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ABSTRACT
We report a preregistered experiment in which we examine the way that men and women are perceived on various interpersonal measures when exhibiting differing presentation styles. We also examined the possible moderating effect of participant gender and benevolent sexism. Participants (N = 337) were randomly assigned to read a scenario in which a target individual was depicted with an inflated, neutral, or deflated presentation style. We found that female participants tended to view inflated female targets as more humble. We also found that male participants rated inflated male targets as significantly more humble than female participants did. Further analysis indicated that greater humility was indirectly associated with greater interpersonal warmth, less perceived dominance, and less perceived threat of being controlled. Taken together, these results highlight the importance of presentation in perception and suggest that women end up paying a steeper price than men do for inflating their ideas or accomplishments.

Imagine that you are nominated to give a presentation of your best accomplishments to a group of your colleagues. Or perhaps you’re interviewing for a job and need to discuss your career achievements (e.g., salespeople sharing their sales record and success earning contracts or academics sharing their publication record and success obtaining grants). Many different thoughts might run through your head: How will I come off to others? What might they think of me? How can I present my ideas in an accurate way? How can I showcase my accomplishments without coming off as conceited or self-absorbed? Though different people may have varied thought processes in this situation, nearly everyone can relate to the feeling of wanting to convey their ideas accurately. How we choose to present our ideas has tangible consequences—both for how our ideas are evaluated and how our character is judged by others. The present study seeks to examine this process and its outcomes: To what extent does one’s gender and presentation style affect how they are perceived by others?

Presentation style

People can present themselves in myriad ways. One could inflate their accomplishments, present them relatively neutrally, or deflate their achievements. An inflated presentation style refers to a style of presenting oneself that inaccurately portrays the subject’s abilities by overselling or overclaiming them. A neutral presentation style is one that accurately portrays the subject’s abilities just as they are. A deflated presentation style is one that inaccurately conveys one’s accomplishments by downplaying them.

Presentation style is conveyed through a variety of means: tone, nonverbal cues, volume of voice, timing in the conversation (when one speaks), modifiers (hedges), uncertainty verb phrases (‘I wonder if . . . ’ or ‘I’m not sure, but . . . ’), sentence length, or any combination of these. The term ‘hedge’ is described as a type of modifier that is added to a statement to denote a lack of confidence, such as ‘sort of’ or ‘maybe’ (Mulac et al., 2000). However, not all of these mechanisms inherently convey a deflated (or inflated) presentation style. One can honestly say ‘I’m not sure’ without it being labeled as deflated—only when there is a difference between one’s presentation and their actual abilities is it considered deflated.

Although both men and women may use a deflated presentation style, women do so much more often (Newman et al., 2008). Why might this be? One possible explanation comes from gender schema theory. Because our reliance on schemas informs how we think and behave, it is much easier for us to act in accordance with these schemas. Likewise, our perceptions of others are also filtered through schemas (Bem, 1981). Because schemas for males and females tend to be different, a
woman performing the same behavior that a man performs may elicit different perceptions based on one’s gender schema. For example, a woman stating her opinion in a straightforward manner may be perceived as aggressive, pushy, or bossy, while a man saying the exact same thing might be perceived as confident (Williams & Tiedens, 2016). When there is congruence between gender schema and perception, information is able to be processed faster and more efficiently (Bem, 1981). However, those whose behaviors do not fit into another’s gender schema tend to receive negative judgements (Gaunt, 2013). This consequence may reinforce women to continue acting in accordance with another’s gender schema. That is, women may pay a steeper price than men for inflating, or overclaiming, their achievements or accomplishments.

There are also more social consequences for those that act outside of these typical gender schemas. When women speak up, especially in professional settings, they take the risk of being interrupted. Anderson and Leaper (1998) found that men were significantly more likely to intrusively interrupt than women. Experiencing these interruptions over time might make women less likely to speak up. Additionally, some men may view women who display dominance features as a threat to their own power (Williams & Tiedens, 2016). Therefore, a woman might display a deflated presentation style to avoid upsetting a social hierarchy in which men have most of the power. Brescoll (2011) found that women who spoke longer than others received negative attributions and consequences from speaking longer than others, compared to a man who didn’t receive any negative attributions for his equivalent speaking time. The combination of any of these factors may encourage women to hold back in expressing their ideas and may result in women incurring a substantially higher social cost for perceived inflation or arrogance.

