Personality and the Enactment of Emotion

Howard S. Friedman
Ronald E. Riggio
Daniel O. Segall

ABSTRACT: The meaning of personality traits for social interaction was investigated by exploring the personality correlates of abilities to pose emotions. This framework focuses on individual differences in socio-emotional skills. Thirty one males and 37 females were videotaped while attempting to communicate seven basic emotions nonverbally (i.e., using standard content communications), and sending success was measured by showing edited videotapes to judges. Hypothesized relationships between "acting" ability and scores on the Jackson Personality Research Form and the Eysenck Personality Inventory were then examined. The findings were seen to have implications for predicting individual strengths and weaknesses in social interaction as a function of certain personality traits and for understanding person perception.

Allport (1961) strongly urged increased attention to expressive behavior, claiming that "the expressive manner and style of the other is an important (perhaps the most important) factor in our understanding of personality" (p. 494). In social interaction, we observe how people behave, not what they are thinking. Proper "manner" is a key element of social adjustment. Although Allport dealt in depth with expressive behavior, he, like many personality

theorists, gave relatively little explicit attention to emotional expression. But though the ties are often left implicit, many concepts of personality are closely tied to emotion (Izard, 1971, 1977). Notions of aggressiveness, dominance, impulsivity, playfulness, and the like all involve the expression and/or control of emotion.

At times, the theoretical link between personality and emotional expression does become fairly explicit. In particular, attention to such matters has been encouraged by theorizing regarding the dimensions of "internalizer–externalizer" and "introvert–extravert" (cf. Buck, 1975, 1977). Examining individual differences in spontaneous (natural) nonverbal emotional expressiveness in children, Buck found expressive children (accurate senders) to be rated by their teachers as sociable, active, aggressive, impulsive, uninhibited, and extraverted.

In addition to being an observable correlate of certain personality traits, expressive ability may be considered a social skill (Rosenthal, 1979). For example, it may be important to social life to be able to express sympathy to a troubled child, anger to an annoying intruder, or happiness to a kind friend. In such an analysis, the emphasis is placed on individual differences in *communication abilities* rather than dispositions. This shift in perspective from traits to abilities may provide a behavioral record of individual differences (in actual nonverbal communications) and, by focusing on interaction process, help blur the distinction between social and personality psychology (Friedman, 1979). For example, if we find that affiliative people are especially able to communicate emotion to others, then we have begun to understand how personality affects, and in turn may be affected by, social interaction.

Although natural (spontaneous) emotional expression may be related to aspects of personality, the question arises as to whether personality is reflected in the *controlled* emotions presented in day-to-day social life. That is, people appear to manage their emotions in most social interactions (e.g., Goffman, 1959) and so posed or acted emotional expression might be quite unrepresentative of underlying dispositions. This point of view is contradicted by two lines of evidence. First, recent research seems to indicate the existence of a high positive correlation between ability to pose emotions accurately and ability to communicate emotions naturally) e.g., Zuckerman, Hall, DeFrank, & Rosenthal, 1976). In fact,

Cunningham (1977) found very similar correlations between personality on the one hand and posed and spontaneous expression on the other hand; he also found high posed–spontaneous correlations. Secondly, research on expressive control involving the concept of "self–monitoring" (Snyder, 1974) does *not* show that ability and desire to manage impressions is strongly related to ability to pose emotions (e.g., Cunningham, 1977; Zuckerman et al., 1976), at least when manipulation is not critical. Expressive ability seems more basic. In fact, it has been shown that high self–monitors, presumably with good communication skills, did not reveal less correspondence between judged and assessed (true) extraversion during role–playing than low self–monitors (Lippa, 1976). Thus, the relationship between acted (posed) emotions and personality also seems deserving of additional research.

Thompson and Meltzer (1964) explored the relationships between abilities to enact emotion through facial expression and personality. It was hypothesized that since enactment of emotion in social situations seems to be an important part of social life, this ability should be related to personality scales like the California Personality Inventory which claims to measure characteristics important for social life. However, no correlations between expressive ability and the CPI were found. Thompson and Meltzer suggested the CPI might be responsible for the failure to find significant effects, but their study also had other methodological limitations. First of all, ten emotions were used, including "love." Recent research fails to establish love as a discrete category of facial expression. Yet "love" was one of 10 choices used by judges and was scored as incorrect if confused with happiness. A similar problem resulted from the inclusion of both "bewilderment" and "surprise." Second, only facial expressions were allowed; no voice cues or body movements were present. Third, there were only four judges of emotion.

