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THESIS ABSTRACT

Examining Moderators of Meta-Accuracy among Participant Dyads

By NATHANIEL L. MARINO

The present study examined two proposed moderators of meta-accuracy: actors’ personality traits and actors’ perceptions of an interaction situation with partners. I hypothesized actors’ personality traits would affect their levels of meta-accuracy (Hypothesis 1) and that actors’ perceptions of the interaction situation with partners would also affect their levels of meta-accuracy (Hypothesis 2). The study consisted of 59 participants recruited from Rutgers University–Camden. Participants completed the HEXACO-60 personality questionnaire to measure their personality traits. Each participant was paired with another participant they were previously unacquainted with and interacted with them for five minutes. After the interaction, participants completed the HEXACO-60 two more times: the first measured how they thought their partner perceived them and the second measured how they perceived their partner. Participants also completed the DIAMONDS questionnaire to measure their perceptions of the interaction situation. Actors’ levels of conscientiousness significantly moderated their meta-accuracy levels across all personality traits, such that actors low in conscientiousness had stronger meta-accuracy concerning personality traits in general than actors high in conscientiousness. Actors’ perception of the interaction situation regarding negativity significantly moderated
their meta-accuracy levels specifically for emotionality, such that actors who perceived the interaction low in negativity had stronger meta-accuracy concerning emotionality. This research extends previous research on meta-accuracy by identifying personality and situational perceptions as moderators of meta-accuracy.
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INTRODUCTION

Social interactions play a strong role in how people understand and define themselves and others (Heider, 1958). The ways individuals present themselves through these interactions are influenced by many factors, such as their personality and the situational characteristics of the social interaction. (Leary & Allen, 2011). One major factor, according to Leary and Kowalski (1990), is individuals’ personal desired goals for how they want to be perceived. For example, when Bob is interacting with a potential romantic partner, he may want to be perceived as warm and caring. When interacting with his new boss, Bob may want to be perceived as organized and motivated. Bob desires to be perceived in these particular ways because Bob knows that making a good impression could mean the difference between getting a date or a promotion, or neither. Our relationships—personal and professional—with others are affected by the impressions we make on them. In knowing how important impressions are to meet our relationship goals, we desire to make particular impressions (depending on the individual we are about to interact with), and behave in the ways we think necessary to make the desired impression (Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Baumeister, 1982).

Both during and after our social interactions, we evaluate the success of our impressions and determine how we are being perceived (Carlson & Kenny, 2012). Not only do we reflect and examine our own behavior, even more so, we reflect and examine the behavior and reactions of the person we are interacting with (Carlson & Kenny, 2012). The most straightforward way to determine what others think of us is to ask them; however, many of us are not comfortable being so forward, especially with new acquaintances, and try to decipher others’ opinions of us instead. When we do this, we
are essentially trying to perceive what another person perceives of us (Carlson & Kenny, 2012). This raises an important question: How accurate are our perceptions of other’s perceptions of us? An even more important question: How does the accuracy of our perceptions of other’s perceptions of us affect our relationship with that person? If our perceptions of what others think of us are not in line with what they actually think of us (i.e., our perceptions are inaccurate), we may have trouble developing positive relationships—perhaps any relationships (Carlson, 2016a). The degree to which our perceptions of what others think of us are in agreement with others’ actual perceptions of us is known as meta-accuracy (Carlson & Kenny, 2012; Kenny & DePaulo, 1993). Meta-accuracy is an important factor in how people navigate social interactions and develop relationships with others.

The purpose of my proposed study is to examine possible mediators and moderators of meta-accuracy. More specifically, I will examine if individuals’ personality traits moderate their meta-accuracy levels. I will also consider whether the characteristics of an interaction situation between two individuals moderate individuals’ meta-accuracy levels in any way. The goals of this study call for an examination of data collected from participants who engage in one-on-one, in-person interactions with another participant.