**Patterns of social perception**

People use information to perceive and judge others; the dimensions of warmth and competence work together to inform these perceptions (Cuddy et al., 2008). Warmth refers to another’s intentions (warmth-based traits include: morality, trustworthiness, friendliness, kindness), while competence refers to another’s capabilities (competence-based traits include: perceived efficacy, skill, knowledge) (Cuddy et al., 2008). Both of these dimensions are important in thinking about how we perceive other individuals: if we perceive someone as high on both dimensions (both warm and competent), we tend to see them as uniformly positive (Fiske et al., 2007).

An inconsistency between these dimensions creates the potential for ambivalent stereotypes. One such stereotype is benevolent sexism, which is the belief that mutual reliance between men and women is necessary in order to fulfill social roles: men need women for affection and warmth, and women need men to provide for and protect them (Glick & Fiske, 1997). Though these beliefs and behaviors may explicitly come across as complimentary and well-meaning, they are harmful for both men and women because they reinforce gender hierarchies (Jost et al., 2001). Therefore, in the present study, we wondered if one’s presentation style would be perceived differently on the warmth and competence dimensions according to their gender. We also wondered the extent to which one’s level of benevolent sexism influenced how they perceive others.

**The role of humility**

Humility plays a central role in one’s presentational style. Despite being incorrectly yet commonly characterized as a low opinion of the self, we operationally define humility here as an intrapersonal acknowledgement of one’s own limitations and an interpersonal expression marked by an accurate and modest display of oneself and accomplishments that respects and prioritizes the needs of others (see Van Tongeren et al., 2019). Though there are inconsistencies surrounding perceptions of humility, Exline and Geyer (2004) found that participants tended to view the virtue of humility both positively and as a strength (as opposed to a weakness). Our conceptualization of humility likely best encapsulates presentational accuracy – or, rather, a neutral presentation style. Alternatively, others might naively perceive someone with a deflated presentation style as more humble. That is, those who use a deflated presentation style might do so because they want to convey humility. But is it actually perceived as such? Our study also sought to explore this question.

Gender also likely has important implications for humility. Despite the growing research corpus on humility, little work has explored the role of gender in humility. First, it is important to distinguish between the terms modesty and humility. Humility is a more expansive trait that includes several components (global humility, modesty, an accurate view of the self, and superiority); modesty is a narrower subdomain of humility which focuses on ‘handling attention in socially acceptable ways’ (Davis et al., 2016). Among some, there is an expectation that modesty should be more important to women than it is to men (Exline & Lobel, 1999). Daubman and Sigall (1997) found that when put in a situation
where they had to disclose information to those they outperformed, women tended to speak more modestly relative to men. Women in these scenarios tended to be preoccupied with how the other person perceived their immodest language; however, the men in this scenario thought that their immodest language made the other person like them even more. From this, we can presume that men and women have different assumptions about how others perceive their performance and abilities. In the present study, we wondered about the extent to which humility is perceived in each gender’s use of a deflated presentation style.

Overview and hypotheses

The central goal of this research sought to examine the extent to gender and presentation study affect perceptions of humility and other various interpersonal perception dimensions (e.g., warmth, competence). We are explored the role participants’ gender played in their perception of others. For example, are men more likely to perceive women’s inflated presentation style as unfavorable? We make the following predictions (all hypotheses were preregistered through OSF: https://osf.io/67byv/):

(1) Females will be rated significantly higher on warmth yet significantly lower on competence relative to males;
(2) As females exhibit more inflated presentation styles, they will be rated less favorably, less likeable, and less friendly relative to males;
(3) As females exhibit more inflated presentation styles, they will be rated as more threatening and less humble relative to males, and;
(4) Perceptions of threat and humility will mediate the effect of women being rated as unfavorable relative to men.

