

PERSONALITY, PERSON PERCEPTION, AND IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT:
DOES IMPRESSION EFFICACY AND MOTIVATION PREDICT CHANGE IN
PERSONALITY PRESENTATION?

By

MICHELLE DIXON

A thesis submitted to the

Graduate School-Camden

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of Master of Arts

Graduate Program in Psychology

Written under the direction of

Christopher S. Nave, Ph.D.

And approved by

Christopher S. Nave, Ph.D.

Kristin J. August, Ph.D.

Charlotte N. Markey, Ph.D.

Camden, New Jersey

May 2017

THESIS ABSTRACT

Personality, Person Perception, and Impression Management: Does Impression Efficacy and Motivation Predict Change in Personality Presentation?

by MICHELLE DIXON

Thesis Director:

Christopher S. Nave, Ph.D.

Social interactions are an integral part of human nature (Leary, 2007). During interactions, how people present themselves to interaction partners (referred to as judges in the person perception literature) is determined by a multitude of influences such as personality, situational characteristics, and personal desired goals. Person perception research (i.e., what information we extract when we interact with another person, how we interpret the interaction, and how our interpretation influences our own behavior) and impression management research (i.e., the conscious and unconscious process of individuals controlling how others perceive them) has not been integrated in the literature prior to this study. The current study ($N=100$) integrates person perception and impression management by examining how individual differences in impression motivation and impression efficacy relates to presenting one's personality to another individual during an interaction and one's reflection of how they presented themselves following an interaction. The results suggest there is variability in how people desire to be perceived and think they were perceived when interacting with another person.

Keywords: Person Perception, Impression Management, Personality

Introduction

Social interactions are an integral part of human nature. As such, there are robust literatures related to social interactions. During interactions, how people present themselves to interaction partners (referred to as judges in the person perception literature) is determined by a multitude of influences such as personality, situational characteristics, and personal desired goals (Leary & Allen, 2011a). Social Psychology tends to be interested in how people manage their impressions and present themselves during an interaction. Personality Psychology and person perception researchers tend to examine the process by which people form impressions of others. Impression management/self-presentation and person perception research have unfortunately not been well-integrated in the psychological literature. The current manuscript attempts to draw on both disciplines to gain a better understanding of initial get-to-know you interactions.

Person perception research encompasses social processing issues such as what information we extract when we interact with another person, how we interpret the interaction, and how our interpretation influences our own behavior (Burusic & Ribar, 2014). There are a number of well-regarded models in person perception including: The Realistic Accuracy Model (RAM; Funder, 1995); Social Accuracy Model (SAM; Biesanz, 2010); Social Relations Model (SRM; Kenny, 1994); and Personality, Error, Residual, Stereotype, Opinion, and Norm (PERSON; Kenny, 2004), but none of these models take into account the goals and motivations (impression management) that individuals bring to an interaction (e.g., some individuals are motivated to make a desired impression). Impression management refers to the conscious and unconscious process of

individuals controlling how others perceive them (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). There are two key components to impression management; impression efficacy and impression motivation (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Impression efficacy (IE) is an individual's confidence in their ability to make a desired impression. Impression motivation (IM) is an individual's motivation to make a desired impression. The overall goal of the current study is to integrate person perception research and impression management research.

Specifically, the current study examines how individual differences in impression motivation and impression efficacy relates to presenting one's personality to another individual during an interaction and one's reflection of how they presented themselves following an interaction. This study combines work in impression management and in person perception to begin to understand how these two constructs interact. The present paper will discuss the previous research on impression motivation, impression efficacy and personality presentation, in addition to discussing how the current study's results reduce the gap in the literature. The aims of the current study include: 1) to understand what personality characteristics people attempt to enhance, reduce, or remain constant during an interaction, 2) to understand what personality characteristics people believe they are successfully able to enhance, reduce, or remain constant during an interaction, and 3) determine if impression efficacy and impression motivation predict statistically significant change in personality presentation.

Social Psychology and Impression Management

People have an invested interest in judge's perceptions of them. Americans spend billions of dollars every year to modify and improve how judges perceive them (E. R., 2014; Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Rawes, 2014). For example, people buy certain clothes,

style their hair a specific way, and talk in a certain syntax in an attempt to embed a desirable impression on judges. Young children are taught by their parents the importance of behaving properly in public due to the notion that other people's perceptions of us matter. Although it may seem superficial, it does matter how people perceive us, which is why person perception research is important (Hofstee, 1994).

In a new social interaction, individuals often attempt to control how judges perceive them since reputations are important (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Since there are implications to how judges perceive people, individuals often try to alter their personality presentation to generate a better impression (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Although people wish to influence how judges perceive them, this does not mean that people are successful in controlling judge's perceptions. An undesirable judgement made by another person can have negative consequences on an individual's life. For example, making a bad impression on a first date will not likely lead to a second date. Impression management allows people to maximize the reward-cost ratio when interacting with others (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). To obtain the rewarding outcome and avoid the undesired outcome, people often attempt to convey a desired impression.

Both impression efficacy and impression motivation are important to study because they are hypothesized to uniquely influence people's life outcomes (e.g., romantic partners, job offers, etc.). For example, an individual who is highly motivated to make a good impression may potentially make a better impression than an individual who is unmotivated to make a good impression. Similarly, an individual who is highly confident in their impressions potentially makes a better impression than someone who is not confident in their ability to make an impression. Impression efficacy and impression

motivation alter how people present themselves to judges which in turn alters future interactions and opportunities. For example, a person high in impression motivation may make a positive impression (e.g., confident, punctual, honest, etc.) on their boss leading to better career opportunities (e.g., promotions).

To understand the mechanisms behind impression management, research must include live interactions between two or more people. Research on impression management that lack live interactions have low external validity. For example, self-report surveys asking participants to imagine how they would behave in a specific situation does not always correlate with how they would act if the situation occurred in real life. It is important for impression management research to be as natural as possible for it to be generalizable to real world interactions. Although it is impossible to make a lab setting truly natural, it is possible to make a lab setting very similar to a real-world situation (e.g., people meeting for the first time in a waiting room). Previous research on impression management has rarely been examined in live interactions which could potentially reveal important information about impression management, personality, and behavior.

