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This article compiles results from a century of social psychological research, more than 25,000 studies of 8 million people. A large number of social psychological conclusions are listed alongside meta-analytic information about the magnitude and variability of the corresponding effects. References to 322 meta-analyses of social psychological phenomena are presented, as well as statistical effect-size summaries. Analyses reveal that social psychological effects typically yield a value of \( r = 0.21 \) and that, in the typical research literature, effects vary from study to study in ways that produce a standard deviation in \( r \) of 0.15. Uses, limitations, and implications of this large-scale compilation are noted.

In 1898 Norman Triplett published an early experiment in social psychology, about an effect of the presence of others on task performance. In the 100 years since Triplett’s investigation, many social psychological effects have been documented. The current article summarizes the best established of these findings, with data from more than 25,000 research studies and 8 million people. Our goal is to quantify the magnitude and variability of social psychological effects. We begin by considering previous summaries of social psychology, note some unresolved issues, and review developments that permit a century of scholarly work to be quantitatively described. For present purposes, we follow Manstead and Hewstone (1995) in regarding social psychology as the study of “the reciprocal influence of the individual and his or her social context” (p. 588).

Social Psychology Summarized

There are many summaries of social psychology. For undergraduates, there are textbooks (e.g., Lord, 1997). For the historically minded, there are chronologies (e.g., Sahakian, 1974). For specialists, edited handbooks of social psychology are periodically published (e.g., Gilbert, Fiske, & Lindzey, 1998). For the educated lay public, an alphabetic encyclopedia of social psychology has appeared (Manstead & Hewstone, 1995).

In light of these earlier efforts, one might imagine that the field of social psychology has been so thoroughly described that any additional description would be redundant. Yet, having read many of the field-wide summaries, we are left with some questions. For example, how large are the effects that social psychologists study? How variable are these effects? No empirically based answers to these questions can be found in any textbook, chronology, handbook, or encyclopedia we have seen.

There has been interest in the strength and variability of social psychological research findings. Some surmise that “many” social psychological effects are “small,” reflecting relationships equivalent to a correlation coefficient of .10 (Cohen, 1988). Others report that the average effect cited in social psychology textbooks is much larger, approaching a correlation coefficient of .50 (Cooper & Findley, 1982). Some believe that social psychological effects are inherently nonreplicable (Cronbach, 1975; Gergen, 1973). Others contend that many relationships of interest to social psychologists are perfectly stable and that their apparent variability is artifactual (Hunter & Schmidt, 1990).

Contentions about the size and consistency of social psychological effects are important be-
cause they bear on the scientific status of the field (Rosenthal, 1984). Previous generalizations about these effects have not, however, been well supported. Perhaps “many” social psychological effects are “small,” but the scholar who offered this assertion acknowledged that it reflected only his “subjective averaging” (Cohen, 1988). Maybe the typical social psychological effect is “large,” but at present this belief is based on 237 effects cited in textbooks. These particular effects may have been selected for textbook citation precisely because they were unusually large (Cooper & Findley, 1982). Contentions about the replicability of social psychological effects have been based on individual scholars’ experiences with a limited number of research literatures in social (Gergen, 1973), educational (Cronbach, 1975), and industrial/organizational psychology (Hunter & Schmidt, 1990). In fact, the size and variability of most social psychological effects is at present unknown.

Meta-Analyses in Social Psychology

Generalizations about social psychological effects require a large-scale compilation of evidence that, until recently, would not have been possible. Such a compilation must draw on quantitative summaries of social psychological research literatures. These involve the use of techniques of meta-analysis (Glass, 1976; Rosenthal, 1984), described next.

A meta-analyst uncovers a number of studies on the same topic and then converts the effect observed in each study to a common metric, such as a Pearson product–moment correlation coefficient ($r$). Each of the effect sizes is weighted by a term that reflects its precision, and a weighted mean effect size is computed to estimate the typical magnitude of the effect. Meta-analysts also examine the heterogeneity of effects in a particular research literature. They may compute the variance in effect sizes from study to study; however, as an estimate of heterogeneity, the total variance among effect sizes is deceptive (Hunter & Schmidt, 1990). Statistical theory implies that effect sizes should vary from study to study by virtue of the fact that researchers investigate only samples of research participants, not populations. Meta-analysts use a homogeneity test to determine whether the effect sizes in a research literature vary more than one would expect from sampling variability. They can also estimate the variance in effect sizes that would have been observed in a research literature if an entire population had participated in each study. This so-called corrected variance is equal to the total variance in effect sizes minus the expected sampling variance (Hedges & Vevea, 1998).

A few quantitative literature reviews had been published on social psychological topics before 1976, when Glass coined the term meta-analysis. Among these early efforts were quantitative reviews of leadership (Stogdill, 1948) and group discussion (Bass, 1954). After 1976, large numbers of social psychological meta-analyses began to appear. By 1997, hundreds had been published.

The present article presents a quantitative summary of a century of social psychological research. It seeks to compile quantitative reviews published on social psychological topics before 1998. Of interest is the mean size of the effect in each research literature, as well as the variability in effect sizes across studies. Accumulation of these data will permit rigorous generalizations about the typical magnitude and variability of social psychological research findings.

Although techniques for research synthesis had been available since the early 1900s, meta-analysis was popularized later, as a method for coping with the “information explosion” in social research. Glass, McGaw, and Smith (1981) hoped that meta-analytic research integrations would be more succinct and widely accessible than narrative research reviews. From the current vantage point, one wonders whether these hopes have been fulfilled. Meta-analyses often run to more than 20 journal pages, and so many quantitative reviews have now been published that primary research may seem as inaccessible as ever.

If one goal of the current article is to offer generalizations about social psychology as a whole, a second goal is to provide the briefest possible summary of the many specific research literatures composing the field. To this end, we present a listing of social psychological effects that have been meta-analyzed. Each effect is stated alongside (a) the number of times the effect has been studied in primary research, (b) the mean size of the effect, and (c) a standard deviation in that effect across studies. Hundreds
of such effects are summarized in this way, with references to the documents from which the effects were abstracted. These summaries are intended to increase the accessibility of social psychological research.

Indices of the magnitude and consistency of social psychological effects may have nonbibliographic uses as well. The mean size of a particular social psychological effect should help subject-area specialists in research planning and statistical power computation (Cohen, 1988). Cross-literature comparisons of effect sizes may help resolve some scholarly controversies. These data will, for example, permit the most complete comparison to date of the size of personality versus situational effects on social behavior (Bowers, 1973) and of the magnitude of sex effects on social behavior relative to other effects (Hall, 1998).

Perhaps the size of social psychological effects is influenced by the process of social psychological research. Perhaps social psychologists are attracted to unusually large effects, or to effects that are unusually stable. Perhaps there is a regular progression to social psychological research literatures: After an initial wave of studies that establish and replicate an effect, most studies are designed to find the limits and boundary conditions of the effect (Zanna & Fazio, 1982). By making statistical comparisons of different research literatures, we assess these possibilities.