Recent studies of the relationships between abilities to pose (enact) emotion and personality traits as measured by the Personality Research Form (PRF) (Jackson, 1974) were more successful. These studies (Friedman, DiMatteo, & Taranta, in press) used four basic emotions (happiness, anger, sadness, and surprise), a more reliable sample of judges of communication accuracy, and three content standard sentences. However, the senders were

mostly male and limited in number (21 in a first study using voice only and 17 in a second study which included face). The pattern of correlations which emerged was striking in the extent of agreement with Buck's (1975) findings concerning spontaneous expression in children. Good actors (senders) scored high on Dominance, Exhibition, Play, Autonomy, and Impulsivity, and low on Harm Avoidance.

The present research extended previous work on the relationships between personality and the ability to enact emotion. A number of advances were made. First, the present study used those basic six categories of emotion about which there seems to be most agreement among researchers (Ekman, Friesen, & Ellsworth, 1972; Izard, 1977). However, we were also more flexible in our scoring of the dependent measures (see below). Second, a large sample of senders ($N = 68$) was employed, including 37 females. Third, senders of varying levels of expressiveness were recruited to insure an adequate range. Fourth and finally, the present research employed both the Jackson Personality Research Form and the Eysenck Personality Inventory (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1968).

On the basis of previous research, it was hypothesized that ability to enact emotions would be related to certain aspects of personality. Specifically, it was expected that this expressive ability would be related to Dominance (influential, persuasive, forceful people), Impulsivity (uninhibited, spontaneous, irrepressible people), Play (jovial, prankish, fun-loving people), and low Harm Avoidance (adventurous, careless, risk-taking people). (The adjectives all come from Jackson, 1974.) An especially important hypothesis concerned Exhibition, which was previously found to be highly related to acting ability. Exhibition derives directly from Murray's (1938) system of basic needs and involves a desire to be dramatic and be the center of attention. It seemed important to ascertain whether people able to communicate emotion nonverbally really had colorful, spellbinding, and exhibitionistic personalities, or whether this tendency could be better understood in terms of extraversion (as measured by the Eysenck Personality Inventory). Finally, on the basis of increasing evidence of sex differences in expressive abilities (Buck, 1977; Hall, 1979), we searched for differences between adult males and females in the personality correlates of these abilities.

METHOD

Subjects

In order to insure an adequate range of individual differences in expressive ability, subjects were recruited according to their scores on the Affective Communication Test (Friedman, Prince, Riggio, & DiMatteo, in press), a self-report measure of nonverbal expressiveness. The subjects or "actors" were 31 male and 37 female undergraduates, paid volunteers.

Procedure

Personality measures. In initial sessions, subjects filled out the Personality Research Form (Jackson PRF) and the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) in small groups. They returned alone after about seven days for the acting session.

Videotaping of emotional sending. The subject was seated in a chair approximately 8 feet (2.4 m) from a Sony black and white video camera which was trained on the subject's head and shoulders. A tie-clip microphone was attached to the collar.

Each subject was given a set of 21 cards. On each card was printed one of three sentences ("I haven't seen you for a while."; "Do you really want to do this?"; or the portion of the alphabet: "A,B,C,D,E,F,G"), and one of seven possible emotions: happiness, anger, surprise, disgust, sadness, fear, and neutral (3 x 7 = 21 cards). The cards were counterbalanced so that each subject received a different order. The sentences were chosen in an effort to use emotionally neutral standard verbal content. The specific emotions were selected because they represent the basic categories of emotion (Ekman & Friesen, 1975).

Subjects were instructed to recite each of the sentences to the camera, while portraying the particular emotion that was written on the card. The videotape camera was left running and subjects were allowed to proceed at their own pace.

Editing. The segments were then edited on to three master tapes for judging. The first master tape included all of the segments (7 emotions x 68 subjects = approximately 476 segments), the second tape was composed of the segments containing the second sentence, and the third tape contained those segments in which emotion was expressed while saying a part of the alphabet. Each segment was three seconds long.

Judging of Videotapes

Judges were male and female undergraduate students. Twenty six judges each viewed the first and second tape, and 17 judges were shown the third master tape (alphabet). Judges were run in small groups (two to eight) seated in front of an RCA 25″ monitor. Judgments were recorded on an answer sheet which gave the choice of the seven possible emotions. Judges circled (on the answer sheet) the emotion they believed was being expressed in a given segment.

