Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2024, 9(4s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

Adapting to Succeed: The Predictive Power of Self-Monitoring on Job Performance

[1]Dr Rashmi Badjatya Rawat, [2]Dr Rashmi Gharia, [3]Dr Shweta Mogre

[1]Assistant Professor, Prestige Institute of Management and Research, Indore, India.

[2]Assistant Professor, Prestige Institute of Management and Research, Indore, India.

[3]Assistant Professor, Prestige Institute of Management and Research, Indore, India.

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 18 Oct 2024

Revised: 25 Nov 2024

Accepted: 10 Dec 2024

ABSTRACT

Self-monitoring has been treated both as a forecaster of specific employee behaviors, and as a moderator of the effects of other traits, contributing to a greater understanding of individual behaviors we have, in this research attempted to investigate a dimension of behavior called the self-monitoring; its impact on Job Performance. For clarity of results Job performance was classified as Task Performance and Contextual performance. Standard scales of Self-Monitoring and job performance were used to collect responses. The data was analyzed using correlation and ANOVA. The study discovered that there are more than forty percent employees who agree that they monitor their behavior according to people and situations. It was also found that while the contextual performance had an Impact of Self-monitoring, the task performance was not affected by Self-Monitoring behaviors, which means that changing or molding behavior according to situation might improve relationship with collogues and superiors, but it cannot improve the task performance of an employee. Therefore the skill required to work in organizations still has maximum influence.

Keywords: Self-Monitoring, Job Performance, Job Behavior, Job Task Performance, Job Contextual Performance.

INTRODUCTION

Employee's behavior in organizations is one of the most popular, most researched and yet most debatable topic for both researchers and professionals. The underlying fact being the human behavior itself is very unpredictable. Scholars have been studying the behavior of employees with numerous permutations and combinations of variables and found varying results that could predict the behavior of employees to certain extent. Since every organization is concerned with performance of employees, it strives to find out of ways and means to improve it. And while attempting to discover the techniques to improve Job performance it was found that employees behavoiur at work constitutes his job performance. (Borman 2004a; Campbell, McHenry & Wise 1990). Also, there are studies which proves that an employees' personality traits and Job performance also have close linkages.(Barrick & Mount, 1991). And since behavior at work is more or less controlled by one's personality trait, it is important to investigate how people with different personality traits behave at work place which ultimately guides their work performance. Each employee is different and behaves differently to various stimuli in the organization, and it is complicated to understand and predict their behavior. Because "self-monitoring has been treated both as a forecaster of specific employee behaviors (e.g., Tasselli, Kilduff, & Menges, 2015), and as a moderator of the effects of other traits, contributing to a greater understanding of

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2024, 9(4s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

individual behaviors" (Barrick, Parks, & Mount, 2005), we have, in this research attempted to investigate a dimension of behavior called the self monitoring; its impact on Job Performance.

Self Monitoring

We can all agree that we strive to make a specific impression on people at a certain time, it could be at an interview or when we meet anyone important. Put differently, we attempt to practice "impression management" in some capacity (Goffman, 1959). We all, and actually every employee, make an effort, both consciously or not, to get a favorable evaluation from his employer. Important data on impression management in businesses can be gained via self-monitoring behavior (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). According to Snyder (1974), "self-monitoring is the extent to which people keep an eye on, modify, and regulate their behavior based on how it is perceived by others." It is also known as the propensity to act in response to either internal or external inputs, such as one's own judgment and attitudes (low self-monitoring) or how other people react (high self-monitoring). High self-monitors are encouraged to do steps that will assist them become more familiar and/or elevate their status. High self-monitors continually study the social settings in which they live and modify their behavior to fit them. As a result, some studies have likened people who actively monitor themselves to "chameleons who craft their self-presentations to fit the requirement of the situation and context." Blakely, Andrews, and Fuller (2003); Bedeian & Day (2004) "High self-monitors are more likely to opt to work in management and sales roles as they are more socially skilled. Lower-level, status-less jobs tend to have smaller of them (Day & Kilduff, 2003; Day et al., 2002; Kilduff & Day, 1994). They are more likely to be acquainted with essential equivalents, within as well as outside the organization (Caldwell & O'Reilly). Strong self-monitors are also more likely to hold leadership positions (Day et al., 2002; Zaccaro, Foti, & Kenny, 1991). Despite a lot of work focusing on suitable images of high self-monitors, there is evidence that they also exhibit less attractive habits. They exhibit less organizational loyalty (Day et al., 2002), are more concerned with controlling their impression (Turnley & Bolino, 2001), and are less devoted to their friends and romantic partners (Snyder & Simpson, 1984). Low self-monitors, on the other hand, value consistency between their actions and who they are; they typically act in the same manner regardless of the circumstances. Self-substantiation is more important to them than status or respect. According to Day, Schleicher, Unckless, and Hiller (2002), "low self-monitors have difficulty carrying off looks and attracting impression management." Low self-monitors are therefore less inclined to alter their conduct in order to impress others when given the opportunity for flexibility. Thus, there is a greater level of conformity between their personality traits and behaviors, while high self-monitors are more likely to adapt to the circumstances.(Zukerman, Koestner, and Bernieri, 1992).

