

11-05 and 11-07 notes

* rational method: write items that seem directly, obviously, and rationally related to what is to be measured

-interested in literal content

* the factor analytic method: generate a LOT of items and identify which group together by using factor analysis

*empirical method: identify items based on how people in pre-identified groups respond

- don't necessarily care about the literal content (interested in behavioral factor, ie extroverts normally like sprinkles on their ice cream)

Best method? *Combination*

-Generate items with rational method, analyze responses with factor analysis, use empirical method to correlate factors with independent criteria (E.g. go see how the extroverts respond

-Jackson's Personality Research Form (PFR)

Consequences of Everyday Judgments of Personality

- Opportunities
 - Employment, friendships
 - Examples: shyness, self-assuredness
 - Environment might judge shy person as cold/aloof
 - Remember reciprocal determinism
 - $\text{person} \leftrightarrow \text{environment} \leftrightarrow \text{behavior} \leftrightarrow \text{person}$
- Expectancy effects
 - Intellectual expectancy effects
 - IE- teachers told about IQ "bloomers" randomly, by the end of the year the children that were labeled bloomers did have a higher IQ (because teacher)
- Rosenthal & Jacobson (1968): climate, feedback, input (more opportunities to test limits to learn), output (opportunities to show what they know and receive praise for it)
 - Social expectancy effects
- Snyder, Tanke, & Berscheid (1977): self-fulfilling prophesy
- Profiling black men, labeled with bad things, believe it, act that way
- Expectancy effects in real life
- Jussim: Where do expectancies generally come from? (in real life—not artificial study situations)
 - Maybe from real data? Eg. Child's test scores are actually good before the teacher expects good things
- Likely to be correct, so they magnify or maintain behavioral tendencies
 - o Respond when treated as "good" or "bad" kid
- Especially strong when held by more than one important person for a long period of time

- o IE- Parents and teachers think your smart, over time will work to live up to this expectation
- End result—expectancy effects may magnify existing tendencies.

The Accuracy of Personality Judgment

- What criteria can be used to assess accuracy?
 - Answer from **constructivism** (the philosophical view that reality, as a concrete entity, *does not exist* and that only ideas or "constructions" of reality exist): none, personality is a social construction
 - Answer from **critical realism** (the philosophical view that the absence of perfect, infallible criteria for truth does not imply that all interpretations of reality are equally valid): all information might be helpful
 - The Animal Farm Philosophy?
 - o All animals are equal...

The Accuracy of Personality Judgment: Criteria for Accuracy

- Same as that for assessing the validity of a test
- Look across information for patterns
- Convergent validation: the process of assembling diverse pieces of information that converge on a common conclusion
 - o The duck test (look like duck? quack like duck? walk like duck?)

The Accuracy of Personality Judgment: Criteria for Accuracy

Primary Criteria for Convergence

- **Interjudge agreement:** the degree to which two or more judges of the same person provide the same descriptions of personality
 - o We all agree you are an uptight person
- **Behavioral prediction/predictive validity:** the degree to which a judgment can predict behavior
 - o You look uptight to me? (do you act that way?)

The Accuracy of Personality Judgment: Snap Judgments

- Mostly automatic, quick, immediate
- Some validity based on the face
 - Extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness to experience based on sitting together without talking
 - Dominant vs. submissive and sexual orientation from looking at a person's face
 - Low vs. high agreeableness, extraversion, and conscientiousness for composite faces of extreme scores

The Accuracy of Personality Judgment: Snap Judgments

- Other visible signs of personality
 - Extraversion: fashionable dress, stylish haircut, speaking in a loud voice
 - Openness and conscientiousness from neatness of bedrooms
 - Musical preferences
 - o Heavy metal= active, new age= inventive, creative
 - Handshakes: firmness=Extroversion, soft grip=shyness, anxious
 - Smiling—people mimic and judge (fake vs real by tapping into experience), smiling makes you appear more attractive and competent

- o Changing other people's judgment of you just by smiling

The Accuracy of Personality Judgment: Moderators of Accuracy

- Definition: variables that change the correlation between a judgment and its criterion
- What might make us better or worse at judging personality?
 - Gets in the way, helps, hurts judgment

The Accuracy of Personality Judgment: Moderators of Accuracy

- **The good judge**
 - Early findings: depends on the context or trait being judged; intelligent and conscientious
 - Good judge males: extraverted, well-adjusted, unconcerned with what others think of them
 - Good judge females: open, wide range of interests, value independence
 - High in *communion*; socially skilled, agreeable, adjusted; attributionally complex; judge others favorably

The Accuracy of Personality Judgment: Moderators of Accuracy

- **The good target:** (people who make it possible to judge them) stable and well-organized, psychologically well adjusted, extraverted, agreeable
 - Related to psychological health and happiness and to low social isolation, hostility, and depression

The Accuracy of Personality Judgment: Moderators of Accuracy

- **The good trait:** easy to observe, highly visible
 - Evidence against the idea that peer judgments are socially constructed and agreement is based on communication
 - Possible evolutionary basis (for easily readable trait)
 - E.g.- sociosexuality: willing to engage in sex with minimal acquaintance and commitment. One of the easier things for people to get right

The Accuracy of Personality Judgment: Moderators of Accuracy

- **Good information:** amount or quantity
 - The acquaintanceship effect and a boundary
 - Usually more info is better
 - Boundary: Close acquaintances usually do better (more agreement with self-report) except where strangers saw person in same type of situation.
 - Time to observe affects self-other agreement but not consensus
 - We agree badly at first (stereotyping, superficiality), and more accurately with more exposure

The Accuracy of Personality Judgment: Moderators of Accuracy

- **Good information:** quality
 - Weak (varied activities) vs. strong situations (social norms)
 - Stressful or emotionally arousing situations—divorce?
 - Best situation: one that brings out the trait you want to judge
 - Situation for dependability/flexibility/concern for others?
 - Thoughts and feelings vs. daily activities