

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

EFFECTS OF PERSONALITY AND GENDER ON SELF-INSIGHT

MEGAN NAUDE
SPRING 2013

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees in Psychology and Labor Studies and Employment Relations
with honors in Psychology

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Rick Jacobs
Professor of Psychology
Thesis Supervisor

Richard Carlson
Professor of Psychology
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

This study tested the hypotheses that gender and personality traits, specifically conscientiousness and emotional stability, would predict different levels of performance based self-insight. Conscientiousness and emotional stability were hypothesized to have a positive relationship with self-insight. The study was also designed to test the prediction that women and individuals low in emotional stability, independent of gender, would be more likely to underestimate their performance. These predictions draw on previous literature that suggests that women tend to have higher conscientiousness and lower emotional stability. Participants completed exercises in an assessment center and were given performance scores on eight competencies by graduate and professional assessors. These performance scores were compared with self-ratings of the same competencies, and the differences between scores were used to measure self-insight. A significant negative relationship was found between conscientiousness and the extent to which participants changed their self-ratings after completing the assessment center, suggesting that conscientious individuals may have a better understanding of their own competencies. The results did not support the hypotheses regarding gender and emotional stability, but restrictions in the population studied in terms of academic achievement may account for the lack of statistically significant findings. Implications for what was found in the study and future directions for this type of research are presented.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	iii
Introduction	1
Background.....	3
Hypotheses.....	7
Methods.....	9
Results.....	14
Discussion.....	17
References.....	20

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Correlations for Gender, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Difference Scores.....	15
Table 2: Independent Samples Test for Gender Differences.....	16

Introduction

Employers continually struggle to find and retain talented employees who will carry out the vision of the organization and help companies and other institutions reach their goals. The more they know about their employees and their potential employees, the closer employers come to creating the ideal workplace where work is performed efficiently and the supply of talent is consistent. Self-insight is a new aspect that researchers are beginning to look into as a factor of employment decisions. Knowing oneself and one's own competencies predicts better success on the job, which makes self-insight particularly significant in terms of choosing the right employees (Hays, McCrorie, McAvoy, McManus, & Rethans, 2002). Instead of spending time and money designing a new tool or a test for this variable organizations should look to information that they already have on file.

Gender and personality are two variables that employers commonly collect from job applicants. Previous literature has explored how these factors influence each other and how males and females differ when it comes to personality. These established relationships can be used to predict other variables such as self-insight. The fact that men and women have different profiles of personality traits and these personality traits lead to differences in self-insight suggests that these two factors would allow employers to collect significant information about applicants and employees that can be used for selection and placement decision making. Gender and personality factors may be all an employer needs to know in order to infer the level of self-insight that a job candidate has and predict how well an employee will perform based on the level of forecasted self-insight.

Self-insight has several meaningful implications for the workplace including job performance and general well-being of employees. Higher levels of self-insight predict positive well-being, higher self-esteem, and lower depression and anxiety, which all in turn contribute to a generally happier and healthier workforce (Silvia & Phillips, 2011). High self-insight is also linked to increased job performance and

productivity (Hays et al., 2002). Furthermore, Stajkovic & Luthans (1998) found that self-efficacy, a concept closely related to self-insight, has a positive relationship with job performance.

Much of the research on self-insight has focused on case studies of students and professionals in the field of medicine. These studies have consistently found significant discrepancies between self-assessments and expert assessments when it comes to tasks related to the medical field, indicating that many people lack self-insight (Barnsley, Lyon, Ralston, Hibbert, Cunningham, Gordon, & Field, 2004; Vnuk, Owen, & Plummer, 2006; Watts, Rush, & Wright, 2009). Hays et al. (2002) also examined self-insight in doctors and found that individuals who lacked self-insight had a lower capacity to change, thus restricting their professional development. Personality has rarely been considered as a predictor of self-insight, although Hays et al. (2002) suggest that conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience may be linked to capacity to change. Gender may be considered as another predictor of self-insight, but the nature of this relationship is somewhat unclear because previous research regarding personality differences presents conflicting predictions. It would seem that individuals high in conscientiousness have more self-insight and that those lower in emotional stability have less self-insight. Recent research on gender and personality has found that women rate lower on scales of emotional stability and higher on some aspects of conscientiousness (Weisburg, DeYoung, & Hirsch, 2011), making it difficult to predict whether men or women have more self-insight.