**Self-Presentation**

Meta-accuracy is a construct primarily examined in person perception research. However, there are several implications of how meta-accuracy can affect an individual’s self-presentation. A brief review of self-presentation is therefore efficacious to our discussion of meta-accuracy.
Self-presentation—otherwise known as impression management—refers to the process of individuals’ attempts to control how others perceive them (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Individuals are aware that their impressions on others may affect their reputation and relationship goals, and therefore may alter aspects of their personalities when engaging in social interactions (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Recall Bob who wants to make a desired impression on his date or his boss. Bob believes that a good impression will lead to success (e.g., a second date, a promotion) and a bad impression will lead to failure (e.g., no second date, no promotion). Bob, being concerned with his impressions, can make sure that he presents himself in the way he believes will maximize his chances of being perceived in the way he desires (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). When presenting themselves to others with desired impressions in mind, individuals try to convey that impression by communicating information about their personality traits, attitudes, moods, or beliefs that they believe will best make that impression (Baumeister, 1982; Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Individuals’ self-presentations vary depending on how motivated and effective they feel to make the impression they desire, their personality, and the situational characteristics of the social interaction (Leary & Allen, 2011; Weiss & Feldman, 2006; Schlenker & Leary, 1982).

When individuals believe they have successfully made their desired impressions on others, they may feel that their personal or professional goals for those interactions have been met (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Successfully making a desired impression gives an individual confidence in his or her social skills and contributes to enhanced social functioning (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Two important factors that affect the success of individuals’ self-presentations are their ability to perceive how they have been
perceived, and the accuracy of that perception. If Bob cannot adequately perceive how he has been perceived, or if his perception is inaccurate compared with others’ actual perception of him, then Bob will have little success making desired impressions. Since unsuccessful self-presentations can undermine individuals’ confidence in their social skills and degrade their social functioning, it is important to understand the relationship between individuals’ perceptions of others’ perceptions and others’ actual perceptions (Carlson, 2016a). That is to say, it’s important to understand individuals’ meta-accuracy and to investigate the possible factors that may affect individuals’ meta-accuracy.

**Person Perception**

In order to have a fuller understanding of meta-accuracy, it is important to understand the domain from which meta-accuracy research evolved—person perception research. Person perception research focuses on understanding what kinds of information individuals gather when interacting with others and how individuals interpret this information (Burusic & Ribar, 2014). The processes involved with person perception are foundational factors for how individuals make judgements and form impressions of other people, particularly of people’s personality (Biesanz, 2010; Burusic & Ribar, 2014; Funder, 1995; Kenny, 2004).

The accuracy of one’s perceptions of others is a major factor in the success of a social interaction—for all parties involved (Carlson & Kenny, 2012). Focusing on the accuracy of individuals’ perceptions of others is a recent development and focus in person perception research. Since person perception research is primarily concerned with how people form perceptions about other people’s personalities, early research on person perception focused primarily on the cognitive strategies people used when making
judgements about others (Biesanz, 2010; Burusic & Ribar, 2014; Funder, 1995; Kenny, 2004; Asch, 1946; Heider, 1958). This focus was criticized initially because it failed to differentiate person perception from object perception—i.e., our understanding and evaluation of inanimate objects—both use similar cognitive strategies but are distinct forms of perception. Additional criticism claimed that focusing on cognitive strategies often removed person perception from its interpersonal context and neglected the behaviors associated with these cognitive strategies (Swann, 1984). Later research still assessed person perception with a cognitive approach, but shifted its focus from more broad cognitive strategies to the specific cognitive errors and biases that cause inaccurate human judgements (Jones, 1979; Kahneman & Tversky, 1973). Although the focus of person perception research was now on the inaccuracy of personality judgements, it still suffered from criticism of the cognitive approach. Contemporary person perception research focuses on examining the underlying factors involved in the accuracy of personality judgements, rather than focusing on the factors of inaccuracy. A notable development in this line of research is the Realistic Accuracy Model (RAM) of person perception (Funder, 1995). RAM’s development was a milestone in the area of person perception because it examines person perception in the interpersonal context and emphasizes that observing behavior and not simply cognitive strategies, is essential to making personality judgements (Funder, 1995). RAM stimulated growth in person perception with new research focusing on understanding the accuracy of our personality judgments.

Since how we perceive others and how they perceive us are central factors in the success of our social interactions and person perception has such an impact on our social
functioning, it is important to continue its research (Hofstee, 1994). I am most interested in meta-accuracy, an aspect of person perception that scales how accurate individuals’ perceptions are of other’s perceptions of them. Individuals’ perceptions of how others perceive them plays a large role in how individuals navigate a social relationship after the initial interaction has taken place. If Bob believes his date perceived him as warm and confident, he may request a second date; however, if Bob is inaccurate and his date actually perceived him as rude and uncourteous, then Bob’s request may be rejected. If Bob’s meta-accuracy were higher, he could have possibly navigated the social relationship better between him and his date and proceeded according to his date’s true perception of him. Therefore, meta-accuracy is a crucial aspect of person perception that merits investigation.