Although no large-scale compilation of social psychological meta-analyses has ever been attempted, there has been related work. Sarason, Smith, and Diener (1975) compiled results from 102 studies and concluded that situational effects on social behavior are similar in size to personality effects (median $r_s = .21$ and $.17$, respectively). Statistical interactions between situation and personality are smaller, the authors found. Hedges (1987) empirically gauged the consistency of research results in a number of fields. He showed that effect sizes in particle physics were no more consistent from study to study than effect sizes in several areas of psychology (e.g., cognitive gender differences).

Scholars have compiled meta-analyses in other fields. Lipsey and Wilson (1993) cumulated results from 302 meta-analytic reviews of the efficacy of psychological, educational, and behavioral treatments. Lipsey and Wilson offered a listing and histogram of mean effect sizes from these 302 quantitative reviews, as well as a number of statistical analyses. On average, people who received treatment scored one half of a standard deviation better on outcome variables than people who did not. This produced a treatment-outcome correlation coefficient of .24. Smaller scale compilations of meta-analyses have been reported in industrial/organizational psychology (Tett, Meyer, & Roese, 1994), on sex differences (Hall, 1998), and on the validity of laboratory research (Anderson, Lindsay, & Bushman, 1999).

Here we compile meta-analyses in social psychology and related fields.

**Method**

**Document Retrieval**

To locate published quantitative reviews of social psychological research, we used the following methods. We searched PsycLIT and other computerized databases for references to meta-analysis, examined a number of special journal issues and books on meta-analysis (e.g., Miller & Cooper, 1991), used the Social Sciences Citation Index to locate documents that had cited certain key references on meta-analysis (e.g., Rosenthal, 1984), consulted lists of meta-analyses that had been compiled by others (e.g., Bausell, Li, Gau, & Soeken, 1995), and manually scanned all of the issues of certain journals (e.g., Psychological Bulletin). Using these methods, we retrieved and photocopied 490 documents for possible inclusion in this work.

**Criteria for Inclusion**

Our goal was to compile quantitative summaries of social psychological effects published before 1998. In selecting documents for this compilation, we used a number of criteria. To be included, a document had to report a numerical measure of the combined magnitude or significance level of a relationship between two variables that had been measured on individuals or small groups. The document had to summarize evidence of this effect collected within five or more primary studies by two or more research teams. The topic under review must have been covered in a recent encyclopedia of social psychology (Manstead & Hewstone, 1995).

These criteria resulted in the exclusion of a number of potentially relevant documents. Narrative reviews of social psychological research were not included, nor were documents that reported only a vote counting of significant and nonsignificant results. We did not compile statistical summaries of a single research
team’s work, quantitative reviews of factor structure, or meta-analytic demonstrations of cross-study relationships. On substantive grounds, reviews of cognitive gender differences were excluded, as were reviews of educational, clinical, medical, marketing, and industrial/organizational research. To ensure the independence of our contribution, we also excluded reviews of all psychological topics that had been covered in Lipsey and Wilson’s (1993) compendium of 302 meta-analyses on psychological treatment effectiveness.

Within the boundaries imposed by these criteria, we sought inclusive coverage of social psychological meta-analyses. We were open to reviews that had not been conducted by social psychologists and to reviews that had not appeared in the usual publication outlets, so long as they addressed topics that would qualify as social psychology, broadly defined. We were open to quantitative reviews of social psychological topics on which meta-analyses had previously been published, so long as the earlier meta-analytic database had been altered in some way. We also compiled reviews of many topics in personality psychology.

**Selection and Coding of Effects**

We selected for coding at least one social psychological effect from each document. Many meta-analysts begin by aggregating all of the literature on a topic into a single effect and then assess the magnitude of that effect in various subsets of the literature. Hoping to compile the broadest generalizations social psychologists find meaningful, we selected for coding the most highly aggregated effect a meta-analytic document displayed. Sometimes in their most highly aggregated analysis, meta-analysts summarize the literature on a topic into two or more distinct effects. In such cases, we coded these effects separately, including in our compilation up to four effects from a given document. From those rare documents that (in their most highly aggregated analyses) summarized a research literature into five or more distinct effects, we selected for compilation only four of those effects, preferring effects that had not been meta-analyzed elsewhere and ones that had been examined in a large number of studies.

We coded a summary measure of size of each effect. We used the meta-analytic’s effect-size metric and whatever summary statistic the reviewer provided, seeking (when available) a weighted mean Fisher’s r-to-Z statistic. We then transformed the meta-analytic’s summary effect size to a Pearson product–moment correlation coefficient according to methods described by Rosenthal (1994). We symbolize this value as $\hat{r}$.

Although meta-analysts usually report positive values for their summary effect sizes, 60 negative summary effect sizes were reported in the documents we retrieved. We analyzed the absolute value of the $\hat{r}$ corresponding to each summary effect size and we provide a statement of the meta-analytic finding. For example, we report an $\hat{r}$ value of .13 for the meta-analytic finding that women experience more anxiety than men, even though Feingold (1994) had expressed this effect as a negative standardized difference between means.

Each of the mean effect sizes in our compilation was independently coded by two of the authors. A preliminary analysis established interrater reliability ($r = .92$ for the relationship between the two sets of $\hat{r}$s). Coding differences were resolved by discussion.

We were interested not only in the magnitude of social psychological effects, but also in their variability. For each effect abstracted from a meta-analytic document, we sought the corrected variance in effect sizes, that is, the variance in effect size from study to study that could not be accounted for by differences among samples of research participants (Hedges & Vevea, 1998). Some meta-analysts report a corrected (or true) variance. In such cases, the meta-analyst’s value was coded. In other cases, we used a method of moments (Shadish & Haddock, 1994) to estimate the corrected variance from information the meta-analyst reported, such as the number of studies being analyzed, the number of research participants, a homogeneity statistic, and a raw variance in effect sizes. Sometimes the requisite information was not reported, and the corrected variance could not be estimated. Corrected variance was estimated in the effect-size metric the meta-analyst had cumulated and then converted to a corrected variance for Pearson product–moment correlation coefficients with Taylor series approximations (e.g., Law, 1995). Occasionally, these procedures resulted in a negative estimate. In such cases, a value of zero was substituted. We report subsequently the square root of our estimate of the corrected variance in correlation coefficients, that is, the corrected standard deviation in $\hat{r}$ from study to study. From each research literature that allowed it, we also coded the total variance in effect sizes from study to study.

**Additional Coding**

Effects may be larger in some research literatures than others. The variabilty in effect sizes may differ from literature to literature. To clarify cross-literature differences in effect sizes, we coded four additional variables from each meta-analysis: (a) number of primary effect-size estimates, (b) proportion of unpublished research, (c) number of theoretical moderator analyses, and (d) number of artifactual moderator analyses. These variables are described next.

Meta-analysts base their conclusions on differing amounts of data. There are two indices of the quantity
of data that enter into a meta-analytic conclusion: the number of primary research studies on which that conclusion is based and the number of primary effect-size estimates. Often, meta-analysts abstract multiple effect-size estimates from a single research study. For our statement of the total number of research studies included in the current compilation, we took care to avoid double counting studies from which multiple effect sizes had been abstracted. However, this double counting could not be avoided in the appended listing of effects. There we note the number of primary effect-size estimates on which a meta-analytic conclusion was based. This value is symbolized as \( k \).