In order to determine the reliability of judges' ratings, the statistic KR20 was computed on the judges who viewed the second tape, using judges as items. The judgments were reliable (KR20 = .89).

Dependent Measure

In studies of emotional communication, an important methodological point concerns whether emotional dimensions (e.g., positive–negative) or emotional categories (e.g., happy, angry) should be used. Both approaches have been widely used. But while emotion categories are more precise when considering *expression*, judges are generally unable to make such fine discriminations. Judges make certain common confusions such as seeing fear as surprise. For example, in the present study, we found that judges' accuracy seemed to be below what should be expected on the basis of previous research (when our judges used seven categories as choices). Therefore a table of judges' confusions was constructed which reveals judges' errors. This information is presented in Table 1. Since this information was consistent with the previous literature (e.g., Ekman et al., 1972), we used the following dependent measures in this study: Happiness was scored as correctly sent if the judges chose either happiness or surprise. When the actors were sending the emotion anger, both anger and disgust were counted as correct. For surprise, happiness and surprise were correct. For disgust, both disgust and anger were correct. When fear was being sent, judgments of both fear and surprise were considered accurate. Judgments of the emotion sadness contained no consistent confusions; therefore only a judgment of sadness was counted as correct.

Preliminary analysis indicated that sending abilities on sentences one and two were highly correlated (median = .55). Therefore, sentences one and two were combined in all analyses. Alphabet sending was considered separately.

Analysis

The percent accuracy (of judgment) scores assigned to each segment revealed both substantial (above chance) abilities to enact

Table 1

Judge's Confusions in Perceiving Emotion

Emotion Sent By "Actor"

Emotion Perceived By Judges	Happiness	Anger	Sadness	Surprise	Disgust	Fear
Neutral	11.0	10.0	15.0	9.3	10.2	11.2
Fear	4.8	6.9	12.9	7.5	8.9	26.4
Disgust	4.2	22.8	11.3	4.7	34.4	12.2
Surprise	30.6	6.0	6.2	47.2	6.4	21.0
Sadness	5.8	9.0	45.2	5.1	12.6	16.4
Anger	2.5	41.6	6.3	3.4	23.8	7.8
Happiness	39.7	2.9	2.2	21.3	2.9	3.8

Note: Numbers represent percentages of judges making each choice.

emotions and substantial variation across actors. Abilities to enact the specific emotions and total acting ab[l]ity were related to the personality scales through Pearson correlation coefficients.

RESULTS

The correlations between abilities to enact emotions and personality traits are presented in Table 2. Since there are numerous correlations, it is important to search for patterns of relationships expected on the basis of previous theory and research. A single isolated significant correlation is meaningful only as a suggestion of a possible hypothesis for future research.

Due to increasing evidence of important sex differences in nonverbal emotional skills, the present study included both males and females and analyzed the results separately by sex. It was found that females were better than males at enacting (with standard content sentences) happiness ($t(66) = 1.75$, $p < .09$), anger ($t(66) = 3.58$, $p < .01$), sadness ($t(66) = 0.11$, N.S.), surprise ($t(66) = 1.82$, $p < .08$), disgust ($t(64) = 2.38$, $p < .05$), and fear ($t(65) = .76$, N.S.). Overall, females were better senders, both for sentences ($t(63) = 2.33$, $p < .05$) and for alphabet sending ($t(63) = 2.32$, $p < .05$). Hence, the correlations between acting and personality are reported separately by sex.

Table 2

Correlations of Acting Abilities and Personality Traits

by Sex (Male/Female)

