

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346241035>

# Evaluation of the accuracy of personality judgments based on written verbal production

Article in *Primenjena Psihologija* · October 2020

DOI: 10.19090/pp.2020.3.333-348

CITATIONS

0

READS

140

3 authors:



Lana Tucaković

University of Belgrade

4 PUBLICATIONS 0 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Jovana Bjekic

University of Belgrade

45 PUBLICATIONS 326 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Goran Knezevic

University of Belgrade

111 PUBLICATIONS 7,146 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Disintegration as a basic personality trait [View project](#)



From brain waves to memory boost: Memory enhancement by personalized frequency-modulated noninvasive brain stimulation (MEMORYST) [View project](#)

**Lana Tucaković<sup>1</sup>**

Department of  
Psychology, Faculty  
of Philosophy,  
University of  
Belgrade

**Jovana Bjekić**

Institute for Medical  
Research, University  
of Belgrade

**Goran Knežević**

Department of  
Psychology, Faculty  
of Philosophy,  
University of  
Belgrade

## EVALUATION OF THE ACCURACY OF PERSONALITY JUDGMENTS BASED ON WRITTEN VERBAL PRODUCTION

The process of personality judgment occurs in daily social interactions and represents an attempt to identify characteristics of someone else's personality, in the way to explain past and predict future behaviors. The results of this process have implications on future decisions and actions of people. This research aimed to examine the accuracy of non-expert ratings of Extraversion and Conscientiousness based on short written texts. The sample consisted of 215 participants ( $M_{age} = 28.58$ ,  $SD = 10.30$ ; 80.5% females). The exclusion criterion was that participants were psychologists or psychology students, i.e., individuals familiar with personality research and taxonomies. Participants rated Extraversion and Conscientiousness, based on the texts written by five different individuals. Criteria used to estimate the accuracy of judgments were the agreement between self-report measures on HEXACO PI-R from people who wrote the texts and ratings from participants, as well as the agreement between multiple raters. The results showed that there was a moderate self-other agreement for Extraversion and Conscientiousness. Also, the results showed that there was a high between-raters agreement for Extraversion and Conscientiousness. This study indicates that it is possible to judge one's personality based on written verbal production, as well that raters tend to form similar impressions about the personality from written texts.

**Key words:** accuracy, personality judgment, personality traits, written verbal production

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author  
e-mail: [lane.tucakovic@f.bg.ac.rs](mailto:lane.tucakovic@f.bg.ac.rs)

Primljeno: 20. 07. 2020.

Primljena korekcija:

16. 09. 2020.

Prihvaćeno za štampu:

23. 09. 2020.

## Introduction

The process of personality judgment occurs in daily social interactions and represents an attempt to identify traits of someone else's personality, thus to explain past behaviors, and also to predict future behaviors (Funder, 1991 as cited in Funder, 1995). As in other types of judgement, in the process personality judgment a person is compared to a reference group (Wood et al., 2012). This means that the same cognitive mechanisms are employed as in the judgment of nonsocial stimuli such as sizes, tones, and weights (Wood et al., 2012). People can make judgments of different personality traits such as fearlessness, sociability, fairness, etc., based on observation (Funder, 1995). Personality judgment occurs in different life contexts, and the results of this process have implications on future decisions and actions of people (Funder, 1995; Funder, 1999). In the case of everyday life situations, personality judgment can be used to explain why a person is prone to impulsive behavior, while in business situations, in the selection process, it can be used to evaluate future work performance (Christiansen et al., 2005; Funder, 1995). In both described cases, indicators of the personality trait of Conscientiousness are assessed (Christiansen et al., 2005; Funder, 1995). The process of personality judgment often takes place in everyday life, as well as under controlled laboratory conditions (Funder, 1995). Personality assessment is conducted by professionals in various fields of applied psychology, but also by non-experts (Funder, 2015). In the field of clinical psychology, accurate personality assessment is important for giving a correct diagnosis and development of a successful treatment plan (Funder, 1999). Personality is more frequently assessed in daily life compared to the contexts in which psychologists perform assessments. Therefore, exploring accuracy of non-expert personality judgments is of a great importance (Funder, 2015).

