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ABSTRACT

This study investigated the extent to which self-monitoring disposition (Snyder, 1974) interacts with accountability and knowledge of a principal's position in affecting a number of responses to accountability, as indicated by integrative complexity, time on task, conformity, and judgment accuracy. Undergraduate students performed a job applicant selection task. For the most part, the hypotheses were not supported. It was concluded that accountability may not influence thinking and behavior when individuals perceive the task to be intrinsically important.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Increased accountability is often thought to be instrumental for ameliorating current societal problems (Weigold & Schlenker, 1991; Schlenker & Weigold, 1989). Commentators have suggested that there is a need for greater accountability in such areas as education, the administration of social programs, economic development, and government. In addition, Cummings and Anton (1990) have argued that accountability is necessary to ensure the effective functioning of organizations. The implication is that accountability leads to desirable outcomes such as better judgments, decisions, and performance. Behavioral scientists have only begun to test the validity of this assertion. Usually they have done this across various contexts (Tetlock, 1991). Consistent with the need to better understand when and where accountability has its effects, the current study investigated whether this assertion is valid for different types of people in a specific situation.
Accountability is defined as being required to justify one's decision or position to some other party, referred to as the principal (Schlenker & Weigold, 1989; Tetlock, 1985a, 1985b, 1985c, 1983a; Tetlock & Boettger, 1989). Research has demonstrated that accountability influences thought processes and/or expressed positions in a number of judgment contexts, including person perception (Tetlock & Kim, 1987), social issue position expression (Tetlock, Skitka, & Boettger, 1989), gambling bets (Cvetkovich, 1978), ethical dilemma resolution (Brief, Dukerich, & Doran, 1991) and group performance (Crawford & Martell, 1993). For the most part, accountability research has supported the proposition that a social situation can be modified through accountability so as to heighten motivation to expend cognitive effort. As the effects of accountability on thought processes and judgments have been found to generalize across contexts, an additional question that needs to be asked is the extent to which the influences of accountability generalize across different types of individuals.

On another level, Driver (1987) has advocated that psychologists need to move towards investigating the potential of interactionism, or the recognition of behavior as being both a function of environmental forces and personality factors. From this perspective, in order for accountability theory to become fully-developed, it is
important to examine the robustness of accountability effects across potentially relevant individual differences.

Thus, the purpose of the present study was two-fold. First, this study tested the proposition that self-monitoring disposition (Snyder, 1974, 1987) influences responses to accountability. Second, this study also examined the notion that high and low self-monitors might differ in their uses of thought processes as they respond to accountability. Data for this laboratory study was collected within the context of a job applicant selection paradigm.

**Social Contingency Model of Judgment and Choice**

As noted, accountability is defined as being required to justify one's decision or position to some other party. Phenomenologically, this requirement is thought to induce a motivational state characterized by a heightened sense of perceived self relevance with reference to the current situation (Klimoski, 1992). Furthermore, accountability makes salient "identity images" that the individual wishes to project in a given situation. Tetlock, Skitka, and Boettger (1989) found that accountable experimental participants, as compared to unaccountable participants, reported feeling more nervous; more embarrassed; and more uncomfortable with the experiment. Somewhat paradoxically, they also reported liking the experiment
more and having more fun as a result of participating. These researchers concluded that the anticipation of having one's position judged by others focuses attention on the task at hand. In summary, the accountable individual experiences a situation as more important to her own self than one who is not accountable.

In essence, accountability is a mechanism for increasing motivation because it makes salient an individual's public self, or the part of self that seeks others' approval (Greenwald, 1982; Greenwald & Breckler, 1985). The underlying cause for responses to accountability is that individuals are motivated to gain social approval, or at least, avoid social disapproval in the eyes of the principal (Tetlock, 1991; Tetlock, 1985a). Specifically, responses to accountability are thought to be a product of separate motivations to: a) protect and enhance one's social image or identity; b) protect and enhance one's self-image; or c) maintain favorable relationships, from a social exchange perspective, with the intent of seeking desired tangible resources (Becker & Klimoski, 1989). Thinking and behavior are then influenced the extent to which individuals are motivated to attain at least one of these outcomes.

The social contingency model of judgment and choice (Tetlock, 1985a) has been recognized as the prevailing explanation for information processing and behavioral
responses to accountability. It is referred to as such because specific responses to accountability are conditional upon the presence of specific contextual factors. One of these critical factors is whether the accountable individual has knowledge of the principal's position (Tetlock, 1985a, 1985b). Individuals respond to accountability by altering the reasoning strategies that they use in making an expressed judgment (Cvetkovich, 1978; Hagafors & Brehmer, 1983; McAllister, Mitchell, & Beach, 1979; Tetlock & Kim, 1987) and/or the expressed judgment itself (Adelberg & Batson, 1978; Crawford & Martell, 1993; Klimoski & Inks, 1990; Simonson & Nye, 1992; Tetlock, 1983a; Tetlock et al., 1989).

Specifically, when individuals are held accountable to a principal whose position is known, they use less complex reasoning strategies in making judgments and express a position that is more consistent with that of the principal than when they are not held accountable (Simonson & Nye, 1992). In essence, this is a conformity effect. Because the principal's position is known, there is little need to engage in complex reasoning in order reach this public position. However, it should be noted that the position expressed may only be a public position. The individual still may privately maintain an alternative position (Cialdini, Levy, Herman, & Evenbeck, 1973).
The social contingency model also maintains that when held accountable to a principal whose position is unknown (but is assumed to hold a position), individuals use more complex reasoning strategies to make judgments than when they are not held accountable. However, under these conditions, the position expressed is less predictable. They may express a neutral position (Cialdini et al., 1973) or one that is consistent with their best guess of what the principal would prefer (Tetlock et al., 1989).

When the principal’s position is not known, however, the accountable individual must determine a way to maintain a favorable image in the eyes of the principal. It is not possible to agree with the principal’s position because it is not known. One way to maintain a favorable image would be to appear to be broad-minded and rational (Cialdini et al., 1973). In this case, the individual engages in more vigilant and complex thinking. That is, she examines arguments and counterarguments for the particular position taken. In doing so, individuals purportedly are also paying close attention to the evidence, are careful to refrain from making judgments on the basis of incomplete information, and are making efforts to integrate contradictory or inconsistent information (Tetlock & Kim, 1987).

Being diligent under these circumstances thus becomes a way of protecting social and self-image (Tetlock, 1991).
Although the individual may take a position that is different from the principal’s, they can demonstrate that they have carefully thought through all available information. This is known as _pre-emptive criticism_.

Consistent with this notion of heightened vigilance (Schlenker & Weigold, 1989; Tetlock, 1985a) and increased cognitive effort caused by accountability to a unknown principal’s position, it has also been found that accountable individuals spend more time on task than individuals who are not held accountable (Ford & Weldon, 1981; Haccoun & Klimoski, 1975; Klimoski, 1972; McAllister, Mitchell, & Beach, 1979). Spending more time on task could be seen as an effective tactic because it suggests that the individual is willing to expend additional effort to make the best judgments possible.

Although it was not investigated in this study, another scenario is that individuals may be held accountable for past judgments. In this case, individuals are likely to expend cognitive effort. However, this effort consists of rigid, defensive, and evaluatively consistent thought. By doing this, individuals will attempt to generate as many reasons as they can why they are right and potential critics are wrong (Tetlock, 1991; Tetlock, et al., 1989). This is known as _defensive bolstering_.


These three responses to accountability (conformity, pre-emptive criticism, and defensive bolstering) are interpreted as coping strategies that are used to maintain or gain a favorable impression in the eyes of the principal. Responses to accountability can thus be inferred by assessing: a) expressed judgments; b) time taken on task; and c) the complexity of reasoning strategies used. In the current study, these variables were measured to determine the differential influence of accountability with regard to self-monitoring disposition.

Complexity of reasoning strategy has been indexed in previous research through a content analysis approach that assesses integrative complexity. Because researchers outside of this particular content domain may be unfamiliar with integrative complexity, the meaning and assessment of this variable is described below.

Integrative Complexity

Integrative complexity of thought (Schroder, Driver, & Streufert, 1967) is an indicator of the cognitive process that an individual uses in making a specific decision or judgment (Baker-Brown, Ballard, Bluck, de Vries, Suedfeld, & Tetlock, 1989). With theoretical roots in conceptual complexity (Harvey, Hunt, & Schroder, 1961; Schroder et al., 1967), integrative complexity is indexed in terms of two properties: differentiation and integration (Coren & Suedfeld, 1990). Differentiation
refers to the number of characteristics or dimensions that an individual takes into account. Integration refers to the degree of development of complex connections among differentiated characteristics or dimensions (e.g. temporal relationships, cause-and-effect, competing alternatives, etc.). Both of these properties have been combined to reflect a single continuum of integrative complexity in a scoring system developed by Baker-Brown et al. (1989). Higher integrative complexity scores indicate that individuals are processing information in multidimensional ways (Tetlock, 1983a), considering each dimension with greater depth, and considering the nature of interrelationships among dimensions.

Previous research has concluded that integrative complexity can be influenced by situational factors such as stress, crisis, role demands, "groupthink," as well as accountability (Suedfeld & Tetlock, 1977; Tetlock, 1983a; Tetlock et al., 1989).

The functional value of integratively complex thinking has also been researched. The notion is that more complex thinking should lead to better judgments because this indicates that the individual is being more analytical. In some instances, integrative complexity has been found to lead to improved judgments. Specifically, integratively complex thinking has been related to the reduction of judgmental biases such as the primacy effect
(Tetlock, 1983b) and the fundamental attribution error (Tetlock, 1985c). Furthermore, integrative complexity is thought to reduce overconfidence in predictions and lead to greater accuracy in person judgment (Tetlock et al., 1987).

It cannot be concluded, however, that integrative complexity always leads to better judgments. Integrative complexity can also result in the dilution effect (Tetlock & Boettger, 1989), or the consideration of irrelevant information in making judgments. These researchers suggested that individuals may become overly analytical in considering information. Furthermore, thinking associated with higher integrative complexity may lead to an unwillingness to state any position when the decision to be made involves potentially costly tradeoffs (Tetlock, 1991). Tetlock (1991) also suggests that integrative complexity may exacerbate the status quo effect, or the unwillingness to change from an already decided course of action. It is apparent that the relationship between integrative complexity and judgment quality is still equivocal. This issue is to be addressed in the current study.

**Individual Differences and Accountability**

The notion that individual differences can influence responses to accountability has been suggested by previous research. For example, Yarnold, Mueser, and Lyons (1988)
found that individual differences in Type A behavior interact with accountability. The nature of the interaction is such that individuals who display Type A behavior who are also held accountable perform better on a simple physical performance task than Type As who are not held accountable or Type Bs irrespective of condition.

Similarly, Earley (1989) found that accountability interacted with cultural beliefs regarding individualism vs. collectivism. The study was conducted within a group performance paradigm. This study found the individualistic people performed better when they were held accountable than when they were not held accountable. On the other hand, collectivistic people performed well regardless of accountability.

Tetlock, Skitka, and Boettger (1989) investigated the potential for a number of individual differences to influence responses to accountability. Specifically, these researchers investigated the effects on responses to accountability related to the following individual differences: dogmatism (Rokeach, 1960), public self-consciousness, and social anxiety (Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975). Dogmatism refers to the degree to which individuals are predisposed to think in rigid, dichotomous terms. Public self-consciousness refers to a disposition to attend to socially available, or public, aspects of the self. Social anxiety refers to concerns
about self-presentation in social situations. These individual differences were investigated within the context of an experiment where accountability and knowledge of the principal's position were manipulated.

The results of Tetlock et al. (1989) suggested that more dogmatic individuals, in general, were less likely to engage in integratively complex thoughts than less dogmatic individuals, irrespective of levels or types of accountability. On the other hand, social anxiety moderated the relationship between knowledge of the principal's views and integrative complexity among accountable subjects. Specifically, among subjects accountable to a principal with unknown views, subjects with high social anxiety reported more integratively complex thoughts than those with low social anxiety. Public self-consciousness was not found to have either a main or moderating effect.

The researchers concluded that these individual differences had a minimal influence on responses to accountability. Social anxiety did influence responses to accountability, but only when individuals are held accountable to a principal whose position is unknown. Furthermore, public self-consciousness did not influence responses to accountability.

The researchers acknowledged that the paucity of results could have been due to a methodological
shortcoming of the study. Specifically, the roles of individual differences were tested by examining within-cell correlations between the individual difference variable and integrative complexity. Therefore, the lack of results for these variables could have been due to low statistical power that occurred because high and low scores on the individual difference variables were not used as classification factors. This criticism by the researchers could be interpreted as a suggestion to use high and low groups when studying individual difference variables in the accountability paradigm.

In a different study, Weigold and Schlenker (1991) found that propensity for risk taking interacted with levels of accountability in predicting risk taking behavior. When held accountable, individuals who described themselves to be low risk takers took lower risks than those who described themselves as high risk takers. However, when not held accountable, risk taking propensity did not influence risky behavior. The researchers explained these results in terms of individuals' perceptions of the principal's expectations. High risk-takers believed that taking risks was admired by others. Because accountability provides an audience for one's own behavior, he is more likely to act consistently with his own self-belief. In this study, it was found that subjects behaved in a way that was more consistent
with their self-belief of risk taking when they were held accountable than when they were not held accountable.

Collectively, these studies suggest that researchers agree with the general proposition that responses to accountability may be influenced by individual differences. The rationale for doing so is made most explicit by Weigold & Schlenker (1990), who posit that accountability "amplifies subjects’ assessment of relevant information about the self, task, and audience. This not only produces more intensive information processing about the task but also makes salient the audience’s expectations and actor’s desired images" (p. 28). With emphasis placed on the latter statement, it appears that, when held accountable, individuals are more motivated to think and act in a way that is consistent with their own self-beliefs or orientations.

Self-Monitoring Disposition

The construct of self-monitoring refers to individuals’ capacity for observing, regulating, and controlling expressive and self-presentational behaviors displayed in social situations and interpersonal relationships (Snyder & Copeland, 1989; Snyder, 1974, 1979). Research on self-monitoring has produced voluminous evidence that supports the contention that there are stable differences among individuals on this variable.
Snyder and Copeland (1989) indicate that high self-monitors are vigilant to situational cues that guide them in the presentation of appropriate behaviors across a wide variety of situations, even if these behaviors are not wholly consistent with their inner dispositions. People low in self-monitoring are less concerned with assessing the social climate around them. Also, they usually do not possess a highly developed repertoire of self-presentation skills. They characteristically display behaviors that are congruent with their inner feelings and beliefs, often risking the possibility of social impropriety. With respect to differences in high vs. low self-monitors, it is apparent that they do not share similar self-presentation concerns. High self-monitors appear more concerned with displaying normative behavior for the situation than low self-monitors. Low self-monitors are more concerned with maintaining consistency between their attitudes and behavior (Kardes, Sanbonmatsu, Voss, & Fazio, 1987; Snyder & Kendzierski, 1982).

To summarize, high self-monitors are individuals who are concerned with maintaining a favorable social impression, but also, they have the capacity to do so. Alternatively, low self-monitors are not concerned with maintaining a favorable social impression.

In giving a precise definition of a construct, it is not only important to identify what it is, but also to
distinguish it from other similar constructs. An abundant body of research has been able to distinguish self-monitoring from constructs such as need for approval; Machiavellianism; extraversion; locus of control; field dependence; self-esteem; need for cognition; and intelligence (Snyder, 1987). Thus, self-monitoring is conceptually unique from other individual difference variables that pertain to tendencies for social information processing and behavior.

Previous empirical research on self-monitoring has supported the ability of this variable to identify differences in the monitoring of and behavior in social situations. High self-monitors have been found to be more conscientious with regard to monitoring their environment for situational cues (Rhodewalt & Comer, 1981; Snyder, 1987, 1983, 1974). Elliott (1979) found this tendency to be so strong that high self-monitors were more likely to "purchase," at some cost to themselves, information that would help them choose appropriate modes of self-presentation. Not only are they more interested in such information, but also, high self-monitors have been found to be more skillful at correctly identifying situational cues (Geizer, Rarick, & Soldow, 1977).

These differences in cue search and usage also result in behavioral differences. High self-monitors have been found to engage in behavior that is thought to be
normative for the situation (Snyder & Monson, 1975). Also, they are more likely than low self-monitors to engage in behavior that is thought to result in positive social consequences for themselves (Danheiser & Graziano, 1982; White & Gerstein, 1987).

Low self-monitors are less susceptible to external influence attempts. For example, Anderson and Tolson (1989) found that the job performance of low self-monitors was not related to leadership behaviors of their supervisors. Instead, job performance was related to their perceived importance of their work. On the other hand, high self-monitors' job performance was related to their supervisor's display of leadership behaviors.

Self-Monitoring and Accountability

In this present study, self-monitoring was investigated because of its relevance to explaining differences among individuals in their tendencies to be influenced by a situational factor such as accountability. Recall that accountability is conceptualized as a social mechanism that induces motivation towards cognitive effort. An implicit assumption of the social contingency model is that individuals consider self-presentational goals to be important. This follows logically from the argument of Tetlock, et al. (1989), who suggest that a motivational basis for reactions to accountability is social approval. However, differences in self-monitoring
are relevant to preferences in social approval. If, in fact, low self-monitors are less concerned with maintaining social approval, this would suggest that they would be less susceptible to the effects of accountability.

Moreover, Tetlock (1991, 1983a) states that dealing with accountability is a matter of adopting a coping strategy that is appropriate under the circumstances. Adoption of a coping strategy is more likely to take place as individuals are more concerned with how they are perceived and evaluated by others (Tetlock, 1985b). Thus, some individuals may be less (or more) influenced by having to be evaluated by other people (Schlenker & Weigold, 1989). Snyder (1987) has suggested that high self-monitors are more likely to engage in coping behaviors, or behaviors that are purposely controlled and consciously performed. On the other hand, low self-monitors are more likely to engage in expressive behavior that is genuinely and spontaneously emitted. If this is the case, then high self-monitors reactions to accountability should be exaggerated while low self-monitors should be relatively unresponsive to accountability pressures.

Another research question relates to differences between high and low self-monitors in their uses of integrative complexity. Recall that integrative
complexity has been found to have either a positive or negative impact on judgment quality. As has been noted by Schlenker and Weigold (1989), accountability makes salient the expectations of the principal. Furthermore, heightened integrative complexity occurs only when the principal's position is unknown, suggesting that it occurs as a means for managing impressions. This line of reasoning leads to the question of whether integrative complexity occurs for impression management purposes or whether it occurs as a legitimate attempt to carefully consider information in the service of formulating more accurate judgments. Or, within the context of this study, will high self-monitors and low self-monitors differ in their uses of integrative complexity?

It is apparent that high self-monitors are more interested in managing impressions. Thus, it is possible that the manifestation of integrative complexity in judgment making is due to attempts to project the image of a critical, analytical thinker to the principal. On the other hand, low self-monitors are less concerned with managing impressions. Therefore, to the extent that they demonstrate integratively complex thinking, it would be less in the service of managing impressions, but instead, to facilitate the legitimate consideration of information provided with the goal of making quality judgments.
This line of thinking suggests different uses of integrative complexity by high and low self-monitors. When high self-monitors display integrative complexity, it may, in fact, be in the service of managing impressions. Thus, there should be no relationship between integrative complexity and judgment accuracy. On the other hand, low self-monitors would display integrative complexity in the service making a correct judgment. If integrative complexity does, in fact, involve more vigilant thinking, integrative complexity should be positively related to judgment accuracy for low self-monitors.

