

Abstract

The present study examined the role of target and judge interaction demands on first impression accuracy ($N = 195$). Specifically, the role of targets' self-presentation concerns and judges' information processing demands on accuracy for interpersonal traits (i.e., traits likely to be accentuated within an interpersonal context) and less interpersonal traits (i.e., traits less likely to be accentuated within an interpersonal context) was examined. Pairs of unacquainted participants ($n = 88$; females = 52, males = 36) interacted for ten-minutes in one of three interaction conditions that sought to vary interaction demands by manipulating the degree to which participants were aware of judging and/or being judged. Accuracy was assessed by correlating judgments formed with a measure of target's personality that comprised an average of self-ratings and informant-ratings ($n = 107$). Findings revealed that in interaction conditions where there was a mismatch in evaluation expectations - when a participant knows he or she will judge but not that he or she will be judged - accuracy for "less interpersonal" traits is diminished. Findings are discussed in relation to Patterson's (1995) Parallel Process model of interpersonal communication and Funder's Realistic Accuracy Model (1995). Limitations in terms of the generalisability of the findings are discussed.

Keywords: interaction demand, parallel process model, impression management, judgement accuracy, interpersonal trait, self-presentation, evaluation expectation, realistic accuracy model

1 **Getting the balance right? A Mismatch in Interaction demands between Target and** 2 **Judge Impacts on Judgement Accuracy for Some Traits but not Others**

3 1. Introduction

4 People routinely judge the personalities of those around them, and the accuracy of such
5 judgments can have important consequences impacting on who they choose to hire,
6 collaborate with, trust and befriend (Funder, 1999). Personality research has examined the
7 moderators of the validity of initial personality judgments (Back, Schmukle, & Egloff,
8 2008; Beer & Watson, 2008; Blackman & Funder, 2002; Wall, Taylor, Dixon, Conchie,
9 & Ellis, 2013) and has shown that ‘accuracy’ or agreement between a judge’s rating of a
10 target and the target’s personality score, is nuanced in terms of characteristics of the *judge*
11 (Human & Biesanz, 2012; Letzring, 2005, 2008), *target* (Akert & Panter, 1988), the
12 *information* on which a judgment is based (Letzring, Wells, & Funder, 2006) and the
13 specific *trait* in question (Gosling, Ko, Mannarelli, & Morris, 2002). Although much
14 substantive accuracy research is concerned with these moderators (see Funder, 1999) less
15 literature has explored proximal influences such as interaction demands, motivation or
16 ‘forewarning’ on ‘real’ interactions (cf. Hall, Blanch, Horgan, Murphy, Rosip & Schmid
17 Mast, 2009). Forewarning targets and judges about their role within an interaction has
18 begun to be examined in the communications and emotion literature (e.g., Ickes, Gesn, &
19 Graham, 2000) and the field of deception detection, (Forrest & Feldman, 2000); however,
20 the role of target and judge interaction demands on the ‘accuracy’ of initial personality
21 judgments has not yet been examined. The present study examines variations in target and
22 judge interaction demands on Big5 judgement accuracy.

23 2. Importance of Target and Judge Interaction Demands

24 Social interaction is complex and is not a passive process (Swann, 1984). Interaction
25 typically involves managing our *own* behaviour whilst simultaneously making social
26 judgments of *others*. The subtleties involved in this everyday task of being a target and a
27 judge is captured in Patterson's (1995) parallel process model of communication. This model
28 assumes that a person's social judgments and behaviours are parallel processes shaped by
29 goals and expectancies (see also Patterson & Stockbridge, 1998), therefore, our cognitive
30 resources within an interaction are affected due to managing our own behaviour and
31 impressions of another. Indirect evidence suggests that the impact of different interaction
32 demands on perceptions is mixed. Specifically, there is evidence to suggest that the more
33 impression management demands placed on people (the targets) the *less* accurate they will be
34 when rating how their partner (the judge) perceives them (i.e., meta-perception; Patterson,
35 Churchill, Farag, & Borden, 1992). In contrast, research has reported *enhanced* interpersonal
36 sensitivity when targets are instructed to 'try hard' to make an 'accurate' impression (Ickes et
37 al. 2000; Keltner, Gruenfield, & Anderson, 2003) yet this accuracy was not examined from a
38 trait perspective. Moreover, 'trying hard' may not always result in enhanced accuracy and has
39 been shown to be moderated by relationship status (Snodgrass, 1985). Studies have
40 concluded that judges instructed to be 'accurate' may overthink an automatic judgement
41 process (Forrest & Feldman, 2000; Klein & Hodges, 2001) or withdraw effort and perform
42 worse (Jamieson & Harkins, 2007). Further indirect support for the importance of interaction
43 demands on judgments comes from research reporting that power imbalances between target
44 and judge interferes with information processing (Rodriguez-Bailon, Moya, & Yzerbyt,
45 2000). Although none of these studies examined personality judgement accuracy the findings
46 reveal the differential effects that interaction demands can have on judgments.

47 Indeed, Funder (1995, 1999) posits that an accurate judgement depends on good cue
48 availability from a target combined with a judge noticing and correctly interpreting these

49 cues. Thus, the question of what happens to judgement accuracy when targets are also judges,
50 as is often the case in most everyday dyadic interactions (i.e., self-presenting whilst
51 simultaneously judging others), is an interesting and open question.

52 In relation to personality judgments, self-presentation demands placed on targets may
53 shape first impression accuracy in important ways. For example, consider two people,
54 William and Jenny, on a first date: the cues that Jenny reveals arguably depends on the
55 degree to which she seeks to manage her presentation. As intimated in the parallel process
56 model of communication, the judge (i.e., William) is also important as the cues on which
57 judges rely in such scenarios likely depends on the degree to which they are attending to
58 these if the situation requires it. It is argued here that the interaction demands placed on
59 targets *and* judges may shape targets' self-presentation efforts and judges' social information
60 processing, and impact on 'accuracy'.