## Accuracy of Personality Judgments

Accuracy of personality judgment belongs to one of two traditions studying accuracy of interpersonal perception, the other one being accuracy of emotion or affect judgment (Hall et al., 2017). Judgment of affective states is mostly done by social psychologists, while judgment of personality traits is mostly done by personality psychologists (Hall et al., 2017). In different types of judgment, including personality judgment, errors happen all the time (Funder, 1995). The process of personality judgment can be conceptualized through the Realistic Accuracy Model (RAM), according to which the judgment process consists of multiple subprocesses that run in a predetermined order (Funder, 2015). For the overall outcome of the judgment to be accurate, it is essential that no errors occur in the following three subprocesses (Funder, 2015): (1) It is necessary that the person being evaluated exhibits behavior and cues rel-

evant for the rating of a certain personality trait. (2) It is required that information about the manifested behavior and cues are available to the rater, and that the rater is able to detect the information. (3) It is required from the rater to properly use behavioral information that is available.

In the field of personality judgment, there are three issues to be addressed: (a) what type of accuracy measure is used, (b) who makes the judgment, and (c) what material is being used for judgment (Connelly & Ones, 2010). Accuracy of personality judgments can be conceptualized in several ways, with the most frequent use of two types of accuracy measures (Funder, 2012). One of the most commonly used measures of accuracy is the convergence between self- and other- ratings of the same trait (Funder, 2012). A large number of studies have shown that there is convergence between self- and other- ratings of the same trait, and that the mean observed self-other correlations corrected for the test-retest reliability range from .10 to .61 (e.g., Beer & Watson, 2008; Beer & Watson, 2010; Connolly et al., 2007; Connelly & Ones, 2010; Hirschmüller et al., 2013; Watson et al., 2000). The effect size depends on the duration of contact between the rater and the person being rated, interpersonal intimacy between the rater and the person being rated, visibility of the trait, and evaluativeness of the trait (Beer & Watson, 2008; Connelly & Ones, 2010; Connolly et al., 2007). The convergence between self- and other- ratings has shown to be the highest for traits that are most visible (i.e., that are clearly and frequently expressed through behavior), namely Extraversion and Conscientiousness, while the convergence is the lowest for Neuroticism, which is considered to be characterized by affective states that are not directly accessible to other people (Connelly & Ones, 2010; Watson et al., 2000).

Another type of accuracy measure that is commonly used is the agreement between multiple raters (Funder, 2012). Numerous studies have found that there is the agreement between multiple raters when they rate personality, with mean interrater reliability corrected for the test-retest unreliability ranging from .22 to .55 (e.g., Albright et al., 1988; Beer, 2013; Connelly & Ones, 2010; Shevlin et al., 2003; Tskhay & Rule, 2014). The effect sizes also depend on the level of interpersonal intimacy and the type of information being used for judgment (Connelly & Ones, 2010). As in the previous case, the agreement between multiple raters is highest for Extraversion and Conscientiousness (Connelly & Ones, 2010).

It should be noted that both measures of accuracy have certain drawbacks (Funder, 2012). If the accuracy is defined as convergence between self- and other- ratings of the same trait, contamination of this type of accuracy may occur if respondents provide socially desirable responses to self-report measures (Funder, 2012). On the other hand, if accuracy is defined as the agreement between multiple raters, the potential risk is that the raters may share common biases, which will cause them to make systematic misjudgments (Funder, 2012).

In personality judgment, we can distinguish between several types of raters by the degree of acquaintance with the person being evaluated (Connelly & Ones, 2010). Personality judgments can be performed by people close to the person being judged such as family, friends, spouses, etc., (Connelly & Ones, 2010), as well as by people who are only moderately close, such as colleagues, roommates, classmates, etc., (Connelly & Ones, 2010). Raters may also be persons who have little-to-no knowledge of the person being judged such as acquaintances, customers, strangers, etc., (Connelly & Ones, 2010). A paradigm that explores situations in which a participant in the role of the personality rater has not had the opportunity to interact with the person being judged (i.e., they are complete strangers to each other) is called the zero-acquaintance paradigm (Albright et al., 1988).

In this paradigm, raters can be provided with different kinds of material for personality judgment, such as photos, videos with or without sound, texts, favorite music of the person being assessed, arranging brief encounters, showing the raters offices and bedrooms of the people being judged, etc. (see Connelly & Ones, 2010; Gosling et al., 2002; Holleran & Mehl, 2008).

In this study we will focus on the accuracy of non-expert ratings of Extraversion and Conscientiousness based on the short written texts in zero-acquaintance situation.