There is an abundance of research on person perception as well as impression management but these two literatures have yet to be integrated. Person perception research (which involves how people make judgements of others) has not taken into consideration that people have goals to present themselves in a certain way. One way in which people try to alter how judges perceive them is through their personality presentation (Leary & Allen, 2011a). Although some research suggests that people are unable to significantly alter their true personality, people can present different aspects and

trait levels of their personality to judges (McCrae & Costa, 2008). For example, when participating in a job interview, an individual may want to present themselves, and be perceived, as more conscientious than they truly are (Hudson & Fraley, 2015).

Previous research shows that people attempt to alter how judges perceive them depending on the situational characteristics (Leary & Allen, 2011a; Weiss & Feldman, 2006). The research on impression management is lacking in that it is unknown via what mechanisms people try to alter their personality presentation and if they are successful (Weinstein & Beckhouse, 1969). For example, do people attempt to make themselves appear more extraverted than they truly are when meeting someone for the first time? Likewise, do people believe they are successful in making others perceive them as more extraverted than they truly are? Determining what personality traits people attempt to alter and believe they are able to alter in a get-to-know-you situation reveals important features of impression management.

Personality and Impression Management

Personality refers to an individual's typical patterns of thought, behavior, and emotion, combined with conscious and unconscious psychological mechanisms behind those patterns (Funder, 2004). Personality is predictive of many life outcomes such as mortality, divorce, and income with equal or greater predictive validity than SES and IQ (Roberts, Kuncel, Shiner, Caspi, & Goldberg, 2007). Personality is stable across time and situations, particularly when discussing rank order stability (e.g., If I rank highest in extraversion, my mean levels may change throughout life, but extraversion will always rank the highest in comparison to other traits).

Personality is potentially an important factor in impression management and person perception but has been underexplored in the literature (Leary & Allen, 2011a). For example, personality plays a role in how individual's present themselves and how judges perceive them (Leary & Allen, 2011a). An individual's personality level for a trait may play a role in their impression management because people with different personality traits present themselves differently and are viewed by judges differently as well. For example, extraversion is the easiest personality trait to detect in others since those high in extraversion present more expressive cues about themselves to judges (Albright et al., 1988; Borkenau & Liebler, 1993, 1995; Funder & Colvin, 1988; Lippa & Diets 2000; Watson, 1989). In other words, highly extraverted people tend to talk more and give judges more information about themselves. Thus, judges are given more information to base their judgements. It is possible that people who are high in extraversion are more aware that they are easily perceived which in turn increase their confidence in their ability to make a desired impression. Previous research suggests that people who are more confident in their ability to make a desired impression tend to be more accurate in their self-judge agreement (Carlson, Furr, & Vazire, 2010). This means that people who are high in impression efficacy are likely better able to alter how judges perceives them.

Person Perception and Impression Management

Person perception research involves examining how people make judgements of other people's personalities (Biesanz, 2010; Burusic & Ribar, 2014; Funder, 1995; Kenny, 2004). Impression management is the degree to which people attempt to regulate how judges perceive them (Schlenker & Leary, 1982). The way people smile, shake

hands, and even walk are all possible forms of impression management. For example, a person at a funeral can avoid smiling and making direct eye contact to attempt to convey extreme sadness, or approach physical contact and embrace other funeral goers to attempt to convey warmth and compassion. Impression management can be an active process where individuals knowingly alter their behavior to portray a certain image or it can be non-conscious and automatic (Baumeister, 1982; Goffman, 1959; Leary, 1995; Schlenker & Leary, 1982). For example, making physical contact at a funeral is a conscious way to manage impressions whereas avoiding smiling at a funeral is a non-conscious way to manage impressions. During an interaction, people have goals in regards to the impression they are portraying (Jones, 1990). Sometimes people want to be perceived as funny and other times people want to be perceived as serious depending on the situational characteristics.

People's outcomes in life depend greatly on how judges perceive them. Someone who thinks you are lazy will not hire you, someone who thinks you are mean will not want to be friends with you, and someone who thinks you are irresponsible will not let you drive his/her car. This will be the case regardless of how lazy, mean, or irresponsible you truly are. In addition, research shows that people live up to the expectations others have for them (Funder, 1999). For example, when parents expect their children to improve their grades, children's academic performance improves (Rosenthal, 1994). This is just one example of the power and importance of other people's perceptions of us.

Due to the importance of impression management, it makes sense that people try to be mindful of how others perceive them. People typically seek to portray impressions that would lead to favorable outcomes (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Research shows that

people occasionally portray themselves differently than they truly are to make a better impression (Weiss & Feldman, 2006). For example, Jack is meeting his girlfriend's parents for the first time. Jack wants to make a good impression on his girlfriend's parents so Jack chooses to present himself as pleasant, intelligent, and respectful.

Regardless of how Jack is presenting himself or how he is perceived, it does not represent his actual pleasantness, intelligence, or respectability. In addition, Jack's girlfriend gives Jack information indicating what her parents appreciate (e.g., altruism). This allows Jack to mention his volunteer work in attempt to manage how his girlfriend's parents perceive him. The previous example depicts a high-risk situation. It is unknown how people manage their impressions in low-risk situations where there are fewer consequences. On the other hand, research suggests that people attempt to present accurate information about themselves (Leary & Allen, 2011; Murphy, 2007). This research suggests that people want judges to perceive them as they truly are. This may prove to be the case when interacting with others in low-risk situations (e.g., getting-to-know-you).

It is imperative to note that altering how judges perceive us via impression management is different from self-monitoring. Self-monitoring describes how people control what information they present about themselves to judges depending on the social appropriateness (Snyder, 1974). Monitoring one's self-presentation is different than impression management in that impression management involves unique goals and motivations in each interaction. Self-monitoring involves hiding or showing different aspects of oneself depending on the situation. When in the presence of others, people can disclose or keep private any information they choose. Some individuals choose not to present information about themselves that would appear socially undesirable.