Jackson PRF	Happiness	Anger	Surprise	Disgust	Sadness	Fear	Total
			Sending of Sentences				
Achievement	-.11/.05 (31/37)	.04/-.20 (31/37)	-.02/.00 (31/37)	-.04/-.31* (30/36)	.01/.02 (31/37)	.09/-.01 30/37)	-.02/-.14 (29/36)
Affiliation	.21/.15 (31/37)	-.07/.08 (31/37)	.07/.28* (31/37)	-.24/-.08 (30/36)	.25/19 (31/37)	.35*/.03 (30/37)	.14/.14 (29/36)
Aggression	-.16/-.06 (31/37)	.03/.04 (31/37)	-.12/.03 (31/37)	.13/.21 (30/36)	-.23/.18 (31/37)	-.15/.06 (30/37)	-.10/.14 (29/36)
Autonomy	.17/.06 (31/37)	.17/-.19 (31/37)	.23/.05 (31/37)	.18/-.14 (30/36)	.01/-.22 (31/37)	.18/.11 (30/37)	.23/-.13 (29/36)
Dominance	.15/.24 (31/37)	.32*/-.08 (31/37)	.28/.34** (31/37)	.19/.17 (30/36)	.14/.18 (31/37)	.30/.08 (30/37)	.33*/.29* (29/36)
Endurance	.15/.21 (31/37)	.06/-.12 (31/37)	.18/.10 (31/37)	-.15/-.10 (30/36)	.12/-.14 (31/37)	.17/.11 (30/37)	.14/.00 (29/36)
Exhibition	.10/.23 (31/37)	.31*/.25 (31/37)	.23/.44*** (31/37)	.33*/.40** (30/36)	.18/.31* (31/37)	.19/.32* (30/37)	.32*/.51** (29/36)
Harm Avoidance	-.03/-.10 (31/37)	.00/.16 (31/37)	-.02/-.23 (31/37)	-.11/.08 (30/36)	-.25/-.20 (31/37)	-.22/-.20 (30/37)	-.14/-.07 (29/36)
Impulsivity	.31*/-.06 (31/37)	.28/-.09 (31/37)	.42**/.02 (31/37)	.24/-.08 (30/36)	.19/.18 (31/37)	.19/-.05 (30/37)	.43**/-.04 (29/36)
Nurturance	-.09/-.30* (31/37)	-.35*/-.29* (31/37)	-.07/-.38** (31/37)	-.44**/-.35** (30/36)	.06/.07 (31/37)	.18/-.31* (30/37)	-.15/-.44* (29/36)
Order	-.11/-.08 (31/37)	-.09/.05 (31/37)	-.17/.05 (31/37)	-.08/.09 (30/36)	-.09/-.24 (31/37)	.01/.29* (30/37)	-.16/.06 (29/36)
Play	.02/-.02 (31/37)	.15/-.06 (31/37)	.04/.15 (31/37)	.24/-.12 (30/36)	.12/-.10 (31/37)	.19/.06 (30/37)	.17/-.05 (29/36)
Social Recognition	-.06/-.18 (31/37)	-.30/.14 (31/37)	-.09/-.13 (31/37)	-.13/.18 (30/36)	.03/-.06 (31/37)	-.09/-.05 (30/37)	-.14/.00 (29/36)
Understanding	.11/-.01 (31/37)	.16/-.02 (31/37)	.18/-.07 (31/37)	.21/.07 (30/36)	.13/.19 (31/37)	.15/-.13 (30/37)	.21/-.02 (29/36)
Infrequency	-.04/-.07 (31/37)	-.02/.01 (31/37)	.02/-.01 (31/37)	-.20/.16 (30/36)	.04/-.22 (31/37)	-.04/-.05 (30/37)	-.03/-.03 (29/36)

Eysenck Personality Inventory	Happiness	Anger	Surprise	Disgust	Sadness	Fear	Total
			Sending of Sentences				
Extraversion	.16/.11 (31/37)	.05/-.10 (31/37)	.09/.29* (31/37)	.03/-.08 (30/36)	.16/.21 (31/37)	.21/.24 (30/37)	.18/.14 (29/36)
Neuroticism	.00/-.15 (31/37)	-.04/.15 (31/37)	-.03/-.20 (31/37)	-.01/.13 (30/36)	-.30/-.04 (31/37)	-.21/-.06 (30/37)	-.12/-.01 (29/36)
Lie	.05/-.07 (31/37)	-.23/-.03 (31/37)	.10/-.03 (31/37)	-.29/-.06 (30/36)	.06/-.13 (31/37)	.02/.04 (30/37)	-.04/-.08 (29/36)

Jackson PRF			Sending of Alphabet				
Achievement	-.07/.00 (31/37)	.05/-.06 (30/37)	.02/-.01 (30/37)	.04/-.05 (31/37)	-.06/.03 (31/37)	-.02/-.18 (30/37)	-.08/-.08 (28/37)
Affiliation	.31*/-.07 (31/37)	.02/.07 (30/37)	.10/.18 (30/37)	.19/-.05 (31/37)	-.32*/.03 (31/37)	.11/.14 (30/37)	.12/.09 (28/37)

