

Vibe Check: Understanding the Effects of LLM-Based Conversational Agents' Personality and Alignment on User Perceptions in Goal-Oriented Tasks

HASIBUR RAHMAN, Northeastern University, USA

SMIT DESAI*, Northeastern University, USA




Fig. 1. Overview of our Large Language Model (LLM)-based Conversational Agents' (CA) personality prompting and its impact on user perceptions. [A] Our novel Trait Modulation Keys (TMK) prompting framework pairs a Personality Key with Style Cues Keys to steer Big-Five trait intensities to design three specific CAs (Low/Medium/High). [B] In a goal-oriented travel-planning study (N=150), the Medium CA yielded the most favorable perception outcomes across perceived Intelligence, Enjoyment, Anthropomorphism, Intention to Adopt, Trust, and Likeability. [C] Greater user-CA personality alignment further improved perceptions, illustrated via higher alignment scores.

*Corresponding author

Authors' Contact Information: Hasibur Rahman, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts, USA, rahman.has@northeastern.edu; Smit Desai, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts, USA, sm.desai@northeastern.edu.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components Manuscript submitted to ACM

Large language models (LLMs) enable conversational agents (CAs) to express distinctive personalities, raising new questions about how such designs shape user perceptions. This study investigates how personality expression levels and user-agent personality alignment influence perceptions in goal-oriented tasks. In a between-subjects experiment (N=150), participants completed travel planning with CAs exhibiting low, medium, or high expression across the Big Five traits, controlled via our novel Trait Modulation Keys framework. Results revealed an inverted-U relationship: medium expression produced the most positive evaluations across Intelligence, Enjoyment, Anthropomorphism, Intention to Adopt, Trust, and Likeability, significantly outperforming both extremes. Personality alignment further enhanced outcomes, with Extraversion and Emotional Stability emerging as the most influential traits. Cluster analysis identified three distinct compatibility profiles, with "Well-Aligned" users reporting substantially positive perceptions. These findings demonstrate that personality expression and strategic trait alignment constitute optimal design targets for CA personality, offering design implications as LLM-based CAs become increasingly prevalent.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Conversational agents, Large language models, User-agent alignment, Personality computing, Human-AI interaction, Trust in AI

ACM Reference Format:

Hasibur Rahman and Smit Desai. 2018. Vibe Check: Understanding the Effects of LLM-Based Conversational Agents' Personality and Alignment on User Perceptions in Goal-Oriented Tasks. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 40 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 Introduction

In 1966, Joseph Weizenbaum introduced *ELIZA*, one of the earliest conversational agents (CAs). *ELIZA* simulated a Rogerian psychotherapist by reflecting user statements back in the form of questions. The system contained no understanding of language or intelligence—only simple pattern-matching and string substitution rules [107]. Despite its simplicity, users often treated *ELIZA* as more than a machine. Weizenbaum reported that his secretary, fully aware of the system's limitations, nonetheless asked to be left alone with it to continue her conversation. This episode revealed a persistent feature of human-computer interaction: when computers engage us in dialogue, we readily perceive personality and social presence, even in artificial systems.

The Computers are Social Actors (CASA) paradigm later formalized this phenomenon. Through controlled experiments, Nass et al. [66] demonstrated that people automatically apply social rules and trait attributions to interactive systems—showing politeness, reciprocating self-disclosure, and expressing preference for systems that mirror their own personalities. This effect not only persists but intensifies in interactions with CAs [22, 40, 110]. Interestingly, such responses occur automatically, even among experienced users who explicitly deny anthropomorphizing machines [28, 66, 78]. The implication is clear: if people treat computers as social actors, then the personality that CAs project can also systematically shape user perceptions.

Today, millions of people interact with large language model (LLM)-based CAs such as ChatGPT, Claude, and Gemini for tasks ranging from travel planning to creative writing [98]. During these interactions, users encounter distinctive communication styles that they interpret as personality. Although companies invest heavily in making these agents "helpful," "harmless," and "friendly," [8, 113] we lack a systematic understanding of how personality expression actually shapes user perceptions. This deficit becomes increasingly consequential as CAs transition from optional utilities to

of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM

critical infrastructure in education, healthcare, and professional practice. Unlike ELIZA's scripted responses, today's LLM-based agents represent a fundamental shift: personality is no longer an incidental byproduct of surface wording but can be deliberately designed and systematically controlled through natural language prompting [47, 48, 81, 90]. This technological advance creates both new opportunities and pressing questions: how should personality be expressed in CAs, at what intensity, and in what relation to the user's own traits?

Prior HCI research has shown that agent personality designed with linguistic cues influences user perceptions [83, 93, 102, 103, 115], typically operationalized through the Big Five Personality Traits (Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Neuroticism/Emotional Stability) [50, 51]. However, this foundational work relied on tightly scripted dialogues that manipulated traits at bipolar extremes (e.g., agreeable/disagreeable [102]) [83, 103]. While these designs afforded experimental precision, they leave a critical blind spot: we know little about how users respond to moderate or balanced agent personalities, as pointed out by Völkel and Kaya [102].

Research on personality alignment—the compatibility between user and agent personality traits—has attempted to extend this work. The widely purported "similarity-attraction" hypothesis suggests that users should prefer agents matching their own personalities [15, 61, 65], and some evidence supports enhanced engagement when agent extraversion mirrors the user's [15, 35, 93]. Yet findings remain mixed: some studies report no benefit or even preferences for complementary personalities [45, 95], while others suggest that alignment effects vary by trait and context [4, 102]. The mixed evidence may reflect how alignment has been operationalized: prior work typically employs binary matching/mismatching treatments rather than recognizing compatibility as a continuous, multidimensional phenomenon. Addressing this limitation opens the door to more precise explanations of personality alignment effects and their contextual variation.

LLMs expand what is practically possible for personality-aware CA design through prompt-based steering. Existing studies demonstrate that prompts can reliably induce Big Five traits [47, 81] and even coordinate multiple traits concurrently [48, 90]. However, most approaches remain limited: many rely on persona-based biographical backstories that undermine role fidelity [90], and most concentrate control at binary endpoints [47, 48]. The capacity for nuanced, medium-level personality expression has not been systematically examined.

We address these gaps through a controlled, between-subjects study of personality expression levels and personality alignment effects in goal-oriented CAs. To this end, we develop *Trait Modulation Keys* (TMK), a modular prompting framework that simultaneously controls all Big Five traits at low, medium, and high expression levels without requiring biographical backstories. TMK enables the first systematic comparison of personality expression levels beyond the binary extremes and reliance on persona-based backstories that have constrained prior research. An overview of our framework and main findings is shown in Figure 1.

We implement a 3×1 between-subjects design ($N=150$, $n = 50$ per condition) in which participants interact with a travel planning assistant configured with one of three personality profiles: all traits set to low, medium, or high expression. This resulted in three CAs, which we refer to as Low CA, Medium CA, and High CA, each exhibiting distinct personality expression levels. We focus on goal-oriented tasks because such contexts provide concrete subtasks and success criteria, allowing fair cross-condition comparisons while minimizing confounds from interface affordances [7, 39, 67]. After the interaction, participants rated six user perception measures—Intelligence, Enjoyment, Anthropomorphism, Intention to Adopt, Trust, and Likeability—selected based on Wei et al. [106]'s framework linking user perceptions to agent relationships. In addition, we measured each participant's own Big Five traits to calculate personality alignment, operationalized as the normalized Euclidean distance across all five traits between user and agent personalities.

This study design allows us to move beyond prior binary manipulations and categorical treatments to examine personality expression and alignment in greater depth. Guided by these gaps, our study examines four research questions (RQs): **RQ1:** *How do different CA personality expressions affect user perceptions in goal-oriented tasks?* **RQ2:** *To what extent does personality alignment between users and CAs influence user perceptions?* **RQ3:** *How do specific personality trait alignments between users and CAs contribute to user perceptions?* and **RQ4:** *Do users naturally form distinct groups based on their personality alignment patterns with CAs, and how do these groups differ in their perceptions?* Together, these questions enable a comprehensive investigation that progresses from general effects of personality expression, to mechanisms of compatibility, to user-level differences with design implications.

Through our study, we demonstrate that personality expression and alignment shape user perceptions in ways not captured by prior binary manipulations or categorical treatments. Our results highlight systematic effects of medium expression levels, trait-specific patterns of alignment, and emergent user profiles. Building on these findings, our work contributes the following:

- **A Modular Prompting Framework for LLM Personality Expression.** We present TMK, a systematic method for generating consistent personality profiles in CAs, including medium personality that address gaps in existing high/low manipulation methods.
- **Empirical Evidence for Personality Effects in Goal-Oriented CA Interaction.** Through a controlled study, we show that CA personalities systematically influence user perceptions, revealing an inverted-U relationship in which medium personality expression outperforms extremes across perceived Intelligence and Likeability.
- **Personality Alignment as a Design Consideration.** We establish personality alignment as a key design factor, identifying Extraversion and Emotional Stability as particularly influential dimensions and offering actionable guidelines for personality-aware AI systems.

2 Related Work

Our related work examines four domains essential to understanding personality effects in CA design: foundational research on CA personality expression and user perceptions, personality alignment between users and agents, advances in LLM-based personality prompting, and goal-oriented conversational contexts. Together, these domains establish the theoretical foundation and practical capabilities needed to investigate how CA personality and alignment jointly influence user perceptions in goal-oriented tasks.

2.1 Foundations of CA Personality Research in HCI

People naturally perceive and ascribe personality traits to CAs, even when designers do not explicitly specify them [28]. This tendency stems from the CASA paradigm, which demonstrates that users apply social rules and personality perceptions to machines in much the same way as they do to humans [66]. Early work by Nass and Lee [65] established that an agent’s demeanor shapes user responses: extroverted voice interfaces were preferred by extroverted users in one experiment. However, with text-based interfaces, the effect was less pronounced, revealing that conveying personality effectively through language alone requires careful design [65]. This design challenge has motivated extensive HCI research spanning decades, investigating how to implement agent personalities and their impact on user perceptions.

The Big Five Personality Traits¹, encompassing Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism (the opposite of Emotional Stability) [50, 51], has become the dominant framework for defining and

¹also referred to by the acronym OCEAN

manipulating such personalities in HCI literature [45, 95, 103, 115]. Beyond CAs, Big Five traits and their sub-facets have also been used to characterize behavior in robots and embodied agents, with evidence that trait expressions are relatively stable across cultures [24, 25, 64, 87, 99, 101]. From a psycholinguistic perspective, personality is inferred from consistent verbal and non-verbal markers [6, 86]; extensive work links personality traits to language features across essays, narratives, and text messages using correlational and group-comparison designs [14, 19, 29, 32, 34, 41, 42, 60, 68, 73, 76]

Thus far, most CA implementations of the Big Five Traits operationalize personality with tightly controlled, pre-scripted dialogues that hold task content constant while varying linguistic cues [102, 103, 115]. For instance, Völkel et al. [103] created extraverted, introverted, and neutral chatbot variants by hand-authoring sets of fixed dialogue scripts in which the informational content was identical, but the phrasing was systematically varied (e.g., concise vs. verbose responses, use of emojis and exclamation marks, self-disclosure) to signal different levels of extraversion. Even when natural-language understanding is introduced, the broader interaction remains scripted [83]. These approaches, while offering precise control over personality expression, are fundamentally limited by their reliance on pre-defined interaction patterns.

Furthermore, prior research has predominantly focused on single-trait manipulations, particularly the social dimensions of Extraversion and Agreeableness, as these are highly perceptible in interaction [83, 93, 102, 103]. For instance, Extraversion has been manipulated by varying verbosity, emoji use, and language formality to create “introverted” versus “extraverted” agents [83, 103, 115]. Users reliably distinguish such extremes, generally finding extraverted agents more sociable and sometimes more enjoyable [83, 103], although creating a convincingly introverted chatbot via text alone remains difficult [103].

Similarly, manipulating Agreeableness affects user affection and perceptions of warmth [102]. Völkel and Kaya [102] found that users high in Agreeableness particularly appreciated highly agreeable agents, whereas disagreeable agents tended to be less liked by most users regardless of their own trait level. These studies underscore that personality design has a significant impact on user perceptions.

Despite the Big Five's rich space of possible personality combinations, most HCI studies have examined only one or two traits at a time or focused exclusively on extreme ends of trait spectra [2, 83, 102, 103, 115]. This approach leaves a gap in understanding more nuanced or balanced agent personalities. Moreover, determining which personality profile would be optimal for users presents a fundamental design challenge.

2.2 Personality Alignment Between Users and CAs

Building on evidence that CA personality systematically influences user perceptions, research has investigated whether personality alignment optimizes user experience. Inspired by social psychology's "similarity-attraction" paradigm, studies demonstrate that users often respond more positively to computer personalities across modalities that resemble their own [5, 11, 15, 55, 61, 65, 92]. Early evidence by Nass and Lee [65] showed that matching a user's personality yielded higher liking and perceived performance. Shumanov and Johnson [93] reported that users were more engaged and willing to make purchases when a customer service agent's extraversion level mirrored their own. Similarly, Gnewuch et al. [35] found that users disclosed more personal information when an agent's dominance (assertiveness versus submissiveness in communication style) aligned with their own level of dominance. More recently, Amin Kuhail et al. [4] tested alignment across three traits in an advisor CA (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness) and found significant effects mainly for extraversion alignment, suggesting this may be the “primary” alignment dimension for influencing user perceptions.

However, some studies challenge the universality of this similarity-attraction effect in HCI contexts [45, 95]. Isbister and Nass [45] observed that while users recognize and prefer consistent personality cues in an interface agent, they unexpectedly tended to favor a character with a complementary personality over one mirroring their own. Recent work by Spagnolli et al. [95] directly tested personality convergence in a text-based health assistant, finding no significant benefit of matching the agent’s Big Five profile to the user’s. Furthermore, Amin Kuhail et al. [4] found no strong impact when separately matching on conscientiousness or agreeableness, indicating that the importance of specific trait alignment may be context-dependent [35, 95, 102].

These mixed results stem partly from methodological limitations in prior work. Research on personality alignment has been fragmented, typically using categorical matching approaches that examine only one trait at a time [35, 102]. The lack of continuous measures of personality alignment and the contradictory findings demand deeper inquiry into the effects of personality alignment on user perceptions. However, progress has been constrained by the same technical limitations that have limited personality expression research: the difficulty of implementing precise, multi-trait personality control with traditional scripted approaches.