Fandt and Ferris (1990) studied the influence of self-monitoring disposition and accountability on tendencies to engage in what they called opportunistic impression management. Specifically, the authors hypothesized that accountability and ambiguity (degree of knowledge about the principal's position) would interact in such a way that high accountability individuals in the low ambiguity condition would engage in the most opportunistic impression management, as compared to other combinations of these two variables. It was also hypothesized that self-monitoring disposition and accountability would interact such that high self-monitors who were held accountable would engage in the most opportunistic impression management, as compared to other combinations of these two variables.
Study participants were customer service employees. They were assigned to one of four conditions in a 2 x 2 x 2 design that varied accountability (high vs. low) as well as ambiguity of the principal's position (high vs. low). Partitioning of high and low self-monitoring groups was conducted by a median-split procedure. Participants were provided with a scenario of a commonly occurring problem in their work area and, because of the absence of their supervisor, were required to generate solutions to the problem. The principal in this study was the individual's supervisor. Accountability was manipulated by indicating to the individual that their performance on this task would be considered as part of their next performance evaluation. Individuals were asked to write a report that explained their decision.

The dependent variable consisted of an index of the nature of statements that were generated by individuals in the written statement regarding their decision. Statements were coded as either "defensive," "negative," "positive," and "open." Opportunistic impression management was defined as sending more positive and defensive information and less negative and open information regarding the position that was taken.

The results indicated that when accountability was high and there was no knowledge of the principal's position, individuals were most likely to emphasize
positive aspects and defensive information regarding the information that they had reached. These effects were more pronounced by high self-monitors. Fandt and Ferris (1990) interpreted these findings in terms of impression management tendencies high of self-monitors.

Using the terminology of the social contingency model, it appears the participants who were exhibiting opportunistic impression management were engaging in defensive bolstering. Recall that defensive bolstering is thought to occur when individuals are held accountable for past behavior. This response is characterized by rigid and defensive thinking that is consistent with one's own expressed position. In the procedures for this study, participants were required to write a report regarding their decision. In order to do this, they had to make their expressed decision prior to actually writing the report. Thus, the report that they were making contained their thoughts that they had after they had made their decision.

In contrast to Fandt and Ferris (1990), the current study examines individuals' responses to accountability when they are allowed to think about their position before expressing it. Thus, the current study had the potential to complement the Fandt and Ferris (1990) study in that, collectively, all of the various permutations of conditions contained in the social contingency model would
have been investigated with regard to differences between high and low self-monitors.

**Applicant Judgment Paradigm**

In the current study, a job applicant judgment paradigm was used to test hypotheses. Participants examined applicant descriptions and made judgments about their suitability for employment. This paradigm was thought to be appropriate because it requires individuals to make judgments that can potentially be based on multidimensional information about each applicant. This multidimensional information can then be used by individuals as they provide justifications for their choices of the most suitable candidate. Also, the applicant descriptions were scaled to reflect varying levels of suitability.

Besides these desirable methodological features, the applicant judgment paradigm also presented an opportunity to study the thought processes used in making judgments about applicants. Recall that integrative complexity is an indicator of the structural characteristics of thoughts. The conclusions made regarding integrative complexity in the current study are also pertinent to thought processes used in making selection decisions under the circumstances manipulated in the study. Typically, researchers who have examined thought processes used in applicant judgment (e.g., Dougherty, Ebert, & Callender,
1986; Graves & Karren, 1992; Valenzi & Andrews, 1973) have
utilized a policy-capturing paradigm (Slovic &
Lichtenstein, 1971).

The policy-capturing paradigm allows the researcher to
determine the relative weights that individuals give to
various dimensions for which they are given information
(e.g., work experience, education level, interpersonal
skills) when they make overall judgments. In order to
determine these weights, study participants make an
overall judgment for each applicant described in a set of
applicant descriptions where all levels of the dimensions
have been fully crossed. For example, if the study is
examining the weights given to five different dimensions
and each dimension has two levels, judgments are made on a
total of 32 applicant descriptions. A regression equation
is then computed for the participant where the dimensions
are the independent variables and the overall applicant
ratings are the dependent variables. The regression
weights reflect the degree to which the participant uses
each of the dimensions in making overall ratings across
applicants.

One limitation of the policy-capturing paradigm is
that the context of this judgment task is its external
validity (Graves & Karren, 1992). Even if participants
are not told initially, it is likely that they eventually
notice that the dimensions are being varied
systematically. In contrast, the current study is a demonstration of an alternative paradigm for studying thought processes used in judging applicants as they occur "in vivo."

Propositions and Hypotheses

The study investigated two propositions and hypotheses pertinent to these propositions. These propositions are based on the above discussions of accountability and self-monitoring disposition.

Proposition 1: Self-monitoring disposition will influence individuals' responses to accountability.

This proposition is based on the notion that accountability imposes social pressures on an individual to either gain approval or avoid disapproval of the principal. Among other things, self-monitors are thought to differ in the importance that they place on behaving in a manner that is normative for a particular situation (Snyder, 1983). The Fandt and Ferris (1990) study concluded an interaction between self-monitoring disposition and accountability. Recall that these results were analyzed in terms of individuals' propensity to explain a decision post-hoc. The current study attempted to determine responses to accountability as they pertain to situations where individuals have the opportunity to think about their judgments prior to making them. The responses to accountability that were investigated
consisted of integrative complexity, time taken, conformity, and judgment accuracy.

**Hypothesis 1:** When held accountable, individuals who are not knowledgeable of the principal's position will show higher integrative complexity than those who are knowledgeable of the principal's position. Integrative complexity will not be influenced by position knowledge when individuals are not held accountable (See Figure 1).

This hypothesized two-way interaction between accountability and knowledge of the principal's position has typically been supported in accountability theory research (Tetlock et al., 1989, 1983a). Because individuals who are held accountable are thought to be responding with social approval motives, knowledge of the principal's position determines how the individual will go about maintaining it. When the principal's position is known, an individual can simply express a position that is consistent with that of the principal without engaging in complex thought. Lacking knowledge of the principal's position, the individual must engage in more complex thought to at least appear to have considered all relevant perspectives and arguments. Although this hypothesis does not address self-monitoring disposition, it is important to test this hypothesis in order to relate the present
Figure 1. Hypothesis 1
study to previous literature. Hypothesis 2 dissects this two-way interaction into a three-way interaction that involves self-monitoring.

**Hypothesis 2:** When held accountable, high self-monitors will show higher integrative complexity when the principal's position is not known than when it is known. On the other hand, low self-monitors' integrative complexity will not be dependent upon accountability or knowledge of the principal's position (See Figure 2).

This hypothesized three-way interaction is based on the notion that high self-monitors would be highly responsive to accountability because of their concerns and ability to maintain social approval. On the other hand, low self-monitors should not be affected by accountability because they are not concerned with maintaining social approval.

**Hypothesis 3:** When held accountable, high self-monitors will spend more time on task when they do not know the principal's position than when they do know the principal's position. Time spent on task by low self-monitors will not be dependent upon accountability or knowledge of the principal's position (See Figure 3).

This interaction is based on previous research which has concluded that time spent on task is affected by
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accountability (Ford & Weldon, 1981; Haccoun & Klimoski, 1975; Klimoski, 1972; McAllister et al., 1979). Greater time spent on task could be interpreted as an indicator of increased vigilance to the task. Consistent with the rationale for hypothesis 2 (maintaining social approval), high self-monitors should respond to accountability, as indicated by time taken to complete the task. On the other hand, low self-monitors' time taken to complete the task should not be influenced by accountability.

**Hypothesis 4:** When held accountable, high self-monitors who know the principal's position will show greater conformity than those who do not. Low self-monitors will not show conformity regardless of accountability or knowledge of the principal's position (See Figure 4).

Recall that, according to the social contingency model, individuals respond to accountability either by altering their thought processes or their expressed position. When the principal's position is known, an obvious way to maintain social approval is to express a position that is consistent with that of the principal. This is not possible, however, when the principal's position is not known.

**Hypothesis 5:** Low self-monitors will make more accurate judgments than high self-monitors.
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Figure 4. Hypothesis 4
Hypotheses 2-4 suggest that high self-monitors are more conscious of social forces during task performance than low self-monitors. In this study, high self-monitors were concerned with a requirement to justify their judgments to someone else. Therefore, during task completion, their attention was focused on maintaining the principal’s approval and performing the task. On the other hand, because low self-monitors are not concerned with maintaining the principal’s approval, they need only focus on task performance. Therefore, high self-monitors would appear to be functioning in a more "distracting" environment than low self-monitors. It is believed that this would detract from the capability of high self-monitors to make accurate judgments.

The second proposition addresses potentially different uses of integratively complex thinking by high and low self-monitors. It states:

**Proposition 2:** High and low self-monitors will differ in their uses of integratively complex thinking.

Recall that the functional value of integratively complex thinking for improving judgment quality is still an unresolved issue. Furthermore, it is uncertain whether individuals engage in more integratively complex thinking as an impression management tactic or as a legitimate attempt to achieve an objectively correct answer. Pertinent to this study, an attempt was made to determine
whether high and low self-monitors differ in their uses of integrative complexity.

It was stated earlier that, for low self-monitors, level of integrative complexity should be affected by neither accountability nor knowledge of the principal's position. Why would low self-monitors ever show integrative complexity? Because low self-monitors are motivated to maintain attitude-behavior consistency, engaging in integratively complex thinking should occur because of perceived importance associated with making accurate judgments (Snyder & Tanke, 1976). If it can be assumed that vigilant thinking does lead to better judgments, integrative complexity and judgment accuracy should be positively related for low self-monitors.

On the other hand, high self-monitors are more concerned with maintaining social approval. As suggested earlier, they are able to adapt their display of integratively complex thinking to cope with the situation. Perhaps, low self-monitors can show integratively complex thinking without using those thoughts to make their judgments.

Based on this rationale, it was hypothesized:

**Hypothesis 6:** Integrative complexity and judgment accuracy will have a stronger relationship for low self-monitors than for high self-monitors.
Exploratory Research Questions

Besides testing the hypotheses indicated above, the data were analyzed to address two other research questions. These questions pertained to: 1) the nature of the relationship between accountability and self-monitoring disposition; and 2) differences between high and low self-monitors in their situational goals within the context of this study. Both of these questions were examined in follow-up analyses because of their potential to explain the hypothesized relationships more precisely. Each question is discussed below.

Relationship Between Accountability and Self-Monitoring. As has been supported by previous research, accountability is a means for heightening the relevance of a situation. Experientially, it is thought to focus attention to the task at hand (Tetlock et al., 1989). The hypotheses of the current study suggest that high and low self-monitors differ in their responses to accountability. A follow-up question is how is it that this occurs. One line of reasoning suggests that accountability has a direct effect on situational relevance for both high and low self-monitors. Thus, differences in behavior between high and low self-monitors occur because of their tendencies to gravitate towards certain types of behavior in situations that have hedonic relevance.
An alternative explanation is that self-monitoring disposition moderates the relationship between accountability and situational relevance. This explanation suggests that low self-monitors experience a lesser degree of situational relevance than do high self-monitors.

To test these alternative explanations, a situational relevance scale was developed and administered in the study.

Differences in Self-Presentational Goals. Although differences in self-monitoring have been found to influence attention and behavioral responses to situational cues, researchers disagree regarding explanations for these differences. One line of reasoning, suggested by Snyder (1987), states that high and low self-monitors may differ in their motivated intentions for self-presentation. Specifically, high self-monitors are thought to be more focused on creating a social image that is consistent with maintaining a positive external image in their current situation. However, their behavior in a particular situation need not correspond to their private thoughts. Snyder (1987) refers to high self-monitors as the "pragmatic self." On the other hand, low self-monitors are less likely to be concerned with external social images and more likely to value congruence between their behavior and private
thoughts. Snyder (1987) refers to low self-monitors as the "principled self."

A motivational explanation of differences in thinking and behavior is offered in terms of examining different audiences to whom self-presentation occurs. Greenwald and Breckler (1985) have suggested that audiences for self-presentation may either include other people (social orientation) or one's self (personal orientation). According to this perspective, self-monitoring is conceptualized as a single dimension with social orientation (high self-monitors) and personal orientation (low self-monitors) as the ends of a single continuum.

An alternative line of reasoning, suggested by Schlenker and Weigold (1992), proposes that self-monitoring reflects a single dimension, social orientation. Thus, low self-monitoring is interpreted as lack of social orientation, but not necessarily as high personal orientation. Lamphere and Leary (1990) examined this proposition by examining the factor structure of a number of private and public self-process measures such as the Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974), the public and private subscales of the Self-Consciousness Scale (Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975), and the social and personal identity subscales from the Aspects of Identity Questionnaire (Cheek, 1982). The results indicated that the other-directedness subscale of the Self-Monitoring
Scale loaded positively on the social orientation factor. The other two subscales, extraversion and acting, loaded positively onto a third factor that was distinct from either the personal orientation or social orientation factor. The researchers interpret these results as evidence that high and low self-monitoring are distinct traits, social and personal orientation, respectively. Furthermore, they concluded that the items on the Self-Monitoring Scale only reflect the trait that suggests a social orientation. Therefore, this implies that individuals who score low on the Self-Monitoring Scale should not necessarily be considered to have a high personal orientation.

These alternative explanations of self-monitoring suggest differences in the degree to which self-monitoring reflects separate dimensions. For the current study, it was thought to be helpful to generate support for one of these explanations in the service of explaining high and low self-monitors' behavior more precisely. To do this, the situational goals of study participants were examined. Adopting Snyder's (1987) perspective, it could be argued that self-presentation goals differ between high and low self-monitors. High self-monitors' self-presentation goals are more likely to focus on creating a social image that is consistent with maintaining a positive external image in their current situation. On the other hand, low
self-monitors are less likely to be concerned with external social images and more likely to value the congruence between their own behavior and private thoughts (Snyder, 1987; Snyder et al., 1976).

The alternative explanation could be that high and low self-monitors differ only in their focus on maintaining a positive external image. Therefore, their internal image is irrelevant.

These explanations were examined in the current study. The theoretical basis for doing so was Greenwald’s (1982; et al., 1985) work regarding ego-task analysis. According to this perspective, tasks in which an individual is engaged can either be seen as either socially (impression management) or internally oriented (self-image orientation). Further, Greenwald suggests that identifying whether an individual is engaging in either a social or internally-oriented task could be determined by asking individuals to describe their current goals. However, this approach assumes that individuals are able and willing to verbalize their goals accurately.

A less direct alternative that was used in the current study was to ask participants indicate what type of feedback that they would be interested in receiving after they have completed the task to be done. If individuals are, in fact, attempting to achieve certain goals, it is likely that specific types of feedback would
appear to be highly desirable. For example, individuals who are focused primarily on social goals would request feedback that consists of normative information of how others similar to them have performed or others' impressions of their performance on the task. On the other hand, individuals who are focused on making a correct decision (i.e. personal orientation) would be more likely to request feedback that focuses on actual task performance. Snyder (1981) has argued that examinations of individual difference x situation interactions need to incorporate methodologies that allow individuals to make choices regarding their environment. In the present study, individuals were given choices regarding feedback preferences, which were expected to be related to self-monitoring disposition.

**Other Follow-Up Analyses.** Because the opportunity presented itself, other follow-up analyses were conducted to determine: a) other predictors of integrative complexity and b) differences between high and low self-monitors for which hypotheses were not formulated.
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METHOD

Overview

The experiment consisted of a 2 x 2 x 2 between-subjects factorial design. The independent variables in the experiment were: 1) self-monitoring disposition (high vs. low), 2) accountability (yes vs. no), and 3) knowledge of the principal's position (known vs. unknown). This experimental design was chosen because of Tetlock et al.'s (1989) suggestion to use high and low individual difference scores as classification factors to produce a more powerful research design. The first variable was measured via the Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974). The other two variables were manipulated during the experiment.

The subjects' task consisted of a job applicant judgment task that is similar to one used by previous researchers (Brooks, 1992; McDonald & Hakel, 1985). This task requires participants to put themselves in the position of someone who is selecting among applicants for residence hall advisor (R.A.) positions. There were a set of seven applicant descriptions that were used as stimulus materials.
The dependent variables were: 1) integrative complexity of a protocol written by participants; 2) time taken to complete the rating task; 3) conformity (as assessed by suitability ratings for the principal's preferred applicant; and 4) judgment accuracy (as assessed by suitability ratings for the objectively most suitable applicant).

Additional variables that were measured included situational relevance and preferences for normative and task-related feedback.

Subjects

Two hundred twenty introductory psychology undergraduate students participated as an option for earning required course points. During the first week of the quarter, potential participants were pre-screened via the Self-Monitoring Scale (See Appendix A). The eligibility requirements for the study included: a) a score of 12 or higher (high self-monitors) or 7 or lower (low self-monitors) on the eighteen-item Self-Monitoring Scale, and b) current or previous residence in an Ohio State University (OSU) residence hall. The first requirement was based on normative data associated with the Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1987). The second requirement was based on the belief that it was important for individuals to have some familiarity with the position of residence advisor. Because residence advisors are
employed in all OSU residence halls, this requirement assured at least minimal familiarity. Eligible students were solicited for participation and scheduled by telephone.

Students participated in the experiment in small groups that ranged from 1-3 participants. Participants were scheduled according to their own availability. Three participants were scheduled for each session, however, cancellations and absences occurred frequently.

Procedure

Participants were given the following introductory comments by a male experimenter (See Appendix B for experiment scripts). Participants were instructed that they were participating in a study that was being jointly sponsored by the Psychology Department and the OSU Department of Residence and Dining Halls. Furthermore, they were participating in a study that was attempting to determine whether undergraduate students could provide valuable input in making resident advisor selection decisions. The results of the study would be used by the Department of Residence and Dining Halls to determine whether the process for hiring R.A.’s should allow for student input.

After these introductory comments, participants received instructions for performing the R.A. selection task. These instructions also contained the inductions
for both accountability and knowledge of principal's position. Participants were instructed that they would be examining a set of R.A. applicant summaries and rating the suitability of the applicants (See Appendix C for applicant summaries and rating scale). Participants were instructed to: 1) examine the set of applicant summaries; 2) decide which applicant is most suitable for the position and write down the thoughts that they have about that applicant; and 3) rate all seven applicants using a 1-7 the suitability scale. It was emphasized to participants to proceed in this order. These instructions were repeated just before participants began the R.A. selection task.

After the instructions had been given, participants were told to complete the "Instructions Questionnaire" (See Appendix D) under the guise that this was being done to make sure that the instructions for the R.A. selection task were clear. This questionnaire, in fact, contained situational relevance measures. Upon completion of the "Instructions Questionnaire," participants were told not put their names on this questionnaire and to place it face-down in front of them.

Following completion of the "Instructions Questionnaire," the participants were asked if they had any questions. Participants were then led into an area of the experiment room that consisted of four separate break-
out rooms. Each participant was instructed to select one of the rooms, close the door behind them, and begin working on the R.A. selection task. Participants then completed the task independently.