Depending on the situation, sometimes people attempt to separate themselves from the crowd and other times people want to appear more normative (i.e., blend in with the crowd) (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). A study done by Furr (2008) found that people high in agreeableness present themselves as more normative. The explanation for this relationship was not offered but a potential motivation is that presenting one's self as normative increases the number of individuals with whom one could get along. For example, a person may find themselves surrounded by a group of people who are exuberantly against religion, although that person has strong positive feelings towards religion, that person may choose to keep their religious preferences to themselves to increase the probability of the group liking them. Showing versus hiding one's true feelings about religion is an example of self-monitoring. An example of impression management would be someone presenting themselves as very religious when surrounded by religious people to make a good impression, when, in reality, that person is not religious.

Overall, impression management is related to achieving desired outcomes. Different goals require different methods of impression management (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). For example, people try to convey a different impression when talking to their boss as opposed to when they are talking to a potential dating partner. In this example, the person's desired outcome in both situations is very different and thus, his/her impression management methods will be different. When people feel that being liked will benefit them in a certain situation, they will present themselves in a likeable manner. If people believe that presenting themselves in a negative manner will benefit them, they will present unfavorable images of themselves. (Braginsky, Braginsky, & Ring, 1969;

Kowalski & Leary, 1990). Previous research on goals and impression management has mainly been conducted in high-risk situations such as job interviews. It is unknown how people manage their impressions in low-risk situations such as a get-to-know-you condition where there are very little risks of consequences. To examine impression management, people's motivations (IM) and beliefs in their ability to convey a desired impression (IE) can be measured.

Impression motivation

Impression motivation is an individual's desire to make particular impressions (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Impression motivation can fluctuate depending on the situation. For example, when interacting with a potential romantic partner, people may be more motivated to make a good impression than when interacting with a stranger. Even when the situation is low-risk, people tend to strive to present themselves to judges in the most favorable manner (Jansen et al., 2012). In addition, some individuals put more thought into how they are viewed by others. These individuals conceivably possess a better understanding of how others perceive them and are more likely to manage their impressions (Fenigstein & Vanable, 1992). People who are self-conscious about how judges perceive them tend to take their audience into consideration when managing their impressions. In other words, highly self-conscious individuals are more likely to alter how they present themselves to judges depending on whom they are presenting themselves to (Tunnell, 1984).

Those who are high in self-monitoring (i.e., possess a high desire to control what information they present about themselves to judges) should be highly motivated to make a desired impression, although the research is inconclusive (Leary & Kowalski, 1990).

Some research suggests that individuals who are high in self-monitoring are more likely to self-present positive images of themselves (Bolino & Turnley, 2003; Lippa, 1976). Conversely, one study found little evidence to support the findings that high self-monitors present more normative images of themselves than low self-monitors (Leary & Kowalski, 1990).

Impression efficacy

Impression efficacy is an individual's confidence in their ability to make particular impressions (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Impression efficacy is complex in that people find it difficult to determine how they are perceived by judges (Carlson & Furr, 2009; DePaulo, Kenny, Hoover, Webb, & Oliver, 1987; Elfenbein, Eisenkraft, & Ding, 2009; Levesque, 1997). When people are unable to determine how judges view them they fill in their uncertainty with their own self-perceptions. This means that people who view themselves positively believe that others view them positively and people who view themselves negatively believe that others view them negatively (Levesque, 1997). Daryl Bem (1972) developed self-perception theory, which specifies how we perceive ourselves. In general, people make judgements about themselves in the same way that they would make inferences and perceive others around them (Funder, 1999). How we view ourselves is important because it affects how we interact with others. For example, if someone is not confident in their public speaking abilities, they will probably decline an invitation to speak in front of a large crowd.

Individuals who view themselves positively score higher in self-esteem ratings and tend to have more confidence in their ability to make a desired impression (Campbell & Fehr, 1990). Similar to having a positive self-perception, possessing a positive outlook

on events and situations is greater in individuals with high extraversion levels (DeNeve & Cooper 1998). Conversely, people with negative self-perceptions tend to have higher levels of social anxiety and less confidence in their ability to make a desired impression (DePaulo et al., 1987; Leary, Kowalski, & Campbell, 1988). Due to low levels of impression efficacy, individuals with social anxiety typically present themselves with a more modest attitude to avoid making a bad impression (Leary & Allen, 2011).

The Current Study

To further previous research, the current study examines three research questions based on the Personality, Health, and Behavior Lab's Self-Presentation and Personality Judgment Study. The research questions include: 1) What personality characteristics do people attempt to enhance, reduce, or remain constant during an interaction? 2) What personality characteristics do people believe they are successfully able to enhance, reduce, or remain constant during an interaction? 3) Does impression efficacy and impression motivation predict statistically significant change in personality presentation. For the last question, the predictor variables include impression efficacy and impression motivation and the outcome variables are change in personality presentation.

Method

Participants

The current study included 100 Rutgers University-Camden undergraduate and graduate students. The mean age was 22.8 with participants ranging from 18 to 56.

Procedure

Data collection began in the Spring of 2014 and concluded in the Spring of 2015. Participants ($N=100$) were compensated \$10 for each session following the initial consent

meeting for a total of \$20. Participants were entered in a drawing for a \$100 VISA gift card following the completion of the study. Gift cards were awarded within one week of the conclusion of the data collection. All participants were eligible for the prize drawings, regardless of study completion.

Individuals who expressed interest in the study were asked to complete an interest survey via email. Individuals completed the interest survey online in which they were asked to give their contact information and availability. Participants were consented in groups of four and were asked to indicate if they were acquainted with anyone in the room. Participants came into the lab for a total of two sessions over a period of three to six weeks. During the first session participants were given the informed consent document. Each participant then reported demographic information and completed a self-report personality assessment and an impression management assessment. Before leaving the lab, participants were randomly scheduled in pairs to come back into the lab for a second session. Each pair of participants had not met prior to participating in this experiment.