Though research has been conducted on gender, personality, and self-insight, the specific inter-relationships/interactions of these three components have yet to be fully explored. The purpose of this study is to further examine personality and gender as predictors of self-insight. The research will discuss theories related to personality and gender differences, and it will explore the interactions between personality, gender, and self-insight. Furthermore, much of the self-insight research has been directed toward self-assessment related to specific tasks, especially in the medical field. This study expands the investigation into these relationships by looking at self-insight when it comes to leadership competencies that can be applied to a variety of tasks across professional fields.

Background

Big Five Personality Theory and Self-Assessment

Norman's (1963) study of personality was the origin of the five factor model of personality that is widely used in personality research today. Extraversion, emotional stability, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience make up the "Big Five" personality factors. Conscientiousness and emotional stability are of particular interest in this study, as they are the two personality traits that have been linked to self-insight and gender differences in previous research. Conscientiousness has been described as being related to concepts including dependability, will to achieve, responsibility, and perseverance, while low emotional stability is associated with anxiety, depression, anger, and insecurity (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Conscientiousness has consistently been positively related to job performance across occupations (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000; Salgado, Moscoso, & Berges, 2013). Similar positive relationships have also been found between emotional stability and job performance (Judge & Bono, 2001).

Sitzmann and Johnson (2012) studied the effect of conscientiousness on trainee reactions to overestimations and underestimations of performance. After finishing each module of an online training program for Microsoft Excel, participants completed a self-assessment of knowledge and then took an exam measuring their actual performance. Based on the discrepancies between the self-assessment and exam, they were placed into one of four categories: (1) uniformly positive ratings, indicating that they have high performance and high self-assessments; (2) uniformly negative ratings, indicating that they have low performance and low self-assessments; (3) overestimation, indicating that they have low performance but high self-assessments; (4) underestimation, indicating that they have high performance but low self-assessments. The participants were given feedback after these assessments, and researchers studied their performance in future modules as well as their decision to either continue with the training

or drop out. The researchers also examined the relationship of these factors with the participants' conscientiousness which was measured before beginning the training.

This study found that participants high in conscientiousness experienced more disappointment and discouragement after learning that they had overestimated their performance and had lower subsequent performance on future modules. Participants high in conscientiousness also had particularly high subsequent performance and low attrition when they received positive feedback consistent with their self-assessments (uniformly positive ratings). The study discussed the fact that conscientious people are more motivated to achieve and are therefore disheartened when feedback of their performance does not match their self perception (Sitzmann & Johnson, 2012). The researchers concluded that individuals who are high in conscientiousness and perform well seem to be more motivated to continue this high performance, while those high in conscientiousness who do not perform well seem to do worse in subsequent measures of performance.

Groeger and Grande (1996) studied the effect of personality on self-assessments of driving ability and found that emotional stability had a positive relationship with self ratings. Participants completed a road test and were assessed by driving instructors on different factors of safe driving. The participants then completed a self-assessment indicating what they thought of their driving skills based on the same factors. The study also found that more emotionally stable participants had ratings that were more similar to the instructor's assessment, indicating that those with higher levels of emotional stability had higher self-insight. Participants with lower emotional stability tended to deflate self-assessed skill and underestimate their abilities. In general, people with low emotional stability are more likely to remember negative things about themselves and consequently underestimate themselves in self-assessments (Zelinski & Gilewski, 2004).

Gender and Personality

Gender differences in the Big Five personality traits have been researched extensively, but mixed results have been found. Specific to conscientiousness, gender has been inconclusively linked across a variety of studies (Costa, Terracciano, & McCrae, 2001), although women have scored higher on some aspects of conscientiousness including order, dutifulness, and self-discipline (Weisburg et al., 2011). Women have been shown to score lower than men on measures of emotional stability, and they score especially high on anxiety and low on self-esteem (Costa et al., 2001; Weisburg et al., 2011). Social role theory also plays a role in the relationship between gender and personality, as discussed by Eagly (1987). Women are more likely to conform to expected gender roles which include being more modest about their abilities (Eagly & Karau, 2002). This leads to lower self-assessment scores by women and a tendency to underestimate personal ability (Minter et al., 2004).

