Effect size guidelines for individual differences researchers

Gilles E. Gignac *, Eva T. Szodorai

University of Western, Australia

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Individual differences researchers very commonly report Pearson correlations between their variables of interest. Cohen (1988) provided guidelines for the purposes of interpreting the magnitude of a correlation, as well as estimating power. Specifically, $r = 0.10$, $r = 0.30$, and $r = 0.50$ were recommended to be considered small, medium, and large in magnitude, respectively. However, Cohen's effect size guidelines were based principally upon an essentially qualitative impression, rather than a systematic, quantitative analysis of data. Consequently, the purpose of this investigation was to develop a large sample of previously published meta-analytically derived correlations which would allow for an evaluation of Cohen's guidelines from an empirical perspective. Based on 708 meta-analytically derived correlations, the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles corresponded to correlations of 0.11, 0.19, and 0.29, respectively. Based on the results, it is suggested that Cohen's correlation guidelines are too exigent, as <3% of correlations in the literature were found to be as large as $r = 0.50$. Consequently, in the absence of any other information, individual differences researchers are recommended to consider correlations of 0.10, 0.20, and 0.30 as relatively small, typical, and relatively large, in the context of a power analysis, as well as the interpretation of statistical results from a normative perspective.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Researchers in the behavioural and cognitive sciences have been recommended to report and interpret effect sizes in their research papers (Wilkinson & the APA Task Force on Statistical Inference, 1999, p. 599). Cohen (1988, 1992) provided guidelines for the purposes of interpreting the magnitude of effect sizes across a number of statistical analyses. Individual differences researchers very commonly report correlation coefficients to represent the magnitude of the association between two continuously scored variables. Cohen (1988, 1992) recommended Pearson r values of 0.10, 0.30, and 0.50 to demarcate small, medium, and large effects, respectively.[1] Cohen's effect size guidelines were based upon the notion that a medium effect should be noticeable to the naked eye of a careful observer (Cohen, 1988). Additionally, Cohen (1988, 1992) suggested that a medium effect is about the average effect observed in the literature across various disciplines. However, Cohen's (1988, 1992) impression of an average effect was not based on a systematic, quantitative analysis of data.

More recently, Hemphill (2003) provided quantitatively-based guidelines for the purposes of interpreting correlation coefficients on the basis of a review of two meta-meta-analyses. Hemphill (2003)

found that that one third of the correlations were <0.20, one third were between 0.20 and 0.30, and one third were >0.30. Consequently, Hemphill (2003) suggested a revision of Cohen's (1988, 1992) guidelines: small <0.20; medium = 0.20 to 0.30, and large >0.30.

Although Hemphill's (2003) recommendations may be considered an advancement over Cohen's (1988, 1992) guidelines, approximately 80% of the correlations included in the Hemphill (2003) review were derived from treatment/therapy experiments, all of which reported Cohen's d values. Hemphill (2003) converted the Cohen's d values into correlations for the purposes of his investigation. Arguably, the effects observed in treatment/experiments may not be valid representations of the effect sizes that might be expected in individual differences research for a number of reasons. First, one of the variables associated with a basic experiment is manipulated. By contrast, a typical individual differences hypothesis is tested by the estimation of the association between two continuously scored variables in the absence of any manipulation. Secondly, a correlation derived from a Cohen's d value is essentially a point-biserial correlation, rather than a Pearson correlation. By contrast, individual differences researchers tend to report Pearson correlations to represent the association between their variables. Thirdly, Hemphill's (2003) investigation was also limited in that the distribution of the correlations was not reported, nor was a relatively complete percentile breakdown of the results provided. Finally, Hemphill (2003) reported only observed correlations, rather than both observed correlations and correlations disattenuated for imperfect reliability (i.e., true score correlations).

Consequently, the principal purpose of this investigation was to collate a large number of meta-analytically derived correlations across the

---

* Corresponding author at: School of Psychology, University of Western Australia, 35 Stirling Highway, Crawley, WA 6009, Australia.
E-mail address: gilles.gignac@uwa.edu.au (G.E. Gignac).

[1] Correlations are reported as positive values throughout, however, it is implied that references to correlations apply equally to negative and positive values (i.e., absolute correlations).

broad area of differential psychology. The sample of correlations (observed score and true score) would then allow for the determination of empirically-based normative guidelines for individual differences researchers.