In the second session, randomly paired participants came into the lab. Participants used the computers in the lab to take a pre-interaction assessment on their desired impression (i.e. how they wish to be perceived by their interaction partner). After completing the pre-interaction survey, participant pairs were put into a room together by themselves for the first time and told to get to know one another for five minutes. After the interaction, participants used the computers in the lab to take post-interaction personality assessments (i.e., how they think they were perceived by their interaction partner). After the session was completed, participants received the \$20 payment.

Measures

HEXACO-60

The HEXACO-60 contains 60 statements in which the participants select how much they agree or disagree with each statement (Ashton & Lee, 2009). The HEXACO-60 is formatted as a five-point Likert scale with responses ranging from 1 “strongly agree” to 5 “strongly disagree”. The HEXACO-60 model of personality structure involves six factors of human personality. The six factors include: Honesty-Humility (H), Emotionality (E), Extraversion (X), Agreeableness (A), Conscientiousness (C), and Openness to Experience (O). Each factor is comprised of ten items each and incorporates traits with characteristics indicating high and low levels of the factor after their interaction. The HEXACO-60 is a valid and reliable scale with high internal consistency ($\alpha = .77- .80$) and test-retest reliability ($\alpha = .74-.86$) (Ashton & Lee, 2009). The HEXACO-60 can be found in Appendix A.

Social motivation/social efficacy

The Social Motivation/Social Efficacy (SMSE) is a newer measure used to assess participants’ self-reported motivation and ability to manage impressions. The SMSE contains 19 statements regarding impression motivation (i.e. how motivated participants are to manage their impressions) and impression efficacy (i.e., participant’s confidence in their ability to convey a desired impression). The SMSE is formatted as a five-point Likert scale with responses ranging from 1 “strongly disagree” to 5 “strongly agree”. (Nave & Furr, 2006). The SMSE is a valid and reliable scale with high internal consistency ($\alpha = .73- .88$) and test-retest reliability ($\alpha = .78-.86$) (Nave & Furr, 2006). The Social Motivation/Social Efficacy Scale can be found in Appendix B.

Results

Aim 1: To understand what personality characteristics people attempt to enhance, reduce, or remain constant during an interaction. Aim 2: To understand what personality characteristics people believe they are successfully able to enhance, reduce, or remain constant during an interaction.

To assess change in personality (i.e., change in HEXACO-60 scores across intake, pre-interaction, and post-interaction), dependent samples t-tests were run to compare mean level changes from intake to pre-interaction and from pre-interaction to post-interaction. Table 1 reports the means and standard deviations of each dimension at the intake and pre-interaction as well as the standardized mean difference and confidence intervals between intake and pre-interaction. Table 2 reports means and standard deviations of each dimension at the pre-interaction and post-interaction as well as the standardized mean difference and confidence intervals between pre-interaction and post-interaction.

Table 1
Change in Personality from Intake (baseline) to Pre-interaction (how participants want to be perceived)

Trait	Intake M(SD)	Pre- interaction M(SD)	Mean Change ^a (CI)	Individual level change		
				Decreased ^b	Stayed the same ^b	Increased ^b
Extra	3.37(.63)	3.48(.67)	.17*(.11,.45)	37%	13%	50%
Agree	3.01(.77)	3.34(.68)	.48**(.02,.97)	34%	13%	53%
Hon/Hum	3.44(.70)	3.42(.75)	-.03(-.3,.25)	44%	17%	39%
Open	3.61(.62)	3.67(.64)	.10 ⁺ (-.18,.37)	50%	13%	37%
Emot	3.27(.70)	3.17(.66)	-.15*(-.42,.13)	50%	13%	37%
Consc	3.72(.59)	3.70(.58)	-.03(-.31,.24)	25%	05%	70%

Note. $N=100$.⁺ $p<.10$, $*p<.05$, $**p<.01$

The HEXACO-60 is a 5-point Likert scale.

Dependent samples t-tests were run to compare the mean level difference.

^aMean-level change in standard score units (i.e., Cohen's d).

^bPercentage of individuals who decreased, stayed the same, or increased on each dimension.

Table 2
Change in Personality from to Pre-interaction (how participants want to be perceived) to Post-interaction (how participants thought they were perceived)

Trait	Pre-interaction M(SD)	Post-interaction M(SD)	Mean Change ^a (CI)	Individual level change		
				Decreased ^b	Stayed the same ^b	Increased ^b
Extra	3.48(.67)	3.55(.64)	.11(-.17, .38)	43%	5%	52%
Agree	3.34(.68)	3.06(.48)	-.48**(-.75, .19)	65%	5%	30%
Hon/Hum	3.42(.75)	3.31(.55)	-.17*(-.44, .11)	64%	7%	29%
Open	3.67(.64)	3.30(.65)	-.57**(-.85, -.29)	72%	6%	22%
Emot	3.17(.66)	3.05(.56)	-.20 ⁺ (-.47, .08)	58%	6%	36%
Consc	3.70(.58)	3.51(.56)	-.33(-.61, -.05)	57%	8%	35%

Note. $N=69$.

⁺ $p < .10$, ^{*} $p < .05$, ^{**} $p < .01$

The HEXACO-60 is a 5-point Likert scale.

Dependent samples t-tests were run to compare the mean level difference.

^aMean-level change in standard score units (i.e., Cohen's d).

^bPercentage of individuals who decreased, stayed the same, or increased on each dimension.

Extraversion

Prior to the interaction, 50% of participants reported wanting to be perceived as more extraverted than they truly are and 37% of participants reported wanting to be perceived as less extraverted than they truly are. Following the interaction, 52% of participants reported believing they were perceived as more extraverted than they wanted to be perceived and 43% reported believing they were perceived as less extraverted than wanted to be perceived. The mean change in extraversion from intake to pre-interaction was statistically significant ($d=.17, p=.03$) meaning participants wanted to be perceived as more extraverted. The mean change in extraversion from pre-interaction to post-interaction was not statistically significant ($d=.11, p=.45$).