61 3. Self-presentation and judgement accuracy

62 Self-presentation (SP) concerns the regulation of one's behaviour so as to convey a
63 specific impression to others (Baumeister, 1982; Schlenker & Weigold, 1989). This
64 presentation of self has also been referred to as impression management (IM) and Leary and
65 Kowalski (1990) note that IM and SP are often used interchangeably, thus SP will be used
66 synonymously with IM.

67 There has been a wealth of social psychological research into the construct of IM
68 ranging from the tactics involved (Ellis, West, Ryan, & Deshon, 2002; Gilmore & Ferris,
69 1989) to the effects of target IM on perceivers' ratings of targets in terms of likeability
70 (Bolino, Varela, Bande, & Turnley, 2006) and attitudinal evaluations (Snyder & Swann,
71 1976). Research has also examined impressions of targets based on the targets' IM attempts
72 in terms of what they do (e.g., specific tactics) (Kacmar & Carlson, 1999; Leary & Kowalski,
73 1990), and the impact of motivation on impression formation in terms of gender stereotypes

74 (Rudman, 1998; see also Vohs, Baumeister, & Ciarocco, 2005). The question of whether the
75 target person engaging in SP is *accurately* perceived in terms of their personality traits
76 remains unanswered (cf. Human & Biesanz, 2010). Specifically, although research
77 examining how targets engaging in IM fare socially is useful in terms of increasing our
78 understanding of the social processes surrounding IM (i.e., how we judge), it is also
79 necessary to understand when IM impacts on accuracy hence the present focus on target and
80 judge interaction demands. This is important for at least two reasons. First, an increased
81 understanding of when interaction demands may shape accuracy is practically important and
82 may inform the planning of interview practises or remote assessments. Second, a focus on
83 target *and* judge interaction demands will enhance our understanding of social information
84 processing from an accuracy perspective as research has exclusively examined either the
85 target being judged *or* the demands placed on the judge. The major objective of the present
86 study, therefore, was to explore the role of target and judge interaction demands on
87 judgement accuracy across situations that varied in terms of judges ‘knowing’ or ‘not
88 knowing’ that a judgement is required about the target and in terms of targets ‘knowing’ or
89 ‘not knowing’ that they will be judged after engaging in a ten-minute getting acquainted
90 interaction.

91 Studies examining first impression accuracy tend to report increased accuracy for the
92 more “interpersonal traits” such as extroversion relative to the less interpersonal traits (and
93 those subject to IM concerns) such as neuroticism (Albright, Kenny, & Malloy, 1988; Funder
94 & Colvin, 1988). These findings are typically explained in terms of properties of the trait
95 itself; whereby traits such as neuroticism are difficult to judge on the basis that there are less
96 overt cues on which to base judgments (Funder & Dobroth, 1987; Funder & Colvin, 1988)
97 whereas extroversion is known as a visible trait with numerous cues available to judges.
98 Another plausible, and related explanation, is that the differences in accuracy by trait type

99 relate to targets' concealing the more negative aspects of self and accentuating the more
100 positive aspects of their personality (i.e., fake good, fake bad: Barrick & Mount, 1996; Ones
101 & Viswesveran, 1998). A number of findings are consistent with this contention. Barrick and
102 Mount (1996) focused exclusively on the less interpersonal traits of neuroticism and
103 conscientiousness and reported evidence of IM. In Gill and Oberlander's (2003) study
104 investigating personality perception based on an email, they conclude that authors of an email
105 appear to linguistically conceal aspects of neuroticism relative to the interpersonal trait of
106 extroversion. Similarly, Paulhus, Bruce and Trapnell (1995) demonstrated that
107 conscientiousness may be susceptible to IM effects because people do not always feel able to
108 act in line with their 'true' selves. Taken together, these findings suggest that targets' SP may
109 shape accuracy in distinctive ways. Specifically, one might expect that interpersonal traits
110 such as extroversion and agreeableness are likely to be judged *more* accurately when SP
111 demands are high (i.e., self enhancement) as targets will emit numerous cues about such
112 highly observable and interpersonal traits whereas less interpersonal traits are likely to be
113 judged *less* accurately when evaluation expectation demands are high as people may choose
114 to conceal relevant cues from judges (i.e., self-deception) and such traits may be less relevant
115 to a social interaction. Of course, as outlined in section 2, there is reason to believe that the
116 cues on which judge's focus may also vary in terms of trait type. Indeed, Ames and Bianchi
117 (2008) assert that the relational context surrounding target and judge can shape the traits that
118 judges focus on. In their study on supervisor-student judgments of each other they reported
119 that students were more concerned with rating their supervisors' level of agreeableness
120 whereas supervisors were more concerned with rating the students' level of
121 conscientiousness.

122 To date, no study has directly examined the impact of different interaction demands
123 and judgement accuracy in 'real life' contexts. Indirect evidence that targets engaging in SP

124 may shape accuracy comes from Human, Biesanz, Parisotto, and Dunn (2012) who
125 demonstrated that SP is positively associated with judgement accuracy. Although substantive,
126 their study did not examine self-presentation concerns *within* an interaction nor differences
127 across trait type. Another study by Murphy (2007) focused on how IM impacted on
128 observers' ratings of effectiveness and found more positive impressions of intelligence for
129 targets engaging in IM in addition to distinctive behavioural patterns. This study, however,
130 did not examine judgments of personality; therefore, the current paper builds on this work
131 and investigates whether different interaction demands shape accuracy.