2. Method

2.1. Studies Included in the meta-analysis

2.1.1. Search procedure

Meta-analytic publications were sought across six journals known to publish research relevant to individual differences: *Personality and Individual Differences*, *Psychological Bulletin*, *Journal of Research in Personality*, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Journal of Personality*, and *Intelligence*. Google Scholar was used to identify the meta-analytic publications by restricting the search results to the titles above. Additionally, journal article title keyword search terms included 'meta-analysis' and 'meta-analytic'. To help ensure the results would be considered relatively contemporary, only articles published from 1985 and onward were considered for potential inclusion. A total of 199 published meta-analyses were identified for potential inclusion in the investigation.

2.1.2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Meta-analyses were excluded if the results were reported as Cohen's *d*, odds-ratios, inter-rater reliability coefficients, intra-class correlations, or heritability coefficients. Additionally, meta-analyses that were based on longitudinal designs (i.e., correlations between the same measures across time) and consensual validity type coefficients (correlations between the same measures as assessed by different people) were also excluded. Thus, only meta-analyses which were relevant to the association between two conceptually distinct constructs were included in the investigation. Based on the application of the exclusion criteria, a total of 87 meta-analyses remained in the sample. The selected meta-analyses included a variety of independent and dependent variables. Specifically, 62.2% of the meta-analyses focused upon constructs typically measured via self-report measures (e.g., self-esteem, depression, anxiety, Big 5, five factor model, self-efficacy, political orientation, narcissism, optimism, EI), and 37.8% of the meta-analyses focused upon at least one construct typically measured via behavioral measures (e.g., academic performance, athleticism, cognitive style, intelligence, inspection time, job performance, training ability). A total of 708 observed correlations were derived from the sample of 87 meta-analyses (8.13 correlations per meta-analysis). Additionally, a total of 345 true score correlations were derived from 24 of the meta-analyses that included at least one correlation disattenuated for imperfect reliability.[2] For the purposes of the analyses, all of the negative correlations were transformed into absolute correlations, as it would be inappropriate to calculate measures of central tendency on a combination of negative and positive values, in this case.

3. Results

As can be seen in Table 1 (left-hand side), the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles corresponded to correlations equal to 0.11, 0.19, and 0.29, respectively. Although not reported in Table 1, only 2.7% of the correlations were 0.50 or greater. Furthermore, approximately 55% of the correlations were ≤0.21. As can be seen in Fig. 1, the distribution of the correlations was skewed positively (skew = 0.95, $z = 10.29$, $p < 0.001$; kurtosis = 1.56, $z = 8.51$, $p < 0.001$).

As can be seen in Table 1 (right-hand side), the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles corresponded to true score correlations equal to 0.16, 0.25,

Table 1

Percentiles associated with correlations (r) and true score correlations (ρ).

Percentile	r	ρ
5	0.02	0.03
10	0.05	0.08
15	0.07	0.12
20	0.10	0.14
25	0.11	0.16
30	0.13	0.18
35	0.15	0.20
40	0.17	0.21
45	0.18	0.23
50	0.19	0.25
55	0.21	0.28
60	0.23	0.30
65	0.24	0.32
70	0.27	0.35
75	0.29	0.37
80	0.31	0.43
85	0.36	0.46
90	0.41	0.52
95	0.45	0.58

Note. Correlations (r) based on 708 meta-analytically derived correlations; true score correlations (ρ) based on 345 meta-analytically derived correlations.

and 0.37, respectively. Although not reported in Table 1, 11.9% of the true score correlations were 0.50 or greater. As can be seen in Fig. 2, the distribution of true score correlations was also positively skewed (skew = 1.00, $z = 7.63$, $p < 0.001$; kurtosis = 1.73, $z = 6.57$, $p < 0.001$).

4. Discussion

The results of this investigation suggest that Cohen's (1988, 1992) commonly cited guidelines for interpreting correlations are too exigent. Specifically, in contrast to Cohen's impression-based guidelines of 0.10, 0.30, and 0.50 for small, medium, and large correlations, the results of this quantitative investigation suggest that normative guidelines should be closer to 0.10, 0.20, and 0.30, respectively. A correlation as large as 0.50 may be expected to occur in only 2.7% of cases. The meta-analytically derived true score correlations were larger than the observed score correlations, as expected. Based on the results of this investigation, normative guidelines for small, medium, and large true score correlations are suggested to be 0.15, 0.25, and 0.35, respectively.

