Judgments of personality traits and self-presentation of others based on a limited amount

of information: The moderating role of self-presentation tactics

Burusic Josip[1]& Ribar Maja[2]

[1]Institute of Social Sciences Ivo Pilar, Zagreb, Croatia

[2]Department of Psychology, Croatian Studies, University of Zagreb, Croatia

Authors' Note

Correspondence concerning this paper should be addressed to: Josip Burusic, Institute of

Social Sciences Ivo Pilar, Marulicev trg 19, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia, Email:

josip.burusic@pilar.hr, Phone: +385 1 4886 832, Fax: +385 1 4828 296

Abstract

The present study considers impression formation in a context in which the information about others is limited and at the same time private by its very nature. The accuracy of judgment of basic personality traits, affective traits and assertive self-presentation tactics of others based on their natural stream of thoughts was examined. Furthermore, the moderating role of self-presentation in accurate evaluations of others was explored. Data was collected using the approach in which 86 participants recorded their natural stream of thoughts, which then served as the basis for judges' ratings. Each participant also completed basic personality traits, affective traits and assertive self-presentation self-rating measures. The possibility of forming accurate impressions about others' personality in a context in which the audience possesses a small amount of relatively private information is partially confirmed. An intriguing finding is that it is even possible to detect self-presentation concerns, particularly Self-promotion. Additional finding with important implications for future studies is that individuals who are prone to use Self-promotion and Exemplification can be in a private context seen differently by others in comparison to those who use them less often.

Keywords: personality judgments, self-presentation, personality traits, affective traits, person perception

Judgments of personality traits and self-presentation of others based on a limited amount of

information: The moderating role of self-presentation tactics

People constantly form impressions about others, and these impressions are generally more accurate when the amount of available information is greater (e.g., Letzring, Wells, & Funder, 2006). An intriguing question is how accurately we form impressions when we have a limited amount of information at our disposal and this issue was examined in various types of contexts (e.g., Borkenau, Brecke, Möttig, & Paelecke, 2009; Rentfrow & Gosling, 2006). Also, it is interesting how accurate are these impressions when the information are at the same time private by their very nature. In addition, if self-presentation is present in the majority or in every interpersonal encounter (Leary, Allen, & Terry, 2011), the issue of accuracy of formed impressions becomes quite complex.

In the present study we examined these issues, using the method of a person's natural stream of thoughts described in detail in Holleran and Mehl (2008). "A person's natural stream of thoughts" is a term which actually indicates written essays on a person's private thoughts and feelings occurring at the time of writing, which is simultaneously recorded by the person. After the production, the essay serves as the basis for judges to form their impressions about the target person, without being acquainted with the person. Previous studies have examined the possibility of judgments about self-esteem (Bosson, Swann, & Pennebaker, 2000) and personality traits (Holleran & Mehl, 2008) using this approach. Holleran and Mehl (2008) demonstrated satisfying self-other agreement in judgments of Big Five personality dimensions, especially in the case of Conscientiousness.

The first step in the present study was to confirm the possibility of forming impressions about personality traits using this approach in a different research context. Holleran and Mehl (2008) showed that it is possible to judge persons' internal entities, such as basic personality

dimensions, based on the person's stream of thoughts. In the present study we aimed to broaden their findings by examining whether this is applicable on affective traits as well, since information about someone's thoughts and feelings can be considered diagnostic for judgment of that person's emotional tendencies (Rodriguez, Holleran, & Mehl, 2010). For this reason, it can be expected that this research approach would provide sufficient information to form a basis for an accurate judgment of affective traits. However, the main focus of this study is the question how accurate are impressions about self-presentation in a context in which the information about others is both limited and at the same time private by its very nature. Findings on this should provide useful information about the role of self-presentation in personality judgments.

Natural stream of thoughts can be considered a relatively private source of information about a person that should not be contaminated with self-presentational behaviors (Leary, 1995). In the present study we firstly examined if the audience can perceive signs of self-presentational concerns even in this relatively private context. The underlying expectation for considering self-presentation even in this context is the fact that it is often automatic and therefore completely natural (Schlenker & Pontari, 2000). Previous studies in the domain of self-presentation have found that impressions about others can be understood as a mixture of existing traits and underlying attempts to create and manage impressions through some form of self-presentation (Leary & Allen, 2011). Therefore, we examined if the audience can recognize not just personality traits, but also the target persons' tactics used in order to make a good impression.