132 4. Current study

133 In the present study we sought to explore the role of judge and target interaction
134 demands on personality judgement accuracy. Accordingly, a dyadic design was employed
135 whereby each dyad member was both a target and a judge and interacted with each other for
136 ten minutes in one of three conditions designed to vary interaction demands. Specifically,
137 interaction demands of both target and judge were manipulated in terms of whether or not the
138 target knows they are being judged and whether or not the judge knows that they will be
139 asked to make a judgement of the target using three conditions: Condition 1: Judge Aware of
140 Judging-Target Aware of being Judged; Condition 2: Judge Aware of Judging-Target
141 Unaware of being Judged; and, Condition 3: Judge Unaware of Judging- Target Unaware of
142 being Judged. Extroversion and agreeableness were operationalised as *interpersonal* traits as
143 numerous studies have reported these two traits as such (Funder & Dornth, 1987; Funder &
144 Colvin, 1988). Further support for this distinction comes from studies examining direct
145 behaviours, which have found extroversion to be related to 'smiles' and 'initiating
146 conversation' (Argyle, Martin, & Crosland, 1989). Similarly, agreeableness has also been
147 linked to smiling (Naumann, Vazire, Rentfrow, & Gosling, 2009) and greater visual attention
148 (Berry & Hansen, 2000). In contrast, conscientiousness and neuroticism were operationalised

149 as *less interpersonal* traits as these are arguably less likely to be accentuated within an
150 interpersonal context (Gill & Oberlander, 2003) and have been linked to behaviours less
151 relevant to communication (e.g., tidiness of office; Gosling et al., 2002; being healthy
152 looking; Berry & Hansen, 2000). Using this dyadic design, the following hypotheses were
153 tested:

154 Hypothesis One: Accuracy will differ across contexts varying in interaction demands.

155 Hypothesis Two: Contextual variations in interaction demands will significantly
156 impact on accuracy in terms of the type of trait being judged; interpersonal vs. non
157 interpersonal traits.

158 5. Method

159 5.1 Participants

160 195 participants (Mean Age = 20.83, $SD = 3.68$) were recruited of which 88
161 comprised the dyad members (i.e., target-judge pairs). Dyads (52 = female, 36 = male) were
162 recruited through the University's research participation scheme. Of this 88, thirty
163 participated in either a 'Judge Unaware of Judging-Target Unaware of being Judged'
164 condition, 26 participated in a 'Judge Aware of Judging-Target Unaware of being Judged'
165 condition, and 32 participated in a 'Judge Aware of Judging-Target Aware of being Judged'
166 condition. Participants were randomly paired with their interaction partner. The self-reported
167 ethnicity of these participants were 82% White British, 14% Asian, 2% Black African, and
168 2% Other. Dyad members were asked to nominate somebody they knew well to provide
169 additional ratings of their personality. These nominated others comprised the remaining
170 informants ($n = 107$) (e.g., friends or family of each dyad member) who provided their
171 ratings using postal questionnaires. Inclusion criteria for participants excluded people who
172 had a previous acquaintance with their interaction partner.

173 *5.2 Materials*

174 *5.2.1 Personality measure.* All participants rendered judgments of Big-5 personality
175 traits using a 50-item questionnaire derived from the International Personality Item Pool
176 (IPIP, Goldberg, Johnson, Eber, Hogan, Ashton, Cloninger, & Gough, 2006). Specifically,
177 participants responded to 5 sets of 10 items measuring extraversion, neuroticism,
178 conscientiousness, openness, and agreeableness. For each item, they were asked to rate the
179 extent to which the statement described themselves, or the person that they were rating, from
180 1 (Extremely Inaccurate) to 7 (Extremely Accurate). The IPIP measure is widely used (e.g.,
181 Ashton & Lee, 2005) and demonstrates good construct validity (Buchanan, Johnson, &
182 Goldberg, 2005).

183 To avoid some of the problems inherent in self-reports of personality (e.g., socially
184 desirable responding; Borkenau & Liebler, 1992), ratings of target personalities were also
185 obtained from knowledgeable informants (i.e., friends, family members) who knew the dyad
186 member well. The average correlation between targets' self-ratings and informant ratings was
187 .54 (Range .34 - .76), which is comparable with the correlations observed in previous
188 research (e.g., Kurtz & Putnam, 2006).

189 *5.2.2. Impression Management.* Bolino and Turnley's (1999) IM scale was employed
190 to measure five IM tactics: i) ingratiation or favour doing; ii) self-promotion, or emphasising
191 abilities/accomplishments; iii) exemplification or going beyond the call of duty; iv)
192 supplication or advertising shortcomings; and, v) intimidation or appearing threatening. The
193 measure used consisted of 23 items tapping the extent to which individuals engage in these
194 IM behaviours, with responses ranging from 1 (Very Inaccurate) to 5 (Very Accurate).

195 *5.3 Procedure*

196 Unacquainted dyad members signed up for a study interested in 'language and
197 personality' and they were scheduled to arrive at different rooms to ensure no prior

198 acquaintance. On arrival, regardless of experimental condition, participants were informed
199 that they would be completing some questionnaires about themselves and then interacting
200 with another participant for 10 minutes in a café. They were further informed that the
201 experimenter would not be present during their chat, and that they should talk about
202 ‘anything they wanted’, which is consistent with previous studies (Letzring et al., 2006;
203 Markey & Wells, 2002). The use of a café sought to create a context that encouraged the
204 expression of individual differences.