Assessment Centers

The use of assessment centers began in the 1930s and 1940s, originally for military officer selection (Lance, 2008; Thornton & Byham, 1982). Although they have been traditionally used in organizational settings, more and more assessment centers are being adapted for university settings, using students as participants. These student assessment centers have been shown to be a valid predictor of early career success (Waldman & Korbar, 2004). A significant strength of assessment center is the use of multiple exercises which evaluate multiple competencies measured by multiple assessors (Thornton & Rupp, 2006). Exercises are designed to represent tasks that employees encounter in the workplace, and they include oral presentations, written reports, and group discussions.

Assessment centers are primarily used to develop employees by providing them with feedback on job-related competencies. Competency-level and overall evaluations of each assessee are determined by assessor consensus and are conveyed to participants through specific developmental feedback. In

organizational settings, the feedback provided to employees helps them realize their strengths and weaknesses specific to the job. After receiving this feedback, employees can seek out training and other tools to help improve certain skills, ultimately leading to higher job performance. In educational settings, the feedback provided to student participants through the assessors is specific to future career paths, and specific plans are developed to help the student make the most of their opportunities while still in school. Participants gain valuable knowledge about themselves as well as advice regarding what will make them qualified candidates when they enter the job market.

Assessment centers are particularly useful in testing the hypotheses in this study because of the wide range of data collected from each participant. Participants complete self-ratings on the same competencies measured by assessors both before and after completing the tasks, providing the means for comparing self-assessment with actual performance. Additionally, participants complete a battery of tests including personality measures, allowing for comparisons of personality traits and outcomes of the assessment center. Furthermore, the assessment center provides a realistic organizational setting, increasing the generalizability of the results.

Hypotheses

Personality and Self-Insight

Because conscientious people are by definition more achievement-oriented, responsible, and persevering (Barrick & Mount, 1991), the consistent relationship between conscientiousness and job performance provides background evidence suggesting that participants high in conscientiousness may have higher ratings of performance on the competencies and may rate themselves higher as well. Additionally, in striving for achievement, participants high in conscientiousness may have pursued more leadership roles and opportunities in their lifetime. Through more experience, these conscientious people may have gained a better understanding of their leadership abilities, and this study therefore predicts that higher levels of conscientiousness will correlate with fewer discrepancies in self and assessor ratings. Furthermore, since people low in emotional stability have more negative views of themselves (Taylor & Francis, 2004), it is predicted that participants with lower scores of emotional stability will generally have lower self ratings of competencies that may not be consistent with ratings of actual performance. In other words, participants who have low emotional stability will underestimate their performance. The underestimation of performance is expected to correlate with more discrepancies in self and assessor ratings in less emotionally stable participants, and a positive relationship between emotional stability and self-insight is predicted.

Hypothesis 1: Participants higher in conscientiousness will have greater self-insight.

Hypothesis 2: Participants lower in emotional stability will underestimate their performance.

Hypothesis 3: Participants higher in emotional stability will have greater self-insight.

Gender and Self-Insight

Although the findings on gender and personality are mixed and sometimes weak, the strongest gender difference occurs in measures of emotional stability, with women scoring lower (Costa et al., 2001). Low emotional stability is related to negative self-image (Taylor & Francis, 2004), so it is expected that women will have lower average self-assessment scores than men and will be more likely to underestimate their performance. Because of the predicted positive relationship between emotional stability and self-insight, it is also predicted that women will subsequently have lower self-insight. The social influence of gender roles as described by Eagly (1987) also contribute to the hypothesis of women having lower self-insight because they are more likely than men to conform to expected gender traits including modesty and will therefore underestimate their ability.

Hypothesis 4: Women will underestimate their performance more than men.

Hypothesis 5: Women will have lower self-insight than men.