Publication practices may compromise the validity of scholarly conclusions. To address this concern, we perused the references to the primary studies on which each meta-analysis was based and noted the proportions of studies that were unpublished. Some research literatures may consist solely of studies that seek to document and replicate an effect. Others may consist largely of studies that seek to neutralize an effect documented earlier. To capture this difference, we read each meta-analytic document carefully, looking for attempts to relate effect sizes to moderator variables. As a proxy for primary researchers’ attempts to neutralize the focal effect of a research literature, we coded the number of psychological moderator variables examined in the meta-analysis of that literature. For comparison, we also coded the number of artifactual moderator variables examined.

Results

Our search yielded 322 codable meta-analytic documents spanning more than 6,200 pages of text. As mentioned, these documents incorporated results from more than 25,000 research studies and 8 million human research participants. References to the 322 documents appear in Appendix A. From these documents, we abstracted 474 effects, reflecting a considerable amount of data (mean \( k = 71.54 \)).

Appendix B lists these 474 social psychological effects. The effects are organized under 18 social psychological topic headings (e.g., aggression and attitudes). Alongside a statement of each meta-analytically established effect is the number of estimates of that effect (\( k \)), the mean size of the effect (expressed as \( r \)), the corrected standard deviation in \( r \) across studies, and a numerical reference to the meta-analytic document from which the effect was abstracted (i.e., to the reference list of Appendix A). Note that the standard deviation in effect sizes was not always estimable. For example, the first row in Appendix B indicates that Document 176 of Appendix A (i.e., the meta-analysis by Miles & Carey, 1997) concluded from 42 effect-size estimates that “there are genetic influences on aggressiveness,” that the mean size of this effect corresponds to a correlation coefficient of .49, and that the corrected standard deviation in this effect across studies cannot be estimated. In some cases, several documents reached the same social psychological conclusion from different meta-analytic databases. In such cases, a separate effect was coded from each document. For instance, three documents (Documents 39, 40, and 143 in Appendix A) concluded that “when people drink alcohol, they become aggressive.”

Appendix B is intended to provide information about effect sizes, not statistical significance. We attempted to include in this appendix every social psychological effect that satisfied the criteria described in the Method section, irrespective of the outcome of a null hypothesis test. Each statement in the appendix expresses the direction of the corresponding mean effect, even if it was not statistically significant. For significance levels, substantive qualifications, and additional information about any of the 474 social psychological effects listed in Appendix B, the relevant meta-analysis should be read.

Appendix B is intended as a reference source. It is keyed to a narrative encyclopedia of social psychology (Manstead & Hewstone, 1995). The 18 topic headings in the appendix appear in the encyclopedia, as does each italicized term. The encyclopedia should be consulted for explanations of these terms and descriptions of relevant scholarship.

Magnitude of Social Psychological Effects

Some suspect that “many” social psychological effects are small, corresponding in size to a correlation coefficient of .10 (Cohen, 1988). Others report that social psychology textbooks cite large effects, ones that approach a correlation coefficient of .50. Figure 1 presents a histogram of the mean size of the 474 social psychological effects listed in Appendix B. Each effect was established by a meta-analysis and is expressed in the histogram by the absolute value of a Pearson product–moment correlation coefficient. As the figure reveals, social psychological effects vary in size. Their distribution is
positively skewed. Although many of these effects are small (30.44% yielding an \( r \) of .10 or less), many others are not (23.68% yielding an \( r \) of .30 or more). Only 5.28% yield a value of \( r \) greater than .50. In this, the largest-scale social psychological database yet compiled, social psychological effects yield a mean value of \( r \) of .21 (\( \text{Mdn} \ r = .18; \text{across-literatures} SD = .15 \)).

Recall that 302 meta-analyses showed a mean correlation of .24 between psychological treatments and outcomes (Lipsey & Wilson, 1993). In principle, this publication bias might influence our estimate of the size of social psychological effects. To assess this possibility, we divided the 474 meta-analytic effects in Appendix B into three categories based on the percentage of unpublished studies cited in the corresponding meta-analytic document. Analyses indicated only a modest relationship between the magnitude of a social psychological effect and the percentage of unpublished studies on which it was based. One hundred seventy-five meta-analytic effects drawn from documents that cited no unpublished studies yielded a mean \( r \) value of .216; 208 effects drawn from documents whose reference lists included a range of 1%-25% unpublished studies yielded a mean value of \( r \) of .202; and 91 meta-analytic effects drawn from documents whose reference lists included more than 25% unpublished studies yielded a mean value of \( r \) of .199. Publication biases seem to have had little impact on our aggregate estimate of social psychological effect sizes.

Social psychologists study a variety of topics, some of which may show larger effects than others. Although social psychological research can be categorized in a number of ways, it is categorized in Appendix B under 18 topic headings: aggression, attitudes, attribution, expectancy effects, gender roles, group processes, health psychology, helping behavior, intergroup relations, law, leadership, methodology, motivation, nonverbal communication, personality, relationships, social cognition, and social influence.

Table 1 summarizes meta-analytic effects on each of these 18 topics. Listed in the table are the number of social psychological conclusions that have been reached about each topic, the number of primary research estimates on which those conclusions are based (total \( k \)), the mean size of the effect (expressed as \( \bar{r} \)), and the mean estimate of the corrected standard deviation in \( r \).
across studies. As the table indicates, more meta-analyses are published on leadership than on motivation or helping behavior. The largest mean effects were found in the study of attitudes (mean $\bar{r} = .27$) and group processes (mean $\bar{r} = .32$). The smallest were found in the study of attribution (mean $\bar{r} = .14$) and social influence (mean $\bar{r} = .13$). It is noteworthy, however, that these effects did not range as widely as one might have expected. In fact, none of the 18 social psychological topic areas in Table 1 yielded a mean correlation coefficient as low as .10 (the value that Cohen stated would describe “many social psychological effects”), nor did any of the topic areas yield a mean correlation coefficient as high as .50 (the typical size of effects cited in social psychology textbooks, according to Cooper & Findley, 1982).

Inspired by criticisms of traditional conceptions of personality (Mischel, 1968), psychologists have debated whether social behavior is more strongly influenced by the person or the situation (Bowers, 1973). Of the 474 effects in our compilation, 247 involved assessments of the relationship of social behavior to a situational variable; 227 involved assessments of the relationship of social behavior to a demographic, personality, or other dispositional variable. Analyses showed that situational effects are similar in magnitude to person effects (mean $\bar{r} = .22$ in 17,631 estimates of situational effects; mean $\bar{r} = .19$ in 16,282 estimates of person effects). Situational effects may be slightly larger.