Agreeableness

Prior to the interaction, 53% of participants reported wanting to be perceived as more agreeable than they truly are and 34% of participants reported wanting to be

perceived as less agreeable than they truly are. Following the interaction, 30% of participants reported believing they were perceived as more agreeable than they wanted to be perceived and 65% reported believing they were perceived as less agreeable than they wanted to be perceived. The mean change in agreeableness from intake to pre-interaction was statistically significant ($d=.48, p=.00$) meaning participants wanted to be perceived as more agreeable. The mean change in agreeableness from pre-interaction to post-interaction was statistically significant ($d=-.48, p=.00$) meaning participants thought they were perceived as less agreeable than they wanted to be perceived.

Honesty-Humility

Prior to the interaction, 39% of participants reported wanting to be perceived as more honest/humble than they truly are and 44% of participants reported wanting to be perceived as less honest/humble than they truly are. Following the interaction, 29% of participants reported believing they were perceived as more honest/humble than they wanted to be perceived and 64% reported believing they were perceived as less honest/humble than they wanted to be perceived. The mean change in honest-humility from intake to pre-interaction was not statistically significant ($d=-.03, p=.60$). The mean change in honesty-humility from pre-interaction to post-interaction was statistically significant; ($d=-.17, p=.02$) meaning participants tended to think they were perceived as less honest/humble than they wanted to be perceived.

Openness

Prior to the interaction, 37% of participants reported wanting to be perceived as more open than they truly are and 50% of participants reported wanting to be perceived as less open than they truly are. Following the interaction, 22% of participants reported

believing they were perceived as more open than they wanted to be perceived and 72% reported believing they were perceived as less open than they wanted to be perceived. The mean change in openness from intake to pre-interaction was statistically significant ($d=.10, p=.09$) meaning participants wanted to be perceived as more open. The mean change in openness from pre-interaction to post-interaction was statistically significant ($d=-.57, p=.00$) meaning participants thought they were perceived as less open than they wanted to be perceived.

Emotionality

Prior to the interaction, 37% of participants reported wanting to be perceived as more emotional than they truly are and 50% of participants reported wanting to be perceived as less emotional than they truly are. Following the interaction, 36% of participants reported believing they were perceived as more emotional than they wanted to be perceived and 58% reported believing they were perceived as less emotional than they wanted to be perceived. The mean change in emotionality from intake to pre-interaction was statistically significant ($d=-.15, p=.05$) meaning participants wanted to be perceived as less emotional. The mean change in emotionality from pre-interaction to post-interaction was statistically significant ($d=-.20, p=.08$) meaning participants thought they were perceived as less emotional than they wanted to be perceived.

Conscientiousness

Prior to the interaction, 70% of participants reported wanting to be perceived as more conscientious than they truly are and 25% of participants reported wanting to be perceived as less conscientious than they truly are. Following the interaction, 35% of participants reported believing they were perceived as more conscientious than they

wanted to be perceived and 57% reported believing they were perceived as less conscientious than they wanted to be perceived. The mean changes in conscientiousness from intake to pre-interaction ($d=-.03, p=.56$) and from pre-interaction to post-interaction were not statistically significant ($d=-.33, p=.12$).

Aim 3: To determine if impression efficacy and impression motivation predict statistically significant change in personality presentation

The previous analyses determined which personality traits people desire to and believe they can enhance or reduce in a get-to-know-you situation. In the following analyses, regressions were run with impression motivation and impression efficacy as predictor variables and changes in personality as outcome variables. Regressions were only run for personality traits that showed statistically significant change. Impression motivation and impression efficacy responses showed little overlap between impression motivation and impression efficacy constructs ($r = -.05$), and adequate variability in response, with 30 percent of participants low in impression motivation and 39 percent low in impression efficacy.

Impression Motivation

Although no statistically significant relationships were found, there is tentative evidence that IM is related to wanting to be perceived as more agreeable and less emotional. Results suggest that impression motivation predicts participants wanting to be perceived as more agreeable ($\beta=.13, t(99)=1.32, p=.19$), and less emotional ($\beta=-.15, t(99)=-1.53, p=.13$) than they truly are.

Impression Efficacy

Results suggest impression efficacy predicts participants wanting to be perceived as less extraverted ($\beta=-.24$, $t(99)=-2.44$, $p=.02$) than they truly are and thinking they were perceived as less open ($\beta=-.21$, $t(68)=-1.73$, $p=.09$) than they wanted to be perceived.

There is tentative evidence that IE is related to individuals thinking they were perceived as less agreeable ($\beta=-.157$, $t(68)=-1.30$, $p=.19$), and less emotional ($\beta=-.160$, $t(68)=-1.33$, $p=.19$) than they wanted to be perceived.

Discussion

Impression management and person perception research has yet to be integrated prior to this study. It is important to study impression management and person perception because of their real-world relevance (e.g., people are judged by and judge others every day). Most importantly, these judgments can have significant implications, including defining an individual's reputation, being hired for a certain job, and being asked on a second date.

The present study enhances the growing literature in addition to making important connections between person perception, personality and impression management. The results from this study suggest there is variability in how people desire to be perceived and think they were perceived when interacting with another person. This variability differed by trait and would have been completely missed using traditional person perception models (e.g., RAM, SAM, SRM, PERSON).

Previous research on person-perception has ignored the idea that people have self-presentational goals and motivations when interacting with other people. These findings suggest that personality presentational goals are an important aspect of person perception and impression management. The results suggest that people attempt to alter how judges

perceive their personality in a get-to-know-you situation. Most notably, people want to be perceived as more agreeable. In addition, the results suggest that participants did not believe judges accurately perceived their desired impression. Participant's reported feeling that their interaction partner did not perceive their personality traits as accurately as they wanted to be perceived (i.e., participants believed their interaction partners perceived them as lower in each personality trait). Most notably, participants thought they were perceived as less open and agreeable than they wanted to be perceived. These results are supported by previous research in that people find it difficult to determine how they are perceived by judges (Carlson & Furr, 2009; DePaulo, Kenny, Hoover, Webb, & Oliver, 1987; Elfenbein, Eisenkraft, & Ding, 2009; Levesque, 1997).

All six factors of the HEXACO-60 are socially desirable except for Emotionally (Ashton & Lee, 2009). The results from this study support the previous research that people want to be perceived as socially desirable (i.e., extraverted, honest, open, agreeable, and conscientious) and do not want to be perceived as socially undesirable (i.e., emotionally unstable) (Leary & Kowalski, 1990).