Self-monitoring has always been a popular idea among researchers who want to see how reliable it is at predicting job behavior. Researchers have looked into how self-monitoring relates to other organizational behavior factors. The impact of self-monitoring activity on work engagement and emotional weariness among SME employees was examined by Boz Taştan et al. (2014), who discovered a positive correlation for self-monitoring behavior and employee work engagement. A different study by Moser Klaus et al. (2007) that looked at insurance sales agents discovered a positive correlation between a less experienced employee's job performance and self-monitoring. Bon, Ana Carla et al. (2018). examined how an employee's career is affected by gender disparities in social media and self-monitoring. They discovered that a higher level had to do with gender homophile in high self-monitors, and that higher positions in the organization's structure were closely tied with male high self-monitors in gender homophilic networks. " "High self-monitoring is positively associated with three major personality traits: extraversion, emotional stability, and openness to experience and supervisors' rating of human performance," according to research by Barrick, M.R. et al. (2005). "Extraversion, emotional stability, and openness to experience and supervisors rating of interpersonal performance" are the three Big Five personality traits that are positively connected with high self-monitoring, according to research by Barrick, M.R. et al. (2005). Additionally, Selin Kudret et al. (2018) discovered that "for those higher on monitoring oneself, personality, attitudes, and values become weaker predictors of behaviors.". High self-monitoring leads to an increase in staff members' on-time and on-task conduct, according to

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2024, 9(4s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

Richman G. S. et al. (1998). Researchers have also looked for a connection between performance reviews and self-monitoring. According to a study by Neville T. Duarte et al. (2012), ratings are influenced by self-monitoring in addition to an employee's apparent performance and superiority complex with the supervisor. When choosing a job, self-monitoring is also studied. According to Mark W. Evans (2018), self-monitoring might not influence people's criteria for choosing a job. In contrast to low self-monitors, strong self-monitors might not choose more structured employment. Kilduff and Tsai (2003) showed in their book on Social Networks and Organizations that people who're very self-monitored prefer to be diplomatic rather than direct. Being polite has a downside of possibly failing to cultivate positive resistance inside the organization. Those that are highly self-monitored exhibit less conflict and are better able to adjust to changing circumstances. Since they would rather support more and carp less, they may usually fail to solve any deficit in the organizations. There is no association between self-reported conformity and self-monitoring, however Scher and Thompson's (2017) research indicates a strong relationship between self-monitoring and behavioral conformity. In her search for self-monitoring, Fonseca (2003) discovered that self-monitoring "correlated significantly and positively with similar magnitude with both communication and psychological measures." "Self-monitoring plays an instrumental role in contributing to job effectiveness and success, leadership emergence, and work attitudes in organizational settings," in line with a meta-analysis by Wilmot (2003). According to the self-monitoring idea, if performance is limited to technical factors, there is no reason why high self-monitors would perform better on activities in their job description. As far as contextual activities are concerned, which includes general behaviour such as cooperating with others, high self-monitors may outgrow the low self-monitors (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1982a). Building on this work, this study is dedicated to find the impact of self-monitoring on both Task performance and contextual factors. It is hypothesis that self-monitoring has no impact on task performance, while it does impact the contextual factors of Job performance