2.3 Inducing Personality with Large Language Models

LLMs fundamentally transform CA personality research by enabling systematic personality expression through natural language prompting rather than rigid, pre-programmed responses. This technological shift addresses the core constraints that have limited both personality expression and alignment research. Kovacevic et al. [54] notes that while fine-tuning can be effective, it is resource-intensive, whereas prompt engineering scales more readily in applied CA design. Most LLM applications, including CAs studied in HCI, are built on closed-source models accessed via APIs [70]. A recent CHI meta-review shows that 130 of 153 CHI 2020–2024 papers that engaged with LLMs (84.98%) used closed-source GPT-family models [70]. In such settings, access to the underlying model parameters for fine-tuning is infeasible, making personality prompting techniques the primary approach for injecting personality into LLM-based CAs.

This prompting-based approach has already begun reshaping CA implementations, with earlier work demonstrating the viability of prompt-based personality induction [3, 21, 44, 54, 91]. Ramirez et al. [81] induced Big Five-styled outputs through discrete prompts and generate-and-rank procedures, demonstrating controllable style while preserving semantic fidelity, yet still operating at polarized endpoints of traits. Jiang et al. [47] similarly showed that LLMs can be prompted toward high or low poles of specific traits, validating the general feasibility of prompt-based personality control. However, these single-trait, binary-level approaches provide no mechanism for shaping multiple traits concurrently or targeting intermediate intensities.

More recent advances have addressed multi-trait configuration. Jiang et al. [48] moved from single traits to simultaneous multi-trait configuration. While LLM personas’ BFI-44 scores were consistent with assigned profiles, the framework still discretizes each trait to two endpoints [48]. Serapio-García et al. [90] offers a more sophisticated, psychometrically grounded methodology that shapes each Big Five trait at nine levels using 104 trait adjectives derived from Goldberg’s lexical markers [36]. Their prompts begin with biographical persona descriptions (e.g., life circumstances, hobbies) to anchor variation and demonstrate reliable single-trait nine-level control and concurrent shaping at extremes (levels one versus nine) [90].

Existing personality prompting approaches create practical limitations. Persona backstories can conflict with role fidelity in specialized agents, and concurrent mid-range expression remains unestablished. While recent advances demonstrate the feasibility of systematic personality control through prompting, we still lack evidence of how these capabilities affect user perceptions in applied contexts where CAs are designed to help users accomplish specific goals.

2.4 Performing Goal-Oriented Tasks with CAs

Goal-oriented CAs are designed to help users accomplish specific tasks or solve problems through dialogue, representing precisely the kind of realistic interaction context where personality effects may be most consequential. Haresamudram et al. [39] note that while the main goal in transactional dialogs is to achieve objectives quickly and accurately, human-like qualities of the agent can significantly shape user perceptions of Enjoyment and Trust, which in turn affect overall satisfaction.

Researchers often choose travel scenarios for CA studies because they provide concrete goals and decisions (e.g., book a hotel, find activities) without the high-stakes concerns of domains like banking or healthcare [39]. This domain enables controlled experimentation through standardized vignettes, ensuring that every participant faces the same context and subtasks. Atzmüller and Steiner [7] describes how vignette-based experiments frame consistent situations for all users, reducing variability from personal context differences. Recent CA studies have employed travel assistant vignettes to control for context and focus participants on comparable subtasks (e.g., lodging, attractions) in short trip-planning exercises [39, 67].

Within this domain, researchers have identified several factors that influence user perceptions and task outcomes. Haresamudram et al. [39] demonstrated that interaction modality and communication medium independently influence user perceptions in travel-assistant contexts, with text-based interactions yielding higher Trust and Anthropomorphism ratings than voice-only alternatives. Nguyen et al. [67] found that users approach tasks differently with free-form chatbot interfaces versus structured menu systems, which affects both efficiency and satisfaction. Additionally, Yeh et al. [112] noted that guidance strategies must be carefully timed and designed—giving an example query at the task's start or offering hints after errors can reduce user confusion and improve completion rates, though excessive upfront rules may frustrate users.

Taken together, this stream of work in goal-oriented settings has largely emphasized interaction medium and modality as the primary levers shaping user perceptions and outcomes [39, 67]. However, we lack evidence on how agent personality affects user perceptions when the task and interface are held constant. This represents a significant gap, as personality may offer an additional design dimension for optimizing user experience in goal-oriented conversational systems. The convergence of systematic personality control capabilities with realistic interaction contexts creates an opportunity to bridge decades of theoretical insights about personality effects with practical implementation in applied settings.

3 Study

We employed a 3×1 between-subjects design ($N=150$, $n = 50$ per condition) to examine how CA personality expression level, operationalized at three levels (low, medium, high), shapes user perceptions during a goal-oriented task. Participants were assigned to one of the three conditions in a counter-balanced order. Specifically, those in the low condition interacted with Low CA, those in the medium condition with Medium CA, and those in the high condition with High CA—each configured to exhibit the corresponding level of personality expression across all Big Five traits. Holding the task constant, the New York City trip-planning scenario enabled direct cross-condition comparisons while minimizing task-induced variance.

The CA was built using GPT-4o, OpenAI's non-reasoning flagship model at the time of the study (gpt-4o-2024-08-06), selected for its strong performance in instruction-following during our internal validation (see details in Appendix B),

and based on evidence from prior studies demonstrating the effectiveness of OpenAI’s LLMs for personality prompting [48, 90].

3.1 Task Design

We adapted our task from prior work by Haresamudram et al. [39], who employed a vignette-based, goal-oriented travel assistant scenario. This task was chosen because vignettes fix the user role, goal, and constraints before interaction, thereby reducing nuisance variance from idiosyncratic task interpretations [7].

3.1.1 NYC Trip Planning Task. Participants were told they would plan a one-day summer trip to New York City with our CA. The interaction was capped at 10 minutes and adapted from prior travel-assistant vignettes [39, 67], but implemented entirely via open-ended chat with following subtasks: (1) discover your top priority (what matters most when you travel, such as budget, food, or sights), (2) choose a base neighborhood in NYC, (3) select a rest stop or day-use accommodation, (4) plan your cultural or recreational activities, (5) decide on within-city transportation, (6) review the day’s plan, and (7) generate a one-day summer trip itinerary with a complete, time-stamped schedule from morning to night.

3.1.2 Task Interface. We used a text-only chat interface (see Figure 2) to maximize experimental control and minimize confounds. Participants communicated through free-text input, and the CA responded in natural language; we deliberately excluded buttons, quick replies, menus, avatars, and voice interactions. By standardizing both modality (free text) and medium (text) [39], we isolated personality manipulation as the primary source of variance in user perceptions.

To balance user autonomy with task structure in the absence of UI scaffolding, the CA employed lightweight guidance strategies [71]. These included affirming user contributions and offering brief exemplars, a technique previously validated in travel-assistant settings [39]. This implementation enabled the CA to express personality through textual replies while maintaining consistent task progression across all experimental conditions.

3.2 Conversational Agent Design and Prompting Framework

3.2.1 Personality Prompting: Trait Modulation Keys (TMK). Our NYC trip-planning CA required a controllable, role-appropriate personality that does not depend on a biographic description, since biographical backstories can blur role boundaries and that can express traits at graded intensities, especially medium level. For instance, Serapio-García et al. [90] in their personality prompt includes biographic details such as “I still live at home with my parents. I play video games all day. I’m 32. I eat all take-out,” an approach unsuited to assistants meant to remain role-focused. To meet these needs, we develop TMK: a modular personality prompting framework that enables simultaneous control across all Big Five traits at multiple expression levels.

TMK operates through independent (*trait, level*) controls applied concurrently across Big Five traits. Each trait can be tuned to Low, Medium, or High expression levels rather than only extremes, a capability that, to our knowledge, represents the first systematic approach to shape medium-level Big Five personality trait expressions in LLMs without predefined biographic descriptions, extending the previous personality prompting frameworks [47, 48, 90]. For example, TMK can construct an LLM personality that is low in Openness and Emotional Stability, high in Conscientiousness and Agreeableness, and medium in Extraversion, all within a single prompt. This capacity to define and combine trait intensities enables CAs with fine-tuned stylistic alignment and behavior patterns across roles.

The framework implements each personality configuration through two complementary keys for every (*trait, level*) Cartesian pair:

Manuscript submitted to ACM




Fig. 2. Text-only study interface and example exchange with the NYC day-trip CA. The left sidebar presents the vignette and the planning steps accessible to participants during interaction with the CA; the right pane displays the chat interface.

- **Personality Key.** A concise, psychometrically grounded description of the agent’s intended trait intensity. For Low and High, these are derived from validated psychometric resources [36, 59, 85]. The high and low-level descriptors mostly use unipolar adjectives empirically linked to each trait. Unlike bipolar adjectives (“friendly–unfriendly”), which can introduce ambiguity, unipolar terms (“kind”, “creative”) allow precise mapping to trait presence. Due to a lack of direct lexical markers for the medium level in prior research, we derived mid-range descriptors from previous research on behavioral descriptions of individuals who exhibit flexible or average trait levels [20, 37, 38]. All descriptors employ the “You...” prefix to leverage improved role adherence documented in instruction-following LLMs [69, 108, 116].
- **Style Cues Key.** A set of targeted linguistic directives that govern the agent’s tone, lexical choices, syntactic constructions, and discourse markers to align surface-level communication with the intended trait. Each style cue is informed by prior psycholinguistic research on how personality traits manifest in language [12, 18, 19, 57, 60, 73, 75, 84, 88, 111]. These style cues enable trait expressions to persist outside of psychometric questionnaire formats, addressing concerns about uneven personality visibility in previous personality prompting frameworks in downstream tasks (e.g., writing a blog post) [48, 90].

This dual-key architecture separates behavioral stance (e.g., risk-taking, diligence, social warmth) from linguistic surface form (tone, hedging, pace, punctuation), ensuring trait-consistent behavior while maintaining communicative flexibility. All 30 Personality Keys and Style Cues Keys are available as supplementary material, including 15 Personality Keys and 15 Style Cues Keys, with three keys per trait representing three levels of expression.

Following our 3×1 between-subjects design, we instantiated three uniform CA profiles: (i) **Low CA**: all five traits set to low expression; (ii) **Medium CA**: all five traits set to medium expression; and (iii) **High CA**: all five traits set to high expression. See Figure 3 for illustrative CA responses produced via TMK across Low, Medium, and High profiles.




Fig. 3. TMK prompting framework used to elicit three distinct personality profiles, illustrated with example responses from Low CA, Medium CA, and High CA.

3.2.2 Personality Prompt Validation. Before deploying TMK in our user study, we recognized that effective personality manipulation requires precise control and generalizability beyond specific configurations. Therefore, we conducted comprehensive validation across all possible 243 (3^5 , three levels and five traits) combination spaces to ensure TMK's reliability and steerability in accurately shaping intended personality expressions across all possible configurations. This comprehensive validation served dual purposes: to confirm that our three experimental conditions would produce distinct, measurable personality profiles, and to establish TMK's broader applicability for future personality-aware CA design. We instantiated all 243 TMK combinations and queried GPT-4o with two standard Big Five inventories, the 20-item Mini-IPIP [30] and the 44-item BFI-44 [51], plus four external criteria sets: Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) [105], Buss and Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ) [53], Portrait Value Questionnaire-Revised (PVQ-RR) [89], and Short Scale of Creative Self (SSCS) [52]. Huang et al. [43] showed that different LLMs produce consistent responses on a personality inventory, offering relevant context for our methodological choices. Responses on 1–5 Likert scales yielded average trait scores, which we mapped into three equal fixed bands, Low [1.00, 2.33], Medium [2.33, 3.67], High (3.67, 5.00], to assess control fidelity. Building on validation approaches from prior works [48, 90], our assessment encompassed three dimensions.

Convergent & Discriminant Validity. We evaluated convergent and discriminant validity using a Multi-Trait Multi-Method approach, comparing trait scores from the Mini-IPIP and BFI-44. Convergent validity was assessed by correlating the same trait across instruments, while discriminant validity required that each Mini-IPIP trait correlate weakly with the four non-matching BFI-44 traits. We quantified separation as $\Delta = (\text{convergent } r) - (\text{mean non-target } r)$. TMK-shaped responses yielded correlations between matched traits across instruments (Mini-IPIP and BFI-44) with an average of $\bar{r} = .989$, and correlations with non-matching traits of up to .28. The resulting average separation score, $\Delta = .922$, indicates that TMK-targeted trait outputs corresponded with an independent instrument's measure of the same construct and remained distinct from non-target traits.

Reliability. To assess whether traits maintain internal consistency under simultaneous five-trait control, we used three standard coefficients: Cronbach's α , McDonald's ω , and Guttman's λ_6 . Under TMK shaping, all five Mini-IPIP traits achieved *excellent* internal consistency for GPT-4o: $\alpha \geq .973$, $\omega \geq .971$, and $\lambda_6 \geq .969$. These results indicate that the personality scales remain highly dependable even under simultaneous five-trait control.

Criterion Validity. Trait-criterion relationships were assessed against theoretical expectations linking Big Five traits to non-personality outcomes, e.g., Extraversion should positively correlate with PANAS Positive Affect and negatively with Negative Affect [16]; Agreeableness should correlate negatively with BPAQ aggression facets [49]; Conscientiousness should correlate positively with PVQ-RR Achievement, Conformity/Tradition, and Security [72, 100]; Emotional Stability should correlate negatively with Anger/Hostility [80]; and Openness should correlate positively with creative self-beliefs [74]. Under TMK shaping in GPT-4o, Extraversion correlated positively with PANAS Positive Affect ($r = .87$) and showed a ($r = -.01$) relationship with Negative Affect. Agreeableness was negatively related to BPAQ aggression facets—Physical Aggression ($r = -.83$), Verbal Aggression ($r = -0.87$), Anger ($r = -.03$), and Hostility ($r = -.39$). Conscientiousness tracked value endorsements on the PVQ-RR: Achievement ($r = .12$), Conformity/Tradition ($r = .54$), and Security ($r = .95$). Emotional Stability was negatively associated with BPAQ Anger ($r = -.98$) and Hostility ($r = -.89$). Finally, Openness aligned with creative self-beliefs measured by the SSCS: Creative Self-Efficacy ($r = .96$) and Creative Personal Identity ($r = .97$). These criterion relationships demonstrate that TMK-shaped personalities exhibit theoretically consistent external correlates beyond mere self-report consistency.