The results from this study also suggest that impression efficacy and impression management both predict which personality traits people wish to alter while managing impressions. Impression motivation was predictive of participants wanting to be perceived as more agreeable and less emotional. Impression efficacy was predictive of participants wanting to be perceived as less extraverted and thinking they were perceived by their interaction partner as less open, agreeable, and emotional than they wanted to be perceived.

One could speculate that impression efficacy predicts people believing they were perceived how they wanted to be perceived, although that was not the case in this study. In other words, impression efficacy predicted people thinking they were perceived differently than they wanted to be perceived. One explanation for this is that the interaction was too short. The five minute interaction may not have been long enough for participants to effectively make their desired impression. Future studies should have longer interaction sessions to see if impression efficacy predicts participants thinking they were perceived more accurately by their interaction partner.

The results also suggest that impression efficacy does not predict people wanting to change how they are perceived, except in the case of extraversion. One explanation for this is that people high in impression efficacy are confident in their ability to make an impression such that they do not believe they need to alter their personality presentation. People high in impression efficacy are confident in their impression making abilities regardless of their perception of how judges perceived them. In other words, a person may be confident that they can portray themselves as likeable, perceive that a judge did not perceive them as likeable as they wanted to be perceived, but nonetheless, still believe that they were able to portray their likability to the judge. Therefore, this participant may believe that they were perfectly able to present themselves as likable but their judge was not able to accurately perceive their likability, thus, this participant is still confident in their ability to make an impression regardless of how they believe they were perceived.

The current research project possesses several limitations. First, the subject pool consisted of only Rutgers University-Camden undergraduate and graduate students. It

remains unknown if the relationship shown between personality, impression motivation, and impression efficacy would also be found with a more diverse subject pool.

Individuals with different backgrounds or cultures might manage their impressions differently and thus the same results may not emerge.

During data collection, there was a human error within the post-interaction survey. As participants were taking the survey, the survey ended before it was complete. This error limited the sample size for the post-interaction measure (i.e., how participants think they were perceived post-interaction). This error was found and fixed prior to the completion of data collection which explains why the N for the post-interaction measure is 69 rather than 100. Had the N for the post-interaction been closer to 100, we may have found more associations in the mean personality change from pre-interaction to post-interaction. Thus, it is possible that there is a statically significant change for some traits in table 2 but there was not enough power in the sample size for these results to be visible. Despite these limitations, the current study shows relationships that help inform the integration of how person perception and impression management work during a get-to-know you interaction. The study is the first known study to directly examine the relationship between person perception and impression management.

Future research is needed to replicate the results from this study especially with larger and more diverse sample sizes. Future studies could also examine meta-accuracy. Meta-accuracy is the degree to which the perceived self and the self's perception of others perception match (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Similarly, it may be important to discover if those who are high in impression efficacy are also more accurate at making desired impressions. Finally, future directions should examine impression management in

a higher risk context. A get-to-know you situation is a relatively low-risk situation. It is hypothesized that in a higher risk situation (e.g., job interview) people will try to alter their personality presentation more frequently, uniquely, and to a higher degree. Most importantly, the results from this study suggest that impression management and person perception are related and future research should continue to uncover the connection between these two concepts.

Appendices

Appendix A

HEXACO-60

**HEXACO-PI-R
(SELF REPORT FORM)**

© Kibeom Lee, Ph.D., & Michael C. Ashton, Ph.D.

DIRECTIONS

On the following pages you will find a series of statements about you. Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement. Then write your response in the space next to the statement using the following scale:

5 = strongly agree

4 = agree

3 = neutral (neither agree nor disagree)

2 = disagree

1 = strongly disagree

Please answer every statement, even if you are not completely sure of your response.

Please provide the following information about yourself.

Sex (circle): Female Male

Age: _____ years

- 1 _____ I would be quite bored by a visit to an art gallery.
- 2 _____ I plan ahead and organize things, to avoid scrambling at the last minute.
- 3 _____ I rarely hold a grudge, even against people who have badly
wronged me
- 4 _____ I feel reasonably satisfied with myself overall.
- 5 _____ I would feel afraid if I had to travel in bad weather conditions.
- 6 _____ I wouldn't use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought it
would succeed
- 7 _____ I'm interested in learning about the history and politics of other countries.
- 8 _____ I often push myself very hard when trying to achieve a goal.
- 9 _____ People sometimes tell me that I am too critical of others.
- 10 _____ I rarely express my opinions in group meetings.
- 11 _____ I sometimes can't help worrying about little things.
- 12 _____ If I knew that I could never get caught, I would be willing to steal a million dollars.
- 13 _____ I would enjoy creating a work of art, such as a novel, a song, or a painting.
- 14 _____ When working on something, I don't pay much attention to small details.
- 15 _____ People sometimes tell me that I'm too stubborn.
- 16 _____ I prefer jobs that involve active social interaction to those that involve working
alone
- 17 _____ When I suffer from a painful experience, I need someone to make me feel
comfortable
- 18 _____ Having a lot of money is not especially important to me.
- 19 _____ I think that paying attention to radical ideas is a waste of time.
- 20 _____ I make decisions based on the feeling of the moment rather than on careful thought.
- 21 _____ People think of me as someone who has a quick temper.
- 22 _____ On most days, I feel cheerful and optimistic.
- 23 _____ I feel like crying when I see other people crying.
- 24 _____ I think that I am entitled to more respect than the average person is.
- 25 _____ If I had the opportunity, I would like to attend a classical music concert.
- 26 _____ When working, I sometimes have difficulties due to being disorganized.
- 27 _____ My attitude toward people who have treated me badly is "forgive and forget".
- 28 _____ I feel that I am an unpopular person.
- 29 _____ When it comes to physical danger, I am very fearful.
- 30 _____ If I want something from someone, I will laugh at that person's worst jokes.