Objectives of the study:

- To study the level of Self-Monitoring amongst Professionals
- To study the effect of level of Self-Monitoring on the task Performance of the Professionals.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopts a quantitative, descriptive research design to investigate the impact of self-monitoring on two dimensions of job performance: task performance and contextual performance. The objective is to determine the relationship and effect between the self-monitoring trait and different performance outcomes among working professionals.

Sample and Sampling Technique

A total of 101 professionals across various industries participated in the study. Participants were selected using a non-probability purposive sampling technique to ensure respondents had adequate workplace experience and represented diverse sectors including academia, banking, IT, and others.

- Gender Distribution: 52% female, 48% male
- Age Range: 72% between 31–40 years
- Experience: 57% had more than 10 years of work experience
- Industries Covered: Academics (28%), Banking & Insurance (9%), IT (9%), Others (54%)

Data Collection Tools

Two standard instruments were used to measure the study variables:

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2024, 9(4s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

1. Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974): A validated scale that measures the degree to which individuals regulate their behavior to accommodate social situations. The scores were categorized into:

- High (15–22)
- Intermediate (9–14)
- Low (0–8)

2. Job Performance Scale (Goodman & Svyantek 1999): The performance of employees was measured in two dimensions:

- Task Performance: Measures job-specific competencies and duties.
- Contextual Performance: Measures interpersonal behaviors and discretionary effort that support the organizational environment.

Statistical Techniques

Data were analyzed using SPSS software with the following statistical methods:

- Descriptive Statistics: To summarize the demographic profile and mean scores of key variables.
- Correlation regression Analysis (Pearson): To examine the relationship between self-monitoring and job performance dimensions.
- ANOVA (Analysis of Variance): To test the significance of differences and assess the impact of self-monitoring on job performance.

Reliability and Validity

Both scales used in the study are established instruments with proven validity and reliability in behavioral research. The items were reviewed to ensure contextual appropriateness for the current sample.

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Variables		N=100
Gender (%)	Female	52
	Male	48
Age (%)	21-30 years	24
	31-40 years	72
	41-50 years	00
	51-60 years	04
Marital Status (%)	Married	81
	Unmarried	19

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2024, 9(4s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

Income (%)	10-20 thousand	10	
	21-30 thousand		25
	31-40 thousand		12
	41thousand and Above	53	
Experience (%)	1-3 Years	18	
	3-5 Years		10
	5-7 Years		06
	7-9 Years		09
	Above 10 Years	57	
Industry (%)	Academics	28	
	Banking & Insurance	09	
	IT	09	
	Others	54	

Objective: To study the level of Self Monitoring amongst Professionals

Table-1: Frequency, percentage of the levels of Self Monitoring amongst Professionals

Self Monitoring	Level	Respondents Percentage
	High	44.56%
	Intermediate	47.82%
	Low	7.60%
** If the score of self monitoring is in between 15to 22 shows high self monitoring, between 9-14 represents intermediate self monitoring and if score is between 0-8 shows low self monitoring behavior*		

The study of self-monitoring levels among the people surveyed shows that most have a middle to high level of self-monitoring. In fact, 47.82% of the participants are in the intermediate group, and 44.56% show high self-monitoring behavior. Only 7.60% of those surveyed are seen as low self-monitors.

This pattern shows that most of the participants have a fair to strong skill in controlling their actions in social situations, changing their responses according to outside signals and expectations. The small number of low self-monitors suggests that only a few people in the group usually act based mainly on their personal values without paying attention to the situation

Objective No 2: To study the effect of level of Self Monitoring on the task Performance of the Professionals.