## Personality and Verbal Production

People differ from each other in the words they use in speaking and writing, and these variations are proposed to reflect stable psychological differences including individual differences in personality (Fast & Funder, 2008; Pennebaker & King, 1999). Thus, various aspects of verbal production have been shown to correlate with personality traits (e.g., Fast & Funder, 2008; Hirsh & Peterson, 2009; Ireland & Mehl, 2014; Lee et al., 2007; Mehl et al., 2006; Pennebaker & King, 1999; Pennebaker et al., 2003; Yarkoni, 2010). However, the correlation coefficients are low to moderate, and do not reach high values (.20-.40). Sizes of correlations between language cues and Extraversion and Conscientiousness fall within this range. Previous studies have found the biggest number of language markers for Extraversion (Ireland & Mehl, 2014), but for the purposes of this paper, markers of Conscientiousness in language are also described. Extraversion is associated with more frequent use of words related to positive emotions, as well as with more frequent use of words related to social settings and social experiences (Bjekić, 2016; Hirsh & Peterson, 2009; Ireland & Mehl, 2014; Lee et al., 2007; Pennebaker & King, 1999; Yarkoni, 2010). High Conscientiousness is associated with avoiding words that denote negative emotions and swearing (Bjekić, 2016; Ireland & Mehl, 2014; Lee et al., 2007; Mehl et al., 2006; Pennebaker & King, 1999; Yarkoni, 2010).

Indicators of individual differences in personality can be found in written materials such as essays on different topics, texts obtained through creative writing, blog posts, email content, personal journals etc., (Gill et al., 2006; Letzring & Funder, 2018; Li & Chignell, 2010). Verbal material, which lacks paralinguistic information that can be used in the studies dealing with accuracy of personality judgment, can be produced in several ways: (a) by asking people to write about a specific topic, (b) by transcribing oral speech into written speech, thus removing paralinguistic features of languages such as tone and pitch of voice, (c) or by taking pre-existing verbal material such as emails, essays, blogs, posts etc. (Borkenau et al., 2016; Gill et al., 2006).

Using verbal material in studies in the field of personality judgment is relevant due to the rise in usage of computer-mediated communication, such as Facebook, Twitter, blogs, chat rooms, e-mail, etc. (Borkenau et al., 2016; Darbyshire et al., 2016; Li & Chignell, 2010). This type of communication consists of the written material, and therefore a reduced dose of personal information is obtained, especially non-verbal information that can be used for personality judgment (Borkenau et al., 2016; Darbyshire et al., 2016; Li & Chignell, 2010).

This research aimed to examine the accuracy of non-expert ratings of Extraversion and Conscientiousness based on short written texts obtained through the Stream of Consciousness paradigm. Extraversion and Conscientiousness were chosen for the assessment because they were the two easiest traits for the raters to perceive accurately, and were highly visible in various forms of materials (Connelly & Ones, 2010; Tskhay & Rule, 2014). Furthermore, these two traits had a substantial value in different real-life contexts, as well as practical implications on work (Witt, 2002). Other traits from the HEXACO model were not used in the present study primarily for practical reasons. Namely, judging personality on several traits would pose a high demand on participants, and probably jeopardize the validity of the assessments. Furthermore, it would be a highly difficult task for participants to judge strangers on traits that were already shown to have a lower agreement between multiple raters and convergence between self- and other- ratings (Connelly & Ones, 2010). Thus, the study aimed to assess how accurate could people judge a stranger's personality based solely on a short confession of private thoughts.

## Method

### Sample and Procedure

The sample consisted of 215 adult participants (80.5 % females; age 18 to 69 ( $M = 28.58$ ,  $SD = 10.30$ )). The exclusion criterion was that participants were psychologists or psychology students. The participants were recruited

via snowball method through social media, and were instructed to send the questionnaire to adult acquaintances with diverse socio-demographical characteristics, as long that they were not psychologists or psychology students. The participation in the study was completely voluntary, and without financial compensation. The study was conducted in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration and the Code of Ethics of the Association of Psychologists of Serbia.

Participants gave their ratings of Extraversion and Conscientiousness on the Scale for assessing indicators of basic personality dimensions, based on the texts written by five different individuals. Prior to the administration of the questionnaire and written texts, participants gave their consent for taking part in the study. Instruments were distributed online and were filled-in anonymously.