- 31 _____ I've never really enjoyed looking through an encyclopedia.
- 32 _____ I do only the minimum amount of work needed to get by.
- 33 _____ I tend to be lenient in judging other people.
- 34 _____ In social situations, I'm usually the one who makes the first move.
- 35 _____ I worry a lot less than most people do.
- 36 _____ I would never accept a bribe, even if it were very large.
- 37 _____ People have often told me that I have a good imagination.
- 38 _____ I always try to be accurate in my work, even at the expense of time.
- 39 _____ I am usually quite flexible in my opinions when people disagree with me.
- 40 _____ The first thing that I always do in a new place is to make friends.
- 41 _____ I can handle difficult situations without needing emotional support from anyone else.
- 42 _____ I would get a lot of pleasure from owning expensive luxury goods.
- 43 _____ I like people who have unconventional views.
- 44 _____ I make a lot of mistakes because I don't think before I act.
- 45 _____ Most people tend to get angry more quickly than I do.
- 46 _____ Most people are more upbeat and dynamic than I generally am.
- 47 _____ I feel strong emotions when someone close to me is going away for a long time.
- 48 _____ I want people to know that I am an important person of high status.
- 49 _____ I don't think of myself as the artistic or creative type.
- 50 _____ People often call me a perfectionist.
- 51 _____ Even when people make a lot of mistakes, I rarely say anything negative.
- 52 _____ I sometimes feel that I am a worthless person.
- 53 _____ Even in an emergency I wouldn't feel like panicking.
- 54 _____ I wouldn't pretend to like someone just to get that person to do favors for me.
- 55 _____ I find it boring to discuss philosophy.
- 56 _____ I prefer to do whatever comes to mind, rather than stick to a plan.
- 57 _____ When people tell me that I'm wrong, my first reaction is to argue with them.
- 58 _____ When I'm in a group of people, I'm often the one who speaks on behalf of the group.
- 59 _____ I remain unemotional even in situations where most people get very sentimental.
- 60 _____ I'd be tempted to use counterfeit money, if I were sure I could get away with it.

Appendix B

The Social Motivation/Social Efficacy Scale

For each of the items below, pick a number to indicate how much you agree with the item, according to the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. IE When I meet someone new, I'm generally able to make whatever impression I want to make.
2. IE In general, people see me the way I want them to see me.
3. DE I have enough social skill or "charisma" to make good impressions on the people I meet.
4. IE-R I am sometimes not able to make the impression that I want to make.
5. IE-R I often feel that others don't see me the way I want them to see me.
6. DE-R I do not consistently make good impressions when I meet new people.
7. IE-R When I get into new situations, I'm often not sure exactly how to act.
8. DE Even in potentially uncomfortable situations, I usually have enough social skill to "look good".
9. DE-R I have many doubts about my social competence.
10. DE Even if I don't really care about making a good impression, I generally do make a good impression.
11. IM I want people to see me in a specific way.
12. IM I often find myself trying to make some kind of impression on the people that I meet.
13. IM It bothers me if people don't see me in the way that I want them to see me.
14. DM I like to make a good impression on others.

15. DM It is important to me for others to have a good attitude towards me.
16. IM-R I often don't care what other people think of me.
17. DM It bothers me if someone doesn't like me.
18. DM-R I don't want others to think I'm nerdy or socially awkward.
19. DM-R It usually doesn't bother me if someone has a bad impression of me.

References

- Albright, L., Kenny, D. A., & Malloy, T. E. (1988). Consensus in personality judgments at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *55*, 387–395. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0803_3
- Ashton, M., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *91*(4), 340–345. doi:10.1080/00223890902935878
- Asscher, J., Prinzie, P., Dekovic, M., & Akker, A. L. Van den. (2014). Mean-level development across childhood and adolescence: A temporary defiance of the maturity principle and bidirectional associations with parenting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *107*(4), 736–750. doi: 10.1037/a0037248
- Baumeister, R.F. (1982). A self-presentational view of social phenomena. *Psychological Bulletin*, *91*, 3-26. doi: 10.1037/0033-290991
- Bem, D. J. (1972). Self-perception theory: Development of self-perception theory was supported primarily by a grant from the National Science Foundation (GS 1452) awarded to the author during his tenure at Carnegie-Mellon University. *Advances In Experimental Social Psychology*, *61-62*. doi:10.1006/S0065-2601(08)60024-6
- Biesanz, J. (2010). The social accuracy model of interpersonal perception: Assessing individual differences in perceptive and expressive accuracy. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *45*(5), 853-885.
- Borkenau, P., & Liebler, A. (1993). Convergence of stranger ratings of personality and intelligence with self-ratings, partner-ratings, and measured intelligence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*, 546–553. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.65.3.546
- Borkenau, P., & Liebler, A. (1995). Observable attributes as manifestations and cues of personality and intelligence. *Journal of Personality*, *63*, 1–25. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.1995.tb00799.x
- Burusic, J., & Ribar, M. (2014). The moderating role of self-presentation tactics judgments of personality traits and self-presentation, *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, *73*(4), 235–242. http://doi.org/10.1024/1421-0185/a000142
- Campbell, J., & Fehr, B. (1990). Self-esteem and perceptions of conveyed impressions: Is negative affectivity associated with greater realism? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *122-133*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.1.122
- Carlson, E., Furr, R., & Vazire, S. (2010). Do we know the first impressions we make? Evidence for idiographic meta-accuracy and calibration of first