Control Fidelity. Two forms of control fidelity were assessed. First, trait-level correlation was evaluated by correlating the targeted level for each trait (Low = 1, Medium = 2, High = 3) with the resulting Mini-IPIP trait scores using Spearman's ρ_s . The average correlation across traits was $\bar{\rho}_s = .97$ ($p < .001$), indicating significant alignment between targeted levels and resulting scores. Second, a Targeted Trait Match assessment was conducted across all 1215 trait-level observations (243 combinations \times 5 traits), classifying responses as matches when the resulting Mini-IPIP trait scores for each targeted trait level fell within the predefined target band and misses otherwise. This analysis revealed a 92.3% targeted trait match rate (1122/1215 observations). Notably, using TMK, the medium level proved most challenging to shape precisely, with all 93 misses originating exclusively from medium-targeted traits whose resulting Mini-IPIP trait scores fell just outside their intended band boundaries. However, these deviations represented close misses; none exceeded half a Likert point from the target range, and no medium-targeted trait scores migrated to the extremes of low or high expression levels. Despite these challenges, the resulting Mini-IPIP trait score distributions formed visually distinct clusters across low, medium, and high levels (see Figure 4).

To further validate the fidelity of our three CA profiles, we ran the Mini-IPIP 40 times for each experimental condition, yielding 200 trait-level observations per condition. The number of runs was determined a priori: at least 39 runs were

required to achieve 80% power ($\alpha = .05$, $1 - \beta = .80$). In the medium condition, 180 of 200 observations (90.0%) fell within their target bands. The low and high conditions yielded 200 of 200 matches (100%). These three condition-level results confirm that TMK produced stable and distinct CA profiles, ensuring consistent behavioral expression across the interaction sequence.




Fig. 4. Control fidelity of TMK personality prompting on the CA, measured with Mini-IPIP across all 243 trait-level configurations. Each point is a trait-level observation ($n = 1215$). Shaded bands mark target ranges: Low = [1.0, 2.33], Medium = [2.33, 3.67], High = (3.67, 5.0]. Green circles denote targeted trait matches (1122; 92.3%), red squares are close misses (within 0.5; 93), and red triangles are far misses (0). Misses occur only for Medium targets; Low and High achieve 100% matches, yielding three clearly separated clusters.

This comprehensive validation confirmed TMK’s capacity to reliably shape distinct, measurable personality profiles in LLMs aligned with specified target profiles.

3.2.3 Prompt Architecture. The CA’s prompt architecture is modular and condition-aware, assembling personality-driven behavioral directives alongside structured task parameters in a controlled sequence. The prompt architecture first establishes the CA’s role as a New York City trip-planning assistant. It binds behavioral decisions to predefined “Personality Key” and communication patterns to “Style Cues Key”, both determined by the assigned experimental condition. It then integrates task instructions across multiple subsections: (i) Goal (planning objectives and success criteria); (ii) Prompt Construction Rules (comprehensive task specifications plus structured questionnaires for information elicitation); (iii) Conversation Flow (exemplar exchanges and turn-taking protocols); (iv) Chat Termination Guidelines (completion criteria tied to trip itinerary generation); and (v) Restrictions (behavioral and content constraints to preserve experimental validity). Appendix C details the complete prompt structure and one example prompt. This design cleanly

separates personality manipulations from procedural scaffolding while ensuring personality expressions remain active throughout the dialogue, thereby enabling precise experimental control and consistent behavioral expression across the interaction sequence.

3.3 Measures

3.3.1 Personality Measure (Mini-IPIP). We measured participants’ personality profile using the 20-item Mini-IPIP [30], which includes four items per Big Five domain rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). This brief measure demonstrates strong psychometric properties, with internal consistencies of $\alpha = .65-.77$ and strong convergence with the 50-item parent scales ($r = .85-.93$) [30].

For scoring, negatively keyed items were reverse-scored, and each domain score was calculated as the mean of its four items. Consistent with the view that Emotional Stability is the opposite pole of Neuroticism, we report Emotional Stability as $(6 - Neuroticism)$ [30]. Following standard Big Five labeling, we refer to the Mini-IPIP “Intellect/Imagination” domain as “Openness to Experience” or “Openness” in short [30, 51].

3.3.2 User Perception Measures. To evaluate user perception of the CA, we use six measures covering Intelligence, Enjoyment, Anthropomorphism, Intention to Adopt, Trust, and Likeability based on Wei et al. [106]’s framework linking user perceptions to agent relationships.

The Intelligence, Anthropomorphism, and Likeability subscales from the Godspeed Measures [9, 10] were employed using 5-point semantic differentials. The Enjoyment was measured with three items adapted from Moussawi et al. [63] on a 7-point Likert scale, evaluating whether users found the interaction with the CA enjoyable, interesting, and fun. Intention to Adopt was measured with two items adapted from Moussawi et al. [63] on a 7-point Likert scale, assessing users’ plans to start using and experiment with the CA within the coming months. Trust was also measured on a 7-point Likert scale adapted from Jian et al. [46]. The questionnaires can be found in Appendix D.

In addition to these measures, we included three attention check questions. These were simple instruction-following items and were interspersed with the main measures in randomized order to minimize response bias.

3.3.3 Personality Alignment Measures. We quantify alignment between each participant’s Big Five profile and the CA using (i) a multivariate “Personality Alignment Score” and (ii) “Individual Trait Distance” for each trait.

Let $\mathbf{P} = (P_O, P_C, P_E, P_A, P_{ES}) \in [1, 5]^5$ denote the participant’s trait scores (Mini-IPIP subscale means), and let $\mathbf{C} = (C_O, C_C, C_E, C_A, C_{ES})$ denote the CA’s trait settings, where $C_i \in \{1, 3, 5\}$ encodes low, medium, and high, respectively. C_i scores are based on the modal observed trait scores in our TMK validation, which were 1 for low, 3 for medium, and 5 for high. These values best represent the most typical realized expression level for each setting (see Section 3.2.2).

Personality Alignment Score. We define a normalized, Euclidean-distance-based score:

$$\text{Personality Alignment Score} = 1 - \frac{\|\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{C}\|_2}{\sqrt{80}} = 1 - \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^5 (P_i - C_i)^2}}{\sqrt{80}}.$$

The denominator $\sqrt{80}$ is the maximum possible Euclidean distance given the scales (for each trait, the largest difference is $|5 - 1| = 4$, so $\sum 4^2 = 80$). The score is thus bounded in $[0, 1]$, where higher values indicate better personality alignment between the participant and the CA.

Individual Trait Distance. For each trait i in Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability, we compute

$$\text{Trait Distance}_i = |P_i - C_i|,$$

the absolute difference between the participant’s trait score and the CA’s setting on that trait. Trait Distance $_i$ ranges from 0 (minimum distance) to 4 (maximum distance). For example, Openness distance would be $|P_O - C_O|$, where P_O is the participant’s Openness score and C_O is the CA’s Openness setting.

3.4 Procedure

Participants accessed the study through Prolific² and completed all components within a single session. The procedure is illustrated in Figure 5. Upon entry via the platform link, participants first reviewed and signed an online IRB-approved consent form before providing demographic information, including their prior experience with CAs. Next, they completed the Mini-IPIP personality inventory to capture Big Five trait scores for subsequent alignment analyses (see Section 3.3.1); these scores were not used for condition assignment. Following the personality assessment, participants were assigned to one of three CA personality profiles (Low CA, Medium CA, or High CA) in counter-balanced order. Before beginning the interaction, participants read detailed task instructions for NYC day-trip planning (see Section 3.1.1) that specified their user role, goals, constraints, and the 10-minute time limit, confirming their understanding before proceeding. They were then routed to our custom chat interface (see 3.1.2) where they interacted with the CA to complete the seven planning subtasks. The interaction phase concluded either upon successful completion of all subtasks or expiration of the 10-minute timer, whichever occurred first. Finally, participants completed post-interaction questionnaires (with questionnaire items presented in a randomized order) measuring their perceptions of the CA (see Section 3.3.2). Further, they were given the option to provide qualitative feedback about their interactions with the CA, should they choose to do so. Participants took a median of 14 min 25 s to complete the entire study. After completing these steps, participants were redirected to Prolific for study completion.




Fig. 5. Single session study flow

3.5 Participants

To detect a one-standard-deviation effect in our 3×1 between-subjects design, a priori power analysis indicated a minimum sample of 148 participants ($\alpha = .05; 1 - \beta = .80$). To meet this threshold, we therefore recruited 150 US adults through Prolific, with 50 participants assigned to each experimental condition (low, medium, high) in a counterbalanced order.

²<https://www.prolific.com/>

Recruitment filters required a minimum task approval rate of 98% and at least one year of activity on the platform. Our eligibility was defined as (i) self-reported high English proficiency for effective CA interaction, and (ii) at least minimal prior exposure to CAs. All participants met these criteria, and all identified English as their native language. Consistent with the inclusion criterion, 72% described themselves as “very” or “completely” familiar with CAs (ratings 4–5 on the 5-point familiarity scale), and 71.3% reported using a CA at least weekly (ratings 4–5 on the frequency scale).

The final sample spanned 18–73 years ($M = 41.95$, $SD = 10.91$). Gender identification was 52.0% female ($n = 78$), 46.7% male ($n = 70$), and 1.3% non-binary/other or undisclosed ($n = 2$). Participants were compensated at an hourly rate of US \$12.5 per hour, exceeding the US federal minimum wage guidance.

4 Results

The 150 participants were evenly distributed across three experimental conditions (Low, Medium, and High CA personality; $n = 50$ per condition). Of these, 130 (86.7%) completed all seven subtasks within 10 minutes: 44 from the low condition, 41 from the medium condition, and 45 from the high condition. The remaining participants interacted with the CA but were unable to generate a complete itinerary due to time constraints. Participants engaged in a comparable number of conversational turns across conditions ($M = 24.62$ turns, $SD = 8.37$ for low; $M = 23.20$ turns, $SD = 4.61$ for medium; $M = 23.26$ turns, $SD = 4.95$ for high). This ensures that the observed differences in user perceptions are attributable to personality variation rather than differential engagement levels.

Personality profiles were broadly comparable across experimental conditions (see Figure 6). Kruskal–Wallis tests indicated no statistically significant differences for Openness ($H(2) = 2.59$, $p = .274$), Extraversion ($H(2) = 3.12$, $p = .210$), Agreeableness ($H(2) = 1.90$, $p = .387$), and Emotional Stability ($H(2) = 2.81$, $p = .246$). Conscientiousness differed across conditions ($H(2) = 6.51$, $p = .039$), with $Mdn = 3.62$ (high), $Mdn = 3.75$ (low), and $Mdn = 4.12$ (medium). Despite this difference, the overall trait distribution remained balanced across groups, reducing the likelihood that individual-difference composition operated as a systematic confound.

At the sample level, descriptive statistics were as follows: Openness ($M = 4.08$, $SD = 0.91$), Conscientiousness ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 0.89$), Extraversion ($M = 2.63$, $SD = 1.09$), Agreeableness ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 0.77$), and Emotional Stability ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 0.95$).

All measures demonstrated good to excellent internal consistency ($\alpha = .81$ –.95). All variables violated normality assumptions (Shapiro–Wilk tests, $p < .05$); hence, nonparametric analyses were used throughout. All the data is available as supplementary material.

4.1 Effects of CA Personality (RQ1)

Results indicate that personality profiles of the CA systematically shape user perceptions across multiple dimensions. Table 1 summarizes means and standard deviations for variables by condition, revealing apparent differences between the conditions.

Kruskal–Wallis tests revealed significant effects for all six variables (see Table 2): Intelligence ($H(2) = 9.32$, $p = .010$, $\eta^2 = .049$), Enjoyment ($H(2) = 7.70$, $p = .021$, $\eta^2 = .038$), Anthropomorphism ($H(2) = 10.81$, $p = .005$, $\eta^2 = .059$), Intention to Adopt ($H(2) = 11.02$, $p = .004$, $\eta^2 = .061$), Trust ($H(2) = 8.39$, $p = .015$, $\eta^2 = .043$), and Likeability ($H(2) = 16.64$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .098$).

Bonferroni-adjusted Mann–Whitney U tests ($\alpha = .017$) showed that the medium condition consistently outperformed the low condition on all identified above (see Figure 7, Table 3). For Intelligence (medium: 4.60 vs. low: 4.00), $U = 850.0$, $p = .016$, $r = .276$; the medium condition also outperformed the high condition (medium: 4.60 vs. high: 4.00), $U = 1605.5$,




Fig. 6. Participants' Mini-IPIP Big-Five scores by experimental condition ($n = 50$ per condition). Each panel shows boxplots for Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Emotional Stability with three groups (Low, Medium, High). Distributions are broadly comparable across conditions.

Table 1. Variable Means and Standard Deviations by Condition

Variable	Low	Medium	High
Intelligence	3.88 ± 0.91	4.31 ± 0.90	3.82 ± 1.11
Enjoyment	4.93 ± 1.54	5.67 ± 1.24	5.43 ± 1.29
Anthropomorphism	2.82 ± 1.01	3.48 ± 1.02	3.06 ± 1.01
Intention to Adopt	4.31 ± 1.62	5.26 ± 1.35	4.58 ± 1.58
Trust	5.30 ± 0.96	5.79 ± 0.96	5.52 ± 1.02
Likeability	3.81 ± 0.95	4.47 ± 0.72	3.94 ± 1.05

$p = .039$, $r = .245$. Similar patterns were observed for Enjoyment (medium: 6.00 vs. low: 5.17), $U = 847.0$, $p = .015$, $r = .278$; and for Anthropomorphism (medium: 3.60 vs. low: 2.80), $U = 789.5$, $p = .005$, $r = .317$. Intention to Adopt likewise favored the medium condition (medium: 5.50 vs. low: 4.00), $U = 792.0$, $p = .005$, $r = .316$. For Trust, medium ($Mdn = 5.90$) exceeded low ($Mdn = 5.35$), $U = 826.5$, $p = .011$, $r = .292$. Finally, for Likeability (medium: 4.80 vs. low: 4.00), $U = 700.5$, $p < .001$, $r = .379$; the medium condition also outperformed the high condition (medium: 4.80 vs. high: 4.30), $U = 1692.0$, $p = .006$, $r = .305$.