Table 1
Social Psychological Effect Sizes, by Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>No. of meta-analytic conclusions</th>
<th>Total k</th>
<th>Mean $\bar{r}$</th>
<th>Mean corrected $SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3,323</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy effects</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender roles</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group processes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health psychology</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping behavior</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergroup relations</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2,588</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal communication</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3,905</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social cognition</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social influence</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>33,912</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There have been arguments about the magnitude of sex differences. Psychological sex differences have been variously characterized as small, large, and highly variable in size (Hall, 1998). Appendix B lists 83 meta-analytically established sex differences: 16 in attribution, 14 in relationships, 10 in nonverbal communication, and 43 on other topics. These differences tend to be small: mean $\bar{r} = .12$ for 5,691 estimates of sex differences and mean $\bar{r} = .22$ for 28,222 estimates of other social psychological effects. Differences in reactions to female and male targets are smaller than differences produced by female and male actors (mean $\bar{r}_{s} = .08$ and .13 for sex of target effects and sex of actor effects, respectively). These sex differences are not especially variable across literatures: Cross-literature standard deviations in $\bar{r}$ values are .10 for the 83 sex differences and .15 for the 391 other meta-analytic effects (note that the current compilation is confined to sex differences on social psychological variables; for a treatment of cognitive sex differences, see Hall, 1998).
Variability of Social Psychological Effects

Researchers who are interested in the typical magnitude of an effect may also be interested in the variability of that effect from study to study. Here we sought to document the variability of social psychological effects by determining, in each of 474 research literatures, a corrected standard deviation, that is, the standard deviation in effect sizes across studies that would have been observed in the absence of sampling variability. This task proved to be challenging. Meta-analysts reported a corrected standard deviation (or variance) for only 61 of the 474 social psychological effects in Appendix B, and many meta-analytic documents do not include sufficient information for standard deviations to be estimated. However, in the 355 literatures that do allow its computation, the corrected standard deviation in correlation coefficients varies in magnitude.

These estimates are presented for 355 of the social psychological effects listed in Appendix B. Statistical summaries indicate that some social psychological literatures show no variability in effect sizes beyond that which is introduced by sampling error (9.29% of the 355 literatures yielding a corrected standard deviation of zero). Others show high study-to-study variability in effect sizes (9.86% yielding a corrected standard deviation of .30 or higher). The mean estimate of the corrected standard deviation is .15 (Mdn = .14; across-literatures SD = .10). It is interesting that the mean corrected standard deviation within a social psychological research literature is similar in magnitude to the standard deviation across the mean effect sizes of all 474 literatures. Each of these standard deviations equals .15.

For each research literature from which a corrected standard deviation in effect sizes could be estimated, we also estimated a total standard deviation as well as the percentage of variance accounted for by sampling error. Across 355 research literatures, our mean estimate of the total standard deviation in correlation coefficients is .19.

Hunter and Schmidt (1990) contended that much of the variability observed in research is artifactual. Our data support this contention. Averaging across 355 social psychological research literatures, sampling variance accounts for a mean of 38.89% of the variance in effect sizes. In 59 of these literatures, sampling variance accounts for more than 75% of the variance in effect sizes.

Correlates of Effect-Size Variability and Magnitude

The number of studies conducted on a social psychological topic may reflect the research community’s interest in that topic. Theoretically, researchers’ interest in an effect might be related to the magnitude or variability of the effect. Analyses of the current database reveal no relationship between the number of studies of a social psychological effect and the mean size of that effect (r = −.04). However, effects that are widely studied tend to be highly variable: r = .11 for the relationship between k and corrected SD. Perhaps social psychologists are attracted to inherently unstable effects. More likely, as research literatures mature, scholars turn their attention from demonstrating an effect to identifying limits and boundary conditions of that effect (Zanna & Fazio, 1982).

Often, meta-analysts abstract variables from a research literature to explain effect-size differences. To understand the heterogeneity in social psychological effects, we examined each of the 322 meta-analytic documents listed in Appendix A and found that 300 analyzed at least one moderator variable. We counted the number of artifactual and the number of psychological moderator variables meta-analyzed in each document.

Perhaps research literatures grow as social psychologists turn their attention from demonstrating an effect to finding limits and boundary conditions of that effect. Perhaps these efforts produce effect-size variability. Given this characterization of the research process, there should be more psychological moderator variables in large than small research literatures. Moreover, the greater the number of psychological moderator variables in a literature, the more variable should be the effect sizes.

Our data confirm these hypotheses. Across the 474 effects in Appendix B, the number of psychological moderator analyses in the associated meta-analytic document is positively associated with k (r = .25) and is positively associated with the corrected SD (r = .15). This pattern is specific to psychological moderator analyses. In fact, the corrected standard devia-
tion of a social psychological effect is not related to the number of artifactual moderator variables examined in a meta-analysis of that effect \( (r = .08) \).

Social psychologists’ attempts to neutralize or reverse a focal finding may deflate the mean effect size in a research literature. Our results are consistent with this suggestion: The mean size of an effect is inversely related to the number of psychological moderator analyses of that effect \( (r = -.12) \) but unrelated to the number of artifactual moderator analyses \( (r = .06) \).

Discussion

Social psychology has grown over the past century. At the dawn of the 1900s, its experimental database consisted of a single study (Triplett, 1898). More studies were conducted, and much was learned. Later, scholars began to question the evidentiary value of individual studies (Schmidt, 1992) and developed methods for synthesizing all of the research on a particular topic (Glass et al., 1981). Now hundreds of research literatures have been meta-analyzed, and social psychology can be quantitatively described.

As a description of social psychology, the present effort has shortcomings. It is restricted to research that has been meta-analyzed and to research topics that were covered in a recent version of the Encyclopedia of Social Psychology. It may omit many important social psychological phenomena, particularly those at the boundaries of the field. No doubt, there are complications, qualifications, and subtleties to every social psychological phenomenon that could never be captured in descriptions as brief as the one-line summaries appended here. Moreover, the magnitude of a social psychological effect does not determine the value of that effect. A small effect can have important real-world consequences (Rosenthal, 1994). A small effect can hold great scientific interest if, for example, it is produced by a small cause (Abelson, 1995). Despite its limitations, this is the largest social psychological database ever assembled. It allows the most rigorous generalizations to date about the magnitude of social psychological effects.

Cohen (1988) provided some guidelines for effect sizes. According to Cohen, “many” effects in social psychology would yield a correlation coefficient of .10, and such values are small. Cohen defined medium-sized effects as those that yield a correlation coefficient of .30. Large effects, he stated, are those that yield a correlation coefficient of at least .50. Cohen, however, cautioned that these guidelines reflected only his “subjective averaging,” and he recommended that they be used only when there was “no better basis” for identifying small, medium, and large effects.

The current review provides an empirical basis for gauging the size of social psychological effects. It indicates that a correlation coefficient of .10 is “small” relative to most social psychological effects. Mean effects this small are found in roughly 30% of social psychological research literatures. It indicates that a correlation coefficient of .20 is a medium-sized effect. Effects that small are found in roughly half of the relevant literatures. A correlation coefficient of .30 is large relative to most social psychological effects. Less than 25% of mean effects are that large.

Although general reference values for “small,” “medium,” and “large” effects can be used in statistical power computation, it is better to base such computations on information that is specific to the research question being posed. Appendix B presents quantitative data for a large number of social psychological effects. Researchers who plan work on one of these effects should consult this appendix for the mean size of that effect in previous research. This value would be a good starting point for power computations.

