they prefer to organize their life.

When individuals derive energy from their inner self of ideas, information and thoughts it is called introversion (I) and if it is towards the outer world of words and actions it is called extroversion (E). The individual who is processing information using senses (S) and on familiar terms it is called sensing and when he gives more emphasis on insight and future and focusing on what might be than what is he is using intuition (N). When an individual makes decisions based on logic and objective consideration he is using his thinking (T) mode in decision making, but when he is making decisions on his personal values he is making decisions based on his subjective, feelings (F).

When an individual tends to organize his life in a structured way, making decisions in an organized manner, he is using his judgment (J), but when he prefers to keep his options open and flexible rather than structured he is called a perceiving type (P).

Based on these four typologies or eight dimensions of Jungian personality types Myers and Briggs brought out the following 16 types of personality. They are ISTJ, ISFJ, INFJ, INTJ, ISTP, ISFP, INFP, INTP, ESTP, ESFP, ENFP, ENTP, ESTJ, ESFJ, ENFJ, and ENTJ. This article mainly examines the relationship between these different personality types and self monitoring behavior. The population taken for the research are the students of undergraduate level majoring in international business, Tourism, and computers.

Lofferedo and Harrington (2001) did a study to understand the relationship between psychological, life satisfaction, self-consciousness, and the four Myers Briggs Type Indicator dimensions. The participants were 97 college students on whom the Psychological Well-Being Inventory (C.D. Ryff, fin, 1985), the Self-Consciousness Scale-Revised (M.F. Scheier & C.S. Carver, 1985), and the MBTI (Form G Self-Scoring). They found significant differences on three of the four dimensions of the MBTI with extraverts showing higher psychological well-being and life satisfaction and lower self-consciousness than introverts. Intuition types scored higher in psychological well being and lower in self-consciousness than Sensing types. Judging types scored higher in psychological well being than Perceiving types. Correlational analysis showed that most dimensions of psychological well being were negatively related to self-consciousness.

The majority of undergraduate students are judging students. Based on data from the Center for Applied Psychological Type (CAPT) between 46% and 60% of over 16,000 freshmen at three state universities were judging students. Interestingly, almost 64% of Rhodes Scholars were perceptive students. The majority of university faculty also have a preference for judging. CAPT reported that almost 65% of 2,282 faculty prefer judging..

Methodology

Sample

103 undergraduate students of business studies, Tourism and Computers in a college in UAE were selected as subjects of the study. The college is one of the prestigious institutions in the region with students of different nationalities (Arabs, Indians, Pakistanis, and Chinese), which offers an American degree at the completion of the course. The average age of the students were 21-22.

Data

The data was collected using two questionnaires- Jung Typology test (Kerbel & Feivishevsky, 1994) and self-monitoring question-

naire, which were administered in the class by the investigator with the help of two student volunteers. The students were told that they were participating in a research study and hence their results were very important. All the questionnaires were returned back with full data. The investigator clarified doubts on any of the questions.

Tools

The two measures used for the study were Snyder's self monitoring questionnaire which was a 25 item True or false version (Snyder, 1974). There are 12 statements for which the answer is false and 13 statements for which answer should be True. This has a correlation value of .93 level with the 18 item version of Gangstead and Snyder 2000 version. A recent comprehensive review pointed out that the most persuasive evidence for the scale's predictive and construct validity consists of several hundred studies of behavioral and attitudinal differences between high and low self monitors consistent with self monitoring theory and detected by means of self monitoring scale (Gangstead and Snyder, 2000) With respect to discriminant validity self monitoring scale reliably predicts a range of criterion behaviors that seemingly similar scales, such as need for approval, locus of control do not predict (Snyder, 1979).

Kerbel and Feivishevsky (1994) developed the Jung Typology Test (JTT). Rights to the test belong to Human metrics. The Jung typology test is based on Myers Briggs Type indicator and is a 72 item version by human metrics.com. The test has content validity and face validity. The test has a construct validity of .72 (Pearson's coefficient of correlation) on the extroversion- introversion dimension with extroversion dimension of 16PF. The test has also got considerably high correlation with Keirsey temperament sorter on the eight dimensions measured by the test. They are .83 for E-I dimension, .75 for S-N dimension, .77 for T-F dimension and .74 for J-P dimension.

The split half reliability of the test on the dimensions E-I, S-N, T-F, and J-P are .83, .85, .86, and .82. The test retest reliability of the test is .82 (E-I), .82 (S-N), .78(T-F), .81 (J-P) with the different dimensions of personality.