Method

Participants

Participants were drawn from 186 students who participated in a one-day assessment center. The students were enrolled in the honors college of a large public university in the Northeastern region of the United States. Students submitted applications to participate and were selected for the assessment center. Multiple assessment center sessions were held between the fall of 2008 and the spring of 2013, and twelve students participated in each session. Students were told that the purpose for the assessment center was to further develop their leadership skills. After eliminating participants who had missing data primarily on the self-report measures of performance, the final data used in the study included 137 participants. The sample was made up of 66 males and 71 females with an average age of 20.4.

Assessment Center Exercises

Several different scenarios and specific organizational activities were used in assessment center sessions, but the nature of the exercises remained the same across sessions. All participants completed a case study analysis, oral presentation, role play scenario, written exercises, and leaderless group discussion. The assessment center linked all exercises under a single organizational setting requiring students to assume a single role for the length of the center. While the exercises were all part of a single organizational setting, performance on one exercise did not determine how well an assessee would do on other exercises. Said another way, while the exercises were related to one another they were not interdependent.

Case Study

Based on the scenario of the specific assessment center, the case study involved analyzing information related to the organization and forming conclusions in the form of a two-paged executive summary. In one scenario, the participant was the Director of Operations for a movie theater trying to combine business with a restaurant. The case study gave students financial information about each possible restaurant as well as qualitative information. Students were tasked with analyzing the possibilities and deciding if any options should be ruled out immediately.

Oral Presentation

The oral presentation involved participants preparing a ten-minute PowerPoint presentation to be given to his or her superior. The presentation included some analysis of information as well as a decision on the next steps for the organization. In the movie theater example, the participant presented the restaurant options to the owner of the theater and made a pitch for which restaurant to partner with. The presentation was followed by questions about the content that was presented from the assessors who were observing the participant.

Role Play

The role play scenario involved participants interacting with an assessor who played the role of a disgruntled customer or an employee who was causing a problem. In the movie theater example, the participant had a ten-minute conversation with the assistant manager of the theater who seemed to have lost motivation and was underperforming. Assessors were given scripts to guide their side of the conversation so as to remain consistent across participants.

Written Exercises

Each assessment center scenario involved the completion of two written exercises by the participants. The written assignments were generally based on a customer complaint and a hiring decision. In the case of the movie theater scenario, the participants were tasked with addressing an upset customer and writing a recommendation for hire based on the review of two candidates' résumés.

Leaderless Group Discussion (LGD)

The LGD involved participants breaking into two groups of six students each. After a 30-minute preparation period during which participants were given the details of the task individually, the students met for 30 minutes and completed a task as a group. While the assessors observed the discussion, no leader was assigned and there was no moderator of the meeting. Students worked together to come up with a final product based on the scenario. In the movie theater scenario, participants devised a promotion or event to help draw customers to the newly combined theater and restaurant. Participants shared their individual ideas first, and then decided on the best option as a group and added on to the idea to come up with the final plan.

Procedure

A week prior to participating, students attended an orientation that describes the schedule for the day, the exercises, and the goals of the assessment center. They are then e-mailed surveys including a self-assessment of Bartram's (2005) Great Eight competencies, a personality assessment, and background information about the leadership position they will be placed in and the scenario that will be used for the assessment center. On the day of the center, students participate in several hours of exercises as described above. After finishing the exercises, the participants complete a post-survey rating themselves on the

competencies assessed during the center. This survey is identical to the self-assessment the participants complete before arriving at the assessment center.

Participants are observed by teams of assessors that include business professionals and psychology graduate students. The assessors receive training in observing and classifying behaviors prior to monitoring the students. Throughout the assessment center, assessors observe the participants in teams of two or three and individually take notes on student behaviors. After each exercise, the assessors individually complete ratings before meeting with their assessor team and coming to a consensus on the ratings. Detailed notes on behaviors are compiled to include in the feedback for the students. At the end of the day, all of the assessors meet to integrate information on each assessee and assign final ratings on each of Bartram's (2005) Great Eight competencies. The information gathered in this integration session is then used to develop a feedback report for each student. Approximately ten days after participating in the assessment center, students met with a graduate assessor to receive written and oral feedback. The feedback included an analysis of their strengths and weaknesses as identified by the assessors during the center. A personalized development plan was created with each student at this session.