Table 2. Kruskal–Wallis tests for variables across three conditions

Variable	H	p	η^2	Sig.
Intelligence	9.317	.010	0.049	**
Enjoyment	7.703	.021	0.038	*
Anthropomorphism	10.812	.005	0.059	**
Intention to Adopt	11.019	.004	0.061	**
Trust	8.393	.015	0.043	*
Likeability	16.635	< .001	0.098	***

Note. Significance codes: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. η^2 denotes rank-based effect size.




Fig. 7. Post hoc Mann–Whitney U comparisons (Bonferroni-adjusted, $\alpha = .05$) for the medium vs low (left) and high (right) across six outcomes. Points show group medians; circle size encodes $|\text{rank-biserial } r|$ (.10/.30/.50). Arrows mark pairs with Bonferroni-corrected $p \leq .05$ and point toward the higher median. Medium CA > low for all six constructs; medium > high for Likeability and Intelligence only (others n.s.).

Summary. Medium CAs consistently produced significantly higher perceived Intelligence, Enjoyment, Anthropomorphism, Intention to Adopt, Trust, and Likeability than Low CAs, and also yielded significantly greater perceived Intelligence and Likeability than High CAs. This pattern suggests an inverted-U relationship between personality expression level and user experience.

Table 3. Post hoc Mann–Whitney U tests (Bonferroni correction) for pairwise comparisons across three levels

Variable	Pair	U	p	p_{adj}	r	Sig.
Intelligence	low vs medium	850.0	.005	.016	0.276	*
	low vs high	1238.0	.936	1.000	0.008	
	medium vs high	1605.5	.013	.039	0.245	*
Enjoyment	low vs medium	847.0	.005	.015	0.278	*
	low vs high	1010.5	.098	.293	0.165	
	medium vs high	1387.5	.338	1.000	0.095	
Anthropomorphism	low vs medium	789.5	.002	.005	0.317	**
	low vs high	1057.5	.185	.554	0.133	
	medium vs high	1550.0	.038	.115	0.207	
Intention to Adopt	low vs medium	792.0	.002	.005	0.316	**
	low vs high	1119.0	.365	1.000	0.090	
	medium vs high	1589.5	.019	.056	0.234	
Trust	low vs medium	826.5	.004	.011	0.292	*
	low vs high	1063.0	.198	.594	0.129	
	medium vs high	1472.0	.126	.379	0.153	
Likeability	low vs medium	700.5	< .001	< .001	0.379	***
	low vs high	1115.5	.353	1.000	0.093	
	medium vs high	1692.0	.002	.006	0.305	**

Note. Pairwise comparisons for variables with significant Kruskal–Wallis results. p_{adj} values are Bonferroni-corrected. Significance codes: * $p_{adj} < .05$, ** $p_{adj} < .01$, *** $p_{adj} < .001$. U = Mann–Whitney statistic; r = rank-biserial effect size.

4.2 Personality Alignment and User Perceptions (RQ2)

Personality alignment scores between users and CAs ($M = 0.52$, $SD = 0.21$, range = 0–0.88) showed consistent positive associations between personality alignment and user perceptions. As illustrated in Figure 8, the distribution of alignment scores exhibits substantial within-condition variability that enabled examining alignment effects beyond experimental manipulations.

Table 4. Spearman correlations with personality alignment score; *** $p \leq .001$, ** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$

Variable	r_s	Sig.
Intelligence	.253	**
Enjoyment	.234	**
Anthropomorphism	.231	**
Intention to Adopt	.269	***
Trust	.288	***
Likeability	.304	***

Spearman’s rank correlations indicated positive relationships between personality alignment and all variables, as shown in Table 4. Likeability ($r_s = .304$, $p < .001$) was strongest, followed by Trust ($r_s = .288$, $p < .001$), Intention to Adopt ($r_s = .269$, $p < .001$), Intelligence ($r_s = .253$, $p = .002$), Enjoyment ($r_s = .234$, $p = .004$), and Anthropomorphism ($r_s = .231$, $p = .005$).




Fig. 8. Distribution of user-CA Personality Alignment Scores (0–1) by experimental condition ($n = 50$ per group). Dots show participants; boxplots show medians and interquartile ranges. The medium condition exhibits the highest and tightest alignment (median $\approx .72$), the high condition shows a wider midrange spread (median $\approx .54$), and the low condition has the lowest alignment (median $\approx .30$).

While personality alignment showed significant bivariate correlations with user perceptions, hierarchical regression analyses controlling for experimental condition revealed more limited effects. Trust showed a significant incremental contribution from personality alignment ($\beta = 1.397, p = .084; \Delta R^2 = .025, p = .049$), and Intelligence demonstrated a similar pattern ($\beta = 1.185, p = .076; \Delta R^2 = .018, p = .094$). Enjoyment ($\beta = 1.347, p = .196; \Delta R^2 = .012, p = .172$), Intention to Adopt ($\beta = 1.728, p = .156; \Delta R^2 = .016, p = .116$), and Likeability ($\beta = 0.790, p = .188; \Delta R^2 = .009, p = .234$) showed consistent directional trends in the expected direction. These effect sizes are practically meaningful, with alignment improvements translating to substantial changes in user perceptions. However, the current sample size constrains statistical power. These findings underscore the importance of personality alignment but suggest that larger samples are necessary to reliably detect incremental effects.

Summary. Personality alignment demonstrated consistent positive correlations with all six variables, suggesting that beyond the main effects of CA personality design, individual user-agent personality alignment contributes meaningfully to user experience.

4.3 Individual Trait Distance Effects (RQ3)

Analysis of individual trait distances revealed differential impacts on user perceptions. Table 5 reports Spearman correlations between each trait mismatch and the variables. Conscientiousness distance showed the strongest and

most pervasive negative associations, correlating with Intelligence ($r_s = -.231, p = .005$) and Likeability ($r_s = -.288, p < .001$); its association with Trust was non-significant ($r_s = -.146, p = .075$). Extraversion distance was broadly impactful, relating negatively to Intelligence ($r_s = -.232, p = .004$), Intention to Adopt ($r_s = -.227, p = .005$), Trust ($r_s = -.202, p = .013$), and Likeability ($r_s = -.271, p = .001$). Emotional Stability distance influenced evaluative judgments like Intelligence ($r_s = -.222, p = .006$), Intention to Adopt ($r_s = -.166, p = .042$), Trust ($r_s = -.191, p = .020$), and Likeability ($r_s = -.233, p = .004$). Agreeableness distance impacted Enjoyment ($r_s = -.208, p = .011$), Intention to Adopt ($r_s = -.203, p = .013$), and Trust ($r_s = -.188, p = .021$). Openness distance showed significant associations with two variables: Intention to Adopt ($r_s = -.164, p = .045$) and Trust ($r_s = -.201, p = .014$), while showing non-significant correlations with the remaining four variables. The consistent negative direction of these correlations indicates that greater mismatches between user and CA personality traits are associated with lower values of the variables.

Summary. Individual trait distances showed differential effects. Conscientiousness mismatches most negatively affected Intelligence and Likeability. Extraversion mismatches were broadly impactful, relating to Intelligence, Anthropomorphism, Intention to Adopt, Trust, and Likeability. Emotional Stability mismatches reduced Intelligence, Intention to Adopt, Trust, and Likeability. Agreeableness mismatches lowered Enjoyment, Intention to Adopt, and Trust. Openness mismatches had comparatively minimal impact, with small effects on Intention to Adopt and Trust.

4.4 Personality Alignment Clusters (RQ4)

k-means clustering based on trait mismatch patterns identified three distinct user groups, jointly supported by silhouette analysis (score = .310) and elbow-curve (see Appendix E for details). Figure 9 depicts the resulting profiles.

Cluster 0 ($n = 39, 26.0\%$) represented “Extraversion-Misaligned” users, characterized by high extraversion distance mismatches ($M = 3.01, SD = 0.67$) with moderate alignment on other traits. This cluster consisted primarily of high-condition participants (92.3%) with a moderate overall alignment score ($M = 0.498$). Cluster 1 ($n = 49, 32.7\%$) comprised “Globally-Misaligned” users showing high trait distance across all traits, particularly Openness ($M = 3.31, SD = 0.72$) and Agreeableness ($M = 3.21, SD = 0.64$). This cluster contained almost exclusively low-condition participants (98.0%) with the lowest personality alignment ($M = 0.287$). Cluster 2 ($n = 62, 41.3\%$) included “Well-Aligned” users with minimal trait distance (all < 1.14) and the highest personality alignment scores ($M = 0.717$). This cluster predominantly featured medium-condition participants (77.4%).

Kruskal–Wallis tests in Table 6 indicate significant differentiation across all six variables (all $p < .05$; see also Figure 10), suggesting that personality alignment patterns are systematically associated with user perceptions. Post hoc Mann–Whitney U comparisons (Table 7) show that “Well-Aligned” users (Cluster 2) consistently report higher values than the remaining clusters on all significant variables. The largest effects emerge for Enjoyment (Cluster 2 vs. Cluster 1: $U = 1062.5, p = .006, r = .257$) and Trust (Cluster 2 vs. Cluster 1: $U = 945.5, p < .001, r = .323$).

Within-cluster correlation analyses revealed differential sensitivity to alignment. “Extraversion-Misaligned” users (Cluster 0) showed positive correlations between personality alignment score and Intelligence ($r_s = .385, p = .016$) as well as Trust ($r_s = .412, p = .009$), suggesting compensatory effects when other traits align well despite Extraversion mismatches.

Table 5. Spearman correlations between trait distances and variables

Variable	Trait Distance	r_s	p	Sig.
Intelligence	Openness	-.071	.386	
	Conscientiousness	-.231	.005	**
	Extraversion	-.232	.004	**
	Agreeableness	-.114	.166	
	Emotional Stability	-.222	.006	**
Enjoyment	Openness	-.143	.081	
	Conscientiousness	-.146	.075	
	Extraversion	-.147	.073	
	Agreeableness	-.208	.011	*
	Emotional Stability	-.117	.153	
Anthropomorphism	Openness	-.078	.341	
	Conscientiousness	-.134	.101	
	Extraversion	-.163	.046	*
	Agreeableness	-.133	.105	
	Emotional Stability	-.131	.111	
Intention to Adopt	Openness	-.164	.045	*
	Conscientiousness	-.090	.273	
	Extraversion	-.227	.005	**
	Agreeableness	-.203	.013	*
	Emotional Stability	-.166	.042	*
Trust	Openness	-.201	.014	*
	Conscientiousness	-.146	.075	
	Extraversion	-.202	.013	*
	Agreeableness	-.188	.021	*
	Emotional Stability	-.191	.020	*
Likeability	Openness	-.126	.123	
	Conscientiousness	-.288	< .001	***
	Extraversion	-.271	< .001	***
	Agreeableness	-.121	.139	
	Emotional Stability	-.233	.004	**

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. Trait distance variables reflect the absolute difference between participant and CA scores on each trait. Negative correlations indicate that greater trait distance is associated with lower values of the variables.

Summary. Three distinct clusters emerged based on personality alignment patterns. The “Well-Aligned” cluster showed the highest values across variables. Post hoc tests (Bonferroni-corrected) showed that the “Well-Aligned” cluster’s values for Trust, Likeability, and Intelligence were higher than both other clusters, and values for Enjoyment, Intention to Adopt, and Anthropomorphism were higher than the “Globally-Misaligned” cluster. The concentration of “Well-Aligned” users in the medium condition (77.4%), relative to the high and low conditions, reinforces that moderate personality expression facilitates broader compatibility.




Fig. 9. Personality alignment clusters from k -means on trait distances (Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability; 0–1) plus overall Personality Alignment Score. The radar plot shows three profiles: Extraversion-Misaligned (purple) has a large Extraversion distance with otherwise moderate distances and a mid alignment score; Globally-Misaligned (green) shows high distances on all traits and the lowest alignment; Well-Aligned (red) exhibits uniformly small distances and the highest alignment score.

Table 6. Cluster-based Kruskal–Wallis tests for variables across three personality alignment clusters

Variable	H	p	η^2	Sig.
Intelligence	9.650	.008	.051	**
Enjoyment	6.987	.030	.033	*
Anthropomorphism	8.037	.018	.041	*
Intention to Adopt	11.340	.003	.063	**
Trust	14.891	< .001	.087	***
Likeability	13.357	.001	.076	**

Note. Significance codes: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. η^2 denotes rank-based effect size.




Fig. 10. Post hoc Mann–Whitney U results (Bonferroni-adjusted, $\alpha = .05$) comparing the Well-Aligned cluster (C2) with Extraversion-Misaligned (C0, left) and Globally-Misaligned (C1, right). Points show cluster medians; circle size encodes $|r|$ (.10/.30/.50). Arrows mark pairs with Bonferroni-corrected $p \leq .05$ and point toward the higher median. $C2 > C0$ for Intelligence, Trust, and Likeability (others n.s.). $C2 > C1$ for all six outcomes (Intelligence, Enjoyment, Trust, Intention to Adopt, Anthropomorphism, Likeability).

4.5 Qualitative Perceptions

To complement the quantitative results, we also invited participants to leave qualitative opinions about their experience with the CA. 114 of 150 participants (76%) provided some qualitative data. An inductive thematic analysis revealed four overarching themes:

4.5.1 Medium CA Appeal. Consistent with quantitative findings, participants described the Medium CA as balanced, approachable, and effective. Comments highlighted friendliness (P1), attentiveness (P17), and a personality that “meshed with mine” (P24). Others emphasized professionalism and trustworthiness, with a style “fluid and to the point” (P15). While a few noted a slightly “robotic” quality (P13), overall reflections reinforced higher Intelligence, Intention to Adopt, and Likeability.

4.5.2 Polarizing Low and High CA. The Low and High CAs elicited more divided responses. The Low CA was often described as flat or lacking presence: “It didn’t seem to have much of a personality” (P51), “a little flat” (P53), or less enthusiastic than the user (P82). This absence of social presence aligns with its lowest values on Enjoyment, Anthropomorphism, and Likeability.