**Meta-accuracy**

Meta-accuracy research, like person perception research, primarily focuses on personality judgements; in these research areas, individuals are commonly referred to as *targets* to distinguish them from *judges*, or those they interact with—for the purposes of the present study targets and judges will hereafter be referred to as *actors* and *partners*, respectively. Within the meta-accuracy literature, the term *meta-perception* denotes actors’ perceptions of partner’s perceptions—actors are typically referred to as *meta-perceivers* but will not be referred to as such here. The following example demonstrates that meta-accuracy is the degree of agreement between actors’ meta-perceptions and partner’s perceptions. Bob—the actor—forms a meta-perception that Sally—the partner—perceives him as extraverted. If Sally’s perception is that Bob is extraverted—i.e., Bob’s meta-perception agrees with Sally’s perception—Bob has high meta-accuracy.
If Sally’s perception is that Bob is introverted—i.e., Bob’s meta-perception disagrees with Sally’s perception—Bob has low meta-accuracy.

Current meta-accuracy literature identifies two distinct kinds of meta-accuracy: generalized meta-accuracy (GMA) and dyadic meta-accuracy (DMA). GMA is the degree to which individuals detect how others in general perceive them; DMA is the degree to which individuals detect how particular others uniquely perceive them (Carlson & Kenny, 2012). Early work to study meta-accuracy used a round-robin design: actors in a group of four to six made meta-perceptions and personality judgements of every other actor in the group (Kenny & DePaulo, 1993). These early meta-accuracy studies found ample evidence among participants for GMA, but little to no evidence of DMA (Kenny & DePaulo, 1993; Levesque, 1997; Malloy, Albright, Kenny, Agatstein, & Winquist, 1997). Regardless of these results, meta-accuracy researchers contended with the idea that people could only perceive how they were generally perceived by others, and not specifically in a case-by-case basis. Recent research has produced evidence that supports DMA and further supports GMA among meta-perceivers.

Erika Carlson is at the forefront of meta-accuracy research and has conducted several studies over the last decade that strongly support DMA. Carlson identifies two approaches to assess DMA: the trait–centered approach and the person–centered approach. The trait–centered approach assesses DMA as the degree to which a meta-perceiver can accurately detect which partners in a group perceive them as high or low in a given personality trait; the person–centered approach assesses DMA as the degree to which a meta-perceiver can accurately detect which traits a particular partner perceives as more characteristic of the meta-perceiver. When using the person–centered approach, in
both participant dyads and larger groups, strong evidence of DMA emerges (Carlson & Furr, 2009). Other research has found that DMA is higher among actors when social relationship with the partner is accounted for (Carlson, Furr, & Vazire, 2010). Such evidence for DMA has been found among meta-perceivers after a brief interaction with a new acquaintance (Carlson & Furr, 2009).

Research has established that meta-accuracy is a real construct of person perception and a fundamental factor in social functioning. A logical next step for meta-accuracy research is to examine more discretely its various aspects, such as its predictors, influences, and possible effects. There are many avenues of investigation for examining meta-accuracy. Several studies of meta-accuracy suggest various moderators of actors’ meta-accuracy levels. These moderators include but are not limited to the type and quality of relationship between actor and partner, meta-perceivers’ confidence in their meta-perception, the degree to which meta-perceivers can distinguish between their self-perceptions and other’s perceptions of them—Carlson and colleagues call this meta-insight—and how psychologically adjusted the meta-perceiver is (Carlson et al., 2010; Carlson, 2016a; Levesque, 1997; Carlson & Furr, 2012; Carlson et al., 2010; Carlson, Vazire, & Furr, 2011; Carlson, 2016b). Carlson and Furr (2009) suggest another avenue of research that examines the possible predictors of meta-accuracy and has yet to be attempted. A final possible direction for effective research is to examine meta-accuracy using various personality models. To date, meta-accuracy has only been examined using Big Five models of personality (Malloy et al., 1997, Carlson et al., 2010; Kenny & DePaulo, 1993; Carlson & Furr, 2009).
The Present Study