Measures

The variables used in this study were drawn from each participant's self-reported WAVE personality inventory published by Saville Consulting, self-ratings of competencies before the assessment center, self-ratings of the same competencies after the assessment center, and the assessor scores of performance on the same competencies during the assessment center. Conscientiousness and emotional stability were measured using results from the WAVE personality assessment. Participants' self-ratings were taken from the surveys administered before and immediately after participating in the assessment center. Students rated themselves on a 7-point scale (1 = highly ineffective, 7 = highly effective) as to how well they believed they would perform on the competencies measured in each exercise. After

completing the exercises the students rated themselves on the same scale based on how well they believed they performed on the same competencies. Averages were calculated for participants' pre and post ratings for each competency, and these were compared with assessors' ratings of performance to measure self-insight. These self-insight scores are defined later, in the results section.

Results

Table 1 shows the correlations between emotional stability, conscientiousness, and the difference scores based on self-assessment and actual performance. Difference scores were determined by calculating the average of the participants' self ratings for the seven competencies and the average of the assessors' ratings for the participants' performance on the seven competencies. The difference between the two averages was the calculated score of self-insight, with higher difference scores reflecting more discrepancies and therefore less self-insight. Participants' self-ratings were separated by the self-assessments they completed before participating in the assessment center and the ratings they gave themselves after completing the assessment center. In order to determine the discrepancies between participant and assessor ratings, the absolute values of the differences were used in calculating difference scores. Additionally, these discrepancies were calculated without absolute values to determine the extent to which the participants underestimated or overestimated their performance.

Conscientiousness was not related to self-insight based on the participants' pre-ratings ($r = .04$) or post-ratings ($r = .05$), and the same was true for emotional stability for pre-ratings ($r = .06$) and post-ratings ($r = .12$). Additionally, emotional stability was not related to underestimation of performance based on pre-ratings ($r = .12$) or post-ratings ($r = .01$). A significant negative relationship was found between conscientiousness and the average difference between participants' pre-ratings and post-ratings ($r = -.17, p < .05$).

Table 2 shows the gender differences in emotional stability, conscientiousness, and the difference scores as determined by an independent samples t-test. There were no significant gender differences found for personality traits or self-insight, as males and females had similar scores across variables.

Table 1

Correlations for Gender, Emotional Stability, Conscientiousness, and Difference Scores^c

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Pre-Post Avg	(Pre-Post) Avg	Pre-Asr Avg	(Pre-Asr) Avg	Asr-Post Avg	(Asr-Post) Avg	Emotional Stability	Conscientiousness	Gender
Pre-Post Average	.225	1.592	.979								
(Pre-Post) Average	1.180	1.460	.872**	.979							
Pre-Asr Average	.735	1.632	.057	-.038	.837						
(Pre-Asr) Average	1.455	1.486	-.014	.053	.891**	.840					
Asr-Post Average	-.354	1.613	.053	.109	.508**	.701**	.972				
(Asr-Post) Average	1.095	1.526	-.106	-.018	.862**	.934**	.655**	.972			
Emotional Stability	6.436	1.388	-.088	-.138	.116	.056	.014	.123	.532		
Conscientiousness	6.184	1.120	-.133	-.169*	.096	.040	-.102	.047	-.031	.468	
Gender	1.518	.502	.071	.073	.055	.080	.102	.075	.095	.076	(-)

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

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

Reliabilities bolded on diagonal

c. Listwise N=137

Table 2

Independent Samples Test for Gender Differences

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Pre-Post Average	2.235	.137	-.826	135	.410	-.225	.272	-.764	.314
(Pre-Post) Average	2.472	.118	-.846	135	.399	-.212	.250	-.706	.283
Pre-Asr Average	1.977	.162	-.643	135	.521	-.180	.280	-.733	.373
(Pre-Asr) Average	1.685	.196	-.936	135	.351	-.238	.254	-.741	.265
Asr-Post Average	1.014	.316	-1.192	135	.235	-.328	.275	-.873	.216
(Asr-Post) Average	1.634	.203	-.877	135	.382	-.229	.261	-.746	.287
Emotional Stability	.361	.549	-1.114	135	.267	-.264	.237	-.733	.205
Conscientiousness	.001	.981	-.883	135	.379	-.169	.192	-.548	.210