Additionally, we sought to explore the following possible hypotheses:

(1) We predict that benevolent sexism will moderate effects, such that as participants have a higher level of benevolent sexism, the predicted effects will be stronger, and
(2) Male participants will have stronger predicted effects as explained by greater levels of benevolent sexism.

Method

Participants

The study was approved by the Hope College Human Subjects Review Board (#20-003). We recruited 415 participants, sampling from Cloud Research (n = 369) and undergraduate students in psychology and communication courses from a liberal arts college (n = 119). The former received $2USD for their participation, and the latter received a small amount of course or extra credit. Data screening revealed that data from 75 participants (71 from Cloud Research, 4 from the undergraduate sample) had to be dropped because they did not pass the manipulation check, which required the participant to indicate the gender of the target individual from the preceding scenario. Thus, the final sample was comprised of 337 participants (101 males, 236 females, 3 did not indicate their gender). Participants ranged in age from 17 to 89, with a mean age of 36.0 years (SD = 18.6). The sample was 80.6% White, 9.7% Black, .3% American Indian/Alaska Native, 5.6% Asian, .3% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and 3.5% Other.

Design

We implemented a (3 presentational style: deflated vs. neutral vs. inflated) x (2 target gender: male vs. female) between-participants design.

Materials and procedure

All materials were completed online via Qualtrics. After providing consent, participants were randomly assigned to one of the six hypothetical scenarios in which a male or female target individual was depicted with either an inflated, neutral, or deflated presentation style. The scenarios varied in both when and how the target individual spoke. In the inflated condition, they spoke immediately, inflating their contribution to the discussion. In the neutral condition, they waited their turn and spoke accurately. In the deflated condition, they waited for a long break in discussion to contribute in a deflated manner. The target individual was referred to as either John or Jane in each scenario. For example, participants in the inflated condition read the following:

Imagine that you are a salesperson for a company. The sales department has gathered you and all the other salespeople together to brainstorm ideas for how to increase sales. Everyone starts throwing out their ideas. Your coworker John (Joanna), who you know has the
best sales record, immediately adds his (her) input: “Obviously, because I’m the top salesperson, you’re gonna want to hear this. I think we should start using this software I’ve been using to track my sales progress.” Everyone else chimes in with their ideas.

Scenarios were pilot tested to ensure they depicted significantly different levels of the dependent variable in a separate Pilot Study (N = 67). Results revealed that when participants rated the presenters’ ego (from −10 = deflated to +10 = inflated), they rated the inflated presenter’s ego as inflated (M = 7.24, SD = 2.35), the neutral presenter’s ego as relatively neutral (M = 5.0, SD = 2.32), and the deflated presenter’s ego as deflated (M = −3.33, SD = 3.44); and all means significantly differed from one another, F(2, 130) = 255.69, p < .001. Similarly, when asked to assess the accuracy of presentation (from −10 = undersells abilities to +10 = oversells abilities), participants rated the inflated presenter as overselling (M = 3.56, SD = 3.40), the neutral presenter as relatively accurate (M = .24, SD = 2.45), and the deflated presenter as underselling (M = −3.23, SD = 3.68); and all means significantly differed from one another, F(2, 130) = 79.55, p < .001. Taken together, these results suggest that these scenarios were well-calibrated to depict differing levels of egoism and presentation inflation (or deflation).

**Humility**

Humility was measured using four items chosen from the Relational Humility Scale (Davis et al., 2011). An example item is: ‘This person thinks of themselves as overly important.’ Participants indicated the extent to which they agreed with the items using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). The Cronbach’s alpha for humility was .89.

**Dominance**

Dominance was measured using three items chosen from a dominance scale developed by Gough et al. (1951). An example item is: ‘This person enjoys taking charge of things.’ Participants indicated the extent to which they agreed with the items using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). The Cronbach’s alpha for dominance was .40.

**Threat/control**

Threat/control was measured using three items developed to assess the degree to which participants perceive another as threatening or controlling. An example item is: ‘This person seems overly controlling.’ Participants indicated the extent to which they agreed with the items using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). The Cronbach’s alpha for threat/control was .90.

