

**DISCLAIMER:**

This document does not meet the  
current format guidelines of  
the Graduate School at  
The University of Texas at Austin.

It has been published for  
informational use only.

Copyright

by

Lindsay Taylor Graham

2014

**The Dissertation Committee for Lindsay Taylor Graham Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:**

**Expression of Personality and Relationship Quality in Couples' Homes**

**Committee:**

---

Samuel D. Gosling, Supervisor

---

Timothy J. Loving

---

Lisa A. Neff

---

James W. Pennebaker

---

William B. Swann

**Expression of Personality and Relationship Quality in Couples' Homes**

**by**

**Lindsay Taylor Graham, B.A.**

**Dissertation**

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy**

**The University of Texas at Austin**

**May 2014**

## **Dedication**

I would like to dedicate this work to three incredibly important people. First, I dedicate this to my mom, Linda Graham— for your unyielding love, support, and belief in me and my ability to accomplish anything I set my mind to. Next, I dedicate this to my grandfather, George Thomas—for your immense pride in me, for teaching me the incredible value of education, and for always inspiring me to keep learning. Finally, I dedicate this to my mentor, Sam Gosling—for always pushing me to grow as a scientist, educator, and person, for igniting and nurturing my passion for personality, and for your companionship and support as we explore all of our past, present, and future research adventures.

## Acknowledgements

The path to the completion of this dissertation has been a long one. I see the completion of this document as more than the conclusion of a study, or even the final test to achieve a degree. I see it as the completion of a chapter of my life that has been one of the most trying, yet rewarding experiences I could ever ask for. I did not complete this journey on my own—nor could I have. So at this time I'd like to thank many of those without whom I could have ever come this far.

First, I'd like to thank all of the families who opened their doors to me and my research team. Your openness and willingness to share your lives is invaluable to me, and without you this project would have been impossible. I would also like to thank the numerous students who have helped me on this project. Your hard work, time, and dedication have meant the world to me. In particular I'd like to thank Emily Glazener, Daniela Herrera, and Michelle Moreau. I have learned so much from you, admire you all dearly, and have appreciated being able to get to know you and watch you grow. I know for certain I could not have maintained my sanity throughout this massive study without your hard work and dedication. At this time I would also like to thank all of the research assistants who have helped throughout the past six years in my lab. You have been what made my research possible and I am forever grateful to you for that. In particular I'd like to thank Erica Beranski, Robert Wilson, and Lindsay Mechem. I am so proud of you guys and so honored to have been a part of your academic path.

Next I would like to thank the members of my committee for all of their guidance and mentorship on this project—Lisa Neff, Tim Loving, Jamie Pennebaker, and Bill Swann. Lisa, thank you for your generosity and help with participant recruitment and all

of your excellent advice on how to venture into the world of couples' research. Jamie, I'd also like to thank you for all of your kindness, support, and mentorship through the past six years. It has been an honor to work with you and learn from you. Your generosity with your time and advice has meant so much to me and truly has been a huge help as I've worked to find my way through grad school and beyond.

I would also like to thank some others who have helped me along the way throughout grad school. I'd first like to thank my engineering buddies, Rich Corsi and Dori Eubanks. Rich, your mentorship has meant so much to me; I can safely say I would not have survived the IGERT program without you. Thank you for taking a chance on a psychologist like myself, for taking me under your wing and helping me forge my way through the world of engineering, and for sharing your love for science with me. I have so appreciated all of your kindness and support and am so incredibly thankful to have stumbled upon a mentor like you. Dori, thank you for all of the time you spent helping me while I was in IGERT. And even more, thank you for your genuine care and interest in my success. You are one of the kindest people I've ever known and have been such an amazing support for me. I will always treasure the countless hours I've spent chatting with you about everything under the sun from research to cats.

Next I'd like to thank Cindy, Mimi, Charlie, Ruby, and Lucy Meston. Your five have helped me through some really tough times. In particular thank you Mimi for all of your cuddles and snuggles throughout grad school. I've so enjoyed getting to be your kitty nanny and have appreciated all of your help as I've written my papers, including this dissertation. Cindy, thank you first for sharing your furry children with me, and second, thank you for your mentorship and friendship. You are an incredibly sweet, intelligent person and I admire you immensely. I am so thankful to have gotten to know you.

I'd also like to thank Chris Travis. Chris, I can't begin to tell you how thankful I am that Sam brought you into my life. You have taught me so much through the years. I thank you for sharing your love of environments with me and for so generously sharing all of your work with. I have been so inspired by your intellectual curiosity and your desire to improve the world. You are a wonderful collaborator, an incredible mentor and I am proud to say you are also an amazing friend. Thank you for believing in me, supporting me, and always cheering me on. Your support has given me so much confidence and for that I am forever grateful.

I would also like to thank my amazing grad school friends—I certainly could not have made it through without you. You all have supported me and pushed me to grow in countless ways. I will never forget the impact you've had on me throughout this time and I thank you for sharing your friendship with me. In particular I'd like to thank Miles and Jesse Bensky, Kate Blackburn, Ryan Boyd, Jamie Fratkin, Taru Flagan, Jason Ferrel, Leah Fredman, and Carson Sandy.

I'd also like thank Jenny Malin. Thank you Jenny for showing me the importance of having a balanced life. And thank you for reminding me of how precious life is and that's it's the people and relationships you build that matter most. I will never forget your wisdom or your lessons.

Jenna Baddeley, Yla Tausczik, Hani Freeman, and Cindy Chung. Thank you for the countless "quiet hours". They were not only the secret to my productivity, they were often what kept me sane. You four kept me going many times when I felt like giving up. I thank you for all of your hugs, all of your support, and all of your reality checks. Your friendship has meant everything to me.

I want to thank those who have helped directly with my personal growth while I've been on this academic journey. Specifically thank you Daniel Foor, Kim Masoni,

and Kristen Neff. Your guidance has kept me grounded and ever growing throughout this whole process. I am so appreciative for all that you have taught me and helped me learn about myself.

I'd also like to thank my family—both adopted and biological. First, thank you to my three “sisters” Sade Jones and Nita and Nikki Garg. I am so grateful I have crossed paths with each of you so early in life. Thank you guys for your friendship, love, and support. You are three of the most special people to me and I wouldn't be the person I am today without your loving influence. I love each of you so much. I'd also like to thank my “second parents” Desh and Manju Garg. You guys are wonderful and I have been so touched by the support and love you have given me.

I'd also like to thank my mom and step dad, Wes. Mom, thank you for always believing in me and never placing any limits on me—and more importantly thank you for never believing in any limits anyone else set for me. It is because of your belief in me that I have accomplished everything that I have. Thank you also for showing me how important school is, for teaching me to love reading and writing, and for all your help throughout my past 23 years of school. Thank you for fighting for me when you needed to, thank you for pushing me when I needed a push, and thank you for encouraging me when I wanted to give up. You are the most amazing parent I could ever ask for. Wes, having you as my step dad was an unexpected life “bonus”. Thank you for all of your love and support, for always treating me as an equal, and for always giving me the encouragement and courage to follow my true path. You are the most amazing “bonus parent” I could have ever asked for, but most importantly I am so thankful you are one of my best friends. Thank you both for all of your support, for putting up with me, for your patience with me, and for your unyielding encouragement as I've pursued my dreams.

Thank you also to my grandparents, Nellie and George Thomas. You both inspired me to always keep learning and to always strive to be the best person I can be. You two were like second parents to me and I am so thankful for all of your love and support. I would also like to thank my aunt Laurie, uncle Russ, uncle Chris, and cousins Anna and Leah. Your love and support have meant so much to me as well. Thank you also to my furry siblings, Molly, Andrew, Macy, and Cody. Your love and snuggles have been great support.

I want to say thank you to one of my best buddies, Spencer. You have made so many hard days better and often have been the one that's kept me going. You are the best kitty a girl could ever ask for and your unconditional love has gotten me through all of this. Also, Alistair Elliot, I am very thankful to have added you to our household this past year. Your cuddly and playful personality has been a wonderful relief amongst all the stress. Thank you both for keeping me happy and grounded.

Finally, I'd like to thank my mentor Sam Gosling. Sam, I don't even know where to begin; so much of my path has been made possible because of you. First, thank you for all of your guidance and support on this project. Also, thank you for believing in the importance of environments and for sharing in that belief with me. Thank you for introducing me to the world of personality. I remember as a sophomore when I began taking your class, it was the first time I felt like I had found where I truly belonged within the world of psychology. Thank you for taking a chance on me countless times as an undergrad. Your belief in my ability to generate questions and conduct quality research gave me the courage to pursue grad school. Thank you for taking a chance on me and for accepting me as your grad student. Thank you for all of your time, patience, effort, and support over the past 10 years. You have pushed me harder than anyone else I have ever known. Your pushing, though, has taught me so much. It's taught me how to be a good

researcher, how to be persistent and never give up, how to be a good mentor, how to write more effectively, and how to present my ideas to others. Your pushing has also helped me to grow as a person; it's taught me how to be a better listener, how to communicate more effectively, and how to be a more patient and compassionate person. I could never thank you enough for all you have taught and given me; and I hope you know how much you and your mentorship truly mean to me. Though sometimes quiet about it, you are an incredibly kind, generous, and thoughtful person. I consider myself to be an incredibly lucky person with you in my life and I wouldn't have wanted to be working alongside anyone else.

# **Expression of Personality and Relationship Quality in Couples' Homes**

Lindsay Taylor Graham, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2014

Supervisor: Samuel D. Gosling

Individuals use their physical environments (e.g., dorm rooms, offices) to broadcast information about themselves, influence their thoughts and feelings, and they unintentionally leave discernable traces of their daily behaviors (Gosling, Ko, Mannarelli, & Morris, 2002). As a result, a lot can be learned about an individual simply by looking at the spaces he or she inhabits. The previous work on this topic has focused on spaces occupied by individuals (Gosling et al., 2002). However, in many instances (e.g., work, home, and public life) people share environments, raising the question of what can be learned about individuals from their shared spaces? The present study examined the shared home environments (living rooms) of 98 heterosexual cohabitating romantic couples. Participants independently completed self-reports of personality, couple personality (i.e., the collective personality of the participant and his or her romantic partner), values, and relationship commitment and satisfaction. Observers independently rated each member of the couple's personality, values, and relationship characteristics, as well as the couple's "couple personality" based solely on photographs of the couples' living rooms. These observations were compared with the couples' self-reported characteristics and the specific environmental features of the spaces. Analyses revealed generally strong inter-observer agreement for most characteristics and in some cases

(e.g., perceptions of male Agreeableness, female and couple Conscientiousness, and male, female, and couple Openness) these observer impressions were also accurate. Results also suggested that observers relied on specific environmental cues (e.g., how colorful or organized a room was) to form these impressions and sometimes these cues were valid.

## Table of Contents

List of Tables .....	xv
List of Figures .....	xvii
Chapter 1 Introduction .....	1
Selection and Manipulation of Physical Spaces as Expression of self .....	2
Framework for Understanding Manipulation of Space .....	6
Identity Claims .....	6
Thought and Feeling Regulators .....	7
Behavioral Residue .....	8
Looking Beyond Spaces of Individuals .....	9
Using Environments to Make Judgments about Romantic Couples.....	14
Classification of Spaces .....	16
Chapter 2 Expression of Personality in Couples' Living Rooms .....	19
Scope of the Present Research .....	19
Study Design .....	21
Observer Judgments .....	22
Accuracy Criteria .....	22
Environmental Cues.....	24
Method .....	25
Participants .....	25
Observer Ratings .....	26
Features of the Environment .....	26
Couples' Classification of the Environment.....	26
Coders' Classification of the Environment .....	27
Instruments.....	27
Couples' Self-ratings of Traits, Values, and Relationship Characteristics.....	28
Observer Ratings of the Occupants.....	29

Coding of the Occupants' Living Spaces .....	30
Chapter 3: Results .....	33
Question 1: Inter-observer Consensus .....	33
Question 2: Inter-observer Accuracy .....	39
Question 3: Environmental Cues .....	41
Summary of Findings.....	46
Chapter 4: General Discussion.....	48
Overview .....	48
Individual Versus Shared Environments .....	48
Consensus and Accuracy .....	50
Cues .....	55
Instances of Inaccuracy .....	57
Stereotypes .....	57
Gender Differences in Personalization .....	61
Possible Limitations.....	63
Conclusions.....	66
Appendix A .....	68
Appendix B .....	71
Appendix C .....	84
Appendix D .....	93
References.....	107

## List of Tables

Table 1: Means and standard deviations of variables measured .....	113
Table 1: Consensus and accuracy of personality impressions of occupants based on photographs of their living rooms and bedrooms .....	115
Table 3: Consensus and accuracy of impressions of occupants' values and relationship characteristics based on photographs of their living rooms and bedrooms .....	116
Table 4: Correlations between occupant self-reports and observer ratings of occupants' Big Five personality traits .....	117
Table 5: Correlations between occupant self-reports and observer ratings of occupants' values and relationship characteristics .....	119
Table 6: Cue utilization, cue validity, and cue sensitivity of personality impressions of occupants based on photographs of their living rooms and bedrooms .....	122
Table 7: Cue utilization, cue validity, and cue sensitivity of impressions of occupants' values and relationship characteristics based on photographs of their living rooms and bedrooms .....	123
Table 8: Lens Model Analysis of Extraversion .....	124
Table 9: Lens Model Analysis of Agreeableness .....	128
Table 10: Lens Model Analysis of Conscientiousness .....	132
Table 11: Lens Model Analysis of Neuroticism .....	136
Table 12: Lens Model Analysis of Openness .....	140
Table 13: Lens Model Analysis of Conformity .....	144
Table 14: Lens Model Analysis of Tradition .....	148

Table 15: Lens Model Analysis of Benevolence .....	152
Table 16: Lens Model Analysis of Universalism .....	156
Table 17: Lens Model Analysis of Self-direction.....	160
Table 18: Lens Model Analysis of Stimulation .....	164
Table 19: Lens Model Analysis of Hedonism .....	168
Table 20: Lens Model Analysis of Achievement .....	172
Table 21: Lens Model Analysis of Power.....	176
Table 22: Lens Model Analysis of Security .....	180
Table 23: Lens Model Analysis of Commitment.....	184
Table 24: Lens Model Analysis of Satisfaction .....	188
Table 25: Similarity in cue utilization and cue validity across the living room and bedroom studies .....	191
Table 26: Correlations between number of photos and observer and self-reports of the Big Five.....	192
Table 27: Correlations of observer ratings of occupants .....	193
Table 28: Correlations of self-report ratings of the Big Five.....	194

## List of Figures

Figure 1: Brunswik Lens Model .....	nn
-------------------------------------	----

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

It is well established that people decorate and arrange their physical environments to meet their practical and psychological needs. For instance, a person may paint the walls of her living room a deep cocoa color, place warm, glowing lamps around the room, hang a photo from her wedding day above the mantel, and furnish the space with a large comfy reading chair, surrounded by bookshelves of her favorite novels. She may make these design decisions in part to create a comfortable place to read and relax, but also to create a cozy and peaceful haven for herself and her partner, and to signal the strength of her relationship to herself and to others.

Individuals use their physical environments to broadcast information about themselves and to influence their thoughts and feelings (Gosling, 2008). They may also unintentionally leave discernable traces of their daily behaviors (Gosling, 2008). As a result, a lot can be learned about an individual simply by looking at the spaces he or she inhabits (Gosling, 2008; Gosling, Gaddis, & Vazire, 2008; Graham, Sandy, & Gosling, 2011). Personal living spaces (e.g., a person's bedroom or office) contain many clues to the occupants' personality traits, values, attitudes, and behaviors (Gosling, Ko, Mannarelli, & Morris, 2002; Wells & Thelen, 2002; Wells, Thelen, & Ruark, 2007). For example, the ways in which a student personalizes his dorm room can help predict his likelihood of dropping out of college (Hansen & Altman, 1976; Vinsel, Brown, Altman, & Foss, 1980). Similar predictive effects can be seen in other types of spaces, too. For instance, the level of personalization of a worker's office space can predict her well-being and satisfaction with her job and company (Wells, 2000). The research to date has almost

exclusively focused on spaces occupied by a single person. However, many people share their personal spaces with others, raising the question of whose characteristics might be reflected in these shared environments?

Little is known about how individuals express themselves in shared spaces, or how shared spaces might reflect attributes of the different occupants and the nature of their relationship. One place to begin understanding how people express themselves in shared spaces is in the homes of romantic couples. Homes are a particularly interesting domain to examine because a home appears to be more than an environment where an individual resides; it is an environment in which a person's past, present, and future self is reflected (Cooper Marcus, 1995). The homes of romantic couples are a particularly interesting domain because within that environment each individual must meet his or her own needs, and also must accommodate his or her partner's needs.

The goal of this dissertation is to understand how cohabitating couples express themselves via the contents and arrangement of items in their home environments. This dissertation will also address what can be learned by others about individual members of a couple and about the quality of that couple's relationship from the contents of their home. In particular, the research will examine which cues in the space others use to form impressions of the occupants of the space, and which cues are actually diagnostic of the occupants and their relationship. Discussion will focus on the implications of these findings in terms of how couples create spaces that meet both their individual and relationship needs.

### **Selection and Manipulation of Physical Spaces as Expressions of Self**

Individuals select, manipulate, and evoke situations in their everyday environments to meet their daily needs (Buss, 1987). Much of the work looking at how people influence their environments has focused on environmental manipulation and selection in social environments; however, physical environments are influenced in similar ways. Selection of one's physical environment occurs on many levels of day-to-day living. Specifically, people tend to select physical environments that are consistent with their personalities, attitudes, and values (Bishop, 2009; Florida, 2008; Rentfrow, Gosling, and Potter, 2008). This effect can be seen on a very broad level, like the geographical regions in which people reside (Rentfrow et al., 2008), as well as on narrower levels, like the cities and neighborhoods in which people choose to live (Florida, 2008).

Individuals also manipulate their personal living spaces (like their bedrooms or offices) to make them reflective of their personalities, attitudes, and habitual behaviors (Gosling, et al., 2002; Wells, 2000; Wells & Thelen, 2002; Wells et al., 2007). For example, an office worker's personality is reflected in the types of items (e.g., photos of family and friends) with which he decorates and generates the ambiance of his space. For instance, those individuals who are high in Openness to Experience tend to display artwork (Wells, 2000) and have spaces that are perceived as stylish (Gosling et al., 2002). Compared to Introverts, Extraverts have workspaces that are more decorated and are perceived as inviting (Gosling et al., 2002). Spaces perceived as highly inviting tend to have an open desk and chair arrangement (McElroy, Morrow, & Ackerman, 1983).

When examining self-expression in physical space, theorists pay a great deal of attention to the ways individuals express their identity and lifestyle in the home. Some architectural practitioners have speculated about the motives that may drive how a home's appearance is shaped. Israel (2003) argued that individuals' home environments are reconstructions of past spaces in which those people felt safe and secure. According to this view, a person may, for example, unconsciously incorporate features into a space that evoke qualities from a well-loved grandmother's home. The motives behind these decisions may not be propelled by conscious tastes and preferences, but rather by the emotional connections promoted by these elements.

Theorists ranging from Carl Jung (e.g., 1963) to Clare Cooper Marcus (e.g., 1995) have proposed that of all places, the *home* has a particularly powerful symbolic and psychological significance. That is, the home is more than a place in which an individual resides, but rather a unique place where a person's identity is reflected and come to life. Based on a series of interviews with homeowners, Cooper Marcus (1995) argued that the home is a place that reflects the character and identity of those who dwell within it.

Empirical evidence shows expressions of an occupant's identity can be found throughout his or her daily living spaces. For instance, clues about the traits and daily behaviors of an occupant may be evident in the more private spaces of a home, such as the bedroom. In the bedroom, those high in Conscientiousness tend to have spaces that are well organized and spaces that are clutter-free compared to those lower in Conscientiousness (Gosling et al., 2002). Also, individuals who are high in Openness tend to have a large and diverse collection of content items, such as books and magazines

(Gosling et al., 2002). These high-Openness individuals are also likely to possess and display items related to travel and other cultures such as maps and souvenirs (Gosling et al., 2002). Further, personality is expressed in more than just the items of a space; it is also expressed in the broader configurable properties. For example, people who are highly conscientious have spaces that are characterized as comfortable and modern (Gosling et al., 2002).

Bedroom spaces can also provide information that can be indicative of future life events. For example, the degree to which students personalize their college dorm room is negatively related to the likelihood of dropping out of school after freshman year (Hansen & Altman, 1976). Surprisingly, two similar studies looking at this relationship found different things. Hansen and Altman (1976) found that individuals likely to dropout personalized their rooms less than those who stayed in college. Conversely, a study conducted a few years later showed the reverse; individuals who dropped out actually personalized *more* than those who stayed in school (Vinsel et al., 1980). The latter Vinsel et al. study explained the discrepancies in terms of the small and limited (i.e., male only) sample of the earlier Hansen and Altman study. Even though the findings relating to degree of personalization to dropout rates differed across the two studies, there were similarities in the types of items that dropout and non-dropout students used to personalize their spaces. In both studies, individuals who dropped out decorated their spaces with reminders of home, (e.g., with photos of family and friends). Conversely, students who stayed in school personalized with items that related to their connection to the university they attended (e.g., college-related emblems).

All of these studies suggest that there are similarities in the ways individuals personalize their spaces in the service of self-expression, and that those traces of self-expression are detectable. But how does one begin to fit all of these findings together to understand *how* self-expression occurs in physical environments?

### **Framework for Understanding Manipulation of Spaces**

The numerous examples of people selecting and altering their daily physical environments suggest that manipulation of environment is prevalent and likely to be psychologically important to individuals. To understand why people decorate their spaces, a framework is needed to conceptualize the various potential mechanisms. Gosling (2008) proposed three ways people intentionally and unintentionally affect their environments in daily living. Gosling's model posits that people want to broadcast information about themselves, they want to affect how they think and feel, and they inadvertently affect their environments with their daily behaviors. Individuals achieve these goals in three ways: with "identity claims," "thought and feeling regulators," and "behavioral residue." Though these three mechanisms are not mutually exclusive, they each explain unique ways people may affect their environments.

#### **IDENTITY CLAIMS**

Identity claims are deliberate declarations of an individual's attitudes, values, goals, motivations, and identity (Gosling, 2008). These intentional statements are intended for others to see, but can also act as affirmation of one's own identity and sense of self. Identity claims are typically thoughtfully and intentionally placed in a space, but they cannot be assumed to be false or manipulative presentations of the self. In fact, an

extensive body of work in the self-literature suggests people desire and strive to be known (Swann, 1983). This literature suggests individuals have happier, healthier, and enjoy more productive lives and relationships when they can bring others to see them as they see themselves (Swann, 1983; Swann & Bosson, 2008; Swann, Chang-Schneider, & Angulo, 2007).

Examples of identity claims found in physical environments would include a poster of a favorite rock band, a framed and prominently displayed college diploma, or an American flag waving on one's front porch. Identity claims are most effective when they communicate universal messages that can be understood and interpreted by the intended audience (Gosling, 2008). Further, the content of identity claims may vary depending on the intended or anticipated audience (Gosling, 2008). For example, displaying a family tartan on one's wall may be simply viewed by some as an interesting plaid pattern, but as a declaration of family pride to fellow Scots.

### **THOUGHT AND FEELING REGULATORS**

There are countless ways physical spaces are used by individuals. Even a person's home can provide many functions; it can be a place of refuge from a hectic day, a space meant to stimulate and entertain, a place to enjoy the company of loved ones, and can serve many other uses, too. Much of what makes a space suitable for specific activities is the space's atmosphere or ambiance. For instance, most people would find it difficult to concentrate on a tedious project that requires a lot of attention when sitting in a crowded room with heavy metal music blaring from the speakers.

Thought and feeling regulators are the deliberate things people do to a space to create desired ambiance (Gosling, 2008). Thought and feeling regulators have two functions: To construct a particular atmosphere conducive to intended activities and to regulate one's emotions while in the space (Gosling, 2008). Examples of thought and feeling regulators might include general environmental features perceivable to one's senses such as the arrangement of furniture, various forms of lighting, use of color, specific fragrances, or sounds. For instance, when trying to create an ambiance of romance, a person might desire a small space filled with lit candles, fresh flowers, and sensual music. To create an atmosphere of high energy and entertainment one might seek a large, open space, and fill it with bright lights, music with an upbeat tempo, and vibrant colors. Thought and feeling regulators can also be items that are far more personalized to the occupants of a space. For example, a person might place a treasured teddy bear given to her by her grandmother when she was a child on a bookshelf in her room. This bear could then act as a trigger to remember her grandmother and to bring back feelings of a particularly happy and carefree time in her life.

### **BEHAVIORAL RESIDUE**

Unlike identity claims and thought and feeling regulators, the term "behavioral residue" explains the *unintentional* ways individuals influence their environments (Gosling, 2008). Behavioral residue refers to the traces of behavior left behind by daily behavioral acts. Behavioral residue can come in many forms, as a result of a single incident or repetitive behaviors. Residue that is a result of repetitive behaviors is most likely to leave discernable traces (Gosling, 2008). For instance, a truly neat and organized

individual will not just tidy up the spaces of his kitchen visible to others; he will also make certain each drawer, cabinet, and cupboard is both tidied and *stays* tidied.

Behavioral residue can reflect activities one does in a particular space. For instance, a homeowner may leave her paints, brushes, and wet canvas on an easel in her living room, which would serve as indicators of a behavior she had just completed in that space.

Behavioral residue can also be an indicator of activity done outside of the space in which the related items are observed. A water bottle, muddy cleats, and sports bag lying by the front door can be an indication of a sports activity done outside of the home. In addition to reflecting past behaviors, behavioral residue can point to anticipated or future behaviors. For example, unopened bags of flour and sugar, a new carton of eggs, and clean mixing cups and bowls on a kitchen counter may indicate that someone plans to bake in the near future.

### **Looking Beyond Spaces of Individuals**

Much of the work that looks at self-expression occurrences in daily living has been done in environments that just one person occupies. In reality, a sizeable portion of the population does not live or work alone. Even those individuals who live alone often interact with others in physical environments they occupy on a regular basis (e.g., at the office, bars, cafes, etc.). So it is important to understand how people express themselves in both their shared and unshared environments.

If most people live and work in shared environments, why has most research focused on unshared environments? Examining shared environments is quite complicated. In shared spaces it is difficult to detect who is responsible for the individual items and the

broader ambient qualities of the space. For instance, in a shared dorm room it is hard to know if the design choices reflect the preferences of both parties or just one of the occupants. Additionally, shared spaces may belong to and be used by each individual sharing it in different ways. For example, two students may reside in the same dorm room, but they each may have varying levels of attachment to the space and use it for very different purposes. One student may rarely occupy the room, using it only as a place to sleep on the rare occasion when she and her boyfriend are fighting. The other student may rarely leave, using the room as a place to entertain, eat, sleep, and study. Further, the two individuals may differ in the degree to which they care about meeting the needs of the other occupants with whom they share the space.

These complications and others are largely unavoidable. Nonetheless, research efforts should be made to minimize such complications. Cohabiting romantic couples are a population that could help alleviate some of these issues. Determining the ownership of specific items is still impossible without actually asking the individuals who occupy the space, but the space itself is, at least theoretically, owned by both individuals. Even if one individual's self-expression or ownership is stronger in a particular space of their home, it is likely that the couple has agreed upon this prominence to some degree (either with explicit discussions or things having evolved organically through daily interactions). Further, couples in long-term, committed relationships provide a unique circumstance in which both partners are presumably committed to not only their own welfare and happiness in their home, but also the welfare and happiness of their partner. They may

not share the same goals for each of the specific spaces of their home, but the underlying purpose of the home is to create a space to fulfill them both.