Discussion

The results do not provide support for the hypotheses that gender, conscientiousness, and emotional stability have an effect on self-insight. While there were no significant relationships between gender or personality traits and difference scores, a significant relationship was found between conscientiousness and the average difference between participants' pre-ratings and post-ratings. Participants who were more conscientious were less likely to change their self-ratings after completing the tasks in the assessment center. These results could point to the idea that conscientious people believe that they have a better understanding of their own competencies. Regardless of whether or not the assessors' ratings reflected this, a participant high in conscientiousness maintained their perceptions of their abilities before and after completing the tasks. Alternatively, this could suggest that conscientious individuals are simply more resistant to change when it comes to their self-ratings. Future studies can examine the reasoning behind this finding by looking at whether or not the self-ratings are consistent with the assessor ratings. It would be interesting to see if conscientious people were correct in not changing their ratings, as reflected in their performance scores. If their pre and post ratings did not change and matched well with the assessors' ratings, this might support the idea that conscientious people understand their own competencies. However, if their pre and post ratings did not change but were different than the assessors' ratings, this could suggest that conscientious people are hesitant to change their self-ratings.

There are several limitations to this study that could account for the lack of support for the hypotheses. The population used in the study was highly restricted, as all of the participants were in the honors college and had therefore proven to be successful in their academic endeavors. The admissions requirements for the honors program are incredibly high and include a minimum GPA of 3.4, the completion of at least 32 credits of rigorous honors courses, and the submission of an honors thesis. This most likely had an effect on the range of participants because they all had similar qualities such as high intelligence and the ability to achieve academic success. Higher self-insight is positively related to job

and academic success (Hays et al., 2002), thus it may be inferred that many of these highly successful participants had better self-insight than the average student. The limits of the population could have also ruled out any gender differences in self-insight that may exist in general populations. Future studies may be able to find significant relationships between the variables if a more diverse population is examined.

Additionally, while scenarios were designed to be parallel from one assessment center to the other and assessors all received training prior to engaging in the assessment process, these variations in scenarios and assessors could have limited the findings of this study. Four different scenarios of organizations were used across assessment center sessions, and although the tasks were similar for all scenarios, they varied slightly based on the background of the simulated organization. Professional and graduate assessors also varied from session to session, and the assessors were rarely put in the same teams for more than one session. These variations in implementation may have introduced unwanted/error variance into the research. Future research should look at the same variables within assessment centers that use consistent scenarios and assessors.

A final issue with respect to the results of this study can be seen by examining the the correlation matrix of Table 1. The WAVE is a highly regarded and well researched instrument for studying personality. The fact that the reliabilities for emotional stability and conscientiousness were far below what was expected contributed to the lack of results. Reliability represents a necessary but not sufficient condition for validity. Perhaps with more reliable measures for these personality assessments there would have been higher levels of correlation between personality and self-insight. Before dismissing the hypothesis it would be wise to test again with improved assessment tools.

The implications for this study are significant for both the workplace and educational settings. If relationships are found between gender, personality, and self-insight, this would provide valuable information for employers to use in selection decisions. Personality tests are common selection tools, and a connection between conscientiousness, emotional stability, and self-insight would increase the amount

of knowledge that an employer gains about candidates from these tests. Instead of just finding out that a job candidate was high in conscientiousness and emotional stability, the employer would now expect the candidate to have better self-insight as well. The fact that self-insight has been shown to predict job and academic success makes it a particularly valuable variable. Knowing the extent to which an employee is aware of his or her competencies is also important for an employer when it comes to giving feedback. A manager might expect to spend more time giving developmental feedback to an employee who lack self-insight than to someone who is aware of what they are good at and in what areas they need to improve. All of this additional knowledge will help employers select and train employees in the most effective way possible, leading to a more productive and successful organization.