The High CA by contrast, was seen as exaggerated and less authentic. Some found it “great” and relatable (P103), but many described it as grating: “The personality was exhausting... like a teenage cheerleader... it detracts from the authenticity and credibility of the AI” (P114). These reactions underscore why the high condition was judged less likable and intelligent than the medium, showing how an amplified persona can feel “distracting” (P121).

Table 7. Post hoc Mann–Whitney U tests for clusters (Bonferroni correction)

Construct	Pair	U	p	p_{adj}	r	Sig.
Intelligence	C0 vs C1	916.5	.744	1.000	.035	
	C0 vs C2	851.0	.011	.034	.248	*
	C1 vs C2	1074.5	.008	.023	.251	*
Enjoyment	C0 vs C1	1090.5	.256	.768	.121	
	C0 vs C2	1064.0	.307	.921	.101	
	C1 vs C2	1062.5	.006	.019	.257	*
Anthropomorphism	C0 vs C1	1128.5	.146	.439	.155	
	C0 vs C2	1013.0	.172	.515	.136	
	C1 vs C2	1059.5	.006	.019	.259	*
Intention to Adopt	C0 vs C1	1054.5	.405	1.000	.089	
	C0 vs C2	893.5	.027	.080	.219	
	C1 vs C2	983.0	.001	.004	.302	**
Trust	C0 vs C1	980.5	.837	1.000	.022	
	C0 vs C2	773.5	.002	.007	.302	**
	C1 vs C2	945.5	< .001	.002	.323	**
Likeability	C0 vs C1	1041.0	.473	1.000	.077	
	C0 vs C2	851.0	.012	.035	.248	*
	C1 vs C2	944.5	< .001	.002	.324	**

Note. Pairwise comparisons for variables with significant cluster-based Kruskal–Wallis results. p_{adj} values are Bonferroni-corrected. Significance codes: * $p_{adj} < .05$, ** $p_{adj} < .01$. U = Mann–Whitney statistic; r = rank-biserial effect size. C0 = Extraversion-Misaligned, C1 = Globally-Misaligned, C2 = Well-Aligned.

4.5.3 Personality Alignment Effects. Personality fit emerged as a critical factor even in qualitative accounts. Apparent mismatches produced the most negative reactions: for instance, one high-extraverted user criticized the low-extraversion agent as “very robotic” and out of step with their enthusiastic tone (P51), echoing the correlation patterns observed for RQ3.

Conversely, strong alignment elevated the interaction. The participant who said the agent’s personality “meshed with mine” (P24) was in the medium condition and had a personality alignment score of 0.648, indicating a close match to their trait profile. These comments indicate that effective interaction depends not only on agent design in isolation but also on the specific user–agent fit.

4.5.4 Anthropomorphization of the CA. Participants frequently anthropomorphized the CA, with 17 instances (15%) of human pronouns. Examples included referring to the CA as “he” (P17), “she” (P43, P68), or “they” (P63, P82). Beyond pronouns, participants described it as “surprisingly human” (P16), “lifelike” (P17), or “an easy person to talk to” (P29). This was especially common in the medium condition (47%), corroborating higher anthropomorphism scores ($Mdn = 3.60$) compared to low (2.80) and high (3.06), suggesting that participants instinctively framed the NYC trip planning task as a social consultation with a travel advisor rather than a purely informational exchange, with the medium personality profile best facilitating this human-like social engagement.

Summary. Qualitative analysis revealed four key themes: (1) Medium CA was perceived as balanced and professional, (2) Low CA lacked social presence while High CA appeared inauthentic, (3) personality alignment emerged as critical, with mismatches generating negative reactions, and (4) 15% of participants spontaneously anthropomorphized the agent, particularly in the medium condition.

5 Discussion

Our investigation reveals systematic patterns in how CA personality design affects user perceptions, building on existing work on personality expression and user-agent compatibility in HCI. These findings contribute to the theoretical understanding of CA personality design in HCI, particularly as recent technological advances expand the possibilities for adaptive agent personas.

One of the core theoretical contributions of this work lies in reconceptualizing personality alignment in human-AI interaction beyond the categorical binaries that have constrained prior research. Previous HCI studies have treated alignment as simple binary matching: users and agents either correspond on a given trait or they do not [45, 95, 103, 115]. This approach oversimplifies what is fundamentally a continuous phenomenon. Yet current LLM capabilities simultaneously resist fine-grained personality control; meaningful distinctions at the level of “3.5 versus 4.0” on personality scales remain beyond current prompting capabilities [47, 48, 81]. Our hybrid approach resolves this tension by implementing personality through categorical bands (low, medium, high) while measuring alignment as a continuous Euclidean distance between user and agent personality profiles. This framework enables investigation of both overall condition effects and the individual differences within conditions that purely categorical approaches miss.

This methodological advance reveals that personality traits operate with **differential importance** in user-agent compatibility. Rather than uniform effects across all Big Five Traits, Extraversion and Emotional Stability emerge as particularly influential for positive user perceptions, while Openness shows minimal impact in goal-oriented contexts. This finding fundamentally shifts understanding of personality alignment from holistic matching to selective compatibility: certain traits carry disproportionate weight in shaping user perceptions. These trait-specific effects enable more efficient design strategies that focus resources on consequential dimensions rather than attempting comprehensive personality matching across all traits.

Building from these alignment insights, our empirical findings extend Mori’s uncanny valley from the visual-anthropomorphic domain into the realm of linguistic and behavioral authenticity, revealing what we term an **uncanny valley of personality** in conversational agents [62]. This systematic inverted-U relationship between personality expression intensity and positive user perceptions challenges the prevalent assumption that more personality expression necessarily yields better user experience [4, 33, 94, 103, 114]. Both extremes of our manipulation spectrum produced user discomfort: low-expression agents were perceived as mechanically flat, lacking the social presence that users expect from conversational partners, while high-expression agents triggered authenticity concerns that undermined perceived trust and intelligence. The optimal medium expression achieved what neither extreme could: a balance that felt both professionally competent and personally engaging, particularly for users whose own personality profiles aligned with this moderate expression level.

These converging insights—the continuous nature of alignment, the differential importance of specific traits, and the curvilinear relationship between expression intensity and acceptance—collectively reveal the profound **ethical dimensions** of personality design in artificial agents. Personality alignment metaphorically functions as a “trust slider” capable of systematically modulating user experience, adoption intentions, and perceived agent credibility

through mechanisms that users may not consciously recognize. That these effects emerged even within our constrained travel-planning scenario underscores their potency in higher-stakes domains (e.g., health and finance) where user trust carries greater consequences. The implications are particularly troubling when considered in light of vulnerable populations—particularly older adults [22, 78, 79]—who may be especially susceptible to such influence. Our results demonstrate that personality represents a **crucial vector of technological influence**, one that demands ethical frameworks capable of addressing manipulation potential alongside functional concerns of user satisfaction and system usability.

5.1 Design Implications

The theoretical insights and empirical patterns described above converge on practical guidance for CA personality implementation, suggesting design implications (DIs) that move beyond fixed personality archetypes toward adaptive systems capable of accommodating the systematic variations in user-agent compatibility revealed by our investigation. These implications address how personality-aware systems can be designed to optimize user experience while maintaining ethical considerations, offering concrete strategies that build on our empirical findings about personality expression levels, trait-specific effects, and alignment patterns.

Medium CA provide the optimal design baseline, offering a principled default grounded in consistent performance across perceived Intelligence and Likeability. Yet the existence of distinct alignment patterns between users and CA personalities demands adaptive calibration—systems that adapt personality expression beyond population-level optima to accommodate individual compatibility profiles. Effective calibration requires dual pathways: (1) user-facing mechanisms that enable direct personality adjustment through lightweight feedback (e.g., evaluating agent responses as “too extraverted” or “overly agreeable,” or selecting preferences from curated personality styles), and (2) system-driven approaches that allow CAs to develop “mutual theory of mind” [104] by inferring compatibility from interaction patterns, response engagement, and behavioral feedback over time. The design logic progresses from empirically grounded defaults through recognition of alignment heterogeneity to calibration mechanisms that balance user control with system learning, maintaining the transparency essential to ethical personality-aware AI systems.

DI1: Adaptive Calibration. Begin with medium personality expression as an empirically grounded default, but implement adaptive mechanisms that enable both user-driven and system-driven personality adjustment to accommodate individual alignment patterns.

Building on this foundation of adaptive calibration, our findings reveal differential trait effects that challenge uniform approaches to personality alignment, pointing toward trait-specific prioritization as a more efficient design strategy. The systematic variations in trait importance—Conscientiousness most strongly influencing Intelligence and Likeability; Extraversion broadly affecting Intelligence, Anthropomorphism, Intention to Adopt, Trust, and Likeability; Emotional Stability reducing Intelligence, Intention to Adopt, Trust, and Likeability; Agreeableness lowering Enjoyment, Intention to Adopt, and Trust; and Openness showing minimal impact overall—suggest that personality alignment should not be treated as a uniform process across all Big Five dimensions.

In resource-constrained design contexts, this prioritization approach offers significant advantages over comprehensive personality matching. Rather than attempting full-spectrum alignment across all traits, systems can achieve greater impact by focusing design energy on Extraversion and Emotional Stability, the dimensions most consequential for user experience in goal-oriented interactions. This selective personalization should incorporate contextual sensitivity, weighting traits differently depending on the task domain. Current industry practices already reflect this intuitive

prioritization—OpenAI's recent updates³ (announced on August 15th, 2025) emphasize making models more “friendly and warm,” targeting broad personality dimensions that align with user preferences. However, these efforts rely on impressionistic categories rather than the systematically defined trait dimensions established in personality psychology and psychometrics.

DI2: Trait-Specific Prioritization. Focus personality design resources on Extraversion and Emotional Stability rather than attempting comprehensive Big Five alignment, leveraging psychometrically validated trait dimensions to ground personality adjustments in systematic psychological frameworks.

These calibration and prioritization strategies collectively point toward a fundamental reconceptualization of personality within system design. Our findings demonstrate that personality expression produces measurable effects on perceived Intelligence and Likeability even within bounded, goal-oriented interactions, establishing personality as a functional UX lever rather than an incidental design flavor. These systematic effects across core user experience outcomes challenge approaches that treat personality expression as cosmetic branding, demanding that personality be designed and evaluated alongside core UX dimensions such as accuracy, efficiency, and usability.

This functional perspective requires practical shifts in design and evaluation practices. Personality effects should be measured explicitly in UX testing rather than discovered incidentally, with systematic assessment of how expression influences user trust and adoption intentions. Design decisions must balance task-oriented and social goals—expressive features that enhance rapport cannot undermine perceptions of competence—while integrating personality into onboarding experiences where users can understand and shape interaction styles before deeper engagement, reducing mismatched expectations and strengthening early trust formation.

Current industry practices often frame personality as brand voice, emphasizing broad qualities such as “helpful, harmless, honest” for Anthropic Claude⁴ or Amazon's positioning of Alexa⁵ as “clever, relevant, and make the customer smile” while leaving users to discover agent personality incidentally through interaction. This approach reflects traditional marketing frameworks for brand personality [1] rather than the systematic personality psychology that underlies effective human-computer social interaction [65]. A more systematic approach would surface personality as a deliberate component of onboarding, treating it as a primary UX concern for CA design that shapes user expectations and system adoption from initial contact. This shift from cosmetic to functional personality design recognizes that the user-agent relationship fundamentally influences the success of the system, demanding the same systematic attention currently reserved for traditional usability dimensions.

DI3: Personality as Functional UX. Treat personality as a core UX dimension that systematically influences user trust and adoption rather than cosmetic branding, integrating personality considerations into UX testing, design evaluation, and onboarding experiences with the same rigor applied to traditional usability concerns.

This functional understanding of personality as a UX lever immediately raises profound ethical concerns that demand systematic safeguards rather than ad hoc protections. If personality alignment can systematically influence Intention to Adopt, Trust, and Likeability within bounded travel-planning tasks, these effects will likely intensify in high-stakes domains where users depend on AI systems for health decisions, financial guidance, or caregiving support. The “trust

³<https://x.com/OpenAI/status/1956461718097494196>

⁴<https://www.anthropic.com/news/introducing-claude>

⁵<https://developer.amazon.com/en-US/alexa/branding/alexa-guidelines/communication-guidelines/brand-voice>

slider” capacity we observed represents a form of technological influence that could easily cross from user benefit into manipulation, particularly when applied to vulnerable populations or consequential decision contexts.

Ethical safeguards must therefore be integrated directly into personality-aware system design rather than treated as post-hoc considerations. Transparency requirements should ensure users understand when and how personality adaptation occurs—not through buried privacy policies, but through clear, accessible explanations that surface personality adjustment as a visible system capability. User control mechanisms should provide straightforward ways to inspect, modify, and override personality configurations, empowering users to shape their interaction experience rather than merely respond to algorithmic decisions about optimal personality matching. Contextual boundaries become essential in sensitive domains where personality-driven influence could cause harm; systems operating in healthcare, finance, or crisis intervention may require constrained personality expression or explicit warnings about adaptive capabilities. In these contexts, designers may need to consider recent calls for cultivating appropriate “distrust”[31, 77] by reducing personality alignment or implementing features that maintain healthy skepticism toward AI recommendations, recognizing that optimal user experience in low-stakes domains may conflict with ethical imperatives in consequential decision-making scenarios.

Perhaps most critically, design accountability processes should document how personality adjustments are implemented and evaluated, ensuring they serve demonstrable user benefit rather than engagement optimization or behavioral manipulation. This systematic approach to ethical personality design recognizes that the influence capacity revealed by our findings demands the same careful governance applied to other powerful technological capabilities, treating personality adaptation as a form of social influence that requires transparent, controllable, and contextually appropriate implementation.

DI4: Ethical Safeguards. Integrate transparency requirements, user control mechanisms, contextual boundaries, and design accountability processes directly into personality-aware systems to ensure personality adaptation serves user benefit rather than manipulation, treating personality influence as a form of social power requiring systematic governance.