### **Material Used for Personality Judgment**

Written texts collected in a previous study by using the Stream of Consciousness task (SOC) were used as a material for personality judgment, and were chosen from the collection of 2,500 texts (Bjekić, 2016). The procedure for the Stream of Consciousness task was that people were instructed to write everything that came to their minds, continuously, without paying attention to grammar or text-consistency, for 20 minutes (Bjekić, 2016). Due to the fact that texts database also included scores of persons who wrote texts on the HEXACO-PI-R self-report form (Bjekić, 2016), we selected the texts that were written by people with high, average or low values of standardized scores on Extraversion and Conscientiousness, thus covering the continuum of both traits. A standardized score was considered high or low if the absolute value was above 1.5 standard deviations, in respect to the original sample in which they were analyzed (Bjekić, 2016). An additional criterion used for the text selection was that the content should cover a sufficiently wide range of life topics, such as student's life, friendship, family, daily activities, as it was usually through information on relevant life fields that personality was assessed in everyday life situations (Borkenau et al., 2016). Five texts from five different female individuals were selected. We used the texts that were written only by females, to control the influence of stereotypical gender roles on personality judgment (Mehl et al., 2006). These texts were used as the material based on which the participants were asked to rate the personality of the author. Descriptive statistics for various features of the texts are shown in Table 1.

Table 1  
Descriptive statistics for various features of the texts

Texts	Text length*	Words (N)	Traits	Z
1	1013	200	X	-1.025
			C	-0.613
2	1085	235	X	0.689
			C	-1.843
3	1139	227	X	1.642
			C	1.643
4	830	168	X	-0.739
			C	0.617
5	846	207	X	-1.692
			C	0.617

*Note.* Characters without spacing. X – Extraversion; C– Conscientiousness; Z – standardized score for self-assessed personality trait by the text-authors.

## Instrument Used for Personality Judgment

### *Scale for Assessing Indicators of Basic Personality Dimensions*

This scale (Čerović, 2018) consists of brief descriptions of the highest (e.g., The person carefully considers the options when making decisions, is cautious and self-controlled; Prudence facet of Conscientiousness) and lowest values (e.g., The person makes decisions impulsively or with little thought about the consequences; Prudence facet of Conscientiousness) for each of the facets that represent Extraversion and Conscientiousness from HEXACO model of personality. Extraversion from HEXACO is characterized by liveliness, social self-esteem, social boldness, and sociability, while Conscientiousness encompasses characteristics such as organization, diligence, perfectionism, and prudence (Lee & Ashton, 2008). The instructions for the participants were to read every text carefully and try to rate the traits of the author of the text accordingly. The questionnaire was shown below every text on which they rated the traits of the person who wrote the text. Ratings were done on a 5-point Likert scale. Cronbach's alpha coefficients of the scales were good, ranging from .72 to .89.



## Data Analysis

Data were analyzed by using SPSS version 21 (IBM Corp, 2012). In order to gain an initial insight into the data, descriptive-statistical measures for the ratings of Extraversion and Conscientiousness were calculated. Correlation coefficients were used to investigate the relationship between the self-report measures of Extraversion and Conscientiousness from the people who wrote the texts and ratings from participants. For this analysis, Extraversion rating variable was created, which included ratings from all 5 texts by the rater, and the same was done for Conscientiousness (thus obtaining  $N = 1075$ ). Two variables were created for the self-report measures, one for Extraversion and one for Conscientiousness, which contained raw scores of self-reports of the authors of texts on given traits repeated by raters (215 times the value of self-report was repeated for each of 5 authors of texts). To determine the degree of agreement between the raters for the traits of Extraversion and Conscientiousness, interclass correlation coefficients (*ICC*) were calculated, more precisely *ICC* (2,1) and *ICC* (2, k) forms were calculated (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). A two-way random effect model was applied with the type of absolute agreement (Koo & Li, 2016). For the purposes of this statistical analysis, the data were organized in the way that the ratings for facets of Extraversion and Conscientiousness were in rows, and the raters in columns.

## Results

### Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 presents a descriptive statistics for ratings of Extraversion and Conscientiousness. It can be noted that the average raters gave different estimates of Extraversion and Conscientiousness for different persons i.e., texts.

Table 2

*Descriptive statistics for ratings of Extraversion and Conscientiousness by 215 raters*

Text	Extraversion		Conscientiousness	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1	2.99	0.82	3.98	0.69
2	1.84	0.73	2.79	0.76
3	4.58	0.59	4.03	0.77
4	2.62	0.79	3.23	0.93
5	1.84	0.80	3.42	0.88

*Note.* *M* – mean; *SD* – standard deviation.