**Warmth-based traits**

Warmth-based traits were measured using eight items developed to assess participants’ feelings of warmth. An example item is: ‘I would like to be friends with this person.’ Participants indicated the extent to which they agreed with the items using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). The Cronbach’s alpha for warmth-based traits was .90.

**Competence-based traits**

Competence-based traits were measured using nine items developed to assess participants’ perceptions of competence. An example item is: ‘Other people often go to this person when they need help with a task.’ Participants indicated the extent to which they agreed with the items using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree). The Cronbach’s alpha for competence-based traits was .87.

**Benevolent sexism**

Benevolent sexism was measured using eleven items chosen from the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1997). An example item is: ‘No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete unless he has the love of a woman.’ Participants indicated the extent to which they agreed with the items using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree). The Cronbach’s alpha for benevolent sexism was .80.

**Results**

**Two-way interactions**

To test our first three hypotheses, we conducted a series of 3 (presentation style: inflated vs. neutral vs. deflated) × 2 (target gender: male vs. female) ANOVAs on each of the five dependent variables. For dominance, there was a significant main effect for presentation style [F(2, 334) = 37.96, p < .001]; there was not a significant main effect for gender [F(1, 334) = .29, p = .591] nor a significant interaction effect [F(2, 334) = .28, p = .753]. Specifically, participants in the inflated condition rated the target as significantly more dominant (M = 5.10, SD = .87) than participants in the neutral (M = 4.80, SD = .87) and deflated (M = 4.07, SD = 1.02) conditions.

For threat/control, there was a significant main effect for presentation style [F(2, 334) = 68.66, p < .001]; there was not a significant main effect for gender [F(1, 334) = .02, p = .888] nor a significant interaction effect
Specifically, participants in the inflated condition rated the target as significantly higher on threat/control (M = 4.58, SD = 1.29) than participants in the neutral (M = 3.00, SD = 1.53) and deflated (M = 2.49, SD = 1.41) conditions.

For warmth, there was a significant main effect for presentation style [F(2, 334) = 87.71, p < .001]; there was not a significant main effect for gender [F(1, 334) = 2.37, p = .124] nor a significant interaction effect [F(2, 334) = .53, p = .587]. Specifically, participants in the deflated condition rated the target as significantly higher on warmth (M = 5.06, SD = 1.03) than participants in the neutral (M = 4.93, SD = .93) and inflated (M = 3.44, SD = 1.14) conditions.

For competence, there was a significant main effect for presentation style [F(2, 334) = 13.00, p < .001]; there was not a significant main effect for gender [F(1, 334) = .80, p = .373] nor a significant interaction effect [F(2, 334) = 1.56, p = .213]. Specifically, participants in the neutral condition rated the target as significantly higher on competence (M = 5.14, SD = .85) than participants in the deflated (M = 4.79, SD = .96) and inflated (M = 4.53, SD = .90) conditions.

For humility, there was a significant main effect for presentation style [F(2, 334) = 143.29, p < .001]; there was not a significant main effect for gender [F(1, 334) = 3.50, p = .062] nor a significant interaction effect [F(2, 334) = .60, p = .550]. Specifically, participants in the deflated condition rated the target as significantly more humble (M = 5.03, SD = 1.27) than participants in the neutral (M = 4.59, SD = 1.10) and inflated (M = 2.56, SD = 1.20) conditions.

The moderating role of benevolent sexism

We also predicted that benevolent sexism would moderate these findings. Although males reported higher benevolent sexism (M = 3.18, SD = .66) than females, (M = 2.85, SD = .72), t(335) = 3.88, p < .001, providing support for hypothesis 6, benevolent sexism did not moderate any of the two-way interactions (all three-way interaction ps > .05). However, given this difference, we examined whether participant gender moderated the interactive effect on humility.