When they had finished the R.A. selection task, participants in the accountability condition were told to slide the form that contained their applicant suitability ratings under the door. Participants in the not accountable conditions were told to open the door to the room in which they were working after they had finished the task. The rationale for these different instructions was relevant to the accountability manipulation, which is explained below.

After all participants completed the rating task, they were asked to complete the "Post-Task Survey" (See Appendix E). This instrument contained manipulation checks and measures of feedback preferences.

After completion of the "Post-Task Survey", participants were instructed to congregate at the area where they were given instructions for the experiment. It was at this time that participants were debriefed and informed of the actual purpose of the experiment.

**Manipulations**

**Accountability.** Accountability was manipulated by incorporating into the experiment script several elements that made it evident to participants that they would have
to justify their judgment of the most suitable applicant. During the task instructions, a confederate knocked on the door and the experimenter opened the door and, out of sight to the participants, engaged in a brief conversation with the confederate. The experimenter later explained to the participants that the person at the door was Jerry/Jeri Wilier, the assistant hall director with whom they would be talking. The gender of the confederate was randomly assigned. Furthermore, the experimenter mentioned that they would be speaking with Jerry/Jeri Wilier after they completed the selection task.

As an additional attempt to manipulate accountability, participants were told that there probably would not be enough time for the assistant hall director to speak with each of them. In order to decide who would speak with the assistant hall director, participants were told that there would be an index card at the desk at which they would be working. This index card indicated the order in which the participant would be speaking to the assistant hall director. In reality, all of the index cards indicated that the participant would be speaking first with the assistant hall director. Participants were also told that the assistant hall director would need some time to examine the suitability ratings for the R.A. applicants before coming to talk with them. With this being the case, participants were told to put their names
on the suitability rating sheet and slide it under the door along with the index card that indicated when they would speaking with the assistant hall director.

In the no accountability condition, it was mentioned to participants that an assistant hall director named Jerry/Jeri Wilier would examine the suitability ratings, however, he/she would not do this until the end of the quarter when all of the sessions of the experiment had been completed. Also, they were told not to place their names on the rating sheet so that their responses would not be traceable to them personally.

**Position Knowledge.** Knowledge of the principal's position was manipulated by having the experimenter provide information, albeit seemingly extemporaneously, regarding the assistant hall director's preference for R.A. candidates who are sophomores. A rationale was provided that sophomores make preferable candidates because the R.A. job is complex, and thus, the first year is used for training and development. This particular characteristic was selected because a pilot study found that the mean importance rating for this characteristic was moderate, however, the standard deviation was relatively high (See Appendix F). This would suggest that this characteristic is marginally related to being a qualified R.A. At the same time, it is not such an irrelevant characteristic that it would be automatically
discounted by participants. Only one of the applicant summaries described a sophomore applicant.

**Dependent Variables**

**Integrative Complexity.** As part of the R.A. selection task, participants wrote their thoughts regarding the applicant that they felt to be most suitable for the position. In the task instructions, all participants were informed that their written thoughts would be kept confidential. This is an important point because it was essential that participants were be able to write their thoughts prior to committing to a public position, as would occur when they rated the suitability of all applicants.

These protocols were scored for integrative complexity (Baker-Brown et al., 1988) by three trained scorers who were blind to the experimental condition of each participant. Furthermore, scoring was conducted on verbatim, typed versions of the written passages.

**Time on Task.** Time taken to complete the R.A. selection task was being recorded unobtrusively. The time taken consisted of the time from which the participants closed the door to their break-out room and concluded when they either opened the door to the room or slid their suitability ratings sheet underneath the door. Therefore, this assessment of time taken would pertain to writing
thoughts about their own preferred applicant and assigning suitability ratings to all seven applicants.

Conformity. Conformity was assessed through the suitability rating given to the applicant who was a sophomore (Applicant 34).

Judgment Accuracy. Judgment accuracy was assessed through the suitability rating for the applicant that was objectively most suitable (Applicant 28) as determined by pilot research (See pilot study results in Appendix G). Judgment accuracy was assessed by the suitability rating, and also, by a categorical variable that indicated whether a participant assigned the highest rating to this particular applicant.

Measured Variables

Manipulation Checks. Manipulation checks for accountability and knowledge of the principal’s position were contained in the "Post-Task Survey." The manipulation checks for accountability consisted of the following items.

8. Just prior to beginning the R.A. judgment task, did you believe that (check one):

_____ you would have to report to the assistant hall director and justify your judgments and ratings.

_____ you would not have to report to the assistant hall director and justify your judgments and ratings.

_____ you can’t recall.
9. In which order will you be reporting to the assistant hall director when you have completed this form?:

______ First
______ Second
______ Third
______ I won’t be reporting to the assistant hall director at any time.
______ I don’t recall.

The manipulation checks for knowledge of the principal’s position consisted of the following items.

10. Just prior to beginning the R.A judgment task, you were told that the assistant hall director had a preference for candidates with a specific:

______ high school activity.
______ college GPA.
______ major.
______ class rank (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior).
______ work experience.
______ No mention was made of the assistant hall director’s preferences.

11. Just prior to beginning the R.A. judgment task, the experimenter told you that he personally has a preference for candidates with a specific:

______ high school activity.
______ college GPA.
______ major.
______ class rank (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior).
______ kind of work experience.
______ The experimenter did not mention his own preferences.
Situational Relevance. The items that assessed situational relevance were contained in the "Instructions Questionnaire." Only five of the thirteen items pertained to situational relevance. The remaining items served as distractors. All items were rated on a 1-7 scale, where 1 = "not at all" and 7 = "to a great extent." The following items pertained to situational relevance.

5. To what extent is your performance on this task meaningful to you?
6. To what extent will this task be pleasurable to you?
7. How important is it to you to do well on this task?
9. To what extent does this task make you feel anxious?
10. To what extent will your performance on this task indicate something important about you?
12. To what extent will your performance on this task affect your opinion about yourself?

Feedback Preferences. Preferences for normative and task-based performance feedback were assessed with items 7a. through 7d. on the "Post-Task Survey." These items were used to infer self-presentational goals of individuals. They were introduced by the following scenario and appeared as follows.

7. We will be doing a number of studies similar to this one in the near future. However, participants in those experiments will be able to actually get feedback on how well they performed this task.
Although we can’t do it for this experiment, we are interested in knowing what kind of feedback students such as yourself would prefer to receive. Using the scale below, indicate how much you would have preferred to receive each of the following types of feedback, if you had the option.

5 = Very Much Prefer
4 = Prefer
3 = Prefer Somewhat
2 = Prefer a Little
1 = Don’t Prefer

_____ a. How your ratings compared to other study participants.

_____ b. The assistant hall director’s evaluations of the candidates.

_____ c. What the assistant hall director thought about your ratings and reasons for those ratings.

_____ d. The actual on-the-job performance ratings of the candidates that were eventually hired compared to your ratings.
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RESULTS

Subjects

A total of 220 subjects participated in the experiment. All participants were chosen via prescreening with the eighteen-item Self-Monitoring Scale. Recall that only students with a score of 12 or above (high SM) or 7 or below (low SM) were eligible to participate in the experiment. An additional requirement for participation was current or previous residence in an OSU residence hall. Table 1 provides descriptive information about participants. The typical participant was a freshman who had lived less than 1 year in the residence hall.

Participants were randomly assigned to treatment. However, the absenteeism rate was approximately 40% throughout the experiment. Attempts were made to contact and re-schedule those who did not report to the experiment the first time. With this being the case, it was difficult to control the influx of participants into each experiment treatment. The result of this difficulty was cells with unequal sample sizes. The cell sizes for the whole sample are listed in Table 2.
Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Demographic Information on Total Sample

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>55% Female</td>
<td>45% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Rank</td>
<td>75% Freshman</td>
<td>16% Sophomore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Residence</td>
<td>81% in OSU Residence Halls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years in</td>
<td>84% Less Than 1 Year</td>
<td>11% Between 1-2 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Counseling Experience</td>
<td>7% With Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Self-Monitoring Score</td>
<td>Low: 5.18, S.D. = 1.72</td>
<td>High: 13.73, S.D. = 1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 220*
Table 2

Cell Frequencies for Full Sample Broken Down by Self-Monitoring Disposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Principal’s Position</th>
<th>Known</th>
<th>Not Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountable</td>
<td>High: 28</td>
<td>High: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 31</td>
<td>Low: 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Accountable</td>
<td>High: 23</td>
<td>High: 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 27</td>
<td>Low: 34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 220 participants
Manipulation Checks

Accountability

Above, it was reported that a total of 220 subjects participated in the experiment. Review of responses to manipulation checks for the accountability condition found that a substantial number of participants did not respond to these items as expected. The manipulation checks are items 8 and 9 of the "Post-Task Survey." For the accountable condition, the expected responses for items 8 and 9 would be "1" and "1" respectively. For the not accountable condition, the expected responses for items 8 and 9 would be "2" and "4."

Deletion of data from participants who did not respond as expected resulted in a total sample size of 165. This number represents a deletion rate of 25%. Table 3 indicates the cell frequencies after deletion and the percentage deleted from the total sample. A chi-square analysis determined that high self-monitors who were accountable to a principal with an unknown position were more likely to be dropped from the sample than would be expected by chance ($X^2 = 7.67, p < .01$).

Why there was such a failure to respond appropriately to the inductions? There are several plausible reasons for this. One of the reasons may have been that some participants were not convinced of the deceptive cover story. Overall, high self-monitoring disposition was
Table 3

Cell Frequencies After Deletion of Data Based on Manipulation Checks (Broken Down by Self-Monitoring Disposition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Principal’s Position</th>
<th>Known</th>
<th>Not Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountable</td>
<td>High: 22 (21%)*</td>
<td>High: 12 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 24 (22%)</td>
<td>Low: 19 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Accountable</td>
<td>High: 22 (4%)</td>
<td>High: 23 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 24 (11%)</td>
<td>Low: 29 (15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Numbers in parentheses indicate the percentage of the original sample that was deleted based on the manipulation checks.
related to being deleted from the sample ($r = .17$, $p < .01$). This finding is consistent with previous research that has concluded that high self-monitors are more successful at detecting deception than low self-monitors (Geizer et al., 1977).

A second reason may be that the cover story may have been too complex and detailed for some participants to understand. Although the cover story was developed iteratively through pilot research, it is possible that the inductions may have been too subtle to be effective for some participants. Even a scenario thought to have a high probability of creating a successful induction may not necessarily be effective in all instances.

A third reason is that the manipulation check items may have caused a reactance effect for some of the participants. The items themselves may have cued participants to the actual purpose of the study, which was different from what they were told in the cover story. It is possible that once participants began to answer these items, they became aware of the actual purpose of the study and were not willing to admit being deceived.

A fourth reason suggests differential reactions by participants to male and female principals. Recall that gender of the principal was randomized in the study. Participants who were in a condition involving a female principal (assistant hall director) were more likely to
fail to respond correctly to the inductions ($r = .14, p < .05$). It is important to note that this finding pertains to participants in both the accountable and not accountable conditions. Furthermore, participant gender was not related to deletion from the sample. Thus, gender effects pertain to the gender of the principal and not of the participant.

Each of the above are plausible explanations for failure to respond appropriately to the inductions. However, detailed discussion of this issue is tangential to the specific hypotheses being tested. Thus, a decision was made to include in hypothesis tests only those participants who responded appropriately to both manipulation check items. This decision rule assures testing hypotheses from subjects who are both convinced of and understand the accountability induction. Evidence that such was the case with participants in the altered sample is provided by an examination of responses to item 3 of the "Post-Task Survey." This item asked participants to indicate the extent to which the thought crossed their mind that they would be explaining their applicant ratings to an assistant hall director. Participants in the accountable conditions reported that this occurred to a greater extent than participants in the not accountable conditions (Means = 5.10 vs. 3.49, $t(162) = 2.97, p < .001$).
An examination of demographic information indicates no substantive differences between the full sample and the altered sample (See Table 4). The altered sample percentages for sex, class rank, current residence status, number of years in the residence hall, and peer counseling experience are almost identical to those of the total sample.

Knowledge of the Principal's Position. Manipulation checks for knowledge of the principal's position consisted of items 5, 6, 10, and 11 of the "Post-Task Survey." The objective of including this set of manipulation checks was to be able to demonstrate that participants were aware of the assistant hall director's candidate preferences and that these were, in fact, attributable to the assistant hall director and not the experimenter.

After 80 participants had participated in the experiment, it was found that participants in the unknown position condition did not differ significantly from those in the known condition in their responses to item 5. This is not to say that the induction itself was not effective, but instead, it was felt that the focus of the questions was too general. It was believed by the principal investigator that participants were relying on their general impression of an assistant hall director to answer this question rather than using specific information that was provided in this experiment. For this reason, items
Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Demographic Variables (After Deletion)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td>53% Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Rank</strong></td>
<td>74% Freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16% Sophomore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% All Others Combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Residence</strong></td>
<td>81% in OSU Residence Halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Years in</strong></td>
<td>84% Less Than 1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence Hall</strong></td>
<td>11% Between 1-2 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5% 2 or more Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer Counseling Experience</strong></td>
<td>8% With Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Self-Monitoring Score</strong></td>
<td>Low: 5.16, S.D. = 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High: 13.72, S.D. = 1.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 165*
10 and 11 were added to directly assess participants' awareness of information that was provided by the experimenter regarding the assistant hall director's purported candidate preferences.

Table 5 contains descriptive statistics for the manipulation check items. Although responses to items 5 and 6 trended as expected, the between-group differences for item 5 were minimal. On the other hand, the responses to items 10 and 11 provide more unequivocal evidence regarding participants' awareness (or lack thereof) of the principal's specific position. Furthermore, participants in the knowledgeable condition were able to distinguish between the principal's position and any that could be attributable to the experimenter.

**Experimental Variables**

In this section, the variables involved in the tests of hypotheses will be described with regard to development of measures, descriptive statistics, and their intercorrelations.

**Integrative Complexity**

The written protocols completed by participants regarding their most preferred applicant were scored for integrative complexity by three trained raters. The raters used the 7-point scoring system described in the manual by Baker-Brown et al. (1989). The lowest level of integrative complexity is a score of 1 while the highest
Table 5  
Means for Manipulation Checks for Knowledge of Principal’s Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent do you think you know the kind of candidate the assistant hall director prefers?</td>
<td>2.94*</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent do you know the kind of candidate that the experimenter preferred?</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequencies and Percentage of Responses Within Each Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Principal’s Position:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. ... you were told that the assistant hall director had a preference for candidates with a specific:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Rank</td>
<td>65 (93%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No mention of preferences</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>68 (99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Response Options</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ... the experimenter told you that he personally has a preference for candidates with a specific:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Rank</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No mention of preferences</td>
<td>68 (97%)</td>
<td>68 (99%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 108; b*n = 106

* Responses to items 5 and 6 were both on a 1-7 scale in which 1 = "clear idea" and 7 = "don’t really know."
level is a score of 7. Appendix H contains an explanation of this scoring system.

Integrative complexity scores were assigned in the following manner. Group scoring sessions took place once a week over a total of seven weeks. Each scoring session lasted for approximately 3 hours. Scorers independently examined each written protocol and rated its integrative complexity without discussion with the other scorers. After a set of protocols had been rated (in most cases 10), the scorers compared their ratings. For those protocols where all three raters agreed on the integrative complexity score, that specific score would be used in data analyses. For those protocols where there was disagreement, the raters discussed their individual scores to reach a consensus. Apparently, scoring disagreements are common occurrences for integrative complexity (Baker-Brown et al., 1989; Gruenfeld et al., 1993). Although the scoring manual prescribes either using a majority vote or averaging of scores to assign a final score, it was felt that using a consensus rule would yield more accurate score assignment.

Furthermore, forty-five protocols were re-scored approximately three weeks following initial scoring for the purpose of calculating a test-retest reliability. Protocols were being re-scored simultaneously with protocols that were being scored for the first time.
Although the raters were not told which protocols were being re-scored, in some cases they did indicate being aware that they were re-scoring a particular protocol.

**Interrater Agreement.** Table 6 shows the interrater agreement for scores determined independently by each rater and the correlations with final scores that were collectively determined. With one exception, the interrater correlations and correlations with the final score were above .80. For this reason, it was felt that the final scores that were attained would be appropriate for testing hypotheses.

**Test-Retest Reliability.** As was indicated above, forty-five of the protocols were scored a second time to determine test-retest reliability. The correlation between final scores at time 1 and time 2 was .45 (p < .01). Although this relationship is statistically significant, it can hardly be interpreted as convincing evidence of reliability over time. The implications of this finding will be discussed in the Discussion chapter.

**Applicant Ratings**

Table 7 shows the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the set of seven R.A. applicant suitability ratings. Applicant 28 was determined to be most suitable applicant via a pilot study. Applicant 34 possessed the characteristic (sophomore rank) that was disclosed to subjects in the known position condition as
Table 6

Interrater Agreements for Integrative Complexity Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rater 1</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Time 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rater 2</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Time 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rater 3</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Time 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Final Score</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Time 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rater 1</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Time 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rater 2</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Time 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rater 3</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Time 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Final Score</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Time 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. For Time 1 ratings, n = 209. For Time 2 ratings, n = 45. All correlations are significant at p < .01.
Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Applicant Suitability Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 (Pref.)</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 (Suit.)</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** N = 165 participants. Range for Suitability Rating Scale is 1-7 with 1 = Highly Unsuitable and 7 = Highly Suitable.

*p < .05. **p < .01.
the principal's preference. Overall, applicant 28 had the highest mean rating while Applicant 34 had the fourth highest mean rating. Furthermore, with the exception of applicant 71, the intercorrelations for applicant ratings were not significant.

Table 8 shows the frequency with which each applicant was rated highest by participants. There was little variability in that 76% of participants assigned their highest rating to applicant 28, the objectively most suitable applicant.

Experiment Variables

Table 9 shows means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the dependent variables. Protocol length is included in this table for the purpose of examining its relationship to integrative complexity. Among the dependent variables, only the correlation between integrative complexity score and time spent on task was statistically significant. However, the magnitude of this correlation was low ($r = .19, p < .05$). This finding was an important consideration in determining which analysis strategy would be most appropriate for testing hypotheses. This is discussed further in the section reporting the results of the hypothesis tests.
Table 8

Frequencies of Highest Ratings Given to Each Applicant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

Correlations Among Experiment Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Integrative Complexity Score</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rating for Most Suitable Applicant (Applicant 28)</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rating for Most Preferred Applicant (Applicant 34)</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Time on Task (in seconds)</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Written Protocol Length (in lines)</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Note. N = 165 participants
Tests of Hypotheses

The dependent variables of the study were: a) scores of integrative complexity; b) time on task; c) suitability rating of the principal’s most preferred applicant (conformity); and d) and suitability ratings of the most suitable applicant (judgment accuracy). Hypotheses 1-5 involved tests of prediction models using separate Analyses of Variance (ANOVA). Because the analyses involve multiple dependent variables, an option could have been to conduct Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA). MANOVA is particular useful when the dependent variables are correlated (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Grablowsky, 1979). However, it was found in the analyses above that the dependent variables were not significantly correlated. Harwell (1988) has suggested that a prerequisite for performing MANOVA is that the dependent variables are correlated with one another. With this being the case, the prediction of each dependent variable was tested with a separate ANOVA model.