205 The three experimental conditions varied according to whether or not participants
206 were informed (verbally and in writing) *before* their interaction that they would be asked to
207 judge their partners personality. Regardless of which condition participants were assigned to
208 *all* participants were asked to complete a personality questionnaire about themselves and
209 engage in a ten-minute interaction with an unacquainted other. However, the crucial
210 differences in pre-interaction instructions given to individual dyad members was in relation
211 to whether or not they would need to judge their interaction partners’ personality. In the
212 *Judge Aware-Target Aware* Condition (i.e., judge aware of judging and target aware of being
213 judged), participants were informed *before* their interaction that, at the end of the interaction,
214 they would be: i) taken to a separate room and asked to provide a judgment of their
215 interaction partner’s personality; and, ii) that their interaction partner would also be rating
216 them. In the *Judge Aware-Target Unaware* Condition (i.e., judge aware of judging and target
217 unaware of being judged), participants were informed *before* the interaction that they would
218 be asked to ‘judge their interaction partner’s personality’ after the interaction but that their
219 interaction partner would not be asked to judge them. In reality, their interaction partner was
220 given the same instructions so that both participants were aware of judging their partner, but
221 unaware that they were being judged themselves. Finally, in the *Judge Unaware-Target*
222 *Unaware* Condition (i.e., judge unaware of judging and target unaware of being judged),

223 participants were given no further information. In the latter two conditions, upon conclusion
224 of the interaction, participants were immediately informed of the true nature of the study (i.e.,
225 that it is interested in personality judgments) and asked if they were happy to continue with
226 the study, which they indicated by signing an additional consent form. Participants who
227 received the full information about the purpose of the study were asked not to reveal this
228 information to their interaction partner. All participants were assured of the confidentiality of
229 their ratings and the study has been ethically approved by the Psychology Department's
230 Research Ethics Committee.

231

232 6. Results

233 6.1 Preliminary Analyses

234 6.1.1. *Trait IM.* To examine whether self-reported IM was contributing to the
235 experimental effect, target participants' self-reported IM was collected before the
236 experimental manipulation. A one-way ANOVA revealed no significant differences in self-
237 reported IM across condition, all F 's < 1, all η^2_p < .06. As a manipulation check, after the
238 experiment all participants were asked if they were aware that they would be asked to make a
239 judgement and whether they were aware that they would be judged themselves by indicating
240 'yes' or 'no'. No participants reported awareness of judging/being judged, with the exception
241 of all participants in the fully informed condition (i.e., Judge-Aware-Target Aware).

242 6.1.2 *Analytic strategy.* Accuracy was assessed as the correlation between targets'
243 composite personality scores (i.e., mean of the self and informant ratings) and scores
244 rendered by judges for interpersonal and less interpersonal traits¹ using the item approach.
245 Specifically, accuracy scores were first computed by item then transformed into Fisher-z

¹ As openness has been referred to as one of the most difficult traits to conceptualise (Dennis, Masthoff, & Mellish, 2012; Digman, 1990) this trait was not included in analyses that focus on interpersonal and less interpersonal traits.

246 coefficients, which are normally distributed, and were then subject to an ANOVA and results
247 were converted back into r for presentation.

248 Dyad members served as both a target and a judge²; therefore, there were 88 judges
249 and 88 targets as each person was treated as a judge. As the potential for non-independence
250 was created intraclass correlations (ICC) were computed at both the individual and aggregate
251 level (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979) for each trait. A one-way random effects model revealed a
252 mean ICC of .11 (range .02 to .22). As no ICC exceeded .3 individually or in the aggregate,
253 analyses were computed with individual participants as the unit of analysis (see Kenny, 1995,
254 Table 4; Kurtz & Sherker, 2003).

255 The item approach was deemed appropriate as it correlates scores *across persons*
256 rendering as many correlations as there are items. An advantage of this approach is that it
257 removes problems associated with stereotype accuracy (i.e. the tendency to rate the mean
258 trait; see Funder, 1999; Letzring *et al.*, 2006). Although it has been argued that such an
259 approach may be confounded by differential accuracy, this should not be a problem for the
260 present study as relative accuracy, not absolute accuracy, is examined (see Cronbach, 1955;
261 Letzring, 2008).

262

263 6.2 Interaction Demands and Judgement Accuracy

264 Table 1 displays the mean accuracy scores for interpersonal and less interpersonal
265 traits as a function of interaction demand.

266 Table 1.

267 *Mean Accuracy Correlations as a Function of Interaction Condition and Trait Type*

² Although a more conservative approach accuracy correlations needed to be computed at the item level and not the trait level as this would only have produced 5 scores per condition - one for each trait. This would not have produced sufficient cell data for univariate analysis to be performed.

MISMATCHED INTERACTION DEMANDS AND ACCURACY

	Condition 1	Condition 2	Condition 3
Judgement Accuracy	Judge Unaware- Target Unaware	Judge Aware-Target Unaware	Judge Aware- Target Aware
Interpersonal Traits	.19 (.14)	.16 (.12) ²	.20 (.09)
Less Interpersonal Traits	.24 (.12) ¹	.06 (.13) ¹²	.13 (.14)

268 Note. *SD* in parentheses – Figures in superscript denote the values that were significantly
 269 different.

270 A 3 (Interaction demand: Judge Aware-Target Aware, Judge Aware-Target Unaware,
 271 Judge Unaware-Target Unaware) x 2 (Trait type: Interpersonal, Less-interpersonal) mixed
 272 ANOVA revealed a main effect of interaction demand, $F(2, 52) = 5.22, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .17,$
 273 95% CI [.13, .19]. Thus, as predicted (H1), variations in interaction demand had a significant
 274 effect on judgement accuracy. Although no specific predictions were made regarding the
 275 direction of effects for overall accuracy (i.e., across trait type) post hoc comparisons with
 276 Bonferonni adjustments revealed that mean accuracy was higher in the Judge Unaware-
 277 Target Unaware condition ($M = .21, SE = .02$) than the Judge Aware-Target Unaware
 278 condition ($M = .11, SE = .02$), $p < .01$ (all other comparisons were non-significant, p 's $> .05$).
 279 These findings suggest that when target and judge demands are equivalent, specifically in
 280 terms of not knowing that any judgement is required, accuracy appears to improve relative to
 281 when only one person is aware of making a judgement. This finding suggests that accuracy is
 282 not solely related to *targets* interaction demands, but also relates to the *judges* interaction
 283 demands or lack thereof. To gain a more nuanced understanding it is imperative to explore
 284 the findings by trait type.

