SOM-R

Session tasks

During the session, participants first performed the "City Building Activity," in which the group was told they were part of a city planning committee and must agree on the six most essential public buildings for a city of 20,000 residents. This activity was a modified version of the "Ideal City Game" used in Bettencourt et al. (2007) to measure intergroup attitudes when assigned social roles were manipulated. Next, participants began the "Mind Trap Activity" based on the 1991 board game, MindTrap®. Including a mentally challenging and potentially highly rewarding (for correct answers) and frustrating (for incorrect answers) task seemed crucial for studying personality expression. The third activity, "What's Important?" was short, more personal than the first two activities, and more akin to an interview question than a formal "activity." It was included to solicit honest and unstructured answers reflective of participants' values. Many gave similar, somewhat standard answers, such as "family" or "career," while others gave unique responses, such as "not being useless" and "my iron supplements." The fourth activity, "Commonalities and Uniqueities," is an "ice breaker" task designed for teambuilding and the promotion of group unity (http://www.group-games.com/team-building/commonalities-and-uniquities.html). During this task, participants' varied in amounts of creativity, engagement, leadership, and personal disclosure. Last, "The Drawbridge Exercise" had participants decide, both individually and collectively, who was most and least at fault for the death of a Baronness. Taken from Judith Katz' book, *White Awareness: Handbook for Anti-racism Training* (2003), this exercise has been used in classroom and workplace settings to facilitate impassioned discussions about morality.

Intraclass Correlation Coefficients (ICCs) for Interrater Reliability and Agreement

Table S2 shows the ICCs for each of the three ways of measuring personality based on the minimum (n = 5) number of raters who rated any given trait across all participants, the median (n = 6), and the maximum (n = 17). These values convey the expected range and average degree of agreement across raters for each of the traits.

Intercorrelations within and across measures

See Table S3 for specific correlations within experimental measures, across conditions, as well as across measures, across conditions.

Effects of randomization

Participants in the Sober and Alcohol conditions were similar in the following drinking variables: typical quantity consumed per occasion in the last 30 days (M_{sober}= 5.75; SE_{sober}= .39; $M_{alcohol}$ = 5.81, $SE_{alcohol}$ = .40), frequency of drinking in the last 30 days (M_{sober} = 8.53 SE_{sober}= .56; $M_{alcohol}$=8.80 days, $SE_{alcohol}$= .63), and frequency of binge drinking in the last 30 days (M_{sober}= 4.98 days.; SE_{sober}= .45; $M_{alcohol}$= 5.86 days, $SE_{alcohol}$= .60), all ps >.43.

Non-experimental effects – replication with self-reports.

The omnibus three-level multilevel model for pre-session differences in drunk/sober personality ratings was as follows:

$$Rating_{gist} = (\beta_0 + \beta_{0g} + \beta_{0i}) + \beta_1 * Trait_{gist} + \beta_2 * State_{gist} + \beta_3 * Trait_{gist} * State_{gist} + \varepsilon_{gist}$$

In this model, the dependent variable is the individual personality rating for specific trait, t, in each of the sober and drunk states, s, by individual, i, in friend group, g. The predictor variables are which trait is being rated (*Trait*), which state the participant is reporting on (*State*), and their interaction (*Trait*State*). Random intercepts were estimated for each individual, i, and group, g, in

order to adjust for the possibility that individuals' self-ratings across traits and states and friend groups' collective ratings might be positively correlated, respectively.

The follow-up three level multilevel models for pre-session differences in drunk/sober ratings of individual traits were:

$$Rating_{gis} = (\beta_0 + \beta_{0g} + \beta_{0i}) + \beta_2 * State_{gis} + \varepsilon_{gis}$$

As in the omnibus model, the dependent variable is the personality rating in each of the sober and drunk states, *s*, by individual, *i*, in friend group, *g*. The single predictor variable is the state the participant is reporting on (*State*) since each of the traits were analyzed separately. Again, random intercepts were estimated for each individual, *i*, and group, *g*.