Might future behaviors and attitudes of a couple be detectable from their space as is the case in an individual's environment? As noted above, an office worker's satisfaction with her job, and a student's likelihood to drop out of college, can be signaled by the items found in their spaces. So, perhaps similar things can be detected in couples' spaces. One study began trying to answer this question by examining expressions of "couplehood" in homes. Homeowners were asked to identify the items each member of the couple viewed as important and those they wanted visitors to see (Lohmann, Arriaga, & Goodfriend, 2003). Couples with jointly acquired items, which they viewed as important and wanted others to see when visiting the space, had closer, better functioning, and more committed relationships than those who did not have such items. These researchers focused on only a handful of self-reported possessions. If these sorts of relationship qualities are detectable from a small subset of items in a home, an entire room of the home has the potential to provide much more insight to the inner workings of a couple's relationship. If commitment is related to certain possessions in a space and spaces can be used to accurately observe a person's characteristics, then commitment to one's relationship could be detectable by viewing the space occupied by a couple.

But what might manifestations of self-expression look like in couples' spaces? Using the framework Gosling (2008) posits some educated guesses as to what these manifestations might look like are possible. Perhaps couples looking to declare their relationship as an important part of their identity choose to display symbols of the

relationship, such as a portrait from their wedding. This portrait could symbolize many things. It would serve as direct communication to those who entered their home that their wedding was a significant moment in their lives and their marriage continues to be important to their identity as individuals and as a couple. Other identity claims may reveal the characteristics of a couple's relationship less directly. Identity claims could also be used to express the couple's joint preferences (e.g., in the form of paintings lining the walls). It is likely that in addition to joint or couple-centric identity claims, each member of the relationship will each have their own individual identity claims included in the design of a space. The expression of joint and individual identity claims may vary depending on the degree to which the couple communicates effectively, and negotiates their autonomous and collective selves with one another in the space. To understand which identity claims were specific to one member of the couple, or to the couple as a whole, it would be essential to ask the members of the couple who the items belong to.

Thought and feeling regulators might look similar to those manipulations found in the spaces of individuals, but the motives behind those manipulations may differ. For instance, in communal spaces (such as the living room) a couple may choose to create an environment where they can both achieve their daily needs. This may result in direct communication or an agreed upon idea about the purpose of the space. For instance, both members of the couple may view their living room as a place to entertain guests. If so, they may have comfortable seating arranged for easy conversation, ambient light to create a warm, friendly atmosphere, and freshly cut flowers to create a warm inviting feeling. On the other hand, a couple may have differing expectations for how a space

should be used. These differences could cause them to divide up a shared room to allow each individual to create the environment needed to achieve the things that he or she wants to think and feel while in that space. For example, if one partner views the living room as a space in which to work, and the other a space to read and relax, they may section the room off accordingly. On one side of the room they could create an organized, productive space complete with desk, bright light, plenty of shelving and drawer space for books and office supplies, well-suited for working. Another portion of the room might contain an oversized chair, floor to ceiling bookshelves, and copious amounts of natural lighting, ideal for reading and relaxing. Of course, each of these scenarios described above requires some degree of compromise, communication, and attention to the needs of one's partner. It may be expected that some couples are more successful at these skills than are others, and thus these individual and relationship differences may be visible in the design of their living environments.

Like identity claims and thought and feeling regulators, behavioral residue may manifest very similarly in shared spaces as it does in individual spaces. However, the information the residue communicates may be indicative of something much more than in individualized spaces. In shared spaces, behavioral residue will still communicate the typical behaviors of the individual partners, but it may also communicate clues about the inner workings of the couple's relationship. For instance, a single, large chair stationed directly in front of a giant television, surrounded by used plates and glasses may indicate one member of the couple spends a sizeable portion of solitary time in front of the television set. Conversely, a coffee table covered with two opened laptops, piles of

papers, pens, and books may indicate that both partners spend time working in the same space. This residue could indicate that they work with one another, or it could indicate that even when working separately, they enjoy doing so in the same space. Both displays of residue described above paint very different pictures of the couples creating these discernable traces of behavior. By looking at these behavioral traces, one might be able to decipher the day-to-day ways the members of a couple relate to one another.

In a shared home, it may be difficult to interpret which member of a couple is responsible for each specific act of self-expression. It is, however, reasonable to assume that the manifestations of expression can provide useful information about what those individuals are like, how those individuals function as individuals, *and* as a pair. If individuals desire to be known, and use space to reflect and verify their impressions of themselves, it seems reasonable to expect shared spaces to reflect how the couple sees their relationship and wishes their relationship to be seen by others. Manifestations of self-expression in a couple's shared space may give clues as to how cohesive, satisfied, and committed a couple is to one another. Self-expression in shared space may also signal how communicative, in-tune, and considerate a couple is to its own needs as well as to those of each partner.

### **Using Environments to Make Judgments About Romantic Couples**

Features of an environment can serve as the manifestations of broader latent properties associated with an environment or situation (Brunswik, 1956). Previous work has used the logic set forth by Brunswik (1956) to explore the links between individual differences and the environments people create in a variety of contexts ranging from

home and office spaces (Gosling et al., 2002) to email addresses (Back et.al, 2010) and usernames of online gamers (Graham & Gosling, 2012). The model has proved to be useful in understanding the links between *individuals* and their environments. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume the links between *couples* and their home environments and the observations and perceptions of those couples can also be conceptualized in terms of the Brunswik lens model (1956). For example, observing a wall full of photographs depicting a couple going on various international travels may act as a lens through which an observer may perceive the couple's high level of Openness to Experience. Within the framework of the Brunswik lens model, the link between the observable cue (e.g., the wall of travel photos) and the impression formed of the couple (e.g., high level of Openness) is referred to as cue utilization (See Figure 1). Further, the link between the observable cue (e.g., the travel photos) and the couples' actual level of the underlying construct (in this case, Openness) is referred to as cue validity. When both links are sound—cue utilization and cue validity—then observer accuracy is likely to occur. I hypothesize that just as in an individual's environment, environmental cues in romantic couples' shared environments will allow judgments to be made of each individual occupant, the couples' joint identity—or “couple personality”—and the quality of their relationship. With regards to impressions formed of the individuals' personalities and couple personality, I hypothesize similar findings as those found in other environments (e.g., bedrooms; Gosling et al., 2002) to emerge. Specifically I predict observations of Extraversion Conscientiousness, and Openness to be both reliably agreed upon and accurate. The framework of the Brunswik lens model (1956) will allow examination of

the mechanisms through which couples impact their shared environments, and how observers can use couples' environments to help inform impressions of the couple and their relationship.

### **Classification of Spaces**

If we are using environments to understand people, how might one go about actually measuring and assessing self-expression in shared physical environments? An extensive review of the ways in which personality traits are manifested in physical environments (Graham, Sandy, & Gosling, 2011) highlighted three broad approaches researchers have taken when examining manifestations of self-expression in individuals' spaces. The first approach relies solely on self-reports from the target individuals under investigation. In this approach researchers ask participants to report the items in their spaces and the various ways they use their spaces. This particular method is quite easy to use with large samples of people but it is potentially taxing for the participant to classify each object of his or her space and is vulnerable to self-reporting biases. Note, however, that some information may be gained only by asking the occupant directly. For instance, it may not be possible to know the meaning and origin behind sentimental objects without asking the owner about them.

A second approach to collecting data about spaces is to capture the contents of a space by photographing the space. This method allows researchers to quickly observe a space, and compare samples more easily and efficiently because they can simply compare photos of spaces rather than the spaces themselves. This method provides a quick way to capture the content of a space, but a lot of nuance and detail may be lost from simply

viewing a photo. It may be hard to assess certain aspects of a space accurately, such as the ambiance or “feel” of a space. Photos may make it easier to accurately identify specific items of space, but observers of a photograph lose the ability to be absorbed by a space and may also miss many of the details that cannot be seen from the photographs.

The third approach researchers have taken is to go into the spaces themselves and classify the individual objects and features of a space first hand. This method is incredibly labor and time intensive, but it allows researchers to capture each item of a space accurately. This method also bypasses the issues that arise from classifying a space by photos of the space. While in the space observers can report on more subjective qualities of the space, such as the ambiance.

None of these methodological approaches is perfect. To examine the kinds of complex behaviors that might be found in shared environments it makes sense to implement a multi-method approach. For instance, having an owner document and classify his or her own items gives helpful information regarding what each item is and is used for. Photographing a space allows researchers the flexibility to retrospectively look at a space after initial observation. Having a research team present in the space itself to classify it first-hand makes it possible to obtain a more accurate and comprehensive view of that place. Ideally, by combining three methods, researchers would be able to provide a relatively thorough record of the space. However, for the present study it would have been time-consuming and potentially difficult for occupants code all of their possessions in a large shared environment like the living room. Therefore, here I implemented the

second and third methods (photographing the space and having a research team classify it first-hand).

## **CHAPTER 2: EXPRESSION OF PERSONALITY IN COUPLES' LIVING**

### **ROOMS**

#### **Scope of the Present Research**

The current work examines the ways in which couples communicate their individual identities and collective identity in a shared space of the home. Specifically, the present work investigates self-expression in the living room of a couple's home. The research focuses on the living room because, unlike the bedroom or some other intimate space of the home, it is a room presumably intended not just for the occupants, but is also used by visitors to their home. As a communal space, the living room is also potentially a space where both members of the couple have influenced the design and use of the space.

What specific forms of self-expression might we expect to be able to examine about individuals' from viewing their homes? Previous work shows the Big Five personality traits to be visible in occupants' individually owned bedrooms and offices (Gosling et al., 2002, Wells & Thelen, 2000) – but can these traits be seen within shared environments? And if Big Five personality traits can indeed be seen in shared environments, are observers able to detect distinct traits for each occupant in that space or can observers just detect a “collective personality” (i.e., how that couple appears as a whole not as individuals) of the occupants? The present work will explore whether or not individual personalities can be detected within a shared environment and if perceptions made based on this detection are accurate.

Though personality traits are helpful in understanding behavior, they are not the only individual differences indicative of how people will behave and the attitudes they

may hold. For instance an individual's values have been predictive of a variety of behaviors (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003) ranging from more internal behaviors such as worrying (Schwartz, Sagiv, & Boehnke, 2000) to behaviors that leave a discernable trace like voting behaviors (Schwartz, Caprara, Vecchione, 2010). If values can be seen in everyday behaviors, can they also be detected in the environments people construct? The present work will examine whether or not an individual's values are accurately detectable from a shared living space.

Past work suggests that individual differences are detectable in an individual's environment, but work that examines individual's spaces also shows aspects of the environment (e.g., the extent and types of personalization) to be related to attitudes and behavioral outcomes (e.g., a student's likelihood of dropping out of college or one's satisfaction with their company; Wells, 2000). Could attitudes and behaviors also be detected in shared environments? To begin trying to examine what sorts of attitudes and behaviors are detectable in shared spaces perhaps it makes most sense to look at aspects of the relationship between those occupants sharing the space. The present study begins investigating these connections by examining the commitment and satisfaction each occupant has with one another and their relationship and whether or not these relationship characteristics are detectable by others by viewing the couples' living space.

Commitment has been linked with the types of possessions couples have in their homes (Lohmann et al., 2003). Satisfaction with one's company has been linked with the possessions one has in one's work space (Wells, 2000). If possessions are detectable in

spaces than it is reasonable to assume observers could form impressions about the state of the couples' levels of commitment or satisfaction by viewing their spaces.

This work highlights what can be learned about individuals, and the characteristics of their romantic relationship. The present work examines the impressions made of a couple based on the environment of their living room. As such, my first research question examines whether consensual impressions can be made of a couples' individual personalities, collective "couple personality," and the quality of their relationship (i.e., how satisfied or committed the member of the dyad are to their relationship). If those impressions are consensual, my second research question examines whether those observers' impressions are accurate. This work also explores which cues are used to form impressions of the couple based on their living room, and which ones are diagnostic of the couples' traits, values, and their relationship characteristics. Therefore, my third research question examines cue utilization and cue validity in relation to observers' impressions of the couples' individual personality, their collective couple personality, each individual's values, and each person's commitment to and satisfaction with their partner and relationship.

### **Study Design**

Data were collected from three independent sources: (1) observer ratings of each occupant's Big Five personality traits, couple personality, values, and quality of the occupant's relationship characteristics (e.g., how satisfied and committed they are to their partner and relationship) based on the living room of the couple's home, (2) self-reports from each occupant of the couple regarding his or her traits, meta perceptions of their

couple personality, individual values, and perceptions of their relationship characteristics, and (3) coding of the items and features of the occupants' living rooms. This design allows examination of interjudge consensus among the observers, the accuracy of their impressions, and the degree to which the items and features of the living room were associated with the occupants' self-ratings and observer's impressions of the couples.

### **OBSERVER JUDGMENTS**

A team of eight observers made ratings of the occupants based solely upon photographs of the couples' living rooms. Each observer used an iPad to view the photographs of each home. The iPads allowed for easy organization of the photos and also allowed for the observers to easily zoom in and out of the photographs so they could see details of the room (e.g., read book titles, examine photographs, closets, etc.) just as one might do when physically examining a space in person. The observers were undergraduates working on this project as research assistants— some received course credit and some were volunteers. The observers were unacquainted with the occupants and their physical environments. The observers did not discuss their ratings with one another. Observer consensus estimates were computed by calculating interclass correlations among the observer ratings.

### **ACCURACY CRITERIA**

To obtain a criterion measure against which the accuracy of the observers' impressions could be determined, I obtained self-reports from the couples. Each member of the dyad provided self-reports of their own traits, meta- perceptions of their couple personality (i.e., how the occupants think they are seen by others as a couple), values, and

the characteristics of their relationship (e.g., satisfaction and commitment to the relationship and their partner).

Of course there are many ways in which to examine and define true “accuracy.” For the purpose of this study, I am defining accuracy as self-other agreement; in other words, accuracy will be defined by the correlation between a person’s self-perceptions (of their personality traits, meta-perceptions of couple personality, values, and relationship characteristics) and the observers’ perceptions of that individual after observing his or her living room. There has been support from past work examining agreement in this way across the Big Five personality traits (John & Robins, 1993; McCrae & Costa, 1987). Accuracy as defined by self-other agreement has some disadvantages (e.g., the self can sometimes be biased when formulating impressions of itself; Vazire, 2010), but, from a theoretical standpoint, perceptions of the self play a large role in the construction of one’s personality and these perceptions have been shown to relate to environmental behaviors (Gosling et al., 2002; Mehl, Gosling, & Pennebaker, 2006).

One question that often emerges when defining accuracy is: Why might accuracy matter? Accuracy is important to the extent that it provides useful information for the self and for others when engaging in social and environmental interactions (Gill & Swann, 2004). Being able to discern accurate information about individuals—and environments—provides a person with knowledge on how to proceed in that social interaction (whether it be with the self or with others) or in that environment. Accurate

information about the self also allows one to make decisions about future behaviors and judgments based on past experiences and behaviors.

“Couple personality” can be assessed in several different ways. Two of those options may be: asking couples how they see themselves as a couple or asking them how they believe *others* see them as a couple. The current study is interested in how perceptions of the occupants are made by others based on their environments. This study is also exploring how self-expression of these occupants is jointly being displayed to themselves and others via their environment. Research by Carlson, Vazire, and Furr (2011) has shown people do indeed have “meta-insight” (i.e., accurate insight into their reputation and how others see them). For the purpose of this study I have chosen to begin the exploration of couple personality by examining the average of each member of the couples’ meta-perceptions of their “couple personality”. Therefore, in this instance the meta-perceptions of couple personality will act as the truth criterion for observers’ perceptions of the couple’s personality. That is, the accuracy correlations will examine the correlations between the observer ratings of the couple and how the couple believes they are viewed by others.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL CUES**

A separate team of four coders examined and recorded the features of each of the occupants’ living rooms. I obtained cue-utilization estimates by correlating those averaged codings with the averaged observer judgments. I obtained cue-validity estimates by correlating the averaged codings with the accuracy criteria. Finally, I computed vector-correlations between the cue-utilization and cue-validity correlations. The vector

correlations provide evidence as to whether the cues observers used to make their judgments correspond to the cues that are actually related to the occupants' traits, values, and relationship characteristics.

### **CONSIDERATION OF INTERDEPENDENCY**

It should be noted that some of these variables being assessed are potentially interdependent because the study is examining couples, and couples within shared environments. To account for this interdependence, aggregated ratings will be made (i.e., in the case of “couple personality”) and I will analyze males and females separately. These precautions should adequately account for interdependency; however, it should be noted that there are more sophisticated statistical models that may account for more possible interdependency than the current approach and those models should be explored in future analyses.

## **Method**

### **PARTICIPANTS**

98 (Mean age = 31.95;  $SD = 7.67$ ) cohabitating heterosexual couples were sampled. All couples were required to have been cohabitating for a minimum of 6 months. Of the sample 72 couples were married, and 26 considered themselves to be in a long-term committed relationship. Of the married couples 30 were recruited through an existing longitudinal study—the Austin Marriage Project—run by Dr. Lisa Neff. The remaining couples were recruited with flyers dispersed throughout Austin, Texas. Of the participants 1% were African American, 4.6% were Asian, 77% were Caucasian, 10.7% were Hispanic, 3.6% reported being of mixed ethnicity, and 3.1% did not report ethnicity.

The couples completed a battery of questionnaires during the experimental session.

Couples were compensated with the choice of either a \$20 movie gift card for a local cinema or a copy of one of two popular books about space or couples' research. Couples were also given personality feedback and feedback on the perceived ambiance of their living rooms.

### **OBSERVER RATINGS**

Eight undergraduates (5 female) at The University of Texas at Austin acted as observers. The observers were given an iPad that held the photographs of each home's living room in separate digital folders. The iPads allowed them to easily zoom in and out of the photographs to see photographed details of a space (e.g., titles of books on a bookshelf, details of a photograph hanging on a wall) just as one might be able to walk closer to an object to examine it in a real physical space. After viewing each living room the observers made ratings of each male and female occupant's personality and the pair's "couple personality." The observers also made ratings of each member of the couple's values and relationship characteristics (e.g., how committed and satisfied each member was with their partner and relationship). Observers were given no instructions as to which items and features of the space they should use to inform their ratings of the occupants. Observers worked independently while completing their ratings and had no interaction with one another or the couples whose homes they were viewing.

### **FEATURES OF THE ENVIRONMENT**

#### **Couples' classification of the environment.**

In many homes the “living room” can be laid out in any number of ways. For example, in some homes the living room is a room completely sectioned off from the rest of the home, and in other homes it is one great room that bleeds into other spaces (e.g., the dining room or kitchen). At the beginning of the experimental session, the couples were asked to define the area of their home they conceptualize as their “living room.” This designated area was the space of the home the research team focused on during their observations.

### **Coder classification of the environment.**

At each home, four undergraduates at The University of Texas at Austin acted as coders. It was challenging to schedule coders to be at the couples’ homes at times that were convenient for the couples so the coders came from a pool of 13 coders. These coders were students who were working in my lab as research assistants for course credit or as volunteers. Four of these individuals were selected for each home visit. Each coder was trained extensively so they understood the coding method and each coder attended at least two visits to practice and become acquainted with the process and measures before acting as an official coder.

Once in the space, the coders were taken to the designated area the occupants had defined as their “living room.” The coders independently coded all of the items and features found in the occupants’ living room. Coders coded for specific items (e.g., couch, pillows, pictures), broader features of the room (e.g., cluttered, colorful), and elements contributing to the ambiance of the room (e.g., stuffy, stylish).

### **INSTRUMENTS**

### **Couples self-ratings of traits, values, and relationship characteristics.**

Basic demographics were collected about each couple and their relationship including: age, gender, ethnicity, the length of time for which they have been in a relationship with their partner, and the length of time they were together before marrying when applicable. Couples completed the 44-item Big Five Inventory (BFI; John & Srivastava, 1999), which measures the Big Five personality dimensions (Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability, and Openness to Experience). To capture self-perceptions of their own personality and perceptions of their collective personality as a pair the couples completed the BFI for themselves and for their “couple personality.” Recall “couple personality” was assessed by asking each member of the couple to denote how they believed others saw their personality and the personality of their partner as a collective pair. The BFI items were rated on a five-point Likert scale and the alpha reliabilities were .88, .75, .82, .86, and .78 for self-reports of their own personalities and .87, .83, .85, .80, and .85 for perceptions of their collective couple personalities for Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness respectively. These values are typical of those generally reported for the BFI (John & Srivastava, 1999). Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations for the Big Five dimensions. Correlations were computed to determine the relationship between occupants’ self-reports and reports of their own couple personality ( $r_s = .51, .53, .54, .41,$  and  $.65$ , all significant at  $p = .000$ , for Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness respectively).

Each occupant also completed the Twenty Item Value Scale (TwIVI; Sandy & Gosling, in prep) to capture self-ratings of each person's values. The TwIVI items were rated on a seven-point Likert scale and the alpha reliabilities were .55, .59, .73, .69, .55, .69, .82, .80, .73, and .19 for Conformity, Tradition, Benevolence, Universalism, Self-direction, Stimulation, Hedonism, Achievement, Power, and Security respectively. See Table 1 for the means and standard deviations of the value dimensions.

Each couple also provided self-reports of their satisfaction with their partner and relationship and their commitment to their partner and relationship. These items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale. When correlated it was revealed that both items of commitment were strongly correlated with one another ( $r = .71$ ;  $p = .000$ ) and both items of satisfaction were strongly correlated with one another ( $r = .88$ ;  $p = .000$ ). Therefore, I generated a composite measure of "commitment" and "satisfaction" by averaging the two items for each individual occupant. The two Commitment and the two Satisfaction items were not strongly correlated with one another, nor were the final composited Commitment and Satisfaction scores. See Table 1 for means and standard deviations of the composite scores.

All self-reported measures can be found in Appendix B.

### **Observer ratings of the occupants**

After viewing the couples' living spaces, observers completed a series of ratings about the occupants. Observers used the Ten Item Personality Inventory (TIPI; Gosling, Rentfrow, & Swann, 2003) to rate the individual personality of the male occupants,

female occupants, and the collective, couple personality of the two occupants (i.e., “couple personality”). The TIPI items were rated on a seven-point Likert scale.

Observers also completed ratings of each individual’s values using the Ten Item Value Inventory (TIVI; Sandy & Gosling, in prep). The TIVI items were rated on a seven-point Likert scale. Observers also rated the occupants’ partner and relationship commitment and satisfaction. These items were rated on a five-point Likert scale. For consistency in measurement with the self-reports of commitment and satisfaction items, the two commitment (i.e., partner and relationship) and two satisfaction items were averaged to generate one measure of commitment and one measure of satisfaction. All observer measures can be found in Appendix C.

#### **Coding of the occupants’ living spaces.**

To classify the items and features of the space, coders used a version of the Personal Living Space Cue Inventory (PLSCI; Gosling et al., 2005) adapted for use in a living room. The PLSCI was designed to thoroughly document the items and features commonly found in individual’s personal living spaces, such as an office or college dorm room. In addition to documenting specific items found within a space, the PLSCI also documents global attributes (i.e., ambiances) of the space (e.g., how comfortable or drafty it is). This survey was modified to capture all the typical items adults may have and likely global attributes in the living spaces included in the present study—the living room. Adaptations were made during a pilot phase in which seven members of the research team visited four living rooms. The living rooms visited during the pilot stages were not included in the current data set because not all of the living rooms were occupied by

cohabitating couples and extensive self-report were not collected from the occupants of the piloted homes. During the pilot phase, researchers compared the original items of the PLSCI to the items found in those four pilot homes. Missing items (e.g., the presence of DVDs, specific fragrances such as vanilla or lavender, and furniture such as ottomans, loveseats, coffee tables) were added to the PLSCI to create the final version of the inventory that was used in the current study. This measure may be found in Appendix C. In addition to documenting the items and features of the space, photographs were taken of each environment. 360-degree photos were taken to provide full views of how the room was laid out, and standard photographs were taken of all of the items and features from a distance and up close. The panoramic 360-degree photos were taken by one of six coders. These panoramic shots were taken before the other coders entered the spaces. These photos were taken with a tripod that was placed in the center of each room. To maintain consistency in the standard photographs across the 98 spaces, the same coder took the standard photographs in all the spaces. To photographs were taken according a standardized sequential procedure. Specifically, upon entering the room, wide angle shots were taken from each corner of the room. Next the coder stood in the middle of the room and took snapshot after snapshot of the room in 360- degree fashion until every point of the room had been documented (this should not be confused with the broader 360 panoramic photos that were also taken and mentioned above). Next the coder would take close-up shots of all of the artwork, photographs, and wall hangings. The coder would then methodically take close-up shots of each of the shelves and surfaces of the room.

The coder would also take close-up photographs of each of the furniture items, wall treatments, and flooring.

## **CHAPTER 3: RESULTS**

Here I present the analyses implemented and resulting findings used to address the three main research questions: Can impressions be consensually made of occupants based on their living rooms, (2) are those impressions accurate, (3) what environmental cues inform and are valid when forming these impressions?

Again, it should be noted by nature of the study design some of the variables being examined are potentially interdependent. To account for this interdependency I analyzed the data separately for men and women in the case of all self-reported variables with the exception of “couple personality.” In the case of couple personality, self-ratings of couple personality from each member of the dyad were averaged to generate one collective measure of couple personality. It may be possible to develop a more sophisticated statistical model that could be used to account for more of this potential interdependence and this option should be explored further in future analyses (See Appendix A for details).

### **QUESTION 1: INTER-OBSERVER CONSENSUS**

Inter-observer consensus was determined by computing the intraclass correlations (ICC) among the ratings of the observers who had formed their impressions based on the photographs of the couples’ living rooms. The ICCs were computed for both single measures and average measures (See Table 2 for full details).

As shown in Table 2, consensus was substantial (average measure ICC max. = .83, min. = .46) for all Big Five dimensions when observers rated the male occupants, female occupants, and the occupants’ couple personality—and consensus was

comparable across all three types of observations (i.e., male, female, couple). For comparison's sake, the present study's findings have been compared to those of Gosling et al.'s (2002) study of individually owned bedroom environments. It should be noted that consensus was not calculated in the same way (i.e., with ICCs) in the Gosling et al. (2002) study as it was in the current study because Gosling et al. computed consensus from the average pairwise agreement among observers. However, the ICC is the more appropriate index and comparison still allows for a conceptual comparison (i.e., illustration of which traits were rated consensually across studies). It should be noted too that when pairwise correlations are computed on the current data those correlations are similar to the single measure ICCs reported in Table 2. Overall consensus reached statistical significance for all five Big Five traits across all ratings (i.e., male, female, couple) of personality. This differs to the Gosling et al. (2002) study, where the consensus correlations reached significance only for ratings of Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Openness (See Table 2, data column 4 for comparison data). As predicted based on findings from impressions formed based on bedrooms in the study by Gosling et al. (2002) consensus was highest for ratings of Openness followed by Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism. In fact, when viewing the patterns in consensus the present study mirrors the findings from Gosling et al. exactly. It should be noted in comparison to ratings of bedrooms (where consensus on ratings of Neuroticism did not reach statistical significance), in the examination of living rooms consensus for Neuroticism was statistically significant. This pattern in consensus was also matched in Gosling and colleague's (2002) study of office spaces in the sense

that Neuroticism was associated with the lowest levels of consensus in both samples. The similarity in these patterns suggests there is some similarity in the presence of environmental cues across various types of environments—and potentially in the underlying processes in how observers use those cues to assess the occupants of an environment.

Additionally, strong consensus was also reached when making observations of both male and female occupant values and relationship characteristics (average measure ICC max. = .89, min. = .37). This was the case for all values and relationship characteristics with the exception of judgments of female occupant Power (See Table 3 for full results). There do appear to be some differences in consensus of values and relationship characteristics across men and women but for the most part the patterns are similar across gender. For example, for both genders consensus was strongest for Tradition and Security. The patterns differ a bit as consensus goes down suggesting there are differences in how male and female values and relationship characteristics are perceived and perhaps differences in the cues observers use when making judgments of males versus females.

The consensus among observer judgments raises the question of whether the observers are making distinctions among the targets they are judging. That is, are the observers judging the male member of the couple in a way that's distinct from the female member of the couple or the couple personality as a whole? Or do the observers essentially see the male member of the couple, the female member of the couple, and the overall couple in essentially the same way? To examine this question, I computed

correlations between the observer ratings of the male member of the couple, the female member of the couple, and the couple as whole for the all the variables examined. These correlations are shown in the last three columns of Table 4 (for personality traits) and the last two columns of Table 5 (for values and relationship variables). Additionally I computed correlations across all the variables measured for by the observers (see Table 26) and all the variables measured in the occupants (See Table 27). As the results in Tables 26 show, there are some strong relationships between the observers ratings of males, females, and couples on many traits suggesting observers are not discriminating among the occupants. There are also some moderate to strong relationships between some of the trait ratings suggesting observers were not discriminating between traits, especially with regards to Agreeableness and Neuroticism. Results in Table 27 reflect some relationships between traits across each member of the couple, but overall these relationships are not large thus suggesting actual differences between partners.