Perhaps the most substantial difference between the results of this investigation and those reported by Hemphill (2003) is the description of a small correlation. Hemphill (2003) suggested a correlation of 0.20 or less should be considered small. However, in this investigation, 55% of all observed score correlations were 0.21 or less in magnitude. Thus, arguably, a correlation of approximately 0.20 should be considered typical (or medium), rather than small. It is difficult to explain fully why the results of this investigation and those reported by Hemphill (2003) diverged.[3] However, as this investigation was based on a wide selection of meta-analyses across a diversity of topics, rather than based principally upon treatment type studies, the results of this investigation may be contended to be more valid for individual differences researchers. Neither Cohen (1988, 1992) nor Hemphill (2003) provided guidelines for the interpretation of correlations disattenuated for imperfect reliability (true score correlations). Consequently, comparisons with previous research are not possible, in this case.

In addition to the interpretation of the magnitude of correlations from a normative perspective, the results of this investigation have possible implications for power analyses. Specifically, in the absence of any

---

[2] The correction applied was the classic disattenuation for imperfect reliability: $r_{xy} / \sqrt{(r_{xx} * r_{yy})}$ where r_{xy} = observed correlation, r_{xx} = reliability of independent variable, and r_{yy} reliability of the dependent variable (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

[3] The fact that Hemphill (2003) used the 33rd, 50th, and 66th percentiles to demarcate small, medium, and large correlations does not account for the differences. In this investigation, the 66th percentile corresponded to a correlation of only 0.24. The 66th percentile was considered too liberal to demarcate a large correlation, as 33% of correlations would be considered normatively large.

Fig. 1. Histogram of meta-analytically derived correlations (r).

other information, researchers are commonly recommended to use Cohen's (1988, 1992) guidelines for specifying the magnitude of an expected effect, in order to determine the sample size required to achieve a power of 0.80 (e.g., Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). Thus, an individual differences researcher who hypothesized a conventionally considered medium effect size ($r = 0.30$), would calculate a required sample size of 84, in order to achieve a power of 0.80. However, based on the results of this investigation, a sample size of 190 would be required, in order to achieve power of 0.80 for a typical ("medium") effect size (i.e., $r = 0.20$). Marszalek, Barber, Kohlhart and Holmes (2011) found that empirical investigations published in the *Journal of Applied Psychology* in 2006 were associated with a median sample size of sample of 114, which would imply a median power of 0.57 to detect a typical correlation ($r = 0.20$) and 0.18 for a relatively small correlation ($r = 0.10$). A *Personality and Individual Differences* sample size study would be useful.

Although the magnitude of a typical observed correlation ($r = 0.20$) may be considered rather small from an absolute perspective, it will be noted that small effects can, nonetheless, have substantial practical consequences. For example, Ozer and Benet-Martinez (2006) argued that, even though the correlation between agreeableness and volunteerism is small ($r \approx 0.20$), a slight upward shift in agreeableness at the population level may imply an increase of 1000s of volunteers for various organizations. Additionally, Noftle and Robins (2007) contended that the relatively small association between conscientiousness and academic achievement may, nonetheless, result in meaningful practical differences in the lives of individuals low and high on conscientiousness across a lifetime, based on the notion of cumulative continuity.


Fig. 2. Histogram of meta-analytically derived true score correlations (ρ).

Despite the above, it would be a disservice to the research community if the results of the current investigation were used to inspire a sense of complacency. Almost undoubtedly, the correlations reported in Table 1 are somewhat smaller than they would otherwise have been, as not all of the studies included in the meta-analyses were measured with excellent levels of validity (e.g., limited measures of IQ; short-form measures of personality). Furthermore, many of the samples included in the meta-analyses were not fully representative of the populations of interest (e.g., range restricted university students). Consequently, researchers are encouraged to specify research designs that will enhance the chances of estimating the effect between two or more constructs in the population, rather than rely upon the normative correlations reported in this investigation as a standard with which to be satisfied.

It should also be emphasized that guidelines for the interpretation of effect sizes is a practice that has been criticized, as there is a concern that researchers will use them mindlessly (e.g., Thompson, 2008). Additionally, Ellis (2010) recommended that researchers interpret effect sizes specifically in the context of their own investigation, in the first instance, which may involve consultation of unstandardized effects, rather than standardized effects. Researchers are encouraged to take these criticisms and recommendations into consideration when consulting the results of this investigation.