In the present study we attempted to address an additional question in the general context of self-presentation. Self-presentation literature indicates that relatively stable individual differences can be found in tendency to use certain self-presentation tactics and styles (Burusic, 2007), whereby some people are more successful in self-presentation, use it more frequently and are more efficient in achieving interpersonal goals by means of self-presentation (Leary, 1995),

and self-presentation can be seen as an important and efficient tool in achieving a whole range of interpersonal goals (Murphy, 2007). It is reasonable to expect that people who are more skilled in using certain self-presentation tactics should, in general, be more successful in managing public impressions about themselves (Jones & Pittman, 1982). An interesting question is whether the persons' general tendency to use certain self-presentation tactics may also affect the perception of that person in a particular context.

One such context is a situation when the available information about a person is limited and private. Therefore, the second aim of the present study was to examine the role of self-presentation in the accuracy of impressions about personality traits formed in a context in which people provide limited amount of information about themselves. Human, Biesanz, Parisotto, and Dunn (2012) showed that motivation to make a good impression leads to more accurate personality judgment, which would imply a moderating role of self-presentation on personality perception accuracy. However, they haven't examined specific self-presentational goals and their impact on accuracy at the level of specific personality traits. It is interesting to ascertain, for example, whether those who are more prone to employ self-promotion are assessed equally accurately as those who rarely or never use self-promotion. If the accuracy of impressions about others formed in the context of natural stream of thoughts is affected by their general self-presentation tendencies, this would imply that self-presentation has an important moderating role in personality judgments.

Participants in this study were given a task to write down their thoughts and feelings over a period of 20 minutes, which resulted in the creation of 'stream-of-consciousness essays' (SOC essays) (Holleran & Mehl, 2008). These essays were used as the source of information, whereby a group of judges rated person's basic personality traits, affective traits and the presence of main assertive self-presentation tactics. Although some authors point out that in personality judgments

the accuracy criterion should be based on multiple sources of information (e.g. Funder, 1995), self-ratings are still the most often used method for this purpose (Funder, 2012), and in this study they were treated as an objective indicator of judges' accuracy.

Method

Participants

Participants were 90 psychology students (four males, age range: 19-25, $M = 21.2$, $SD = 1.88$). The group of judges consisted of 11 participants (five males; age range: 23-35, $M = 26.5$, $SD = 3.50$) who were not acquainted with participants nor had ever taken any psychology courses. All the participants volunteered for the study, and were not paid for participation.

Measures

Two groups of measures were used in the study. The first consisted of self-rating measures, used to assess the basic personality traits, affective traits and general tendency to use certain assertive self-presentation tactics. The second group of measures was used by judges to assess the same traits and behaviors in participants, after reading their SOC essays. In order to reduce the overall size of judges' load and to increase the time efficiency of their ratings, short versions of measures were used.

Self-ratings.

(1) Self-ratings of basic personality traits were obtained using The Big Five Inventory (BFI, John & Srivastava, 1999). A preliminary validation study has confirmed that the psychometric characteristics of the Croatian version of BFI are satisfactory (Burusic, Gelo, & Marinic, 2002). The alpha coefficients for Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience were .89, .81, .89, .88, and .86, respectively.

(2) Self-ratings of positive and negative affect were obtained using The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS – Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). For each item, participants were asked to rate how often they generally feel that way. The alpha coefficient for both positive and negative affect was .86.