Table S1: RBQ items by factor and facet (Extraversion only)

E	Mean	SD	A	Mean	SD	C	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	O	Mean	SD
Enths	2.00	.00	Agree	2.00	.00	Ambit	1.80	.45	ExpIns	2.00	.00	WideRng	2.00	.00
Social	1.80	.45	Sympath	2.00	.00	Concen	1.80	.45	NegSlf	2.00	.00	Unusual	1.60	.55
Laughs	1.80	.45	SeemInt	1.80	.45	*Giveup*	*-1.80*	*.45*	PhyTens	1.80	.45	Intelct	1.60	.89
Play	1.80	.45	Likable	1.60	.55				ExGlt	1.80	.45	Intel	1.40	.55
VoInfo	1.60	.55	Warmth	1.60	.55				SlfPit	1.80	.45	SayDoInt	1.20	.84
Control	1.60	.55	OthAdv	0.80	.45				Timid*	1.60	.55	*Masc*	*-1.20*	*.45*
Domin	1.60	.55	SkAdv	0.40	.89				Reass	1.40	.55			
Smiles	1.60	.55	*Compet**	*-1.40*	*.55*				Irrt	1.40	.55			
Likeoth	1.60	.55	*TalkAt*	*-1.60*	*.55*				PhyPain	1.20	.84			
Talk	1.60	.55	*BlmOth*	*-1.60*	*.55*				*EnjSit**	*-1.20*	*.45*			
Express	1.60	.55	*Hostil*	*-1.80*	*.45*				*Relaxd*	*-2.00*	*.00*			
Cheer	1.60	.55	*Sacas*	*-1.80*	*.45*									
Loud	1.60	.55	*Criticism*	*-2.00*	*.00*									
PhyActv	1.40	.55	*Condes*	*-2.00*	*.00*									
IniHumr	1.40	.89												
PhyAtt	1.40	.55												
Compet*	1.40	.55												
SpkQ	1.40	.55												
Interv	1.20	.45												
EnjSit*	1.20	.84												
Sexint[a]	1.20	.84												
ExpIdea	1.20	.84												
Contact	1.20	.45												
OffAdv	1.00	.71												
Femin	0.80	.84												
Detach	*-1.40*	*.55*												
*Timid**	*-1.60*	*.55*												
Reserved	*-2.00*	*.00*												
AwkInt[a]	*-2.00*	*.00*												
Distnce	*-2.00*	*.00*												

Extraversion Facet Assignment	
	= Warmth
	= Gregariousness
	= Assertiveness
	= Both Gregariousness & Assertiveness
	= Activity
	= Positive Emotions

Note. E = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; N = Neuroticism; O = Openness; * = assignment to two factors; [a] = assignment to two Extraversion facets; Mean = mean rank of that item on that factor (scale -2 to 2); SD = standard deviation of rank.. For full item wording, see Appendix.

Table S2. Item Intraclass Correlation Coefficients (ICCs) based on 5, 6, and 17 raters

		ICCmin (5)	ICCmed (6)	ICCmax (17)
Thin Slice				
	Extraversion	.84	.86	.95
	Agreeableness	.54	.59	.80
	Conscientiousness	.63	.67	.85
	Neuroticism	.65	.69	.86
	Openness	.41	.46	.71
	Mean	**.62**	**.66**	**.83**
BFI-10				
	Extraversion	.85	.87	.95
	Agreeableness	.58	.62	.82
	Conscientiousness	.73	.76	.90
	Neuroticism	.54	.58	.80
	Openness	.54	.59	.80
	Mean	**.65**	**.68**	**.85**
RBQ (factors, not items)				
	Extraversion	.90	.91	.97
	Agreeableness	.66	.70	.87
	Conscientiousness	.70	.74	.89
	Neuroticism	.78	.81	.92
	Openness	.65	.69	.86
	Mean	**.74**	**.77**	**.90**

Note. BFI-10-Observer = Big Five Inventory – 10 item, observer-reported; RBQ = Riverside Behavioral Q-sort.