Hypotheses 1 and 2

Hypotheses 1 and 2 addressed the influences of self-monitoring, accountability, and knowledge of the principal’s position on the dependent variable of integrative complexity. Hypothesis 1 posits a two-way interaction between accountability and knowledge of the principal’s position. Hypothesis 2 posits a three-way
interaction between accountability, knowledge of the principal’s position, and self-monitoring disposition.

Table 10 shows the results of the three-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) that tested these two hypotheses. Neither hypothesis 1 or hypothesis 2 were supported. However, the two-way interaction between position knowledge and self-monitoring disposition approached statistical significance (p = .07). Although this relationship was not hypothesized, the nature of this interaction was examined further for the purpose of identifying the source of this trend.

Figure 5 shows the cell means for the self-monitoring x position knowledge interaction. A post-hoc Tukey Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) range test was performed on cell means to determine significant group differences. The shortest significant difference range at the .05 alpha level is .47. None of the post-hoc comparisons were found to be statistically significant. However, one of the mean comparisons did approach a significance. In the known position condition, low self-monitors displayed higher integrative complexity than high self-monitors.

In summary, hypothesis 1 was not supported. Hypothesis 2 was supported to some extent, as indicated by a two-way interaction between self-monitoring disposition and position knowledge that approached statistical
# Table 10

## ANOVA to Test the Prediction of Integrative Complexity

**Dependent Variable = Integrative Complexity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>1.688</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Knowledge</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Accountability</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Knowledge x Accountability</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>1.195</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Position Knowledge</td>
<td>2.195</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.195</td>
<td>3.298</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Accountability x Position Knowledge</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>5.333</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>104.521</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109.854</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 165 participants

* p < .08.
Figure 5. Self-Monitoring x Position Knowledge Interaction
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significance. A pattern of results similar to these was hypothesized for the accountable condition. However, these results were found irrespective of accountability.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 posited a three-way interaction between accountability, knowledge of the principal’s position, and self-monitoring in predicting time on task. Table 11 contains the results of this analysis. The three-way interaction was not found to be significant, $F(1, 157) = .812, ns$. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 posited a three-way interaction between accountability, knowledge of the principal’s position, and self-monitoring in predicting conformity, as indicated by the suitability rating of the principal’s preferred applicant (applicant 34). The results of this analysis appear in Table 12. The three-way interaction was not significant, $F(1,157) = .000, ns$. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

The accountability x position knowledge interaction approached statistical significance ($p = .07$). The cell means for these groups are plotted in Figure 6. Although this two-way interaction was not expected, it was further examined with a post-hoc Tukey HSD range test. The shortest significant difference range at the .05 alpha
# Table 11

**ANOVA to Test the Prediction of Time on Task**

**Dependent Variable = Time Taken (In Seconds)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring</td>
<td>2487</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2487</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>112283</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112283</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Knowledge</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Accountability</td>
<td>9209</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9209</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Knowledge x Accountability</td>
<td>116244</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11624</td>
<td>2.415</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Position Knowledge</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Accountability x Position Knowledge</td>
<td>36016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36016</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>306352</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43764</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>7556551</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>48130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7862904</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>479444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** N = 165 participants
Table 12

ANOVA to Test the Prediction of Conformity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring</td>
<td>2.478</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.478</td>
<td>1.555</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Knowledge</td>
<td>1.728</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.728</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Accountability</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Knowledge x Accountability</td>
<td>5.114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.114</td>
<td>3.208</td>
<td>.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Position Knowledge</td>
<td>2.485</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.458</td>
<td>1.559</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Accountability x Position Knowledge</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>12.994</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.856</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>250.244</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1.594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>263.238</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1.605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  N = 165 participants

*p < .08.
Figure 6. Accountability x Position Knowledge Interaction
level is .73. None of the between-group comparisons yielded significant differences. The longest range difference was between the not accountable, position known condition and the not accountable, position unknown condition. These results would suggest that individuals who are not held accountable and know the principal's position are most likely to show conformity.

**Hypothesis 5**

Hypothesis 5 posited that low self-monitors would give higher suitability ratings to the most suitable applicant than high self-monitors. The ANOVA model used to test this hypothesis contained the independent variables of self-monitoring, accountability, and position knowledge (See Table 13). The analyses indicated that high and low self-monitors did not differ in their ratings of the most suitable applicant. In fact, as noted earlier, most participants selected the nominally most suitable applicant. Hypothesis 5 was not supported.

**Hypothesis 6**

Hypothesis 6 posited that integrative complexity and judgment accuracy will have a higher relationship for low self-monitors than for high self-monitors. This hypothesis was tested by conducting t-tests of Fisher r-to-z transformations of the correlations between integrative complexity and judgment accuracy within each group. Judgment accuracy was operationalized in two
Table 13

ANOVA to Test the Prediction of Judgment Accuracy

Dependent Variable = Judgment Accuracy (As indicated by ratings of the most suitable applicant, #28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring</td>
<td>1.257</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.257</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Knowledge</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Accountability</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Knowledge x Accountability</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Position Knowledge</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Accountability x Position Knowledge</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>5.019</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>142.957</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147.976</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 165 participants
different ways: a) rating for the most suitable applicant (applicant 28) and b) whether or not the most suitable applicant was given the highest rating (yes vs. no). A separate analysis was to be conducted for each of these operationalizations.

Table 14 shows the correlations between integrative complexity and judgment accuracy broken down by self-monitoring disposition. An examination of these correlations suggests that there is no relationship between integrative complexity and judgment accuracy within each condition. With this being the case, it made little sense to perform r-to-z transformations. Hypothesis 6 was not supported.

Ancillary Analyses

As was indicated in the introduction, ancillary analyses were also conducted. These analyses examined these additional research questions: a) the nature of the relationship between accountability and self-monitoring disposition; b) differences between high and low self-monitors in regard to their situational goals; c) other predictors of integrative complexity besides the independent variables in the experiment; and d) non-hypothesized differences between high and low self-monitors.
Table 14

Correlations Between Integrative Complexity and Judgment Accuracy Broken Down by Condition

For Low Self-Monitors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Integrative Complexity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rating for Most Suitable Applicant (#28)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Choosing the Most Suitable Applicant (yes vs. no)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For High Self-Monitors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Integrative Complexity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rating for Most Suitable Applicant (#28)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Choosing the Most Suitable Applicant (yes vs. no)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01.
Relationship Between Accountability and Self-Monitoring

Recall that one of the questions raised in the introduction addressed the nature of the relationship between accountability and self-monitoring disposition. One perspective on their relationship is that high and low self-monitors are both equally responsive to accountability pressures in the sense that it produces situational relevance. The alternative explanation is that only high self-monitors experience heightened situational relevance when held accountable. To test these alternative propositions, a measure of situational relevance was developed for the purposes of the study. The development of this measure is described below.

The "Instructions Questionnaire" contained items that would be used to assess situational relevance as perceived by participants prior to task performance. The items that were thought to be pertinent to this construct include items 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 12. The other items served as distractor items. The means, standard deviations, correlations for all items in this questionnaire are indicated in Table 15.

In general, the items that are pertinent to situational relevance were significantly correlated with one another and not correlated with other items. To explore the relationship among these items further, an exploratory principal axis factor analysis with orthogonal
rotation was performed for all thirteen items on the "Instructions Questionnaire." It was expected that the situational relevance items would load onto the first factor and the other items would load onto other factors. However, these additional factors were not interpreted. The decision used for selecting items for the situational relevance factor required a high loading on the first factor and loadings close to zero for the other factors. This decision rule is consistent with the criteria for simple structure developed by Thurstone (1947, as cited by Rummel, 1970).

The results of this analysis appear in Table 16. The items thought to be related to situational relevance loaded onto the first factor, which accounted for 28% of total variance. Unexpectedly, item 12 did not exhibit a high factor loading on the first factor while item 11 did. With this being the case, a reliability analysis was computed for a scale consisting of items 5, 6, 7, 10, and 11 (See Table 17). The coefficient alpha for the situational relevance scale was .81. An internal consistency of at least .80 is seen as acceptable for making an argument that a scale measures a single construct. Therefore, these items were combined to form the situational relevance scale used in subsequent analyses.
Table 15

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Among "Instructions Questionnaire" Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 165

All items are on a 1-7 scale with "1" indicating a "Not At All" and a "7" indicating "To a Great Extent."

*p < .05. **p < .01.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.
Table 16

**Principal Axis Factor Loadings For Initial Questionnaire Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>-.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>-.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>-.094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalues 3.699 1.730 1.307

Percentage of Variance Accounted For 28.5 13.3 10.1

*Note. N = 220 participants*
Table 17

Reliability Analysis for Situational Relevance Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Alpha If Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficient Alpha = .81

Note. N = 219 participants
Subsequently, a two-way analysis of variance was performed to test the relationship between self-monitoring disposition and accountability. Situational relevance was the dependent variable. The ANOVA results are found in Table 18. In this case, neither self-monitoring disposition nor accountability significantly influenced situational relevance.

Differences in Situational Goals

An additional follow-up analysis examined differences between high and low self-monitors as indicated by situational goals. As was mentioned in the introduction, measuring these types of goals is problematic. Therefore, goals that imply a social orientation or personal orientation were inferred by individuals' feedback preferences. Conceptually, it was believed that individuals whose goals were socially-oriented would be more likely to prefer normative feedback about task performance. This would most likely be the case with high self-monitors. On the other hand, individuals whose goals were personally-oriented would be more likely to prefer task-referenced feedback. This would give them feedback that is more inherent to the task itself. It was expected that this would be likely to be the case with low self-monitors.
Table 18

ANOVA to Test the Prediction of Situational Relevance

Dependent Variable = Situational Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring</td>
<td>7.819</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.819</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Accountability</td>
<td>15.108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.108</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>22.440</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.480</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>4253.160</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>26.417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4275.600</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>26.071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 165 participants
Feedback preferences were assessed by items 7a. to 7d. of the "Post-Task Survey." Although feedback preferences were conceptualized as either normative or task-referenced, the positive intercorrelations among the four measures do not necessarily suggest that they are distinct (See Table 19). A coefficient alpha for these four items was .72, which is slightly below the accepted standard for a scale (.80). This is an important implication for this study because the intent of using these measures was to be able to distinctly categorize participants as either having goals with a social or personal orientation. With this being the case, these measures should be regarded as indicators of overall preferences for feedback.

Because the opportunity presented itself, an analysis was conducted to determine the extent to which self-monitoring disposition and accountability explained the degree of preference for feedback. A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted because the dependent variables, normative and task-referenced feedback, were positively correlated ($r = .50, p < .01$). The independent variables were self-monitoring and accountability.

The results of the MANOVA are found in Table 20. The multivariate tests for self-monitoring,
Table 19

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Feedback Preference Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Own ratings compared to other participants.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. Assistant hall director's evaluations of the candidates.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Assistant hall director's thoughts about own ratings.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Actual on-the-job performance ratings.</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficient Alpha = .72

Note. N = 218 participants. All correlations are significant at p < .01 level.
accountability, and their interaction were not significant (See Table 20). Furthermore, the univariate F-tests conducted for each dependent variable were not significant. However, there was a finding that warranted further attention. The self-monitoring x accountability interaction approached statistical significance (p = .06) for predicting task-referenced feedback. Figure 7 shows a plot of cell means. A Tukey HSD post-hoc range test was performed to determine whether any of the cell means differed significantly from one another. The shortest significant difference range at the .05 alpha level is .94. None of the cell differences were found to be significant. However, the largest cell difference indicated that high self-monitors in the accountable condition preferred more task-based feedback than low self-monitors in that same condition.

**Situational Relevance and Feedback Preferences**

Table 21 contains the correlations of situational relevance, normative feedback preferences, and task-referenced feedback preference with other experiment variables. It should be noted that the mean for situational relevance is rather high (24.9) for a 35-point scale. Furthermore, situational relevance correlated positively with each of the feedback preferences. Time spent on task was positively correlated with task-based
Table 20

MANOVA for the Prediction of Normative and Task-Based Feedback Preferences

Multivariate Tests of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Accountability</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.831</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate F Tests of Significance

Dependent Variable = Normative Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.026</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.026</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>3.477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable = Task-Based Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.076</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.665</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.579</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .07
Figure 7. Accountability x Self-Monitoring Interaction
Table 21

Correlations of Situational Relevance and Feedback Preferences with Other Experiment Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational Relevance</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Feedback</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Based Feedback</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Knowledge</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Complexity</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time on Task</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 165 subjects. Scale range for situational relevance is 5-35. Scale range for normative feedback and task-referenced feedback is 2-10.

*p < .05.  **p < .01.
feedback preferences. Otherwise, no other significant relationships with experimental variables emerged.

**Predicting Integrative Complexity**

The independent variables in this experiment did not predict integrative complexity very well. Because of its importance in this study, it was especially worthwhile to determine which variable or group of variables would predict integrative complexity. Situational relevance was considered because it was felt that perhaps those individuals who viewed the judgment task as more important would be willing to spend more cognitive effort. However, the correlation between situational relevance and integrative complexity was not found to be significant ($r = -.07$). However, perhaps, situational relevance interacted with another variable to predict integrative complexity.

In determining potential moderators, categorical variables provide a viable alternative. Previous research has been equivocal about the relationship between sex and integrative complexity. Previous research has found a positive effect for either sex (Baker-Brown et al., 1989) or no sex differences (de Vries & Walker, 1988). With this being the case, sex was chosen as a categorical variable that may moderate the relationship between situational relevance and integrative complexity.
A moderated hierarchical regression was performed for predicting integrative complexity with situational relevance and sex. The sex x situational relevance interaction was, in fact, statistically significant (See Table 22). A graphic representation of this interaction is found in Figure 8. The interaction indicates that situational relevance is inversely related to integrative complexity for males ($r = -.25$, $p < .05$), but not so for females ($r = .07$, ns). Plausible explanations of this interaction are discussed in the Discussion chapter.

Predicting Rating Quality

Overall, it was found that neither ratings of the most suitable nor the most preferable candidates were predicted by self-monitoring, accountability, or knowledge of the principal's position. Although ratings of the most suitable applicant served as an index of rating quality, it is possible that other indicators which reflect the quality of the overall set of ratings could be influenced by the independent variables of the study.

There are thought to be three different indicators of rating quality that are relevant to data sets where multiple raters rate multiple ratees on a single overall dimension. Two of these are elevation and differential elevation (Cronbach, 1955). The other is an "accuracy index" formulated by Vance, Kuhnert, and Farr (1978).
Table 22
Hierarchical Moderated Regression for Predicting Integrative Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Variable</th>
<th>Unstandard. Weight</th>
<th>Cum. R²</th>
<th>Change in R²</th>
<th>F_Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sex</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>7.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sex</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sit. Relevance</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sex</td>
<td>-.955</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sit. Relevance</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex x</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sit. Relevance</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 165 participants

* Sex was dummy-coded so that "female" = 1 and "male" = 0.
Figure 8. Sex x Situational Relevance Interaction
Elevation indicates the differences between the way that a rater uses a scale relative to the true score (Brooks & Brooks, 1990; Cronbach, 1955). It is an indicator of a rater's leniency or severity in making ratings (Harvey & Lozada-Larsen, 1988). An elevation score closer to "0" indicates that the rater is using the rating scale in a manner that is closer to the true score, and thus, yielding higher quality ratings. A computational formula for elevation is:

\[
\text{Elevation} = (\bar{x} - \bar{t})^2
\]

where \(\bar{x}\) is equal to the grand mean for the rater and \(\bar{t}\) is equal to the grand mean of the true scores (Formula taken from Brooks et al., 1990, p. 413). For this and other rating quality indices, true scores for each ratee were derived by rounding the means from pilot study 2 to the nearest whole integer. Whole integers were used as true scores because participant ratings came only in the form of whole integers. Thus, using the actual means would have resulted in producing variance that is an artifact of the rating scale.

The ratings were also examined for differential elevation (Cronbach, 1955). Differential elevation indicates how closely the ratings given to individual ratees by a rater correspond to differences in true score
for a ratee (Brooks & Brooks, 1990; Harvey & Lozada-Larsen, 1988). A computational formula for differential elevation is:

\[
\text{Differential Elevation} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} [(x_k - \bar{x}) - (t_k - \bar{t})]^2, \quad (2)
\]

where \(x_k\) is equal to the rater's rating for each ratee, \(t_k\) refers to true score for that same ratee, and \(n\) refers to the number of ratees. As with elevation, a lower score indicates a higher quality rating (Formula taken from Brooks et al., 1990, p. 414).

A third potential indicator of rating quality is rating bias as exhibited by the mean absolute difference between a rater's rating for a ratee and the true score for that same ratee (Vance et al., 1978). The computational formula for this indicator is:

\[
\text{Absolute Rating Bias} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} | x_k - t_k |, \quad (3)
\]

where the terms are the same as those in formula (2) above. As with the other two rating quality indices, a score closer to zero indicates higher quality ratings.
Table 23 shows means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among the three rating quality indices. In addition, a spot check of data indicated that sex was marginally correlated with each of these variables, and therefore, is included in this table. It was found that there were significant intercorrelations among these three dependent variables. In addition, sex was significantly related to absolute rating bias (r = .17, p < .01). With this being case, it was decided that a Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) with sex as a covariate would be the most appropriate analysis strategy.

Table 24 contains the results of the MANCOVA. The multivariate F-test for sex approached statistical significance (p < .07). The univariate tests indicated significant effects for elevation and absolute rating bias. These results suggest that it was appropriate to use sex as a covariate. The multivariate F-tests for position knowledge and self-monitoring were both found to be significant. None of the other multivariate tests were found to be statistically significant. With this being the case, the univariate F-tests for the effects of position knowledge and self-monitoring were examined. The univariate F-tests for position knowledge found a significant effect for differential elevation. Persons in the known position condition had greater rater bias than
Table 23

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among Rating Quality Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Elevation</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Differential Elevation</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Absolute Rating Bias</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sex(^a)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 165 participants.

\(^a\) Sex was dummy-coded so that "female" = 1 and "male" = 0.
Table 24

MANCOVA for the Prediction of Rating Quality Indices
Multivariate Tests of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex (Covariate)</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Accountability x Position Knowledge</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability x Position Knowledge</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Position Knowledge</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.118</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring x Accountability</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Knowledge</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.531</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate F Tests of Significance
Source = Sex (Covariate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. Elevation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.047</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abs. Rating Bias</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 (Cont.)

MANCOVA for the Prediction of Rating Quality Indices
Univariate F Tests of Significance

Effect = Self-Monitoring x Accountability x Position Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. Elevation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.559</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abs. Rating Bias</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect = Accountability x Position Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. Elevation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abs. Rating Bias</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect = Self-Monitoring x Position Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. Elevation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.460</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abs. Rating Bias</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect = Self-Monitoring x Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. Elevation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.976</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abs. Rating Bias</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 (Cont.)

MANCOVA for the Prediction of Rating Quality Indices
Univariate F Tests of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect = Position Knowledge</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. Elevation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.624</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abs. Rating Bias</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect = Accountability</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. Elevation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.568</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abs. Rating Bias</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect = Self-Monitoring</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.450</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. Elevation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abs. Rating Bias</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  N = 165 participants.