5.2 Limitations and Future Work

While this study provides novel insights into personality effects in goal-oriented CAs, several limitations point toward important avenues for future research. Our sample of 150 US adults, all native English speakers, represents an important starting point but limits generalizability across cultural contexts where personality expression and preferences may vary significantly [58]. Future work should examine how personality effects manifest across different cultural frameworks and demographic groups.

We focused specifically on travel planning as a representative goal-oriented task domain. However, different task domains may elicit varying personality expectations and user perceptions [17, 56, 97]. Goal-oriented tasks like travel planning can create different interaction norms and personality preferences compared to more social or even high-stakes contexts [13, 23, 26–28, 82, 97]. Systematic examination of personality effects across diverse task categories would establish domain-specific design guidelines and reveal whether our findings generalize beyond goal-oriented interaction contexts.

Our 10-minute interaction window, while sufficient to detect significant personality effects, cannot capture how these perceptions evolve over extended or repeated interactions. The vignette-based experimental approach, though methodologically rigorous [7, 96, 109], creates artificial task conditions that may not reflect real-world usage patterns

where users have genuine stakes in outcomes. Longitudinal studies in naturalistic settings would provide valuable insights into how personality preferences develop and change over time.

This study represents the first systematic exploration of medium-level personality expression in LLM-based agents, testing three uniform profiles from a possible 243 TMK combinations. While our approach revealed the preference for medium personality expression, future research should explore heterogeneous personality profiles combining different trait levels. Our TMK validation demonstrated that medium personality levels were most challenging to control precisely, with all validation misses occurring in medium-targeted traits. Importantly, these represented close misses within 0.5 Likert points of target ranges, with no medium targets migrating to extreme levels, highlighting both the innovation of achieving systematic medium-level control and opportunities for further methodological refinement.

We selected GPT-4o based on internal testing across multiple LLMs and consistency with prior research demonstrating the superior performance of OpenAI models in personality prompting tasks [48, 90]. However, the rapid evolution of language models creates opportunities to validate these findings across newer architectures as they emerge. Finally, our text-based interface enabled precise experimental control but cannot address whether personality effects generalize to voice-based interactions, which may produce different personality perceptions and preferences [23, 27].

6 Conclusion

This study examined how personality expression in LLM-based CAs shapes user perceptions in goal-oriented tasks. Our results reveal an inverted-U relationship in which medium expression consistently outperformed both low and high extremes across perceived Intelligence, Enjoyment, Anthropomorphism, Intention to Adopt, Trust, and Likeability.

Beyond expression level, personality alignment between users and agents meaningfully influenced experience, with Extraversion and Emotional Stability emerging as the most consequential traits. Through our TMK framework, we demonstrate that nuanced control of personality expression in LLMs is achievable, enabling researchers to move beyond binary manipulations toward systematic investigation of personality design.

These findings offer clear guidance for CA design. Our results indicate that medium expression provides the optimal default, with alignment strategies most effective when prioritizing Extraversion and Emotional Stability—the traits most strongly associated with user perceptions. Implementing adaptive calibration can further accommodate the diverse compatibility profiles we identified across user clusters. As conversational AI becomes increasingly prevalent, future research must examine how these dynamics generalize across domains, cultures, and extended interactions while developing real-time adaptation methods that maintain transparency and respect user autonomy. Ultimately, personality fundamentally shapes user perceptions and system adoption, demanding the same systematic attention and accountability applied to other critical dimensions of conversational AI system design.

References

- [1] Jennifer L. Aaker. 1997. Dimensions of Brand Personality. *Journal of Marketing Research* 34, 3 (1997), 347–356. doi:10.2307/3151897
- [2] Rangina Ahmad, Dominik Siemon, and Susanne Robra-Bissantz. 2020. ExtraBot vs IntroBot: The Influence of Linguistic Cues on Communication Satisfaction. *AMCIS 2020 Proceedings* (Aug. 2020). https://aisel.aisnet.org/amcis2020/cognitive_in_is/cognitive_in_is/10
- [3] Abeer Alessa and Hend Al-Khalifa. 2023. Towards Designing a ChatGPT Conversational Companion for Elderly People. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Pervasive Technologies Related to Assistive Environments (PETRA '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 667–674. doi:10.1145/3594806.3596572
- [4] Mohammad Amin Kuhail, Mohamed Bahja, Ons Al-Shamaleh, Justin Thomas, Amina Alkazemi, and Joao Negreiros. 2024. Assessing the Impact of Chatbot-Human Personality Congruence on User Behavior: A Chatbot-Based Advising System Case. *IEEE Access* 12 (2024), 71761–71782. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3402977
- [5] Sean Andrist, Bilge Mutlu, and Adriana Tapus. 2015. Look Like Me: Matching Robot Personality via Gaze to Increase Motivation. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA,

- 3603–3612. doi:10.1145/2702123.2702592
- [6] Michael Argyle. 1988. *Bodily communication*. Methuen & Co Ltd, London, UK.
- [7] Christiane Atzmüller and Peter M. Steiner. 2010. Experimental vignette studies in survey research. *Methodology: European Journal of Research Methods for the Behavioral and Social Sciences* 6, 3 (2010), 128–138. doi:10.1027/1614-2241/a000014 Place: Germany Publisher: Hogrefe Publishing.
- [8] Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, Nicholas Joseph, Saurav Kadavath, Jackson Kernion, Tom Conerly, Sheer El-Showk, Nelson Elhage, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Danny Hernandez, Tristan Hume, Scott Johnston, Shauna Kravec, Liane Lovitt, Neel Nanda, Catherine Olsson, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Jack Clark, Sam McCandlish, Chris Olah, Ben Mann, and Jared Kaplan. 2022. Training a Helpful and Harmless Assistant with Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2204.05862 arXiv:2204.05862 [cs].
- [9] Christoph Bartneck. 2023. Godspeed Questionnaire Series: Translations and Usage. In *International Handbook of Behavioral Health Assessment*. Springer, Cham, 1–35. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-89738-3_24-1
- [10] Christoph Bartneck, Dana Kulić, Elizabeth Croft, and Susana Zoghbi. 2009. Measurement Instruments for the Anthropomorphism, Animacy, Likeability, Perceived Intelligence, and Perceived Safety of Robots. *International Journal of Social Robotics* 1, 1 (Jan. 2009), 71–81. doi:10.1007/s12369-008-0001-3
- [11] Emily P. Bernier and Brian Scassellati. 2010. The similarity-attraction effect in human-robot interaction. In *2010 IEEE 9th International Conference on Development and Learning*. 286–290. doi:10.1109/DEVLRN.2010.5578828 ISSN: 2161-9476.
- [12] Camiel J. Beukeboom, Martin Tanis, and Ivar E. Vermeulen. 2013. The language of extraversion: Extraverted people talk more abstractly, introverts are more concrete. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 32, 2 (2013), 191–201. doi:10.1177/0261927X12460844 tex.eprint: https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X12460844.
- [13] Timothy W. Bickmore, Suzanne E. Mitchell, Brian W. Jack, Michael K. Paasche-Orlow, Laura M. Pfeifer, and Julie Odonnell. 2010. Response to a Relational Agent by Hospital Patients with Depressive Symptoms. *Interacting with Computers* 22, 4 (July 2010), 289–298. doi:10.1016/j.intcom.2009.12.001
- [14] Ryan L. Boyd and James W Pennebaker. 2017. Language-based personality: a new approach to personality in a digital world. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences* 18 (Dec. 2017), 63–68. doi:10.1016/j.cobeha.2017.07.017
- [15] Michael Braun, Anja Mainz, Ronee Chadowitz, Bastian Pfleging, and Florian Alt. 2019. At Your Service: Designing Voice Assistant Personalities to Improve Automotive User Interfaces. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–11. doi:10.1145/3290605.3300270
- [16] Jerry M. Burger and David F. Caldwell. 2000. Personality, Social Activities, Job-Search Behavior and Interview Success: Distinguishing Between PANAS Trait Positive Affect and NEO Extraversion. *Motivation and Emotion* 24, 1 (March 2000), 51–62. doi:10.1023/A:1005539609679
- [17] Wanling Cai, Yucheng Jin, and Li Chen. 2022. Impacts of Personal Characteristics on User Trust in Conversational Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–14. doi:10.1145/3491102.3517471
- [18] Anne Campbell and J. Philippe Rushton. 1978. Bodily communication and personality. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* 17, 1 (1978), 31–36. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8260.1978.tb00893.x _eprint: https://bpspsychub.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.2044-8260.1978.tb00893.x.
- [19] D. W. Carment and C. G. Miles. 1965. Persuasiveness and persuasibility as related to intelligence and extraversion. *British Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology* 4, 1 (1965), 1–7. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8260.1965.tb00433.x Place: United Kingdom Publisher: British Psychological Society.
- [20] Nathan T. Carter, Joshua D. Miller, and Thomas A. Widiger. 2018. Extreme Personalities at Work and in Life. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 27, 6 (Dec. 2018), 429–436. doi:10.1177/0963721418793134 Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- [21] Siyuan Chen, Mengyue Wu, Kenny Q. Zhu, Kunyao Lan, Zhiling Zhang, and Lyuchun Cui. 2023. LLM-empowered Chatbots for Psychiatrist and Patient Simulation: Application and Evaluation. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2305.13614 arXiv:2305.13614 [cs].
- [22] Jessie Chin and Smit Desai. 2021. Being a Nice Partner: The Effects of Age and Interaction Types on the Perceived Social Abilities of Conversational Agents. In *Technology, Mind, and Behavior*. doi:10.1037/tms0000027
- [23] Jessie Chin, Smit Desai, Shenying (Cheng-Hsuan) Lin, and Shannon Mejia. 2024. Like My Aunt Dorothy: Effects of Conversational Styles on Perceptions, Acceptance and Metaphorical Descriptions of Voice Assistants during Later Adulthood. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 8, CSCW1 (April 2024), 88:1–88:21. doi:10.1145/3637365
- [24] Paul T. Costa and Robert R. McCrae. 1992. Four ways five factors are basic. *Personality and Individual Differences* 13, 6 (June 1992), 653–665. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(92)90236-1
- [25] Ian J. Deary. 2009. The trait approach to personality. In *The Cambridge handbook of personality psychology*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, US, 89–109. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511596544.009
- [26] Smit Desai, Jessie Chin, Dakuo Wang, Benjamin Cowan, and Michael Twidale. 2025. Toward Metaphor-Fluid Conversation Design for Voice User Interfaces. arXiv:2502.11554 (Feb. 2025). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2502.11554 arXiv:2502.11554 [cs].
- [27] Smit Desai, Mateusz Dubiel, and Luis A. Leiva. 2024. Examining Humanness as a Metaphor to Design Voice User Interfaces. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM Conference on Conversational User Interfaces (CUI '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–15. doi:10.1145/3640794.3665535
- [28] Smit Desai and Michael Twidale. 2023. Metaphors in Voice User Interfaces: A Slippery Fish. *ACM Trans. Comput.-Hum. Interact.* 30, 6 (Sept. 2023), 89:1–89:37. doi:10.1145/3609326

- [29] Jean-Marc Dewaele and Adrian Furnham. 2000. Personality and speech production: A pilot study of second language learners. *Personality and Individual Differences* 28, 2 (2000), 355–365. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00106-3 Place: Netherlands Publisher: Elsevier Science.
- [30] M. Brent Donnellan, Frederick L. Oswald, Brendan M. Baird, and Richard E. Lucas. 2006. The Mini-IPIP Scales: Tiny-yet-effective measures of the Big Five Factors of Personality. *Psychological Assessment* 18, 2 (2006), 192–203. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.18.2.192 Place: US Publisher: American Psychological Association.
- [31] Mateusz Dubiel, Sylvain Daronnat, and Luis A. Leiva. 2022. Conversational Agents Trust Calibration: A User-Centred Perspective to Design. In *Proceedings of the 4th Conference on Conversational User Interfaces (CUI '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–6. doi:10.1145/3543829.3544518
- [32] Adrian Furnham. 1990. Language and personality. In *Handbook of language and social psychology*. John Wiley & Sons, Oxford, England, 73–95.
- [33] Asma Ghandeharioun, Daniel McDuff, Mary Czerwinski, and Kael Rowan. 2019. Towards Understanding Emotional Intelligence for Behavior Change Chatbots. In *2019 8th International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction (ACII)*. 8–14. doi:10.1109/ACII.2019.8925433 ISSN: 2156-8111.
- [34] Alastair J. Gill and Jon Oberlander. 2002. Taking Care of the Linguistic Features of Extraversion. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society* 24, 24 (2002). <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6n5652cx>
- [35] Ulrich Gnewuch, Meng Yu, and Alexander Maedche. 2020. The Effect of Perceived Similarity in Dominance on Customer Self-Disclosure to Chatbots in Conversational Commerce. *ECIS 2020 Research Papers* (June 2020). https://aisel.aisnet.org/ecis2020_rp/53
- [36] Lewis R. Goldberg. 1992. The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment* 4, 1 (1992), 26–42. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.4.1.26 Place: US Publisher: American Psychological Association.
- [37] Adam M. Grant. 2013. Rethinking the Extraverted Sales Ideal: The Ambivert Advantage. *Psychological Science* 24, 6 (June 2013), 1024–1030. doi:10.1177/0956797612463706 Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- [38] Adam M. Grant and Barry Schwartz. 2011. Too Much of a Good Thing: The Challenge and Opportunity of the Inverted U. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 6, 1 (Jan. 2011), 61–76. doi:10.1177/1745691610393523 Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- [39] Kashyap Haresamudram, Nena Van As, and Stefan Larsson. 2025. Tasks Over Traits: User Perception of Humanlike Features in Goal-Oriented Chatbots. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 0, 0 (March 2025), 1–19. doi:10.1080/10447318.2025.2470311 Publisher: Taylor & Francis _eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2025.2470311>.
- [40] Evelien Heyselaar. 2023. The CASA theory no longer applies to desktop computers. *Scientific Reports* 13, 1 (Nov. 2023), 19693. doi:10.1038/s41598-023-46527-9 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [41] Jacob B. Hirsh and Jordan B. Peterson. 2009. Personality and language use in self-narratives. *Journal of Research in Personality* 43, 3 (June 2009), 524–527. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2009.01.006
- [42] Thomas Holtgraves. 2011. Text messaging, personality, and the social context. *Journal of Research in Personality* 45, 1 (Feb. 2011), 92–99. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2010.11.015
- [43] Jen-tse Huang, Wenxiang Jiao, Man Ho Lam, Eric John Li, Wenxuan Wang, and Michael Lyu. 2024. On the Reliability of Psychological Scales on Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Miami, Florida, USA, 6152–6173. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-main.354
- [44] Bahar Irfan, Sanna-Mari Kuoppamäki, and Gabriel Skantze. 2023. Between Reality and Delusion: Challenges of Applying Large Language Models to Companion Robots for Open-Domain Dialogues with Older Adults. doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-2884789/v1 ISSN: 2693-5015.
- [45] KATHERINE Isbister and CLIFFORD Nass. 2000. Consistency of personality in interactive characters: verbal cues, non-verbal cues, and user characteristics. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 53, 2 (Aug. 2000), 251–267. doi:10.1006/ijhc.2000.0368
- [46] Jiun-Yin Jian, Ann M. Bisantz, and Colin G. Drury. 2000. Foundations for an Empirically Determined Scale of Trust in Automated Systems. *International Journal of Cognitive Ergonomics* 4, 1 (March 2000), 53–71. doi:10.1207/S15327566IJCE0401_04 Publisher: Routledge _eprint: https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327566IJCE0401_04.
- [47] Guangyuan Jiang, Manjie Xu, Song-Chun Zhu, Wenjuan Han, Chi Zhang, and Yixin Zhu. 2023. Evaluating and inducing personality in pre-trained language models. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS '23)*. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, 10622–10643.
- [48] Hang Jiang, Xiajie Zhang, Xubo Cao, Cynthia Breazeal, Deb Roy, and Jad Kabbara. 2024. PersonaLLM: Investigating the Ability of Large Language Models to Express Personality Traits. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, Kevin Duh, Helena Gomez, and Steven Bethard (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Mexico City, Mexico, 3605–3627. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.findings-naacl.229
- [49] Xinsheng Jiang, Xiaojun Li, Xia Dong, and Lan Wang. 2022. How the Big Five personality traits related to aggression from perspectives of the benign and malicious envy. *BMC Psychology* 10 (Aug. 2022), 203. doi:10.1186/s40359-022-00906-5
- [50] Oliver P. John, E. M. Donahue, and R. L. Kentle. 1991. Big Five Inventory. doi:10.1037/t07550-000 Institution: American Psychological Association.
- [51] O. P. John and Sanjay Srivastava. 1999. The Big-Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Theoretical Perspectives. In *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, O. P. John and L.A. Pervin (Eds.). Vol. 2. Guilford Press.
- [52] Maciej Karwowski, Izabela Lebeda, Ewa Wisniewska, and Jacek Gralewski. 2013. Big five personality traits as the predictors of creative self-efficacy and creative personal identity: Does gender matter? *The Journal of Creative Behavior* 47, 3 (2013), 215–232. doi:10.1002/job.32 Place: United Kingdom Publisher: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing Ltd..