The moderating role of participant gender

Next, we conducted a 3 (presentation style: inflated, neutral, or deflated) × 2 (target gender: male vs. female) × 2 (participant gender: male vs. female) ANOVA on humility to determine if participants’ gender moderated this effect. A significant three-way interaction was found [F(2, 325) = 4.14, p = .017]. To explore this interaction, we conducted pairwise comparisons (with Sidak adjustments) to compare the 12 conditions. The primary differences occurred in the inflated presentation condition (see Figure 1). Results revealed that female participants rated inflated female targets as significantly (p = .017) more humble (M = 2.72, SD = .17) relative to inflated male targets (M = 2.08, SD = .21). In addition, male participants viewing inflated male targets rated them as significantly (p = .010) more humble (M = 2.92, SD = .25) than female participants did (M = 2.08, SD = .21).
**Conditional indirect effects model**

We further predicted that humility would mediate the relationship between the conditions and the primary dependent variables. That is, there might be evidence for an indirect effect via humility. Previous work has suggested that indirect effects may be present even in the absence of direct effects (Hayes, 2013). Toward that end, because the primary differences were found in the inflated presentation style condition, we examined how humility may mediate the interactive effect of target gender and participant gender on the subsequent evaluations of dominance, threat, warmth, and competence within the inflated presentation condition. We analyzed these results using PROCESS (Hayes, 2013) Model 7 over 5,000 bootstrapping iterations.

First, within the inflated presentation style condition, there was a significant interaction between target gender and participant gender on humility ratings, \( b = 1.14, \ SE = .50, t = 2.28, p = .025, 95\% CI = .149 \) to 2.140. Next, we examined the conditional indirect effects of the interaction on the target ratings via humility (i.e., index of moderated mediation). We found support for conditional indirect effects via humility on perceptions of warmth (index = .80, \( SE = .36, 95\% CI = .092 \) to 1.490), dominance (index = −.45, \( SE = .20, 95\% CI = −.843 \) to −.062), threat and control (index = −.63, \( SE = .31, 95\% CI = −1.268 \) to −.078), but not competence (index = .156, \( SE = .11, 95\% CI = −.014 \) to .405). That is, the interactive effect of target and participant gender on humility revealed that as perceptions of humility increased, this resulted in perceptions of greater interpersonal warmth, less perceived dominance, and less perceived threat of being controlled. These relationships are depicted in (Figure 2).

**Discussion**

The present preregistered experiment sought to examine the way men and women are perceived differently when expressing various presentational styles. We

![Figure 2. Conditional indirect effect models in the inflated presentation style condition.](image-url)
hypothesized that women would be penalized on various dimensions of person perception for exhibiting an inflated presentation style. Taken together, what do these results reveal for our preregistered hypotheses? Our first hypothesis was that females will be rated significantly higher on warmth yet significantly lower on competence relative to males. This was not supported by the data, as there were no main effects of gender on any of the primary dependent variables.

Our second hypothesis was that as females exhibit more inflated presentation styles, they will be rated less favorably, less likable, and less friendly relative to males, and our third hypothesis was that as females exhibit more inflated presentation styles, they will be rated as more threatening and less humble relative to males. The three-way interaction provided partial – nuanced – support for these hypotheses. Males view inflated males more humbly, and, in turn, more favorably across various dimensions of person perception, than females view those inflated males.

Our fourth hypothesis was that perceptions of threat and humility will mediate the effect of women being rated as unfavorable relative to men. Our conditional indirect effect models provide partial support for this hypothesis: within the inflated presentation style, the interactive effect of target gender and participant gender on perceptions of warmth, dominance, and threat/control were mediated (i.e., occurred through) humility.

Our fifth and sixth hypotheses predicted associations of benevolent sexism, as well as enhanced benevolent sexism being expressed by males. Although we did not find support for the prediction the benevolent sexism would moderate the interactions (fifth hypothesis), we did find that males reported higher benevolent sexism than females, as predicted (sixth hypothesis).

**Implications of research**

Our results, though nuanced, revealed three main findings which provide support for two of our hypotheses. First, inflated presenters were viewed as less humble, warm, and competent, and more dominant and threatening or controlling, than accurate or deflated presenters. This was the most consistent effect. Our first finding, that inflated presenters were rated less favorably across various interpersonal dimensions, illustrates that how one presents their ideas matters. Perceived arrogance is penalized across the board. Speaking in a way that is accurate to one’s ideas results in better evaluations.