H01: There is no significant effect of Self Monitoring on the Task Performance of the Professionals.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2024, 9(4s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Job Performance	3.5203	.41383	101
Self Monitoring	1.4380	.15319	101

Table 3: Inter Variable Correlation Analysis Table:

Correlations			
		Task Performance	Self Monitoring
Pearson Correlation	Job Performance	1.000	-.150
	Self Monitoring	-.150	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Job Performance	.	.067
	Self Monitoring	.067	.
N	Job Performance	101	101
	Self Monitoring	101	101

Table No. 4

Model Summary			
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.150	.022	.013	.411
The independent variable is Self monitoring			

Table No. 5

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	.385	1	.385	2.277	.135
Residual	16.741	99	.169		
Total	17.126	100			
The independent variable is Self monitoring.					

Table No. 6

Coefficients

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2024, 9(4s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Self Monitoring	-.405	.268	-.150	-1.509	.135
(Constant)	4.103	.388		10.569	.000

Model Summary and ANOVA Findings

The correlation between self-monitoring and task performance is weak (R = 0.150). The model explains only 2.2% of the variance in task performance (R^2 = 0.022). The standard error of the estimate is 0.411, indicating moderate prediction error.

The ANOVA significance value (p = 0.135) is greater than 0.05, meaning the overall model is not statistically significant. We fail to reject the null hypothesis, indicating no significant effect of self-monitoring on task performance.

Coefficients Interpretation

The unstandardized coefficient for self-monitoring is B = -0.405, suggesting a slight negative relationship: as self-monitoring increases by one unit, task performance decreases by 0.405 units. The standardized beta value is -0.150, indicating a weak influence. The p-value for self-monitoring is 0.135, which is not statistically significant (p > 0.05).

The regression analysis shows that self-monitoring does not have a statistically significant effect on job performance (task performance). Although the direction of the relationship is negative, the effect is weak and not meaningful in a statistical sense. Therefore, self-monitoring is not a strong predictor of task performance, and other variables may need to be explored.

H02: There is no significant effect of self-monitoring on the contextual performance of the professionals.

Table No. 7

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Task	3.2200	.53198	100
Self	1.4404	.15208	100

Table No. 8

Correlations			
		Contextual performance	Self Montitoring
Pearson Correlation	Task	1.000	.200
	Self	.200	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Task	.	.023
	Self	.023	.

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2024, 9(4s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

N	Task	100	100
	Self	100	100

Table No. 9

Model Summary[b]									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.200[a]	.040	.030	.52387	.040	4.088	1	98	.046
a. Predictors: (Constant), Self Monitoring									
b. Dependent Variable: Job contextual Performance									

Table No. 10

ANOVA[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.122	1	1.122	4.088	.046[b]
	Residual	26.895	98	.274		
	Total	28.017	99			
a. Dependent Variable: Job contextual Performance						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Self Monitoring						

Table No. 11

Coefficients[a]								
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.212	.501		4.411	.000	1.217	3.207
	Self monitoring	.700	.346	.200	2.022	.046	.013	1.387
a. Dependent Variable: Job Contextual Performance								

The F-statistic = 4.088 with a significance value of 0.046, which is less than 0.05, indicates that the regression model is statistically significant. This means that self-monitoring has a significant impact on job contextual performance and that the model explains a meaningful amount of variance in the dependent variable.

Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management
2024, 9(4s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://www.jisem-journal.com/

Research Article

The unstandardized coefficient (B = 0.700) indicates that for every one-unit increase in self-monitoring, the job contextual performance increases by 0.700 units, holding all else constant. The standardized beta coefficient (Beta = 0.200) shows a moderate positive relationship between self-monitoring and contextual performance. The t-value = 2.022 and p-value = 0.046 confirm that this relationship is statistically significant at the 5% level. The confidence interval [0.013, 1.387] does not include zero, which further supports the significance of the predictor.

The results of the regression analysis indicate that self-monitoring has a statistically significant and positive effect on job contextual performance. The model is significant overall, and the coefficient for self-monitoring suggests that employees with higher self-monitoring skills tend to perform better in terms of contextual behaviors (e.g., cooperation, initiative, and adaptability).

RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

The current study aimed to explore the impact of self-monitoring on two critical components of job performance: task performance and contextual performance. Based on the statistical analysis conducted using correlation and ANOVA, the following findings emerged:

How much do professionals monitor their behavior?

The data indicate that a substantial majority of professionals demonstrate moderate to high levels of self-monitoring behavior. Notably, 44.56% of respondents scored in the high self-monitoring range, while 47.82% exhibited intermediate levels. In contrast, only 7.60% of professionals reported low self-monitoring behavior. These findings suggest that most professionals possess a strong capacity to adjust their behavior in response to social cues and situational contexts, highlighting their adaptability and social perceptiveness in professional settings.

Effect of self-monitoring on Job Performance

The results of the study offer valuable theoretical insights into the relationship between self-monitoring and the dual dimensions of job performance, as defined by Borman and Motowidlo (1993)—namely, task performance and contextual performance.

The findings suggest that self-monitoring does not have a statistically significant influence on task performance, which is consistent with the idea that task performance is primarily driven by an employee's technical competencies, role clarity, and cognitive ability (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Since task performance involves core job duties and formal responsibilities, it may not require high levels of social adaptability or behavioral adjustment.

In contrast, a positive and statistically significant association was observed between self-monitoring and contextual performance, which includes behaviors such as helping colleagues, demonstrating initiative, and voluntarily supporting organizational goals. This finding aligns with Snyder's (1974) theory of self-monitoring, which describes high self-monitors as individuals who are particularly sensitive to social cues and adept at adjusting their behavior to fit situational demands. Such adaptability appears especially relevant in performing organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs)—a core element of contextual performance.

This supports the theoretical proposition that contextual performance is more socially embedded and discretionary, and thus more likely to be influenced by individual traits such as self-monitoring (Snyder, 1987; Borman & Motowidlo, 1997).

CONCLUSION

The study reinforces the theoretical distinction between the two primary components of job performance. It suggests that self-monitoring is a personality trait with greater relevance to social and interpersonal aspects of job behavior, rather than structured, task-oriented performance. While task

performance remains rooted in procedural efficiency and role execution, contextual performance benefits more from interpersonal awareness, impression management, and behavioral flexibility—all hallmarks of high self-monitoring individuals (Snyder, 1974; 1987).

In line with Borman and Motowidlo's (1993) conceptual framework, the findings affirm that contextual performance extends beyond formal job duties and is closely tied to personal attributes that facilitate cooperation, organizational commitment, and extra-role behavior.

Practically, these results suggest that organizations may benefit from assessing self-monitoring during hiring or development processes, particularly for roles that demand teamwork, adaptability, and proactive engagement with the organizational culture. Furthermore, managers should recognize and support high self-monitors, as their contributions are likely to enhance team cohesion and overall organizational climate.

For future research, it would be valuable to investigate moderating variables such as leadership style, team dynamics, or organizational culture, to understand the conditions under which self-monitoring most strongly predicts contextual performance.

REFERENCES

[1] Ana Carla Bon, Sylvia Therezinha Almeida Moraes, Jorge Ferreira Silva, The Influence of Social Network and Self-Monitoring on Career , R. Adm. FACES Journal Belo Horizonte v. 17 n. 1 p. 70-88, jan./mar. 2018

[2] Barrick MR, Mount MK. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY, 44, 1–26.

[3] Barrick, M. R., Parks, L., & Mount, M. K. (2005). Self-monitoring as a moderator of the relationships between personality traits and performance. Personnel Psychology, 58, 745-767.

[4] Bedeian, A. G., & Day, D. V. (2004). Can chameleons lead? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(5), 687–718.

[5] Blakely, G. L., Andrews, M. C., & Fuller, J. (2003). Are chameleons good citizens? *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(6), 799–806.

[6] Boz Taştan İlknur et.al (2014), The effect of the level of self-monitoring on work engagement and emotional exhaustion: A Research on Small and Medium Size Enterprises (SMEs), Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 150 (2014) 1080 – 1089 (Elsevier)

[7] Caldwell DF, O'Reilly CA III. (1982). Boundary spanning and individual performance: The impact of self-monitoring. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 124–127l.