HOWARD S. FRIEDMAN, RONALD E. RIGGIO, DANIEL O. SEGALL

Jackson PRF	Happiness	Anger	Surprise	Disgust	Sadness	Fear	Total
Aggression	-.11/.10 (31/37)	.15/.07 (30/37)	-.18/-.24 (30/37)	.05/.22 (31/37)	.20/.03 (31/37)	.09/-.21 (30/37)	.09/-.02 (28/37)
Autonomy	-.13/-.27 (31/37)	-.14/-.17 (30/37)	.27/.13 (30/37)	.12/-.21 (31/37)	-.01/-.15 (31/37)	.10/-.15 (30/37)	.07/-.25 (28/37)
Dominance	.07/-.07 (31/37)	.15/.18 (30/37)	.16/.13 (30/37)	.37**/.13 (31/37)	.23/.29* (31/37)	.42**/-.05 (30/37)	.38**/.16 (28/37)
Endurance	.01/.10 (31/37)	-.14/-.04 (30/37)	.09/.21 (30/37)	-.05/-.04 (31/37)	-.02/-.06 (31/37)	.02/-.06 (30/37)	-.05/.04 (28/37)
Exhibition	-.04/-.18 (31/37)	.19/.33** (30/37)	.21/.32* (30/37)	.44**/.07 (31/37)	.41**/.18 (31/37)	.05/.15 (30/37)	.28/.25 (28/37)
Harm Avoidance	.26/.01 (31/37)	.13/.25 (30/37)	.17/-.25 (30/37)	-.20/.11 (31/37)	-.12/-.04 (31/37)	-.08/.21 (30/37)	.11/.09 (28/37)
Impulsivity	.05/-.10 (31/37)	.05/-.18 (30/37)	.02/.11 (30/37)	.31*/.05 (31/37)	.21/-.01 (31/37)	.17/-.31* (30/37)	.28/-.15 (28/37)
Nurturance	.17/-.22 (31/37)	-.33*/-.06 (30/37)	-.05/-.14 (30/37)	.01/-.23 (31/37)	-.35*/.05 (31/37)	-.07/-.12 (30/37)	-.18/-.23 (28/37)
Order	-.06/-.18 (31/37)	.06/.16 (30/37)	.00/-.09 (30/37)	-.06/-.12 (31/37)	.05/.09 (31/37)	.10/.36** (30/37)	-.03/.07 (28/37)
Play	.03/-.13 (31/37)	.21/-.16 (30/37)	.06/.15 (30/37)	.45**/-.30* (31/37)	.31*/.12 (31/37)	.42**/-.07 (30/37)	.38**/-.12 (28/37)

Jackson PRF	Happiness	Anger	Surprise	Disgust	Sadness	Fear	Total

Sending of Alphabet

	Happiness	Anger	Surprise	Disgust	Sadness	Fear	Total
Social Recognition	.18/-.08 (31/37)	-.17/.31* (30/37)	-.12/-.38** (30/37)	-.20/-.09 (31/37)	-.17/-.04 (31/37)	-.23/.05 (30/37)	-.14/-.06 (28/37)
Understanding	.20/.09 (31/37)	.10/.01 (30/37)	.27/-.06 (30/37)	.25/.05 (31/37)	-.05/-.14 (31/37)	.18/-.37** (30/37)	.23/-.12 (28/37)
Infrequency	-.15/-.14 (31/37)	.11/.22 (30/37)	.07/-.18 (30/37)	-.22/.17 (31/37)	.12/.16 (31/37)	-.01/-.11 (30/37)	.01/.02 (28/37)

Eysenck Personality Inventory

	Happiness	Anger	Surprise	Disgust	Sadness	Fear	Total
Extraversion	.10/-.22 (31/37)	.06/-.08 (30/37)	.03/.34** (30/37)	.38**/-.20 (31/37)	.08/.05 (31/37)	.13/.02 (30/37)	.23/-.03 (28/37)
Neuroticism	-.09/.15 (31/37)	.15/.27 (30/37)	-.11/-.38** (30/37)	-.25/.18 (31/37)	-.17/-.14 (31/37)	-.27/-.10 (30/37)	-.15/.00 (28/37)
Lie	.16/-.24 (31/37)	-.06/.27 (30/37)	.22/-.18 (30/37)	-.30/-.06 (31/37)	-.17/-.02 (31/37)	-.03/.20 (30/37)	-.05/-.01 (28/37)

$* \ p < .10$
$** \ p < .05$
$*** \ p < .01$

Notes: The N for each correlation is shown in parentheses.