Social psychological effects vary considerably from study to study, but much of this variation is artifactual. In a typical social psychological research literature, almost 40% of the cross-study variance in effects can be accounted for by differences among research samples. Even after correction for sampling error, however, substantial effect-size variance remains. No doubt, some of this residual variance is due to artifacts such as measurement error (Hunter & Schmidt, 1990). Variance is also introduced by social psychologists’ attempts to manipulate effects (Zanna & Fazio, 1982). In our view, each standard deviation listed in Appendix B should be regarded as an upper bound to the value that would be obtained in a series of attempts at exact replication and as a lower bound to the impact on the effect of a typical
moderator variable. In literatures in which most of the studies are designed to document a focal effect, our standard deviation may be a reasonable measure of effect-size consistency. In literatures in which most of the studies are intended to reverse an effect, our standard deviation may better measure the effect’s manipulability. In light of these considerations, scholars should be cautious in comparing effect-size variability across research literatures.

The mean effect size yielded by a meta-analysis also requires judicious interpretation. Meta-analytic means (such as those listed in Appendix B) incorporate effects from a variety of conditions, settings, and research designs. Strong conclusions can be reached from research literatures that show homogeneous effect sizes. There, the mean is estimating a single effect. However, in research literatures that contain highly heterogeneous findings, it would be naive to interpret the mean size of an effect as the magnitude of that effect under any particular set of conditions (say, conditions that specialists regard as standard or theoretically prescribed). A social psychological effect may be larger under standard conditions than is the mean effect in the literature as a whole, the mean having been deflated by investigators’ attempts to neutralize and reverse the usual finding.

Narrative reviews of social psychology have presented rich interpretations of verbally stated effects (e.g., Gilbert et al., 1998). Here we have offered a quantitative description.
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### 474 Meta-Analytic Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meta-analytic conclusion</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Document no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are <em>genetic influences</em> on aggressiveness</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly aggressive men have high levels of testosterone</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People become aggressive when they see aggression-related cues</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People become aggressive when they are provoked</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are aggressive toward individuals who provoke them</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who have been provoked are aggressive toward bystanders</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are aggressive when they are in a bad mood</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are aggressive when they are hot</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are aggressive when they are under environmental stress</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are aggressive when they are anonymous</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who have aggressive personalities display aggressive behavior</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pornography increases aggression</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational briefings prevent pornography from increasing aggression</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually aggressive men are aroused by depictions of rape</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When people drink alcohol, they become aggressive</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When people drink alcohol, they become aggressive</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When people drink alcohol, they become aggressive</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When people think they are drinking alcohol, they become aggressive</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When people think they are drinking alcohol, they become aggressive</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to mass media violence increases aggression</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to mass media violence increases aggression</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People act antisocially after seeing antisocial behavior on TV</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressiveness is stable over time</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males’ aggressiveness is stable over time</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females’ aggressiveness is stable over time</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are sex differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men are more aggressive than women</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men are more aggressive than women</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men are more aggressive than women</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men are more aggressive than women</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After exposure to violence, men are more aggressive than women</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are more aggressive toward men than women</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive fear appeals induce attitude change</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive fear appeals induce attitude change</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive fear appeals induce behavior change</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive fear appeals induce behavior change</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative exposure to mass media influences viewers’ attitudes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mere exposure to a stimulus increases liking for that stimulus</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people are more persuasive than others</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are involved in a message are unlikely to be persuaded by it</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A message is most persuasive if it presents a lot of information</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The higher a person’s credibility, the more persuasive that person will be</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good arguments are persuasive to people who have a high need to think</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes a message has more persuasive impact after a delay</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about a speaker’s credibility has less impact if it is delayed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distraction increases the persuasive impact of a message</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-sided messages are more persuasive than one-sided messages</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are more persuaded by comparative than non-comparative ads</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subliminal advertising increases sales</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meta-analytic conclusion</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>$\bar{r}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Document no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scarcity increases the value of a commodity</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is consistency between people’s attitudes and behavior</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is consistency between people’s attitudes and behavior</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People do what they intend to do</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People do what they intend to do</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People do what they intend to do</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People do what they intend to do</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are likely to perform an action if they . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intend to perform the action and believe they can control it</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel positively about the action and believe it is common</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are likely to recycle if they . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know about recycling</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know about recycling, like it, and have an incentive to recycle</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have concern for the environment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People attribute their successes to ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People attribute their successes to ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People attribute their successes to effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People attribute their successes to effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students attribute their academic successes to luck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People attribute their failures to bad luck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People attribute their failures to the difficulty of their task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People attribute their failures to the difficulty of their task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People attribute their failures to external factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People take more responsibility for success than failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are held more responsible for a severe than a minor accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are actor–observer differences in work performance attributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful, expected work performances are attributed to ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults who suffer depression attribute . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative outcomes to internal, global, stable factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive outcomes to external, specific, unstable factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children who suffer depression attribute . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative outcomes to internal, global, stable factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative outcomes to internal, global, stable factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive outcomes to external, specific, unstable factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive outcomes to external, specific, unstable factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are sex differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men attribute their performance to ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men attribute their performance to ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men attribute their performance to ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men attribute their performance to effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men attribute their performance to effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women attribute their performance to luck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women attribute their performance to luck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women attribute their performance to luck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women attribute their performance to the difficulty of their task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women attribute their performance to the difficulty of their task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women attribute their performance to the difficulty of their task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women take more responsibility than men for academic performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Meta-analytic conclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document no.</th>
<th>Attribution (continued)</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>$\bar{r}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Women’s successes are attributed to effort</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Men’s successes are attributed to ability, luck, and the ease of the task</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Women’s failures are attributed to task difficulty</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Men’s failures are attributed to lack of ability, lack of effort, and bad luck</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expectancy effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document no.</th>
<th>People behave as others expect them to behave</th>
<th>114</th>
<th>0.16</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>People behave as others expect them to behave</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Males behave as others expect them to behave</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Females behave as others expect them to behave</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Experimenters find the research results they expect to find</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Some experimenters show bigger expectancy effects than others</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Some subjects show bigger experimenter expectancy effects than others</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Teachers expect more from female than male students</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Teachers expect more from Anglo-Americans than African-Americans</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Teachers expect more from attractive than unattractive students</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Teachers who have positive expectations for a student have positive interactions with that student</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Teachers form self-fulfilling prophecies about students</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Students achieve the most if their teachers interact with them, display warmth, and give them positive feedback</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>People have status expectations for one another</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document no.</th>
<th>Parents encourage their children to engage in sex-stereotypic activities</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>0.21</th>
<th>0.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Exposure to TV increases acceptance of gender role stereotypes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Boys who are reared in father-absent homes are nonmasculine</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Girls who are reared in father-absent homes are nonfeminine</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Women are more likely than men to support the feminist movement</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Members of the women’s movement are perceived to be unattractive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Traditionally sex-typed people have traditional attitudes toward women</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Men are recommended for jobs over women</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>People rate male authors more favorably than female authors</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Counselors evaluate female clients more favorably than male clients</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Women are more likely than men to say positive things about people</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Nonmasculine men are at risk for assaulting their wives</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Highly feminine women are at risk for being assaulted by their husbands</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Highly feminine people . . . have high self-esteem</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>. . . have high self-esteem</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>. . . report high social satisfaction</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Highly masculine people . . . have high self-esteem</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>. . . have high self-esteem</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>. . . report high social satisfaction</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document no.</th>
<th>Goal-setting facilitates group performance</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>0.42</th>
<th>0.08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Highly cohesive groups show high group productivity</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Highly cohesive groups show high group productivity</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Highly cohesive groups show high group productivity</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Highly cohesive groups make bad decisions</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>There is social loafing when people work in a group</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>All-male groups outperform all-female groups</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>People produce more ideas alone than in group brainstorming</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Appendices continue)
Appendix B (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meta-analytic conclusion</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$\bar{r}$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Document no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The members of a group influence one another</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who deviate from a group are rejected by that group</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent people are the most active members of a group</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who is close to others and central to group communication...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be satisfied with the group</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will actively participate in the group</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is likely to emerge as leader of the group</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who participate in a group are likely to become the leader of that group</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are highly esteemed are likely to lead group discussions</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of others’ views causes a group polarization of attitudes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing others’ arguments causes a group polarization of attitudes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitory crowding makes residents dissatisfied</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large groups have firmer spatial boundaries than small groups</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In social dilemmas, people favor self-interest over group interest</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough bargaining strategies produce advantageous outcomes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiators are likely to compromise if they...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are experienced</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have a cooperative personality and a tough opponent</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiators sometimes reach mutually disadvantageous agreements</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations lack social content if they are computer-mediated</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health psychology