* p ≤ .05.
persons in the not known condition ($M's = 2.15$ and $1.60$, respectively). Recall that higher scores suggest greater bias. The univariate F-tests for self-monitoring found a significant effect for elevation. Specifically, it was found that high self-monitors produced ratings with greater bias than low self-monitors ($M's = .41$ and $.25$, respectively).
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

This study was designed to test two propositions. First, it was expected that high self-monitors and low self-monitors would differ in their response to accountability, as indicated by integrative complexity, time on task, conformity, and judgment accuracy. Second, it was expected that high and low self-monitors would differ in their uses of integratively complex thinking.

Hypotheses 1-5 were relevant to the first proposition. Hypothesis 1 stated an interaction between accountability and knowledge of the principal's position in predicting integrative complexity. This hypothesis was not supported. This result is anomalous with previous accountability research (Tetlock, 1983a; Tetlock et al., 1989), and quite frankly, is somewhat surprising.

One of the reasons that this hypothesis may not have been supported is because, overall, participants in the study reported a high degree of situational relevance. The overall mean was 24.9 on a 35-point scale. Furthermore, a follow-up analysis found that accountable
and not accountable participants did not differ in their reports of situational relevance.

Accountability is supposed to heighten an individual's sense of self-relevance in a situation. However, participants reported high situational relevance irrespective of accountability. This may be due to the fact that individuals who were convinced of the cover story believed that the task that they were performing was important. Because all participants either currently or previously resided in residence halls, they may have been sensitive to the important role of residence advisors. Thus, they may have seen the task that they were performing to be inherently important. Because situational relevance was high, this may have created a ceiling effect on further motivation or arousal that could have been induced by accountability.

Hypothesis 2 predicted an interaction between self-monitoring disposition, accountability, and knowledge of the principal’s position would influence integrative complexity. This hypothesis received marginal support. In particular, the self-monitoring x knowledge of principal’s position interaction approached statistical significance. Substantively, high self-monitors’ integratively complex thinking decreased when the principal’s position was known. Although this was expected in the accountable condition, it occurred
irrespective of accountability. However, this is consistent with the notion that high self-monitors are focused on external cues (Snyder, 1987).

Hypothesis 3 stated that self-monitoring disposition, accountability, and knowledge of the principal's position interacted in predicting time taken on task. No support was found for this hypothesis. Such an effect has been common in research. However, similar to the results of this study, Breaugh and Klimoski (1977) found that accountability did not influence time on task.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that self-monitoring disposition, accountability, and knowledge of the principal's position would influence conformity, as indicated by ratings of the principal's most preferred applicant. This hypothesis was not supported.

A two-way interaction between accountability and position knowledge did approach statistical significance. Specifically, individuals who were not accountable but knew the principal's position were more likely to conform. This would suggest that individuals who are not accountable, but aware of a nominally acceptable answer may simply accept that answer. Tetlock (1985b) discusses an acceptability heuristic that is typically used by an individual who is held accountable to a principal with a known position. This was not the case in the present study. However, this acceptability heuristic may pertain
more appropriately to individuals who do not anticipate having to explain their judgments, but know of a potentially acceptable judgment. Previous accountability research has not included a no accountability, known position condition. Therefore, it is not possible to relate this result to previous efforts.

Hypothesis 5 predicted a three-way interaction of self-monitoring, accountability, and knowledge of the principal's position in influencing judgment accuracy. No support was found for this hypothesis.

The second proposition stated that high and low self-monitors would differ in their uses of integrative complexity. Relevant to this, it was hypothesized that, for low self-monitors, integrative complexity would be related to judgment accuracy. On the other hand, these variables would not be related for high self-monitors. This hypothesis was not supported. However, this may be attributable greatly to the fact that there was little variability in judgments of the objectively most suitable applicant. Recall that 76% of participants indicated that the most suitable applicant was the one that they preferred most. Therefore, even individuals whose thinking was not integratively complex would probably indicate their preference for the most suitable applicant.

Some of the follow-up analyses indicated results that were worth noting. First, marginal support was found for
the notion that high self-monitors who are accountable will express greater interest in task-referenced feedback relative to low self-monitors who are held accountable. This is consistent with what is known about high self-monitors. Specifically, they are thought to be very interested in their own performance when there is an audience present. When there is not an audience present, their concerns regarding performance is indistinguishable from that of low self-monitors.

A second finding from the ancillary analysis was that sex moderated the relationship between situational relevance and integrative complexity. For females, these variables were unrelated. On the other hand, there was an inverse relationship for these variables for males. This pattern of results would suggest sex differences in how individuals strategically cope with situational relevance. Perhaps, when they experience situational relevance, males engage in less complex thinking but re-direct either their cognitive effort or behavior. Unfortunately, this study was not able to further identify how this occurs.

An object lesson from this finding is that apparent sex differences in integrative complexity may actually reflect an interaction with other variables. In the current study, sex was significantly correlated with integrative complexity ($r = .21, p < .01$), whereby females performed better than males. This result could then be
added to the set of unequivocal findings regarding gender differences in integrative complexity (cf. Baker-Brown et al., 1989; de Vries et al., 1988). However, an alternative interpretation found in this study is that sex actually interacts with another variable, in this case, situational relevance.

A third finding was that high self-monitors provided lower quality ratings than low self-monitors, as indexed by elevation. Recall that elevation indicates the extent to which ratings were made with leniency or severity. In this case, it was found that low self-monitors made lower quality ratings.

A fourth finding was that position knowledge interfered with making accurate ratings, as indicated by differential elevation. Recall that differential elevation indicates how closely the ratings given to individual ratees by a rater corresponds to differences in true score for a ratee (Harvey & Lozada-Larsen, 1988). However, because this result was not related to accountability or differences between high and low self-monitors, the primary foci of the current study, this result will not be discussed.

**Conclusions**

Based on the results of this study, conclusions can be made about: a) the effects of accountability; b) the difficulty associated with manipulating accountability, c)
differences between high and low self-monitors; and d) predictors of integrative complexity.

First, in this study, accountability was not found to influence either the thinking or behavior of individuals. These results are anomalous with the Fandt and Ferris (1990) study that did find an effect. It is believed that the lack of results in the present study are due to the fact that study participants reported that their performance on this task was highly relevant to themselves, regardless of manipulated levels of accountability. In the cover story, participants were told that an effort was being made by a university office to improve the way that decisions are made regarding resident advisor selection. Regardless of whether they were held accountable, individuals apparently believed that their input would be used for future selection decisions.

With this being the case, making quality judgments outweighed individuals' needs to maintain the social approval of the principal to whom they were held accountable. Therefore, perhaps, accountability is ineffective in altering behavior when the importance with which persons hold in making correct judgments is outweighed by concerns with maintaining social approval. Relating this point to self-monitoring, Gerstein, Ginter, and Graziano (1985) have suggested that, to the extent
that differences in self-monitoring are motivational as opposed to ability-based, the behavior of high and low self-monitors may not differ when the perceived payoff of a situation is high.

An examination of the contexts that are typically used in accountability indicate that they include only an immediate "social payoff." For example, in some studies, participants are held accountable to other participants (e.g., Tetlock, 1983a; Tetlock et al., 1989). Other researchers have used paradigms where participants are held accountable to the experimenters (e.g., Simonson & Nye, 1992; Tetlock, 1983b; Tetlock & Boettger, 1989; Tetlock & Il Kim, 1987; Weigold & Schlenker, 1991). Furthermore, there are no consequences associated with the participants' behavior (i.e., no one gets fired, hired, or admitted to graduate school, etc.) With this being the case, the consequences of acting appropriately in the current situation were very salient to individuals. Moreover, there were no consequences beyond those created in the immediate social situation.

In the current study, participants appear to have perceived the consequences of doing well in this study to be important irrespective of accountability. This may have been, in part, because of the potential long-term implications of the study. In the participants' minds, if the results of this study would, in fact, have a long-term
impact on how R.A.'s are selected, participants may be more willing to risk social disapproval for a greater overall good.

There are two lines of research that may be relevant to this discussion. One is the Job Characteristics Model (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). This model specifies characteristics of jobs and tasks that make them more intrinsically motivating. One of these characteristics is task significance. Task significance describes the extent to which one’s own performance on a task has an impact on other people. The greater task significance experienced by an individual, the greater the intrinsic motivation.

Another relevant line of research is the substitutes for leadership construct (Kerr and Jermier, 1978). This suggests that certain characteristics of individuals, tasks, and organizations may neutralize external influence attempts. Kerr and Jermier (1978) have argued that intrinsically satisfying tasks neutralize leader behaviors in motivating performance.

Taken together, these lines of research suggest that task characteristics may nullify or neutralize external influence attempts. Inducing accountability involves creating such an influence. Thus, it is possible that the expected effects of accountability may not occur when individuals are intrinsically motivated by a task because
of a belief that their performance may contribute to some overall important purpose.

A second conclusion of this study is that accountability is a difficult effect to induce in a laboratory setting when deception is involved. This is especially true when participants may be prone to detect attempts at deception, such as is the case of high self-monitors. This was found in this particular study. Perhaps, the difficulty associated with successfully manipulating accountability has not been given sufficient attention in the published literature. Simply providing a bogus cover story that informs participants of a reporting requirement is not sufficient to induce accountability.

In the current study, great effort was invested to induce accountability by: a) embedding it within an elaborate rationale for the study; b) using a confederate to reinforce the reporting requirement; c) repeating the reporting requirement several times during experiment instructions; and d) providing a tangible prop that stated the certainty of the reporting requirement. In the current study, this was found not to be enough to be convincing with all participants. Participants were not convinced of the cover story to a great extent. Perhaps, this suggests that published literature needs to contain more detailed descriptions of accountability manipulations than currently is the case.
A third conclusion addresses differences between high and low self-monitors in their behavior within this experimental context. In particular, high self-monitors acted in prototypical ways. For example, when informed of a position that could be adopted, their level of complex thinking decreased. When held accountable, they showed a heightened interest in receiving task-referenced feedback. Although this type of effect would be expected, research that has documented this effect could not be found. Furthermore, their overall ratings of applicants were more likely to exhibit effects such as halo or leniency. Taken together, these results suggest a tendency for high self-monitors to do what is necessary to promote and assure maintenance of a favorable social impression. The fact that they were more susceptible to rater errors suggests that they provided less attention to the task at hand.

A fourth conclusion addresses factors that influence integratively complex thinking. In particular, it was found in this study that sex and situational relevance produced an interaction effect on integrative complexity. Although the manipulated variables in this study did not have a great impact, the results of this study do suggest that integrative complexity can be influenced by situational and personal variables. Furthermore, these differences may be strategic in nature.
Limitations of the Study

While the above conclusions are reasonable, they are based largely on the lack of significant results obtained in the study. There are, of course, other potential reasons for such lack of findings. The lack of results may be attributable to the small cell sizes that were an outcome of deleting data. Thus, it is possible that the lack of results are actually a Type II error.

Another limitation of the study involves the reliability of integrative complexity scores. As noted earlier, integrative complexity scores exhibited acceptable interrater reliability but unacceptable test-retest reliability. Results such as these call to question the scoring process used for integrative complexity. As a personal observation, scoring decisions were often based upon the raters' interpretation of what has been written. Thus, the differences may partly be a result of the verbal clarity of writing. In any event, scoring integrative complexity is problematic, even for trained raters. In defense of the present study, an attempt to was made to actually determine the test-retest reliability of this measure. Other studies that have used this construct have not done so (e.g., Coren & Suedfeld, 1990; Gruenfeld & Hollingshead, 1993). Certainly, this issue needs to be addressed in future research.
Future Research Directions

Recommendations about future research directions will address both paradigmatic issues as well as topical issues addressed in the current study. First, what do the propositions tested in this study imply? From a broad perspective, the propositions in this study imply that interventions, such as accountability, interact with individual differences in producing differential results. Therefore, the impact on behavior and thinking may not be the same for persons who possess extreme levels of a characteristic as compared to those who possess an average level.

Although not intentionally planned that way, several recent dissertations completed or currently being conducted in the Industrial/Organizational Psychology area at Ohio State fit into a paradigm of investigating intervention x person interactions. The topic domains consist of the following interventions and individual difference variables: goal setting and negative affectivity (Necowitz, 1994); groups and conscientiousness (Brice, 1994); training and goal orientation (Boyle, 1994); and groups and ethical orientations of group members (Dose, 1994). It would appear that there is a "local Zeitgeist," or spirit of the times, that is influencing the topics that are being chosen for investigation (Hothersall, 1984).
If amount of activity is an indicator of relevance or importance, it would appear that intervention x person interactions are worthwhile of future study. If anything, this is for the very simple reason that past research has shown that such interactions do exist (e.g. Fandt & Ferris, 1990). From a more pragmatic perspective, organizations often lament that their own interventions do not result in an intended effect because they do not have "the right people."

With regard to accountability, future research should determine the nature of its interaction with self-monitoring. Although the current study did not find a significant interaction, it is still believed that this relationship exists under specific circumstances. Fandt and Ferris (1990), in fact, found such an interaction. With this being the case, constructive replications of the current study and the Fandt and Ferris (1990) study would be useful.

Furthermore, accountability research needs to determine boundary conditions for the effects of accountability. Under what conditions will accountability not influence behavior? In the present study, it was concluded that the lack of results for accountability may have been due to the intrinsically motivating characteristics that were present in the task. The Job Characteristics Model and substitutes for leadership
notion were offered as potential vehicles for examining potentially relevant task characteristics.

Contributions of the Research

What are the contributions of a study in which the hypotheses are not supported? A study can be a contribution if it challenges prevailing views. For example, the results of the current study suggest circumstances under which accountability does not influence thinking and behavior. In explaining this lack of results, a question was raised whether contextual factors or characteristics of the task may influence the extent to which individuals respond to accountability. Questions such as these are used to stimulate thinking in developing elaborate, inclusive theoretical models.

An additional contribution of this study is that it further demonstrates differences between high and low self-monitors in their behavior and thought. Specifically, some of the results were consistent with the notion that high self-monitors are more interested in avoiding projection of an unfavorable social impression. The finding that accountable high self-monitors were highly interested in obtaining feedback after task performance has not been documented by previous research. However, this kind of result is consistent with prevailing thinking about this construct. Collectively, these kind of results provide further support for this construct.
Furthermore, the current study demonstrates an alternative method of examining thought processes that occur when individuals make judgments about applicants. Specifically, the study found that when the principal’s position was known, the thought processes of high self-monitors are less complex. As was mentioned earlier, the policy-capturing paradigm that is typically used in selection research has been criticized for its superficial nature. Although examining written thoughts via integrative complexity has been found to have problems of its own (low test-retest reliability), this study did provide a demonstration of an alternative method for studying the structure of thoughts as selection judgments are being made.

A Concluding Thought

Initially, it was intended for this study to investigate the boundary conditions of the social contingency model as it applies to the individual difference variable of self-monitoring disposition. The results that pertained to answering this research question were not significant. In making sense of this lack of results, it is suggested that task characteristics may play an important role in determining the success of accountability manipulations. Moreover, this implies that perhaps the "contingencies" of the social contingency model need to be expanded. Up to this point, the key
contingencies appeared to be: a) whether or not an individual is held accountable; b) knowledge of the principal's position; and c) whether an individual is held accountable for past or future behavior. The results of the current study perhaps suggest that task characteristics may also be important in shaping responses to accountability. Specifically, tasks that are perceived to be especially significant to the individual may neutralize the social pressures that are induced by accountability.
ENDNOTES

1. Researchers have also suggested that integrative complexity is an individual difference variable (e.g., de Vries & Walker, 1988; Schroder, Driver, and Streufert, 1967; Schroder, 1971; Tetlock, 1988; Tetlock, 1983a). However, this perspective of describing integrative complexity is beyond the scope of the current study.

2. Eighteen items from the original twenty-five item Self-Monitoring Scale were used. Snyder (1987) found that seven items did not discriminate well between high and low self-monitors. In the present study, the original survey was administered and only eighteen items were used to identify high and low self-monitors. The additional items served as distractor items.
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APPENDIX A

PRE-SCREENING QUESTIONNAIRE AND SELF-MONITORING SCALE
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION FOR EXPERIMENT QK-1

Your responses on this page and the accompanying questionnaire will be seen only by the researchers conducting this experiment. Your responses will remain confidential.

If you are eligible to participate in experiment QK-1, you will be contacted by telephone within the next 3 weeks. Participation in experiment QK-1 is worth 1 hour of credit.

Your Name: ____________________________________________

PSY 100 Class Time: ______________

Phone Number You Can Be Reached At:
   During the Day: _____________________________
   During the Evening: _____________________________

1. Indicate your gender:   Female     Male

2. Class Rank:   Freshman  Sophomore  Junior  Senior

3. Do you currently live in a university residence hall?
   Yes ____  No ____

4. Indicate how long you have lived in university residence halls.
   Never have       ____
   Less than 1 year  ____
   Between 1-2 years  ____
   Between 2-3 years  ____
   More than 3 years  ____

5. Have you ever been a resident advisor or some other type of peer counselor?
   No ____
   Yes ____

If yes, please indicate the position you had and for how long you have (or had) done it.
INITIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Please circle the appropriate response to each question as it pertains to you.

(Note: The items used for calculating an overall self-monitoring score in this study are indicated with an asterisk. The response that appears in parentheses is the one more likely to be given by high self-monitors.)

T = True
F = False

1.* I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people. (F) T F

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

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

4.* I can only argue for ideas which I already believe. (F) T F

5.* I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information. (T) T F

6.* I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people. (T) T F

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

8.* I would probably make a good actor. (T) T F

9. I rarely seek advice of my friends to choose movies, books, or music. (F) T F

10. I sometimes appear to others to be expressing deeper emotions than I actually am. (T) T F

11. I laugh more when I watch a comedy with others than when I am alone. (T) T F

12.* In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention. (F) T F
13.* In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons. (T) T F

14.* I am not particularly good at making other people like me. (F) T F

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

16.* I'm not always the person I appear to be. (T) T F

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

18.* I have considered being an entertainer. (T) T F

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

20.* I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting. (F) T F

21.* I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations. (F) T F

22.* At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going. (F) T F

23.* I feel a bit awkward in company and do not show up quite so well as I should. (F) T F

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

25.* I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them. (T) T F
APPENDIX B

EXPERIMENT SCRIPTS
SCRIPT FOR ACCOUNTABLE, KNOWLEDGEABLE OF PRINCIPAL'S POSITION CONDITION

Good (morning, afternoon). This is experiment QK-1. It is worth 1 hour of credit. My name is Mark, and I will be your experimenter this (morning, afternoon). Before we go ahead and get started, I just need to take attendance.

(Experimenter takes attendance)

Before you go ahead and do the experiment, I need to give you some background information about the study as well as some instructions for what it is that you will be doing. This experiment is being jointly-sponsored by the OSU Department of Residence and Dining Halls and the Psychology Department. Currently, the Department of Residence and Dining Halls is looking at the idea of having students such as yourself involved in the R.A. selection process, or how it is that residence advisors are selected for the residence halls. The idea is that since students have day-to-day contact with R.A.'s, you probably have some idea of what makes for a good R.A. as well as a not so good R.A. So, the idea is that students may have valuable input to provide in the R.A. selection process.