As shown in Tables 4 and 5 the observer ratings of the three targets (male, female, couple) were generally strongly correlated. For example, for the trait of extraversion, the observer ratings of the male members of the couple correlated .56 with the observer ratings of the female member of the couple and .84 with the observer ratings of the couple personality; and the observer ratings of the female member of the couple correlated .84 with the observer ratings of the couple personality. With one exception (discussed below), similar or stronger correlations were found for the other personality traits and for values and relationship variables. These findings suggest the observers are not making strong distinctions between the targets (male, female, couple) that they are

rating. The lack of discrimination could arise because they are unable to make the distinctions based on the items in the living room or because they do make distinctions among the targets but believe all three targets are genuinely similar to one another.

The one exception to the high correlations between observer ratings of the male and female members of the couple was for the value of Power, which had a correlation of only .11. For this value, it seems that observer did feel they could distinguish between the males and females. Note that the correlation was not strongly negative so it is unlikely that the observers were simply relying on gender stereotypes and rating males as high and females as low on Power; instead, in this one case, their perceptions were genuinely unrelated.

The strong correlations among the observer ratings of males, females, and couples raise the question of whether the observed strong links among the three targets reflect reality. That is, do the male members of a couple really have similar traits to the female members of the couple? And does the couple as a whole have a similar personality to the male and female members of the couple? Past research on couples has consistently failed to find much evidence for assortative mating on traits, but perhaps in this sample the males are similar to the females and both are similar to the couple personality. To examine this question, I computed correlations between the self-ratings of the male member of the couple, the female member of the couple, and the couple as whole for the all the variables examined. These correlations are shown in the first three data columns of Table 4 (for personality traits) and first two data columns of Table 5 (for values and relationship variables).

As shown in Table 4, and in contrast to the observer ratings, the self-ratings of the personality traits of the male and female members of the couple were generally weakly correlated. For example, for the trait of extraversion, the self-ratings by the male members of the couple correlated  $-.09$  with the self-ratings by the female member of the couple. Despite these low correlations between the male and female self-ratings, both sets of self-ratings (by the male and female) correlated moderately strongly with how they thought they were seen as a couple. Note that this finding is not entailed by the way the couple variable was constructed because the couple personality rating was not simply the average of the male and female self-ratings.

As shown in Table 5, the self-ratings of the values and relationship variables by the male and female members of the couple were generally stronger than those found for traits. There were still some discrepancies in the magnitude of the male-female self-ratings across value dimensions. Self-direction, Hedonism, Power, and Security showed little overlap in the male and female self-ratings but the other values showed greater similarity in the male and female self-ratings. Male and female self-rated satisfaction was strongly correlated across males and females but Commitment was not.

One possible explanation for the strong consensus in observer ratings is that they were using some cue that was an artifact of the assessment procedures. One such artifact would be the number of photographs taken of each space. That is, it is possible that the observers saw the number of photographs taken as a cue to being high or low on a particular trait, without attending to the details in the photographs. To test whether the number of photos was associated with ratings correlations between observer ratings of the

Big Five traits and the number of photographs for each space were computed (See Table 28). These results reflect moderate relationships between number of photos and observers ratings of male, female, and couple Extraversion and Openness, and female and couple Agreeableness. To test whether or not there was any validity to these relationships correlations were computed between the occupants' self-reports and the number of photos taken in the spaces (See Table 28). Results show moderate relationships between the number of photos and occupants' self-reports of Openness thus suggesting more open individuals have more possessions and items in their spaces to photograph.

#### **QUESTION 2: INTER-OBSERVER ACCURACY**

To determine the accuracy of the observers' impressions of personality, I computed the correlations between the aggregated ratings of the observers and the couples' self-reports of their own personalities, and aggregated ratings of the couples' meta-perception reports of their couple personalities. Self-reports of personality for each occupant acted as the accuracy criterion for male and female personality, values, and relationship characteristics. The accuracy criterion for couple personality was derived by averaging each partner's meta-perceptions of their couple personality on each of the Big Five dimensions.

As depicted in Table 2, the accuracy correlations reached statistical significance for ratings of male Agreeableness and Openness, but not for ratings of male Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism. When judging female personality Openness and Conscientiousness, accuracy reached statistical significance, but Agreeableness did not. Also, similar to perceptions of males, female Extraversion and Neuroticism accuracy was

not statistically significant. Judgments of couple personality followed a similar pattern to those judgments made of women—statistical significance of accuracy was achieved for perceptions of Conscientiousness and Openness, but not for Extraversion, Agreeableness, or Neuroticism.

Overall these findings show both similarities and differences with those impressions of personality made based on individually occupied bedrooms. When viewing bedrooms in comparison to living rooms, accuracy correlations also reached significance for ratings of Conscientiousness (as it did in the present study for women and couples) and for Openness. However, the Extraversion and Neuroticism accuracy correlations were significant in the case of bedrooms, but were not in the present study. The correlations did not reach conventional cutoffs of statistical significance but the effect-size estimates suggest some accuracy, especially in the case of Extraversion and Neuroticism. Also, Agreeableness correlations were significant in the study of bedrooms and in males based on living rooms; but Agreeableness correlations did not reach conventional levels of statistical significance in the case of females or couples based on living rooms but the effect sizes indicate there was some accuracy.

It should be noted that the accuracy criterion differed in the Gosling et al. (2002) bedroom study, where the accuracy criterion was based on a composite of self and informant ratings of personality (see Table 2 for details of how the Gosling et al. findings were calculated). Perhaps these differences in methodology account for the differences in accuracy perceptions. The findings also suggest potential differences in the ways in which cues are present and potentially utilized in different spaces. For example, perhaps

useful information in helping form these accurate judgments is present in the bedroom, but not in the living room.

To determine the accuracy of impression of the occupants' values and relationship characteristics, again I computed correlations between each occupant's self-reports and averaged observer ratings of both males and females individually. Again, in this case self-reports served as the accuracy criterion. As shown in Table 3, accuracy correlations reached significance for perceptions of male Benevolence and Hedonism, for female Conformity and Security, and for both male and female Tradition. Again, as in the case for consensus, these gender differences suggest potential differences in the ways in which *valid* cues are utilized to perceive male and female values. Contrary to my original predictions, accuracy correlations were not significant for either male or female relationship characteristics (commitment and satisfaction).

### **QUESTION 3: ENVIRONMENTAL CUES**

To further understand the ways in which impressions were being formed of couples based on their living-room environments, I implemented a lens-model analysis (Brunswik, 1956; See Figure 1 for a schematic representation of the model). For each Big Five personality trait for males, females, and couple personality, male and female values, and male and female relationship characteristics, this analysis points to the cues the observers may have used to form their judgments, the diagnosticity of those cues, and observers' sensitivity to the diagnosticity of the cues.

Overall utilization of environmental cues was computed by regressing the averaged codings of all of the observable environmental cues onto the observer ratings

for each of the Big Five dimensions. Adjusted-R values, which are shown in Table 6, indicate the extent to which observers may have used the coded observable cues in their ratings of the couples' personalities. Equivalent analyses (i.e., regression of the cues onto observer ratings) were not computed for the Gosling et al. (2002) study so they are not available for exact comparison. Unsurprisingly, in the case of the Big Five, those traits highest in consensus were also highest in cue utilization; results reveal that observers tended to utilize cues when forming impressions of men, women, and couple personality on the Big Five dimensions for judgments of Conscientiousness and Openness for both men and women, and judgments of Conscientiousness and Openness for couples. These patterns are similar to those found in bedrooms by Gosling et al. (2002). Interestingly, cue utilization was also high for ratings of male and female Neuroticism, which was viewed consensually but not accurately for males, females, or couples. As shown in Table 7, cues were also utilized when forming impressions of male Conformity, Hedonism, and Achievement, female Commitment, and both male and female Self-direction, Stimulation, and Security. These findings again suggest differences in the cues observers may be utilizing when forming impressions of both males and females.

To determine which specific cues were associated with judgments of each personality dimension, value, and relationship characteristic I computed correlations between the individual cues and observer ratings (See Tables 8 - 12 for cues associated with each personality dimension, Tables 13- 22 for cues associated with each value, and Tables 23 and 24 for cues associated with Commitment and Satisfaction respectively). Overall, it appears that with regards to the Big Five personality traits, those traits for

which observer agreement was strongest (i.e., Openness and Conscientiousness) produced the strongest associations between cues and observer ratings. Generally these cues tended to be cues relating to broad environmental features of the space (e.g., how organized, inviting the environment was) versus more specific features (e.g., the diversity of the occupants' books). Interestingly, ratings of Neuroticism were also associated with a wide swath of cues. Many of these cues appeared to be associated with ideas surrounding the overall environment of the space as well. An aspect of Neuroticism is sensitivity to one's environmental surroundings—specifically alertness to potential hazards or unexpected dangers. Perhaps observers were associating a well-organized, clean, tidy space with an individual who is aware and sensitive to the environment around them.

To determine whether or not these individual environmental cues were potentially valid, I computed correlations between the codings of the individual environmental cues and the self-reported traits of each of the occupants. With regards to the Big Five, very few cues were associated with self-reports of Extraversion, and surprisingly, few valid cues were associated with self-reports of Openness; however, some cues were related to Agreeableness. Many cues that were potentially utilized by observers in forming impressions of Conscientiousness were indeed valid (e.g., organization of and neatness of space, lack of clutter), and surprisingly, many of the cues utilized in impression formation of Neuroticism were also valid (e.g., cleanliness, neatness, and condition of space). It should be noted that these associations were often most valid for ratings of females and couple personality. These findings largely mirror those of Gosling et al. (2002) with

regards to Conscientiousness, but the patterns deviate somewhat for the other traits. For instance, in the Gosling et al. study cues were both utilized and valid when forming impressions of Openness and very few cues were utilized and valid when forming impressions of Neuroticism. This pattern suggests that there may be differences in the ways these cues are presented in different kinds of environments (i.e., bedrooms vs. living rooms).

With regards to values and relationship characteristics, again, there was variability from trait to trait and across gender in the cues utilized and those cues that were valid. Unsurprisingly cues were utilized most in ratings of values for which agreement was strong (i.e., Security, Tradition, and Conformity). Surprisingly, the cues utilized—for these three values as well as others— were often valid only for females' values. Interestingly, there were several cues utilized when forming impressions of satisfaction and commitment, but these cues were generally not valid (with the exception of male/female commitment and amount of books, female commitment and amount of magazines, and female satisfaction and the masculinity of the space).

Next, I examined cue validity more rigorously by regressing averaged codings of all of the environmental cues onto the couples' self-reports of personality (See data columns 4-6 in Table 6). Equivalent analyses (i.e., regression of the cues onto occupant self-ratings) were not computed for the Gosling et al. (2002) study so they are not available for exact comparison. Adjusted R-values indicate the extent to which the cues serve as valid indicators of self-reported occupant personality, values, and relationship characteristics. With respect to occupant personality results suggest that cues were only

valid when determining female occupant Neuroticism (See Table 6). Cues were also valid indicators of male Security and female Tradition and Benevolence. Equivalent analyses were not computed for the Gosling et al. (2002) study. It should be noted the results produced a negative adjusted-R value in a few of the relationships, suggesting the model does not fit for the current data well. Future work should explore which cues may be the best predictors to generate a model that better fits this data.

To determine observers' "sensitivity" (the extent to which observers were weighing cues in a way that reflected their diagnosticity), I computed column-vector correlations between the cue-utilization correlations and the cue-validity correlations for each personality dimension (See data columns 7-9 in Table 6 for the Big Five and Table 7, columns 5 and 6 for values and relationship characteristics). I computed a conservative measure of column-vector correlations based on the (Fisher's z-transformed) absolute cue-utilization and cue-validity correlations. This metric of cue sensitivity is useful in the sense that allows one to gauge the overall convergence between the cue-utilization and cue-validity patterns. If the observers' accuracy was indeed accounted for by the physical features of the room, the vector correlations should be highest for the accurately judged traits. Indeed, cue sensitivity was high for ratings of some of the accurately perceived traits (e.g., male Agreeableness, Tradition, and Hedonism, female Conscientiousness, Openness, Conformity, Tradition, and Security, and couple Conscientiousness and Openness). However, sensitivity was also high for other traits consensually, but not accurately assessed (e.g., Neuroticism), suggesting something other

than the environmental cues (perhaps use of stereotypes) are potentially influencing the formation of impressions.

### **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

This study aimed to answer three broad questions: (1) could perceptions of occupants be consensually formed on the basis of their shared living space, (2) were those impressions accurate, and (3) what environmental cues were potentially utilized and valid in the formation of those impressions. With respect to Question 1, results showed that indeed impressions showed interobserver consensus regarding both male and female occupants and their joint personality on the basis of their shared environment. Agreement varied across trait and was highest for impressions of Openness and Conscientiousness, which mirror findings in previous research examining impressions formed on the basis of bedrooms. Similarly, impressions also showed consensus regarding occupants' values and relationship characteristics.

Question 2 examined the accuracy of those impressions formed. Again, accuracy was achieved for some trait and value ratings. Many of the traits for which consensus was high, were also judged accurately; however, there were some differences in accuracy across males and females suggesting the potential differences in the ways males and females are perceived. However, analyses showed that the ratings of males, females, and couple traits were strongly intercorrelated, raising the possibility that the observers were not making meaningful distinctions between the three kinds of targets—even though male and female self-ratings differed from one another. There was also some variability

in accuracy across the Big Five personality traits in comparison to the Gosling et al. study of bedrooms.

With respect to Question 3, results revealed that different environmental cues were associated with different traits; often the cues assessed here were associated with observer judgments and sometimes they were also valid indicators of the traits, values, and relationship variables. Sensitivity to these cues was high in some accurately assessed traits, but also high in some inaccurately judged traits, again suggesting the potential for differences in perceptions of males and females, perhaps due to the use of gender stereotypes.

## **CHAPTER 4: GENERAL DISCUSSION**

### **Overview**

I examined consensus and accuracy of impressions made of individual occupants (heterosexual, cohabitating, romantic couples) based on their shared living room environments. I found evidence for inter-observer consensus in impressions for each individual's Big Five personality traits, couple personality, values, and relationship characteristics. Evidence of accuracy (indexed in terms of correlations between observer ratings and occupant self-reports) was found for some of those impressions formed (e.g., Conscientiousness, Openness, and Tradition) but not for others (e.g., Neuroticism, Benevolence, Satisfaction). Results also suggest observers are making use of environmental cues when forming these impressions and some of these cues are potentially valid. Further, the current findings suggest gender differences in how males and females express their individual differences in shared space and how those individual differences are perceived. These findings raise a few questions: (1) how do these findings compare to previous work conducted in individuals' unshared spaces, (2) what is driving inter-observer consensus when there is no accuracy in those impressions, and (3) why might impressions of males and females differ?

### **Individual versus Shared Environments**

Previous work on expression of self and personality within environments has focused on individually owned personal spaces. However, environments are often shared with another person, if not multiple others. The present work sought to begin exploring

how aspects of a person and their social relationships manifest themselves, and the traces left behind as a result of these manifestations, in shared spaces.

There have been a handful of studies examining what can be learned about an individual and aspects of his or her life based on physical spaces, but the literature is quite sparse. Even sparser is the literature that makes the effort to examine more than just self-reports of how individuals act within and perceive themselves in environments (Graham et al., 2011). However, one of the main reasons physical spaces are such a rich context in which to examine people and aspects of their daily lives is that physical spaces capture and collect people's everyday unique and repeated behaviors. By examining these discernable traces of behaviors (in addition to self-perceptions) scientists are able to get a fuller view of who a person really is. The present study has made efforts to capture and examine discernable traces in these occupants' environments; for this reason, I have chosen to explore how the current findings compare to the Gosling et al. (2002) study on bedrooms, which also examined specific environmental features of occupants' spaces. The Gosling et al. (2002) study provides an excellent comparison to provide context for understanding the differences in what can be learned about individuals when in solitary spaces versus shared spaces.

Five main differences between the Gosling et al. (2002) and present study should be noted before proceeding with this comparison. First, Gosling et al. define accuracy differently from how it is defined in the present study; Gosling et al. used both self- and informant ratings as the accuracy criterion whereas I used self-ratings only. Second, conceptually the findings across these two studies are comparable, but the indexes of

consensus and accuracy were computed slightly differently. These details are outlined in the notes section of Table 2 and above in Chapter 3. Third, observers in the Gosling et al. study were able to physically be present in the bedroom environments. Part of what made that feasible for Gosling et al. was the fact that they were examining student housing—which is often clustered together in a dormitory, sorority house, or apartment complex. It would have been ideal to undertake such procedures in the present study too, but it was not logistically feasible because I was examining an older population who were dispersed across a wide geographic area. It required a team of six individuals to document each environment (four to code, two to photograph). So also bringing another eight observers to the sessions would have been impractical; for this reason my observers viewed photographs of the spaces instead of inspecting the spaces in person. Fourth, in the Gosling et al. study photographs of the occupants were covered with a post-it note so that observers could not see what the occupants looked like. In the current study I decided to keep things as naturalistic as possible and photographs were not concealed. Future analyses could explore the potential impact these photographs had on observers' impressions. Fifth, the Gosling et al. study examined only Big Five traits (and thus did not include values or relationship characteristics), so my comparative analyses focus on the Big Five.

#### **CONSENSUS AND ACCURACY**

Table 2 summarizes the findings of consensus from the current study split by perceptions of males, females, and couple personality and presents the findings from Gosling et al. (2002) alongside the current results. In this comparison consensus reached

statistical significance in all perceptions of the Big Five in the current study, but what is most striking is that the pattern in strength of consensus is identical to the Gosling et al. (2002) study of bedrooms. This pattern is also identical to Gosling et al.'s (2002) examination of offices as well.

The fact that the current pattern in consensus replicates that of Gosling et al. augments evidence that perceptions can indeed be made about occupants based solely on their spaces. These findings also suggest there is potentially something specific about the information environments provide—and also potentially about the person-perception process that occurs when making judgments about people based on their spaces. The fact that the current findings present statistically significant consensus could be due to any number of things—sample size, type of space, the fact there are two occupants thus potentially twice the amount of behavioral residue to view. But this increase in consensus suggests there are potential differences in the amount and type of information gleaned from shared spaces compared to individually owned environments. Future work should continue to explore these potential causes of the statistically significant consensus across all traits and also work to unpack what person-perception processes might be at play when observing environments compared to other sources of data.

When comparing accuracy across the two studies, Openness is the trait that is consistently judged accurately across male, female, and couple personality based on living rooms, and single-occupant personality based on bedrooms. This finding strengthens the suggestion that physical spaces may be particularly useful for revealing this trait. This finding is consistent with the fact that “Tradition” was the only value that

also yielded high accuracy in the observer impressions. If Openness (a trait that deals with conventionality or lack thereof) is uniquely detectable in physical spaces then it is not surprising that a value such as Tradition (a trait shown to be negatively linked with Openness; Roccas et, al., 2002) would also be accurately detected. Perhaps there is something unique about the artifacts of a space that convey traits like Openness and values like Tradition.

For the other Big Five traits, female and couple, but not male, perceptions of Conscientiousness based on shared living rooms behave similarly to those impressions made in solitary bedrooms; that is, in both cases the trait can be perceived accurately. Agreeableness was accurately judged in men, but not women or couple personality, though it was accurately detected in bedrooms. (However, even though the accuracy correlations for couple Agreeableness did not reach conventional levels of statistical significance, the effect-size measures indicate there was some accuracy. These discrepancies between judgments of Agreeableness in the bedrooms versus a living room could be a manifestation of the accuracy criterion chosen in the current study, or they could also be a result of differences in the ways in which men and women personalize their environments and the extent to which they do so. One interesting feature of these results is the discrepancy between genders and the pair's "couple personality." Recall that "couple personality" was self-rated by each member of the dyad and they were asked to rate how others see them as a couple (i.e., meta-perceptions; Kenny, 1994); these scores were then averaged. Might one partner contribute more to this "couple personality" (perceptions others form of the pair) than the other partner? For instance, is couple

personality more strongly related to the personality of the female or male member of the couple? If there is a discrepancy in how the partners contribute to the couple personality, do the observers also detect this discrepancy? By and large, the self-reported personalities of the male and female members of the couples were generally uncorrelated with one another (though there were exceptions, for Tradition, Achievement, and Satisfaction). However, the personality of each partner was strongly related to overall couple personality (see Tables 4 and 5).

In contrast to the independence of the males and females self-reports the observer ratings of males and females were strongly correlated. Moreover, and consistent with self-reports, the observer ratings of males and of females were both strongly related to the observer ratings of couple personality. The fact that observers rate males, females, and couples similarly could be what contributes to the lack of accuracy. Specifically this lack of specification across target type (male vs. female vs. couple) could result in inaccurate perceptions.

Another striking pattern is that contrary to the Gosling et al. findings observers could not accurately perceive Extraversion, Agreeableness, or Neuroticism (though in the current study they rated both traits reliably—and again, although statistical significance was not reached for these variables, often the effect size estimates indicate some degree of accuracy). In the case of Neuroticism it seems as though the cues needed to make reliable impressions are present in shared environments but not in spaces occupied by individuals; but those cues measured and discussed here are not valid in shared spaces. However, there are obviously some environmental cues in individual spaces that do allow

for accurate impressions to be formed; perhaps they are just cues not analyzed in the Gosling et al. (2002) or the current study. The Gosling et al. study also discusses the use of stereotypes as a possible explanation for their findings. The use of gender specific stereotypes may be what aids the accurate detection of some traits in single-occupant spaces; that is, observers may detect the gender of the bedroom occupant and then simply make judgments about Neuroticism that are consistent with gender stereotypes. However, it might be harder to use these specific stereotypes in spaces that are occupied by both males and females.

One potential explanation for the discrepancies in Extraversion findings across the two studies could be the methodological differences between them. Recall that in the Gosling et al. study photographs of the targets were covered (with a post-it note). The post-it notes thus drew the observers' attention to the fact that there was a picture in which the occupant is depicted. Past work by Naumann et al. (2009) shows that Extraversion is a trait accurately detected simply by viewing a photograph of an individual. In the current study, we did not cover the photographs of the occupants so the observers could see the targets at times (even if they had no way of knowing for certain that a picture depicted one or both of the occupants).

Alternatively, the discrepancy across studies in the Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism findings could also be due to the fact both studies were examining different kinds of spaces; in particular, one study focused on bedrooms of college aged students, and the other focused on living rooms of adults from a wide age range. These two types of spaces are likely to be populated with different materials. In addition,

perhaps individuals personalize their environments and express their personalities within their spaces differently (i.e., with different types of items and features) as they age. The fact that the PLSCI was modified to fit the current study because its original form it did not include all of the items and features found within a living room is consistent with the idea that different aged people design their spaces differently.

## **CUES**

Recall one of the benefits to using physical environments to determine what a person is like is that it allows researchers to look at the specific cues that may inform those perceptions. Tables 8- 24 display the findings regarding which cues observers were potentially using when forming their impressions of the occupants and which of those cues are valid. Within each of the tables the Gosling et al. (2002) findings are presented alongside the current findings. In the Gosling et al. studies results indicated that observers made best use of cues related to Openness and Conscientiousness (traits for which their observers also had strongest agreement and strong accuracy). The present study on the other hand showed that my observers made strong use of cues for Openness and Conscientiousness as well, but in the case of Openness these cues were often not valid. This pattern suggest that the cues being assessed here are not the cues that help inform accurate impressions of Openness; that is the observers may have been drawing on cues that were not captured by our instrument and currently analyzed here. The pattern of findings also suggests that the cues being assessed here do help inform accurate judgments of Conscientiousness. According to the results observers are potentially using valid cues for both men, women, and couple personality but they are accurately detecting

only female and couple Conscientiousness. This pattern suggests the need to look further into what comprises couple personality and the ways in which that composite personality is manifested in shared environments.

Interestingly observers are also potentially detecting and using cues that are actually valid with regards to occupant Neuroticism (especially for women and couples), which may account for the consensus that was found for Neuroticism in the present study; however this finding does not explain the lack of accuracy in those judgments made in living rooms. One possible explanation for this incongruence between valid cue use, consensus, and accuracy could be the observers' beliefs about the relationship between the occupants and their personalities. In other words perhaps the observers are relying on specific gender or specialized stereotypes when viewing certain cues to form their impressions.

To test the extent to which the same cues were utilized and valid across both the bedroom and living room study I computed vector correlations between the 41 absolute utilized cues and valid cues that were common to both studies for each Big Five dimension (See Table 25 for full findings). Results indicate that when forming impressions for both Agreeableness and Conscientious for men, women, and couples, for impressions of Extraversion for men and women, and for impressions of Openness in couples, the potential cues used were the same across bedrooms and living rooms. However, when it came to valid cues used, those cues were only the same in living rooms as they were in bedrooms when forming impressions of couple Agreeableness and female Conscientiousness. This pattern points to specific similarities and differences in how

traits were perceived across the two studies. For example, in both living rooms and bedrooms, judgments of Agreeableness were associated with cues such as appearing cheerful and colorful and judgments of Conscientiousness were associated with cues such as appearing organized and uncluttered. However, judgments of Openness were associated with cues such as appearing full (versus empty) and multi-purpose (versus single-purposed) in bedrooms but cues such as appearing cheap and in poor condition in living rooms.

This pattern points to specific similarities and differences in the diagnosticity of cues across the two studies. For example, in both living rooms and bedrooms, male Extraversion was associated with being decorated, male Agreeableness was associated with being colorful and stylish and male Conscientiousness was associated with being cheerful and in good condition. However, male Openness levels were associated with cues such as appearing full and multi-purpose in bedrooms but cues such as appearing cheap and in poor condition in living rooms.

The source of these differences is not clear but they could be due to the differences in populations (college students versus older adults). Both living rooms and bedrooms (especially student bedrooms) function quite differently from one another in that college bedrooms serve many purposes because they are the only living space the student owns. Older adults (at least those adults in this study) generally have multiple rooms in their living space so the function of each space varies.

### **Instances of Inaccuracy**

#### **STEREOTYPES**

Existing models of person-perception processes may shed light on why we might see consensus and accuracy in some cases, but consensus and no accuracy in others. Kenny's Weighted Average Model (WAM; 1994) emphasizes the role observer stereotypes can play in impression formation. WAM essentially states that observer consensus increases when observers hold—and use—similar stereotypes when forming impressions. So for example, assume observers use the stereotype that women are more anxious and fastidious than men. Next assume Living Room A has décor and objects that indicate a woman has decorated the place (e.g., magazines targeted to women), but Living Room B has the hallmarks of a male decorating the space. Observers then may assume Living Room A to be associated with more stereotypically female traits and Living Room B to be associated with more stereotypically male traits. Consensus would thus be promoted when forming impressions of those stereotypically female and male traits.

Another explanation for lack of accuracy may be that there are more specialized stereotypes at play. Observers knew that each couple was a heterosexual couple living with one another in a long-term relationship—which could have influenced how they perceived the couples. Also, they could have made inferences of the couple's couple personality or one partner of the dyad based on their impressions of only one of the partners. For example, perhaps some observers hold specific beliefs about what “type” of male is partnered with a certain “type” of female. So perhaps an observer reasoned, if the environment looks like it partially belongs to a particularly feminine, neurotic, fastidious woman, then she must be partnered with a male who is calm, stable, and flexible. This

sort of reasoning could lead to either accuracy or inaccuracy depending on the extent to which all observers made these sorts of judgments, the extent to which there is some truth to these presumed relationships among partners (Lee et al., 1995).