Analysis

Analysis means a critical examination of assembled and grouped data for studying the characteristics of the object under study and for determining the patterns of relationships among the variables relating to it.

Empirical studies require collection of first hand data pertaining to the units of study from the field. The data for the present study was collected using questionnaires. There were eight personality variables as measured using the Jung Typology test and self-monitoring behavior questionnaire. The age, sex, nationality and stream of study are the other important independent variables of the study.

Hypotheses

Based on the above literature review the present investigator concludes that

Different concepts related to self, like self consciousness, self regulation etc are related to different personality dimensions as measured by Myer's Brigg's Typology tests. Self monitoring behavior is closely related to self regulation and self consciousness and can also be considered to be a behavioral outcome of highly emotionally intelligent individuals. Personality is the dynamic organization of those psychophysical systems within an individual which determines his unique pattern of ways of reacting to the environment (Allport, 1937). The definition gives importance to behavior as an outcome of what is happening within the individual. Self monitoring behavior hence can be considered to vary from individual to individual depending on their basic personality dimensions.

Hypothesis 1- There exist a positive relationship between personality type and self- monitoring behavior

High and low self-monitors are motivated to create two different social worlds. A recent review of self-monitoring literature shows that high self-monitoring type tend to make more social networks and create public images towards status enhancements. Low self-monitors may in contrast invest more in closer relationships in which they and their partners are trusted (Gangstead and Snyder, 2000). The majority of undergraduate students are extraverts. Based on data from the Center for Applied Psychological Type (CAPT) between 56% and 58% of over 16,000 freshman students at three state universities were extraverts. Interestingly, over 83% of college student leaders were extraverts, while over 65% of students were introverts.. It is not surprising that almost two-thirds of undergraduate business students are extraverts. Students may major in business administration because the business world appreciates and rewards action that coincides with the extraverts' strength. Introverts generally report higher levels of communication anxiety and less argumentativeness than extroverts (Loffredo and Opt (1998). From these we can draw the conclusion that-

Hypothesis 2- Extroverts exhibits high self monitoring behavior than introverts.

Sensing types of personality will always look for facts when they look for information to make decisions. They are really focused on practicality, experience and the present. They are very realistic. They are very practical and have their foot in the reality of the present that they are less future oriented. Self-monitors on the other hand as is evident from the literature are always looking for opportunities to enhance their social relations and advancement. Trobacky, Diggers and Hourcade (1991) in their study have shown that intuition is highly related to self-monitoring behavior. The study done by Opt and Loffredo, 1998 and 2001 states that sensing types exhibit higher communication apprehension than the intuitive types. Research on a group of chess players (Simon, 1987) found that grand masters sometimes identify some kind of relationship and see patterns in the situations and make meaning out of it when they take decisions, which are difficult decisions to take. This is intuitive decision making. Eight conditions identified in a study (Agor, 1989), for intuitive decision making are, people take intuitive decisions when a high level of uncertainty prevails, when there is little precedent to draw on, when variables are less scientifically predictable, when facts are limited, when analytical data are of little use, when there are several alternatives to choose from and finally limited time to take the decision. Hence the conclusion that intuitive who look for future novel, possibilities, who have high aspiration and who prefers to communicate in creative ways may exhibit a high self monitoring behavior than the sensing types.

Hypothesis 3 -Intuitive types exhibits high self- monitoring behavior than sensing

Thinking types are highly logical, critical, objective and analytical and has got a long term view and onlooker attitude. Hence they would be able to analyse and act on situations in a detached manner. Also their long-term view enable them to see what kind of actions they should take to lead them to success. In contrast to this the feeling types hold on to their attitudes and values, they are very subjective and have an immediate view and always a participant attitude. Hence they will not be able to make objective long-term decisions. These kind of people hence will have low self-monitoring trait in them. They are more inner directed that they fail to react according to situations and people. Hence the conclusion-

Hypothesis 4. -Thinking types exhibit high self monitoring behavior than Feeling types

Discovering life as one live is perceptive type. These types of people are open, like to explore, show spontaneity and flexibility

to situations, people and events. The judging type are close, would like to do things in time, like to structure, organize and show a firmness in their decisions. They like to control the situation. Self-monitoring theory states that self-monitors like to occupy positions of high betweenness centrality. In social networks they tend to be present in many groups and almost play a liaison role in the organization (Mehra, Kilduff, Brass, 2001). In one study high self-monitors showed themselves acutely sensitive to differing contexts in which social interaction took place. The high self-monitors were conformists in social situations in which conformity was the most appropriate interpersonal orientation and was non-conformist when group norms favored autonomy. By contrast low self-monitoring group members were virtually unaffected by their social settings. (Snyder and Monson, 1975). These studies lead to the conclusion-

Hypothesis-5. Perceiving types exhibit high self-monitoring behavior than judging types

Discussion of results

The Pearson r' correlation brings out interesting results. The table-1 shows the correlation between the eight variables, extroversion-introversion, intuitive-sensing, Thinking-Feeling and Judging-Perceiving with self-monitoring behavior.