| People who receive the most social support are healthy                                   | 316 | .11       |      | 258          |
| People who receive the most social support are unhealthy                                 | 110 | .07       | .13  | 251          |
| People who receive the most social support are unhealthy                                 | 83  | .06       | .07  | 250          |
| People who lack social support have high blood pressure                                  | 21  | .08       | .01  | 294          |
| Social support facilitates healthy maternal attitudes and behavior                       | 163 | .30       | .24  | 17           |
| People who believe they have social support in fact have social support                 | 39  | .27       | .41  | 224          |
| People with Type A personalities suffer chronic emotional distress                       | 101 | .13       | .33  | 278          |
| The most socially active people report the highest life satisfaction                     | 506 | .15       | .10  | 209          |
| Anglo Americans report higher life satisfaction than African-Americans                   | 54  | .10       | .08  | 272          |
| Married people report higher life satisfaction than others                                | 111 | .14       | .08  | 128          |
| Women report higher life satisfaction than men                                           | 85  | .00       | .04  | 317          |
| Men report higher life satisfaction than women                                          | 149 | .04       | .40  | 127          |
| When people drink alcohol, they engage in extreme behaviors                              | 121 | .24       |      | 267          |
| When people think they are drinking alcohol...                                           |     |           |      |              |
| they engage in extreme behaviors                                                         | 48  | .19       |      | 267          |
| they engage in illicit social behaviors                                                  | 20  | .08       | .18  | 140          |
| People with AIDS suffer more stigma than people with other diseases                     | 21  | .22       | .32  | 61           |
| People who suffer depression are evaluated negatively                                    | 26  | .27       | .19  | 253          |
| People who suffer depression make their interaction partners feel bad                   | 63  | .16       | .22  | 253          |
| Disabled students have low status among their peers                                     | 37  | .30       | .09  | 205          |
| People exercise if they are encouraged to exercise                                      | 173 | .21       | .00  | 48           |
| People exercise if they intend to exercise and like to exercise                          | 70  | .40       | .00  | 133          |
| People donate blood if they intend to donate blood and like to do so                     | 23  | .26       |      | 98           |

Helping behavior

| People are likely to help others when they are in a bad mood                             | 85  | .11       |      | 46           |
| People are likely to help others when they are in a good mood                           | 61  | .26       |      | 43           |
| Children who are helpful can infer others’ motives and thoughts                          | 22  | .28       | .46  | 296          |
| Children who are helpful can infer others’ feelings and concerns                         | 14  | .09       | .49  | 296          |
| People act prosocially after seeing prosocial behavior on TV                             | 108 | .26       | .42  | 134          |
| Only children are prosocial in character                                                | 26  | .07       | .23  | 90           |
| People are likely to help individuals who depend on them                                 | 72  | .25       |      | 33           |
## Appendix B (continued)

### Helping behavior (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meta-analytic conclusion</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$\bar{r}$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Document no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural people are more helpful than urban people</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men are more likely than women to help others</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are more likely than men to perform caretaking tasks for others</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women have more empathy than men</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy increases helping behavior</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are empathetic are nonaggressive</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic people do not act negatively, antisocially, or abusively</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intergroup relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intergroup relations</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$\bar{r}$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Document no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People prefer their own group to other groups</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority psychotherapy clients prefer counselors of their own ethnicity</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolchildren prefer classmates of their own race</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People identify members of their own race better than members of another race</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In judging performance, Anglo Americans favor Anglo Americans over African Americans</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In judging performance, African Americans favor African Americans over Anglo Americans</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People give higher job ratings to Anglo than African Americans</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors rate African Americans by job performance and knowledge</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans believe that they have high academic ability</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School desegregation raises African Americans’ academic achievement</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School desegregation raises African Americans’ academic achievement</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks are slightly more impulsive, aggressive, and mature than Whites</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People fuse the visual images of individuals of different races</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People perceive less in-group than out-group homogeneity</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice causes discrimination</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men are more likely than women to dislike homosexuals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men are more likely than women to dislike homosexuals</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men are more likely than women to dislike homosexuals</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People prefer young adults to elderly adults</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people believe that the elderly are unqualified for jobs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly people give equal ratings to young and old job applicants</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People attribute negative behaviors to members of stereotyped groups</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People associate small groups with negative events</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People associate small groups with negative events</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$\bar{r}$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Document no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A confident eyewitness gives accurate eyewitness testimony</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A confident eyewitness gives accurate eyewitness testimony</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyewitnesses are accurate if they were confident before seeing a lineup</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyewitnesses who are told that the perpetrator is in a lineup . . .</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are confident in identifying a perpetrator</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are inaccurate in identifying a perpetrator</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easier to identify a suspect from a lineup than from photographs</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If weapons are present at a crime, eyewitnesses have difficulty . . .</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identifying the perpetrator of the crime in a lineup</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recalling the perpetrator’s features</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyewitnesses are more accurate under some conditions than others</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are individual differences in eyewitnesses’ accuracy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large juries are more likely than small juries to reach a correct verdict</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A jury’s final verdict is likely to be the verdict a majority initially favored</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Appendices continue)
Appendix B (continued)