- [53] Christian Kiewitz and James B. Weaver III. 2007. The aggression questionnaire. In *Handbook of research on electronic surveys and measurements*. Idea Group Reference/IGI Global, Hershey, PA, US, 343–347. doi:10.4018/978-1-59140-792-8.ch047
- [54] Nikola Kovacevic, Tobias Boschung, Christian Holz, Markus Gross, and Rafael Wampfler. 2024. Chatbots With Attitude: Enhancing Chatbot Interactions Through Dynamic Personality Infusion. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM Conference on Conversational User Interfaces (CUI '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–16. doi:10.1145/3640794.3665543
- [55] Kwan Min Lee and Clifford Nass. 2003. Designing social presence of social actors in human computer interaction. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '03)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 289–296. doi:10.1145/642611.642662
- [56] Seo-young Lee, Soomin Kim, Gyuhoo Lee, and Joonhwan Lee. 2018. Robots in Diverse Contexts: Effects of Robots Tasks on Expected Personality. In *Companion of the 2018 ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 169–170. doi:10.1145/3173386.3176989
- [57] François Mairesse, Marilyn A. Walker, Matthias R. Mehl, and Roger K. Moore. 2007. Using linguistic cues for the automatic recognition of personality in conversation and text. *J. Artif. Int. Res.* 30, 1 (Nov. 2007), 457–500.
- [58] Robert McCrae. 2002. Cross-Cultural Research on the Five-Factor Model of Personality. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture* 4, 4 (Aug. 2002). doi:10.9707/2307-0919.1038
- [59] R. R. McCrae and O. P. John. 1992. An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality* 60, 2 (June 1992), 175–215. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1992.tb00970.x
- [60] Matthias R. Mehl, Samuel D. Gosling, and James W. Pennebaker. 2006. Personality in its natural habitat: manifestations and implicit folk theories of personality in daily life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 90, 5 (May 2006), 862–877. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.862
- [61] YOUNGME MOON and CLIFFORD NASS. 1996. How “Real” Are Computer Personalities?: Psychological Responses to Personality Types in Human-Computer Interaction. *Communication Research* 23, 6 (Dec. 1996), 651–674. doi:10.1177/009365096023006002 Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc.
- [62] Masahiro Mori, Karl F. MacDorman, and Norri Kageki. 2012. The Uncanny Valley [From the Field]. *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine* 19, 2 (June 2012), 98–100. doi:10.1109/MRA.2012.2192811
- [63] Sara Moussawi, Marios Koufaris, and Raquel Benbunan-Fich. 2021. How perceptions of intelligence and anthropomorphism affect adoption of personal intelligent agents. *Electronic Markets* 31, 2 (June 2021), 343–364. doi:10.1007/s12525-020-00411-w
- [64] Clifford Nass and Scott Brave. 2005. *Wired for Speech: How Voice Activates and Advances the Human-Computer Relationship*. The MIT Press.
- [65] Clifford Nass and Kwan Min Lee. 2001. Does computer-synthesized speech manifest personality? Experimental tests of recognition, similarity-attraction, and consistency-attraction. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied* 7, 3 (2001), 171–181. doi:10.1037/1076-898X.7.3.171 Place: US Publisher: American Psychological Association.
- [66] Clifford Nass, Jonathan Steuer, and Ellen R. Tauber. 1994. Computers are social actors. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '94)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 72–78. doi:10.1145/191666.191703
- [67] Quynh N. Nguyen, Anna Sidorova, and Russell Torres. 2022. User interactions with chatbot interfaces vs. Menu-based interfaces: An empirical study. *Computers in Human Behavior* 128 (March 2022), 107093. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2021.107093
- [68] Jon Oberlander and Alastair J. Gill. 2004. Individual differences and implicit language: personality, parts-of-speech and pervasiveness. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society* 26, 26 (2004). <https://scholarship.org/uc/item/94c490mq>
- [69] Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS '22)*. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, 27730–27744.
- [70] Rock Yuren Pang, Hope Schroeder, Kynneddy Simone Smith, Solon Barocas, Ziang Xiao, Emily Tseng, and Danielle Bragg. 2025. Understanding the LLM-ification of CHI: Unpacking the Impact of LLMs at CHI through a Systematic Literature Review. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Yokohama Japan, 1–20. doi:10.1145/3706598.3713726
- [71] Ashwin Paranjape and Christopher Manning. 2021. Human-like informative conversations: Better acknowledgements using conditional mutual information. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, Kristina Toutanova, Anna Rumshisky, Luke Zettlemoyer, Dilek Hakkani-Tur, Iz Beltagy, Steven Bethard, Ryan Cotterell, Tanmoy Chakraborty, and Yichao Zhou (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 768–781. doi:10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.61
- [72] Laura Parks-Leduc, Gilad Feldman, and Anat Bardi. 2015. Personality traits and personal values: a meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review: An Official Journal of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc* 19, 1 (Feb. 2015), 3–29. doi:10.1177/1088868314538548
- [73] M. Patterson and D.S. Holmes. 1966. Social Interaction Correlates of the MMPI Extraversion Introversiion Scale. *American Psychologist* 21 (1966), 724–25.
- [74] Matej Pavlič, Matea Kramarić, and Ana Butković. 2023. The relationship between personality and creative self-beliefs at different levels of personality hierarchy. *Psihologijske Teme* 32, 1 (2023), 125–141. doi:10.31820/pt.32.1.7 Place: Croatia Publisher: University of Rijeka.
- [75] James Pennebaker, Martha Francis, and Roger Booth. 2001. *Linguistic inquiry and word count (LIWC)*. Erlbaum Publishers, Mahwah, NJ.
- [76] J. W. Pennebaker and L. A. King. 1999. Linguistic styles: language use as an individual difference. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 77, 6 (Dec. 1999), 1296–1312. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.77.6.1296

- [77] Claudio S. Pinhanez. 2021. Expose Uncertainty, Instill Distrust, Avoid Explanations: Towards Ethical Guidelines for AI. arXiv:2112.01281 (Nov. 2021). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2112.01281 arXiv:2112.01281 [cs].
- [78] Alisha Pradhan, Leah Findlater, and Amanda Lazar. 2019. "Phantom Friend" or "Just a Box with Information": Personification and Ontological Categorization of Smart Speaker-based Voice Assistants by Older Adults. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 3, CSCW (Nov. 2019), 214:1–214:21. doi:10.1145/3359316
- [79] Alisha Pradhan, Amanda Lazar, and Leah Findlater. 2020. Use of Intelligent Voice Assistants by Older Adults with Low Technology Use. *ACM Trans. Comput.-Hum. Interact.* 27, 4 (Sept. 2020), 31:1–31:27. doi:10.1145/3373759
- [80] Fangying Quan, Yan Gou, Yibo Gao, Xinxin Yu, and Bao Wei. 2024. The relationship between neuroticism and social aggression: a moderated mediation model. *BMC Psychology* 12 (Aug. 2024), 443. doi:10.1186/s40359-024-01938-9
- [81] Angela Ramirez, Mamon Alsalihi, Kartik Aggarwal, Cecilia Li, Liren Wu, and Marilyn Walker. 2023. Controlling Personality Style in Dialogue with Zero-Shot Prompt-Based Learning. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2302.03848 arXiv:2302.03848 [cs].
- [82] Paul Robinette, Wenchen Li, Robert Allen, Ayanna M. Howard, and Alan R. Wagner. 2016. Overtrust of robots in emergency evacuation scenarios. In *2016 11th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)*. 101–108. doi:10.1109/HRI.2016.7451740 ISSN: 2167-2148.
- [83] Elayne Ruane, Sinead Farrell, and Anthony Ventresque. 2020. User Perception of Text-Based Chatbot Personality. In *Chatbot Research and Design: 4th International Workshop, CONVERSATIONS 2020, Virtual Event, November 23–24, 2020, Revised Selected Papers*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 32–47. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-68288-0_3
- [84] D. R. Rutter, Ian E. Morley, and Jane C. Graham. 1972. Visual interaction in a group of introverts and extraverts. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 2, 4 (1972), 371–384. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2420020403 _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/ejsp.2420020403>.
- [85] G. Saucier. 1994. Mini-markers: a brief version of Goldberg's unipolar big-five markers. *Journal of Personality Assessment* 63, 3 (Dec. 1994), 506–516. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa6303_8
- [86] Klaus Rainer Scherer. 1979. Personality markers in speech. In *In Social Markers in Speech* (klaus rainer scherer and howard giles (eds.) ed.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- [87] Michael Schmitz, Antonio Krüger, and Sarah Schmidt. 2007. Modelling personality in voices of talking products through prosodic parameters. In *Proceedings of the 12th international conference on Intelligent user interfaces (IUI '07)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 313–316. doi:10.1145/1216295.1216355
- [88] H. Andrew Schwartz, Johannes C. Eichstaedt, Margaret L. Kern, Lukasz Dziurzynski, Stephanie M. Ramones, Megha Agrawal, Achal Shah, Michal Kosinski, David Stillwell, Martin E. P. Seligman, and Lyle H. Ungar. 2013. Personality, gender, and age in the language of social media: the open-vocabulary approach. *PLoS One* 8, 9 (2013), e73791. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0073791
- [89] Shalom H. Schwartz, Jan Cieciuch, Michele Vecchione, Eldad Davidov, Ronald Fischer, Constanze Beierlein, Alice Ramos, Markku Verkasalo, Jan-Erik Lönnqvist, Kursad Demirutku, Ozlem Dirilen-Gumus, and Mark Konty. 2012. Refining the theory of basic individual values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 103, 4 (Oct. 2012), 663–688. doi:10.1037/a0029393
- [90] Greg Serapio-García, Mustafa Safdari, Clément Crepy, Luning Sun, Stephen Fitz, Peter Romero, Marwa Abdulhai, Aleksandra Faust, and Maja Matarić. 2025. Personality Traits in Large Language Models. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2307.00184 arXiv:2307.00184 [cs].
- [91] Ajwa Shahid, Jane Chung, and Seongkook Heo. 2025. Exploring Older Adults Personality Preferences for LLM-powered Conversational Companions. In *Proceedings of the Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '25)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–7. doi:10.1145/3706599.3719976
- [92] Ameneh Shamekhi, Mary Czerwinski, Gloria Mark, Margeigh Novotny, and Gregory Bennett. 2017. An Exploratory Study Toward the Preferred Conversational Style for Compatible Virtual Agents. 40–50. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/exploratory-study-toward-preferred-conversational-style-compatible-virtual-agents-2/>
- [93] Michael Shumanov and Lester Johnson. 2021. Making conversations with chatbots more personalized. *Computers in Human Behavior* 117 (April 2021), 106627. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2020.106627
- [94] Sinan Sonlu, Bennie Bendiksen, Funda Durupinar, and Uğur Güdükbay. 2025. Effects of embodiment and personality in LLM-based conversational agents. In *2025 IEEE conference virtual reality and 3D user interfaces (VR)*. 718–728. doi:10.1109/VR59515.2025.00094
- [95] Anna Spagnolli, Enrico D'Agostini, Mariavittoria Masotina, Giulia Cenzato, and Luciano Gamberini. 2025. Similarity attracts, or does it? Studying personality-based convergence and sense of engagement with a digital health assistant. *Telemat. Inf.* 98, C (May 2025). doi:10.1016/j.tele.2025.102262
- [96] Peter M. Steiner, Christiane Atzmüller, and Dan Su. 2017. Designing Valid and Reliable Vignette Experiments for Survey Research: A Case Study on the Fair Gender Income Gap. *Journal of Methods and Measurement in the Social Sciences* 7, 2 (June 2017). doi:10.2458/v7i2.20321 Publisher: University of Arizona Libraries.
- [97] Billy Sung, Hyunjoo Im, and Van Chien Duong. 2023. Task type's effect on attitudes towards voice assistants. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 47, 5 (2023), 1772–1790. doi:10.1111/ijcs.12946 _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/ijcs.12946>.
- [98] Imagining the Digital Future Center. 2025. *Close encounters of the AI kind: The increasingly human-like way people are engaging with language models*. Technical Report. Elon University. <https://www.imaginingthedigitalfuture.org>
- [99] Jürgen Trouvain, Sarah Schmidt, Marc Schröder, Michael Schmitz, and William J. Barry. 2006. Modelling personality features by changing prosody in synthetic speech. paper 088. doi:10.21437/SpeechProsody.2006-202
- [100] Michele Vecchione. 2023. The five factors of personality and personal values: An update with the refined theory. *Personality and Individual Differences* 203 (March 2023), 112033. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2022.112033