(3) The Inventory of Self-Presentation Tactics Measured through Target Attributions (Burusic, 2007) is an instrument designed to measure assertive self-presentation tactics – self-promotion, ingratiation and exemplification. Each tactic is operationalized through nine adjectives describing desirable attributions a person is trying to create in the majority of interactions when using a particular tactic, as postulated in the Jones and Pittman's (1982) taxonomy. Jones and Pittman's taxonomy provides a solid basis for development of self-presentation measure and encompass a wide variety of behaviors and specific target impression individuals tend by each kind of behaviors. In self-promotion, individuals engage in social behavior with the intention to be seen as competent, intelligent or successful; by using ingratiation individuals want to elicit impression of likability from audience, and exemplification as a self-presentation tactics serves to present oneself as a moral and honest person. The construction of the inventory was conducted in several phases, using Leary's (1996) work as the starting point. Selected adjectives were presented in random order, using a five-point response scale (1 = I do not attempt to be perceived by others that way at all; 5 = I strongly attempt to be perceived by others that way). The alpha coefficients for Exemplification, Ingratiation, and Self-promotion were .72, .85, and .86, respectively.

Other-ratings.

(1) A short version of the questionnaire for assessment of Big Five personality traits was used. Each trait was operationalized through three items from the Croatian version of IPIP (Mlacic & Goldberg, 2007). In previous studies the reliability of these short self-report versions

was satisfactory, ranging from .59 (Agreeableness) to .78 (Emotional stability) (Milas, 2007).

Five-point response scale was used (1 = completely inaccurate; 5 = completely accurate). All the

items were formulated in the third person in order to fit the purposes of judges' ratings. The

alpha coefficients of aggregated judges' ratings (i.e., coefficients based on item responses

averaged over judges) for Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and

Openness to Experience were .92, .97, .95, .86, and .94, respectively.

(2) The original Inventory of Self-Presentation Tactics Measured through Target

Attributions (Burusic, 2007) was shortened and adapted for ratings in the third person. The

adjectives with the highest saturation with certain self-presentation tactics (Burusic, 2007) were

chosen, and the Ingratiation scale included four items, while the Exemplification and Self-

promotion scales consisted of three items. Five-point response scale was used (1 = the person

does not attempt to be perceived that way at all; 5 = the person strongly attempts to be perceived

that way). The alpha coefficients of aggregated judges' ratings for Exemplification, Ingratiation,

and Self-promotion were .87, .84, and .93, respectively.

(3) The judges assessed the positive and negative affect on the basis of a single item in

which they rated to what extent the author of the essay generally experiences positive or negative

affect. For each affect, most of the items from PANAS scales (Watson et al., 1988) were

provided in parenthesis for additional clarification. The response scale was a seven point Likert

scale (0 = never or not at all; 6 = constantly).

Procedure

Procedure was similar to the one described in Holleran and Mehl's (2008) study, with few

modifications. Each participant was given a protocol with blank sheets of paper for recording his

or her natural stream of thoughts, and self-rating questionnaires of basic personality traits,

affective traits and self-presentation tactics, presented in a counterbalanced order (i.e. self-ratings measures). They were told that they are taking part in research dealing with personality and its manifestations.

In order to record their natural stream of thoughts each participant task was to write a free-style essay (SOC essays) about their thoughts and feelings for a period of 20 minutes. They were asked to write about everything that comes to their mind, without paying any attention to spelling, grammar, or sentence structure. The SOC essays were then transcribed using word processing software (MS Word) and made uniform with respect to the font type in order to reduce the effects of person's handwriting. The number of words written by the participants ranged from 164 to 647, with the mean of 420 words (SD = 105.29).

Complete anonymity was emphasized and an option to drop out from the study at any stage was assured. The recorded thoughts of one participant were left out from further analysis due to extremely illegible handwriting and three participants dropped out during the course of this study.

In the second phase of the study, transcribed SOC essays were given to a group of judges, fully unfamiliar with the participants, authors of essays. Each judge read the SOC essays of all the participants, with a random order of appearance of the particular essays. Judges task was, on the basis of impression they got during the reading of each essay, to assess Big five personality traits, self-presentation tactics and the positive and negative affect of person: same traits and behaviors that were previously assessed by participants themselves (i.e. other-ratings).

Data Analysis

Judges' consensus was determined by calculating the intraclass correlation coefficient [2, 1] (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979), while the accuracy was determined as *average perceiver accuracy*

(i.e. Pearson correlation coefficient between participants' self-ratings and the average rating of all the judges) and *single perceiver accuracy* (i.e. Pearson correlation coefficients between self-ratings and each judge's ratings, firstly transformed into z-values using the Fisher logarithmic transformation, averaged and re-transformed into correlation coefficient).