285 6.3. Interaction demands and Accuracy by Trait type

286 The second hypothesis was that variations in interaction demands will significantly
287 impact on judgement accuracy for the less interpersonal traits of conscientiousness and
288 neuroticism. This was supported as a significant interaction effect was found between
289 interaction demand and Trait-type, $F(2, 52) = 3.39, p < .05, \eta^2_p = .12$. As no specific
290 predictions were made about which condition would positively shape accuracy, given the
291 previous lack of research, post hoc tests were performed (with Bonferroni adjustments) and
292 revealed that accuracy for less interpersonal traits was *higher* in the Judge Unaware-Target
293 Unaware condition than in the Judge Aware-Target Unaware ($p = .004$) (i.e., Condition 1 vs.
294 Condition 2; see Table 1). This finding suggests that when targets and judges have *different*
295 interaction demands accuracy for less interpersonal traits was lower than when judge and
296 target demands are equivalent in terms of both target and judge ‘knowing’ that a judgement is
297 required.

298 The post hoc tests also revealed that the difference in accuracy for less interpersonal
299 traits in the Judge Unaware-Target Unaware condition ($M = .24, SE = .03$) were not
300 significantly different to accuracy for those traits in the Judge Aware-Target Aware condition
301 ($M = .13, SE = .03$), $p < .10$ (i.e., Condition 1 vs. Condition 3; see Table 1).

302 Further post hoc tests for the significant interaction effect revealed that interpersonal
303 traits were judged more accurately ($M = .16, SE = .03$) than less interpersonal traits ($M = .06,$
304 $SE = .03$) when judges were aware of making a judgement but unaware of being judged (i.e.,
305 a within condition effect) ($p = .01$). All other comparisons between interpersonal and less
306 interpersonal traits within the Judge Unaware- Target Unaware condition ($p > .05$) and the
307 Judge Aware- Target Aware condition ($p > .05$) were not significant. Interestingly, this
308 suggests that when targets and judges have different interaction demands accuracy is
309 negatively affected for less interpersonal traits relative to interpersonal traits. Results for each
310 Big-5 trait are reported in the supplementary materials.

311 Finally, although no specific predictions were made for judgement accuracy of
312 interpersonal traits across interaction condition, post hoc tests (with Bonferroni adjustments)
313 revealed that interpersonal traits were rated with similar levels of accuracy across all
314 conditions as no significant differences in accuracy were found ($p > .05$).

315 Although participants were not asked about differences in cognitive load they were
316 asked, at the end of the study, how accurately they felt that they perceived their partner's
317 personality. A one-way ANOVA with condition as the IV and perception of accuracy as the
318 DV found a non-significant difference across conditions, $F(2, 84) = 1.09, p > .05, \eta^2_p = .09$
319 suggesting that judges felt equally accurate in their judgement regardless of interaction
320 demand. All effect sizes reported (η^2_p) are small (see footnote 3).

321 7. Discussion

322 The present study sought to examine the impact of target and judge interaction
323 demands on judgement accuracy. Given that no previous research, to the best of our
324 knowledge, has explored Big-5 judgement accuracy in contexts where people are unaware
325 that a judgement task is involved relative to when people are aware that a judgement is
326 involved, the findings offer a fruitful contribution to the accuracy and impression
327 management literatures.

328 One interesting pattern of results that emerged was the role that a mismatch in
329 interaction demands placed on judges and targets had on accuracy. In terms of overall
330 accuracy across trait type, poorer accuracy was found when target-judge interaction demands
331 differed compared to when these demands were equivalent. This difference was only found to
332 be significant when compared to the context where interaction demands were equivalent in
333 terms of not knowing that a judgement was required. However, findings indicated that in
334 those conditions where judge and target demands were equivalent no difference in accuracy

335 was found between interpersonal and less interpersonal traits. However, in the context in
336 which interaction demands differed interpersonal traits were judged significantly more
337 accurately than less interpersonal traits ($p < .01$) as a significant within context effect was
338 found.

339 Interpersonal traits were judged with similar levels of accuracy in all conditions.
340 Although speculative, one possible explanation is that judges focus closely on interpersonal
341 traits in an interaction. This is supported by Funder's (1995, 1999, 2010) Realistic Accuracy
342 Model, which posits that judge motivation can impact on the detection and utilisation of
343 behavioural cues when rating others. One possible explanation for why judges may focus on
344 interpersonal traits relates to the notion that these traits are functional within an interpersonal
345 context (Ames & Bianchi, 2008). The present findings corroborate this differential trait focus
346 and indicate that the task demands placed on targets *and* judges appear to shape accuracy in
347 specific ways. Given the nature of any first impression encounter it is not surprising that
348 interpersonal traits may be the traits that people focus on when rating another's personality,
349 as knowing whether someone will be talkative (i.e., a facet of extroversion) and be friendly
350 (i.e., a facet of agreeableness) are arguably more relevant during an initial encounter than
351 knowing whether someone is emotionally stable (i.e., a facet of neuroticism) and dependable
352 (i.e., a facet of conscientiousness) (see McLarney-Vesotski, Bernieri, Rempala, 2006). This
353 explanation may also account for why judgement of interpersonal traits did not differ
354 significantly across interaction conditions; accuracy for interpersonal traits did not operate as
355 a function of condition but due the functional nature of attending to the relevant cues,
356 however, judgement of the less interpersonal traits was hindered when judgement demands
357 differed. Thus, these findings corroborate literature on enhanced accuracy for observable
358 traits such as extroversion and reduced accuracy for neuroticism (e.g., Albright, Kenny, &
359 Malloy, 1988; Watson, 1989).