Although combined male-female correlations are not reported, it is of course true that several correlations become more significant when those for males and females are averaged and the N thereby increased.

As predicted, Dominance is related to abilities to enact emotion. Since a dominant person "attempts to influence other people and express opinions forcefully" (Jackson, 1974), it makes sense that such people are also able to enact emotion. Since the data are correlational, it is not known whether people with a need for dominance develop nonverbal emotional skills, or whether good actors tend to become dominant, or whether both aspects spring from some more basic element of personality. Most likely, in adults, all three processes are constantly at work.

Also as predicted, acting ability was clearly related to Exhibition, a desire to be dramatic and be the center of attention. People needing to be showy and colorful could indeed pose emotion. However, acting ability was much less strongly related to Extraversion. Thus it appears that ability to pose emotions is more closely tied to being flashy and exhibitionistic than to the easygoing, uncontrolled, sociable personality of an extravert.

Contrary to prediction, acting ability seemed generally unrelated to Harm Avoidance (which was expected to be negatively correlated).

The expected relationship between acting abilities and Impulsivity and Play occurred, but only for males. Significant sex differences emerged. Impulsive (uninhibited, spontaneous) males were better able to enact emotions but this relationship did not hold true for females. This finding thus clarifies previous research (Friedman, DiMatteo & Taranta, in press) in which mostly males were studied. More importantly, this finding indicates that males who readily vent their feelings are also able to enact feelings; perhaps those males socialized to be "manly" and hold back feelings (cf. Buck, 1977) also lose the ability to enact emotion. Similar differences occurred regarding Play, especially on alphabet sending.

Otherwise, males and females seem to show similar results. However, on Nurturance (assists others, cares for children), the correlations with acting abilities are higher for females. More nurturant people were less able to enact emotion. Explanation of this finding awaits further research, but it may be that nurturant people are more concerned with (and good at) detecting the emotional needs of others rather than with communicating their own feelings.

The correlations between abilities to enact the various emotions (not shown) varied considerably and were sometimes very

low. Since this study was not designed to investigate this question of the structure of sending abilities, it is not clear whether this lack of stability is the result of true wide variation in acting abilities across emotions or results from the particular features of this study. However, no clear relationships between abilities to enact specific emotions and personality emerged. Either the correlations were similar or could reasonably be attributed to chance. Thus although it might make sense to assume that Dominance is more closely related to abilities to enact anger, disgust, and happiness than to sadness, this line of thought did not receive strong support in the present study. Specific sending abilities may be relevant to personality in more complex ways.

It is important to note that the same handful of traits seems to be reappearing in recent research. Dominance, exhibition, impulsivity, playfulness, and possibly nurturance seem somehow related to various aspects of emotional expression, but traits like achievement, endurance, order (tidy, methodical), and understanding (inquiring, analytical) do not seem relevant. Various key aspects of personality are not related to acting abilities. Such patterns add to our confidence that some stable, basic relationships are being uncovered, and facilitate further attempts at theoretical explanation.

DISCUSSION

The fact that abilities to enact emotions to a camera show systematic relationships to personality traits points the way to a new perspective in understanding personality. Just as intelligence is conceived to be a set of abilities to solve problems, it may be possible to view aspects of personality not only as a system of traits but also as a set of observable abilities to deal with the emotional aspects of social life.

We are often presented with a variety of social situations which require the enactment of particular emotional states. Those individuals who are more adept at expressing specific emotions in an easily interpretable manner may function better in such situations. For example, the individual who can portray happiness in a convincing way in morale-boosting situations may also instill positive feelings in others. Similarly, a leader who gives a convincing show of emotion may be able to more easily influence followers.

Although the ability to enact emotions does seem to be related to extraversion, the present data suggest that the narrow construct of Exhibition is more relevant. That is, people able to enact emotion do like being around people and are impulsive and uninhibited (like extraverts), but they especially desire and enjoy being dramatic and having an audience. Although the course of development of this relationship is not known, it appears reasonable both that people with a desire to excite or entertain others would develop abilities to enact emotions and that people able to be colorful and dramatic would enjoy being the center of attention.