The moderating role of each self-presentation tactic on impression accuracy was examined using moderated multiple regression, with self-rating of a given trait as a criterion, average of judges' ratings of the same trait as a predictor, and self-rated tactic as a moderator. Predictor and moderator were mean-centered and the squared semi-partial correlation coefficient between the criterion and their product was used as a measure of moderating effects since in this case it represents the criterion variance explained by the product term, over and above the variance explained by the combination of their separate effects (e.g. Aiken & West, 1991; Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). Additionally, the nature of the regression model was also tested with a procedure described by Lubinski and Humphreys (1990). In cases of significant moderator effects, a regression of participants' self-ratings on judges' ratings at different values of the moderator was made using the procedure described by Aiken and West (1991).

Results

Judges' consensus and accuracy in judgments of basic personality traits, affective traits, and self-presentation tactics are presented in Table 1.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

A notable consensus was found among the judges, with the highest level of consensus for Agreeableness, followed by Neuroticism, Positive affect and Self-promotion as an assertive self-presentation tactic. Both average and single perceiver accuracy were the highest for Negative affectivity, and single perceiver accuracy reached the conventional level of statistical

significance only for this trait. Average perceiver accuracy was also significant in cases of Openness, Extraversion, Positive affect, Self-promotion, and marginally significant in cases of Neuroticism and Ingratiation.

The intercorrelations matrices among traits included in each moderated regression analysis are given in Table 2, where the self-other agreement correlations for the corresponding traits already presented in Table 1 are omitted.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

In general, self-rated self-presentation tactics more strongly correlated with self-ratings of basic and affective personality traits than with judges' ratings of the corresponding traits. The correlations were the highest between Exemplification and self-rated Conscientiousness, Ingratiation and self-rated Agreeableness, and Self-promotion and self-rated Openness. Personality traits that generally showed the lowest correlations with the use of assertive self-presentation tactics were Neuroticism and Negative affect.

The results of the conducted moderator analyses for each self-presentation tactic are presented in Table 3.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

At different levels of use of Exemplification tactics the degree of self-other agreement differed for Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. When it comes to Conscientiousness, self-other agreement also differed at different levels of Self-promotion. In other words, the accuracy of forming impressions about these two traits could differ in a situation where motivation for Exemplification or Self-promotion exists. The third self-presentation tactic, Ingratiation, apparently did not have an effect on judges' accuracy, and its moderating potential was marginally present in the case of Neuroticism.

As is evident from Table 2, judgments of Consciousness were significantly correlated with both Exemplification and Self-promotion, so these two interactions could also be the result of a curvilinear relationship (Cohen et al., 2003; Lubinski & Humphreys, 1990). To ensure that these results were not a methodological artifact, we applied a hierarchical procedure where the predictor and the moderator are included in the first step of the analysis, while in the second step their product and squared terms were included in the regression model in a stepwise fashion (Lubinski & Humphreys, 1990). The analysis indicated that in the interaction between Consciousness and Self-promotion prediction of the criterion was truly enhanced by the interaction. However, the interaction between Exemplification and judgment of Conscientiousness could also be understood as an effect of a curvilinear relationship between the self-rated Conscientiousness and Exemplification, where the contribution of the squared function to the explanation of the criterion was 3.8% ($\Delta R^2 = .038$; $p = .021$; $f^2 = .068$). For this reason, this interaction was not further examined.

We additionally calculated the regression coefficients for predicting self-ratings on the basis of the judges' ratings at mean levels of self-presentation as a moderator and at levels that are equal to one standard deviation below and above the average (e.g., Cohen & Cohen, 1983). The performed analyses did not reveal any statistically significant self-other agreement for Agreeableness at average ($b = -0.39$; $p = .273$) or at high ($b = 0.51$; $p = .299$) levels of exemplification. At low levels of Exemplification a statistically significant negative correlation between self-rated Agreeableness and judgment of Agreeableness by others ($b = -1.30$; $p = .023$) was found. Regarding the moderator effect of Self-promotion on accuracy of judgments of Conscientiousness, the analysis revealed that at the low level of use of this tactic, a statistically significant positive correlation between the predictor and the criterion ($b = 1.96$; $p = .027$)

existed. The correlation did not prove to be significant at average ($b = 0.62$; $p = .301$), or at high levels of use of this tactic ($b = -0.78$; $p = .292$).