360 The relationship between the accuracy of judgments for less interpersonal traits and
361 interaction condition is not simple. The within context finding that less interpersonal traits
362 were rated less accurately than interpersonal traits when target-judge demands varied ($p =$
363 $.004$) suggests that accuracy for traits such as conscientiousness and neuroticism may be
364 more negatively affected by interaction condition than accuracy for interpersonal traits. This
365 difference in accuracy is difficult to account for as there is little evidence to suggest that it
366 was due to target performance. Funder's (1995, 1999, 2010) RAM suggests that target
367 provision of accurate and relevant cues can impact on judgement accuracy, yet in the current
368 study there is no reason to believe that the cues for less interpersonal traits differed between
369 the Judge Aware-Target Unaware condition and the Judge Unaware-Target Unaware
370 condition, in which the greatest level of accuracy was found, at a descriptive level (see Table
371 1). In fact, both conditions in which the target and judge faced equivalent demands resulted in
372 less interpersonal traits being judged as accurately as interpersonal traits. As the pattern of
373 results observed cannot be explained solely through the interaction demands of the judge nor
374 those of the target we suggest that they arise as a result of the interaction between both judge
375 and target motivations and behaviours. We acknowledge that this suggestion is tentatively
376 made but feel that, in the context of our findings, it is reasonable and justifies further
377 investigation of a previously unexplored issue. As noted by Funder (1995, 1999) - the best
378 judge in the world cannot make an accurate judgement if valid cues are not revealed by the
379 target - the present study suggests that when judges are also targets and interaction demands
380 differ, detection may be hampered for less interpersonal traits.

381 In relation to Patterson's (1995) parallel process model, how we present ourselves to
382 others is only part of an interpersonal interaction and our judgments of others are also
383 important to consider. The present findings suggest that these differences are relevant for
384 differences in accuracy in terms of the type of trait concerned and warrant further

385 investigation. Indeed, a possible explanation is that the effect observed here is primarily
386 driven by judge awareness, as accuracy in the Judge Aware-Target Aware condition was also
387 (marginally) lower than accuracy in the Judge Unaware-Target Unaware condition. Thus, it
388 may just be that awareness of having to form a judgment enhances cognitive load, which
389 could both hinder the judge's ability to form accurate judgments and also lead them to
390 provide less useful information as a target.

391 7.1 Limitations and Future Directions

392 When comparing the moderate to low effect sizes reported herein to other research
393 some studies have reported similar results. For example, research by Back and colleagues
394 (2008) into personality judgments based on an email address reports accuracy correlations
395 ranging from .05 to .13. A review by Hall, Andrzejewski, Murphy, Mast and Feinstein (2008)
396 reported average accuracy for face to face studies ($r = .23$). In the present study accuracy
397 correlations ranged from .06 to .18. The small effect sizes obtained are likely, in part, due to
398 the more conservative analytical approach adopted³. The significant findings obtained using
399 this approach arguably limit the possibility of a type one error and warrant further research.
400 Indeed, given the complexities in real life dyadic interaction it is intriguing that significance
401 was observed and good reliability of judges' ratings supports this, to some degree.

402 When considering the generalisability of the findings it is important to acknowledge
403 that the sample comprised of undergraduate students, with little variation in ethnicity.
404 Therefore, it would be useful for future research to examine a more representative sample.
405 Indeed, it would be interesting to examine whether cultural differences impact on the pattern
406 of findings observed here. Related to this suggestion it would be interesting for future studies
407 to incorporate a measure of self-monitoring behaviour (i.e., sensitivity to social cues and

³ Mean accuracy across trait and condition using summed scale scores across person and item (i.e., one correlation per trait per condition) produced a value of .33. Importantly, the pattern of findings was the same and suggests that the present set of results using the item approach is more conservative.

408 ability to modify self-presentation; Snyder, 1974) so as to develop the theoretical contribution
409 of the findings further.

410 A strength of the present research was the focus on 'real' people in 'real' (i.e., non-
411 laboratory) contexts, which Funder (1999) acknowledges is crucial for accuracy research as it
412 enhances the generalisability of the findings.

413 *7.2 How Can these Findings be Used?*

414 The findings of the current paper suggest that the demands within a judgement task
415 need to be equivalent and that one must be particularly cautious when judging people in
416 contexts where self-presentation demands vary, as one is likely to form a less accurate
417 impression for less interpersonal traits. A likely scenario is the assessment of a potential
418 future date where one person interacts with another knowing that they are judging them as a
419 potential partner whereas the other is oblivious that the interaction is anything other than an
420 initial first encounter.

421 As noted in Patterson's (1995) parallel process model, important subtleties are
422 involved in interpersonal interactions shaped by goals and expectancies. Our data indicates
423 that we need to *get the balance right* in terms of managing our own behaviour and
424 impressions of another, as evident in a differential pattern of accuracy for interpersonal and
425 less interpersonal traits.

426

427

428

429

430

431 Declaration of Conflicting Interest.

432

433 The author declares no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship,
434 and/or publication of this article.

435

436 Funding.

437 No funding was sought for this research

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456 References

- 457 Akert, R. M., & Panter, A. T. (1988). Extraversion and the ability to decode nonverbal
458 communication. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 9, 965-972.
459 [doi:10.1016/0191-8869\(88\)90130-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(88)90130-4)
- 460 Albright, L., Kenny, D. A., & Malloy, T. E. (1988). Consensus in personality judgments at
461 zero-acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55,387-395.
462 [doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.55.3.387](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.55.3.387)
- 463 Ames, D. R., & Bianchi, E. (2008). The agreeableness asymmetry in first
464 impressions: Perceivers' impulse to (mis)judge agreeableness and how it is moderated
465 by power. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34, 1719-1736. DOI:
466 [10.1177/0146167208323932](https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167208323932)
- 467 Argyle, M., Martin, M., & Crossland, J. (1989). Happiness as a function of personality and
468 social encounters. *Recent advances in social psychology: An international*
469 *perspective*, 189-203. Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2005). Honesty-humility, the big
470 five, and the five factor model. *Journal of Personality*, 73, 1321-1353.
471 [doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00351](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00351)
- 472 Back, M. D., Schmukle, S. C., & Egloff, B. (2008). How extraverted is
473 honey.bunny77@hotmail.de? Inferring personality traits from email addresses.
474 *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42, 1116-1122. [doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2008.02.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.02.001)
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job
performance: a meta-analysis. *Personnel psychology*, 44(1), 1-26.
[doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x)
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1996). Effects of IM and self-deception on the predictive
validity of personality constructs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(3), 261-

272. doi: [10.1037/0021-9010.81.3.261](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.3.261)

Berry, D. S., & Hansen, J. S. (2000). Personality, nonverbal behavior, and interaction quality in female dyads. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(3), 278-292.