Something else to consider is observers' knowledge and use of stereotypical gender roles and cultural and relationship norms. Observers were able to see everything within the couples' spaces and often couples displayed photographs of themselves and their families. So it is quite possible that observers used these cues of what the couples looked like (e.g., via their ethnicity or how they dressed) to form judgments about how the couple interacts and relates with one another. They could have also made inferences about the closeness of the couple or how connected and in-tune they are with one another by how they are posed within the photographs. For example, a couple standing uncomfortably and stiffly side-by-side paints a significantly different picture than a photo of a couple embracing each other in a giant hug while wearing goofy facial expressions. In future work the current photographic data could be coded for various cues found within photographs displayed in the occupants' environments to discern any specific cues observers may have detected and used to form their impressions. I did not collect specific information on the extent to which the occupants subscribe to typical gender roles, cultural norms, or relationship norms so I cannot answer these questions with the present data. However, future studies should begin to explore how culture and social norms influence individuals' relationships with and interactions within physical environments.

Yet another explanation for the lack of accuracy in some cases could be the use of invalid stereotypes when forming impressions. The use of stereotypes can either promote

or hinder accuracy depending on the extent to which the stereotype holds a kernel of truth (Lee, Jussim, & McCauley, 1995). It is reasonable to assume certain invalid stereotypes were being formed about the occupants, the occupants' belongings, and who was controlling and influencing the various aspects of the space. For instance, observers may hold the stereotype that women are more organized than men—but perhaps the color-coded, alphabetized bookshelf was actually a result of the male occupant. I did not code which item belonged to which partner, or even which items observers believed belonged to each partner, so it is difficult to untangle how these perception processes are working. It is complicated to unravel what fragments of personalization belong to each occupant when examining shared environments. One way future work could tackle these issues is to examine spaces over time, beginning with when cohabitation first takes place. For instance, researchers could follow students moving into dorm space, office workers moving into office space, or even couples cohabitating with one another for the first time. It would still be time consuming to document the individuals' belongings, but many interesting things could be examined such as how gender differences in personalization occur and are mitigated in shared environments. Work by Gosling et al. (2005b) shows differences in the kinds of items men and women have in their private bedrooms (for instance, women have more flowers, plants, and beauty products whereas men have more books and sports related items in their bedrooms; Gosling et al., 2005b). Work should look to see how these types of cues (i.e., specific items and furniture) appear in men and women's shared environments; for example, are there more "female items" versus "male items" in environments shared by opposite-sexed occupants? Future work should also

look at how these gender differences in possessions contribute to the evolution of shared spaces and how they become integrated across pairs or groups of people.

### **GENDER DIFFERENCES IN PERSONALIZATION**

The use of stereotypes (whether they are valid or not) may not be the only thing contributing to the gender differences we see in the present findings. Past research has unearthed these differences to some extent within the context of environments of individuals' of all ages. For example, one study examined the ways in which adolescence's rooms were decorated across genders (Jones, Taylor, Dick, Singh, & Cook; 2007). Differences were found in the types of items boys and girls had in their spaces; for instance, girls tended to have more stuffed animals and photographs whereas boys tended to have more things they had constructed themselves (like model rockets) and sports-related items (Jones et al., 2007). It could be argued some of these items fall in line with gender stereotypes and some stereotypes have a kernel of truth (Lee et al., 1995). Also, as mentioned previously, work by Gosling et al. (2005b) also found differences across genders in the ways in which each gender personalized their spaces with specific items (e.g., women have more photos of family and friends than men do) and with regards to their spaces overall ambiances (e.g., female spaces are more organized and colorful than men's spaces).

In a study examining personalization in office spaces, Wells (2000) discovered significant differences in personalization across male and female office workers. Specifically, men and women differed in the extent to which they personalized their spaces (i.e., women personalized more), the types of items they personalized with, and

the reasons for personalization of the space (Wells, 2000). These findings suggest that there are potentially individual differences not only in gender preferences for certain items, but also in the underlying motives for one to personalize in their space in their first place. Certainly the present findings shed some light on what occurs when these two genders come together to personalize an environment, but future work should be conducted to examine the extent to which males and females contribute to the design of shared space and the kinds of items and features each gender contributes to the environment. Perhaps most importantly, future work should examine individuals' reasons for personalizing their spaces in the first place. If gender differences are expressed and detectable in space to some extent (just as personality traits are), then perhaps other individual differences such as personality, values, age, culture, race, socioeconomic status, may also influence motives for personalization and thus how personalization is reflected in physical spaces. In fact, some of these differences are seen within the context of individual environments. For instance Gosling et al. (2005b) also found ethnic differences in personalization addition to gender differences. They found few ethnic differences with regards to global attributes of the spaces (e.g., ambiance and layout of the environment) but they did find some differences amongst specific items and features of the space. For instance, Asians (compared to whites) had fewer computer books and CDs of musicals, but more health related books and q-tips (Gosling et al, 2005b). These findings suggest similar differences might emerge in shared environments. Future exploration should examine how other individual differences present themselves in shared spaces and what personalization occurs when unique individual differences are

integrated (e.g., the homogeneity of items found in same-race couples versus mixed-race couples).

### **Potential Limitations**

There are several potential limitations with regards to both the study design and the statistical analyses used here. The first few limitations relate to the environments under investigation. Occupants were instructed not to alter their environments prior to our arrival at their homes, however it is possible that they altered their space in some way to make them appear a certain way (e.g., cleaner, more organized) that was different from how they looked on a day-to-day basis. However, I do not believe the environments were altered significantly for two main reasons: First, the homeowners were told all of their data would be anonymous and their identities kept confidential. Second, a large part of incentive for participation was to receive personalized personality feedback of the occupants' personalities and the "personality" of their space (i.e., how it made others feel). Previous work by Swann (1983) supports the idea that individuals want to be viewed accurately by others, even when those views are less than favorable. So altering the space would undermine the accuracy of that feedback.

I do not have reason to believe the occupants altered their spaces for the purpose of our visit, but the present study design does not account for the potential that the occupants have personalized their space in a socially desirable way. Living rooms were selected as the target room *because* they are environments in which occupants potentially *expect* others to visit. With the knowledge that others may one day see this public space it increases the possibility for occupants to generate environments that are more positive or

incongruent with their actual personalities and values. However, again, past work shows that individuals strive to be seen accurately even when perceptions may not be favorable (Swann, 1983). Also, research in the domain of online environments (e.g., Facebook, personal websites) shows individuals generally present accurate depictions of themselves (Wilson, Gosling, & Graham, 2012; Back et al., 2010; Back, Schmukle, & Egloff, 2008; Machilek, & Schutz, 2006; Vazire & Gosling, 2004). One theory for why people depict themselves accurately in domains such as Facebook is that the domain helps promote accountability for accurate depictions of self. Often a person's online friends are also their offline friends, therefore those people have access to what a person is truly like offline. Should any incongruence emerge in offline and online personality presentation a person's social network is there to help correct (or point out) that incongruence. Thus, an individual may be motivated to present themselves accurately because they know others will detect and potentially point out any discrepancies. Perhaps this accountability for staying congruent to one's identity would also be found in a public environment in the home (such as one's living room) as well. The focus of the current study was public spaces (living rooms) but many of my participants permitted me to enter the other spaces of their homes (e.g., bedrooms, bathrooms, offices) to collect data via photographs. Examination of these other spaces indicated that the appearance of the living room was generally similar to these other spaces in terms of style choices and the overall state of the rooms (e.g., in terms of messiness). This consistency in appearance across rooms—both those anticipated to be studied by the research team and those not anticipated to be

studied by the research team—suggests that the occupants had not altered their living rooms for the sake the of the assessments.

Another limitation of the present work results from the cues assessed. We went to extensive lengths to document as many of the items and features as possible, but it is possible we missed certain cues that were useful pieces of information that observers were utilized in the judgments and/or that were valid. Also with respect to cues, the fact that I did not code for which items and features were generated by and belonged to each individual in the couple limits my ability to detect how these cues are associated with each occupant.

It should also be noted that although the coupled occupants were the primary owners of these environments, they were potentially influenced by others interacting in the space (e.g., visitors, other family members, children, pets).

The findings are also limited by the potential role of statistical interdependence. By nature of examining shared spaces interdependence in the target environment is inevitable. Additionally, by examining couples—who exist in the same relationship and in the same home environment—some level interdependence is unavoidable. The analytical plan of the present study attempted to reduce the effects of these instances of interdependence, but there is no known standard for how to deal with data of this type. There may however be ways in which to modify and implement well-established statistical modeling (e.g., Kenny, Kashy, & Cook's Dyadic Data Analysis models; 2006) within the context of the lens model analysis.

The sheer amount of correlations computed means that many of the significant correlations will be significant by chance; thus, the strongest evidence is provided by the correlations that match the previous findings in bedrooms because the present work can be seen as a conceptual replication of the earlier bedroom study.

Also note there were strong ceiling effects for the participants' self-reports of satisfaction and commitment. These ceiling effects serve to reduce variability and therefore reduce the likelihood of finding accuracy in the observer judgments (because there is little variability for the observers to detect). Therefore, future work should try to examine measures that might elicit greater variability, such as more specific measures of satisfaction and commitment (rather than the current global measures) and other types of relationship characteristics (e.g., how close the partners feel to one another, conflict resolution abilities, negotiation style).

### **Conclusion**

The present study lays the foundation for exploration of shared spaces. It highlights some of what can and cannot be learned about pairs of individuals occupying and affecting the same environment. The present work also begins to examine the specific ways occupants manipulate and craft their environments when cohabitating. What is apparent from this work is that much can be learned about individuals and their social interactions from the environments that they inhabit. Individuals do not exist in a vacuum and neither do their social interactions. It is therefore important to continue to look to the environments in which people exist and interact with one another. This work has made great strides in beginning this exploration but it only scratches the surface of

what can be learned from shared spaces and environments more broadly.

## Appendix A

As mentioned in the text there is a need for future exploration into more advanced statistical modeling of the data. People who interact in pairs or dyads potentially influence one another's attitudes and behaviors—this is especially true in romantic relationships (Campbell & Kashey, 2002). By nature of the current dataset—because I am examining romantic couples—there is interdependence between the participants. The current analysis accounts for this interdependency by separating and analyzing males and females separately. This separation however makes the assumption that there is something specifically different about men and women—and in the context of this study, specifically that there is some inherent difference between men and women in environments. Though past work shows substantial gender differences in environments between males and females of all ages (See Chapter 4 for details on this literature) thus supporting the theoretical argument that this potentially a valid way to examine males and females in environments, there are other analyses and practices that have been developed by relationship researchers to account for the interdependence of couples.

Accounting for interdependence within dyads can begin with taking into account actor-partner effects; to do this Kenny and colleagues have generated the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM; Kashy & Kenny, 2000). The APIM model essentially examines how a person's independent variables influence their own dependent variables (i.e., the “actor effect) and their partner's dependent variables (i.e., the “partner effect”). The APIM model works with both distinguishable and indistinguishable dyads thus making it appropriate for the current dataset (which has distinguishable dyads since I am

examining heterosexual couples that can be distinguished by gender). There are many ways one can go about generating these actor-partner effects, but Campbell and Kashy (2002) have generated a very straightforward way of doing this through hierarchical linear modeling techniques (HLM).

By implementing these methods in the current data I would be able to investigate between-dyad variables, within-dyad variables, and mixed predictor variables (Kenny, 1988, 1996). A between-dyad variable is a variable for which the scores are the same for each member of the dyad. In the current data an example of a between-dyad variable may be the presence of a coded environmental cue. A within-dyad variable is a variable that is different for each member of the dyad but whose average score is the same for all dyads. An example of a within-dyads variable in the current study would be gender. Mixed predictor variables are variables that differ both within dyads and between dyads. Calculations of both partner and actor effects are only possible with mixed predictor variables—though these effects can be estimated in interactions between mixed variables and between or within-dyad variables (Campbell & Kashy, 2002). Examples of mixed predictor variables in the current study may be personality traits, values, and levels of satisfaction and commitment. By using HLM to examine these actor-partner effects I can explore the interactions of these various types of variables. For example, I can explore how gender or cues in the environment interact with an individual's personality traits. I can also examine actor-partner effects that occur within my mixed variables like traits, values, and relationship characteristics. By illuminating these effects and interactions I

will be able to get a more comprehensive view of the current dataset and the influences each parent has over the other and their shared environment.

## Appendix B

### Occupant Self-reports

#### BFI (V44) (Self)

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who likes to spend time with others? Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

---

Disagree Strongly 1	Disagree a little 2	Neither agree nor disagree 3	Agree a little 4	Agree strongly 5
---------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

---

#### *I See MYSELF as Someone Who . . .*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| ____ 1. Is talkative                            | ____ 23. Tends to be lazy                           |
| ____ 2. Tends to find fault with others         | ____ 24. Is emotionally stable, not easily upset    |
| ____ 3. Does a thorough job                     | ____ 25. Is inventive                               |
| ____ 4. Is depressed, blue                      | ____ 26. Has an assertive personality               |
| ____ 5. Is original, comes up with new ideas    | ____ 27. Can be cold and aloof                      |
| ____ 6. Is reserved                             | ____ 28. Perseveres until the task is finished      |
| ____ 7. Is helpful and unselfish with others    | ____ 29. Can be moody                               |
| ____ 8. Can be somewhat careless                | ____ 30. Values artistic, aesthetic experiences     |
| ____ 9. Is relaxed, handles stress well         | ____ 31. Is sometimes shy, inhibited                |
| ____ 10. Is curious about many different things | ____ 32. Is considerate and kind to almost everyone |
| ____ 11. Is full of energy                      | ____ 33. Does things efficiently                    |
| ____ 12. Starts quarrels with others            | ____ 34. Remains calm in tense situations           |
| ____ 13. Is a reliable worker                   | ____ 35. Prefers work that is routine               |
| ____ 14. Can be tense                           | ____ 36. Is outgoing, sociable                      |
| ____ 15. Is ingenious, a deep thinker           | ____ 37. Is sometimes rude to others                |
| ____ 16. Generates a lot of enthusiasm          | ____ 38. Makes plans and follows through with them  |
| ____ 17. Has a forgiving nature                 | ____ 39. Gets nervous easily                        |

\_\_\_\_ 18. Tends to be disorganized

\_\_\_\_ 19. Worries a lot

\_\_\_\_ 20. Has an active imagination

\_\_\_\_ 21. Tends to be quiet

\_\_\_\_ 22. Is generally trusting

\_\_\_\_ 40. Likes to reflect, play with ideas

\_\_\_\_ 41. Has few artistic interests

\_\_\_\_ 42. Likes to cooperate with others

\_\_\_\_ 43. Is easily distracted

\_\_\_\_ 44. Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature

**BFI (V44)**  
**(Couple)**

*Sometimes groups or pairs of people possess a “collective personality”. Think about the impression others have of you and your spouse as a COUPLE. Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you and your spouse’s collective COUPLE personality. For example, do you agree that others see you two as a COUPLE who likes to spend time with others? Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.*

---

Disagree Strongly 1	Disagree a little 2	Neither agree nor disagree 3	Agree a little 4	Agree strongly 5
---------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

---

*I Think Others See Us as a COUPLE Who . . .*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| ____ 1. Is talkative                            | ____ 23. Tends to be lazy                           |
| ____ 2. Tends to find fault with others         | ____ 24. Is emotionally stable, not easily upset    |
| ____ 3. Does a thorough job                     | ____ 25. Is inventive                               |
| ____ 4. Is depressed, blue                      | ____ 26. Has an assertive personality               |
| ____ 5. Is original, comes up with new ideas    | ____ 27. Can be cold and aloof                      |
| ____ 6. Is reserved                             | ____ 28. Perseveres until the task is finished      |
| ____ 7. Is helpful and unselfish with others    | ____ 29. Can be moody                               |
| ____ 8. Can be somewhat careless                | ____ 30. Values artistic, aesthetic experiences     |
| ____ 9. Is relaxed, handles stress well         | ____ 31. Is sometimes shy, inhibited                |
| ____ 10. Is curious about many different things | ____ 32. Is considerate and kind to almost everyone |
| ____ 11. Is full of energy                      | ____ 33. Does things efficiently                    |
| ____ 12. Starts quarrels with others            | ____ 34. Remains calm in tense situations           |
| ____ 13. Is a reliable worker                   | ____ 35. Prefers work that is routine               |
| ____ 14. Can be tense                           | ____ 36. Is outgoing, sociable                      |
| ____ 15. Is ingenious, a deep thinker           | ____ 37. Is sometimes rude to others                |
| ____ 16. Generates a lot of enthusiasm          | ____ 38. Makes plans and follows through with them  |
| ____ 17. Has a forgiving nature                 | ____ 39. Gets nervous easily                        |
| ____ 18. Tends to be disorganized               | ____ 40. Likes to reflect, play with ideas          |

\_\_\_\_ 19. Worries a lot

\_\_\_\_ 20. Has an active imagination

\_\_\_\_ 21. Tends to be quiet

\_\_\_\_ 22. Is generally trusting

\_\_\_\_ 41. Has few artistic interests

\_\_\_\_ 42. Likes to cooperate with others

\_\_\_\_ 43. Is easily distracted

\_\_\_\_ 44. Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature

TwIVI: Twenty Item Values Inventory for Males

Person Profiles

Here we briefly describe some people. Please read each description and think about how much each person is or is not like you. Put an X in the box to the right that shows how much the person in the description is like you.

**HOW MUCH LIKE YOU IS THIS PERSON?**

	<b>very much like me</b>	<b>like me</b>	<b>some- what like me</b>	<b>a little like me</b>	<b>not like me</b>	<b>not like me at all</b>
1. He believes he should always show respect to his parents and to older people. It is important to him to be obedient	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Religious belief is important to him. He tries hard to do what his religion requires.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. It's very important to him to help the people around him. He wants to care for their well-being.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. He thinks it is important that every person in the world be treated equally. He believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. He thinks it's important to be interested in things. He likes to be curious and to try to understand all	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**HOW MUCH LIKE YOU IS THIS PERSON?**

	<b>very much like me</b>	<b>like me</b>	<b>some- what like me</b>	<b>a little like me</b>	<b>not like me</b>	<b>not like me at all</b>
sorts of things.						
6. He likes to take risks. He is always looking for adventures.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. He seeks every chance he can to have fun. It is important to him to do things that give him pleasure.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Getting ahead in life is important to him. He strives to do better than others.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. He always wants to be the one who makes the decisions. He likes to be the leader.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. It is important to him that things be organized and clean. He really does not like things to be a mess.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. It is important to him to always behave properly. He wants to avoid doing anything people would say is wrong.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. He thinks it is best to do things in traditional ways. It is	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**HOW MUCH LIKE YOU IS THIS PERSON?**

	<b>very much like me</b>	<b>like me</b>	<b>some- what like me</b>	<b>a little like me</b>	<b>not like me</b>	<b>not like me at all</b>
important to him to keep up the customs he has learned.						
13. It is important to him to respond to the needs of others. He tries to support those he knows.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. He believes all the worlds' people should live in harmony. Promoting peace among all groups in the world is important to him.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Thinking up new ideas and being creative is important to him. He likes to do things in his own original way.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. He thinks it is important to do lots of different things in life. He always looks for new things to try.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. He really wants to enjoy life. Having a good time is very important to him.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Being very successful is important	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**HOW MUCH LIKE YOU IS THIS PERSON?**

	<b>very much like me</b>	<b>like me</b>	<b>some- what like me</b>	<b>a little like me</b>	<b>not like me</b>	<b>not like me at all</b>
to him. He likes to impress other people.						
19. It is important to him to be in charge and tell others what to do. He wants people to do what he says.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Having a stable government is important to him. He is concerned that the social order be protected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Thank you for your cooperation!

---

TIVI scale scoring: Conformity: 1,11; Tradition: 2, 12; Benevolence: 3, 13; Universalism: 4, 14; Self-Direction: 5, 15; Stimulation: 6, 16; Hedonism: 7, 17; Achievement: 8, 18; Power: 9, 19; Security: 10, 20.

TwIVI: Twenty Item Values Inventory for Females

Person Profiles

Here we briefly describe some people. Please read each description and think about how much each person is or is not like you. Put an X in the box to the right that shows how much the person in the description is like you.

**HOW MUCH LIKE YOU IS THIS PERSON?**

	<b>very much like me</b>	<b>like me</b>	<b>some- what like me</b>	<b>a little like me</b>	<b>not like me</b>	<b>not like me at all</b>
1. She believes she should always show respect to her parents and to older people. It is important to her to be obedient.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Religious belief is important to her. She tries hard to do what her religion requires.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. It's very important to her to help the people around her. She wants to care for their well-being.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. She thinks it is important that every person in the world be treated equally. She believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. She thinks it's important to be interested in things. She likes to be curious and to try to	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**HOW MUCH LIKE YOU IS THIS PERSON?**

	<b>very much like me</b>	<b>like me</b>	<b>some- what like me</b>	<b>a little like me</b>	<b>not like me</b>	<b>not like me at all</b>
understand all sorts of things.						
6. She likes to take risks. She is always looking for adventures.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. She seeks every chance she can to have fun. It is important to her to do things that give her pleasure.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Getting ahead in life is important to her. She strives to do better than others.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. She always wants to be the one who makes the decisions. She likes to be the leader.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. It is important to her that things be organized and clean. She really does not like things to be a mess.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. It is important to her to always behave properly. She wants to avoid doing anything people would say is wrong.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**HOW MUCH LIKE YOU IS THIS PERSON?**

	<b>very much like me</b>	<b>like me</b>	<b>some- what like me</b>	<b>a little like me</b>	<b>not like me</b>	<b>not like me at all</b>
12. She thinks it is best to do things in traditional ways. It is important to her to keep up the customs she has learned.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. It is important to her to respond to the needs of others. She tries to support those she knows.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. She believes all the worlds' people should live in harmony. Promoting peace among all groups in the world is important to her.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Thinking up new ideas and being creative is important to her. She likes to do things in her own original way.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. She thinks it is important to do lots of different things in life. She always looks for new things to try.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. She really wants to enjoy life. Having a good time is very important to her.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**HOW MUCH LIKE YOU IS THIS PERSON?**

	<b>very much like me</b>	<b>like me</b>	<b>some- what like me</b>	<b>a little like me</b>	<b>not like me</b>	<b>not like me at all</b>
18. Being very successful is important to her. She likes to impress other people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. It is important to her to be in charge and tell others what to do. She wants people to do what she says.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Having a stable government is important to her. She is concerned that the social order be protected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Thank you for your cooperation!

---

TIVI scale scoring: Conformity: 1,11; Tradition: 2, 12; Benevolence: 3, 13; Universalism: 4, 14; Self-Direction: 5, 15; Stimulation: 6, 16; Hedonism: 7, 17; Achievement: 8, 18; Power: 9, 19; Security: 10, 20.

How committed are you to...

	Not at all	Slightly committed	Committed	Moderately committed	Strongly committed
Your relationship	1	2	3	4	5
Your partner	1	2	3	4	5

How satisfied are you with your...

	Not at all	Slightly unsatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied
Your relationship	1	2	3	4	5
Your partner	1	2	3	4	5
Your life	1	2	3	4	5

## Appendix C

### Observers Ratings of Occupants

Think about the occupants whose home you have just viewed. Here are a number of personality traits that may or may not apply to the **MALE** in this couple.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement. You should rate the extent to which the pair of traits applies to the **MALE** in this couple even if one characteristic applies more strongly than the other.

The **MALE** in this couple is...

	Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Moderately agree	Strongly agree
Extraverted, enthusiastic.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Critical, quarrelsome.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dependable, self-disciplined.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Anxious, easily upset.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Open to new experiences, complex.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Reserved, quiet.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sympathetic, warm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disorganized, careless.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Calm, emotionally stable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Conventional, uncreative.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Continue to think about the MALE in this relationship. To what extent do you think he is COMMITTED to...

	Not at all	Slightly committed	Committed	Moderately committed	Strongly committed
His relationship	1	2	3	4	5
His partner	1	2	3	4	5

Continue to think about the MALE in this relationship. To what extent do you think he is SATISFIED with...

	Not at all	Slightly unsatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied
His relationship	1	2	3	4	5
His partner	1	2	3	4	5
His life	1	2	3	4	5

Here we briefly describe some people. Please read each description and think about how much each person is or is not like the **MALE** in this couple. Indicate how much the person in the description is like the **MALE** in this couple.

	Very much like him	Like him	Somewhat like him	A little like him	Not like him	Not like at all
He believes he should always show respect to his parents and to older people. It is important to him to be obedient.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Religious belief is important to him. He tries hard to do what his religion requires.	1	2	3	4	5	6
It's very important to him to help the people around him. He wants to care for their well-being.	1	2	3	4	5	6
He thinks it is important that every person in the world be treated equally. He believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
He thinks it's important to be interested in things. He likes to be curious and to try to understand all sorts of things.	1	2	3	4	5	6
He likes to take risks. He is always looking for adventures.	1	2	3	4	5	6
He seeks every chance he can to have fun. It is important to him to do things that give him pleasure.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Being very successful is important to him. He likes to impress other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6
It is important to him to be in charge and tell others what to do. He wants people to do what he says.	1	2	3	4	5	6
It is important to him that things be	1	2	3	4	5	6

<b>organized and clean. He really does not like things to be a mess.</b>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Think about the occupants whose home you have just viewed. Here are a number of personality traits that may or may not apply to the **FEMALE** in this couple.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement. You should rate the extent to which the pair of traits applies to the **FEMALE** in this couple even if one characteristic applies more strongly than the other.

The **FEMALE** in this couple is...

	Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Moderately agree	Strongly agree
Extraverted, enthusiastic.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Critical, quarrelsome.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dependable, self-disciplined.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Anxious, easily upset.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Open to new experiences, complex.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Reserved, quiet.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sympathetic, warm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disorganized, careless.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Calm, emotionally stable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Conventional, uncreative.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Continue to think about the FEMALE in this relationship. To what extent do you think she is COMMITTED to...

	Not at all	Slightly committed	Committed	Moderately committed	Strongly committed
Her relationship	1	2	3	4	5
Her partner	1	2	3	4	5

Continue to think about the FEMALE in this relationship. To what extent do you think she is SATISFIED with...

	Not at all	Slightly unsatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied
Her relationship	1	2	3	4	5
Her partner	1	2	3	4	5
Her life	1	2	3	4	5

Here we briefly describe some people. Please read each description and think about how much each person is or is not like the **FEMALE** in this couple. Indicate how much the person in the description is like the **FEMALE** in this couple.

	Very much like her	Like her	Somewhat like her	A little like her	Not like her	Not like her at all
She believes she should always show respect to her parents and to older people. It is important to her to be obedient.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Religious belief is important to her. She tries hard to do what her religion requires.	1	2	3	4	5	6
It's very important to her to help the people around her. She wants to care for their well-being.	1	2	3	4	5	6
She thinks it is important that every person in the world be treated equally. She believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
She thinks it's important to be interested in things. She likes to be curious and to try to understand all sorts of things.	1	2	3	4	5	6
She likes to take risks. She is always looking for adventures.	1	2	3	4	5	6
She seeks every chance she can to have fun. It is important to her to do things that give her pleasure.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Being very successful is important to her. She likes to impress other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6
It is important to her to be in charge and tell others what to do. She wants people to do what she says.	1	2	3	4	5	6
It is important to her	1	2	3	4	5	6

<b>that things be organized and clean. She really does not like things to be a mess.</b>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Sometimes groups of pairs of people possess a "collective personality". Think about how you view these occupants as a **COUPLE**. For example, do you see them as a **COUPLE** who likes to spend time together?

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement. You should rate the extent to which the pair of traits applies to the **COUPLE** as a whole even if one characteristic applies more strongly than the other.

These occupants are a **COUPLE** who...

	Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Moderately agree	Strongly agree
Extraverted, enthusiastic.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Critical, quarrelsome.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dependable, self-disciplined.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Anxious, easily upset.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Open to new experiences, complex.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Reserved, quiet.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sympathetic, warm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disorganized, careless.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Calm, emotionally stable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Conventional, uncreative.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

## Appendix D

### Coding Form For Cues Present in Occupants' Living Rooms

#### Personal Living Space Cue Inventory (PLSCI)

*Version—Living Room*

#### STEP 1 -- INITIAL APPRAISAL

**Below indicate the degree to which you notice the following odors in the space. If the odor is not listed, insert it on the ? lines. Also, indicate where the fragrance is coming from with the following codes: p=perfume; i=incense; af=air freshener; f=food; d=drugs; c = candle**

Citrus _____	Weak	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strong
Vanilla _____	Weak	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strong
Lavender _____	Weak	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strong
Mint _____	Weak	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strong
Cinnamon _____	Weak	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strong
Floral _____	Weak	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strong
Musk _____	Weak	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strong
Food _____	Weak	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strong
? _____	Weak	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strong
? _____	Weak	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strong

(CIRCLE ONE) Does the room smell      BAD              GOOD              DANK              NEUTRAL

**Do you see any of the following items, and if so, how many?**

Plug-in air fresheners	Yes	No	Amount?
Incense	Yes	No	Amount?
Diffusers	Yes	No	Amount?
Spray air fresheners	Yes	No	Amount?
Potpourri	Yes	No	Amount?
Candles	Yes	No	Amount?      Describe:
Have the candles been lit?	Yes	No	How many have been lit?
Are any candles lit today?	Yes	No	How many are lit today?

**What kind of NOISE is occurring in and around the space? And to what is the noise level? Also, please explain the noise you are hearing (i.e., what is it)**

	<i>Quiet</i>						<i>Noisy</i>	Explain
In room	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
In house	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Outside      1      2      3      4      5      6      7      \_\_\_\_\_

**What is the lighting like in this space? Indicate the degree to which the space is lit. Also, indicate HOW MANY of each types of lamps are present in the room.**

	<i>Dim/dark</i>							<i>Well Lit</i>	
Overall	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Natural	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Artificial		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Fixtures: ( ) Desk lamp ( ) Free standing lamp ( ) ceiling lamp  
 ( ) strip lighting ( ) strands of x-mas lights ( ) Can Light

Other lights?  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**What is the temperature like in the space?**

Cold    1      2      3      4      5      6      7    Hot

**What is the atmosphere like in the space?**

Stuffy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Drafty
Stale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Fresh

**What is the general state of the room? Remember, indicate the degree to which the room is each of these things—use your best judgment.**

Poor Condition	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good Condition
Undecorated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Decorated
Gloomy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Cheerful
Drab	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Colorful
Dirty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Clean
Poorly Organized	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Well Organized
Messy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Neat
Uncluttered	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Cluttered
Empty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Full
Cramped	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Roomy
Cheap	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Expensive
Uncomfortable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Comfortable
Repelling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inviting
Small	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Large
Ordinary	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Distinctive

Unstylish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Stylish
Old Fashioned	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Modern
Old	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	New
Single Purpose	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Multiple Purpose
Masculine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Feminine

**STEP 2 – FLOORS, WINDOWS, & BROAD FEATURES OF THE ROOM**

**What kind of flooring does this space have?**

Wood	Yes	No	Polished or unpolished?	
Carpeting	Yes	No	Color?	
If carpeting, what kind? (circle)	Shag	Wall to wall	Scattered small rugs	Large area rugs
			How many?	How many?
Concrete	Yes	No	Color?	
Tile	Yes	No	Color?	
Stone	Yes	No	Color?	
Other notes?				

**Blinds, Curtains, & Shutters: Indicate the type of item, the color, pattern, and condition of the item.**

		Color	Pattern	Condition (1-7; <i>poor to good</i> )
Blinds (circle)	<b>closed</b>			
	<b>open</b>			
	1 2 3 4 5	_____	_____	_____
		Wood	Plastic	Fabric
Curtains (circle)	<b>closed</b>			
	<b>open</b>			
	1 2 3 4 5	_____	_____	_____
		Sheer	Opaque	Blackout
Shutters	<b>closed</b>			
	<b>open</b>			
	1 2 3 4 5	_____	_____	_____
Wind. shades	<b>closed</b>			
	<b>open</b>			
	1 2 3 4 5	_____	_____	_____

**What kind of windows are in the space?**

<b>Window Size (Circle &amp; indicate amount)</b>	No windows		Large How many?	Medium How many?	Small How many?	
	Floor to ceiling How many?	Bay window How many?	Window seat How many?	Frosted glass How many?	Normal—in wall	Inside Door

**What are the general features of the room?**

Centrally located in the house?	Yes	No
Connected to kitchen?	Yes	No
Connected to dining room?	Yes	No
Open floor plan?	Yes	No
Accessible to the outside?	Yes	No
Built-in cabinetry?	Ye	No
Built-in bookshelves?	Yes	No
Fireplace?	Yes	No
Mantle?	Yes	No
High ceilings?	Yes	No
Game closet?	Yes	No
Wainscoting?	Yes	No
Crown molding?	Yes	No
Skylight?	Yes	No
Air conditioning type (circle)	Can't tell	Central AC How many vents? AC window units How many?
Heating (circle)	Can't tell	Central heat How many vents? Stand-alone/window units How many?
Type of fireplace	Gas	Wood Burning Electric   No
Other specifications?		

--	--

**STEP 3 – WALLS & CEILINGS**

**What are the walls of the space like?**

**Explain**

Painted	Yes	No	
Unpainted	Yes	No	
Wallpapered	Yes	No	
Wood paneled	Yes	No	
Unfinished?	Yes	No	
Other?			

**What is the ceiling like?**

Ceiling Color: \_\_\_\_\_ Patterns: \_\_\_\_\_ Texture: Popcorn/Smooth/Other:

High ceiling?	Yes	No
Coffered ceilings?	Yes	No
Exposed beams?	Yes	No
Exposed pipes?	Yes	No
Other?		

% covered with posters, painting, etc. 0%|----|----|----|----50%----|----|----|----|100%

**On Display**

	Post/ Print	Paint	Photo	Hangings		Post/ Print	Paint	Photo	Hangings
Abstract					Movie				
Animal					Movie Stars				
Baby					Naked				
Daring Things					Nature				
Family					People				
Fantasy					Pet				
Fashion					Political				
Friends					Religious				
Girlie					Romantic				
Hand Drawn					Science				
					Fiction				
Historical					Scientific				
Holiday					Self				
Which?					Sports				
Humor					Travel				
Inspirational					TV Shows				
Journalistic					Violence				
Military					Wedding				

Other  
Other


Art (specify):

---



---



---

Music (specify):

---



---

Flags ( ): \_\_\_\_\_

Bulletin board ( ): \_\_\_\_\_ Dry erase board ( ): \_\_\_\_\_

Calendar 1 ( ) planner yr. mo. wk. dy filled \_\_\_\_\_

Calendar 2 ( ) planner yr. mo. wk. dy filled \_\_\_\_\_

Events calendars: \_\_\_\_\_ Flyers: \_\_\_\_\_

Mirrors 1: \_\_\_\_\_ type: \_\_\_\_\_ location: \_\_\_\_\_

Mirrors 1: \_\_\_\_\_ type: \_\_\_\_\_ location: \_\_\_\_\_

Mirrors 1: \_\_\_\_\_ type: \_\_\_\_\_ location: \_\_\_\_\_

Clocks 1 : \_\_\_\_\_ type: \_\_\_\_\_ location: \_\_\_\_\_ slow/on time/fast

Clocks 2 : \_\_\_\_\_ type: \_\_\_\_\_ location: \_\_\_\_\_ slow/on time/fast

Clocks 3 : \_\_\_\_\_ type: \_\_\_\_\_ location: \_\_\_\_\_ slow/on time/fast

#### STEP 4 – FURNITURE

**What kind of furniture is in the space?**

Chair 1 \_\_\_\_\_ Easy Office Dining Stool Beanbag Other

Chair 2 \_\_\_\_\_ Easy Office Dining Stool Beanbag Other

Chair 3 \_\_\_\_\_ Easy Office Dining Stool Beanbag Other

Garbage can \_\_\_\_\_ empty 1 2 3 4 5 overflowing

Closet (open or closed) \_\_\_\_\_

Wardrobe (open or closed) \_\_\_\_\_

**Amount**

**Color/Pattern**

	Yes	No	Amount	Color/Pattern
Armoire	Yes	No		
Bookshelves	Yes	No		
Chandelier	Yes	No		
Coat Rack	Yes	No		
Coffee table	Yes	No		
Couch	Yes	No		

Crates	Yes	No		
Desk	Yes	No		
End table	Yes	No		
Entertainment center	Yes	No		
File cabinets	Yes	No		
Hooks	Yes	No		
Love seat	Yes	No		
Mini fridge	Yes	No		
Ottoman	Yes	No		
Sectional	Yes	No		
Shelves	Yes	No		
Sofa Table	Yes	No		
Stereo stand	Yes	No		
TV Tray	Yes	No		
Other?				
Other?				

## STEP 5 -- ITEMS/OBJECTS

### Electronic Equipment

Answering Machine	# of messages	Remote Control
Blue Ray		Scanner
Boombbox		Smart Phone
CD Player		Speakers
CDs		Tablet
Charger		Tape Player
Cell phone		Tapes
Computer (desktop)	PC/Mac	TV
Computer (laptop)	PC/Mac	VCR Player
DVD Player		Video Game Console
DVDs		Video Games
DVR		Walkman
Fax		Zip Drive
Hi-Fidelity		Other?
Home Phone		
Integrated Stereo		
iPad		
iPod		
Modem		
Pager		

Printer  
Radio  
Record Player  
Records

**Books ( )**

Few	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Many	
Disorganized	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Organized	alphabetized ( ) sorted by:
Homogenous	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Varied	

**Magazines ( )**

Few	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Many	
Disorganized	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Organized	alphabetized ( ) sorted by:
Homogenous	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Varied	

**CDs ( )**

Few	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Many	
Disorganized	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Organized	alphabetized ( ) sorted by:
Homogenous	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Varied	

**Records ( )**

Few	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Many	
Disorganized	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Organized	alphabetized ( ) sorted by:
Homogenous	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Varied	

**DVDs ( )**

Few	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Many	
-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	--

Disorganized 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Organized alphabetized ( )  
 sorted by:  
 Homogenous 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Varied

**Videos ( )**

Few 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Many  
 Disorganized 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Organized alphabetized ( )  
 sorted by:  
 Homogenous 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Varied

Beauty Products: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Bags: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Athletic equipment: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Collections: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Food: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Games: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Jewelry: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Kids: \_\_\_\_\_

---

Labels: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Medication: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Musical instruments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Pets: \_\_\_\_\_ /Accommodation: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Plants: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Religious artifacts: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Specialized clothing: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Tools: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Toys: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Weapons: \_\_\_\_\_

**Clothing**

No clothing visible 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Clothing everywhere  
 Neatly organized 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strewn everywhere

Clothing: \_\_\_\_\_

**Stationery**

	Few	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 Many
Disorganized	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Organized

- Address labels
- Address book
- Bulldog clips
- Calculator
- Card file
- Envelopes
- Eraser
- Folders
- Glue
- Hi-lighter
- Hole-punch
- In trays
- Loose Paper
- Marker pens
- Notebooks
- Paper
- Paper clips
- Paper weight
- Pencil holder
- Pencils/sharp
- Pens
- Ring binders
- Rolodex
- Rubber bands
- Ruler
- Scissors
- Sharpener
- Stamps
- Stapler
- Staples
- Staple remover
- Sticky labels
- Sticky tape
- Tape dispenser
- Thumb tacks
- Whiteout
- Xacto-knife

Notes:  
To Do Lists:  
Post Its:

**Items: List number**

Art supplies  
Ash trays  
Bar Tools (e.g. wine shaker/opener)  
Beer  
Bills  
Black light  
Blankets  
Book Ends  
Bowl (Misc. Material)  
Boxes (e.g., empty shoe)  
Candle holders  
Cards (e.g., birthday)  
Certificates  
Check book  
Cigarettes  
Cleaning supplies  
Coasters  
Contraceptives  
Cup of change  
Cups  
Decorative Bowl  
Decorative Tray  
Dolls  
Drinking Glasses  
Drug paraphernalia  
Ear plugs  
Executive toys  
Family Photos  
Flashlight  
Flowers – dried  
Flowers – fake  
Flowers – fresh  
Flyers  
Food wrappers  
Games (e.g. board/cards)  
Glasses  
Globes  
Health products  
Incense holder  
Invitations  
Iron  
Ironing board  
Knickknacks  
Laundry basket  
Letters  
Lighter

Liquor  
Mail  
Maps - unidentified  
Maps - city  
Maps - international  
Maps - tour  
Matches  
Memorabilia - childhood  
Memorabilia - college  
Memorabilia - cultural  
Memorabilia - high school  
Memorabilia - sports  
Message pad  
Mirror  
Outlet Covers  
Paintings  
Parking tickets  
Piggy bank  
Plaques & medals  
Plates  
Pocket knife  
Postcards  
Receipts  
Recycling bin  
Relaxation supplies  
Scrap notes  
Sculptures  
Security equip.  
Sex toys  
Smoke alarm  
Spectacles  
Soda (other non-alcoholic beverages)  
Stickers  
Stuffed animals  
Throw Pillows—Giant  
Throw Pillows—Small  
Tickets (e.g., concert)  
Tickets (e.g., movie)  
Tickets (e.g., museum)  
Tickets (travel)  
Tissues  
Travel souvenirs  
Umbrellas  
Vases  
Wallets  
Wind chimes

Wine  
Wine Decanter  
Wine Rack  
Yoga mat

Other items of significance?  
List here:



## References

- Back, M.D., Schmukle, S.C., & Egloff, B. (2008). How extraverted is [honey.bunny77@hotmail.de](mailto:honey.bunny77@hotmail.de)? Inferring personality from e-mail addresses. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42*, 1116-1122.
- Back, M. D., Stopfer, J. M., Vazire, S., Gaddis, S., Schmukle, S. C., Egloff, B., & Gosling, S. D. (2010). Facebook profiles reflect actual personality, not self-idealization. *Psychological Science, 21*, 372-374
- Bardi, A. & Schwartz, S.H. (2003). Values and behavior: Strength and structure of relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 1207- 1220.
- Bishop, B. (2009). *The big sort: Why the clustering of like-minded America is tearing us apart*. Boston: Mariner Books.
- Brunswik, E. (1956). *Perception and the representative design of experiments*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Buss, D.M. (1987). Selection, evocation, and manipulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 1214-1221.
- Campbell, L. & Kashy, D.A. (2002). Estimating actor, partner, and interaction effects for dyadic data using PROC MIXED and HLM: A user friendly guide. *Personal Relationships, 9*, 327- 342.
- Cooper-Marcus, C. (1995). *House as a mirror of self: Exploring the deeper meaning of home*. Berkeley, CA: Conari Press.
- Florida, R. (2008). *Who's your city?* New York: Basic Books.

- Gill, M.J. & Swann, W.B., Jr. (2004). On what it means to know someone: A matter of pragmatics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 405-418.
- Gosling, S.D. (2008). *Snoop: What your stuff says about you*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gosling, S.D., Craik, K.H., Martin, N.R., & Pryor, M.R. (2005a). The Personal Living Space Cue Inventory: An analysis and evaluation. *Environment and Behavior*, 37, 683-705.
- Gosling, S. D., Craik, K. H., Martin, N. R., & Pryor, M. R. (2005b). Material attributes of Personal Living Spaces. *Home Cultures*, 2, 51-88.
- Gosling, S. D., Gaddis, S., & Vazire, S. (2008). First Impressions From the Environments That We Create and Inhabit. In J. Skowronski, & N. Ambady (Eds.), *First Impressions*. (pp. 334-356). New York: Guilford.
- Gosling, S. D., Ko, S. J., Mannarelli, T., & Morris, M. E. (2002). A Room with a cue: Judgments of personality based on offices and bedrooms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 379-398.
- Gosling, S.D., Rentfrow, P.J., & Swann, W.B., (2003). A very brief measure of the Big Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37, 504- 528.
- Graham, L.T., Sandy, C.J., & Gosling, S.D. (2011). Manifestations of personality in physical and virtual environments. In T. Chamorro-Premuzic, A. Fumham, & S. von Stumm (Eds.), *Handbook of Individual Differences*, (pp. 773-800). Oxford: Wiley- Blackwell.
- Hansen, W.B., & Altman, I. (1976). Decorating personal places: A descriptive analysis. *Environment and Behavior*, 8, 491-504.

- Israel, T. (2003). *Some place like home: Using Design Psychology to create ideal places*. New York: Wiley-Academy.
- John, O.P. & Robins, R.W. (1993). Determinants of interjudge agreement on personality traits: The Big Five domains, observability, evaluativeness, and the unique perspectives of the self. *Journal of Personality*, *61*, 521-551.
- John, O.P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement and theoretical perspectives. In L.A. Pervin & O.P. John (Eds.) *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*. New York: Guilford Press, pp. 102-138.
- Jones, R.M., Taylor, D.E., Dick, A.J., Singh, A., & Cook, J.L. (2007). Bedroom design and decoration: Gender differences in preference and activity. *Adolescence*, *42*, 539-553.
- Jung, C. G. (1963). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Kashy, D. A., & Kenny, D. A. (2000). The analysis of data from dyads and groups. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social psychology* (pp. 451–477). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kenny, D. A. (1988). The analysis of data from two person relationships. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Handbook of inter- personal relationships* (pp. 57–77). London: Wiley.
- Kenny, D.A. (1994). *Interpersonal perceptions: A social relations analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kenny, D.A., Kashy, D.A., & Cook, W.L. (2006). *Dyadic data analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.

- Lee, Y., Jussim, L.J., & McCauley, C.R. (1995). Stereotype accuracy: Toward appreciating group differences. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Lohmann, A., Arriaga, X.B., & Goodfriend, W. (2003). Close relationships and placemaking: Do objects in a couple's home reflect couplehood? *Personal Relationships, 10*, 437-449.
- Marcus, B., Machilek, F., & Schutz, A. (2006). Personality in cyberspace: Personal websites as media for personality expression and impressions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 1014-1031.
- McCrae, R.R. \* Costa, P.T. (1987). Validation of the Five-Factor Model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 81-90.
- McElroy, J.C., Morrow, P.C., & Ackerman, R.J. (1983). Personality and interior office design: Exploring the accuracy of visitor attributions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 541-544.
- 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*, 862-877.
- Naumann, L.P., Vazire, S., Rentfrow, P.J., & Gosling, S.D. (2009). Personality judgments based on physical appearance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*, 1661-1671.

- Rentfrow, P.J., Gosling, S.D., & Potter, J. (2008). The geography of personality: A theory of emergence, persistence, and exploration of regional variation in basic traits. *Perspectives in Psychological Science, 3*, 339-369.
- Roccas, S., Sagiv, L., Schwartz, S.H., & Knafo, A. (2002). The Big Five personality factors and personal values. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 789-801.
- Sandy, C.J. & Gosling, S.D. The development and validation of a short values measure. (Manuscript in preparation).
- Schwartz, S.H., Sagiv, L., & Boehnkel, K. (2000). Worries and values. *Journal of Personality, 68*, 309-346.
- Schwartz, S.H., Caprara, G., & Vecchione, M. (2010). Basic personal values, core political beliefs, and voting: A longitudinal analysis. *Political Psychology, 31*, 421- 452.
- Swann, W. B., Jr. (1983). Self-verification: Bringing social reality into harmony with the self. In J. Suls & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), *Social psychological perspectives on the self, Vol. 2*, (pp. 33-66). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Swann, W.B., Jr. (1984). Quest for accuracy in person perception: A matter of pragmatics. *Psychological Review, 91*, 457-477.
- Swann, W.B., Jr. & Bosson, J. (2008). Identity Negotiation: A Theory of Self and Social Interaction. In O. John, R. Robins, & L. Pervin (Eds.) *Handbook of Personality Psychology: Theory and Research*, (pp. 448-471) New York: Guilford Press.

- Swann, W. B., Jr. Chang-Schneider, C., & Angulo, S. (2007). Self-verification in relationships as an adaptive process. In J. Wood, A. Tesser & J. Holmes (Eds.) *Self and Relationships*, New York: Psychology Press.
- Vazire, S. (2010). Who knows what about a person?: The self-other knowledge asymmetry (SOKA) model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *98*, 281-300.
- Vazire, S. & Gosling, S.D. (2004). e-Perceptions: personality impressions based on personal websites. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *87*, 123-132.
- Vinsel, A., Brown, B.B., Altman, I., & Foss, C. (1980). Privacy regulation, territorial displays and effectiveness of individual functioning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *39*, 1104-1115.
- Wells, M.M. (2000). Office clutter or meaningful personal displays: The role of office personalization in employee and organizational well-being. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *20*, 239-255.
- Wells, M.M. & Thelen, L. (2002). What does your workspace say about you? The influence of personality, status, and workspace on personalization. *Environment and Behavior*, *34*, 300-321.
- Wells, M.M., Thelen, L., & Ruark, J. (2007). Workspace personalization and organizational culture: Does your workspace reflect you or your company? *Environment and Behavior*, *39*, 616-634.
- Wilson, R.E., Gosling, S.D., & Graham, L.T. (2012). A review of Facebook research in the social sciences. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *7*, 203-230.

Table 1: Means and standard deviations of variables measured

Variable	Occupants' self-reports		Observers' ratings of occupants	
	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>
<b>Self-reports</b>				
Male Extraversion	3.15	0.80	4.48	0.57
Male Agreeableness	3.79	0.58	5.14	0.37
Male Conscientiousness	3.71	0.63	5.16	0.64
Male Neuroticism	2.50	0.77	2.79	0.31
Male Openness	3.91	0.63	4.90	0.75
Male-Couple Extraversion	3.73	0.69	-	-
Male-Couple Agreeableness	4.12	0.56	-	-
Male-Couple Conscientiousness	4.01	0.60	-	-
Male- Couple Neuroticism	2.39	0.68	-	-
Male-Couple Openness	3.79	0.60	-	-
Female Extraversion	3.62	0.90	4.62	0.54
Female Agreeableness	3.74	0.67	5.26	0.33
Female Conscientiousness	3.93	0.66	5.25	0.61
Female Neuroticism	3.08	0.85	2.93	0.32
Female Openness	3.82	0.60	4.91	0.72
Female- Couple Extraversion	3.93	0.75	-	-
Female- Couple Agreeableness	4.25	0.55	-	-
Female- Couple Conscientiousness	4.09	0.59	-	-
Female- Couple Neuroticism	2.21	0.60	-	-
Female- Couple Openness	3.81	0.67	-	-
Couple Extraversion	3.83	0.63	4.63	0.57
Couple Agreeableness	4.19	0.46	5.24	0.42
Couple Conscientiousness	4.05	0.51	5.28	0.73
Couple Neuroticism	2.30	0.53	2.80	0.34
Couple Openness	3.80	0.54	4.88	0.81
Male Conformity	3.04	1.27	2.48	0.58
Male Tradition	4.40	1.35	3.53	1.00
Male Benevolence	2.21	0.92	2.40	0.43
Male Universalism	2.44	1.09	2.39	0.34
Male Self-direction	2.01	0.92	2.26	0.57
Male Stimulation	2.81	1.08	3.31	0.62
Male Hedonism	2.47	1.09	2.66	0.58
Male Achievement	3.32	1.34	2.45	0.50
Male Power	3.63	1.13	3.67	0.40
Male Security	3.16	1.10	2.78	0.83
Male Commitment	4.93	0.29	4.36	0.41
Male Satisfaction	4.87	0.36	4.47	0.32
Female Conformity	3.21	1.22	2.36	0.54
Female Tradition	4.38	1.41	3.36	1.01
Female Benevolence	1.84	0.86	2.17	0.39
Female Universalism	2.13	1.07	2.25	0.31
Female Self-direction	2.17	0.93	2.34	0.58
Female Stimulation	3.00	1.11	3.45	0.56
Female Hedonism	2.55	1.07	2.77	0.52

---

Female Achievement	3.05	1.28	2.60	0.42
Female Power	3.34	1.26	3.82	0.28
Female Security	2.80	1.03	2.50	0.82
Female Commitment	4.96	0.29	4.40	0.40
Female Satisfaction	4.82	0.54	4.40	0.38

---

Table 2: Consensus and accuracy of personality impressions of occupants based on photographs of their living rooms and bedrooms.

Trait Assessed	Consensus (ICC)				Accuracy (r)			
	Living Room (Male)	Living Room (Female)	Living Room (Couple)	Bedrooms <sup>a</sup>	Living Room (Male)	Living Room (Female)	Living Room (Couple)	Bedrooms <sup>a</sup>
Extraversion	.20 (.67)***	.18 (.63)***	.18 (.64)***	.31*	.12	.14	.02	.22*
Agreeableness	.17 (.61)***	.11 (.50)***	.16 (.61)***	.20	.24*	.07	.19	.20*
Conscientiousness	.34 (.80)***	.32 (.79)***	.37 (.82)***	.47**	-.02	.25*	.20*	.33**
Neuroticism	.10 (.46)***	.10 (.46)***	.11 (.49)***	.08	-.13	.09	.19	.36**
Openness	.38 (.83)***	.33 (.80)***	.37 (.82)***	.58**	.20*	.22*	.37***	.65**

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Consensus is indexed by interclass correlations (ICCs) among 8 observers. Single and average ICCs are presented with average ICCs shown in parentheses.

<sup>a</sup> For comparison purposes, findings for impressions of occupants based on bedrooms (from Gosling et al., 2002) are presented in data column 4. Within the Gosling et al. study it should be noted consensus represents the mean of 21 correlations derived from all possible pairwise combinations of seven observers. Conceptually this number is close to those measures of single observer ICCs (i.e., those represented outside the parentheses).

Accuracy presented in data columns 5 and 6 is the correlation between observers' judgments and occupants' self-reports of personality (N = 98 for males and 98 for females). Accuracy presented in data column 7 is the correlation between the averaged observer judgments of the occupants and the average of the occupants individual ratings of their impressions of their own "couple personality" (N = 98).

<sup>a</sup> For comparison purposes, findings for impressions of occupants based on bedrooms (from Gosling et al., 2002) are presented in data column 8. Observer accuracy is the correlation between the aggregated observer ratings and the composite criterion (i.e., self and other reports) ratings. Significance for the Gosling et al. consensus correlations were based on a sample size of 68, the average number of cases across which the correlations were computed. \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$

Table 3: Rater consensus and accuracy of impressions of occupants' values and relationship characteristics based on photographs of their living rooms and bedrooms.

Traits Assessed	Consensus		Accuracy	
	Living Room (Male)	Living Room (Female)	Living Room (Male)	Living Room (Female)
Conformity	.27 (.75)***	.26 (.74)***	.18	.34***
Tradition	.51 (.89)***	.51 (.89)***	.60***	.68***
Benevolence	.16 (.61)***	.15 (.58)***	.30***	.05
Universalism	.07 (.37)**	.08 (.40)***	.11	.12
Self-direction	.20 (.67)***	.23 (.70)***	.20	.12
Stimulation	.20 (.67)***	.18 (.64)***	.10	.18
Hedonism	.27 (.74)***	.20 (.70)***	.29**	.11
Achievement	.21 (.68)***	.15 (.58)***	-.07	.14
Power	.09 (.43)***	.02 (.12)	-.10	-.06
Security	.44 (.86)***	.38 (.83)***	.14	.33**
Commitment	.26 (.74)***	.28 (.76)***	-.06	-.11
Satisfaction	.23 (.70)***	.24 (.72)***	.14	.04

Notes: \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Consensus is indexed by interclass correlations (ICCs) among 8 raters. Single and average ICCs are presented with average ICCs shown in parentheses. Accuracy presented in data columns 3 and 4 is the correlation between aggregated raters' judgments and targets' self-reports of values ( $N = 98$  for males and 98 for females) and relationship characteristics ( $N = 81$  for males and 79 for females)

Table 4: Correlations between occupant self-reports and observer ratings of occupants' Big Five personality traits

	Male (Self)	Female (Self)	Couple (Self)	Observer (Male)	Observer (Female)	Observer (Couple)
<b>Extraversion</b>						
Male (self)	1.00	-.09	.52***	.12	-.05	.04
Female (self)	-.09	1.00	.51***	.15	.14	.16
Couple	.52***	.51***	1.00	.06	-.05	.02
Observer Male	.12	.15	.06	1.00	.56***	.84***
Observer Female	-.05	.14	-.05	.56***	1.00	.84***
Observer Couple	.04	.16	.03	.84***	.84***	1.00
<b>Agreeableness</b>						
Male (self)	1.00	-.07	.43***	.24*	.10	.18
Female (self)	-.07	1.00	.52***	.14	.07	.09
Couple	.43***	.52***	1.00	.25*	.19	.19
Observer Male	.24*	.14	.25*	1.00	.78***	.81***
Observer Female	.10	.07	.19	.78***	1.00	.87***
Observer Couple	.18	.09	.19	.81***	.87***	1.00
<b>Conscientiousness</b>						
Male (self)	1.00	-.01	.36***	-.02	.03	.01
Female (self)	-.01	1.00	.62***	.24*	.25*	.24*
Couple	.36***	.62***	1.00	.21*	.23*	.20*
Observer Male	-.02	.24*	.21*	1.00	.94***	.95***
Observer Female	.03	.25*	.23*	.94***	1.00	.96***
Observer Couple	.01	.25*	.20*	.95***	.96***	1.00

	Male (Self)	Female (Self)	Couple (Self)	Observer (Male)	Observer (Female)	Observer (Couple)
<b>Neuroticism</b>						
Male (self)	1.00	-.26**	.34**	-.13	-.04	-.03
Female (self)	-.26**	1.00	.47***	.15	.09	.09
Couple	.34**	.47**	1.00	.09	.14	.19
Observer Male	-.13	.15	.09	1.00	.82**	.80***
Observer Female	-.04	.09	.14	.82***	1.00	.82***
Observer Couple	-.03	.09	.19	.80***	.82***	1.00
<b>Openness</b>						
Male (self)	1.00	.07	.61***	.20 <sup>+</sup>	.09	.18
Female (self)	.07	1.00	.55***	.22 <sup>+</sup>	.22 <sup>+</sup>	.23 <sup>+</sup>
Couple	.61***	.55***	1.00	.38***	.32**	.37**
Observer Male	.20 <sup>+</sup>	.22 <sup>+</sup>	.38***	1.00	.91***	.95***
Observer Female	.09	.22 <sup>+</sup>	.32**	.91***	1.00	.96***
Observer Couple	.18	.23 <sup>+</sup>	.37***	.95***	.96**	1.00

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ .

Table 5: Correlations between occupant self-reports and observers' ratings of occupants' values and relationship characteristics

	Male (Self)	Female (Self)	Observer (Male)	Observer (Female)
<b>Conformity</b>				
Male (Self)	1.00	.28**	.18	.19
Female (Self)	.28**	1.00	.37***	.34**
Observer (Male)	.18	.37***	1.00	.92***
Observer (Female)	.19	.34**	.92***	1.00
<b>Tradition</b>				
Male (Self)	1.00	.69***	.60***	.61***
Female (Self)	.69***	1.00	.67***	.68***
Observer (Male)	.60***	.67***	1.00	.97***
Observer (Female)	.61***	.68***	.97***	1.00
<b>Benevolence</b>				
Male (Self)	1.00	.23 <sup>†</sup>	.30**	.22 <sup>†</sup>
Female (Self)	.23 <sup>†</sup>	1.00	-.06	.05
Observer (Male)	.30**	-.06	1.00	.75***
Observer (Female)	.22 <sup>†</sup>	.05	.75***	1.00
<b>Universalism</b>				
Male (Self)	1.00	.26 <sup>†</sup>	.11	.11
Female (Self)	.26 <sup>†</sup>	1.00	.10	.12
Observer (Male)	.11	.10	1.00	.71***
Observer (Female)	.11	.12	.71***	1.00
<b>Self-direction</b>	Male	Female	Observer	Observer

	(Self)	(Self)	(Male)	(Female)
Male (Self)	1.00	.05	.20	.16
Female (Self)	.05	1.00	.17	.12
Observer (Male)	.20	.17	1.00	.81***
Observer (Female)	.16	.12	.81***	1.00
<b>Stimulation</b>	Male	Female	Observer	Observer
	(Self)	(Self)	(Male)	(Female)
Male (Self)	1.00	.22 <sup>†</sup>	.10	.23 <sup>†</sup>
Female (Self)	.22 <sup>†</sup>	1.00	.18	.18
Observer (Male)	.10	.18	1.00	.83***
Observer (Female)	.23 <sup>†</sup>	.18	.83***	1.00
<b>Hedonism</b>	Male	Female	Observer	Observer
	(Self)	(Self)	(Male)	(Female)
Male (Self)	1.00	.05	.29**	.19
Female (Self)	.05	1.00	.18	.11
Observer (Male)	.29**	.18	1.00	.74***
Observer (Female)	.19	.11	.74***	1.00
<b>Achievement</b>	Male	Female	Observer	Observer
	(Self)	(Self)	(Male)	(Female)
Male (Self)	1.00	.36***	-.07	-.09
Female (Self)	.36***	1.00	.09	.14
Observer (Male)	-.07	.09	1.00	.73***
Observer (Female)	-.09	.14	.73***	1.00
<b>Power</b>	Male	Female	Observer	Observer

	(Self)	(Self)	(Male)	(Female)
Male (Self)	1.00	.04	-.11	-.02
Female (Self)	.04	1.00	.10	-.06
Observer (Male)	-.11	.10	1.00	.11
Observer (Female)	-.02	-.06	.11	1.00
<b>Security</b>	Male (Self)	Female (Self)	Observer (Male)	Observer (Female)
Male (Self)	1.00	-.04	.14	.15
Female (Self)	-.04	1.00	.25 <sup>*</sup>	.33 <sup>**</sup>
Observer (Male)	.14	.25 <sup>*</sup>	1.00	.92 <sup>***</sup>
Observer (Female)	.15	.33 <sup>**</sup>	.92 <sup>***</sup>	1.00
<b>Commitment</b>	Male (Self)	Female (Self)	Observer (Male)	Observer (Female)
Male (Self)	1.00	.12	-.06	-.04
Female (Self)	.12	1.00	-.05	-.11
Observer (Male)	-.06	-.05	1.00	.94 <sup>***</sup>
Observer (Female)	-.04	-.11	.94 <sup>***</sup>	1.00
<b>Satisfaction</b>	Male (Self)	Female (Self)	Observer (Male)	Observer (Female)
Male (Self)	1.00	.43 <sup>***</sup>	.14	.15
Female (Self)	.43 <sup>***</sup>	1.00	-.01	.04
Observer (Male)	.14	-.01	1.00	.94 <sup>***</sup>
Observer (Female)	.15	.04	.94 <sup>***</sup>	1.00

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ .

Table 6: Cue utilization, cue validity, and cue sensitivity of personality impressions of occupants based on photographs of their living rooms and bedrooms

Traits Assessed	Cue Utilization			Cue Validity			Cue Sensitivity			Bedroom <sup>a</sup>
	Living Room (Male)	Living Room (Female)	Living Room (Couple)	Living Room (Male)	Living Room (Female)	Living Room (Couple)	Living Room (Male)	Living Room (Female)	Living Room (Couple)	
Extraversion	.02	.26	.10	.21	.18	-.03	.09	.13	-.15	.24
Agreeableness	.16	.13	.24	-.14	-.18	.04		.08	.45*	-.23
Conscientiousness	.81***	.78***	.77***	.03	.19	-.40	.51***	-.30*	.77***	.79**
Neuroticism	.44**	.40*	.22	.01	.39*	.08	-.26	.68***	.77***	.16
Openness	.80***	.71***	.79***	-.06	.25	-.06	.21	.69***	.38**	.80**

Notes: \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Cue utilization is indexed by the adjusted R values when mean rater scores are regressed on cue scores. Cue validity is indexed by the adjusted R values when occupants' self-reports are regressed on cue scores. Cue sensitivity is indexed by vector correlations between absolute values of cue-utilization and cue-validity correlations. Mean correlations and vector correlations were computed using Fisher's r-to-z transformation.

<sup>a</sup> For comparison, findings depicting impressions of occupants based on bedrooms (from Gosling et al., 2002) are presented in data column 10.

Table 7: Cue utilization, cue validity, and cue sensitivity impressions of values and relationship characteristics of occupants based on photographs of their living rooms and bedrooms

Traits Assessed	Cue Utilization		Cue Validity		Cue Sensitivity	
	Living Room (Male)	Living Room (Female)	Living Room (Male)	Living Room (Female)	Living Room (Male)	Living Room (Female)
Conformity	.36*	.32	.28	.27	.36*	.68***
Tradition	.20	.28	.08	.38*	.78***	.57***
Benevolence	.22	.22	.19	.42*	-.15	-.04
Universalism	-.02	.08	.13	.25	.03	.04
Self-direction	.62***	.57**	-.17	-.21	.26	.40**
Stimulation	.51**	.43*	.17	-.03	.33*	.34*
Hedonism	.47**	.30	.29	-.05	.36*	-.04
Achievement	.37*	.19	-.04	.21	.22	-.57***
Power	.26	.14	-.05	.06	.07	-.10
Security	.67***	.72***	.39*	.17	-.23	.79***
Commitment	.30	.42*	-.47	-.46	-.17	.33*
Satisfaction	.32	.22	-.02	-.06	-.10	.01

Notes: \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Cue utilization is indexed by the adjusted R values when mean rater scores are regressed on cue scores. Cue validity is indexed by the adjusted R values when occupants' self-reports are regressed on cue scores. Cue sensitivity is indexed by vector correlations between absolute values of cue-utilization and cue-validity correlations. Mean correlations and vector correlations were computed using Fisher's r-to-z transformation. Cue sensitivity is indexed by vector correlations between absolute values of cue-utilization and cue-validity correlations. Mean correlations and vector correlations were computed using Fisher's r-to-z transformation.

Table 8: Lens Model Analysis for Extraversion

Cue Validity				"Cues"	Cue Utilization			
<i>Extraversion</i>					<i>Extraversion</i>			
Males	Females	Couple	Bedrooms	Males	Females	Couple	Bedroom	
.12	.15	.22*	.13	Noisy (vs. quiet) in room	.08	.02	.07	.05
.02	.20	.16	.25*	Noisy (vs. quiet) in house	-.11	-.03	-.07	.21
-.06	-.06	-.06	.03	Noisy (vs. quiet) outside	.17	.09	.11	.12
-.02	-.01	-.02	-.14	Well-lit (vs. dark) overall	-.06	.04	.03	-.02
.05	-.29**	-.16	-.13	Well-lit (vs. dark) natural light	-.04	.03	.03	.04
.03	.07	.11	-.17	Well-lit (vs. dark) artificial light	-.01	-.01	.02	.07
.07	-.04	-.01	.08	Drafty (vs. stuffy)	-.01	.07	.06	.06
.12	.11	.08	-.04	Fresh (vs. stale)	-.02	.12	.09	.20
.11	-.05	.02	.00	Hot (vs. cold)	.08	.07	.08	-.06
.01	.19	.15	.03	Good (vs. poor) condition	-.05	.12	.05	.03
-.12	.07	-.07	.06	Decorated (vs. undecorated)	.23*	.44***	.37***	.41**
-.03	.18	.09	.02	Cheerful (vs. gloomy)	.10	.35***	.25*	.16
-.10	.06	-.06	.07	Colorful (vs. drab)	.21*	.35***	.32**	.21

---

.07	.12	.10	.08	Clean (vs. dirty)	-.02	.08	.03	-.02
-.06	.11	.01	.13	Organized (vs. disorganized)	-.01	.12	.05	.01
.01	.13	.05	.13	Neat (vs. messy)	-.03	.09	.05	-.05
.01	-.08	-.14	-.06	Cluttered (vs. uncluttered)	.04	-.04	.00	.24*
-.02	.02	.03	-.01	Clothing everywhere (vs. not visible)	.08	.00	.06	.13
-.02	-.04	-.07	-.01	Clothing strewn around (vs. organized)	.07	-.04	.02	-.04
.05	-.09	-.14	-.04	Full (vs. empty)	.23*	.30**	.26**	.19
-.06	.13	.08	-.03	Roomy (vs. cramped)	.03	.10	.09	-.01
-.03	.20*	.16	-.02	Expensive (vs. cheap)	.02	.15	.11	.11
-.11	.09	.01	.01	Comfortable (vs. uncomfortable)	.11	.22*	.18	-.07
-.04	.14	.07	.06	Inviting (vs. repelling)	.07	.18	.14	-.01
-.04	.13	.14	.08	Large (vs. small)	.08	.15	.15	-.02
-.14	-.01	-.02	.19	Distinctive (vs. ordinary)	.19	.14	.21*	.20
-.06	.15	.14	.01	Stylish (vs. unstylish)	.05	.23*	.18	.15
-.03	.27**	.18	-.04	Modern (vs. old-fashioned)	.03	.26**	.18	.05
-.04	.28**	.16	-.08	New (vs. old)	.04	.27**	.15	.11
-.07	.14	.15	.02	Multi (vs. single) purpose	.14	.30**	.26**	.14

---

-01	-08	-09	NA	Masculine (vs. feminine)	-08	.29**	.11	NA
-02	-17	-07	-09	Many (vs. few) books	-08	.02	-.03	-.13
-10	-01	-11	-03	Organized (vs. disorganized) books	.02	.11	.06	-.16
.02	-.1	-.01	.14	Varied (vs. homogeneous) books	.02	.09	.6	-.07
-.07	.01	-.08	.01	Many (vs. few) magazines	.10	.23*	.23*	.05
-.18	.04	-.10	.29	Organized (vs. disorganized) magazines	-.03	.06	.07	.36*
-.13	.15	-.01	.15	Varied (vs. homogeneous) magazines	.05	.07	.11	-.05
-.16	-.07	-.21*	-.03	Many (vs. few) CDs	.08	.01	.07	.11
-.09	-.08	-.22*	.08	Organized (vs. disorganized) CDs	.04	.04	.09	.04
-.19	-.04	-.23*	-.02	Varied (vs. homogeneous) CDs	.02	-.02	.02	.01
-.03	.17	.06	NA	Many (vs. few) DVDs	.01	-.05	-.02	NA
-.05	.14	.01	NA	Organized (vs. disorganized) DVDs	-.05	.02	-.04	NA
-.01	.07	-.04	NA	Varied (vs. homogeneous) DVDs	.06	.00	.01	NA
.02	.01	.11	-.18	Many (vs. few) items of stationery	-.26**	-.19	-.19	-.01

---

-02	-07	-12	.26*	Organized (vs. disorganized) stationery	-03	-03	.03	.00
-----	-----	-----	------	---	-----	-----	-----	-----

---

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Coefficients represent Pearson correlations. Cue validity is the correlation between self-reports of Extraversion and the presence of a cue. Cue utilization is the correlation between raters' ratings of Extraversion and the presence of a cue.

Table 9: Lens Model Analysis for Agreeableness

Cue Validity				"Cues"	Cue Utilization			
<i>Agreeableness</i>					<i>Agreeableness</i>			
Males	Females	Couple	Bedrooms	Males	Females	Couple	Bedroom	
.04	.11	.14	-.11	Noisy (vs. quiet) in room	.13	-.03	.00	-.07
.11	.07	.11	.00	Noisy (vs. quiet) in house	.12	.02	.06	.06
.14	-.03	.06	-.13	Noisy (vs. quiet) outside	.10	.08	.11	.10
.10	.06	.28**	-.05	Well-lit (vs. dark) overall	.10	.05	.11	.04
.16	.07	.17	-.01	Well-lit (vs. dark) natural light	-.05	-.09	-.05	.06
.04	.00	.21	-.15	Well-lit (vs. dark) artificial light	.07	.03	.07	.20
-.11	.20*	.12	-.16	Drafty (vs. stuffy)	.04	-.07	.06	.20
-.09	.23*	.23*	-.11	Fresh (vs. stale)	.15	.08	.14	.20
.11	-.12	-.03	.17	Hot (vs. cold)	.09	.10	.06	-.14
.14	.21*	.43***	-.09	Good (vs. poor) condition	.20	.11	.22*	.37**
.10	.03	.14	-.11	Decorated (vs. undecorated)	.33**	.31**	.37***	.20
.08	.16	.33**	-.05	Cheerful (vs. gloomy)	.33**	.27**	.36***	.66*
.07	.12	.20*	-.16	Colorful (vs. drab)	.31**	.23*	.38***	.51**
.14	.27**	.47***	-.06	Clean (vs. dirty)	.19	.11	.20*	.37**

.17	.23*	.41***	-.12	Organized (vs. disorganized)	.17	.08	.21*	.26*
.13	.27**	.42***	-.09	Neat (vs. messy)	.19	.10	.20*	.33**
-.07	-.25*	-.34**	-.01	Cluttered (vs. uncluttered)	-.10	.00	-.12	-.15
-.02	-.25*	-.27**	-.04	Clothing everywhere (vs. not visible)	-.15	-.15	-.18	-.39**
-.12	-.19	-.33**	.01	Clothing strewn around (vs. organized)	-.12	-.12	-.15	-.23
.10	-.16	-.10	-.01	Full (vs. empty)	.22*	.31**	.26*	-.05
.01	.18	.28**	-.03	Roomy (vs. cramped)	.06	-.02	.08	.12
.12	.12	.35**	-.08	Expensive (vs. cheap)	.19	.10	.16	.21
.05	.15	.31**	.03	Comfortable (vs. uncomfortable)	.18	.11	.19	.43**
.12	.16	.36***	.00	Inviting (vs. repelling)	.22*	.15	.25*	.52**
-.05	.09	.21*	.01	Large (vs. small)	.08	.01	.04	.04
-.07	-.06	-.08	-.03	Distinctive (vs. ordinary)	.02	.02	.06	.01
.12	.09	.31**	.01	Stylish (vs. unstylish)	.25*	.17	.26*	.33**
.00	.12	.12	-.10	Modern (vs. old-fashioned)	.10	-.04	.08	.27*
.08	.22*	.30**	-.20	New (vs. old)	.21*	.06	.19	.38**
.12	-.11	.04	-.12	Multi (vs. single) purpose	.13	.00	.11	.03
.24*	.13	.34**	NA	Masculine (vs. feminine)	.44***	.40***	.50***	NA
.11	-.17	.03	-.08	Many (vs. few) books	.11	.11	.16	-.17

.01	.04	.12	-.13	Organized (vs. disorganized) books	.16	.20*	.28**	.10
.04	-.06	.02	-.13	Varied (vs. homogeneous) books	.06	.08	.14	-.01
.07	-.06	.10	-.01	Many (vs. few) magazines	.17	.09	.12	-.21
-.07	-.09	-.08	-.38**	Organized (vs. disorganized) magazines	-.00	-.01	.05	.23
-.08	-.07	-.17	-.03	Varied (vs. homogeneous) magazines	-.11	-.16	-.13	-.23
-.01	-.03	.02	-.14	Many (vs. few) CDs	-.08	-.06	.02	-.10
-.11	-.01	.00	-.15	Organized (vs. disorganized) CDs	.02	.03	.05	.26*
-.03	-.04	-.02	-.26*	Varied (vs. homogeneous) CDs	-.07	-.02	.03	.03
.00	.11	.06	NA	Many (vs. few) DVDs	-.20*	-.11	-.13	NA
-.02	.13	.09	NA	Organized (vs. disorganized) DVDs	-.05	.03	-.02	NA
-.04	.10	.06	NA	Varied (vs. homogeneous) DVDs	-.12	-.03	-.03	NA
.04	-.16	-.04	.17	Many (vs. few) items of stationery	-.24*	-.19	-.19	-.07
.08	-.09	.10	-.03	Organized (vs. disorganized) stationery	-.04	.05	.09	.41**

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Coefficients represent Pearson correlations. Cue validity is the correlation between self-reports of Agreeableness and the presence of a cue. Cue utilization is the correlation between raters' ratings of Agreeableness and the presence of a cue.

Table 10: Lens Model Analysis for Conscientiousness

Cue Validity				Cue Utilization				
<i>Conscientiousness</i>				<i>Conscientiousness</i>				
Males	Females	Couple	Bedrooms	"Cues"	Males	Females	Couple	Bedroom
.26*	.12	.19	.00	Noisy (vs. quiet) in room	.00	.03	.05	-.03
.14	-.02	.01	.06	Noisy (vs. quiet) in house	.20	.19	.21*	-.04
.02	-.12	-.12	.16	Noisy (vs. quiet) outside	-.06	-.10	-.10	.05
-.08	.16	.17	.26*	Well-lit (vs. dark) overall	.38***	.38***	.36***	.07
-.13	.07	.03	.24*	Well-lit (vs. dark) natural light	.10	.08	.09	.22*
.03	.08	.16	.04	Well-lit (vs. dark) artificial light	.21	.23*	.19	.08
.09	-.03	.07	.09	Drafty (vs. stuffy)	.24*	.27**	.30**	.15
.11	.01	.19	.17	Fresh (vs. stale)	.46***	.45***	.48***	.13
-.01	.03	-.06	.13	Hot (vs. cold)	-.12	-.12	-.14	.05
.06	.30**	.38***	.15	Good (vs. poor) condition	.73***	.73***	.72***	.57**
-.01	.00	.03	-.10	Decorated (vs. undecorated)	.40***	.44***	.38***	.04
.05	.08	.19	.07	Cheerful (vs. gloomy)	.57***	.58***	.55***	.46*
-.03	-.03	.02	.05	Colorful (vs. drab)	.42***	.47***	.42***	.42**

---

.06	.29**	.39***	.17	Clean (vs. dirty)	.74***	.73***	.74***	.61**
.01	.32**	.33**	.29**	Organized (vs. disorganized)	.77***	.77***	.77***	.70**
.04	.29**	.36***	.27*	Neat (vs. messy)	.79***	.77***	.78***	.75**
-.08	-.25*	-.33**	-.32**	Cluttered (vs. uncluttered)	-.55***	-.59***	-.59***	-.56**
-.01	-.30**	-.25*	-.11	Clothing everywhere (vs. not visible)	-.42***	-.44***	-.43***	-.57**
-.08	-.25*	-.27**	-.24	Clothing strewn around (vs. organized)	-.61***	-.62***	-.60***	-.28*
-.08	-.10	-.22*	-.26*	Full (vs. empty)	-.08	-.06	-.09	-.35**
-.01	.21*	.28**	.17	Roomy (vs. cramped)	.52***	.52***	.52***	.34**
.10	.27**	.35***	.04	Expensive (vs. cheap)	.66***	.68***	.66***	.31**
-.05	.20	.24*	.24*	Comfortable (vs. uncomfortable)	.55***	.59***	.53***	.62**
-.04	.22*	.25*	.19	Inviting (vs. repelling)	.58***	.61***	.57***	.64**
.09	.15	.28**	.03	Large (vs. small)	.33**	.36***	.36***	.20
-.00	-.17	-.14	-.06	Distinctive (vs. ordinary)	.06	.11	.09	.12
.05	.06	.15	.14	Stylish (vs. unstylish)	.61***	.65***	.62***	.34**
.14	.23*	.21*	.24*	Modern (vs. old-fashioned)	.30**	.33**	.30**	.23*
.04	.27**	.28**	.14	New (vs. old)	.50***	.51***	.48***	.29**
.11	.03	.10	.04	Multi (vs. single) purpose	.20*	.27**	.23*	.05

---

---

.00	.15	.18	NA	Masculine (vs. feminine)	.63***	.65***	.63***	NA
-.09	.04	-.17	-.01	Many (vs. few) books	.12	.05	.11	.00
-.09	.02	-.07	.24*	Organized (vs. disorganized) books	.35***	.34**	.33**	.50**
-.00	-.03	-.11	.06	Varied (vs. homogeneous) books	.12	.06	.09	.01
.09	.14	.19	.11	Many (vs. few) magazines	.10	.08	.09	-.07
.07	.16	.10	.22	Organized (vs. disorganized) magazines	.28**	.32**	.31**	.27
.05	.05	-.01	-.14	Varied (vs. homogeneous) magazines	-.07	-.08	-.10	-.17
-.11	-.09	-.09	-.01	Many (vs. few) CDs	.01	.05	.04	-.03
-.01	-.04	-.01	.27*	Organized (vs. disorganized) CDs	.06	.05	.05	.47**
-.10	-.07	-.07	.01	Varied (vs. homogeneous) CDs	.04	.06	.04	.15
.18	-.07	.01	NA	Many (vs. few) DVDs	-.02	.01	-.03	NA
.09	.00	-.01	NA	Organized (vs. disorganized) DVDs	.03	.01	-.04	NA
.06	-.10	-.08	NA	Varied (vs. homogeneous) DVDs	-.02	.01	-.04	NA

---

---

.01	-.12	-.05	-.17	Many (vs. few) items of stationery	-.31**	-.38***	-.31**	-.29**
-.05	.08	.06	.21	Organized (vs. disorganized) stationery	.13	.04	.05	.59**

---

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Coefficients represent Pearson correlations. Cue validity is the correlation between self-reports of Conscientiousness and the presence of a cue. Cue utilization is the correlation between raters' ratings of Conscientiousness and the presence of a cue.

Table 11: Lens Model Analysis for Neuroticism

Cue Validity				Cue Utilization				
<i>Neuroticism</i>				<i>Neuroticism</i>				
Males	Females	Couple	Bedrooms	"Cues"	Males	Females	Couple	Bedroom
.26*	.12	.19	.05	Noisy (vs. quiet) in room	.00	.03	.05	.09
.14	-.02	.01	-.10	Noisy (vs. quiet) in house	.20	.19	.21*	-.01
.02	-.12	-.12	-.19	Noisy (vs. quiet) outside	-.06	-.10	-.10	-.17
-.08	.16	.17	-.18	Well-lit (vs. dark) overall	.38***	.38***	.39**	-.23*
-.13	.07	.03	-.20	Well-lit (vs. dark) natural light	.10	.08	.09	-.22*
.03	.08	.16	.01	Well-lit (vs. dark) artificial light	.21	.23*	.19	-.17
.09	-.03	.07	-.07	Drafty (vs. stuffy)	.24*	.27**	.30**	-.17
.11	.01	.19	.16	Fresh (vs. stale)	.46***	.45***	.48***	-.24*
-.01	.03	-.06	-.01	Hot (vs. cold)	-.12	-.12	-.14	.06
.06	.30**	.38***	.09	Good (vs. poor) condition	.73***	.73***	.72***	-.02
-.01	.00	.03	.15	Decorated (vs. undecorated)	.40***	.44***	.38***	-.11
.05	.08	.19	.03	Cheerful (vs. gloomy)	.57***	.58***	.54***	-.12
-.03	-.03	.02	.08	Colorful (vs. drab)	.42***	.47***	.42***	-.15

---

.06	.29**	.39***	.08	Clean (vs. dirty)	.74***	.73***	.74***	.06
.01	.32**	.33**	-.08	Organized (vs. disorganized)	.77***	.77***	.78***	.02
.04	.29**	.36***	-.04	Neat (vs. messy)	.79***	.77***	.78***	.06
-.08	-.25*	-.33**	.14	Cluttered (vs. uncluttered)	-.55***	-.59***	-.59***	-.05
-.01	-.30**	-.25*	-.07	Clothing everywhere	-.42***	-.44***	-.43***	-.12
-.08	-.25*	-.27**	.18	(vs. not visible)				
-.08	-.10	-.22*	.16	Clothing strewn around	-.61***	-.62***	-.60***	-.02
-.01	.21*	.28**	-.12	(vs. organized)				
.10	.27**	.35***	.07	Full (vs. empty)	-.08	-.06	-.09	-.02
-.05	.20	.24*	.05	Roomy (vs. cramped)	.52***	.52***	.52***	.07
-.04	.22*	.25*	.07	Expensive (vs. cheap)	.66***	.68***	.66***	-.13
.09	.15	.28**	-.13	Comfortable				
-.00	-.17	-.14	-.04	(vs. uncomfortable)	.55***	.59***	.53***	.15
.05	.06	.15	-.04	Inviting (vs. repelling)	.58***	.61***	.57***	.03
.14	.23*	.21*	-.06	Large (vs. small)	.33**	.36***	.36***	.07
.04	.27**	.28**	.09	Distinctive (vs. ordinary)	.06	.11	.09	.04
.11	.03	.10	.02	Stylish (vs. unstylish)	.61***	.65***	.62***	-.20
				Modern (vs. old-fashioned)	.30**	.33**	.30**	-.18
				New (vs. old)	.50***	.51***	.48***	-.18
				Multi (vs. single) purpose	.20*	.27**	.23*	-.15

---

---

.00	.15	.18	NA	Masculine (vs. feminine)	.63***	.65***	.63***	NA
-.09	.04	-.17	-.03	Many (vs. few) books	.12	.05	.11	.20
-.09	.02	-.07	-.07	Organized (vs. disorganized) books	.35***	.34**	.33**	.05
-.00	-.03	-.11	.02	Varied (vs. homogeneous) books	.12	.06	.07	.07
.09	.14	.19	.02	Many (vs. few) magazines	.10	.08	.09	-.07
.01	.07	.02	-.00	Organized (vs. disorganized) magazines	-.01	-.08	-.09	-.12
.05	.05	-.01	.11	Varied (vs. homogeneous) magazines	-.07	-.08	-.10	.19
-.11	-.09	-.09	.02	Many (vs. few) CDs	.01	.05	.04	-.10
-.01	-.04	-.05	-.06	Organized (vs. disorganized) CDs	.06	.05	.05	.01
-.10	-.07	-.07	.19	Varied (vs. homogeneous) CDs	.04	.06	.04	.08
.18	-.07	.01	NA	Many (vs. few) DVDs	-.02	.01	-.03	NA
.09	.00	-.01	NA	Organized (vs. disorganized) DVDs	.03	.01	-.04	NA
.06	-.10	-.08	NA	Varied (vs. homogeneous) DVDs	-.02	.01	-.04	NA

---

---

.01	-.12	-.05	-.02	Many (vs. few) items of stationery	-.31**	-.38***	-.31**	.06
-.05	.08	.06	-.04	Organized (vs. disorganized) stationery	.13	.04	.05	.12

---

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Coefficients represent Pearson correlations. Cue validity is the correlation between self-reports of Neuroticism and the presence of a cue. Cue utilization is the correlation between raters' ratings of Neuroticism and the presence of a cue.