Meta-analytic conclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law (continued)</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$\hat{r}$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Document no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If a jury is initially split on a verdict, its final verdict is likely to be lenient</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juries are more influenced by credible than noncredible witnesses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juries are harsher on African American than Anglo American defendants</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurors are harsh on poor, unattractive African American male defendants</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurors are harsh if the victim is an attractive Anglo American female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurors who are high in authoritarianism favor harsh sentences</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In sexual assault cases, female jurors are harsher than male jurors</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men, more than women, believe that people get what they deserve</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to pornography encourages acceptance of rape myths</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people most tolerant of rape are aging, lower-class men of color</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A woman is likely to be held responsible for being raped if she . . . was previously acquainted with her attacker</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is of questionable character</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leadership

In comparison with subordinates . . .

leaders are older | 13  | .21       |       | 273          |
leaders are more intelligent | 196 | .25       |       | 172          |
leaders are more intelligent | 17  | .28       |       | 273          |
leaders are more intelligent | 13  | .38       | .03  | 165          |
leaders are more extroverted | 119 | .15       |       | 172          |
leaders are more extroverted | 10  | .10       | .19  | 165          |

Leaders are most effective if they . . .

have charisma | 49  | .54       | .14  | 107          |
have charisma | 47  | .62       | .25  | 166          |
stimulate subordinates and show them consideration | 86  | .52       | .01  | 166          |
offer rewards that are contingent on performance | 43  | .34       | .27  | 166          |
avoid making unnecessary changes | 41  | .04       | .20  | 166          |
People are less satisfied with autocratic than democratic leaders | 28  | .23       | .18  | 110          |
People are more productive under autocratic than democratic leaders | 23  | .02       | .07  | 110          |
In large groups, leaders initiate structure and are inconsiderate | 16  | .07       | .08  | 185          |
People are satisfied with leaders who initiate structure | 90  | .25       | .17  | 313          |
People perform well under leaders who initiate structure | 87  | .13       | .28  | 313          |
People are satisfied with leaders who show them consideration | 88  | .46       | .20  | 313          |
People perform well under leaders who show them consideration | 88  | .19       | .27  | 313          |
Good leader–subordinate relations promote subordinate satisfaction | 60  | .53       | .25  | 111          |
Good leader–subordinate relations promote subordinate productivity | 65  | .28       | .24  | 111          |
In favorable situations, task-oriented leaders are most effective | 58  | .28       | .23  | 218          |
In favorable situations, task-oriented leaders are most effective | 57  | .18       | .65  | 116          |
In favorable situations, task-oriented leaders are most effective | 40  | .24       |       | 275          |
In favorable situations, task-oriented leaders are most effective | 18  | .32       |       | 245          |
In favorable situations, task-oriented leaders are most effective | 11  | .54       |       | 100          |
In unfavorable situations, task-oriented leaders are most effective | 22  | .41       | .21  | 218          |
In unfavorable situations, task-oriented leaders are most effective | 20  | .44       | .61  | 116          |
In unfavorable situations, task-oriented leaders are most effective | 13  | .45       |       | 100          |
In unfavorable situations, task-oriented leaders are most effective | 12  | .44       |       | 245          |
In intermediate situations, morale-oriented leaders are most effective | 69  | .13       | .54  | 116          |
In intermediate situations, morale-oriented leaders are most effective | 57  | .29       | .06  | 218          |
In intermediate situations, morale-oriented leaders are most effective | 50  | .36       |       | 245          |
In intermediate situations, morale-oriented leaders are most effective | 43  | .31       |       | 275          |
In intermediate situations, morale-oriented leaders are most effective | 30  | .20       |       | 100          |

There are sex differences

Women are more effective leaders than men | 76  | .01       | .13  | 83           |
Men are more effective leaders than women | 18  | .02       | .12  | 71           |
### Leadership (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meta-analytic conclusion</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$\bar{r}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Document no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men are more likely than women to...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be evaluated favorably as leaders</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be evaluated favorably as leaders</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remain subordinates in social groups</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emerge as leaders in other groups</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be task oriented, solitary, and autocratic as leaders</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be non–task oriented and autocratic as school principals</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$\bar{r}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Document no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological ratings are reliable</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures of communication anxiety are reliable across situations</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures of subjective well-being are valid</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluations of ability are valid</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluations of performance are valid</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who report being feminine exhibit feminine behaviors</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who report being masculine exhibit masculine behaviors</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men report greater masculinity than women</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women report greater femininity than men</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive fear appeals effectively arouse fear</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illusion of control manipulations changes perceptions of control</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental mood induction procedures effectively alter mood</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When assessed with a bogus pipeline measure, people...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acknowledge undesirable attitudes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acknowledge smoking</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deny using drugs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are most likely to respond to surveys if they...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are greeted face-to-face, rather than through the mail</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are assured that their responses will be confidential</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are offered monetary incentives</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are offered monetary incentives</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are given monetary gratuities</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are given return postage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receive prior notice, follow-ups, and monetary incentives</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who volunteer to participate in research are unusually...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low in authoritarianism</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high in sensation-seeking</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking a pretest improves a person’s score on a posttest</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People act differently if they believe they are being studied</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$\bar{r}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Document no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External rewards increase productivity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External rewards decrease the amount of free time spent on a task</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External rewards decrease intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External rewards increase intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External rewards decrease intrinsic motivation in some circumstances</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External rewards increase intrinsic motivation in other circumstances</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who have high achievement motivation achieve a lot</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans have less achievement motivation than Anglos</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only children have high achievement motivation</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational factors influence a person’s willingness to wait for a reward</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men are more motivated than women to manage businesses</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys are more competitive than girls</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meta-analytic conclusion</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$\bar{r}$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Document no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal behavior quickly conveys accurate information about the actor</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people who are good at understanding others’ nonverbal behavior . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have dominant personalities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have high socioeconomic status</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are from nonexpansive families</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are intelligent, trusting, well adjusted, and cognitively complex</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People like individuals who make eye contact, smile, and lean forward</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People can recognize facial expressions of emotion across cultures</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People can recognize facial expressions of emotion across cultures</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions are expressed more on the left than the right side of the face</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiling increases happiness</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People judge deception accurately</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People judge deception accurately from nonverbal cues</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People judge deception accurately from verbal cues</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People judge deception from certain visible cues (like gaze aversion)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People judge deception from certain audible cues (like high pitch)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are lying have wide pupils, blink a lot, and don’t move their head</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are lying have wide pupils, blink a lot, and don’t move their head</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are lying give short responses, and offer negative, irrelevant remarks</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are lying give short responses, and offer negative, irrelevant remarks</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are sex differences: Females smile more than males</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In comparison with women, men maintain more physical distance from others</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In comparison with males, females gaze more at others</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men touch women more than women touch men</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are more skilled at expressing emotion than men</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In comparison with men, women have more understanding of nonverbal behavior</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In comparison with men, women have more understanding of nonverbal behavior</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are more sensitive than men to facial cues</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are more sensitive than men to vocal cues</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are more sensitive than men to nonverbal body cues</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personality

