In this dissertation the transsituational consistency of two kinds of personality measures was compared: (1) judgments, i.e., inferential judgments in terms of global traits; (2) cues, i.e., behavioral observation data and other characteristics of stimulus persons, that can be measured objectively. Especially two related questions were answered:
(1) Are judgments obtained in a particular situation better predicted by judgments in another situation than by cues in the other situation?
(2) Which substantive transsituational relations between cues and judgments can be established?

Background for this study is the discontent with trait theory and the often low validity of traits. Interactionist theory stresses that personality assessment has to make allowance for situational determinants of behavior. Trait theory focuses only on personal predispositions to behavior. In addition to this criticism, opponents of trait theory allege that its poor results are due to the fallibility of trait assessors, which is, for instance, reflected in low interrater reliability. Advocates of the so-called action approach wish to replace trait theory for the study of molecular acts, which can be assessed without much inference by the observers. The main objections, thus, pertain to neglecting situational influences and to difficulties of judging in broad terms like personality traits. However, these criticisms were, in turn, attacked by several authors, which suggests that the classical debate concerning the usefulness of trait theory is still open.

The empirical part of this study consists of two phases. In phase 1 the stimulus material for the judges of personality was prepared. A number of 45 stimulus persons was recruited. Biographical and handwriting cues were collected, and two different behavior sample according to two dissimilar situation were recorded on audio-video tape.

A comprehensive instrument for trait judgments was available, but a checklist for personality-relevant cues was not. As the number of potential cues within the stimulus material was quite considerable, the material was subdivided into several domains, namely biographical and handwriting cues, verbal content, auditory channel, static visible characteris.
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In phase 2 the cues were recorded. For that purpose an observation instrument for body motion was constructed. An observation instrument for voice and speech cues was already available. The biographical data provided by the stimulus persons were quantified. Observers were recruited to score the stimulus persons' motion and voice cues. The motion, voice and biographical scores were subjected to separate factor analyses and factor scores were computed. Out of the judgmental data from phase 1 three variables per situation were taken which reflected best the three sets of factor scores of cues. These three variables were the judgmental predictors. The judgments based on the complete stimulus material in either situation served as the criterion for the judgmental predictors and for the factor scores of cues.

The median transsituational predictions by the cues and judgments was about .40 and .20, respectively. So the main result of this study is that the predictive validity of cues exceeded the validity of judgments. Powerful cues were trunk movements, eye-contact, hand contact, hand movement, sex and age. Voice cues were not very transsituationally predictive.

The results are discussed with reference to several aspects. It is argued that differences between cues and judgments in reliability do not explain away the outcomes. In a similar vein the design, procedures and computations did not advantage the cues. So the results did probably not rely on artefacts, but were due to poor judging. The interactionist view that personality-relevant behavior and cues are not transsituationally consistent is questioned. The substantive relations between cues and judgments, however, have to be considered with some precaution, because of sample size and the way of selecting stimulus persons, situations
and cues. Finally, some implications for future research are stipulated, especially with regard to the action approach.