As given in the hypotheses there is a positive and significant correlation (.318)** between extroversion and self-monitoring. The results point out that when individuals are outward and people-oriented they tend to have high self-monitoring behavior. The negative correlation (-.428)** between variable introversion and self-monitoring also goes as hypothesized proving that hypothesis number 1 is true for the sample taken for the study. Both the correlations are significant at .01 level.

The results indicate a significant and negative correlation (-.222)* at .05 level, between variable intuitive and self-monitoring behavior. There is a negative correlation between sensing and self-monitoring. The results although prove, one part of hypotheses do negate another part of the hypothesis. The hypothesis three stated that intuitive type exhibits high self-monitoring behavior than Sensing. This means there is a positive correlation between intuitiveness and self-monitoring behavior and a negative correlation between sensing and intuitiveness. The results are against the finding of Trobacky, Diggers and Hourcade (1991) which have shown that intuition is positively related to self-monitoring behavior. Hence the hypotheses which says that higher the intuitiveness higher the self-monitoring behavior came out to be false for the present sample. The negative correlation (-.132) between sensing and self-monitoring is not significant. This might be due to the fact that for intuition one needs to have more experience and intuition comes out of distilled experience. Self-monitoring behavior is proper sensing of what is happening around and responding in a desirable way. Probably this requires more of sensing orientation. But just sensing and gathering information will not help the individuals much. The variable Thinking and Feeling did not make any significant correlation with self-monitoring behavior. The investigator sees this as interesting and further research can be done on this variable.

The final dimension judging and perceiving type exhibits a relationship as stated in the hypotheses. There is a negative and significant correlation between judging and self-monitoring (-.260). There is a positive correlation between perceiving and self-monitoring (.037) which is not significant. The higher the score on the judgment the lower the self-monitoring behavior is proved by the finding. This may be due to the personality of judgment types who are unable to deal with unstructured and uncertain situations. Managers who already have a clear picture as to how to deal with subordinates or a situation will be guided by their previous experience and egos. This will be a hindrance to perceiving the situation very clearly

and reacting in a way that the other person wants you to behave. The judgment personality type hence will tend to be poor in self-monitoring. For practicing managers this is a definite indication that many of the managers fall into the trap of their own previous experience and tend to ignore many of the situational cues which might help them to manage the situation more effectively. When linear regression was done using self-monitoring as the dependent variable with all the other eight personality types as independent variables, the most important predictors that emerged in the regression results were perceiving, intuitive, extroversion, Thinking, introversion, judging, sensing, and finally feeling in the order of precedence.

Regression results are given in detail in tables at the end of the paper. The B value is the highest for variable one (E) is 2.0831 and beta value is .103. B and Beta values for the other variables are -variable two (I-, -7.407, -.363), variable three (N,-8.303,-.320), variable four (S,-.123,-.231), variable five (T, -2.854,-.112), variable six (F, -8.069,-.041), variable seven (J, -3.127,-.187) and variable eight (P, -2.322, -.080). The findings do highlight the importance of having perceiving, intuitive, extroverted, and Thinking type of personality over the judging, Introverted, sensing type of personality.

The correlation results did not highlight the importance of thinking as an important personality variable for self-monitoring as no significant correlation came out between the two variables.

The study does throw several interesting questions for the future researchers. The following questions.

Why did the correlation between intuitiveness (N) and self-monitoring come out to be negative although many of the former studies could highlight the importance of intuitiveness (Trobacky, Diggers, Hourcade, 1991; Agor, 1989), which gives the actor opportunity to become masters over uncertain situations. These results are in line with the CAPT findings that teachers are high in intuitiveness. The negative correlation between sensing type and self-monitoring behavior can be explained using the description on sensing types being very practical kind of people who are fact-oriented. The study done by Opt and Lofferdo (1998, 2001), also supports the negative relationship between sensing type and self-monitoring behavior. As self-monitoring is a personality dimension which enables an individual to quickly react to the situations in a positive manner thereby creating a positive effect on the actor as well as the observers, this question is quite relevant.