Discussion

The possibility of forming impressions about others in a context where the audience possesses a small amount of relatively private information is satisfactory: impressions formed are consistent among judges and to a certain degree congruent with the self-perception of the people whose traits were judged. The outcome regarding impressions about Big Five personality traits is in accordance with Holleran and Mehl's (2008) study, with markedly lower consensus and accuracy correlations. These differences can primarily be explained by differences in the recorded number of words (420 vs. 766), which could have resulted from the fact that participants in our study wrote their text on paper, while participants in Holleran and Mehl's study used computers for recording their thoughts and feelings. The decreased amount of information in the present study could have led to reduced quality of insights, which is in accordance with general expectations that larger amount of information leads to greater accuracy of impressions (cf. Letzring et al., 2006). Another reason could be of purely methodological nature, since we used shorter questionnaires for other-ratings, and traits measured using this procedure lost some of their facets in the employed short versions.

There were also interesting differences between the two studies in terms of accuracy across all Big Five traits, where in Holleran and Mehl's (2008) study accuracy was relatively uniform across all five of them. Research has shown that traits differ in their visibility or observability (Funder & Dobroth, 1987; John & Robins, 1993), and results obtained in our research show that private context contains information that is not equally relevant for judgments of different traits. Although expectation would be that less visible or more private traits could

possibly be judged with greater accuracy when compared to more visible traits, obtained results did not confirm this expectation. At the other hand, our research confirmed that both affective traits, as internal emotional tendencies, were judged quite accurately, so we can conclude that essays were quite diagnostic for different traits. Since participants in our study wrote about their feelings, the obtained results imply that this context contains information relevant to affective traits, which in return enhances the accuracy of their judgment (cf. Rodriguez et al., 2010).

An intriguing finding of this study is that it is possible to detect the motivation for creating a desirable impression about oneself in a private context in which overall anonymity was ensured. Such a context did not reduce the desire to form certain impressions about oneself, which is especially pronounced in the case of self-promotion. This implies that both impression motivation and impression construction (Leary & Kowalski, 1990) exist even in this highly private context. An additional explanation is based on the premise that the majority of self-presentational behaviors are well-learned and automated (Schlenker & Pontari, 2000), and therefore evident even in such a context. Both of these explanations lead to conclusion that people are almost never completely free of self-presentational concerns or actions (Leary et al., 2011).

Assertive self-presentation also has an important role in the process of forming impressions about others' personality traits. The results confirm the moderating role of some self-presentation tactics: in a situation where little information about a person is available, someone who is more agreeable but less prone to self-present as an exemplary and outstanding person will be perceived as less agreeable than he or she really is. On the other hand, smaller tendency to self-promote leads to greater accuracy in judgments of that person's Consciousness.

The described outcome of the present study, where exemplification increases the accuracy regarding agreeableness, and self-promotion decreases accuracy regarding

conscientiousness, opens important questions regarding the relationship between self-presentation tactics and basic personality traits. Outcomes of our study indicate that a combination of two desirable entities – Agreeableness trait and Exemplification tactic, appears to be functional, while a combination of a desirable trait of Consciousness and mostly undesirable Self-promotion tactic is less functional in influencing other's impressions. In other words, judgment of a person's general approach to tasks or goals (which is represented by personality trait) is more accurate if a person emphasizes to a lesser degree her natural talents as a cause of accomplishments (as a self-presentational tactic).

Previous research has shown that target persons' motivation to appear smart can lead to more accurate judgment of their intelligence (Murphy, 2007), and that general motivation to make a good impression can lead to a more accurate personality judgment (Human et al., 2012). Since in our research target persons were not instructed to self-present in any way, further research is needed to examine the role of general tendency to use assertive self-presentation tactics in personality perception when target persons are motivated to make a good impression. Nevertheless, taken together with aforementioned findings, our results suggest that self-presentation is an important aspect of person perception and accuracy in personality judgments.