Now, before Residence & Dining Halls decides for sure that yes, they want to do this or no, they don't, they want to get an idea of what happens when students are allowed to make R.A. selection decisions. That's where this particular study comes in. Because after I'm finished giving you these instructions, each of you will work individually in one of the offices that are adjacent to this room here.

(Experimenter points to the three breakout rooms that are adjacent to the area where participants are currently sitting.)

At the desk that you will be working at, there will be a set of seven R.A. applicant summaries. These are summaries of people who actually applied for R.A. positions last spring for the current academic year. There are several things that you will be doing with the applicant summaries. First, you will be taking a look at them just to see what kind of information is available about each of the applicants.

Then, you will decide which of the applicants is most suitable for the R.A. position. What I would like for you to do then is to write your thoughts that you have about the most suitable applicant on this page. (Experimenter
hands blank thought protocol sheet to participants). Please note that I am interested in your honest thoughts about the most suitable applicant. Don’t put your name on it anywhere so it is not personally identifiable to you. Also, you can turn it face down at your desk after you are finished with it. The only people who are going to look at what you wrote are other Psychology Department researchers who are interested in the thoughts that people have while making selection decisions. But even this won’t happen until the end of the quarter after all of the sessions of this experiment have been done. Because your name is not on this page anywhere, there is no way of identifying what you wrote to you personally. All we want are your honest thoughts about the most suitable applicant.

(At this point, there is a knock on the door and the confederate posing as the assistant hall director appears at the door out of sight to the participants and has a short conversation with the experimenter that can be overheard by the participants).

Exp.: Oh, hi Jerry/Jeri.

Confed.: Is it time for me to talk with them yet?

Exp.: No, the experiment just started. They should be ready to talk with you in about 20 minutes. I tell you what, I’ll come and get you when they’re ready to talk with you. Do you know where you’ll be?

Confed.: I’ll wait in room 109, right next door.

Exp.: O.K., great, I’ll come and get you when they’re ready to talk to you. Thanks, Jerry/Jeri.

Confed.: O.K.

(Experimenter then closes door. Confederate goes into adjacent room and closes the door to it so that it is audible to experiment participants.)

Sorry about that, I thought that might have been another subject for the experiment, but it was actually someone who is actually helping out with the experiment. Let’s see, where was I. Oh yeah, I was telling you about writing your thoughts about the most suitable applicant.

After you’re done writing your thoughts about the most suitable applicant, the last thing I would like for you to do is to rate all 7 applicants on the sheet that I am passing out right now. (Experimenter passes out rating
sheet). You will rate them on a 1 to 7 scale where a 1 means "highly unsuitable" and a 7 means "highly suitable." Please note that this is a rating scale, so you can assign the same rating to more than one applicant if you want.

Now, after you’re done rating all seven applicants, you’ll be talking with Jerry/Jeri Willer, an assistant hall director on campus about your ratings. He/she was at the door a minute ago. He/she is just a few minutes early for the experiment. Does anybody here know Jerry/Jeri or live in his/her residence hall? (Experimenter waits for responses). Good, because it kind of causes a problem if people in the experiment already know him/her. Anyway, Jerry/Jeri is an assistant hall director on campus. He/she is also head of the R.A. selection committee on campus. Obviously, he/she is interested in the results of this study. So after you’re done making your ratings, he/she will be in to speak with you individually about your ratings and ask you some questions about why rated the applicants the way that you did.

To facilitate this process, I would like you to write your name at the top of the ratings sheet. This will let Jerry/Jeri know which rating sheet is yours. Also, after you are finished making your ratings, slide the ratings sheet under the door of the office that you are working. This will give Jerry/Jeri a few minutes to look at your ratings before he/she comes in to talk with you. Are there any questions?

Just to summarize, make sure to write your thoughts about the most suitable applicant first. Then, go ahead and rate all seven applicants on the 1-7 scale. It’s important that you go in that particular order, so even if you have additional thoughts about the most suitable applicant after you begin making your ratings, do not go back and write those additional thought. We are just interested in your thoughts prior to rating all seven applicants. Are there any questions?

This may or may not help you, but I know that Jerry/Jeri typically prefers R.A. candidates who are sophomores at the time that they apply for R.A. positions. I guess Jerry’s/Jeri’s reason for this is that the R.A. position is pretty complex and typically takes a long time to learn. With this being the case, the R.A. usually spends their first year learning how to do the job. It’s not until the second year that they can become the "best R.A. that they can be." Again, that may or may not help you on this task. That’s just something that I know about Jerry’s/Jeri’s preferences.
Because we have only 50 minutes to get the entire experiment completed, it's possible that Jerry/Jeri will not be able to speak with each of you. Typically, we get through one or two interviews, but usually not all three. So, in order to make it fair in deciding who will talk to Jeri/Jerry, there will be an index card at the desk that you will be working at. This index card will let you know which order you will be talking to Jerry/Jeri. So, if your index card says that you will be talking to him/her third, you probably won't talk to him/her. We'll just have to see how this goes. Anyway, we're doing it this way just to make it fair in deciding who will talk with Jeri/Jerry first.

Also, when you slide your applicant rating sheet under the door of your office, make sure to slide the index card under the door also. This will let me know in which order each of you will be speaking with Jerry/Jeri.

Are there any questions? Before you get started on the task, I just need to make sure that the instructions for this experiment are clear. Please take a few moments to complete this survey. (Experimenter hands out "Instructions Questionnaire." Participants complete the survey.)

Please make sure not to put your name on the survey that you just completed. Just put it face-down at your place when you are finished.

Are there any questions? (Experimenter answers any questions).

Just to remind you, make sure to write your thoughts about the most suitable applicant first. Then, go ahead and rate all seven applicants on the 1-7 scale. It's important that you go in that particular order, so even if you have additional thoughts about the most suitable applicant after you begin making your ratings, do not go back and write those additional thoughts. Also, when you are finished rating all of the applicants, make sure to slide the ratings sheet along with the index card underneath the door. This will give Jerry/Jeri a chance to look at your ratings before he/she comes in to speak with you. Are there any questions?

O.K., please take the rating sheet and the other sheet and come follow me please. (Experimenter leads participants to breakout rooms). Simply pick one of the offices to work in, close the door behind you, and begin working.
Jerry/Jeri will need just a few more moments to look at your ratings. While you're waiting for Jerry/Jeri, please take a few moments to fill out this survey. (Experimenter hands participant the "Post-Task Survey" and closes door behind them).

(After four minutes, experimenter instructs each participant to go back to the area where they originally assembled. At this time, the debriefing is given).

Debriefing: (Experimenter stands in front of the room. Confederate is seated at a desk in front of the room.) O.K., who will be meeting with Jerry/Jeri first. (Wait for all three people to raise their hands.) As you can see, there is something going on here. There are a few things that I have to tell you about this experiment. First, this study is not being sponsored by the OSU Department of Residence and Dining Halls. Second, you won't be talking with anyone named Jerry/Jeri Willer. In fact, this person doesn't even exist. This is ____________, my research assistant.

However, I had to tell you these things because there is a certain effect that we're trying to create in this study. You see, we are actually looking at the effects of accountability on people's thought processes. Accountability is the idea that you believe that you will have justify your decisions to someone else. We believe that people who are held accountable for their ratings would think about this task differently than people who are not held accountable. You may be able to relate to this from your own real-life experiences. When you know that you have to justify your decisions to someone else, you probably think more about the decision, have different kinds of thoughts, and perhaps, spend more time making those decisions. This is basically what this study is trying to document. Based on what you wrote about the most suitable applicant and the ratings that you gave to all of the applicants, we will be able to see how people's thought processes differ when they are held accountable as compared to when they are not held accountable.

I hope you can see why it was important to tell you these things in the beginning. We are simply trying to create an environment in this study that reflects real-life. Had I simply told you to pretend these things, you probably
would not have been very interested in this experiment. Are there any questions?

Although I did tell you some things that were not true, one thing that you can believe me about is that all of your responses in this experiment will be kept confidential. Also, all of your responses will be given a code number. Once that happens, your responses will not be traceable to you personally.

There is one thing that I will ask of you. Because it is natural for people to talk about their participation in experiments with friends and classmates, I ask that you limit your comments to your overall reactions to the experiment. If you want to say that the experiment was really stupid or really interesting, go ahead and do so. But please don't tell any of the details of the experiment. Because of the environment that we're trying to create in this experiment, people may not act naturally if they know ahead of time what is going to happen. And really, all we want is for people to act naturally in these experiments. Are there any questions?

Thank you for your participation.
SCRIPT FOR ACCOUNTABLE, NOT KNOWLEDGEABLE OF PRINCIPAL’S POSITION CONDITION

Good (morning, afternoon). This is experiment QK-1. It is worth 1 hour of credit. My name is Mark, and I will be your experimenter this (morning, afternoon). Before we go ahead and get started, I just need to take attendance.

(Experimenter takes attendance)

Before you go ahead and do the experiment, I need to give you some background information about the study as well as some instructions for what it is that you will be doing. This experiment is being jointly-sponsored by the OSU Department of Residence and Dining Halls and the Psychology Department. Currently, the Department of Residence and Dining Halls is looking at the idea of having students such as yourself involved in the R.A. selection process, or how it is that residence advisors are selected for the residence halls. The idea is that since students have day-to-day contact with R.A.’s, you probably have some idea of what makes for a good R.A. as well as a not so good R.A. So, the idea is that students may have valuable input to provide in the R.A. selection process.

Now, before Residence & Dining Halls decides for sure that yes, they want to do this or no, they don’t, they want to get an idea of what happens when students are allowed to make R.A. selection decisions. That’s where this particular study comes in. Because after I’m finished giving you these instructions, each of you will work individually in one of the offices that are adjacent to this room here.

(Experimenter points to the three breakout rooms that are adjacent to the area where participants are currently sitting.)

At the desk that you will be working at, there will be a set of seven R.A. applicant summaries. These are summaries of people who actually applied for R.A. positions last spring for the current academic year. There are several things that you will be doing with the applicant summaries. First, you will be taking a look at them just to see what kind of information is available about each of the applicants.

Then, you will decide which of the applicants is most suitable for the R.A. position. What I would like for you to do then is to write your thoughts that you have about the most suitable applicant on this page. (Experimenter
hands blank thought protocol sheet to participants). Please note that I am interested in your honest thoughts about the most suitable applicant. Don't put your name on it anywhere so it is not personally identifiable to you. Also, you can turn it face down at your desk after you are finished with it. The only people who are going to look at what you wrote are other Psychology Department researchers who are interested in the thoughts that people have while making selection decisions. But even this won't happen until the end of the quarter after all of the sessions of this experiment have been done. Because your name is not on this page anywhere, there is no way of identifying what you wrote to you personally. All we want are your honest thoughts about the most suitable applicant.

(At this point, there is a knock on the door and the confederate posing as the assistant hall director appears at the door out of sight to the participants and has a short conversation with the experimenter that can be overhead by the participants).

Exp.: Oh, hi Jerry/Jeri.
Confed.: Is it time for me to talk with them yet?
Exp.: No, the experiment just started. They should be ready to talk with you in about 20 minutes. I tell you what, I'll come and get you when they're ready to talk with you. Do you know where you'll be?
Confed.: I'll wait in room 109, right next door.
Exp.: O.K., great, I'll come and get you when they're ready to talk to you. Thanks, Jerry/Jeri.
Confed.: O.K.

(Experimenter then closes door. Confederate goes into adjacent room and closes the door to it so that it is audible to experiment participants.)

Sorry about that, I thought that might have been another subject for the experiment, but it was actually someone who is actually helping out with the experiment. Let's see, where was I. Oh yeah, I was telling you about writing your thoughts about the most suitable applicant.

After you're done writing your thoughts about the most suitable applicant, the last thing I would like for you to do is to rate all 7 applicants on the sheet that I am passing out right now. (Experimenter passes out rating}
sheet). You will rate them on a 1 to 7 scale where a 1 means "highly unsuitable" and a 7 means "highly suitable." Please note that this is a rating scale, so you can assign the same rating to more than one applicant if you want.

Now, after you’ve done rating all seven applicants, you’ll be talking with Jerry/Jeri Willer, an assistant hall director on campus about your ratings. He/she was at the door a minute ago. He/she is just a few minutes early for the experiment. Does anybody here know Jerry/Jeri or live in his/her residence hall? (Experimenter waits for responses). Good, because it kind of causes a problem if people in the experiment already know him/her. Anyway, Jerry/Jeri is an assistant hall director on campus. He/she is also head of the R.A. selection committee on campus. Obviously, he/she is interested in the results of this study. So after you’re done making your ratings, he/she will be in to speak with you individually about your ratings and ask you some questions about why rated the applicants the way that you did.

To facilitate this process, I would like you to write your name at the top of the ratings sheet. This will let Jerry/Jeri know which rating sheet is yours. Also, after you are finished making your ratings, slide the ratings sheet under the door of the office that you are working. This will give Jerry/Jeri a few minutes to look at your ratings before he/she comes in to talk with you. Are there any questions?

Just to summarize, make sure to write your thoughts about the most suitable applicant first. Then, go ahead and rate all seven applicants on the 1-7 scale. It’s important that you go in that particular order, so even if you have additional thoughts about the most suitable applicant after you begin making your ratings, do not go back and write those additional thoughts. We are just interested in your thoughts prior to rating all seven applicants. Are there any questions?

Because we have only 50 minutes to get the entire experiment completed, it’s possible that Jerry/Jeri will not be able to speak with each of you. Typically, we get through one or two interviews, but usually not all three. So, in order to make it fair in deciding who will talk to Jerry/Jeri, there will be an index card at the desk that you will be working at. This index card will let you know which order you will be talking to Jerry/Jeri. So, if your index card says that you will be talking to him/her third, you probably won’t talk to him/her. We’ll just have to see how this goes. Anyway, we’re doing it this
way just to make it fair in deciding who will talk with Jeri/Jerry first.

Also, when you slide your applicant rating sheet under the door of your office, make sure to slide the index card under the door also. This will let me know in which order each of you will be speaking with Jerry/Jeri.

Are there any questions? Before you get started on the task, I just need to make sure that the instructions for this experiment are clear. Please take a few moments to complete this survey. (Experimenter hands out "Instructions Questionnaire." Participants complete the survey.)

Please make sure not to put your name on the survey that you just completed. Just put it face-down at your place when you are finished.

Are there any questions? (Experimenter answers any questions).

Just to remind you, make sure to write your thoughts about the most suitable applicant first. Then, go ahead and rate all seven applicants on the 1-7 scale. It's important that you go in that particular order, so even if you have additional thoughts about the most suitable applicant after you begin making your ratings, do not go back and write those additional thoughts. Also, when you are finished rating all of the applicants, make sure to slide the ratings sheet along with the index card underneath the door. This will give Jerry/Jeri a chance to look at your ratings before he/she comes in to speak with you. Are there any questions?

O.K., please take the rating sheet and the other sheet and come follow me please. (Experimenter leads participants to breakout rooms). Simply pick one of the offices to work in, close the door behind you, and begin working.

(Experimenter waits until all participants have slid their materials under the door. Afterwards, he knocks on each office individually and says the following to each participant).

Jerry/Jeri will need just a few more moments to look at your ratings. While you're waiting for Jerry/Jeri, please take a few moments to fill out this survey. (Experimenter hands participant the "Post-Task Survey" and closes door behind them).
Debriefing: (Experimenter stands in front of the room. Confederate is seated at a desk in front of the room.) O.K., who will be meeting with Jerry/Jeri first. (Wait for all three people to raise their hands.) As you can see, there is something going on here. There are a few things that I have to tell you about this experiment. First, this study is not being sponsored by the OSU Department of Residence and Dining Halls. Second, you won’t be talking with anyone named Jerry/Jeri Willer. In fact, this person doesn’t even exist. This is my research assistant.

However, I had to tell you these things because there is a certain effect that we’re trying to create in this study. You see, we are actually looking at the effects of accountability on people’s thought processes. Accountability is the idea that you believe that you will have justify your decisions to someone else. We believe that people who are held accountable for their ratings would think about this task differently than people who are not held accountable. You may be able to relate to this from your own real-life experiences. When you know that you have to justify your decisions to someone else, you probably think more about the decision, have different kinds of thoughts, and perhaps, spend more time making those decisions. This is basically what this study is trying to document. Based on what you wrote about the most suitable applicant and the ratings that you gave to all of the applicants, we will be able to see how people’s thought processes differ when they are held accountable as compared to when they are not held accountable.

I hope you can see why it was important to tell you these things in the beginning. We are simply trying to create an environment in this study that reflects real-life. Had I simply told you to pretend these things, you probably would not have been very interested in this experiment. Are there any questions?

Although I did tell you some things that were not true, one thing that you can believe me about is that all of your responses in this experiment will be kept confidential. Also, all of your responses will be given a code number. Once that happens, your responses will not be traceable to you personally.

There is one thing that I will ask of you. Because it is natural for people to talk about their participation in
experiments with friends and classmates, I ask that you limit your comments to your overall reactions to the experiment. If you want to say that the experiment was really stupid or really interesting, go ahead and do so. But please don't tell any of the details of the experiment. Because of the environment that we're trying to create in this experiment, people may not act naturally if they know ahead of time what is going to happen. And really, all we want is for people to act naturally in these experiments. Are there any questions? Thank you for your participation.
SCRIPT FOR NOT ACCOUNTABLE, KNOWLEDGEABLE OF PRINCIPAL'S POSITION CONDITION

Good (morning, afternoon). This is experiment QK-1. It is worth 1 hour of credit. My name is Mark, and I will be your experimenter this (morning, afternoon). Before we go ahead and get started, I just need to take attendance.

(Experimenter takes attendance)

Before you go ahead and do the experiment, I need to give you some background information about the study as well as some instructions for what it is that you will be doing. This experiment is being jointly-sponsored by the OSU Department of Residence and Dining Halls and the Psychology Department. Currently, the Department of Residence and Dining Halls is looking at the idea of having students such as yourself involved in the R.A. selection process, or how it is that residence advisors are selected for the residence halls. The idea is that since students have day-to-day contact with R.A.'s, you probably have some idea of what makes for a good R.A. as well as a not so good R.A. So, the idea is that students may have valuable input to provide in the R.A. selection process.

Now, before Residence & Dining Halls decides for sure that yes, they want to do this or no, they don't, they want to get an idea of what happens when students are allowed to make R.A. selection decisions. That's where this particular study comes in. Because after I'm finished giving you these instructions, each of you will work individually in one of the offices that are adjacent to this room here.

(Experimenter points to the three breakout rooms that are adjacent to the area where participants are currently sitting.)

At the desk that you will be working at, there will be a set of seven R.A. applicant summaries. These are summaries of people who actually applied for R.A. positions last spring for the current academic year. There are several things that you will be doing with the applicant summaries. First, you will be taking a look at them just to see what kind of information is available about each of the applicants.