4.1. Limitations

The current investigation was based on a total of 87 meta-analyses across six journals (708 meta-analytically derived correlations). Undoubtedly, several possibly relevant meta-analyses were not included in this investigation, as they did not include the words 'meta-analysis' or 'meta-analytic' in their title. However, the sample of correlations was considered sufficiently large for the purposes of estimating the measures of central tendency and dispersion. Nonetheless, the results may be to some degree inaccurate, if there was something systematic associated with the difference between meta-analytic investigations which include the words 'meta-analysis' or 'meta-analytic' in their titles versus those that did not include such words.

The results of this investigation were also limited to Pearson correlations. The possibility of conducting a similar evaluation to that reported here for Cohen's d is a much more complicated one. Some investigations which report Cohen's d as a measure of effect size are based on true experiments which involve the manipulation of an independent variable. Arguably, not all manipulations are of equal magnitude. Consequently, it may be inappropriate to combine the effects of clearly different studies (drug manipulations versus a 10 min cognitive training exercise, for example). Other investigations which have reported Cohen's d are based on the artificial dichotomization of a continuous variable, some of which are based on a median split, while others are based on an extreme groups approach. The extreme groups approach would be expected to yield much more substantial Cohen's d values, in comparisons to the median split approach. Finally, some Cohen's d investigations are based on naturally nominally scaled variables (e.g. gender). Arguably, the diversity of the investigations which have used Cohen's d may preclude the justifiable amalgamation of these investigations to help yield valid guidelines across all study types.

5. Conclusion

It is doubtful the emphasis on reporting and interpreting effect sizes in research will abate. Consequently, it is important to have a guidelines for the interpretation of effect sizes that are based on good quality, representative data, rather than subjective impressions. Differential psychologists will be arguably better served by applying the normative correlation guidelines reported in this investigation (0.10, 0.20, and 0.30), rather than those reported by Cohen (1988, 1992), or even Hemphill (2003), in order to obtain an accurate sense of the magnitude

of their effect sizes relative to others reported in the individual differences literature.

References

*Alarcon, G. M., Bowling, N. A., & Khazon, S. (2013). Great expectations: A meta-analytic examination of optimism and hope. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *54*(7), 821–827.

*Albarracin, D., Johnson, B. T., Fishbein, M., & Muellerleile, P. A. (2001). Theories of reasoned action and planned behavior as models of condom use: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *127*(1), 142–161.

*Ambady, N., & Rosenthal, R. (1992). Thin slices of expressive behavior as predictors of interpersonal consequences: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *111*(2), 256–274.

*Andersson, G. (1996). The benefits of optimism: A meta-analytic review of the Life Orientation Test. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *21*(5), 719–725.

*Baker, C. A., Peterson, E., Pulos, S., & Kirkland, R. A. (2014). Eyes and IQ: A meta-analysis of the relationship between intelligence and "reading the mind in the eyes". *Intelligence*, *44*, 78–92.

*Balliet, D. (2010). Conscientiousness and forgivingness: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *48*(3), 259–263.

*Banks, G. C., Batchelor, J. H., & McDaniel, M. A. (2010). Smarter people are (a bit) more symmetrical: A meta-analysis of the relationship between intelligence and fluctuating asymmetry. *Intelligence*, *38*(4), 393–401.

*Bleidorn, W., & Ködding, C. (2013). The divided self and psychological (mal) adjustment–A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *47*(5), 547–552.

*Bogg, T., & Roberts, B. W. (2004). Conscientiousness and health-related behaviors: a meta-analysis of the leading behavioral contributors to mortality. *Psychological Bulletin*, *130*(6), 887–919.

*Bonta, J., Law, M., & Hanson, K. (1998). The prediction of criminal and violent recidivism among mentally disordered offenders: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *123*(2), 123–142.

*Bornstein, R. F. (1989). Exposure and affect: Overview and meta-analysis of research, 1968–1987. *Psychological Bulletin*, *106*(2), 265–289.

*Bornstein, R. F. (1998). Interpersonal dependency and physical illness: A meta-analytic review of retrospective and prospective studies. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *32*(4), 480–497.

*Brown, S. P. (1996). A meta-analysis and review of organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin*, *120*(2), 235–255.