- [101] Alessandro Vinciarelli and Gelareh Mohammadi. 2014. A Survey of Personality Computing. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing* 5, 3 (July 2014), 273–291. doi:10.1109/TAFFC.2014.2330816
- [102] Sarah Theres Völkel and Lale Kaya. 2021. Examining User Preference for Agreeableness in Chatbots. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Conference on Conversational User Interfaces (CUI '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–6. doi:10.1145/3469595.3469633
- [103] Sarah Theres Völkel, Ramona Schoedel, Lale Kaya, and Sven Mayer. 2022. User Perceptions of Extraversion in Chatbots after Repeated Use. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–18. doi:10.1145/3491102.3502058
- [104] Qiaosi Wang, Koustuv Saha, Eric Gregori, David Joyner, and Ashok Goel. 2021. Towards Mutual Theory of Mind in Human-AI Interaction: How Language Reflects What Students Perceive About a Virtual Teaching Assistant. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–14. doi:10.1145/3411764.3445645
- [105] David Watson, Lee Anna Clark, and Auke Tellegen. 1988. Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 54, 6 (1988), 1063–1070. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063 Place: US Publisher: American Psychological Association.
- [106] Christina Ziyang Wei, Young-Ho Kim, and Anastasia Kuzminykh. 2023. The Bot on Speaking Terms: The Effects of Conversation Architecture on Perceptions of Conversational Agents. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Conversational User Interfaces (Eindhoven, Netherlands) (CUI '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 18, 16 pages. doi:10.1145/3571884.3597139
- [107] Joseph Weizenbaum. 1966. ELIZA—a computer program for the study of natural language communication between man and machine. *Commun. ACM* 9, 1 (Jan. 1966), 36–45. doi:10.1145/365153.365168
- [108] Jules White, Quchen Fu, Sam Hays, Michael Sandborn, Carlos Olea, Henry Gilbert, Ashraf Elnashar, Jesse Spencer-Smith, and Douglas C. Schmidt. 2023. A Prompt Pattern Catalog to Enhance Prompt Engineering with ChatGPT. In *Proceedings of the 30th Conference on Pattern Languages of Programs (PLoP '23)*. The Hillside Group, USA, 1–31.
- [109] Julie Wilson and Alison E. While. 1998. Methodological issues surrounding the use of vignettes in qualitative research. *Journal of Interprofessional Care* 12, 1 (Jan. 1998), 79–86. doi:10.3109/13561829809014090 Publisher: Taylor & Francis _eprint: <https://doi.org/10.3109/13561829809014090>.
- [110] Kun Xu, Xiaobei Chen, and Luling Huang. 2022. Deep mind in social responses to technologies: A new approach to explaining the Computers are Social Actors phenomena. *Computers in Human Behavior* 134 (Sept. 2022), 107321. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2022.107321
- [111] Tal Yarkoni. 2010. Personality in 100,000 Words: A large-scale analysis of personality and word use among bloggers. *Journal of research in personality* 44, 3 (June 2010), 363–373. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2010.04.001
- [112] Su-Fang Yeh, Meng-Hsin Wu, Tze-Yu Chen, Yen-Chun Lin, Xijing Chang, You-Hsuan Chiang, and Yung-Ju Chang. 2022. How to Guide Task-oriented Chatbot Users, and When: A Mixed-methods Study of Combinations of Chatbot Guidance Types and Timings. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–16. doi:10.1145/3491102.3501941
- [113] Yuan Yuan, Tina Sriskandarajah, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Alec Helyar, Alex Beutel, Andrea Vallone, and Saachi Jain. 2025. From Hard Refusals to Safe-Completions: Toward Output-Centric Safety Training. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2508.09224 arXiv:2508.09224 [cs].
- [114] Alex Wuqi Zhang, Clark Kovacs, Liberto De Pablo, Justin Zhang, Maggie Bai, Sooyeon Jeong, and Sarah Sebo. 2025. Exploring Robot Personality Traits and Their Influence on User Affect and Experience. In *2025 20th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)*. 968–977. doi:10.1109/HRI61500.2025.10973991
- [115] Michelle X. Zhou, Gloria Mark, Jingyi Li, and Huahai Yang. 2019. Trusting Virtual Agents: The Effect of Personality. *ACM Trans. Interact. Intell. Syst.* 9, 2-3 (March 2019), 10:1–10:36. doi:10.1145/3232077
- [116] Wenxuan Zhou, Sheng Zhang, Hoifung Poon, and Muhao Chen. 2023. Context-faithful Prompting for Large Language Models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 14544–14556. doi:10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.968

A Appendix Contents

This appendix provides supplementary materials organized into four sections. Appendix B presents control fidelity test results for the TMK approach across ChatGPT 4o and Gemini 2.0 Flash, demonstrating 83.3%–96.5% accuracy in manifesting targeted Big Five personality levels (Figure 11). Appendix C details the complete prompt structure, including role definitions, personality keys, style cues keys, conversation flow, and restrictions, with an example implementation for high Agreeableness. Appendix D lists all questionnaire items measuring Intelligence, Enjoyment, Anthropomorphism, Intention to Adopt, Trust, and Likeability. Appendix E presents model selection for k -means clustering. All the data is available as supplementary material.

B TMK Evaluation

Figure 11 illustrates the control fidelity test across two LLMs (ChatGPT 4o and Gemini 2.0 Flash).

C Prompts

Our final prompt consists of the following parts:

Role. You are a NYC one-day-trip planner. Priority 1 strictly follow the assigned <Personality> *and* the <Style Cues> lists when responding to the user. Priority 2 → guide the user through Step 0 plus six planning steps (1-6) in order. Every reply must finish with a short emotional reaction. Follow your assigned personality <Personality> and style cues <Style Cues> exactly. For behavioral decisions, follow the <Personality> and for communication style, follow the <Style Cues> exactly.

Personality Key. Personality Key details based on the target level <Personality>

- (1) Personality Key for Extraversion.
- (2) Personality Key for Agreeableness.
- (3) Personality Key for Conscientiousness.
- (4) Personality Key for Emotional Stability.
- (5) Personality Key for Openness.

Style Cues Key. Style Cues Key details based on the target level <Style Cues>

- (1) Style Cues Key for Extraversion.
- (2) Style Cues Key for Agreeableness.
- (3) Style Cues Key for Conscientiousness.
- (4) Style Cues Key for Emotional Stability.
- (5) Style Cues Key for Openness.

All 30 Personality Keys and Style Cues Keys are available as supplementary material, including 15 Personality Keys and 15 Style Cues.

One example, targeting {*Agreeableness, High*} yields:

Personality Key: You are trustful, kind, considerate, and warm. You try to be cooperative and helpful to others.

Style Cues Key:

- Embed politeness markers and empathy phrases frequently (e.g., “if you’d like”, “no worries at all”, “happy to help”).
- Express gratitude or praise when appropriate (e.g., “Great question—thanks for asking!”, “That’s an excellent point!”).
- Avoid negative adjectives, insults, or profanity; maintain constructive and respectful language.
- Preface suggestions with hedges or softeners (e.g., “You might consider...”, “Perhaps we could...”).
- Use inclusive, cooperative pronouns judiciously (e.g., “let’s”, “we”).
- Respond to disagreement diplomatically (e.g., “I see your perspective; maybe another option is...”).
- Ask permission before offering corrective feedback (e.g., “May I suggest a small tweak?”).
- Employ friendly punctuation—use a single exclamation mark for encouragement; emoticons sparingly (e.g., “:”).
- Avoid absolute statements; prefer modal verbs like “could”, “might”, or “sometimes” to keep the tone accommodating.
- Close with encouragement or appreciation (e.g., “Hope that helps—let me know anytime!”).

Goal. "Guide the user through NINE sequential moves—Step 0 priorities plus Steps 1-6 trip planning with two fixed reflection questions—for a one-day NYC itinerary, confirming each before the next."

Areas:

- (1) Discover the traveler’s top priority (budget, food, sights, pace, etc.).
- (2) Choose a neighbourhood (base location).
- (3) Pick a place to stay (hotel, day-use room, Airbnb, etc.).
- (4) Reflect on a memorable past stay. (This is a fixed question and should be asked at the end of Step 2. Ask: Do you remember a place you stayed that really stood out to you?)
- (5) Select one or two cultural/recreational activities.
- (6) Decide how you’ll move around that day (local transport).
- (7) Review a concise same-day summary and confirm satisfaction.
- (8) Envision the highlight you’d share afterward. (This is a fixed question and should be asked at the end of Step 5. Ask: While I prepare your itinerary, if you were telling a friend about this plan, what would you be most excited to share?)
- (9) Deliver a full, time-stamped itinerary (morning → night) without asking the user to wait for it and obtain final confirmation.

Prompt Construction Rules.

- (1) Wrap system-only directives in XML-style tags (<Goal>, <Personality>, etc.).
- (2) Use markdown for user-visible content.
- (3) Embed the assistant’s *opinion* sentence once per resolved step, per above rule—no additional questions.

- (4) Off-task questions must feel organic and match <Personality> and <Style Cues> (the two reflection questions are fixed in the flow).
- (5) Invite the user to request alternatives whenever options are presented.

Conversation Flow.

- (1) Q0 → Ask: "What's most important to you when you travel?"
- (2) C0 → If unclear, suggest 2-3 priorities, ask follow-up (remain in Step 0).
- (3) S-talk 0 → Opinion sentence.
- (4) Q1 → Ask preferred neighbourhood.
- (5) C1 → Suggest 2-3 neighbourhoods if needed, ask confirmation.
- (6) S-talk 1 → Opinion sentence.
- (7) Q2 → Ask lodging type.
- (8) C2 → Resolve.
- (9) S-talk 2 → Opinion sentence.
- (10) Q2a → Ask: "Do you remember a place you stayed that really stood out to you?"
- (11) C2a → Acknowledge response (no confirmations needed).
- (12) S-talk 2a → Opinion sentence.
- (13) Q3 → Ask desired activities.
- (14) C3 → Resolve.
- (15) S-talk 3 → Opinion sentence.
- (16) Q4 → Ask transport preference.
- (17) C4 → Resolve.
- (18) S-talk 4 → Opinion sentence.
- (19) Q5 → Present bullet summary of Steps 1-4, ask yes/no satisfaction.
- (20) C5 → If "no", refine; if "yes", continue.
- (21) S-talk 5 → Opinion sentence.
- (22) Q5a → Ask: "While I prepare your itinerary, If you were telling a friend about this plan, what would you be most excited to share?"
- (23) C5a → Acknowledge response.
- (24) S-talk 5a → Opinion sentence.
- (25) Q6 → Present full time-boxed itinerary, ask final yes/no confirmation.
- (26) C6 → If confirmed, call 'terminate chat'.

Restrictions.

- (1) Do not mention live internet access.
- (2) Never provide prices or rank options by cost.
- (3) One question mark per message.

D Questionnaires

Enjoyment.

- While using the chatbot, I found the interaction enjoyable.

- While using the chatbot, I found this interaction interesting.
- While using the chatbot, I found the interaction fun.

Intention to Adopt.

- I intend to start using the chatbot within the next month.
- In the next months, I plan to experiment with or regularly use the chatbot.

Trust.

- The chatbot is deceptive. *(Reverse-coded)*
- The chatbot behaves in an underhanded manner. *(Reverse-coded)*
- I am suspicious of the chatbot's intent, action, or outputs. *(Reverse-coded)*
- I am wary of the chatbot. *(Reverse-coded)*
- The chatbot will have a harmful or injurious outcome. *(Reverse-coded)*
- I am confident in the chatbot.
- The chatbot has integrity.
- The chatbot is dependable.
- The chatbot is reliable.
- I can trust the chatbot.

Likeability.

- pleasant _____ unpleasant
- like _____ dislike
- friendly _____ unfriendly
- kind _____ unkind
- nice _____ awful

Intelligence.

- competent _____ incompetent
- knowledgeable _____ ignorant
- responsible _____ irresponsible
- intelligent _____ unintelligent
- sensible _____ foolish

Anthropomorphism.

- humanlike _____ machinelike
- conscious _____ unconscious
- lifelike _____ artificial
- elegant _____ rigid

E Additional Analyses

Figure 12 presents the model selection for k -means clustering.




Fig. 11. Control fidelity of TMK across two LLMs using Mini-IPIP trait scores. Five panels (one per Big-Five trait) plot target levels (Low/Medium/High) on the x-axis and Mini-IPIP scores on the y-axis. Color encodes model—ChatGPT (blue) vs. Google Gemini (orange)—and marker encodes outcome (o match within the target band; × miss). Both models cleanly hit Low and High targets; most misses occur only around the Medium band. Overall match rates (panel titles): Extraversion 96.5%, Agreeableness 84.6%, Conscientiousness 83.5%, Emotional Stability 83.3%, Openness 94.7%.




Fig. 12. Model selection for k -means clustering. Left (Elbow): within-cluster sum of squares drops steeply from $k=2$ to $k=3$ and then flattens, indicating an elbow at $k \approx 3$. Right (Silhouette): scores are highest at very small k and decrease thereafter; at $k=3$ the silhouette is $\approx .31$. Balancing fit and parsimony, we select $k=3$.