When considering results of the present study, it should be noted that our sample of target persons consisted of psychology students, who were predominately females. It should also be taken into account that the examination of moderating effects did not include adjustment for multiple testing. When we take into consideration that tests of interactions often have quite low statistical power (Aiken & West, 1991) and that most effects sizes obtained in social sciences are small to moderate (e.g. Cohen et al., 2003), size of our sample did not allow us to use an adjustment for multiple testing. However, previous research confirmed the moderating role of self-presentation in person perception accuracy (Human et al., 2012; Murphy, 2007) and the

obtained results are in accordance with those findings. Given our sample size, it is also possible that we were not able to detect all the interaction effects that exist in the population. Thus, further research is needed to examine the generalizability of the obtained effects across genders and across different and larger samples.

The results of the present study demonstrate that information about someone's thoughts and feelings is diagnostic for some of the private personality traits, especially for Negative affect. On a theoretical level, these results confirm the Realistic Accuracy Model (Funder, 1995) assumption that certain kinds of information can be especially diagnostic for certain traits (i.e., Trait x Information interaction, entitled *Diagnosticity* within the model). The obtained results also indicate that self-presentation is present even in this type of context and that it affects accuracy of personality judgment. Unlike most self-presentation research in which the desired social images are often imposed on research participants (Leary et al., 2011), in this research the occurrence of self-presentation was not induced and participants were free to choose their desired images, making our results more applicable to everyday life situations. Although in those situations we rarely have access to someone's thoughts and feelings, the most similar type of information are on-line blogs. However, since on-line blogs are more publicly-oriented, future research could examine the role of self-presentation when personality judgment is based on them.

Other examples of verbal self-descriptions are on-line chats or forums which include two-sided communication, or job applications in which successful self-presentation is highly desirable. Although these contexts are less private when compared to the context used in this research, they can capture two important aspects of everyday life self-presentation, namely its' dynamic nature and important consequences for self-presenter (Leary et al., 2011). Since our results show that self-presentation is present even in a highly private context, it can be expected

that in contexts that are more public or important to self-presenter this type of behavior would be even more pronounced. Thus, its' role in person perception accuracy deserves additional testing in future studies based on larger and more complex sets of information about persons being judged, with varying levels of privacy, as well as with different types of audience and including not just verbal modes of self-presentation.

Conclusions

The results of the present study indicate that it is possible to form impressions about personality traits, affective traits, and assertive self-presentation tactics of others on the basis of limited and private information. The possibility of accurate judgment is greater in the case of some personality traits (i.e. Extraversion and Openness) and it is the greatest in the case of Negative affectivity trait. The most interesting finding of this study pertains to the role of self-presentation. A person's tendency for Exemplification or Self-promotion can influence the accuracy of others' judgment, especially in the case of impressions about Agreeableness and Conscientiousness.

References

Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Borkenau, P., Brecke, S., Möttig, C., & Paelecke, M. (2009). Extraversion is accurately perceived after a 50-ms exposure to a face. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43,* 703-706. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2009.03.007

Bosson, J. K., Swann, W. B., Jr., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2000). Stalking the perfect measure of implicit self-esteem: The blind men and the elephant revisited? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 631-643. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.79.4.631

Burusic, J. (2007). *Self-presentation: tactics and styles* [Samopredstavljanje: taktike i stilovi]. Jastrebarsko: Naklada Slap.

Burusic, J., Gelo, J., & Marinic, D. (2002). Croatian Version of Big Five Inventory (BFI)-Overview and preliminary findings [Osnovne karakteristike Big Five Inventara (BFI) – Prikaz preliminarnih rezultata hrvatske inacice], *Book of Abstract of XIII. Psychology Days* in Zadar (pp. 9), Zadar: Department of Psychology.

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

Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Funder, D. C. (1995). On the accuracy of personality judgment: A realistic approach. *Psychological Review, 102*, 652-670.

Funder, D. C. (2012). Accurate personality judgment. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 21*, 177-182. doi:10.1177/0963721412445309

Funder, D. C., & Dobroth, K. M. (1987). Differences between the traits: Properties associated with interjudge agreement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 409-418.