*Cameron, J. J., Finnegan, H., & Morry, M. M. (2012). Orthogonal dreams in an oblique world: A meta-analysis of the association between attachment anxiety and avoidance. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *46*(5), 472–476.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*(1), 155–159.

*Connolly, J. J., & Viswesvaran, C. (2000). The role of affectivity in job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *29*(2), 265–281.

*Connor-Smith, J. K., & Flachsbart, C. (2007). Relations between personality and coping: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*(6), 1080–1107.

*Dittmar, H., Bond, R., Hurst, M., & Kasser, T. (2014). The relationship between materialism and personal well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *107*(5), 879–924.

*Donahue, M. J. (1985). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness: Review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *48*(2), 400–419.

*Duckworth, A. L., & Kern, M. L. (2011). A meta-analysis of the convergent validity of self-control measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *45*(3), 259–268.

*Elfenbein, H. A., & Eisenkraft, N. (2010). The relationship between displaying and perceiving nonverbal cues of affect: A meta-analysis to solve an old mystery. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *98*(2), 301–318.

Ellis, P. D. (2010). *The essential guide to effect sizes: Statistical power, meta-analysis, and the interpretation of research results.* Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

*Ensari, N., Riggio, R. E., Christian, J., & Carslaw, G. (2011). Who emerges as a leader? Meta-analyses of individual differences as predictors of leadership emergence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *51*(4), 532–536.

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G* Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, *39*(2), 175–191.

*Frattaroli, J. (2006). Experimental disclosure and its moderators: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *132*(6), 823–865.

*Giluk, T. L. (2009). Mindfulness, Big Five personality, and affect: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *47*(8), 805–811.

*Giluk, T. L., & Postlethwaite, B. E. (2015). Big Five personality and academic dishonesty: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *72*, 59–67.

*Gorrese, A., & Ruggieri, R. (2013). Peer attachment and self-esteem: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *55*(5), 559–568.

*Greenwald, A. G., Poehlman, T. A., Uhlmann, E. L., & Banaji, M. R. (2009). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*(1), 17–41.

*Grudnik, J. L., & Kranzler, J. H. (2001). Meta-analysis of the relationship between intelligence and inspection time. *Intelligence*, *29*(6), 523–535.

*Hall, J. A., Coats, E. J., & LeBeau, L. S. (2005). Nonverbal behavior and the vertical dimension of social relations: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *131*(6), 898–924.

*Hemphill, J. F. (2003). Interpreting the magnitudes of correlation coefficients. *American Psychologist*, *58*(1), 78–80.

*Herbert, T. B., & Cohen, S. (1993). Depression and immunity: a meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *113*(3), 472–486.

*Hönekopp, J., & Schuster, M. (2010). A meta-analysis on 2D: 4D and athletic prowess: Substantial relationships but neither hand out-predicts the other. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *48*(1), 4–10.

*Hönekopp, J., & Watson, S. (2011). Meta-analysis of the relationship between digit-ratio 2D: 4D and aggression. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *51*(4), 381–386.

*Hu, T., Zhang, D., & Wang, J. (2015). A meta-analysis of the trait resilience and mental health. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *76*, 18–27.

*Iaffaldano, M. T., & Muchinsky, P. M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *97*(2), 251–273.

*Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Postmes, T. (2004). Intergroup distinctiveness and differentiation: a meta-analytic integration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *86*(6), 862–879.

*Johnson, D. P., & Whisman, M. A. (2013). Gender differences in rumination: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *55*(4), 367–374.

*Kim, K. R., & Seo, E. H. (2015). The relationship between procrastination and academic performance: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *82*, 26–33.

*Kong, D. T. (2014). Mayer–Salovey–Caruso emotional intelligence test (MSCEIT/MEIS) and overall, verbal, and nonverbal intelligence: Meta-analytic evidence and critical contingencies. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *66*, 171–175.

*Kranzler, J. H., & Jensen, A. R. (1989). Inspection time and intelligence: A meta-analysis. *Intelligence*, *13*(4), 329–347.

*Krizan, Z., & Suls, J. (2008). Are implicit and explicit measures of self-esteem related? A meta-analysis for the Name-Letter Test. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *44*(2), 521–531.

*Kuncel, N. R., Hezlett, S. A., & Ones, D. S. (2001). A comprehensive meta-analysis of the predictive validity of the graduate record examinations: implications for graduate student selection and performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, *127*(1), 162–181.