Table S3. Factor correlations between Thin Slice, BFI-10-Observer, RBQ, and (midsession) BFI-10-Self measures (across both sober and alcohol conditions)

	E TS	A TS	C TS	N TS	O TS	E BFI-O	A BFI-O	C BFI-O	N BFI-O	O BFI-O	E RBQ	A RBQ	C RBQ	N RBQ	O RBQ	E BFIself	A BFIself	C BFIself	N BFIself
E_TS																			
A_TS	.13																		
C_TS	.32***	.31***																	
N_TS	-.31***	-.10	-.10																
O_TS	.32***	.28**	.31**	-.02															
E_BFI-O	.80***	.05	.22**	-.30***	.30***														
A_BFI-O	-.08	.41***	.03	-.13	.17*	-.14													
C_BFI-O	0.26**	.30**	.54***	-.17*	.24**	.25**	.25**												
N_BFI-O	-.39***	-.15	-.06	.43***	-.16	-.56***	-.05	-.14											
O_BFI-O	.27**	.23**	.29**	.10	.59***	.32***	.21*	.45***	-.15										
E_RBQ	.81***	.12	.33***	-.30***	.30***	.94***	-.03	.35***	-.52***	.36***									
A_RBQ	.17*	.50***	.10	-.08	.15	-.25**	.83**	.24**	.04	.18*	-.12								
C_RBQ	.01	.15	.33***	-.08	-.08	.01	.08	.70***	.02	.06	.08	.11							
N_RBQ	.64***	.17*	-.36***	.41***	-.30***	-.77***	-.10	-.48***	.72**	-.37***	-.83***	.02	.23**						
O_RBQ	.10	.28**	.35***	.14	.49***	.09	.20**	.53***	-.03	.68***	.17*	.29**	.20*	-.25**					
E_BFIself	.27**	.12	.10	-.20*	.03	.34***	-.03	.06	-.25**	.14	.34***	-.04	-.02	-.31***	.05				
A_BFIself	.05	.18*	.01	-.03	-.07	.02	.16*	-.02	.05	-.08	.03	.21**	.05	-.01	-.01	.09			
C_BFIself	.09	.15	.17*	-.14	-.02	.03	.13	.10	.03	-.16*	.06	.12	.04	-.07	-.02	.07	.16*		
N_BFIself	-.10	-.02	.03	.21**	.09	-.10	-.05	-.03	.20*	.08	-.08	.02	-.11	.14	.29**	-.21**	-.21**	-.04	
O_BFIself	.08	.10	.22**	-.01	.29***	.12	.13	.11	-.03	.37***	.14	.12	.00	-.18*	.25**	.09	.13	.13	.11

Note: E = Extraversion; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; N = Neuroticism; O = Openness; _TS = Thin Slice; _BFI-O = Big Five Inventory – 10 item, observer-reported; _RBQ = Riverside Behavioral Q-sort; BFIself = Big Five Inventory, self-reported; Cells highlighted pink designate same-factor correlations between TS and BFI-10-Observer; Cells highlighted in orange designate same-factor correlations between RBQ and BFI-10-Observer; Cells highlighted in green designate same-factor correlations between TS and RBQ; Cells highlighted in purple designate same-factor correlations between BFI-10-Self and TS; Cells highlighted in gray designate same-factor correlations between BFI-10-Self and BFI-10-Observer; Cells highlighted in blue designate same-factor correlations between BFI-10-Self and RBQ; *** $p < .0001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$.

References

Bettencourt, A.B., Molix, L., Talley, A., Eubanks, J.P. (2007). Numerical representation and cross-cut role assignments: Majority members' responses under cooperative interaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 43,* 553-564.

Katz, J.H. (2003). *White awareness: Handbook for anti-racism training*. University of Oklahoma Press: Norman, OK.