## Self-other Agreement in Judgments of Extraversion and Conscientiousness

In order to examine the relationship between self-report measures of Extraversion and Conscientiousness from the people who wrote the texts and ratings from participants, we used Pearson's correlation coefficients. As 215 raters assessed the five texts, it resulted in 1,075 assessments per personality dimension. The results showed that there was a moderate self-other agreement for Extraversion,  $r(1075) = .44$ ,  $p < .01$ , and Conscientiousness,  $r(1075) = .30$ ,  $p < .01$ . Therefore, this criteria for accuracy was met in the case of both personality traits.

## Agreement between Multiple Raters for Extraversion and Conscientiousness

Table 3 lists the measures of the agreement with their respective confidence intervals, for both the single rater and all raters taken together, and for both personality traits. The table,  $ICC(2,1)$  and  $ICC(2,k)$  presents the forms respectively (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). The following values were taken as criteria for interpreting the size of coefficients.  $ICC$  below .50 was treated as a low agreement, between .50 and .75 as moderate, between 0.75 and 0.90 as good, and above .90 as an excellent agreement (Koo & Li, 2016).

Table 3

*Agreement between multiple raters for Extraversion and Conscientiousness*

Personality trait	$ICC_{average}$	$ICC_{single}$	95% CI $ICC_{average}$	95% CI $ICC_{single}$
Extraversion	.99	.69	[.99, 1.00] $p < .001$	[.45, .95] $p < .001$
Conscientiousness	.98	.29	[.96, .99] $p < .001$	[.13, .78] $p < .001$

*Notes.*  $ICC_{average}$  – intraclass correlation coefficient average measure;  $ICC_{single}$  – intraclass correlation coefficient single measure; 95% CI – 95% confidence interval.

The results showed that there was a high between-raters agreement for Extraversion and Conscientiousness (the intraclass correlation coefficient average measure,  $ICC_{average}$ ). The ICC single measure ( $ICC_{single}$ ) reliability coefficient for Extraversion was satisfactory, however, the width of the 95% confidence interval for this value should be considered, which meant that there was a 95% chance that the true ICC value landed on any point between .45 and .95 (Perinetti, 2018). In the case of Conscientiousness, low reliability was obtained for the single rater, again with a wide 95% confidence interval.

## Discussion

The aim of this study was to evaluate the accuracy of non-expert ratings of Extraversion and Conscientiousness based on short written texts in a zero-acquaintance situation. The results showed that there was a moderate self-other agreement for Extraversion and Conscientiousness. It was also shown that there was a high between-raters agreement for Extraversion and Conscientiousness.

Results regarding the self-other agreement indicate the convergent validity of the self-report and rating measures, and obtained coefficients are comparable to those from the previous studies (Funder, 2015). These findings also indicate that Extraversion and Conscientiousness are “visible” enough in written verbal production (Gill et al., 2006). The potential explanation for this finding is that the visibility of a certain trait depends on the context in which they are rated in, and therefore in the context of written verbal production, where indicators of Extraversion and Conscientiousness are sufficiently and equally visible (Back & Nestler, 2016).

Consistent with previous research, there was the agreement between multiple raters for Extraversion and Conscientiousness, and the obtained coefficients were higher in comparison to the previous studies (e.g., Albright et al., 1988; Tskhay & Rule, 2014). A possible reason for this could be that our study included a large number of raters, which was not the case in the previous studies. Consensus among multiple raters in the field of personality judgment is interpreted as a measure of accuracy (Funder, 2012; Tskhay & Rule, 2014). It is advisable to use the agreement between multiple raters, instead of single rater reliabilities, to avoid single rater’s idiosyncratic judgments (Connelly & Ones, 2010). Another possible explanation is that the gained consensus is based on shared beliefs about what people are like in general i.e. stereotypes (Pretsch et al., 2014). However, it is necessary to keep in mind the limited generalizability of these findings, given that the coefficients have been obtained based on the ratings of only five texts.

When looking at the obtained results from the perspective of the RAM model, it seems that there are relevant cues of personality traits in the written texts, and that the raters have been able to detect and properly use them (Funder, 2015). Therefore, our data support the idea that the written verbal production, especially if it reflects one’s inner thoughts and feelings, can be an appropriate material for personality judgment, as it provides personality-related cues usable in personality judgement even for the non-professionals.