[8] Day DV, KilduffM. (2003). Self-monitoring personality and work relationships: Individual differences in social networks.

[9] Day, D. V., Kilduff, M., & Slaughter, J. E. (2002). Self-monitoring personality and work relationships: Individual differences in social networks. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 24, 55–93.

[10] Day, D. V., Schleicher, D. J., Unckless, A. L., & Hiller, N. J. (2002). Self-monitoring at work: A meta-analytic investigation of construct validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 390–401.

[11] Duarte, N. T., Goodson, J. R., & Kilburn, B. R. (2012). The compensatory role of self-monitoring in performance appraisal. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(24), 1–9.

[12] Evans, M. W. (2018). Self-monitoring and job selection preferences. *International Journal of Management and Applied Research*, 5(3), 102–112.

[13] Fonseca, C. R. (2003). *Self-concept, self-monitoring, and the relationship of human social interaction* (Master's thesis, University of Rhode Island). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses/808

[14] Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.

[15] Kilduff, Martin & Tsai Wenpin (2003), Social Networks and Organizations. Sage: London

[16] Koestner, R., Berneieri, F., & Zukerman, M(1992). Self Regulation and Consistency between attitudes, traits and behaviours. Personality and social Psychology Bulletin, 18, 52-59.
[17] Mehra A, Kilduff M, Brass DJ. (2001). The social networks of high and low self-monitors: Implications for work place performance. Administrative Science Quarterly, 46, 121–146. Mount MK,
[18] Moser Klaus and Galais Nathalie (2007), Self-Monitoring and Job Performance: The Moderating Role of Tenure, International Journal of Selection and Assessment, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 83-93, March 2007.
[19] Neville T. Duarte, Jane R. Goodson, The Compensatory Role of Self-Monitoring in Performance Appraisal, International Journal of Business and Social Science, Vol. 3 No. 24 [Special Issue – December 2012]
[20] Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct cleanup time. *Human Performance*, 10(1), 85–97.
[21] Richman, G. S., Riordan, M. R., Reiss, M. L., Pyles, D. A., & Bailey, J. S. (1998). The effects of self-monitoring and supervisor feedback on staff performance in a residential setting. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 18(1), 45–63.
[22] Scher, S. J., & Thompson, V. (2007). The effect of self-monitoring on behavioral conformity. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 35(6), 723–732.
[23] Selin Kudret, Berrin Erdogan, Talya N. Bauer (2018), Self-Monitoring Personality Trait at Work:
[24] Snvdler. M,, & Copeland, j, 1989. Seif-monitoring processes in organizational settings, hi R- A, Giaialone & I' Kosenfeici (Kds]. Impression management in the organization: 7-19. Hillsdale. N|: Erlbauni
[25] 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.
[26] Snyder M, Ickes W. (1985). Personality and social behavior. In Lindsey G, Aronson E (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (3rd ed., vol. 2, pp. 883–947). Reading, MA:Addison-Wesley.
[27] Snyder M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal ofPersonality and Social Psychology, 30*, 526–537.
[28] Snyder, M., & Ickes, W. (1985). Personality and social behavior. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (3rd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 883–947). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
[29] Snyder, M., & Simpson, J. A. (1984). Self-monitoring and dating relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(6), 1429–1440.
[30] Tasselli, S., Kilduff, M., & Menges, J. I. (2015). The micro foundations of organizational social networks. Journal of Management, 41, 1361-1387.
[31] Turnley WH, Bolino MC. (2001). Achieving desired images while avoiding undesired images: Exploring the role of self-monitoring in impression management. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(2), 351–360.
[32] Turnley, W. H., & Bolino, M. C. (2001). Achieving desired images while avoiding undesired images: Exploring the role of self-monitoring in impression management. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(2), 351–360.
[33] Wilmot, M. P. (2011). *Self-monitoring personality at work revisited: A comparative meta-analysis* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/aglecdiss/21
[34] 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.