References

- Barnsley, L., Lyon, P. M., Ralston, S. J., Hibbert, E. J., Cunningham, I., Gordon, F. C., & Field, M. J. (2004). Clinical skills in junior medical officers: A comparison of self-reported confidence and observed competence. *Medical Education, 38*(4), 358-367.
- Barrick, M. R. & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*(1), 1-26.
- Bartram, D. (2005). The great eight competencies: A criterion-centric approach to validation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(6), 1185-1203.
- Costa, P. T., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*(2), 322-331.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eagly, A. H. & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychology Review, 109*(3), 573-598.
- Groeger, J. A. & Grande, G. E. (1996). Self-preserving assessments of skill? *British Journal of Psychology, 87*, 61-79.
- Hays, R. B., Jolly, B. C., McCrorie, P., McAvoy, P.A., McManus, I. C., & Rethans, J. J. (2002). Is insight important? Measuring capacity to change. *Medical Education, 36*, 965-971.
- Hurtz, G. M. & Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The Big Five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(6), 869-879.
- Judge, T. A. & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(1), 80-92.

- Lance, C. E. (2008). Why assessment centers do not work the way they are supposed to. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1*, 84-97.
- Minter, R. M., Gruppen, L. D., Napolitano, K. S., & Gauger, P. G. (2005). Gender differences in the self-assessment of surgical residents. *The American Journal of Surgery, 189*(6), 647-650.
- Norman, W. T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66*(6), 574-583.
- Salgado, J. F., Moscoso, S., & Berges, A. (2013). Conscientiousness, its facets, and the prediction of job performance ratings: Evidence against the narrow measures. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 21*(1), 74-84.
- Silvia, P. J. & Phillips, A. G. (2011). Evaluating self-reflection and insight as self-conscious traits. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*(2), 234-237.
- Sitzmann, T. & Johnson, S. K. (2012). When is ignorance bliss? The effects of inaccurate self-assessments of knowledge on learning and attrition. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 117*(1), 192-207.
- Stajkovic, A. D. & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 124*(2), 240-261.
- Thornton, G. C. & Byham, W. C. (1982). *Assessment centers and managerial performance*. New York: Academic.
- Thornton, G. C. & Rupp, D. E. (2006). *Assessment centers in human resource management: Strategies for prediction, diagnosis, and development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Vnuk, A., Owen, H., & Plummer, J. (2006). Assessing proficiency in adult basic life support: Student and expert assessment and the impact of video recording. *Medical Teacher, 28*(5), 429-434.
- Waldman, D. A. & Korbar T. (2004). Student assessment center performance in the prediction of early career success. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 3*(2), 151-167.

- Watts, W. E., Rush, K., & Wright, M. (2009). Evaluating first-year nursing students' ability to self-assess psychomotor skills using videotape. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 30*(4), 214-219.
- Weisburg, Y. J., DeYoung, C. G., & Hirsh, J. B. (2011). Gender differences in personality across the ten aspects of the Big Five. *Frontiers in Psychology, 2*(178), 1-11.
- Zelinski, E. M. & Gilewski, M. J. (2004). A 10-item Rasch modeled memory self-efficacy scale. *Aging and Mental Health, 8*(4), 293-306.

Academic Vita

Megan Naude

728 Bellaire Avenue Apt. A6
State College, PA 16801
mnn5018@psu.edu
(201)310-4034

Education

August 2009-
May 2013

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA
Schreyer Honors College - Paterno Fellows Program
Primary Major: BS in Psychology, Business Option; BS in Labor
Studies and Employment Relations (LSER)

Honors and Scholarships

2013

Harold L. Hinman Memorial Scholarship

\$1,000 scholarship for undergraduate psychology majors with an interest in pursuing a career in industry.

2012-2013

**R. Stewart Brunhouse Jr. Endowed Scholarship in the
College of the Liberal Arts**

A \$2,000 scholarship for high academic achievement and extracurricular activities.

2011-present

Paterno Fellows Program - Schreyer Honors College

Liberal Arts program focused on ethics, service, leadership, excellence in communication, and international and intercultural awareness. Entrance to Schreyer Honors College based on high academic achievement and completion of honors thesis.