Second, and more specifically, we found that female participants viewing inflated female targets rated them as significantly more humble than when viewing inflated male targets. Third, we also found that male participants viewing inflated male targets rated them as significantly more humble than female participants did, revealing that women pay an arrogance penalty that men do not exact on other men. That is, men view other men who overexaggerate and brag about their abilities as more humble than women do. Not only do these findings illustrate a within-participant bias for females, they demonstrate that females may hold different standards for humility according to gender, but this is not apparent to others. On the other hand, our work showing that male participants viewing inflated male targets rated them as significantly more humble than female participants did, illustrates a between-participant bias that is evident to others. We wonder if this latter effect, demonstrated by males, may be more pernicious.

Put another way, when males and females are judging the same inflated male target, males view the target as more humble than females do. In this way, males seem to be giving other males a ‘pass’ to act arrogantly, and perhaps even rewarding it by viewing them as more humble. In the same way, females pay an arrogance penalty for speaking with a perceived lack of humility. And this perception of humility has real consequences. The results from the conditional indirect effects models suggest that there are significant downstream consequences of viewing a target as more humble: they are also perceived as interpersonally warmer, less dominant, and less threatening. The primacy of humility in shaping these perceptions underscores the potent implications of this bias.

Our findings have consequential, real-life implications for any setting in which both males and females are having discussions and making decisions. Because humility is an important quality that others value in leaders (Rego et al., 2018), and if males tend to be the ones making consequential decisions, then the implication is that men in power tend to keep other men in power because they are viewing their arrogance more humbly. Moreover, the downstream effects of viewing someone as more dominant and threatening, because they are less humble, could have potent consequences, given the centrality of person perception in our social cognitive and behavioral responses to others.

**Limitations and suggestions for future research**

Our research had several strengths. First, we preregistered our hypotheses on the OSF, making clear our methodology, predictions, and data analytic plan. Second, we employed an experimental paradigm,
which allows for causal statements. Third, our sample was comprised of both undergraduates and community members sampled from Cloud Research.

However, like all studies, our research had some limitations. Firstly, gender may not have been salient enough in the participants’ mind when they completed the questions after reading the scenario, especially given the high rate of failed manipulation checks in the Cloud Research subsample. Perhaps if the gender of the target individual was made more apparent in the scenarios they read, then the effects from gender would be more prominent in the data. Future research could make gender more salient in the experimental methodology. Second, we were also limited by potential social desirability bias. Participants might have been hesitant to admit possible negative feelings toward the target individual (e.g., feeling threatened by an assertive businesswoman) in the scenario they read because of the negative social consequences of such beliefs. Especially in younger people, these beliefs may be less acceptable or ‘politically incorrect.’ Efforts to reduce, or statistically control for, social desirability would be fruitful. Third, our measure of dominance had low internal consistency. Surely, this limited our findings, and we encourage future researchers to use a more reliable measure of dominance. Fourth, we could have increased external validity. It is also possible that the different scenarios did not sufficiently imitate real-life scenarios. Because scenarios were only a paragraph in length, it could be that participants were not able to imagine the scenarios well enough to answer the questions accurately. Here too, future work in this area could make more accurately portray scenarios to better imitate real life. Finally, although our sample was large, it could be beneficial to replicate our study with a larger sample size in order to increase its statistical power.

**Conclusion**

How people convey themselves, their achievements, and their ideas matter. We found reliable differences based on presentation style for each of the dependent variables we measured: inflated presenters are viewed more negatively than accurate or deflated presenters. In addition, we found that males view inflated males as more humble than women do, suggesting that when men give other men a pass for being arrogant, women are assessed an arrogance penalty when their presentation style outpaces their achievements or accomplishments. And this perceived lack of humility matters and can affect myriad other features of perception. It appears that men and women are judged differently (by men) for a perceived lack of humility, and women end up paying a steeper price.
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