Then, you will decide which of the applicants is most suitable for the R.A. position. What I would like for you to do then is to write your thoughts that you have about the most suitable applicant on this page. (Experimenter
Please note that I am interested in your honest thoughts about the most suitable applicant. Don’t put your name on it anywhere so it is not personally identifiable to you. Also, you can turn it face down at your desk after you are finished with it. The only people who are going to look at what you wrote are other Psychology Department researchers who are interested in the thoughts that people have while making selection decisions. But even this won’t happen until the end of the quarter after all of the sessions of this experiment have been done. Because your name is not on this page anywhere, there is no way of identifying what you wrote to you personally. All we want are your honest thoughts about the most suitable applicant.

After you’re done writing your thoughts about the most suitable applicant, the last thing I would like for you to do is to rate all 7 applicants on the sheet that I am passing out right now. (Experimenter passes out rating sheet). You will rate them on a 1 to 7 scale where a 1 means "highly unsuitable" and a 7 means "highly suitable." Please note that this is a rating scale, so you can assign the same rating to more than one applicant if you want.

Now, as with the previous sheet, do not put your name on the rating sheet. What will happen with the ratings sheets is at the end of quarter, after all sessions of the experiment have been run, these will be looked at by Jerry/Jeri Willer, an assistant hall director on campus about your ratings. Does anybody here know Jerry/Jeri or live in his/her residence hall? (Experimenter waits for responses). Anyway, Jerry/Jeri is an assistant hall director on campus. He/she is also head of the R.A. selection committee on campus. Obviously, he/she is interested in the results of this study. So, he/she will be looking at the rating sheets. However, once again, this won’t happen until after the quarter ends. Because your name does not appear anywhere on the rating sheet, there is no way of identifying your own ratings. When you are finished rating the applicants, simply put these sheet face-down at the desk you’ll be working at.

Just to summarize, make sure to write your thoughts about the most suitable applicant first. Then, go ahead and rate all seven applicants on the 1-7 scale. It’s important that you go in that particular order, so even if you have additional thoughts about the most suitable applicant after you begin making your ratings, do not go back and write those additional thoughts. We are just interested in your thoughts prior to rating all seven applicants. Are there any questions?
This may or may not help you, but I know that Jerry/Jeri typically prefers R.A. candidates who are sophomores at the time that they apply for R.A. positions. I guess Jerry’s/Jeri’s reason for this is that the R.A. position is pretty complex and typically takes a long time to learn. With this being the case, the R.A. usually spends their first year learning how to do the job. It’s not until the second year that they can become the "best R.A. that they can be." Again, that may or may not help you on this task. That’s just something that I know about Jerry’s/Jeri’s preferences.

Are there any questions? Before you get started on the task, I just need to make sure that the instructions for this experiment are clear. Please take a few moments to complete this survey. (Experimenter hands out "Instructions Questionnaire." Participants complete the survey.)

Please make sure not to put your name on the survey that you just completed. Just put it face-down at your place when you are finished.

Are there any questions? (Experimenter answers any questions).

Just to remind you, make sure to write your thoughts about the most suitable applicant first. Then, go ahead and rate all seven applicants on the 1-7 scale. It’s important that you go in that particular order, so even if you have additional thoughts about the most suitable applicant after you begin making your ratings, do not go back and write those additional thoughts. Also, when you are finished rating all of the applicants, make sure to turn this page face down at the place you are working at. When you are finished rating the applicants, open the door to the office in which you are working. This will let me know that you are finished.

O.K., please take the rating sheet and the other sheet and come follow me please. (Experimenter leads participants to breakout rooms). Simply pick one of the offices to work in, close the door behind you, and begin working.

(Experimenter waits until a participant opens the door to signal that they are finished. Then, he says the following to each participant).

One last thing I need for you to do is to complete this survey. (Experimenter hands participant the "Post-Task Survey" and closes door behind them).
(After all participants have been finished with the judgment task for four minutes, experimenter instructs each participant to go back to the area where they originally assembled. At this time, the debriefing is given).

Debriefing: (Experimenter stands in front of the room.)
O.K., the experiment is over. However, before you go, there are a few things that I need to tell you about the experiment. First, this study is not being sponsored by the OSU Department of Residence and Dining Halls. Second, your ratings of the applicants won't be examined by anyone named Jerry/Jeri Willer. In fact, this person doesn't even exist.

However, I had to tell you these things because there is a certain effect that we're trying to create in this study. You see, we are actually looking at the effects of accountability on people's thought processes. Accountability is the idea that you believe that you will have justify your decisions to someone else. In other variations of this study, participants are being led to believe that they will have to justify their ratings to someone else. We believe that people who are held accountable for their ratings would think about this task differently than people who are not held accountable. You may be able to relate to this from your own real-life experiences. When you know that you have to justify your decisions to someone else, you probably think more about the decision, have different kinds of thoughts, and perhaps, spend more time making those decisions. This is basically what this study is trying to document. Based on what you wrote about the most suitable applicant and the ratings that you gave to all of the applicants, we will be able to see how people's thought processes differ when they are held accountable as compared to when they are not held accountable.

I hope you can see why it was important to tell you these things in the beginning. We are simply trying to create an environment in this study that reflects real-life. Had I simply told you to pretend these things, you probably would not have been very interested in this experiment. Are there any questions?

Although I did tell you some things that were not true, one thing that you can believe me about is that all of your responses in this experiment will be kept confidential. Also, all of your responses will be given a code number. Once that happens, your responses will not be traceable to you personally.
There is one thing that I will ask of you. Because it is natural for people to talk about their participation in experiments with friends and classmates, I ask that you limit your comments to your overall reactions to the experiment. If you want to say that the experiment was really stupid or really interesting, go ahead and do so. But please don't tell any of the details of the experiment. Because of the environment that we're trying to create in this experiment, people may not act naturally if they know ahead of time what is going to happen. And really, all we want is for people to act naturally in these experiments. Are there any questions?

Thank you for your participation.
SCRIPT FOR NOT ACCOUNTABLE, NOT KNOWLEDGEABLE OF PRINCIPAL'S POSITION CONDITION

Good (morning, afternoon). This is experiment QK-1. It is worth 1 hour of credit. My name is Mark, and I will be your experimenter this (morning, afternoon). Before we go ahead and get started, I just need to take attendance.

(Experimenter takes attendance)

Before you go ahead and do the experiment, I need to give you some background information about the study as well as some instructions for what it is that you will be doing. This experiment is being jointly-sponsored by the OSU Department of Residence and Dining Halls and the Psychology Department. Currently, the Department of Residence and Dining Halls is looking at the idea of having students such as yourself involved in the R.A. selection process, or how it is that residence advisors are selected for the residence halls. The idea is that since students have day-to-day contact with R.A.’s, you probably have some idea of what makes for a good R.A. as well as a not so good R.A. So, the idea is that students may have valuable input to provide in the R.A. selection process.

Now, before Residence & Dining Halls decides for sure that yes, they want to do this or no, they don’t, they want to get an idea of what happens when students are allowed to make R.A. selection decisions. That’s where this particular study comes in. Because after I’m finished giving you these instructions, each of you will work individually in one of the offices that are adjacent to this room here.

(Experimenter points to the three breakout rooms that are adjacent to the area where participants are currently sitting.)

At the desk that you will be working at, there will be a set of seven R.A. applicant summaries. These are summaries of people who actually applied for R.A. positions last spring for the current academic year. There are several things that you will be doing with the applicant summaries. First, you will be taking a look at them just to see what kind of information is available about each of the applicants.

Then, you will decide which of the applicants is most suitable for the R.A. position. What I would like for you to do then is to write your thoughts that you have about the most suitable applicant on this page. (Experimenter
hands blank thought protocol sheet to participants). Please note that I am interested in your honest thoughts about the most suitable applicant. Don’t put your name on it anywhere so it is not personally identifiable to you. Also, you can turn it face down at your desk after you are finished with it. The only people who are going to look at what you wrote are other Psychology Department researchers who are interested in the thoughts that people have while making selection decisions. But even this won’t happen until the end of the quarter after all of the sessions of this experiment have been done. Because your name is not on this page anywhere, there is no way of identifying what you wrote to you personally. All we want are your honest thoughts about the most suitable applicant.

After you’re done writing your thoughts about the most suitable applicant, the last thing I would like for you to do is to rate all 7 applicants on the sheet that I am passing out right now. (Experimenter passes out rating sheet). You will rate them on a 1 to 7 scale where a 1 means "highly unsuitable" and a 7 means "highly suitable." Please note that this is a rating scale, so you can assign the same rating to more than one applicant if you want.

Now, as with the previous sheet, do not put your name on the rating sheet. What will happen with the ratings sheets is at the end of quarter, after all sessions of the experiment have been run, these will be looked at by Jerry/Jeri Willer, an assistant hall director on campus about your ratings. Does anybody here know Jerry/Jeri or live in his/her residence hall? (Experimenter waits for responses). Anyway, Jerry/Jeri is an assistant hall director on campus. He/she is also head of the R.A. selection committee on campus. Obviously, he/she is interested in the results of this study. So, he/she will be looking at the rating sheets. However, once again, this won’t happen until after the quarter ends. Because your name does not appear anywhere on the rating sheet, there is no way of identifying your own ratings. When you are finished rating the applicants, simply put these sheet face-down at the desk you’ll be working at.

Just to summarize, make sure to write your thoughts about the most suitable applicant first. Then, go ahead and rate all seven applicants on the 1-7 scale. It’s important that you go in that particular order, so even if you have additional thoughts about the most suitable applicant after you begin making your ratings, do not go back and write those additional thoughts. We are just interested in your thoughts prior to rating all seven applicants. Are there any questions?
Before you get started on the task, I just need to make sure that the instructions for this experiment are clear. Please take a few moments to complete this survey. (Experimenter hands out "Instructions Questionnaire." Participants complete the survey.)

Please make sure not to put your name on the survey that you just completed. Just put it face-down at your place when you are finished.

Are there any questions? (Experimenter answers any questions).

Just to remind you, make sure to write your thoughts about the most suitable applicant first. Then, go ahead and rate all seven applicants on the 1-7 scale. It’s important that you go in that particular order, so even if you have additional thoughts about the most suitable applicant after you begin making your ratings, do not go back and write those additional thought. Also, when you are finished rating all of the applicants, make sure to turn this page face down at the place you are working at. When you are finished rating the applicants, open the door to the office in which you are working. This will let me know that you are finished.

O.K., please take the rating sheet and the other sheet and come follow me please. (Experimenter leads participants to breakout rooms). Simply pick one of the offices to work in, close the door behind you, and begin working.

(Experimenter waits until a participant opens the door to signal that they are finished. Then, he says the following to each participant).

One last thing I need for you to do is to complete this survey. (Experimenter hands participant the "Post-Task Survey" and closes door behind them).

(After all participants have been finished with the judgment task for four minutes, experimenter instructs each participant to go back to the area where they originally assembled. At this time, the debriefing is given).

Debriefing: (Experimenter stands in front of the room.) O.K., the experiment is over. However, before you go, there are a few things that I need to tell you about the experiment. First, this study is not being sponsored by the OSU Department of Residence and Dining Halls. Second, your ratings of the applicants won’t be examined by anyone
named Jerry/Jeri Willer. In fact, this person doesn’t even exist.

However, I had to tell you these things because there is a certain effect that we’re trying to create in this study. You see, we are actually looking at the effects of accountability on people’s thought processes. Accountability is the idea that you believe that you will have justify your decisions to someone else. In other variations of this study, participants are being led to believe that they will have to justify their ratings to someone else. We believe that people who are held accountable for their ratings would think about this task differently than people who are not held accountable. You may be able to relate to this from your own real-life experiences. When you know that you have to justify your decisions to someone else, you probably think more about the decision, have different kinds of thoughts, and perhaps, spend more time making those decisions. This is basically what this study is trying to document. Based on what you wrote about the most suitable applicant and the ratings that you gave to all of the applicants, we will be able to see how people’s thought processes differ when they are held accountable as compared to when they are not held accountable.

I hope you can see why it was important to tell you these things in the beginning. We are simply trying to create an environment in this study that reflects real-life. Had I simply told you to pretend these things, you probably would not have been very interested in this experiment. Are there any questions?

Although I did tell you some things that were not true, one thing that you can believe me about is that all of your responses in this experiment will be kept confidential. Also, all of your responses will be given a code number. Once that happens, your responses will not be traceable to you personally.

There is one thing that I will ask of you. Because it is natural for people to talk about their participation in experiments with friends and classmates, I ask that you limit your comments to your overall reactions to the experiment. If you want to say that the experiment was really stupid or really interesting, go ahead and do so. But please don’t tell any of the details of the experiment. Because of the environment that we’re trying to create in this experiment, people may not act naturally if they know ahead of time what is going to happen. And really, all we want is for people to act naturally in these experiments. Are there any questions? Thank you.
APPENDIX C

APPLICANT SUMMARIES AND ASSESSMENT MATERIALS
OSU Department of Residence and Dining Halls
R.A. Applicant Selection Study

Candidate ID#: 28 (Most Suitable Applicant)

R.A. APPLICANT INFORMATION

Have you ever lived in an OSU Residence Hall?: Yes
If yes, how long: 2 Years

HIGH SCHOOL INFORMATION:
School & Location: Vermillion High School, Vermillion, OH
High School Standing: 1 out of 355, valedictorian
Activities: Member, National Honor Society;
President, Student Council;
Debate Team

COLLEGE INFORMATION:
Current Class Rank: Junior
Major: Sociology
Cumulative Grade Point Average: 3.45

WORK EXPERIENCE:
Camp Ticonderoga: Summer, 1992, Summer Camp Counselor
Kinko's Copies: Current, Weekend Manager

ACTIVITIES/INTERESTS:
Activities: Undergraduate Student Government Rep.
President, Sociology Professional Organization
Telephone Volunteer, Columbus Crisis Hotline

Hobbies/Interests: photography, camping

Average Time Per Week You Will Spend on Extracurricular Activities During the Upcoming Year: 10-15 hours
OSU Department of Residence and Dining Halls
R.A. Applicant Selection Study

Candidate ID#: 34  (Principal's Most Preferred Applicant)

R.A. APPLICANT INFORMATION

Have you ever lived in an OSU Residence Hall?: Yes
If yes, how long: 1 Year

HIGH SCHOOL INFORMATION:
School & Location: Lincoln Senior, Cleveland, OH
High School Standing: 170 out of 364
Activities: Reporter, School Newspaper
            Varsity Swim Team
            Concert Band

COLLEGE INFORMATION:
Current Class Rank: Sophomore
Major: Physical Education
Cumulative Grade Point Average: 2.45

WORK EXPERIENCE:
Ponderosa: 1991-92, Food Preparation Assistant
White's Furniture Warehouse: Current, Warehouse Worker

ACTIVITIES/INTERESTS:
Activities: Member, OSU Marching Band
            OSU Karate Club
Hobbies/Interests: music, racquetball

Average Time Per Week You Will Spend on Extracurricular Activities During the Upcoming Year: 15-20 hours
OSU Department of Residence and Dining Halls
R.A. Applicant Selection Study

Candidate ID#: 71

R.A. APPLICANT INFORMATION

Have you ever lived in an OSU Residence Hall?: Yes
If yes, how long: 1 Year

HIGH SCHOOL INFORMATION:
School & Location: Roger Bacon High School, Cincinnati, OH
High School Standing: 146 out of 285
Activities: Yearbook Staff
          French Club
          Varsity Basketball Team

COLLEGE INFORMATION:
Current Class Rank: Junior
Major: Finance
Cumulative Grade Point Average: 2.49

WORK EXPERIENCE:
Kroger: 1991-92, Produce Clerk
Agler-Davidson Sporting Goods: Current, Salesperson

ACTIVITIES/INTERESTS:
Activities: Member, OSU Ski Club
          Member, Finance Professional Organization
Hobbies/Interests: softball, jogging
Average Time Per Week You Will Spend on Extracurricular
Activities During the Upcoming Year: 10-15 hours
Candidate ID#: 56

R. A. APPLICANT INFORMATION

Have you ever lived in an OSU Residence Hall?: Yes
If yes, how long: 2 Years

HIGH SCHOOL INFORMATION:
School & Location: Washington High School, Toledo, OH
High School Standing: 160 out of 311
Activities: Homeroom Representative, Student Council Treasurer, Senior Class Photography Club

COLLEGE INFORMATION:
Current Class Rank: Junior
Major: Electrical Engineering
Cumulative Grade Point Average: 2.6

WORK EXPERIENCE:
McDonald's: 1991-92, Cook
OSU Main Library: Current, Book Check-Out Clerk

ACTIVITIES/INTERESTS:
Activities: Member, Electrical Engineering Society
OSU Bowling Club

Hobbies/Interests: playing golf, reading mystery novels

Average Time Per Week You Will Spend on Extracurricular Activities During the Upcoming Year: 5-10 hours
Candidate ID#: 49

R. A. APPLICANT INFORMATION

Have you ever lived in an OSU Residence Hall?: Yes
If yes, how long: 1 Year

HIGH SCHOOL INFORMATION:

School & Location: Centerville High School, Centerville, OH

High School Standing: 300 out of 405

Activities: Drama Club
Junior Varsity Track Team

COLLEGE INFORMATION:

Current Class Rank: Freshman

Major: Political Science

Cumulative Grade Point Average: 2.09

WORK EXPERIENCE:

Ponderosa: 1991, Cashier

7-11: Current, Cashier

ACTIVITIES/INTERESTS:

Activities: Member, Political Science Professional Organization

Hobbies/Interests: playing video games, watching videos

Average Time Per Week You Will Spend on Extracurricular Activities During the Upcoming Year: 1-5 hours
OSU Department of Residence and Dining Halls
R.A. Applicant Selection Study

Candidate ID#: 36

R.A. APPLICANT INFORMATION

Have you ever lived in an OSU Residence Hall?: Yes
If yes, how long: 1 Year

HIGH SCHOOL INFORMATION:
School & Location: Kirtland High School, Kirtland, OH
High School Standing: 78 out of 106
Activities: Dungeons and Dragons Club
           Student Council Homeroom Representative

COLLEGE INFORMATION:
Current Class Rank: Freshman
Major: History
Cumulative Grade Point Average: 2.35

WORK EXPERIENCE:
Wendy’s: 1991-92, Cook

ACTIVITIES/INTERESTS:
Activities: Society for Creative Anachronisms
           (Medieval Club)

Hobbies/Interests: playing fantasy games, jogging

Average Time Per Week You Will Spend on Extracurricular Activities During the Upcoming Year: 15-20 hours
Candidate ID#: 65

R.A. APPLICANT INFORMATION

Have you ever lived in an OSU Residence Hall?: Yes
If yes, how long: 1 Year

HIGH SCHOOL INFORMATION:

School & Location: Mooney High School, Youngstown, OH
High School Standing: 104 out of 325
Activities: Homeroom Representative, Student Council Yearbook Staff, Photographer Jazz Band

COLLEGE INFORMATION:

Current Class Rank: Senior (graduating Winter, 1994 quarter)
Major: Marketing
Cumulative Grade Point Average: 2.59

WORK EXPERIENCE:

Kroch's & Brentano's Bookstore: 1991-92, Sales Clerk
Damon's Clubhouse: Current, Bartender

ACTIVITIES/INTERESTS:

Activities: Member, American Marketing Association Member, OSU Young Republicans

Hobbies/Interests: playing racquetball, playing trumpet

Average Time Per Week You Will Spend on Extracurricular Activities During the Upcoming Year: 5-10 hours
In order to give you the opportunity to collect your thoughts before rating each of the applicants, please take a few moments to consider the applicant that you currently feel is most suitable. Write your thoughts regarding the qualifications of this most suitable applicant for an RA position. Write your thoughts regarding this applicant only.