2010-present

Psi Chi Honors Society

Member

2009-present

Dean's List: Each semester attended.

Research Experience

- 2012-2013 **Honors Thesis**
Department of Psychology
Senior honors thesis under the supervision of Dr. Rick Jacobs. Used data from PNC Leadership Assessment Center to assess personality and gender differences as predictors of self-insight. Developed research questions, conducted extensive literature review, used SPSS to analyze and interpret data, and wrote manuscript.
- 2012-present **Undergraduate Research Assistant**
PNC Leadership Assessment Center
Worked with Dr. Rick Jacobs and Dr. Greg Loviscky to coordinate assessment centers for participants from Schreyer Honors College. Developed assessment center exercises, administered assessment centers, and collected data for honors thesis.
- 2011-present **Undergraduate Research Assistant**
Department of Psychology
Worked in Dr. Sam Hunter's Leadership and Innovation Lab. Coded data for NSF leader errors project, ran subjects for several dissertation and thesis projects, helped create script and acted as a confederate for leader error experiment. Team leader for video coding team for core dyads study in Fall 2012—coordinated schedules and created spreadsheets for data collection.
- 2010-present **Undergraduate Research Assistant**
Department of Psychology
Worked in Dr. Susan Mohammed's teamwork lab. Assisted with Neocities project studying communication in virtual teams. Conducted experiments, trained participants in Neocities program, coded data, contributed to experiment improvements, and analyzed data using SPSS.

Internships and Work Experience

- 2012-present **Penn State Career Services Center**
Mock Interviewing Intern
Selected for internship as a mock interviewer. Conducted interviews and provided students with effective feedback to improve interviewing skills. Chosen as lead intern for Spring 2013—will train and supervise new interns.

- 2012 **Everest National Insurance Company**
Statistical Reporting Intern
 Selected for eight-week, paid summer internship in Statistical Reporting Department. Developed and presented training program in teamwork, communication, and customer focus for department employees. Organized and analyzed company production data and used Microsoft Excel skills to create reports to aid executives in prioritizing department projects.
- 2011 **Everest National Insurance Company**
Comptrollers Intern
 Selected for six-week, paid summer internship in Comptrollers department. Assisted full-time employees with everyday duties and long-term projects, processed collections files, and created procedure reports to educate future employees.

Campus and Community Involvement

- 2012-present **Schreyer Honors College Career Development Program**
Career Development Mentor
 Selected as a mentor for freshman Schreyer Honors College students. Gave mentees advice and guidance about future career plans and provided resources for obtaining internship and research experiences.
- 2011-present **Applied Psychology Research Association**
Treasurer
 Cofounded club for undergraduate students interested in industrial-organizational psychology research. Helped fundraise and plan trips for undergraduate research assistants to Society for Industrial-Organizational Psychology Conference in 2012 and 2013. Requested and received university funding for trips, tracked account balances, and coordinated refunds and payments related to travel expenses.
- 2010-present **Penn State IFC/Panhellenic Dance Marathon**
Finance Committee Member
 Member of finance committee for dance marathon raising money for pediatric cancer. Organized donation checks and entered funds into database, helped plan fundraising trips, as well as counted and tracked money raised.
- 2010-present **Centre County Special Olympics Beaver Stadium Run** *Volunteer Chair*
 Planned 5k run to benefit the Special Olympics of Pennsylvania. Recruited, trained, and managed volunteers for the event. Organized and participated in fundraising and advertising efforts.

Related Coursework in Industrial-Organizational (I/O) Psychology

- Selection and Assessment in Organizations
- Introduction to Labor and Employment Relations
- Introduction to I/O Psychology
- Work Attitudes and Motivation
- Occupational Health: Policy and Practice
- Leadership in Work Settings
- Statistics
- Research Methods
- Management
- Emotional Intelligence

Organization Memberships

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 2012-present | Society for Industrial/Organizational Psychology
<i>Student Member</i> |
| 2012-present | Industrial/Organizational Psychology Society
<i>Member</i> |