Table 12: Lens Model Analysis for Openness

Cue Validity				"Cues"	Cue Utilization			
<i>Openness</i>					<i>Openness</i>			
Males	Females	Couple	Bedrooms		Males	Females	Couple	Bedroom
-.09	.07	-.09	.05	Noisy (vs. quiet) in room	-.04	-.03	-.12	.02
.12	.17	.16	.06	Noisy (vs. quiet) in house	-.17	-.16	-.12	.04
-.05	-.19	-.02	-.16	Noisy (vs. quiet) outside	-.07	-.05	-.04	-.19
-.15	-.06	-.15	-.05	Well-lit (vs. dark) overall	-.22*	-.26*	-.23*	-.01
.15	-.19	-.06	-.18	Well-lit (vs. dark) natural light	-.06	-.13	-.04	.00
-.31**	.08	-.17	-.17	Well-lit (vs. dark) artificial light	-.05	-.13	-.09	-.10
.14	-.02	-.02	.01	Drafty (vs. stuffy)	-.09	-.09	-.12	.02
.10	-.03	-.08	-.02	Fresh (vs. stale)	-.28***	-.25*	-.27***	.06
-.08	-.07	-.03	-.03	Hot (vs. cold)	-.02	-.03	.01	-.18
.07	-.12	-.23*	-.02	Good (vs. poor) condition	-.32**	-.28**	-.40***	-.03
.11	.16	.05	.21	Decorated (vs. undecorated)	-.19	-.30**	-.31**	.35**
.05	.00	-.13	.00	Cheerful (vs. gloomy)	-.35***	-.38***	-.42***	.00
.08	-.04	-.06	.12	Colorful (vs. drab)	-.24*	-.36***	-.35***	.11
.13	-.20*	-.25*	.02	Clean (vs. dirty)	-.33**	-.30**	-.41***	-.11

.18	-.22*	-.13	-.01	dirty)				
				Organized (vs. disorganized)	-.33**	-.28**	-.38***	-.02
.22*	-.27**	-.16	.04	Neat (vs. messy)	-.37***	-.31**	-.40***	-.08
-.08	.22*	.15	.14	Cluttered (vs. uncluttered)	.29**	.16	.28**	.26*
-.03	.26*	.21*	.03	Clothing everywhere (vs. not visible)	.29**	.20*	.29**	.17
-.11	.22*	.11	-.22	Clothing strewn around (vs. organized)	.31**	.17	.30**	-.06
-.08	.19	.09	.15	Full (vs. empty)	-.04	-.15	-.13	.22*
.07	-.12	-.16	-.02	Roomy (vs. cramped)	-.19	-.15	-.27**	-.05
.02	-.03	-.14	-.09	Expensive (vs. cheap)	-.26*	-.25*	-.34**	.04
.06	-.08	-.12	.03	Comfortable (vs. uncomfortable)	-.20*	-.19	-.33**	.03
.07	-.08	-.14	.05	Inviting (vs. repelling)	-.27**	-.28**	-.37***	-.01
-.02	.04	-.15	.16	Large (vs. small)	-.08	-.12	-.20	.10
.05	.20	.13	.35**	Distinctive (vs. ordinary)	.06	-.13	-.04	.35**
.15	.03	.01	.07	Stylish (vs. unstylish)	-.29**	-.30**	-.34**	.11
-.03	.05	.04	-.09	Modern (vs. old-fashioned)	-.07	-.01	-.08	-.03
-.01	-.05	-.07	-.03	New (vs. old)	-.21*	-.12	-.24*	-.01
-.02	.27**	.04	.13	Multi (vs. single) purpose	-.01	-.06	-.12	.23*
.04	-.12	-.10	NA	Masculine (vs. feminine)	-.38***	-.35**	-.47***	NA
.15	.07	.19	.16	Many (vs. few)	-.02	-.08	-.03	.37**

---

.25*	-.07	.12	-.02	books Organized (vs. disorganized)	-.17	-.20*	-.19	.08
.09	-.04	.15	.44**	books Varied (vs. homogeneous)	.04	-.07	-.05	.50**
-.00	.07	.03	.18	books Many (vs. few) magazines	.01	-.11	-.13	.16
			.14	Organized (vs. disorganized) magazines				.01
.10	.03	.08	.51**	Varied (vs. homogeneous) magazines	.22*	.07	.10	.33*
.06	.04	.11	.17	Many (vs. few) CDs	.07	-.08	-.04	.32**
.06	.09	.14	-.06	Organized (vs. disorganized) CDs	.01	-.14	-.12	.02
.10	-.03	.10	.22	Varied (vs. homogeneous) CDs	.02	-.14	-.08	.09
.03	-.01	.08	NA	Many (vs. few) DVDs	.15	.16	.04	NA
.04	-.07	.09	NA	Organized (vs. disorganized) DVDs	.01	.02	-.04	NA
.01	-.11	.06	NA	Varied (vs. homogeneous) DVDs	.04	.04	-.04	NA
-.12	.10	-.04	.13	Many (vs. few) items of stationery	.41***	.32**	.33**	.19

---

---

.02	-.07	.00	.06	Organized (vs. disorganized) stationery	-.03	-.05	.04	-.13
-----	------	-----	-----	---	------	------	-----	------

---

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Coefficients represent Pearson correlations. Cue validity is the correlation between self-reports of Openness and the presence of a cue. Cue utilization is the correlation between raters' ratings of Openness and the presence of a cue.

Table 13: Lens Model Analysis for Conformity

<b>Cue Validity</b>		"Cues"	<b>Cue Utilization</b>	
<i>Conformity</i>			<i>Conformity</i>	
Males	Females		Males	Females
-.20	-.11	Noisy (vs. quiet) in room	-.05	-.01
-.25*	.09	Noisy (vs. quiet) in house	-.01	.01
-.25*	-.04	Noisy (vs. quiet) outside	.01	-.03
-.10	-.07	Well-lit (vs. dark) overall	-.16	-.04
-.12	-.11	Well-lit (vs. dark) natural light	.03	.05
-.03	.01	Well-lit (vs. dark) artificial light	-.10	-.02
-.08	-.04	Drafty (vs. stuffy)	-.00	.03
-.13	-.12	Fresh (vs. stale)	-.16	-.13
-.00	.02	Hot (vs. cold)	.04	-.02
-.12	-.18	Good (vs. poor) condition	-.30**	-.28**
.01	-.04	Decorated (vs. undecorated)	-.04	-.09
-.05	-.15	Cheerful (vs. gloomy)	-.14	-.12
.00	-.06	Colorful (vs. drab)	.01	.01

---

-.19	-.30**	Clean (vs. dirty)	-.31**	-.31**
-.19	-.29**	Organized (vs. disorganized)	-.31**	-.32**
-.24*	-.32**	Neat (vs. messy)	-.33**	-.33**
.10	.19	Cluttered (vs. uncluttered)	.27**	.24*
.09	.16	Clothing everywhere (vs. not visible)	.23*	.25*
.14	.13	Clothing strewn around (vs. organized)	.31**	.36***
.13	.05	Full (vs. empty)	-.03	-.11
-.03	-.02	Roomy (vs. cramped)	-.16	-.12
-.14	-.11	Expensive (vs. cheap)	-.30**	-.30**
-.15	-.16	Comfortable (vs. uncomfortable)	-.19	-.23*
-.19	-.20	Inviting (vs. repelling)	-.18	-.21*
-.01	.07	Large (vs. small)	-.08	-.07
.17	.15	Distinctive (vs. ordinary)	.35**	.33**
-.13	-.07	Stylish (vs. unstylish)	-.08	-.09
.12	.19	Modern (vs. old-fashioned)	.08	.06
-.01	-.03	New (vs. old)	-.18	-.19
.08	.19	Multi (vs. single) purpose	.01	-.03

---

---

-.10	-.21*	Masculine (vs. feminine)	-.44***	-.43***
-.02	.02	Many (vs. few) books	-.03	-.06
-.08	-.10	Organized (vs. disorganized) books	-.08	-.13
.03	.05	Varied (vs. homogeneous) books	.09	.02
-.00	.03	Many (vs. few) magazines	.03	.00
.05	.08	Organized (vs. disorganized) magazines	.00	.04
.12	.10	Varied (vs. homogeneous) magazines	.21*	.16
-.12	.10	Many (vs. few) CDs	.12	.04
-.16	.09	Organized (vs. disorganized) CDs	.06	.02
-.13	.08	Varied (vs. homogeneous) CDs	.07	-.02
.01	.01	Many (vs. few) DVDs	.05	-.07
.08	-.13	Organized (vs. disorganized) DVDs	-.05	-.11
-.01	-.04	Varied (vs. homogeneous) DVDs	.02	-.09

---

---

.03	.04	Many (vs. few) items of stationery	.12	.08
.00	-.14	Organized (vs. disorganized) stationery	-.05	-.06

---

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Coefficients represent Pearson correlations. Cue validity is the correlation between self-reports of Conformity and the presence of a cue. Cue utilization is the correlation between raters' ratings of target Conformity and the presence of a cue.

Table 14: Lens Model Analysis for Tradition

Cue Validity		"Cues"	Cue Utilization	
<i>Tradition</i>			<i>Tradition</i>	
Males	Females		Males	Females
-.06	-.08	Noisy (vs. quiet) in room	.00	.03
-.15	.03	Noisy (vs. quiet) in house	-.01	.05
-.22*	-.03	Noisy (vs. quiet) outside	.12	.03
-.03	-.03	Well-lit (vs. dark) overall	-.13	-.11
.05	.07	Well-lit (vs. dark) natural light	-.07	-.08
-.06	-.03	Well-lit (vs. dark) artificial light	-.02	-.00
-.08	-.07	Drafty (vs. stuffy)	-.07	-.07
-.09	-.07	Fresh (vs. stale)	-.19	-.19
.10	.12	Hot (vs. cold)	.10	.08
-.20	-.15	Good (vs. poor) condition	-.29**	-.27**
.02	.13	Decorated (vs. undecorated)	-.01	-.01
-.04	.00	Cheerful (vs. gloomy)	-.08	-.06
.04	.10	Colorful (vs. ...)	.05	.06

		drab)		
-.24*	-.22*	Clean (vs. dirty)	-.30**	-.27**
-.24*	-.17	Organized (vs. disorganized)	-.28**	-.26**
-.27**	-.24*	Neat (vs. messy)	-.33**	-.31**
.17	.17	Cluttered (vs. uncluttered)	.21*	.20
.19	.20	Clothing everywhere (vs. not visible)	.26**	.22*
.24*	.14	Clothing strewn around (vs. organized)	.33**	.29**
.13	.18	Full (vs. empty)	.07	.05
-.11	-.10	Roomy (vs. cramped)	-.19	-.16
-.18	-.14	Expensive (vs. cheap)	-.24*	-.23*
-.15	-.08	Comfortable (vs. uncomfortable)	-.16	-.15
-.21*	-.12	Inviting (vs. repelling)	-.20*	-.19
-.00	.00	Large (vs. small)	-.04	-.02
.27**	.30**	Distinctive (vs. ordinary)	.27**	.28**
-.08	.02	Stylish (vs. unstylish)	-.07	-.08
.12	.26*	Modern (vs. old-fashioned)	.17	.17
-.12	-.03	New (vs. old)	-.12	-.10
.14	.19	Multi (vs. single)	.08	.09

---

		single) purpose		
-.20	-.19	Masculine (vs. feminine)	-.33**	-.34**
-.01	.07	Many (vs. few) books	-.12	-.15
.02	.08	Organized (vs. disorganized) books	-.18	-.19
.01	.11	Varied (vs. homogeneous) books	-.06	-.11
.04	.12	Many (vs. few) magazines	.03	.01
.11	.20*	Organized (vs. disorganized) magazines	.03	.04
.17	.20	Varied (vs. homogeneous) magazines	.15	.10
-.07	.09	Many (vs. few) CDs	.03	.02
-.09	.14	Organized (vs. disorganized) CDs	-.02	-.04
-.06	.09	Varied (vs. homogeneous) CDs	-.00	-.01
-.01	.02	Many (vs. few) DVDs	-.01	-.03
-.02	-.07	Organized (vs. disorganized)	-.10	-.14
		DVDs		
-.03	.02	Varied (vs. homogeneous) DVDs	-.05	-.07

---

-06	-05	Many (vs. few) items of stationery	.00	-.07
.03	-.02	Organized (vs. disorganized) stationery	-.07	-.14

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Coefficients represent Pearson correlations. Cue validity is the correlation between self-reports of Tradition and the presence of a cue. Cue utilization is the correlation between raters' ratings of target Tradition and the presence of a cue.

Table 15: Lens Model Analysis for Benevolence

<b>Cue Validity</b>		"Cues"	<b>Cue Utilization</b>	
<i>Benevolence</i>			<i>Benevolence</i>	
Males	Females		Males	Females
-.01	-.19	Noisy (vs. quiet) in room	-.01	-.07
-.02	-.11	Noisy (vs. quiet) in house	-.07	-.17
-.21*	-.02	Noisy (vs. quiet) outside	-.01	-.03
.02	-.10	Well-lit (vs. dark) overall	-.10	-.06
-.05	-.11	Well-lit (vs. dark) natural light	-.05	-.08
.04	.01	Well-lit (vs. dark) artificial light	-.15	-.01
.11	-.08	Drafty (vs. stuffy)	.02	-.07
.13	-.10	Fresh (vs. stale)	-.09	-.16
-.08	.06	Hot (vs. cold)	.01	.02
.07	-.03	Good (vs. poor) condition	-.14	-.33**
.07	-.01	Decorated (vs. undecorated)	-.15	-.26*
.06	-.10	Cheerful (vs. gloomy)	-.17	-.28**
.01	.00	Colorful (vs. ...)	-.13	-.18

		drab)		
.07	-.04	Clean (vs. dirty)	-.13	-.33**
.09	-.06	Organized (vs. disorganized)	-.12	-.32**
.06	-.10	Neat (vs. messy)	-.11	-.32**
-.05	.13	Cluttered (vs. uncluttered)	.09	.15
-.13	.02	Clothing everywhere (vs. not visible)	.08	.25*
.02	-.01	Clothing strewn around (vs. organized)	.12	.37***
-.04	.19	Full (vs. empty)	-.16	-.12
.13	-.12	Roomy (vs. cramped)	.01	-.09
.07	-.06	Expensive (vs. cheap)	-.10	-.21*
.16	.04	Comfortable (vs. uncomfortable)	-.16	-.27**
.13	.03	Inviting (vs. repelling)	-.15	-.30**
.19	-.04	Large (vs. small)	.05	.02
.12	-.08	Distinctive (vs. ordinary)	.30**	.20
-.03	-.10	Stylish (vs. unstylish)	-.03	-.16
.06	-.10	Modern (vs. old-fashioned)	.08	.11
.06	-.07	New (vs. old)	-.08	-.12
.17	.04	Multi (vs. single)	-.00	-.00

		single) purpose		
-.12	-.07	Masculine (vs. feminine)	-.36***	-.41***
-.10	-.11	Many (vs. few) books	-.10	-.13
.02	-.10	Organized (vs. disorganized) books	-.16	-.27**
-.02	-.18	Varied (vs. homogeneous) books	.00	-.13
.09	.00	Many (vs. few) magazines	.10	-.07
.19	.09	Organized (vs. disorganized) magazines	.17	.01
.05	.06	Varied (vs. homogeneous) magazines	.27**	.21*
.24*	-.04	Many (vs. few) CDs	.05	.02
.25*	-.03	Organized (vs. disorganized) CDs	.05	-.01
.24*	-.03	Varied (vs. homogeneous) CDs	.04	.02
.20	-.03	Many (vs. few) DVDs	.08	.00
.16	-.13	Organized (vs. disorganized) DVDs	.02	-.11
.22*	-.01	Varied (vs. homogeneous) DVDs	.06	-.05

.07	.01	Many (vs. few) items of stationery	.11	.06
.03	-.10	Organized (vs. disorganized) stationery	-.03	-.15

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Coefficients represent Pearson correlations. Cue validity is the correlation between self-reports of Benevolence and the presence of a cue. Cue utilization is the correlation between raters' ratings of target Benevolence and the presence of a cue.

Table 16: Lens Model Analysis for Universalism

<b>Cue Validity</b>		"Cues"	<b>Cue Utilization</b>	
<i>Universalism</i>			<i>Universalism</i>	
Males	Females		Males	Females
-.04	-.02	Noisy (vs. quiet) in room	.04	.03
.01	.10	Noisy (vs. quiet) in house	-.02	-.09
-.25*	-.18	Noisy (vs. quiet) outside	-.04	-.11
.13	.01	Well-lit (vs. dark) overall	.02	.03
-.09	-.32**	Well-lit (vs. dark) natural light	-.05	-.10
.22*	.19	Well-lit (vs. dark) artificial light	-.05	.04
.12	-.04	Drafty (vs. stuffy)	.18	.09
.09	.00	Fresh (vs. stale)	.16	.04
-.10	-.06	Hot (vs. cold)	-.12	-.06
.12	.13	Good (vs. poor) condition	.12	-.04
.08	.07	Decorated (vs. undecorated)	-.20*	-.27**
.08	.07	Cheerful (vs. gloomy)	-.01	-.08
.04	-.07	Colorful (vs. drab)	-.09	-.11

.08	.06	Clean (vs. dirty)	.10	-.08
.06	.03	Organized (vs. disorganized)	.09	-.09
.05	.03	Neat (vs. messy)	.12	-.07
-.05	-.05	Cluttered (vs. uncluttered)	-.19	-.05
-.05	-.18	Clothing everywhere (vs. not visible)	-.24*	-.04
-.03	-.25*	Clothing strewn around (vs. organized)	-.17	.05
-.05	.13	Full (vs. empty)	-.31**	-.23*
.08	.02	Roomy (vs. cramped)	.20*	.11
.13	.20*	Expensive (vs. cheap)	.19	.02
.22*	.23*	Comfortable (vs. uncomfortable)	.05	-.04
.18	.16	Inviting (vs. repelling)	.09	-.04
.14	.07	Large (vs. small)	.17	.14
-.07	-.18	Distinctive (vs. ordinary)	.07	.07
-.06	.07	Stylish (vs. unstylish)	.09	-.05
.04	.10	Modern (vs. old-fashioned)	.18	.14
.12	.15	New (vs. old)	.18	.05
.11	.07	Multi (vs. single) purpose	.07	.00
-.03	.10	Masculine (vs. feminine)	-.01	-.19

		feminine)		
-.21*	-.08	Many (vs. few) books	-.21*	-.31**
-.06	-.12	Organized (vs. disorganized) books	-.18	-.35***
-.15	-.20	Varied (vs. homogeneous) books	-.20*	-.30**
-.01	-.00	Many (vs. few) magazines	-.06	-.16
.15	.17	Organized (vs. disorganized) magazines	.07	-.07
-.00	-.07	Varied (vs. homogeneous) magazines	-.01	.02
.04	-.09	Many (vs. few) CDs	-.14	-.17
.03	-.13	Organized (vs. disorganized) CDs	-.14	-.23*
-.02	-.09	Varied (vs. homogeneous) CDs	-.12	-.18
.07	-.07	Many (vs. few) DVDs	.08	-.04
.06	-.13	Organized (vs. disorganized) DVDs	-.06	-.16
.07	-.12	Varied (vs. homogeneous) DVDs	.00	-.10
.02	-.07	Many (vs. few) items of stationery	.01	-.08
-.11	-.19	Organized (vs.	-.15	-.19

---

disorganized)  
stationery

---

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Coefficients represent Pearson correlations. Cue validity is the correlation between self-reports of Universalism and the presence of a cue. Cue utilization is the correlation between raters' ratings of target Universalism and the presence of a cue.

Table 17: Lens Model Analysis for Self-direction

<b>Cue Validity</b>		"Cues"	<b>Cue Utilization</b>	
<i>Self-direction</i>			<i>Self-direction</i>	
Males	Females		Males	Females
-.02	-.06	Noisy (vs. quiet) in room	.17	.20
.02	-.01	Noisy (vs. quiet) in house	.08	.07
.13	-.01	Noisy (vs. quiet) outside	-.15	-.12
.10	.07	Well-lit (vs. dark) overall	.13	-.00
.17	.00	Well-lit (vs. dark) natural light	-.15	-.15
.04	.11	Well-lit (vs. dark) artificial light	.08	.03
.03	.07	Drafty (vs. stuffy)	.14	.03
.05	.10	Fresh (vs. stale)	.27**	.10
.02	-.00	Hot (vs. cold)	-.17	-.16
.18	.24*	Good (vs. poor) condition	.28**	.24*
.06	-.02	Decorated (vs. undecorated)	-.16	-.23*
.08	.12	Cheerful (vs. gloomy)	.11	-.03
.15	.06	Colorful (vs. ...)	-.14	-.24*

		drab)		
.18	.17	Clean (vs. dirty)	.26*	.16
.23*	.12	Organized (vs. disorganized)	.22*	.13
.22*	.10	Neat (vs. messy)	.26**	.16
-.21*	-.18	Cluttered (vs. uncluttered)	-.33**	-.24*
-.09	-.15	Clothing everywhere (vs. not visible)	-.22*	-.18
-.17	-.06	Clothing strewn around (vs. organized)	-.23*	-.20
-.05	-.02	Full (vs. empty)	-.32**	-.29**
.14	.11	Roomy (vs. cramped)	.21*	.14
.13	.18	Expensive (vs. cheap)	.33**	.26**
.20	.22*	Comfortable (vs. uncomfortable)	.22*	.21*
.23*	.20*	Inviting (vs. repelling)	.20*	.16
.10	.11	Large (vs. small)	.23*	.15
-.16	-.15	Distinctive (vs. ordinary)	-.38***	-.49***
.09	.04	Stylish (vs. unstylish)	.01	-.10
.21*	.11	Modern (vs. old-fashioned)	.13	-.00
.24*	.25*	New (vs. old)	.41***	.31**
.01	.00	Multi (vs. single)	-.04	-.07

---

		single) purpose		
.15	.03	Masculine (vs. feminine)	.26*	.13
-.19	-.17	Many (vs. few) books	-.44***	-.46***
.03	-.05	Organized (vs. disorganized) books	-.26**	-.35***
.04	-.17	Varied (vs. homogeneous) books	-.44***	-.47***
.03	-.02	Many (vs. few) magazines	-.21*	-.23*
-.09	.19	Organized (vs. disorganized) magazines	-.22*	-.23*
-.03	-.02	Varied (vs. homogeneous) magazines	-.28**	-.20*
.08	-.14	Many (vs. few) CDs	-.23*	-.24*
.07	-.17	Organized (vs. disorganized) CDs	-.26*	-.30**
.06	-.17	Varied (vs. homogeneous) CDs	-.24*	-.23*
.10	-.05	Many (vs. few) DVDs	.02	-.01
.14	-.06	Organized (vs. disorganized) DVDs	.01	.03
.14	-.05	Varied (vs. homogeneous)	.01	-.04

---



Table 18: Lens Model Analysis for Stimulation

<b>Cue Validity</b>		<b>“Cues”</b>	<b>Cue Utilization</b>	
<i>Stimulation</i>			<i>Stimulation</i>	
Males	Females		Males	Females
.04	-.11	Noisy (vs. quiet) in room	-.09	.03
.07	-.13	Noisy (vs. quiet) in house	.15	.10
.04	-.02	Noisy (vs. quiet) outside	-.14	-.10
.11	.09	Well-lit (vs. dark) overall	-.03	.03
.10	.16	Well-lit (vs. dark) natural light	-.12	-.16
-.02	-.00	Well-lit (vs. dark) artificial light	-.07	.07
.05	.09	Drafty (vs. stuffy)	.02	-.04
.01	.09	Fresh (vs. stale)	.11	.03
-.14	-.12	Hot (vs. cold)	-.14	-.13
.14	.11	Good (vs. poor) condition	.24*	.19
-.01	-.01	Decorated (vs. undecorated)	-.09	-.15
-.01	.06	Cheerful (vs. gloomy)	.07	-.04
.01	-.02	Colorful (vs. ...)	-.08	-.19

---

		drab)		
.10	.06	Clean (vs. dirty)	.23*	.15
.16	-.03	Organized (vs. disorganized)	.22*	.13
.16	-.05	Neat (vs. messy)	.22*	.12
-.19	-.02	Cluttered (vs. uncluttered)	-.19	-.16
-.08	-.13	Clothing everywhere (vs. not visible)	-.18	-.22*
-.10	-.04	Clothing strewn around (vs. organized)	-.28**	-.32**
-.11	.11	Full (vs. empty)	-.17	-.16
.20	.02	Roomy (vs. cramped)	.13	.08
.14	.07	Expensive (vs. cheap)	.24*	.22*
.23*	.14	Comfortable (vs. uncomfortable)	.10	.14
.18	.07	Inviting (vs. repelling)	.12	.12
.19	.05	Large (vs. small)	.04	.03
-.16	-.23*	Distinctive (vs. ordinary)	-.27**	-.37***
.06	-.08	Stylish (vs. unstylish)	.03	-.03
.06	-.02	Modern (vs. old-fashioned)	-.03	-.08
.16	.11	New (vs. old)	.19	.13
.11	.02	Multi (vs. single)	-.01	-.06

---

---

.10	.14	single) purpose Masculine (vs. feminine)	.35***	.29**
-.07	-.01	Many (vs. few) books	.07	-.06
.04	-.07	Organized (vs. disorganized) books	.04	-.10
-.02	-.12	Varied (vs. homogeneous) books	-.09	-.16
.15	.21*	Many (vs. few) magazines	-.11	-.14
.15	.16	Organized (vs. disorganized) magazines	-.03	-.06
.21*	-.02	Varied (vs. homogeneous) magazines	-.22*	-.19
-.01	-.09	Many (vs. few) CDs	-.13	-.22*
-.07	-.04	Organized (vs. disorganized) CDs	-.04	-.15
-.04	-.13	Varied (vs. homogeneous) CDs	-.05	-.16
.16	-.07	Many (vs. few) DVDs	.05	.04
.08	.01	Organized (vs. disorganized) DVDs	.12	.06
.06	-.05	Varied (vs. homogeneous) DVDs	.01	-.02

---

.01	.04	Many (vs. few) items of stationery	.13	.12
-.11	.07	Organized (vs. disorganized) stationery	-.03	-.09

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Coefficients represent Pearson correlations. Cue validity is the correlation between self-reports of Stimulation and the presence of a cue. Cue utilization is the correlation between raters' ratings of target Stimulation and the presence of a cue.