Our study shows that it is possible to assess one’s personality with satisfactory degree of accuracy based on only written verbal production, as well as that the raters tend to form similar impressions about the personality of the evaluated person. These findings are in line with previous research (e.g., Beer & Watson, 2008; Hirschmüller et al., 2013; Li & Chignell, 2010), and provide additional evidence to support language use as a marker of individual

differences in personality traits. It is important to emphasize that personality judgment in this study has been done by non-experts in a zero-acquaintance paradigm, based on the exclusively written material, and it was still done with considerable level of accuracy. Therefore, it seems that the accurate personality judgment is not the ability distinctive to highly trained professionals, but rather an adaptive ability that is essential in everyday functioning, especially in social interactions. However, it should be emphasized that the term accuracy in this area of research is used not in absolute terms, but rather with the awareness that in personality judgment we can only make approximations, and that there are errors in the process (Funder, 1995). For example, as we noted before, there is a risk that the raters may share common biases, which will lead them to form similar impressions, and which will cause all the raters to systematically misjudge (Funder, 2012). The most precise way to achieve accuracy would be to use behavioral prediction, i.e. to see if ratings of personality can successfully predict behavior and life outcomes associated with certain behaviors (Funder, 2012). In that way, we could truly compare the accuracy of experts and non-experts.

In addition to insights into the accuracy of personality judgment based on the written verbal production in a zero-acquaintance paradigm, this study is unique in several additional aspects. First, this is one of the rare studies of accuracy of personality judgment done in a non-English language. Therefore, it provides a glimpse into the cross-cultural universality of the findings presented in previous studies. Second, this is one of the only studies that focused specifically on the accuracy as the main aim of the study, and therefore reported on different types of accuracy (the self-other agreement and the agreement between multiple raters). It can be observed that the very concept of accuracy and its magnitude varies in the case of the measures used, and in this study, accuracy is presented with multiple measures, and thus the outcome of personality judgment is more fully illustrated (Hall et al., 2018). Third, the positive findings on personality judgement accuracy by non-experts open up a question on the nature of the ability to judge one's personality, that should be further explored. Finally, the results have practical implications on how we judge others and present ourselves through computer-mediated communication, where personality judgment is sometimes made solely based on the verbal material.

Despite its contribution, our study has several limitations and drawbacks. First, we have provided participants with only 5 texts to judge. In an ideal scenario, a large number of raters would judge an equally large number of persons, i.e. texts. Unfortunately, this represents a highly time consuming and resource-wise challenging study, since every participant would need to dedicate approximately 20-hours to provide 200 personality judgements. Moreover, despite showing the level of accuracy on a zero-acquaintance personality judgement, this study cannot provide an insight into the aspects of verbal productions that serve as valid cues for personality assessment. Lastly, the results concern only two personality traits, from a single personality model.

## Conclusion

The main results of the study have shown that there is a moderate self-other agreement for the traits Extraversion and Conscientiousness, i.e. that there is a moderate correlation between self-report measures of Extraversion and Conscientiousness from the people who wrote the texts and ratings from non-experts. Also, the main results of the study have shown that there is a high agreement between multiple non-expert raters for judgment of traits Extraversion and Conscientiousness. Our work adds to the body of knowledge about understanding how people can use others' linguistic style and word choice to make inferences about their personality.

## References

- Albright, L., Kenny, D. A., & Malloy, T. E. (1988). Consensus in personality judgments at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(3), 387–395. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.55.3.387>
- Back, M. D., & Nestler, S. (2016). Accuracy of judging personality. In J. A. Hall, M. Schmid Mast, & T. V. West (Eds.), *The social psychology of perceiving others accurately* (pp. 98–124). Cambridge University Press.
- Beer, A. (2013). Group personality judgments at zero acquaintance: Communication among judges versus aggregation of independent evaluations. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47(4), 385–389. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.03.008>
- Beer, A., & Watson, D. (2008). Personality judgment at zero acquaintance: Agreement, assumed similarity, and implicit simplicity. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 90(3), 250–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890701884970>
- Beer, A., & Watson, D. (2010). The effects of information and exposure on self-other agreement. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44(1), 38–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.10.002>
- Bjekić, J. (2016). Stilističke i sadržinske karakteristike verbalne produkcije kao indikatori bazične ličnosti [The style and content of verbal production as indicators of basic personality structure]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Department of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade.
- Borkenau, P., Mosch, A., Tandler, N., & Wolf, A. (2016). Accuracy of judgments of personality based on textual information on major life domains. *Journal of Personality*, 84(2), 214–224. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12153>
- Čerović, S. L. (2018). *Primena analize verbalne produkcije u selekcionom intervjuu* [Application of verbal production analysis in the selection interview]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Department of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade.
- Christiansen, N. D., Wolcott-Burnam, S., Janovics, J. E., Burns, G. N., & Quirk, S. W. (2005). The good judge revisited: Individual differences in the accuracy of