- impressions. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 94-98. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0024297>
- Caspi, A. (2000). The child is father of the man : Personality continuities from childhood to adulthood, *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 78(1), 158–172. <http://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.78.1.158>
- Deneve, K., & Cooper, H. (1998). The happy personality: A meta-analysis of 137 personality traits and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 197-229. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.197
- DePaulo, B., Kenny, D., Hoover, C., Webb, W., & Oliver, P. V. (1987). Accuracy of person perception: do people know what kinds of impressions they convey? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 303-315. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.2.303>
- Rawes, Erika., (2014). How much do we spend on beauty? Retrieved April 11, 2016, from <http://www.cheatsheet.com/personal-finance/how-much-do-we-spend-on-beauty.html/?a=viewall>
- Erdle, S., Gosling, S., & Potter, J. (2009). Does self-esteem account for the higher-order factors of the Big Five? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 921-922. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/j.jrp.2009.04.012>
- Elfenbein, H., Eisenkraft, N., & Ding, W. (2009). Do we know who values us? Dyadic meta-accuracy in the perception of professional relationships. *Psychological Science*, 1081-1083. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02396.x
- Fenigstein, A., & Venable, P. (1992). Paranoia and self-consciousness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 129-138. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.62.1.129
- Fleeson, W. (2001). Toward a structure- and process- integrated view of personality: Traits as density distributions of states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(6), 1001-1027. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.80.6.1001
- Funder, D. C. (2004). *The personality puzzle*. New York: Norton.
- Funder, D. C. (1995). On the accuracy of personality judgment: A realistic approach. *Psychological Review*, 102(4), 652–670. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.102.4.652
- Funder, D. C., & Colvin, C. R. (1988). Friends and strangers: Acquaintanceship, agreement, and the accuracy of personality judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 149–158. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.55.1.149
- Funder, D. C. (1999). *Personality judgment a realistic approach to person perception*.

- Amsterdam: Elsevier. Funder, D. C. (2013). *The personality puzzle by David C. Funder, 6th ed.* S. 1.: Cram100.
- Hofstee, W. K. B. (1994). Who should own the definition of personality? *European Journal of Personality*, 8, 149–162. doi: 10.1177/0956797613504966
- Hudson, N. W., & Fraley, R. C. (2015). Volitional personality trait change : Can people choose to change their personality traits? *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 109(3), 490–507. doi: 10.1037/pspp0000021.
- Hudson, N. W., & Roberts, B. W. (2014). Goals to change personality traits : Concurrent links between personality traits , daily behavior, and goals to change oneself. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 53, 68–83. <http://doi.org/10.1006/j.jrp.2014.08.008>
- Hudson, N. W., Roberts, B. W., & Lodi-Smith, J. (2012). Personality trait development and social investment in work. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 46, 334–344. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/j.jrp.2012.03.002>
- Jansen, A., König, C., Kleinmann, M., & Melchers, K. (2012). The interactive effect of impression motivation and cognitive schema on self-presentation in a personality inventory. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1932-1957. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00925.x
- Jones, E.E. (1990). *Interpersonal perception*. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Kenny, D. A. (1988). Interpersonal perception: A social relations analysis. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5(2), 247-261. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.80.3.439
- Kenny, D. A. (2004). PERSON : A general model of interpersonal perception. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8(3), 265-280. doi: 10.1023/A:1025608105284
- Kenny, D. A. (1994). Social relations model. *Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*. doi:10.4135/9781412950589.n933
- Leary, M.R. (1995). *Self-presentation: Impression management and interpersonal behavior*. Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark Publishers.
- Leary, M., & Allen, A. (2011). Personality and persona: Personality processes in self-presentation. *Journal of Personality*, 1191-1218. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00704.x
- Leary, M., Kowalski, R., & Campbell, C. (1988). Self-presentational concerns and social anxiety: The role of generalized impression expectancies. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 308-321. doi:10.1006/0092-6566(88)90032-3

- Leary, M. R., & Allen, A. B. (2011). Self-presentational persona : Simultaneous management of multiple impressions, *100*(5), 1033–1049.
<http://doi.org/10.1037/a0023884>
- Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model, *Psychological bulletin*, *107*(1), 34–47.
- Lehnart, J., Neyer, F. J., & Eccles, J. (2010). Long-term effects of social investment: The case of partnering in young adulthood. *Journal of Personality*, *78*, 639–670. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00629.x>
- Levesque, M. (1997). Meta-accuracy among acquainted individuals: A social relations analysis of interpersonal perception and meta-perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66-74. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.72.1.66
- Lippa, R. A., & Dietz, J. K. (2000). The relation of gender, personality, and intelligence to judges' accuracy in judging strangers' personality from brief video segments. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *24*, 25–43. doi: 10.1023/A:1006610805385
- McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., Jr., Pedroso de Lima, M., Simões, A., Ostendorf, F., Angleitner, A., Piedmont, R. L. (1999). Age differences in personality across the adult life span: Parallels in five cultures. *Developmental Psychology*, *35*, 466–477.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.35.2.466>
- Nave, C. & Furr, R.M. (2006, January). *Development and validation of a social motivation/social efficacy scale*. Poster presented at the 7th annual Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Palm Spring, CA.
- Roberts, B. W., Walton, K. E., & Viechtbauer, W. (2006). Patterns of mean-level change in personality traits across the life course: A meta- analysis of longitudinal studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, *132*, 1–25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.1.1>
- Roberts, B. W., & Wood, D. (2006). Personality development in the context of the neo-socioanalytic model of personality. In D. K. Mroczek & T. D. Little (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality Development* (pp. 11– 39). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rosenthal, R. (1994). Interpersonal expectancy effects: A 30-year perspective. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *3*, 176-179.
- Schlenker, B.R., & Leary, M.R. (1982). Social anxiety and self-presentation: A conceptualization and model. *Psychological Bulletin*, *92*, 641-669.
- Shiner, R. L., Masten, A. S., & Tellegen, A. (2002). A developmental perspective on personality in emerging adulthood: Childhood antecedents and concurrent

- adaptation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 1165–1177. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.83.5.1165. 1165
- Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 30(4), 526–537. doi: 10.1037/h0037039
- Tunnel, G. (1984). The discrepancy between private and public selves: Public self-consciousness and its correlates. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 549-555. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa4805_15
- Watson, D. (1989). Strangers' ratings of five robust personality factors: Evidence of a surprising convergence with self-report. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 120-128. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.57.1.120
- Weinstein, E. A., & Beckhouse, L. S. (1969). Audience and personality factors in presentation of self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(6), 1001-1027. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.80.6.1001
- Yang, S., Sung, J., Kim, J., Song, Y., Lee, K., Kim, H., ... Cloninger, C. R. (2016). Some personality traits converge gradually by long-term partnership through the lifecourse: Genetic and environmental structure of Cloninger's temperament and character dimensions. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 63(2015), 43–49. <http://doi.org/10.1006/j.jpsychires.2015.01.020>