475 Baumeister, R. F. (1982). A self-presentational view of social phenomena. *Psychological*
476 *Bulletin*, 91, 3-26

477 Beer, A., & Watson, D. (2008). Asymmetry in Judgments of Personality: Others Are
478 Less Differentiated Than the Self. *Journal of Personality*, 76, 3, 535-560

479 Biesanz, J. C., & Human, L. J. (2010). The Cost of Forming More Accurate Impressions
480 Accuracy-Motivated Perceivers See the Personality of Others More Distinctively
481 but Less Normatively Than Perceivers Without an Explicit Goal. *Psychological*
482 *Science*, 21(4), 589-594. DOI: 10.1177/0956797610364121

483 Blackman, M. C. & Funder, D.C. (2002). Effective Interview Practices for Accurately
484 Assessing Counterproductive Traits. *International Journal of Selection and*
485 *Assessment*, 10, 1/2, 109-116.

486 Bolino, M. C., Varela, J. A., Bande, B., & Turnley, W. H. 2006. The impact of impression-
487 management tactics on supervisor ratings of organizational citizenship behaviour.
488 *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 27: 281-297.

489 Bolino, M. C. & Turnley, W. H. (1999). Measuring IMin Organizations: A Sale Development
490 Based on the Jones and Pittman Taxonomy. *Organizational Research Methods*, 2,
491 187-206. doi:10.1002/job.185

492 Borkenau, P., & Liebler, A. (1992). Trait inferences: Sources of validity at zero acquaintance.
493 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 645-657. doi: 10.1037/0022-
494 3514.62.4.645

495 Buchanan, T., Johnson, J. A., & Goldberg, L. (2005). Implementing a Five-Factor personality

- 496 inventory for use on the Internet. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*,
497 21, 115-127. doi: 10.1027/1015-5759.21.2.115
- 498 Cronbach, L. J. (1955). Processes affecting scores on understanding of others and
499 assumed similarity. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 177-193
- 500 Dennis, M. G., Masthoff, J. & Mellish, C. S. (2012). 'Adapting performance feedback to a
501 learner's conscientiousness'. in *Proceedings of User Modeling, Adaptation, and*
502 *Personalization*. Springer-Verlag, pp. 297-302, 20th International Conference,
503 UMAP 2012, Montreal, Canada, 16-20 July. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-642-31454-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-31454-4_25)
504 [4_25](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-31454-4_25)
- 505 Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual*
506 *review of psychology*, 41(1), 417-440.
- 507 Ellis, A. P. J., West, B. J., Ryan, A.M., & DeShon, R. P. (2002). The use of impression
508 management tactics in structured interviews: A function of question type. *Journal of*
509 *Applied Psychology*, 87, 1200–1208
- 510 Forrest, J. A., & Feldman, R. S. (2000). Detecting deception and judge's involvement: Lower
511 task involvement leads to better lie detection. *Personality and Social Psychology*
512 *Bulletin*, 26(1), 118-125.
- 513 Funder, D. C. (1999). *Personality judgment: A realistic approach to person perception*. San
514 Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- 515 Funder, D. C. (1995). On the accuracy of personality judgment: A realistic
516 approach. *Psychological Review*, 102, 652-670. doi: [10.1037/0033-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.102.4.652)
517 [295X.102.4.652](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.102.4.652)
- 518 Funder, D. C. (2012). Accurate personality judgment. *Current Directions in Psychological*
519 *Science*, 21(3), 177-182.
- 520 Funder, D. C., & Colvin, C. R. (1988). Friends and strangers: Acquaintanceship,

- 521 agreement, and the accuracy of personality judgment. *Journal of Personality and*
522 *Social Psychology*, 55, 149-158.
- 523 Funder, D. C., & Dobroth, K. M. (1987). Differences between traits: properties associated
524 with interjudge agreement. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 52(2),
525 409. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.52.2.409.
- 526 Gill, A. J. & Oberlander, J. (2003). *Perception of e-mail personality at zero-acquaintance:*
527 *Extraversion takes care of itself, but Neuroticism is a worry*. In Proceedings of the
528 25th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, pp. 456-461. Boston, MA,
529 August 2003.
- 530 Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R.,
531 Gough, H. G. (2006). The international personality item pool and the future of
532 public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 84-
533 96. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2005.08.007
- 534 Gosling, S. D., Ko, S. J., Mannarelli, T., & Morris, M. E. (2002). A Room with a cue:
535 Judgments of personality based on offices and bedrooms. *Journal of Personality and*
536 *Social Psychology*, 82, 379-398
- 537 Hall, J. A., Andrzejewski, S. A., Murphy, N. A., Mast, M. S., & Feinstein, B. A. (2008).
538 Accuracy of judging others' traits and states: Comparing mean levels across tests.
539 *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42, 1476-1489
- 540 Hall, J. A., Blanch, D. C., Horgan, T. G., Murphy, N. A. Rosip, J. C. & Schmid Mast, M.
541 (2009). Motivation and interpersonal sensitivity: Does it matter how hard you
542 try? *Motivation and Emotion*, 33(3), 291-302. doi: 10.1007/s11031-009-9128-2
- 543 Human, L. J., Biesanz, J. C., Parisotto, K. L., & Dunn, E. W. (2012). Your Best Self Helps
544 Reveal Your True Self Positive Self-Presentation Leads to More Accurate Personality
545 Impressions. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3(1), 23-30

546 doi:10.1177/1948550611407689

547 Ickes, W., Gesn, P. R., & Graham, T. (2000). Gender differences in empathic accuracy:
548 Differential ability or differential motivation? *Personal Relationships*, 7, 95–109.