You should understand that everything you write down will be completely confidential. Do not put your name on this page. These responses will be examined at the end of the quarter by Psychology Department researchers and will not be traceable to you personally. After you have finished making your ratings, turn this page face-down so that nobody can see it.
Using the scale below, rate the suitability of each of the R.A. position applicants.

1 = highly unsuitable
2 = unsuitable
3 = slightly unsuitable
4 = neither suitable nor unsuitable
5 = slightly suitable
6 = suitable
7 = highly suitable

Or, if you are not sure, indicate:

X = not sure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(TURN THIS PAGE FACE-DOWN AFTER YOU HAVE RATED THE APPLICANTS)
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RESIDENT ADVISOR APPLICANT JUDGMENTS

(NOTE: FOR NOT ACCOUNTABLE CONDITIONS ONLY)

Using the scale below, rate the suitability of each of the
R.A. position applicants.

1 = highly unsuitable
2 = unsuitable
3 = slightly unsuitable
4 = neither suitable nor unsuitable
5 = slightly suitable
6 = suitable
7 = highly suitable

Or, if you are not sure, indicate:

X = not sure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(TURN THIS PAGE FACE-DOWN AFTER YOU HAVE RATED THE
APPLICANTS)
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INSTRUCTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

The researchers conducting this experiment want to make sure that everyone understands the R.A. selection task that you will be doing. For each of the scales listed below, please indicate your thoughts about the R.A. selection task by circling one number.

1. Generally speaking, how good do you think you are at judging how qualified people are to perform a job?

Excellent 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very Poor

2. To what extent are the instructions for this task clear?

Not At All 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  To A Great Extent

3. To what extent will this task be time-consuming?

Not At All 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  To A Great Extent

4. To what extent was the experimenter courteous?

Not At All 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  To A Great Extent

5. To what extent is your performance on this task meaningful to you?

Not At All 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  To A Great Extent

6. To what extent will this task be pleasurable to you?

Not At All 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  To A Great Extent

7. How important is it to you that you do well on this task?

Not At All 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very Important
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.  To what extent is this task complex?</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 To A Great Extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.  To what extent does this task make you feel anxious?</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 To A Great Extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To what extent will your performance on this task indicate something important about you?</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 To A Great Extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To what extent does this task seem interesting?</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 To A Great Extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To what extent will your performance on this task affect your opinion about yourself?</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 To A Great Extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To what extent does this task seem difficult?</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 To A Great Extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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POST-TASK SURVEY

For each question, circle the response that applies best to you.

1. If asked to describe your judgments on this R.A. judgment task, how prepared would you be to do so?

1----------2----------3----------4----------5
somewhat prepared
extremely prepared
x = not sure

2. How much attention did you give to rating each applicant?

1----------2----------3----------4----------5
average extreme attention
attention
x = not sure

3. As you were completing the R.A. judgment task, to what extent did the thought cross your mind that you would have to explain your judgments about the applicants to an assistant hall director.

1----------2----------3----------4----------5----------6----------7
it didn't it occurred I was it weighed
occur to to me in a aware heavily on
me passing way of it my mind
x = not sure

4. As you were completing the R.A. judgment task, to what extent were you thinking about strategies for selecting the best candidates?

1----------2----------3----------4----------5
not at all to some to a great extent
extent
x = not sure

(Go On To The Next Page)
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5. To what extent do you think you know the kind of candidate the assistant hall director prefers?

1 = clear
2 = somewhat
3 = don’t have an idea
4 = clear idea
5 = really know

x = not sure

6. To what extent do you know the kind of candidate that the experimenter preferred?

1 = clear
2 = somewhat
3 = don’t have an idea
4 = clear idea
5 = really know

x = not sure

7. We will be doing a number of studies similar to this one in the near future. However, participants in those experiments will be able to actually get feedback on how well they performed this task.

Although we can’t do it for this experiment, we are interested in knowing what kind of feedback students such as yourself would prefer to receive. Using the scale below, indicate how much you would have preferred to receive each of the following types of feedback, if you had the option.

5 = Very Much Prefer
4 = Prefer
3 = Prefer Somewhat
2 = Prefer a Little
1 = Don’t Prefer

_____ a. How your ratings compared to other study participants.

_____ b. The assistant hall director’s evaluations of the candidates.

_____ c. What the assistant hall director thought about your ratings and reasons for those ratings.

_____ d. The actual on-the-job performance ratings of the candidates that were eventually hired compared to your ratings.

(Go On To The Next Page)
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8. Just prior to beginning the R.A. judgment task, did you believe that (check one):

_____ you would have to report to the assistant hall director and justify your judgments and ratings.

_____ you would not have to report to the assistant hall director and justify your judgments and ratings.

_____ you can't recall.

9. In which order will you be reporting to the assistant hall director when you have completed this form?:

_____ First

_____ Second

_____ Third

_____ I won't be reporting to the assistant hall director at any time.

_____ I don't recall.

10. Just prior to beginning the R.A. judgment task, you were told that the assistant hall director had a preference for candidates with a specific:

_____ high school activity.

_____ college GPA.

_____ major.

_____ class rank (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior).

_____ kind of work experience.

_____ No mention was made of the assistant hall director's preferences.

(Go On To The Next Page)
11. Just prior to beginning the R.A. judgment task, the experimenter told you that he personally has a preference for candidates with a specific:

- high school activity.
- college GPA.
- major.
- class rank (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior).
- work experience.

The experimenter did not mention his own preferences.
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Use the following scales to rate each of the characteristics that an R.A. applicant may possess.

In your opinion, to what extent does this characteristic reflect an R.A. applicant that is suitable for this position?

1 = highly unsuitable
2 = unsuitable
3 = slightly unsuitable
4 = neither suitable nor unsuitable
5 = slightly suitable
6 = suitable
7 = highly suitable

Or, if you are not sure, indicate:

X = not sure

In your opinion, how useful is this piece of information in deciding whether an individual would make a good R.A.?

1 = useless information
2 = slightly useful information
3 = useful information
4 = very useful information
5 = extremely useful information

Or, if you are not sure, indicate:

X = not sure

Instructions Given To Study Participants

Below are characteristics that Resident Advisor (R.A.) applicants typically possess. Rate each characteristic as it pertains to the R.A. positions. For characteristics that consist of part-time work experience, you can assume that the candidates will not continue to hold the job if they are hired as an R.A.
## Table 25

### Means and Standard Deviations for Suitability and Importance of R.A. Applicant Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUITABLE M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>IMPORTANT M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Being a graduate student.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Being a Sociology major.</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Having a GPA between 3.5 and 4.0.</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Being a TA for a 100-level course.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Being a member of ROTC.</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Being a member of a fraternity/sorority.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Having lived in an OSU residence hall for 2 years.</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Being the president of a fraternity/sorority.</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Being a Finance major.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Being born and raised in a small town (less than 5,000 people) in Ohio.</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Being a member of a campus religious organization such as Campus Crusade for Christ, Newman Center, InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, or Hillel Foundation.</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Being a History major.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Having a part-time job at McDonald’s taking food orders from customers.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Being a member of the varsity swim team.</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25 (Cont.)

Means and Standard Deviations for Suitability and Importance of R.A. Applicant Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUITABLE</th>
<th></th>
<th>IMPORTANT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Being an Electrical Engineering major.</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Being put on academic probation during their first year in school, but currently academically eligible.</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Having lived in the state of Ohio throughout their entire lives.</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Having graduated from high school with a class rank of 10 out of 300.</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Being a homeroom vice-president in high school.</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Having hobbies that include photography and camping.</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Being valedictorian of their high school graduating class.</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Being a member of the photography club while in high school.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Being a member of the Ohio State Pistol Club.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Have a criminal record for shoplifting when he/she was a teenager.</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Being a member of the OSU Flying Club.</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Having a part-time job as a check-out clerk at a grocery store.</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25 (Cont.)

Means and Standard Deviations for Suitability and Importance of R.A. Applicant Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>SUITABLE</th>
<th>IMPORTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Having a part-time job as a bookkeeper for a local restaurant.</td>
<td>4.26 1.11</td>
<td>2.00 1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Having a part-time job as a weekend manager at Kinko's.</td>
<td>4.31 1.12</td>
<td>2.21 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Having a GPA between 2.5 and 3.0.</td>
<td>5.08 .76</td>
<td>3.18 .90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Being a member of the baseball team while in high school.</td>
<td>4.00 1.01</td>
<td>1.76 .94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Being a member of the swim team while in high school.</td>
<td>4.08 .94</td>
<td>1.75 .88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Being an Undergraduate Student Government representative.</td>
<td>5.32 1.36</td>
<td>3.13 1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Being a marketing major.</td>
<td>4.05 .85</td>
<td>1.87 1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Being born and raised in Youngstown, OH.</td>
<td>3.80 1.05</td>
<td>1.32 .58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Having hobbies that include swimming, golf.</td>
<td>4.18 1.20</td>
<td>1.82 1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. A person who will spend 16-20 hours per week on extracurricular activities while they are an R.A.</td>
<td>4.26 1.55</td>
<td>3.03 1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Having hobbies that include watching T.V. and playing video games.</td>
<td>3.58 1.20</td>
<td>2.10 1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Having a part-time job cleaning tables at a restaurant.</td>
<td>4.05 .91</td>
<td>1.95 1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Having a part-time job as an assistant manager at an auto parts store.</td>
<td>4.24 1.12</td>
<td>2.13 1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 25 (Cont.)

### Means and Standard Deviations for Suitability and Importance of R.A. Applicant Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUITABLE</th>
<th>IMPORTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Being a school newspaper reporter while in high school.</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Being a member of the glee club while in high school.</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Being a member of the OSU ski club.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Having a part-time job as a night manager at a 7-11.</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Being a member of the track team while in high school.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Being a member of Ohio Staters, Inc. (Public Service to OSU).</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Having hobbies that include fishing, music.</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Having a part-time job as a produce clerk at a grocery store.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Having a part-time job with the university food service preparing food lines and washing dishes.</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Being a member of a professional organization in their major.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Living in an OSU residence for at least 1 year.</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Having a GPA between 2.0 and 2.5.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Being a chemistry major.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25 (Cont.)

Means and Standard Deviations for Suitability and Importance of R.A. Applicant Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUITABLE M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>IMPORTANT M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53. Being a freshman at the time he/she applies for an R.A. position.</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Being a Biology major.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Having a part-time job at the library checking out books.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Having work experience as a counselor at a summer camp for teenagers.</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Having a part-time job as a bartender.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Having graduated from high school with a class rank of 48 out of 324.</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Having a part-time job as an assistant night manager at a fast-food restaurant.</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Being a member of Future Farmers of America while in high school.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Having graduated from high school with a class rank of 166 out of 171.</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Being editor of the OSU Yearbook.</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Being a member of the OSU Karate Club.</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. A person who will spend 20-25 hours per week on extracurricular activities while they are an R.A.</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUITABLE</td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Being a member of the National Honor Society while in high school.</td>
<td>5.05 1.14</td>
<td>2.57 1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Being President of the OSU Accounting Association.</td>
<td>4.39 1.42</td>
<td>2.21 1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Having graduated from high school with a class rank of 206 out of 241.</td>
<td>3.66 1.40</td>
<td>2.74 1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Being Secretary of the Undergraduate Student Organization (USG).</td>
<td>5.05 1.43</td>
<td>3.03 1.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Being a member of the Golden Key National Honor Society.</td>
<td>5.05 1.23</td>
<td>2.68 1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Having hobbies that include music, racquetball.</td>
<td>4.32 1.23</td>
<td>1.95 1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Having a part-time job as a warehouse worker at a department store.</td>
<td>3.84 1.03</td>
<td>1.82 .95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Being a member of the school choir while in high school.</td>
<td>3.76 .95</td>
<td>1.38 .98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Being a member of the OSU Bowling Club.</td>
<td>3.87 .91</td>
<td>1.37 .59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Having a GPA between 3.0 and 3.5</td>
<td>5.84 .87</td>
<td>3.39 1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Being a member of the OSU Strollers Dramatic Society.</td>
<td>4.16 1.03</td>
<td>1.84 1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Having hobbies that include drama, music.</td>
<td>4.22 1.18</td>
<td>1.89 1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Having a part-time job as a food preparer at a family restaurant.</td>
<td>3.71 1.09</td>
<td>1.68 .93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUITABLE M  S.D.</td>
<td>IMPORTANT M  S.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Being born and raised in Columbus, OH.</td>
<td>4.10 1.43</td>
<td>2.03 1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Being a member of the yearbook staff while in high school.</td>
<td>4.05 .80</td>
<td>1.50 .69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>A person who will spend 6-10 hours per week on extracurricular activities while they are an R.A.</td>
<td>5.03 1.15</td>
<td>3.08 1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Being born and raised in Cincinnati, OH.</td>
<td>3.74 .95</td>
<td>1.26 .56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Being born and raised in Dayton, OH.</td>
<td>3.74 .95</td>
<td>1.26 .56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Being Vice-President of the Student Council while in high school.</td>
<td>4.97 1.28</td>
<td>2.42 1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Being a member of the French Club while in high school.</td>
<td>4.05 .96</td>
<td>1.66 .78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Being a member of Phi Beta Kappa (Honor Society).</td>
<td>5.26 1.39</td>
<td>2.76 1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Having a part-time job as an evening manager at a department store.</td>
<td>4.10 1.49</td>
<td>2.40 1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Being a member of the debate team while in high school.</td>
<td>4.50 .98</td>
<td>1.92 .94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Being the treasurer of the Senior class while in high school.</td>
<td>4.47 1.11</td>
<td>2.16 .95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>A person who will spend 11-15 hours per week on extracurricular activities while they are an R.A.</td>
<td>4.67 1.22</td>
<td>2.81 1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25 (Cont.) Means and Standard Deviations for Suitability and Importance of R.A. Applicant Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUITABLE</th>
<th>IMPORTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90. Having hobbies that include fencing, scuba diving.</td>
<td>4.21 .99</td>
<td>1.68 .99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Having a part-time job as a salesperson at a sporting goods store.</td>
<td>4.00 .99</td>
<td>1.87 .99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Having a part-time job as an evening manager at a furniture store.</td>
<td>3.95 1.29</td>
<td>2.08 1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Having a part-time job stocking shelves at a grocery store.</td>
<td>4.00 .99</td>
<td>1.84 .89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Having hobbies that include playing the violin and reading mystery novels.</td>
<td>4.21 .96</td>
<td>1.66 .94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Being a sophomore at the time he/she applies for an R.A. position.</td>
<td>5.34 1.26</td>
<td>3.63 1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Being a junior at the time he/she applies for an R.A. position.</td>
<td>5.74 1.06</td>
<td>3.63 .97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Being an English major.</td>
<td>4.21 .94</td>
<td>1.95 1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Being a Psychology major.</td>
<td>4.29 1.01</td>
<td>2.11 1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Having a part-time job as a research assistant for a professor.</td>
<td>4.30 1.18</td>
<td>2.18 1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Being born and raised in Cleveland, OH.</td>
<td>3.84 1.08</td>
<td>1.40 .89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Being a Physical Education major.</td>
<td>4.05 1.06</td>
<td>1.87 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Having a GPA lower than 2.0.</td>
<td>2.13 1.42</td>
<td>3.92 1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUITABLE</td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. Currently on academic probation.</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. Having a part-time job answering telephones for a crisis hotline.</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. Having lived in an OSU residence hall for 3 years.</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. Being an Education major.</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. Being president of the professional organization for their major.</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. Having been born and raised in a state other than Ohio.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. Having graduated from high school with a class rank of 115 out of 234.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. Being a Music major.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. Having hobbies that include playing the guitar and painting.</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. Being President of the Undergraduate Student Government Association.</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114. Being a foreign student.</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. Being a member of the OSU Marching Band.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116. Having hobbies that include playing tennis and reading novels.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUITABLE M S.D.</td>
<td>IMPORTANT M S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117. A person who will spend 1-5 hours per week on extracurricular activities while they are an R.A.</td>
<td>4.97 1.68</td>
<td>3.11 1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118. Having a part-time job as a waiter/waitress.</td>
<td>3.92 .98</td>
<td>1.90 1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119. Being a Political Science major.</td>
<td>4.18 .93</td>
<td>1.71 1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120. Having graduated from high school with a class rank of 134 out of 212.</td>
<td>3.97 1.08</td>
<td>2.37 1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121. Having hobbies that include playing softball and jogging.</td>
<td>4.32 1.07</td>
<td>1.79 1.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

PILOT STUDY II RESULTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** N = 16 participants. Ratings were made on a scale where 1 = "highly unsuitable" and 7 = "highly suitable."
The scoring of integrative complexity in the present study was conducted using the scoring manual developed by Baker-Brown et al. (1989). The scoring system ranges from 1-7. Below, critical elements of each score are explained.

1 - Low Differentiation, Low Integration

Presentation of a single, one-dimensional argument or justification for the position that is taken or the judgment that is made.

2 - Emerging Differentiation, Low Integration

One dimension or perspective is fully-developed and the potential for an alternative dimension or perspective is mentioned. Indicators of this score include:

a) Conditional acceptance of other dimensions
b) Conditional statements
c) Brief mention of exceptions to a rule

3 - High Differentiation, Low Integration

At least two different dimensions or perspectives are clearly elaborated on by the writer. These dimensions or perspectives may be either conflicting or consistent with the same position. Indicators of this score include:

a) Multiple perspectives
b) Multiple dimensions
c) Temporal perspectives
d) Probability statements

4 - High Differentiation, Emerging Integration

At least two alternative dimensions or perspectives must be clearly elaborated on by the writer. In addition, there must be an implied recognition of a dynamic relationship between or among them. Indicators of this score include:

a) Withholding judgment (writer mentions more information is needed before a position can be taken)
b) Mention of the tension between alternatives
c) Integration is expressed as a superordinate statement
5 - High Differentiation, Explicit Integration

Unlike a score of 4, alternative dimensions need to be clearly evident. Indicators of this score include:

a) Mutual influence and interdependence
b) Mention of the tradeoffs associated with choosing either alternative or position
c) Causal attributions

6 - High Differentiation, High Integration I

The writer must work across at least two conceptual levels. Furthermore, one of these levels needs to be made explicit and other mentioned. The writer may explicitly indicate a global overview and only briefly mention the dynamics of the relationship between the alternatives or perspectives. Conversely, a global overview may only be mentioned and the dynamics of the relationship among the alternative described in detail. Indicators of this score include:

a) Comparison of outcomes
b) Systemic Analysis (Description of how an existing relationship, network, or system can be affected by changes in an internal or external variable).
c) Hypothesis Testing

7 - High Differentiation, High Integration II

Unlike a score of 6, overarching principles and the specific dynamics of the relationship among perspectives are made explicit. Necessary indicators of this score include (both of these indicators are necessary):

a) Presentation of an overarching principle that contains an explanation of the organizing principles at lower levels.
b) The interaction among levels is explicitly described.