There is no significant relationship between sensing and self-monitoring. The future investigators can focus on this area as sensing does create some communication apprehension, which should be a hindrance to self-monitoring behavior. Further more the correlation is a negative one between sensing and self-monitoring which do support the hypotheses. In all the other personality dimensions one dimension of the pair is positive and the other is negative. In only sensing-intuitive types did both the dimensions (N -.222*, and S (-.132) showed a negative correlation with self-monitoring.

The second question is the lack of positive relationship between Thinking and self-monitoring. The question is why is there no positive relationship between the thinking type and self-monitoring behavior? One relevant argument could be that when we involve ourselves in decision-making using thinking mode we invest some time for logical analysis of the data. This is in contrast with the demand of a self-monitoring behavior where the person is expected to behave or change their colors like a chameleon according to situations. There is a positive correlation between feeling and self-monitoring which shows that higher the feeling higher the self-monitoring. But the correlation is not significant.

Altogether the study show that there exists a positive and significant relationship between extroversion and self monitoring behavior (E=.318**). The other significant correlations are negative- Introversion (I=-.428**), intuitive (N= -.222*), and judging (J= -.260**) where the independent variables, which correlated with the variable self- monitoring which is the dependent variable. In the regression analysis where all the independent variables were put as predictors for the dependent variable self monitoring behavior extroversion and intuitiveness came out as the first two important predictors. Introversion and judging came as the fourth and the fifth important predictors of self-monitoring behavior.

Summary

Hence it can be concluded that Hypothesis 1- There exist a positive relationship between personality type and self- monitoring behavior is proved as personality Types like extroversion, Introversion, intuition and judging do affect self-monitoring behavior, although there is a negation on the positive aspect of the relationship.

Hypothesis 2- Extroverts exhibits high self-monitoring behavior than introverts is also proved using the results of the study. Extroverted people are high in self-monitoring behavior than introverted individuals.

Hypothesis 3 –Intuitive types exhibits high self– monitoring behavior than sensing. The present study failed to prove this hypothesis. But the study could establish a significant and negative relationship between intuitive type and self-monitoring behavior, which is a question to analyse for future researchers in this area. This does contradict many previous researches, which has highlighted the ability to make quick decisions (Riggio, Friedman, 1986).

Hypothesis 4. –Thinking types exhibit high self-monitoring behavior than Feeling types. The study failed to bring out a significant correlation between self-monitoring and the variables, thinking and feeling Type. There exists a negative correlation between thinking and self-monitoring and a positive correlation between feeling and self-monitoring. Hence the hypotheses four is proved to be wrong although the correlations are not significant.

Hypothesis-5. Perceiving types exhibits high self-monitoring behavior than judging types. The final hypothesis is proved by the present study, which does highlight the inability of judging type individuals to easily cope and adapt with changes, as they love to plan and live a structured life.

Limitations and future directions of the study

The study was done among the graduate students majoring in business, Tourism and computers in one institution only. Hence any attempt to generalizing the results to general population is not possible. A comparative study of these results with students of technical educational field may be considered by the future researchers along with several questions asked in the discussion part of the paper.