549 doi:10.1111/j.1475- 6811.2000.tb00006.x.

550 Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. A. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition.
551 *Psychological Review*, 110, 265–284.

552 Kacmar, K. M., Carlson, D. S., & Brymer, R. A. (1999). Antecedents and consequences of
553 organizational commitment: A comparison of two scales. *Educational and*
554 *Psychological Measurement*, 59(6), 976-994.

555 Klein, K. J., & Hodges, S. D. (2001). Gender differences, motivation, and empathic accuracy:
556 When it pays to understand. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(6), 720
557 730.

558 Kurtz, J. E., & Putnam, S. H. (2006). Patient-informant agreement on personality ratings and
559 self-awareness after head injury. *Clinical Neuropsychology*, 20, 453-468. doi:
560 10.1080/13854040590967090

561 Kurtz, J. E., & Sherker, J. L. (2003). Relationship quality, trait similarity, and self-other
562 agreement on personality ratings in college roommates. *Journal of Personality*, 71(1),
563 21-48.

564 Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and
565 two-component model. *Psychological bulletin*, 107(1), 34. doi: [10.1037/0033](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.1.34)
566 [2909.107.1.34](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.1.34)

567 Letzring, T. D. (2005). Personality and behavioural correlates of accurate personality
568 judgment. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation*, University of California

569 Letzring, T. D., Wells, S. M. & Funder, D. C. (2006). Information quantity and quality affect
570 the realistic accuracy of personality judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social*

- 571 *Psychology, 91*. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.91.1.111.
- 572 Letzring, T. D. (2008). The good judge of personality: Characteristics, behaviours, and
573 observer accuracy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42*, 914-932. doi:
574 [10.1016/j.jrp.2007.12.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2007.12.003)
- 575 Markey, P. M., & Wells, S. M. (2002). Interpersonal perception in Internet chat rooms.
576 *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*, 134-146. doi:
577 org/10.1006/jrpe.2002.2340
- 578 McLarney-Vesotski, A. R., Bernieri, F., & Rempala, D. (2006). Personality perception:
579 A developmental study. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*, 652-674
- 580 Murphy, N. A. (2007). Appearing smart: the IMof intelligence, person perception accuracy,
581 and behaviour in social interaction. *Personality and Social Psychological*
582 *Bulletin, 33*, 3, 325-39
- 583 Naumann, L. P., Vazire, S., Rentfrow, P. J., & Gosling, S. D. (2009). Personality judgments
584 based on physical appearance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. Ones,
585 D. S., Viswesvaran, C. (1998). The effects of social desirability and faking on
586 personality and integrity assessment for personnel selection, *Human*
587 *Performance, 11*, 2-3, 245-269
- 588 Patterson, M. L. (1995). Invited article: A parallel process model of nonverbal
589 communication. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 19*(1), 3-29.
- 590 Patterson, M. L., & Stockbridge, E. (1998). Effects of cognitive demand and judgment
591 strategy on person perception accuracy. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 22*(4), 253
592 263.
- 593 Patterson, M. L., Churchill, M. E., Farag, F., & Borden, E. (1991). Impression management,
594 cognitive demand, and interpersonal sensitivity. *Current Psychology, 10*(4), 263-271.
- 595 Paulhus, D. L., Bruce, M. N., & Trapnell, P. D. (1995). Effects of self-presentation strategies

- 596 on personality profiles and their structure. *Personality and Social Psychology*
597 *Bulletin*, 21(2), 100-108. doi: .1177/0146167295212001
- 598 Rodriguez-Bailon, R., Moya, M., & Yzerbyt, V. (2000). Why do superiors attend to negative
599 stereotypic information about their subordinate? Effects of power legitimacy on social
600 perception. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 651-671
- 601 Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of
602 counter stereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social*
603 *Psychology*, 74, 629–645.
- Salgado, J. F. (1997). The Five Factor Model of personality and job performance in the
European Community. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 82(1), 30.
doi: [10.1037/0021-9010.82.1.30](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.1.30)
- 604 Schlenker, B. R. & Weigold, M. F. (1989). Goals and the self-identification process. In L.
605 Pervin (Ed.), *Goals concepts in personality and social psychology* (pp. 243-290).
606 Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- 607 Snodgrass, S. E. (1985). Women's intuition: The effect of subordinate role on interpersonal
608 sensitivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49(1), 146.
- 609 Snyder, M., & Swann, W. B. (1976). When actions reflect attitudes: The politics of
610 impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34(5),
611 1034-1042. doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.34.5.1034
- 612 Swann, W. B. (1984). Quest for accuracy in person perception: a matter of pragmatics.
613 *Psychological review*, 91(4), 457.
- 614 Vohs, K. D., Baumeister, R. F., & Ciarocco, N. J. (2005). Self-regulation and self-
615 presentation: Regulatory resource depletion impairs impression management and
616 effortful self-presentation depletes regulatory resources. *Journal of Personality*
617 *and Social Psychology*, 88, 632–657.

- 618 Wall, H. J., Taylor, P. J., Dixon, J., Conchie, S. M., & Ellis, D. A. (2013). Rich Contexts Do
619 Not Always Enrich the Accuracy of Personality Judgments. *Journal of*
620 *Experimental Social Psychology, 49, 1190-1195. Doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2013.05.010*
- 621 Watson, D. (1989). Strangers' ratings of the five robust personality factors: Evidence of a
622 surprising convergence with self-report. *Journal of Personality and Social*
623 *Psychology, 57(1), 120.*