Table 19: Lens Model Analysis for Hedonism

Cue Validity		"Cues"	Cue Utilization	
<i>Hedonism</i>			<i>Hedonism</i>	
Males	Females		Males	Females
.07	-.25*	Noisy (vs. quiet) in room	-.06	.13
.13	-.01	Noisy (vs. quiet) in house	.13	.11
-.07	.11	Noisy (vs. quiet) outside	-.19	-.15
.13	-.11	Well-lit (vs. dark) overall	.17	.10
-.03	.05	Well-lit (vs. dark) natural light	.04	-.03
.08	-.11	Well-lit (vs. dark) artificial light	.03	.04
.08	.00	Drafty (vs. stuffy)	.15	.04
.12	.01	Fresh (vs. stale)	.24*	.11
-.05	-.03	Hot (vs. cold)	-.20*	-.10
.21*	.05	Good (vs. poor) condition	.29**	.26*
.10	.07	Decorated (vs. undecorated)	-.11	-.20
.12	.00	Cheerful (vs. gloomy)	.11	.02
.14	-.00	Colorful (vs. drab)	-.05	-.13
.19	.08	Clean (vs. ...)	.32**	.26*

---

		dirty)		
.21*	.03	Organized (vs. disorganized)	.28**	.23*
.23*	.01	Neat (vs. messy)	.31**	.25*
-.14	.08	Cluttered (vs. uncluttered)	-.24*	-.25*
-.01	-.12	Clothing everywhere (vs. not visible)	-.13	-.16
-.08	-.05	Clothing strewn around (vs. organized)	-.25*	-.31**
-.06	.08	Full (vs. empty)	-.22*	-.22*
.18	-.01	Roomy (vs. cramped)	.23*	.14
.23*	-.02	Expensive (vs. cheap)	.26**	.25*
.21*	-.04	Comfortable (vs. uncomfortable)	.08	.15
.16	.01	Inviting (vs. repelling)	.12	.14
.21*	-.01	Large (vs. small)	.08	.03
.07	-.04	Distinctive (vs. ordinary)	-.24*	-.29**
.20	.02	Stylish (vs. unstylish)	.08	.02
.07	-.09	Modern (vs. old-fashioned)	.05	-.03
.13	.01	New (vs. old)	.19	.16
.16	.06	Multi (vs. single) purpose	-.04	-.13
.249*	.109	Masculine (vs. feminine)	.353***	.234*

---

.17	.21*	Many (vs. few) books	.12	-.11
.09	.12	Organized (vs. disorganized) books	.02	-.12
.08	.16	Varied (vs. homogeneous) books	.00	-.20
.20*	.06	Many (vs. few) magazines	.00	-.08
.19	-.02	Organized (vs. disorganized) magazines	.09	.04
.15	-.07	Varied (vs. homogeneous) magazines	-.07	-.09
.06	.09	Many (vs. few) CDs	-.09	-.19
.09	.06	Organized (vs. disorganized) CDs	.05	-.11
.08	.06	Varied (vs. homogeneous) CDs	.01	-.12
-.06	.04	Many (vs. few) DVDs	-.02	-.03
-.11	.15	Organized (vs. disorganized) DVDs	.01	-.01
-.15	.11	Varied (vs. homogeneous) DVDs	-.06	-.07
-.04	.07	Many (vs. few) items of stationery	.18	.09
-.01	.15	Organized (vs. disorganized)	.08	-.01

---

---

stationery

---

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Coefficients represent Pearson correlations. Cue validity is the correlation between self-reports of Hedonism and the presence of a cue. Cue utilization is the correlation between raters' ratings of target Hedonism and the presence of a cue.

Table 20: Lens Model Analysis for Achievement

Cue Validity		"Cues"	Cue Utilization	
Achievement			Achievement	
Males	Females		Males	Females
-.22*	-.22*	Noisy (vs. quiet) in room	-.01	.08
.06	-.03	Noisy (vs. quiet) in house	.00	-.03
-.15	.07	Noisy (vs. quiet) outside	.04	.03
.11	.12	Well-lit (vs. dark) overall	-.20	-.17
.11	.16	Well-lit (vs. dark) natural light	.06	.05
-.04	-.02	Well-lit (vs. dark) artificial light	-.12	-.08
.15	.20*	Drafty (vs. stuffy)	-.10	-.09
.22*	.16	Fresh (vs. stale)	-.24*	-.25*
-.25*	-.19	Hot (vs. cold)	.04	.04
.18	.03	Good (vs. poor) condition	-.47***	-.39***
.14	-.05	Decorated (vs. undecorated)	-.20*	-.25*
.16	-.06	Cheerful (vs. gloomy)	-.30**	-.31**
.13	.03	Colorful (vs. ...)	-.21*	-.24*

		drab)		
.17	.06	Clean (vs. dirty)	-.51***	-.42***
.13	.02	Organized (vs. disorganized)	-.49***	-.41***
.16	.05	Neat (vs. messy)	-.49***	-.42***
-.01	.05	Cluttered (vs. uncluttered)	.37***	.29**
-.09	.03	Clothing everywhere (vs. not visible)	.39***	.19
-.08	-.01	Clothing strewn around (vs. organized)	.43***	.32**
-.00	.00	Full (vs. empty)	-.04	-.07
.15	.07	Roomy (vs. cramped)	-.34**	-.32**
.11	.00	Expensive (vs. cheap)	-.55***	-.55***
.06	-.04	Comfortable (vs. uncomfortable)	-.42***	-.33**
.12	-.02	Inviting (vs. repelling)	-.37***	-.29**
.05	.03	Large (vs. small)	-.28**	-.28**
.07	.12	Distinctive (vs. ordinary)	.10	.00
.18	.03	Stylish (vs. unstylish)	-.34**	-.39***
.10	-.06	Modern (vs. old-fashioned)	-.17	-.21*
.13	-.01	New (vs. old)	-.38***	-.34**
.07	.00	Multi (vs. single)	-.10	-.15

---

.17	-.04	single) purpose Masculine (vs. feminine)	-.43***	-.45***
.20	.21*	Many (vs. few) books	-.07	-.09
.17	.13	Organized (vs. disorganized) books	-.18	-.12
.05	.19	Varied (vs. homogeneous) books	.06	.02
.01	-.10	Many (vs. few) magazines	.00	-.15
.07	-.08	Organized (vs. disorganized) magazines	-.09	-.12
-.01	-.05	Varied (vs. homogeneous) magazines	.15	.03
.08	.33**	Many (vs. few) CDs	.18	.04
.10	.25*	Organized (vs. disorganized) CDs	.08	-.06
.12	.31**	Varied (vs. homogeneous) CDs	.14	.01
-.07	.13	Many (vs. few) DVDs	.06	.13
-.05	.11	Organized (vs. disorganized) DVDs	.01	.10
-.06	.14	Varied (vs. homogeneous) DVDs	.02	.10

---

.03	.15	Many (vs. few) items of stationery	.29**	.29**
.05	.17	Organized (vs. disorganized) stationery	.02	.07

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Coefficients represent Pearson correlations. Cue validity is the correlation between self-reports of Achievement and the presence of a cue. Cue utilization is the correlation between raters' ratings of target Achievement and the presence of a cue.

Table 21: Lens Model Analysis for Power

Cue Validity		"Cues"	Cue Utilization	
Power			Power	
Males	Females		Males	Females
-.20	-.15	Noisy (vs. quiet) in room	-.07	.03
-.14	-.09	Noisy (vs. quiet) in house	.07	.03
.05	-.03	Noisy (vs. quiet) outside	-.04	.07
.00	.11	Well-lit (vs. dark) overall	-.04	.00
-.03	.14	Well-lit (vs. dark) natural light	.12	-.02
-.05	.11	Well-lit (vs. dark) artificial light	-.01	.04
.06	.22*	Drafty (vs. stuffy)	-.06	-.25*
.03	.09	Fresh (vs. stale)	-.20*	-.30**
-.18	-.14	Hot (vs. cold)	.11	.13
.11	-.07	Good (vs. poor) condition	-.24*	-.19
.09	-.15	Decorated (vs. undecorated)	.11	-.22*
-.01	-.08	Cheerful (vs. gloomy)	.01	-.22*
.01	.01	Colorful (vs. ...)	.16	-.17

---

		drab)		
.04	-.03	Clean (vs. dirty)	-.30**	-.21*
.06	-.07	Organized (vs. disorganized)	-.27**	-.24*
.05	-.03	Neat (vs. messy)	-.32**	-.25*
-.01	.02	Cluttered (vs. uncluttered)	.27**	.26*
.04	.08	Clothing everywhere (vs. not visible)	.35***	-.05
-.04	.07	Clothing strewn around (vs. organized)	.36***	.07
.09	-.07	Full (vs. empty)	.15	.04
.06	-.09	Roomy (vs. cramped)	-.25*	-.17
.13	-.17	Expensive (vs. cheap)	-.35**	-.30**
.14	-.10	Comfortable (vs. uncomfortable)	-.21*	-.22*
.07	-.12	Inviting (vs. repelling)	-.19	-.16
.04	-.07	Large (vs. small)	-.22*	-.20
-.04	.00	Distinctive (vs. ordinary)	.26*	-.01
.11	-.09	Stylish (vs. unstylish)	-.08	-.25*
-.05	-.10	Modern (vs. old-fashioned)	.04	-.20*
.10	-.09	New (vs. old)	-.16	-.29**
.02	-.15	Multi (vs. single)	.10	-.24*

---

---

		single) purpose		
.14	-.05	Masculine (vs. feminine)	-.11	-.30**
-.12	-.08	Many (vs. few) books	.14	.03
-.15	-.10	Organized (vs. disorganized) books	.13	-.01
-.18	-.13	Varied (vs. homogeneous) books	.25*	.03
.03	-.37***	Many (vs. few) magazines	.09	-.11
-.01	-.25*	Organized (vs. disorganized) magazines	.15	-.08
.10	-.26**	Varied (vs. homogeneous) magazines	.21*	-.03
.01	.07	Many (vs. few) CDs	.12	.07
-.16	-.03	Organized (vs. disorganized) CDs	.09	-.03
-.00	.01	Varied (vs. homogeneous) CDs	.08	.09
.07	-.01	Many (vs. few) DVDs	-.02	.14
.00	-.16	Organized (vs. disorganized) DVDs	.05	.01
.03	-.09	Varied (vs. homogeneous) DVDs	-.00	.07

---

-09	-06	Many (vs. few) items of stationery	.21*	.24*
.00	-.02	Organized (vs. disorganized) stationery	.08	.13

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Coefficients represent Pearson correlations. Cue validity is the correlation between self-reports of Power and the presence of a cue. Cue utilization is the correlation between raters' ratings of target Power and the presence of a cue.

Table 22: Lens Model Analysis for Security

Cue Validity		"Cues"	Cue Utilization	
<i>Security</i>			<i>Security</i>	
Males	Females		Males	Females
-.20	.05	Noisy (vs. quiet) in room	.01	-.03
-.22*	.16	Noisy (vs. quiet) in house	-.18	-.23*
-.11	.12	Noisy (vs. quiet) outside	.16	.13
.05	-.13	Well-lit (vs. dark) overall	-.32**	-.36**
.03	-.06	Well-lit (vs. dark) natural light	.01	-.03
.01	-.06	Well-lit (vs. dark) artificial light	-.24*	-.23*
.04	-.15	Drafty (vs. stuffy)	-.31**	-.28**
-.03	-.24*	Fresh (vs. stale)	-.52***	-.47***
.03	.03	Hot (vs. cold)	.16	.11
-.06	-.40***	Good (vs. poor) condition	-.71***	-.69***
-.05	-.23*	Decorated (vs. undecorated)	-.30**	-.33**
-.03	-.28**	Cheerful (vs. gloomy)	-.51***	-.51***
-.05	-.25*	Colorful (vs. ...)	-.37***	-.37***

		drab)		
-.11	-.41***	Clean (vs. dirty)	-.730***	-.72***
-.05	-.37***	Organized (vs. disorganized)	-.76***	-.77***
-.12	-.40***	Neat (vs. messy)	-.78***	-.80***
.04	.30**	Cluttered (vs. uncluttered)	.64***	.65***
.13	.16	Clothing everywhere (vs. not visible)	.41***	.43***
.15	.20*	Clothing strewn around (vs. organized)	.52***	.58***
.05	-.01	Full (vs. empty)	.24*	.19
.09	-.16	Roomy (vs. cramped)	-.55***	-.51***
-.02	-.33**	Expensive (vs. cheap)	-.67***	-.63***
-.04	-.33**	Comfortable (vs. uncomfortable)	-.51***	-.51***
-.02	-.39***	Inviting (vs. repelling)	-.56***	-.55***
.13	-.13	Large (vs. small)	-.40***	-.33**
.06	-.09	Distinctive (vs. ordinary)	-.13	-.15
-.13	-.37***	Stylish (vs. unstylish)	-.61***	-.64***
-.02	-.23*	Modern (vs. old-fashioned)	-.37***	-.35***
.03	-.30**	New (vs. old)	-.50***	-.47***
.09	-.13	Multi (vs. single)	-.23*	-.21*

---

		single) purpose		
-.10	-.22*	Masculine (vs. feminine)	-.53***	-.54***
.13	.08	Many (vs. few) books	.01	-.04
.13	-.05	Organized (vs. disorganized) books	-.27**	-.28**
.17	.04	Varied (vs. homogeneous) books	.01	-.02
.24*	-.05	Many (vs. few) magazines	.06	-.02
.16	-.17	Organized (vs. disorganized) magazines	-.24*	-.28**
.24*	-.03	Varied (vs. homogeneous) magazines	.16	.15
.04	.24*	Many (vs. few) CDs	-.06	-.04
.04	.17	Organized (vs. disorganized) CDs	-.06	.00
-.01	.24*	Varied (vs. homogeneous) CDs	-.06	-.02
.05	.21*	Many (vs. few) DVDs	.04	.07
.12	.20*	Organized (vs. disorganized) DVDs	.09	.10
.11	.24*	Varied (vs. homogeneous) DVDs	.08	.08

---

.10	.16	Many (vs. few) items of stationery	.39***	.43***
.11	-.01	Organized (vs. disorganized) stationery	-.04	-.01

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Coefficients represent Pearson correlations. Cue validity is the correlation between self-reports of Security and the presence of a cue. Cue utilization is the correlation between raters' ratings of target Security and the presence of a cue.

Table 23: Lens Model Analysis for Commitment

<b>Cue Validity</b>		"Cues"	<b>Cue Utilization</b>	
<i>Commitment</i>			<i>Commitment</i>	
Males	Females		Males	Females
.01	.07	Noisy (vs. quiet) in room	-.01	.01
-.15	.04	Noisy (vs. quiet) in house	.01	.03
-.01	.06	Noisy (vs. quiet) outside	.10	.10
.06	-.19	Well-lit (vs. dark) overall	.13	.09
.13	.09	Well-lit (vs. dark) natural light	-.02	-.09
-.08	-.21	Well-lit (vs. dark) artificial light	.09	.08
-.03	-.18	Drafty (vs. stuffy)	.01	.04
-.10	-.17	Fresh (vs. stale)	.12	.16
-.02	.03	Hot (vs. cold)	.09	.07
-.06	-.10	Good (vs. poor) condition	.19	.26*
-.04	-.14	Decorated (vs. undecorated)	.30**	.32**
-.02	-.18	Cheerful (vs. gloomy)	.31**	.34**
.08	-.19	Colorful (vs. ...)	.32**	.32**

		drab)		
-.08	-.13	Clean (vs. dirty)	.24*	.30**
-.03	-.12	Organized (vs. disorganized)	.23*	.30**
-.06	-.12	Neat (vs. messy)	.21*	.29**
.09	.19	Cluttered (vs. uncluttered)	-.11	-.18
.02	.05	Clothing everywhere (vs. not visible)	-.20*	-.21*
-.11	.03	Clothing strewn around (vs. organized)	-.18	-.22*
.16	-.02	Full (vs. empty)	.31**	.26**
-.06	-.06	Roomy (vs. cramped)	.09	.13
-.03	-.09	Expensive (vs. cheap)	.20	.26*
-.07	-.14	Comfortable (vs. uncomfortable)	.24*	.25*
-.06	-.17	Inviting (vs. repelling)	.23*	.25*
-.13	-.10	Large (vs. small)	.10	.13
.05	-.19	Distinctive (vs. ordinary)	-.07	-.06
-.03	-.21	Stylish (vs. unstylish)	.18	.22*
-.03	-.22	Modern (vs. old-fashioned)	.07	.07
-.07	-.17	New (vs. old)	.23*	.26**
-.12	-.01	Multi (vs. single)	.12	.13

.01	-.24*	single) purpose Masculine (vs. feminine)	.44***	.54***
-.01	.06	Many (vs. few) books	.11	.10
-.09	-.15	Organized (vs. disorganized) books	.19	.21*
.07	.11	Varied (vs. homogeneous) books	.08	.05
.16	-.02	Many (vs. few) magazines	.11	.09
.01	-.17	Organized (vs. disorganized) magazines	.01	-.01
-.07	.01	Varied (vs. homogeneous) magazines	-.06	-.11
.10	.06	Many (vs. few) CDs	-.05	-.05
.12	.07	Organized (vs. disorganized) CDs	.02	.02
.12	.07	Varied (vs. homogeneous) CDs	-.02	-.02
-.13	.04	Many (vs. few) DVDs	-.00	.01
-.14	.05	Organized (vs. disorganized) DVDs	.11	.10
.01	.09	Varied (vs. homogeneous)	.09	.05

		DVDs		
.06	.04	Many (vs. few) items of stationery	-.20*	-.21*
-.02	-.17	Organized (vs. disorganized) stationery	.04	.06

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Coefficients represent Pearson correlations. Cue validity is the correlation between self-reports of Commitment and the presence of a cue. Cue utilization is the correlation between raters' ratings of target Commitment and the presence of a cue.

Table 24: Lens Model Analysis for Satisfaction

Cue Validity		"Cues"	Cue Utilization	
Satisfaction			Satisfaction	
Males	Females		Males	Females
-.11	-.07	Noisy (vs. quiet) in room	-.05	-.07
-.05	.08	Noisy (vs. quiet) in house	-.03	-.03
.10	.03	Noisy (vs. quiet) outside	.15	.11
.01	.02	Well-lit (vs. dark) overall	.04	.13
.00	.07	Well-lit (vs. dark) natural light	-.05	-.06
.12	.06	Well-lit (vs. dark) artificial light	.06	.12
.05	-.05	Drafty (vs. stuffy)	-.05	.04
.03	.11	Fresh (vs. stale)	.06	.16
-.05	.05	Hot (vs. cold)	.17	.10
.18	.15	Good (vs. poor) condition	.11	.22*
.01	-.03	Decorated (vs. undecorated)	.32**	.33**
.14	.10	Cheerful (vs. gloomy)	.28**	.36***
.15	.11	Colorful (vs. drab)	.32**	.35***
.09	.09	Clean (vs. dirty)	.16	.27**
.11	.13	Organized (vs. disorganized)	.16	.26*
.09	.11	Neat (vs. messy)	.143	.253*
-.13	-.17	Cluttered (vs. ...)	-.05	-.16

---

		uncluttered)		
		Clothing		
		everywhere (vs.		
		not visible		
		Clothing strewn		
		around (vs.		
		organized)		
		Full (vs. empty		
		Roomy (vs.		
		cramped)		
		Expensive (vs.		
		cheap)		
		Comfortable (vs.		
		uncomfortable)		
		Inviting (vs.		
		repelling)		
		Large (vs. small)		
		Distinctive (vs.		
		ordinary)		
		Stylish (vs.		
		unstylish)		
		Modern (vs. old-		
		fashioned)		
		New (vs. old)		
		Multi (vs. single)		
		purpose		
		Masculine (vs.		
		feminine)		
		Many (vs. few)		
		books		
		Organized (vs.		
		disorganized)		
		books		
		Varied (vs.		
		homogeneous)		

---

		books		
-.21	-.27*	Many (vs. few) magazines	.07	.11
-.06	-.08	Organized (vs. disorganized) magazines	-.03	.02
-.01	-.13	Varied (vs. homogeneous) magazines	-.09	-.13
-.14	-.01	Many (vs. few) CDs	-.03	-.02
-.24*	-.12	Organized (vs. disorganized) CDs	.06	.05
-.17	-.01	Varied (vs. homogeneous) CDs	.02	.00
-.03	-.01	Many (vs. few) DVDs	.00	.00
-.03	-.06	Organized (vs. disorganized) DVDs	.11	.09
-.05	-.11	Varied (vs. homogeneous) DVDs	.08	.06
.01	.02	Many (vs. few) items of stationery	-.20*	-.23*
.11	-.03	Organized (vs. disorganized) stationery	.07	.07

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Coefficients represent Pearson correlations. Cue validity is the correlation between self-reports of Satisfaction and the presence of a cue. Cue utilization is the correlation between raters' ratings of target Satisfaction and the presence of a cue.

Table 25: Similarity in cue utilization and cue validity in the living room and bedroom studies

Trait Assessed	Cross- study similarity in pattern					
	Male Cue Utilization Correlations	Male Cue Validity Correlations	Female Cue Utilization Correlations	Female Cue Validity Correlations	Couple Cue Utilization Correlations	Couple Cue Validity Correlations
Extraversion	.38*	-.01	.39*	-.03	.27	-.06
Agreeableness	.42**	-.18	.39*	-.16	.54***	-.36*
Conscientiousness	.72***	-.20	.69***	.37*	.70***	.24
Neuroticism	-.16	.17	-.15	.08	-.16	.08
Openness	-.24	-.05	-.24	-.04	-.35*	-.10

Notes: \*\*\* =  $p \leq .000$ ; \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ ; \* =  $p \leq .05$ . Column-vector correlations were computed across cues that were common across both studies. N = 41 cues

Table 26: Correlations of observer ratings of occupants

	E- Male	E- Female	E- Couple	A- Male	A- Female	A- Couple	C- Male	C- Female	C- Couple	N- Male	N- Female	N- Couple	O- Male	O- Female	O- Couple
E-Male	1.00	.56**	.84**	.23*	.22*	.20*	-.13	-.04	-.10	-.03	-.10	-.13	.42**	.40**	.40**
E-Female	.56**	1.00	.84**	.58**	.40**	.49**	.14	.14	.11	-.27**	-.19	-.31**	.20	.39**	.26**
E-Couple	.84**	.84**	1.00	.41**	.31**	.33**	-.02	.05	-.01	-.13	-.15	-.20	.37**	.48**	.41**
A-Male	.23*	.58**	.41**	1.00	.78**	.81**	.40**	.38**	.37**	-.69**	-.68**	-.69**	-.04	.15	.05
A-Female	.22*	.40**	.31**	.78**	1.00	.87**	.37**	.37**	.33**	-.62**	-.69**	-.69**	.02	.14	.07
A-Couple	.20*	.49**	.33**	.81**	.87**	1.00	.48**	.48**	.47**	-.65**	-.71**	-.75**	-.00	.14	.04
C- Male	-.13	.14	-.02	.40**	.37**	.48**	1.00	.94**	.95**	-.63**	-.57**	-.64**	-.28**	-.20	-.22*
C- Female	-.04	.14	.05	.38**	.37**	.48**	.94**	1.00	.96**	-.61**	-.57**	-.64**	-.24*	-.17	-.19
C- Couple	-.10	.11	-.01	.37**	.33**	.47**	.95**	.96**	1.00	-.59**	-.53**	-.62**	-.27**	-.20	-.23*
N- Male	-.03	-.27**	-.13	-.69**	-.62**	-.65**	-.63**	-.61**	-.59**	1.00	.82**	.80**	.22*	.11	.13
N- Female	-.10	-.19	-.15	-.68**	-.70**	-.71**	-.57**	-.57**	-.53**	.82**	1.00	.82**	-.00	-.06	-.06
N- Couple	-.13	-.31**	-.20	-.69**	-.69**	-.75**	-.64**	-.64**	-.62**	.80**	.82**	1.00	.09	-.01	.05
O- Male	.42**	.20	.37**	-.04	.02	-.00	-.28**	-.24*	-.27**	.22*	-.00	.09	1.00	.91**	.95**
O- Female	.40**	.39**	.48**	.15	.14	.14	-.20	-.17	-.20	.11	-.06	-.01	.91**	1.00	.96**
O- Couple	.40**	.26**	.41**	.05	.07	.04	-.22*	-.19	-.23*	.13	-.06	.05	.95**	.96**	1.00

Notes: \*\* =  $p < .01$ , \* =  $p < .05$ . E = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, C = Conscientiousness, N = Neuroticism, O = Openness

Table 27: Correlations of self-report ratings of the Big Five

	E- Male	E- Female	E- Couple	A- Male	A- Female	A- Couple	C- Male	C- Female	C- Couple	N- Male	N- Female	N- Couple	O- Male	O- Female	O- Couple
E-Male	1.00	-.09	.52**	.26**	.06	.25*	.24*	-.01	.11	-.33**	.04	-.27**	.11	-.10	.17
E-Female	-.09	1.00	.51**	-.11	.16	.04	.14	.06	.31**	.12	.06	.07	-.08	-.01	.05
E-Couple	.52**	.51**	1.00	.11	.14	.28**	.22*	.02	.35**	-.20*	.10	-.26**	.13	-.00	.28**
A-Male	.26**	-.11	.11	1.00	-.07	.43**	.05	.19	.19	-.15	.07	-.14	.01	-.03	-.03
A-Female	.06	.16	.14	-.07	1.00	.52**	.08	.12	.27**	.09	-.41**	-.28**	-.20	-.00	-.02
A-Couple	.25*	.04	.28**	.43**	.52**	1.00	.10	.29**	.52**	-.10	-.23*	-.52**	-.05	-.03	.02
C- Male	.24*	.14	.22*	.05	.08	.10	1.00	-.01	.36**	-.14	-.01	-.19	.17	-.01	.12
C- Female	-.01	.06	.02	.19	.12	.29**	-.01	1.00	.62**	-.03	-.21*	-.24*	-.04	-.22*	-.21*
C- Couple	.11	.31**	.35**	.19	.27**	.52**	.36**	.62**	1.00	-.13	-.13	-.46**	.02	-.12	-.04
N- Male	-.33**	.12	-.20*	-.15	.09	-.10	-.14	-.03	-.13	1.00	-.26**	.34**	.01	.03	-.05
N- Female	.04	.06	.10	.07	-.41**	-.23*	-.01	-.21*	-.13	-.26**	1.00	.47**	.05	.08	.05
N- Couple	-.27**	.07	-.26**	-.14	-.28**	-.52**	-.19	-.24*	-.46**	.34**	.47**	1.00	-.05	.09	-.02
O- Male	.11	-.08	.13	.01	-.20	-.05	.17	-.04	.02	.01	.05	-.05	1.00	.07	.61**
O- Female	-.10	-.01	-.00	-.03	-.00	-.03	-.01	-.22*	-.12	.03	.08	.09	.07	1.00	.55**
O- Couple	.17	.05	.28**	-.03	-.02	.02	.12	-.21*	-.04	-.05	.05	-.02	.61**	.55**	1.00

Notes: \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ , \* =  $p \leq .05$ . E = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, C = Conscientiousness, N = Neuroticism, O = Openness

Table 28: Correlations between number of photos and observer and self-reports of the Big Five

<b>Observer Ratings</b>	<b>Number of Photos</b>
E- Male	.28**
E- Female	.28**
E- Couple	.33**
A- Male	.18
A- Female	.26*
A- Couple	.24*
C- Male	.04
C- Female	.05
C- Couple	.01
N- Male	-.08
N- Female	-.18
N- Couple	-.16
O- Male	.41**
O- Female	.40**
O- Couple	.41**
<b>Self Reports</b>	
E- Male	-.03
E- Female	-.09
E- Couple	-.05
A- Male	-.07
A- Female	.02
A- Couple	.03
C- Male	-.08
C- Female	-.13
C- Couple	-.14
N- Male	.04
N- Female	.12
N- Couple	-.01
O- Male	.24*
O- Female	.19
O- Couple	.23*

Notes: \*\* =  $p \leq .01$ , \* =  $p \leq .05$ . E = Extraversion, A = Agreeableness, C = Conscientiousness, N = Neuroticism, O = Openness

**Figure 1: Brunswik's (1956) lens model**