References

- Agor W. H.1989. Intuition in organizations Sage Publications, Newbury Park.
- Allport G, W. 1937. Personality: A Psychological interpretation, Newyork: Holt, Rinehart and Winstion, p 48.
- Baron, R.A. 1989 “Personality and organizational conflict: Effect of Type A Behavior pattern and self- monitoring” Organisation Behavior and Human Decision Processes,44: 196-281
- Becker, Jeffery, Aymen Roya, Korabit Karen (2002) Discrepancies in Self/Subordinates’ Perceptions of Leadership Behavior: Leader’s Gender, Organizational Context, and Leader’s Self-Monitoring. Group and Organisation Management Jun2002, Vol. 27 Issue 2,p226,19p.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1961) Co-efficient Alpha and internal structure of tests, Psychometika,16, 297-334.
- Friedman, H S & Miller-Herringer,T. (1991). Nonverbal display of emotion in public and private. Self-monitoring, personality and expressive cues. Journal of personality and social psychology, 61-766-775
- Feivishevsky V. & Kerbel S. (1994), www.human metrics.com. The test was used after seeking permission from the authors.
- Gangstead, S. and Snyder M 1985, To carve nature at its joints, On the existence of discrete classes in personality, Psychological review, 92,317-349.
- Gangstead, S. and Snyder M 2000, Self Monitoring: Appraisal and reappraisal Psychological Bulletin, 126,530-555
- Hammer, A.L; Mitchell. D. (1996), The distribution of MBTI Types in US by gender and ethnic group. Journal of Psychological Type, 37, 2-15.
- Kilduff M; and Day D V, (1994), Do Chameleons get ahead? - The effects of self monitoring on managerial careers”, Academy of Management journal, Vol.60.
- Mehra Ajay, Kilduff Martin, Brass Daniel J (2001) , The social networks of high and low self monitors: implications for workplace performance., Administrative science quarterly, vol 46, issue1. p 121.
- Miller, Janice S (2001) Self Monitoring and performance appraisal satisfaction an explorative study, Human Resource Management, Winter 2001, Vol. 40. Issue-4
- Osborn, Suzanne and Field Hubert,S, 1998 winter issue, Self-Monitoring, and Applicant Performance in a Situational Panel, Journal of Business and Psychology, Introversion-Extraversion, RiggioR. E and Friedman, H.S. (1986). Impression formation: The role of expressive Behavior. Journal of personality and social Psychology, 50, 421-427
- Sarah Polack Levine and Robert S Feldman,(2002) Women and Men’s Nonverbal behavior and self monitoring in a Job interview setting, Applied HRM research, Vol.7.
- Simon A., 1987, Making Management Decisions: The role of intuition and emotion, Academy of Management Executive, PP. 59-60.
- Snyder and Simpson (1984), Self-Monitoring and Future Time Orientation in Romantic Relationships, By: Öner, Bengi, Journal of Psychology, 00223980, Jul2002, Vol. 136.
- Snyder M. (1987) Public appearances Private realities: The Psychology of self-monitoring, Newyork: W. H. Freeman
- Snyder, M and Copland,J. (1989) Self Monitoring Process in organizational settings. In R,A Giacalone &P. Rosenfield (Eds), Impression Management in organizations (pp-7-19). Hillside, NJ: LawrenceErlbaum Associates
- Snyder, M and T.C. Monson 1975, Persons, Situations and Control of social behaviors, Journal of Personality and social Psychology,32, 637-644.
- Snyder, M (1974) The self-monitoring of expressive Behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30 526-537
- SnyderM, and Gangstead S (1986), On the nature of self -Monitoring: Matters of Assessment, Matters of validity, Journal of Personality and social Psychology, 51: 125-139.
- Sosik,J, Potosky Denise, Jung Dong (2002) Adaptive Self regulation: Meeting others expectations of leadership and performance, Journal of Social Psychology, Vol.142, issue-2, pp-211
- **Percentage data taken from Isabel Briggs Myers and Mary McCaulley, Manual: A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, Consulting Psychologist Press, 1985.
- Toback, J.J, Driggers, E C & Hourcade J (1991). Self-Monitoring and Psychological Type: A social cognitive information processing model. Journal of Psychological Type, 22, 33-38.

Lofferedo, D,A & Opt,S,K (1998), Relating the MBTI to communication Apprehension, receiver apprehension, and argumentativeness. Journal of Psychological Type, 47- 21- 27.
 Lofferedo D. A and Harrington (2001), The relationship between

life satisfaction, self-consciousness and Myers Briggs Type inventory dimensions. Journal of Psychology, Vol.135, p 429.
 Opt Susan K, & Lofferedo, Donald A, (2000), Journal of Psychology, Vol-134, Issue 5, PP-556.

Table –1 Correlation results

	Extroversion	introversion	Intuitive	Sensing	Thinking	Feeling	Judging	perc eivin g
Self monitoring	.318**	-.428**	-.222*	-.132	-.103	.024	-.260**	.037

** significant at .01 level

* significant at .05 level

Table 2-Regression results.

Model	R	R square	Adjusted square	R	Std error of the estimate
1	.588 a	.346	.291		3.0652

Predictors of self monitoring (V9) behavior in order

Perceiving V 8
Intuitive V3
Extraversion V1
Thinking V5
Introversion V2
Judging- V7
Sensing - V4
Feeling- V6

<p>Dr. Beena S. Saji Visiting Professor, Management UAE University, Al-Ain, UAE. Tel. + 971 50 3604987 e-mail: dr_beena@yahoo.com</p>