Another implication of the correlations between emotional expressiveness and personality concerns person perception. Researchers have long searched for the personality correlates of expressive style such as links between the qualities of the voice and personality traits (e.g., Kramer, 1963). On the whole such attempts have failed. Only stereotypes have consistently emerged — correlations between expressive style and *perceived* personality (e.g., between breathiness of voice and sexiness). The results of the present research suggest that with increased attention to *emotional* communication, attempts to discover actual correlates of expression may prove fruitful.

In fact, cues of emotional expression may be those commonly (and perhaps validly) employed by naive observers in drawing inferences about personality. People are often willing confidently to describe others as "excitable," "domineering," "flashy," and so on. The present study suggests that such inferences may be validly made by observing others' abilities to communicate emotions in various situations.

In addition to its general importance for understanding personality, the present line of research has implications for applied settings. Both the PRF and the EPI were developed for and are currently employed in educational guidance and counseling, industry, and clinical diagnosis, as well as in research. Knowledge of an individual's ability to produce a given emotion when the situation demands it should prove helpful in understanding social success or the lack of success. For example,knowing that a male high on Dominance (who attempts to control his environment and influence others) and a female high on Exhibition (who wants to be the center of attention) are both likely to be able to communicate emotions to others might help such people choose careers in sales

or television news broadcasting rather than in financial management or theatrical direction and production.

Conclusion. Although it is true both that certain basic aspects of personality are closely tied to emotional expression and that ability to enact emotion is an important aspect of many social situations; the relationship between personality and the enactment of emotion is not yet well understood. The present study provides further evidence encouraging recent research in this field. There seem to be stable ties between self-report personality traits and actual abilities to pose emotion in the laboratory, suggesting that a social skill approach to both the expression and perception of personality may prove fruitful.

REFERENCES

Allport, G.W. *Pattern and Growth in Personality.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.

Buck, R. Nonverbal communication of affect in children. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 1975, *31*, 644-653.

Buck, R. Nonverbal communication of affect in preschool children: Relationships with personality and skin conductance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 1977, *35*, 225-236.

Cunningham, M.R. Personality and the structure of the nonverbal communication of emotion. *Journal of Personality,* 1977, *45*, 564-584.

Ekman, P. & Friesen, W. *Unmasking the face.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Ekman, P., Friesen, W.V., & Ellsworth, P. *Emotions in the human face: Guidelines for research and integration of findings.* New York: Pergamon Press, Inc., 1972.

Eysenck, H. & Eysenck, S. *Manual for the Eysenck Personality Inventory.* San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1968.

Friedman, H.S. The concept of skill in nonverbal communication: Implications for understanding social interaction. In R. Rosenthal (Ed.), *Skill in Nonverbal Communication.* Cambridge, MA.: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain, 1979.

Friedman, H.S., DiMatteo, M.R., & Taranta, A. A study of the relationship between individual differences in nonverbal expressiveness and factors of personality and social interaction. *Journal of Research in Personality,* in press.

Friedman, H.S., Prince, L.M., Riggio, R.E., & DiMatteo, M.R. Towards understanding and assessing nonverbal expressiveness: The ACT. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* in press.

Goffman, E. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, 1959.

Hall, J.A. Gender, gender roles, and nonverbal communication skills. In R. Rosenthal (Ed.), *Skill in nonverbal communication.* Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn, & Hain, 1979.

Izard, C.E. *The Face of Emotion.* N.Y.: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971.

Izard, C.E. *Human Emotions.* New York: Plenum Press, 1977.

Jackson, D.N. *Personality Research Form Manual.* New York: Research Psychologists Press, Inc., 1974.

Kramer, E. Judgment of personal characteristics and emotions from nonverbal properties. *Psychological Bulletin,* 1963, *60*, 408-420.

Lippa, R. Expressive control and the leakage of dispositional introversion-extraversion during role-played teaching. *Journal of Personality*, 1976, *44*, 541-559.

Murray, H. (Ed.) *Explorations in Personality*. New York: Oxford, 1938.

Rosenthal, R. (Ed.) *Skill in nonverbal communication*. Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn, & Hain, 1979.

Snyder, M. The self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1974, *30*, 526-537.

Thompson, D.F. & Meltzer, L. Communication of emotional intent by facial expression. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1964, *68*, 129-135.

Zuckerman, M., Hall, J., DeFrank, R., & Rosenthal, R. Encoding and decoding of spontaneous and posed facial expressions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1976, *34*. 966-977.