*Lebuda, I., Zabelina, D. L., & Karwowski, M. (2015). Mind full of ideas: A meta-analysis of the mindfulness–creativity link. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *93*, 22–26.

*Malouff, J. M., Thorsteinsson, E. B., Schutte, N. S., Bhullar, N., & Rooke, S. E. (2010). The five-factor model of personality and relationship satisfaction of intimate partners: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *44*(1), 124–127.

Marszalek, J. M., Barber, C., Kohlhart, J., & Holmes, C. B. (2011). Sample size in psychological researcher over the past 30 years. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *112*(2), 331–348.

*Martins, A., Ramalho, N., & Morin, E. (2010). A comprehensive meta-analysis of the relationship between emotional intelligence and health. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *49*(6), 554–564.

*Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, *108*(2), 171–194.

*Matsumoto, D. (1987). The role of facial response in the experience of emotion: more methodological problems and a meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*(4), 769–774.

*McDaniel, M. A. (2005). Big-brained people are smarter: A meta-analysis of the relationship between in vivo brain volume and intelligence. *Intelligence*, *33*(4), 337–346.

*Mukunda, K. V., & Hall, V. C. (1992). Does performance on memory for order correlate with performance on standardized measures of ability? A meta-analysis. *Intelligence*, *16*(1), 81–97.

*Mullen, B. (1985). Strength and immediacy of sources: A meta-analytic evaluation of the forgotten elements of social impact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *48*(6), 1458–1466.

*Murphy, N. A., & Hall, J. A. (2011). Intelligence and interpersonal sensitivity: A meta-analysis. *Intelligence*, *39*(1), 54–63.

*Myrtek, M. (1995). Type A behavior pattern, personality factors, disease, and physiological reactivity: A meta-analytic update. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *18*(4), 491–502.

*Neter, E., & Ben-Shakhar, G. (1989). The predictive validity of graphological inferences: A meta-analytic approach. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *10*(7), 737–745.

Noftle, E. E., & Robins, R. W. (2007). Personality predictors of academic outcomes: Big Five correlates of GPA and SAT scores. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*(1), 116–130.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

*O'Boyle, E. H., Forsyth, D., Banks, G. C., & Story, P. A. (2013). A meta-analytic review of the Dark Triad–intelligence connection. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *47*(6), 789–794.

*Okada, R. (2010). A meta-analytic review of the relation between self-esteem level and self-esteem instability. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *48*(2), 243–246.

Ozer, D. J., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2006). Personality and the prediction of consequential outcomes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *57*, 401–421.

*Pässler, K., Hell, B., & Beinicke, A. (2015). Interests and intelligence: A meta-analysis. *Intelligence*, *50*, 30–51.

*Perry, R., Sibley, C. G., & Duckitt, J. (2013). Dangerous and competitive worldviews: A meta-analysis of their associations with social dominance orientation and right-wing authoritarianism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *47*(1), 116–127.

*Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*(5), 751–783 (Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97(2), 351–362).

*Poropat, A. E. (2009). A meta-analysis of the five-factor model of personality and academic performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, *135*(2), 322–338.

*Postmes, T., & Spears, R. (1998). Deindividuation and antinormative behavior: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *123*(3), 238–259.

*Prinzie, P., Stams, G. J. J., Deković, M., Reijntjes, A. H., & Belsky, J. (2009). *The relations between parents' Big Five personality factors and parenting: A meta-analytic review.*

*Randler, C. (2007). Gender differences in morningness–eveningness assessed by self-report questionnaires: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *43*(7), 1667–1675.

*Richardson, M., Abraham, C., & Bond, R. (2012). Psychological correlates of university students' academic performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 138*(2), 353–387.

*Robbins, S. B., Lauver, K., Le, H., Davis, D., Langley, R., & Carlstrom, A. (2004). Do psycho-social and study skill factors predict college outcomes? A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 130*(2), 261–288.

*Rosenthal, S. A., Montoya, R. M., Ridings, L. E., Rieck, S. M., & Hooley, J. M. (2011). Further evidence of the narcissistic personality inventory's validity problems: A meta-analytic investigation—Response to Miller, Maples, and Campbell (this issue). *Journal of Research in Personality, 45*(5), 408–416.

*Rothbaum, F., & Weisz, J. R. (1994). Parental caregiving and child externalizing behavior in nonclinical samples: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 116*(1), 55–74.

