The curse of self in profile image selection Additional File 1: Calibration Experiment Analysis

David White*, Clare A. M. Sutherland, Amy L. Burton *Corresponding author: david.white@unsw.edu.au

Calibration data were computed as Spearman's Rho coefficients between selection likelihood ratings (Facebook, dating, professional) and trait ratings (attractiveness, dominance, trustworthiness, competence, confidence). These calibration scores were computed between the likelihood ratings and selectors own trait ratings, and also between likelihood ratings and trait ratings by a group of unfamiliar viewers recruited via the Internet. These data are summarized in Figure 2, and provided in full in Additional File 3. Calibration scores were analysed by separate three-way mixed factor ANOVA with between-subject factor of Selection Type (self, other) and within-subject factors Context (Facebook, dating, professional) and Trait (attractiveness, dominance, trustworthiness, competence, confidence).

Own ratings

For own ratings, the main effect of Selection Type was non-significant, F (1, 202) = 1.48, p = 0.225, $\eta_p^2 = 0.007$. Main effects of Trait, F (4, 808) = 45.5, p = 0.003, $\eta_p^2 = 0.184$, and Context, F (2, 404) = 22.3, p = 0.011, $\eta_p^2 = 0.099$, were highly significant. There was a significant two-way interaction between Trait and Selection Type, F (4, 808) = 13.9, p < 0.000, $\eta_p^2 = 0.065$. Analysis of Simple Main Effects revealed that this interaction was driven by: (i) significantly lower calibration of self-selection with trustworthiness ratings, F (1, 202) = 9.75, p = 0.002, and competence ratings, F (1, 202) = 5.49, p = 0.020, compared to other-selection calibrations; (ii) *higher* calibration of self-selection with selector's own dominance ratings, F (1, 202) = 10.6, p = 0.001; (iii) a non-significant difference between self and other selection calibration for attractiveness ratings, F (1, 202) = 0.68, p = 0.411.

The interaction between Context and Selection Type, F (2, 404) = 4.16, p = 0.016, η_p^2 = 0.020, was also significant, reflective of a higher calibration between selection likelihood and selectors own trait ratings for other-selections in professional, F (1, 202) = 5.73, p = 0.018, η_p^2 = 0.028, but not Facebook, F (1, 202) = 0.413, p = 0.521, η_p^2 = 0.002, or dating contexts, F (1, 202) = 0.035, p = 0.852, η_p^2 < 0.000.

A significant two-way interaction between Trait and Context was also observed, F (8, 1616) = 22.3, p = 0.011, η_p^2 = 0.099, but this was qualified by a significant three-way interaction, F (8, 1616) = 3.73, p < 0.000, η_p^2 = 0.018. In light of the three-way interaction, we analysed Trait and Context interaction separately for self and other selection. Calibration of self-selection to Trait varied as a function of selection Context for attractiveness, F (2, 1010) = 54.9, p < 0.001, η_p^2 = 0.10, dominance, F (2, 1010) = 9.32, p < 0.001, η_p^2 = 0.02, and confidence, F (2, 1010) = 7.89, p < 0.001, η_p^2 = 0.02 (with non-significant main effects of trustworthiness, F (2, 1010) = 1.06, p > 0.05, and competence F (2, 1010) = 0.90, p > 0.05). For other-selection, calibration between varied as a function of selection Context only for attractiveness ratings, F (2, 1010) = 55.1, p < 0.001, η_p^2 = 0.10. (Non-significant simple main effects of trustworthiness: F (2, 1010) = 0.57, p > 0.05; dominance: F (2, 1010) = 0.90, p > 0.05; competence: F (2, 1010) = 0.90, p > 0.05; confidence: F (2, 0.00) = 0.90, p > 0.05).

Internet ratings

For Internet ratings, the main effect of Selection Type was significant, F (1, 202) = 4.12, p = 0.044, η_p^2 = 0.020. Main effects of Trait, F (4, 808) = 3.96, p = 0.003, η_p^2 = 0.019, and Context, F (2, 404) = 4.54, p = 0.011, η_p^2 = 0.022, were also significant. The interaction between Context and Selection Type was significant, F (2, 404) = 4.26, p = 0.015, η_p^2 = 0.021, reflecting an overall benefit of self-selection for professional networking context, F (1, 202) = 11.16, p < 0.000, η_p^2 = 0.052, but not in compared to other contexts [Facebook: F (2, 202) = 1.73, p = 0.190, η_p^2 = 0.008; Dating: F (1, 202) = 0.687, p = 0.408, η_p^2 = 0.003].

The interaction between Trait and Selection Type was non-significant, F (4,808) = 0.74, p = 0.562, η_p^2 = 0.004. The interaction between Trait and Context was significant, F (8, 1616) = 10.98, p < 0.000, η_p^2 = 0.052, but this was qualified by a significant three-way interaction, F (8, 1616) = 6.21, p < 0.000, η_p^2 = 0.030.

Given the three-way interaction, we analysed Trait and Context interactions separately for self and other selection calibration. This interaction was significant for both self, F (4, 808) = 10.18, p < 0.000, η_p^2 = 0.09, and other selection, F (4, 808) = 7.54, p < 0.000, η_p^2 = 0.07.

However, qualitatively different patterns emerged. For self-selection, Simple Main Effects of Context were significant for attractiveness, F (2, 1010) = 4.76, p < 0.01, η_p^2 = 0.01, trustworthiness, F (2, 1010) = 6.20, p < 0.01, η_p^2 = 0.01, dominance, F (2, 1010) = 5.14, p < 0.01, η_p^2 = 0.01, and competence, F (2, 1010) = 8.69, p < 0.001, η_p^2 = 0.02, (but non-significant for confidence: F (2, 1010) = 1.25, p > 0.05, η_p^2 < 0.00). For other-selection, Simple Main Effects of Context were significant for trustworthiness, F (2, 1010) = 7.18, p < 0.001, η_p^2 = 0.01, dominance, F (2, 1010) = 21.31, p < 0.001, η_p^2 = 0.04, and competence, F (2, 1010) = 9.48, p < 0.001, η_p^2 = 0.02, (but non-significant for attractiveness, F (2, 1010) = 1.72, p > 0.05, η_p^2 < 0.00, and confidence ratings, F (2, 1010) = 0.84, p > 0.05, η_p^2 < 0.00).