- personality judgments. *Human Performance*, 18(2), 123–149. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1802\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327043hup1802_2)
- Connolly, B. S., & Ones, D. S. (2010). An other perspective on personality: Meta-analytic integration of observers' accuracy and predictive validity. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(6), 1092–1122. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021212>
- Connolly, J. J., Kavanagh, E. J., & Viswesvaran, C. (2007). The convergent validity between self and observer ratings of personality: A meta-analytic review. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 15(1), 110–117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2007.00371.x>
- Darbyshire, D., Kirk, C., Wall, H. J., & Kaye, L. K. (2016). Don't Judge a (Face) Book by its Cover: Exploring judgement accuracy of others' personality on Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 58, 380–387. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.01.021>
- Fast, L. A., & Funder, D. C. (2008). Personality as manifest in word use: correlations with self-report, acquaintance report, and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(2), 334–346. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.2.334>
- Funder, D. C. (1995). On the accuracy of personality judgment: A realistic approach. *Psychological Review*, 102(4), 652–670. <https://doi.org/0033-295X/95/S3.00>
- Funder, D. C. (2012). Accurate personality judgment. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 21(3), 177–182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721412445309>
- Funder, D. C. (2015). *The personality puzzle: Seventh international student edition*. WW Norton & Company.
- Funder, D. C. (Ed.). (1999). *Personality judgment: A realistic approach to person perception*. Elsevier.
- Gill, A. J., Oberlander, J., & Austin, E. (2006). Rating e-mail personality at zero acquaintance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40(3), 497–507. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.06.027>
- Gosling, S. D., Ko, S. J., Mannarelli, T., & Morris, M. E. (2002). A room with a cue: Personality judgments based on offices and bedrooms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(3), 379–398. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.3.379>
- Hall, J. A., Back, M. D., Nestler, S., Frauendorfer, D., Schmid Mast, M., & Ruben, M. A. (2018). How do different ways of measuring individual differences in zero-acquaintance personality judgment accuracy correlate with each other?. *Journal of Personality*, 86(2), 220–232. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12307>
- Hall, J. A., Gunnery, S. D., Letzring, T. D., Carney, D. R., & Colvin, C. R. (2017). Accuracy of judging affect and accuracy of judging personality: How and when are they related? *Journal of Personality*, 85(5), 583–592. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12262>

- Hirschmüller, S., Egloff, B., Nestler, S., & Back, M. D. (2013). The dual lens model: A comprehensive framework for understanding self-other agreement of personality judgments at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(2), 335–353. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030383>
- Hirsh, J. B., & Peterson, J. B. (2009). Personality and language use in self-narratives. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43(3), 524–527. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.01.006>
- Holleran, S. E., & Mehl, M. R. (2008). Let me read your mind: Personality judgments based on a person's natural stream of thought. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42(3), 747–754. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2007.07.011>
- IBM Corp. (2012). IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 21.0. IBM Corp.
- Ireland, M. E., & Mehl, M. R. (2014). Natural language use as a marker of personality. In T. Holtgraves (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of language and social psychology* (pp. 22–35). Oxford university press.
- Koo, T. K., & Li, M. Y. (2016). A guideline of selecting and reporting Intraclass correlation coefficients for reliability research. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*, 15(2), 155–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012>
- Lee, C. H., Kim, K., Seo, Y. S., & Chung, C. K. (2007). The relations between personality and language use. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 134(4), 405–413. <https://doi.org/10.3200/GENP.134.4.405-414>
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2008). The HEXACO personality factors in the indigenous personality lexicons of English and 11 other languages. *Journal of Personality*, 76, 1001–1053. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00512.x>
- Letzring, T. D., & Funder, D. C. (2018). Interpersonal accuracy in trait judgments. In Zeigler-Hill, V. & Shackelford, T. K. (Eds.) *The SAGE handbook of personality and individual differences: Volume III: Applications of personality and individual differences* (pp. 253–282). SAGE.
- Li, J., & Chignell, M. (2010). Birds of a feather: How personality influences blog writing and reading. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 68(9), 589–602. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2010.04.001>
- Mehl, M. R., Gosling, S. D., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2006). Personality in its natural habitat: Manifestations and implicit folk theories of personality in daily life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 862–877. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.862>
- Pennebaker, J. W., & King, L. A. (1999). Linguistic styles: Language use as an individual difference. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(6), 1296–1312. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.6.1296>
- Pennebaker, J. W., Mehl, M. R., & Niederhoffer, K. G. (2003). Psychological aspects of natural language use: Our words, our selves. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54(1), 547–577. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145041>
- Perinetti, G. (2018). StaTips Part IV: Selection, interpretation and reporting of the intraclass correlation coefficient. *South European Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Research*, 5(1), 3–5. <https://doi.org/10.5937/sejodr5-17434>