Holleran, S.E., & Mehl, M. R. (2008). Let me read your mind: Personality judgments based on person's natural stream of thought. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42*, 747-754. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2007.07.011

Human, L. J., Biesanz, J. C., Parisotto, K. L., & Dunn, E. W. (2012). Your best self helps reveal your true self: Positive self-presentation leads to more accurate personality impressions. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 3*, 23-30. doi:10.1177/1948550611407689

John, O. P., & Robins, R. W. (1993). Determinants of interjudge agreement on personality traits: The Big Five domains, observability, evaluativeness, and unique perspective of the self. *Journal of Personality, 4*, 521-551.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement and theoretical perspectives. In: L.A. Pervin and O.P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality Psychology* (pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford.

Jones, E. E., & Pittman, T. S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In: J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological Perspectives on the Self* (pp. 231–262). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Leary, M. R. (1995). *Self-presentation: Impression management and interpersonal behavior.* Boulder: Westview.

Leary, M. R. (1996). *Self-presentation tactics inventory* (unpublished manuscript). Department of Psychology, Wake Forest University.

Leary, M. R., & Allen, A.B. (2011). Self-Presentational Persona: Simultaneous Management of Multiple Impressions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*, 1033-1049. doi: 10.1037/a0023884

Leary, M. R., Allen, A. B., & Terry, M. L. (2011). Managing social images in naturalistic versus laboratory settings: Implications for understanding and studying self-presentation. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 41*, 411-421. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.813

Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*, 34-47.

Letzring, T. D., Wells, S. M., & Funder, D. C. (2006). Information quantity and quality affect the realistic accuracy of personality judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*, 111-123. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.91.1.111

Lubinski, D., & Humphreys, L. G. (1990). Assessing spurious „moderator effects": Illustrated substantively with the hypothesized („synergistic") relation between spatial and mathematical ability. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*, 385-393.

Mlacic, B., Goldberg, L. R. (2007). An analysis of a Cross-Cultural Personality Inventory: The IPIP Big-Five Factor Markers in Croatia. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *88*, 168-177. doi:10.1080/00223890701267993

Milas, G. (2007). Basic personality traits and some aspects of political behavior [Temeljne osobine ličnosti i neki vidovi političkog ponašanja]. *Društvena istraživanja, 16*, 27-49.

Murphy, N. A. (2007). Appearing smart: The impression management of intelligence, person perception accuracy, and behavior in social interaction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*, 325-339. doi: 10.1177/0146167206294871

Rentfrow, P. J., & Gosling, S. D. (2006). Message in a ballad: The role of music preferences in interpersonal perception. *Psychological Science, 17*, 236-242.

Rodriguez, A. J., Holleran, S. E., & Mehl, M. R. (2010). Reading between the lines: The lay assessment of subclinical depression from written self-descriptions. *Journal of Personality, 78*, 575-598. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00627.x

Schlenker, B. R., & Pontari, B. A. (2000). The strategic control of information: Impression management and self-presentation in daily life. In A. Tesser, R. B. Felson, & J. M. Suls (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on self and identity* (pp. 199-232). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10357-008

Shrout, P. E., & Fleiss, J. L. (1979). Intraclass Correlations: Uses in Assessing Rater Reliability. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*, 420-428.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and Validation of Brief Measures of Positive and Negative Affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 1063-1070.

Table 1

Consensus, correlations of self-reports with aggregated judgments, and average self-other agreement

Assessed characteristic	Consensus	Accuracy	
		Average judge	*Single judge*
Big Five personality traits			
Extraversion	.17**	.23*	.12
Agreeableness	.32**	-.07	-.04
Conscientiousness	.22**	.14	.08
Neuroticism	.25**	.19†	.13
Openness	.22**	.28**	.16
Affective traits			
Positive affect	.25**	.22*	.13
Negative affect	.20**	.45**	.26*
Assertive self-presentation tactics			
Exemplification	.20**	.18	.10
Ingratiation	.20**	.19†	.11
Self-promotion	.25**	.26*	.16