| Personality characteristics are stable over time | 106 | .66 | 246 |
| People agree with one another about others’ personality characteristics | 36  | .16 | 151 |
| Introverts are more vigilant than extroverts | 216 | .08 | .07 | 1  |
| Introverts are less intelligent than extroverts | 100 | .06 | .03 | 159|
| Unintelligent people have strong reactions to stress | 217 | .09 | .08 | 1  |
| Intelligent people are popular | 38  | .10 |      | 172|
| Sociable, intelligent children are popular with their peers | 176 | .05 | .20 | 204|
| Aggressive, withdrawn children are rejected by their peers | 194 | .03 | .28 | 204|
| Nonaggressive, unsociable children are neglected by their peers | 182 | .06 | .11 | 204|
| Aggressive, sociable children cause controversy among their peers | 63  | .18 | .26 | 204|
| People who are optimistic are usually in a good mood | 42  | .43 | .13 | 16 |
| People with low self-esteem often feel bad | 6   | .46 | .22 | 300|
| People with low self-esteem often suffer communication apprehension | 31  | .35 |      | 167|
| Students who have high self-esteem achieve a lot | 1,136 | .21 | .47 | 132|
| Students who perform well have high perceived self-efficacy | 38  | .38 | .04 | 199|
| Students who perform poorly are external in locus of control | 261 | .23 | .39 | 148|
| Students who perform poorly are external in locus of control | 67  | .18 | .41 | 101|
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### Meta-analytic conclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality (continued)</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$\bar{r}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Document no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People who suffer depression are external in locus of control</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who suffer depression are external in locus of control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrewd, manipulative people are external in locus of control</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsically religious people do not make selfish use of religion</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Socially anxious people . . .  
  - blush and have rapid heart rate | 28  | .36    |    | 217          |
  - have negative self-focus, and worry about being evaluated | 232 | .46    |    | 217          |
  - stutter, pause before speaking, and avoid others | 120 | .40    |    | 217          |
| A person’s ability to process messages is disrupted by anxiety | 18  | .34    | .14 | 221          |
| Only children are highly sociable | 54  | .00    | .22 | 220          |
| There are sex differences: men have higher self-esteem than women | 88  | .06    | .06 | 97           |
| Women experience more anxiety than men | 64  | .13    | .08 | 97           |
| Women are more anxious than men about communicating with others | 22  | .10    |    | 167          |
| Women are more likely than men to be external in locus of control | 39  | .06    | .16 | 97           |
| Men are more assertive than women | 52  | .08    | .19 | 97           |
| Girls develop mature personalities at an earlier age than boys | 113 | .14    | .12 | 53           |

### Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$\bar{r}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Document no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romantic partners resemble one another in physical attractiveness</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are physically attractive are judged to have positive traits</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are physically attractive are judged to have positive traits</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are physically attractive are judged to have positive traits</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are physically attractive have positive traits</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are physically attractive are judged to be intelligent</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are physically attractive are intelligent</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically attractive women are popular</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically attractive men are popular</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People engage in self-disclosure to people they like</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who disclose a lot about themselves are liked by others</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal attraction is reciprocated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends interact more positively with one another than nonfriends</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Adolescents use contraceptives if they . . .  
  - receive social support | 45  | .22    |    | 309          |
  - have a good relationship with their partner | 37  | .16    |    | 309          |
| Spouses who treat one another well are satisfied with their marriage | 13  | .32    |    | 150          |
| People who relate well to their children relate well to their spouse | 253 | .22    | .15 | 88           |
| People involved in intimate violence give undesirable self-descriptions | 18  | .18    | .05 | 277          |
| There are sex differences in relationships: Women are more likely than men to engage in self-disclosure to others | 205 | .09    | .12 | 70           |
| In comparison with women, men are more likely to rate . . .  
  - physical attractiveness as important in romantic attraction | 10  | .18    | .03 | 94           |
  - physical attractiveness as important in mate selection | 34  | .26    | .05 | 93           |
  - similarity as unimportant in romantic attraction | 10  | .11    | .00 | 94           |
| In selecting a mate, women attach more importance than men to . . .  
  - intelligence | 23  | .14    | .04 | 95           |
  - socioeconomic status | 23  | .31    | .11 | 95           |
  - character | 19  | .16    | .04 | 95           |
| Women are attracted to taller men; men are attracted to shorter women | 14  | .46    | .37 | 219          |
| Men are more likely than women to . . .  
  - favor premarital sex | 46  | .18    | .10 | 213          |
  - report being aroused by sexual stimuli | 62  | .15    | .13 | 200          |
  - be sexually permissive | 39  | .27    | .12 | 213          |
  - report sexual intercourse | 135 | .16    | .11 | 213          |
  - report petting | 28  | .05    | .14 | 213          |
  - be satisfied if they remarry | 65  | .03    | .02 | 297          |

(Appendixes continue)
Appendix B (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meta-analytic conclusion</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$\bar{r}$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Document no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social cognition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who engage in a behavior believe that the behavior is common</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who engage in a behavior believe that the behavior is common</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The members of a majority will underestimate the size of their majority</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The members of a minority will overestimate the size of their minority</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A majority consisting of 50%–62% of a group will overestimate its size</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once people know something, they believe they “knew it all along”</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impressions are based on stereotyping</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impressions are based on individuals’ special characteristics</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People know how well they are liked by others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For social categorization, person categories are most often used</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy in rating others is reduced by biases, like being too lenient</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are most likely to recall information from social memory if</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is inconsistent with their expectations</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is consistent with their expectations</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is consistent with their attitudes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is consistent with their stereotypes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they think about how the information relates to them</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their mood is the same as when they learned the information</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People remember positive events when they are elated</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People remember negative events when they are depressed</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People normally remember more positive than negative events</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory is positively related to an individual’s need for cognition</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are more accurate than men at recognizing people’s faces</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social influence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the presence of others . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people become physiologically aroused</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people become physiologically aroused</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people show a social facilitation of simple task performance</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people show a social impairment of complex task performance</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children perform well on tests that are administered by people they know</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who get a foot-in-the-door by securing compliance to a small request are likely to gain compliance to a larger request</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who get a foot-in-the-door by securing compliance to a small request are likely to gain compliance to a larger request</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who get a door-in-the-face by securing refusal to a large request are likely to gain compliance to a smaller request</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who get a door-in-the-face by securing refusal to a large request are likely to gain compliance to a smaller request</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who get a door-in-the-face by securing refusal to a large request are likely to gain compliance to a smaller request</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who get a door-in-the-face by securing refusal to a large request are likely to gain compliance to a smaller request</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People show a conformity to others’ incorrect answers</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are more likely than men to conform to others’ actions</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are more susceptible to social influence than men</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are unlikely to express their opinions without others’ support</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are likely to jaywalk if they see another person jaywalk</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who engage in ingratiation are well-liked</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easiest to influence a person who . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has low self-esteem</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has moderate self-esteem</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has little intelligence</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The higher a person’s status, the greater the person’s social influence</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meta-analytic conclusion</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$\bar{r}$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Document no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social influence (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinates are most productive and satisfied if their supervisors . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use expert or referent power</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use legitimate or reward power</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refrain from using coercive power</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In comparison with majority influence, minority social influence produces . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more change in private behaviors unrelated to the influence</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less change in other behaviors</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Italicized terms are those that appear in the Manstead and Hewstone (1995) encyclopedia.
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