*Rushton, J. P., & Irwing, P. (2008). A general factor of personality (GFP) from two meta-analyses of the Big Five: and. *Personality and Individual Differences, 45*(7), 679–683.

*Saroglou, V. (2002). Religion and the five factors of personality: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Individual Differences, 32*(1), 15–25.

*Saroglou, V., Delpierre, V., & Dernelle, R. (2004). Values and religiosity: A meta-analysis of studies using Schwartz's model. *Personality and Individual Differences, 37*(4), 721–734.

*Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Thorsteinsson, E. B., Bhullar, N., & Rooke, S. E. (2007). A meta-analytic investigation of the relationship between emotional intelligence and health. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*(6), 921–933.

*Shamosh, N. A., & Gray, J. R. (2008). Delay discounting and intelligence: A meta-analysis. *Intelligence, 36*(4), 289–305.

*Sheeran, P., Abraham, C., & Orbell, S. (1999). Psychosocial correlates of heterosexual condom use: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*(1), 90–132.

*Sibley, C. G., Osborne, D., & Duckitt, J. (2012). Personality and political orientation: Meta-analysis and test of a Threat-Constraint Model. *Journal of Research in Personality, 46*(6), 664–677.

*Sitzmann, T., & Ely, K. (2011). A meta-analysis of self-regulated learning in work-related training and educational attainment: What we know and where we need to go. *Psychological Bulletin, 137*(3), 421–442.

*Sowislo, J. F., & Orth, U. (2013). Does low self-esteem predict depression and anxiety? A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 139*(1), 213–240.

*Sporer, S. L., Penrod, S., Read, D., & Cutler, B. (1995). Choosing, confidence, and accuracy: A meta-analysis of the confidence-accuracy relation in eyewitness identification studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 118*(3), 315–327.

*Stadler, M., Becker, N., Gödker, M., Leutner, D., & Greiff, S. (2015). Complex problem solving and intelligence: A meta-analysis. *Intelligence, 53*, 92–101.

*Strenze, T. (2007). Intelligence and socioeconomic success: A meta-analytic review of longitudinal research. *Intelligence, 35*(5), 401–426.

*Suls, J., & Wan, C. K. (1989). The relation between Type A behavior and chronic emotional distress: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*(3), 503–512.

*Sweeney, P. D., Anderson, K., & Bailey, S. (1986). Attributional style in depression: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*(5), 974–991.

Thompson, B. (2008). Computing and interpreting effect sizes, confidence intervals, and confidence intervals for effect sizes. In J. W. Osborne (Ed.), *Best practices in quantitative methods* (pp. 246–262). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

*Van der Linden, D., te Nijenhuis, J., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). The general factor of personality: A meta-analysis of Big Five intercorrelations and a criterion-related validity study. *Journal of Research in Personality, 44*(3), 315–327.

*Van Eerde, W. (2003). A meta-analytically derived nomological network of procrastination. *Personality and Individual Differences, 35*(6), 1401–1418.

*Van Hiel, A., Onraet, E., & De Pauw, S. (2010). The relationship between social-cultural attitudes and behavioral measures of cognitive style: A Meta-Analytic integration of studies. *Journal of Personality, 78*(6), 1765–1800.

*Vedel, A. (2014). The Big Five and tertiary academic performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences, 71*, 66–76.

*Voracek, M., Tran, U. S., & Dressler, S. G. (2010). Digit ratio (2D: 4D) and sensation seeking: New data and meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences, 48*(1), 72–77.

*Whitley, B. E. (1983). Sex role orientation and self-esteem: A critical meta-analytic review. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44*(4), 765–778.

Wilkinson, L., & the American Psychological Association Task Force on Statistical Inference (1999r). Statistical methods in psychology journals: Guidelines and explanations. *American Psychologist, 54*, 594–604.

*Wilson, K. E., & Dishman, R. K. (2015). Personality and physical activity: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences, 72*, 230–242.

*Wolf, M. B., & Ackerman, P. L. (2005). Extraversion and intelligence: A meta-analytic investigation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*(3), 531–542.

*You, X., Huang, J., Wang, Y., & Bao, X. (2015). Relationships between individual-level factors and burnout: A meta-analysis of Chinese participants. *Personality and Individual Differences, 74*, 139–145.