- Pretsch, J., Heckmann, N., Flunger, B., & Schmitt, M. (2014). Agree or Disagree?. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 30(1), 31–39. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000165>
- Shevlin, M., Walker, S., Davies, M. N., Banyard, P., & Lewis, C. A. (2003). Can you judge a book by its cover? Evidence of self–stranger agreement on personality at zero acquaintance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35(6), 1373–1383. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(02\)00356-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00356-2)
- Shrout, P. E., & Fleiss, J. L. (1979). Intraclass correlations: uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86(2), 420–428. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.86.2.420>
- Tskhay, K. O., & Rule, N. O. (2014). Perceptions of personality in text-based media and OSN: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 49, 25–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.12.004>
- Watson, D., Hubbard, B., & Wiese, D. (2000). Self–other agreement in personality and affectivity: The role of acquaintanceship, trait visibility, and assumed similarity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(3), 546–558. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.78.3.546>
- Witt, L. A. (2002). The interactive effects of extraversion and conscientiousness on performance. *Journal of Management*, 28(6), 835–851. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(02\)00188-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(02)00188-5)
- Wood, A. M., Brown, G. D., Maltby, J., & Watkinson, P. (2012). How are personality judgments made? A cognitive model of reference group effects, personality scale responses, and behavioral reactions. *Journal of Personality*, 80(5), 1275–1311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2012.00763.x>
- Yarkoni, T. (2010). Personality in 100,000 words: A large-scale analysis of personality and word use among bloggers. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44(3), 363–373. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2010.04.001>



**Lana Tucaković**

Odeljenje za  
psihologiju,  
Filozofski fakultet,  
Univerzitet u  
Beogradu

**Jovana Bjekić**

Institut za  
medicinska  
istraživanja,  
Univerzitet u  
Beogradu

**Goran Knežević**

Odeljenje za  
psihologiju,  
Filozofski fakultet,  
Univerzitet u  
Beogradu

## EVALUACIJA TAČNOSTI PROCENA LIČNOSTI NA OSNOVU PISANE VERBALNE PRODUKCIJE

Proces procene ličnosti javlja se u svakodnevnim socijalnim interakcijama i predstavlja pokušaj identifikovanja karakteristika tuđe ličnosti i na taj način objašnjavanja prošlog i predviđanja budućeg ponašanja. Rezultati ovog procesa imaju implikacije na buduće odluke i postupke ljudi. Ovo istraživanje imalo je za cilj da ispita tačnost laičkih procena ekstraverzije i savesnosti na osnovu kratkih pisanih tekstova. Uzorak je činilo 215 ispitanika ( $M_{starost} = 28.58$ ,  $SD = 10.30$ ; 80.5% žena). Ekskluzioni kriterijum bio je da su ispitanici psiholozi ili studenti psihologije, tj. da su upoznati sa istraživanjima i taksonomijama iz oblasti ličnosti. Ispitanici su procenili ekstraverziju i savesnost, na osnovu tekstova pisanih od strane pet različitih pojedinaca. Kriterijumi koji su korišćeni za ispitivanje tačnosti procene bili su slaganje mera samoprocene na HEXACO-PI-R-u ljudi koji su pisali tekstove i procena ispitanika, kao i slaganje između više procenjivača. Rezultati su pokazali da postoji umereno slaganje između procene od strane ispitanika i samoprocene autora tekstova u proceni ekstraverzije i savesnosti. Takođe, rezultati su pokazali da postoji visoko slaganje između procenjivača za ekstraverziju i savesnost. Ova studija ukazuje na to da je moguće proceniti nečiju ličnost na osnovu pisane verbalne produkcije, kao i da procenjivači imaju tendenciju da iz pisanih tekstova formiraju slične utiske o ličnosti.

**Ključne reči:** crte ličnosti, pisana verbalna produkcija, procena ličnosti, tačnost