Note. *N*'s range from 83 to 86 due to occasional missing data; consensus is an intraclass

correlation ICC [2,1] for 11 judges; average judge accuracy is a correlation between average of

judges' ratings and the target person's self-report; single judge accuracy is the average of 11

correlations between self-reports and judges' ratings calculated with Fisher r-to-z transformation

* *p* < .05; **p<.01; †p<.1

Table 2

Correlations of self-reported self-presentation tactics with self-ratings and judges' ratings of basic personality and affective traits

Trait	Exemplification	Ingratiation	Self-promotion
Extraversion			
self-report	.29**	.31**	.25*
judges' rating	.24*	.31**	.18*
Agreeableness			
self-report	.27**	.46**	.13
judges' rating	.05	-.04	-.02
Conscientiousness			
self-report	.63**	.15†	.34**
judges' rating	.25*	.16	.24*
Neuroticism			
self-report	-.14†	-.11	-.12
judges' rating	-.12	-.13	-.07
Openness			
self-report	.34**	.34**	.51**
judges' rating	.04	.09	.20*
Positive affect			
self-report	.38**	.24*	.35**
judges' rating	.09	.17†	.02
Negative affect			
self-report	-.03	.00	.08
judges' rating	-.14	-.18*	-.05

Note. *N*'s range from 81 to 86 due to occasional missing data

* $p < .05$; **p<.01; †p<.1

Table 3

Regression of self-reported trait on the basis of judges' ratings (x), self-presentation tactic (m) and their product (p)

Moderator/predictor	b_1 (x)	b_2 (m)	b_3 (p)	R^2	$r_{y(p.xm)}^2$	$r_{yp.xm}^2$	f^2
Exemplification							
Extraversion	0.84	0.36*	-0.03	.11*	.000	.000	.000
Agreeableness	-0.39	0.33*	0.23*	.14**	.058*	.063*	.067
Conscientiousness	0.17	1.03**	-0.25*	.44**	.035*	.058*	.062
Neuroticism	0.79†	-0.16	-0.08	.06	.007	.007	.007
Openness	1.41**	0.49**	-0.16	.20**	.012	.015	.015
Positive affect	1.82†	0.55**	-0.03	.18**	.000	.000	.000
Negative affect	3.93**	0.06	0.20	.21**	.009	.011	.012
Ingratiation							
Extraversion	0.82	0.41*	0.06	.12*	.002	.002	.002
Agreeableness	-0.17	0.58**	-0.01	.21**	.000	.000	.000
Conscientiousness	0.68	0.21	0.01	.04	.000	.000	.000
Neuroticism	0.73	-0.04	-0.20†	.08†	.038†	.040†	.042
Openness	1.26*	0.48**	0.12	.18**	.006	.007	.007
Positive affect	1.74†	0.32†	-0.06	.09*	.000	.001	.001
Negative affect	3.80**	0.17	-0.23	.22**	.014	.017	.017
Self-promotion							
Extraversion	0.93	0.29*	-0.02	.10*	.000	.000	.000
Agreeableness	-0.31	0.14	0.15†	.06	.041†	.042†	.043
Conscientiousness	0.62	0.47**	-0.31*	.19**	.066*	.075*	.081
Neuroticism	0.83†	-0.14	-0.07	.05	.006	.006	.006
Openness	0.97†	0.64**	-0.02	.29**	.000	.000	.000
Positive affect	2.08*	0.46**	0.01	.17**	.000	.000	.000
Negative affect	4.03**	0.12	-0.12	.21**	.003	.004	.004

Note. *N*'s range from 81 to 86 due to occasional missing data. b_1, b_2, b_3 = raw partial regression coefficients; R^2 = squared multiple correlation coefficient; $r_{y(p.xm)}^2$ = squared coefficient of semipartial correlation between the criterion and the product of predictor and moderator; $r_{yp.xm}^2$ = squared coefficient of partial correlation between the criterion and the product of the predictor and the moderator; f^2 = effect size indicator for the interaction member, defined as $r_{yp.xm}^2/(1 - r_{yp.xm}^2)$ (Cohen, 1988)

* $p < .05$; **p<.01; †p<.1