The present study utilized the Self-Presentation and Personality Judgment (SPPJ) model proposed by Nave (in prep), depicted in Figure 1, as the theoretical framework for this research. There are various other person perception models that could be used in the study of meta-accuracy, such as the Realistic Accuracy Model (RAM, the Social Accuracy Model (SAM), the Social Relations Model (SRM), or the Personality, Error, Residual, Stereotype, Opinion, Norm (PERSON) model (Funder, 1995; Biesanz, 2010; Kenny, 1994; Kenny, 2004). The advantage of the SPPJ model is that it accounts for the goals and motivations individuals have that may affect the course of the interaction. For example, the RAM posits that a partner perceives an actor’s personality traits by observing their behavior. The RAM fails to account for the fact that actors may change

---

**Figure 1**: Self-Presentation and Personality Judgment Model (Nave, in prep)
which may be their behavior in order to impress upon the partner the personality the actor desires, different from the actor’s “true” personality. The advantage of the SPPJ model over these other person perception models makes it an appropriate framework for studying meta-accuracy.

There are several components to the SPPJ model, but only three were relevant to this study: Self as is, Self’s perception of other’s perception, and Target as perceived—the SPPJ model uses “self” and “target” in reference to the actor and partner, respectively. Self as is represents an actor’s true personality traits. Self’s perception of other’s perception represents an actor’s meta-perceptions. Target as perceived represents a partner’s actual perceptions of an actor’s personality. Meta-accuracy depicted in this model is the link between Self’s perception of other’s perception and Target as perceived.

After reviewing the meta-accuracy literature, I proposed two research questions. The first question: Do personality traits affect meta-accuracy levels? There is some evidence showing what actors’ meta-accuracy affects—such as their relationship quality with others (Carlson, 2016a)—but there is still much to be discovered as to what affects actors’ meta-accuracy levels. Carlson and Furr (2009) found significant individual differences in meta-accuracy levels for the personality traits agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness. Carlson and Furr postulated that this finding might suggest that individual differences in actors’ personality traits may affect their meta-accuracy levels—perhaps some individuals have a disposition to be better at perceiving how others perceive them concerning certain personality traits, e.g., agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness—but this was not investigated further. The first aim of
this study was to examine if actors’ personality traits affect their meta-accuracy levels. More specifically, I examined if actors’ personality traits moderate the relationship between their meta-perceptions and partners’ perceptions of them—i.e., their meta-accuracy. I hypothesized (Hypothesis 1) that actors’ personality traits will moderate their meta-accuracy levels. To test Hypothesis 1, partners’ actual perceptions and actors’ meta-perceptions were represented by the SPPJ model constructs of Target as perceived and Self’s perceptions of other's perception, were treated as the predictor and dependent variables, respectively. Actors’ personality was represented by the construct Self as is and was treated as the moderator variable.

The second question proposed: Do aspects of an interaction situation affect meta-accuracy levels? A few meta-accuracy studies accounted for social context but focused primarily on the type of relationships actors had with partners or on actors’ meta-accuracy across groups (Malloy et al., 1997; Carlson & Furr, 2009; Carlson & Furr, 2009). None of these studies, particularly the ones that contained live interactions between actors and partners, examined the characteristics of the interaction situation for how those characteristics may or may not affect actors’ meta-accuracy levels. The second aim of this study was to examine if actors’ perception of the interaction situation with their partner affect their meta-accuracy levels. More specifically, I examined if actors’ perception of situational traits moderates the relationship between their meta-perceptions and partners’ perceptions of them. Previous research has shown that characteristics of the interaction situation affect the way individuals perceive and behave toward the other person (Leary & Allen, 2011; Weiss & Feldman, 2009). If situational characteristics affect actors’ perceptions of other people, it is reasonable to postulate that situational
characteristics may also affect actors’ perceptions of other people’s perceptions—i.e., actors’ meta-accuracy. I hypothesized (Hypothesis 2) that situational traits will moderate actors’ meta-accuracy levels. To test Hypothesis 2, Target as perceived and Self’s perceptions of other's perception again served as the predictor and dependent variables, respectively. A variable named Situational traits was used to represent actors’ perceptions of the traits associated with interaction situation and was treated as the moderator variable.
METHODS

Research Design

For the present study, I used archival data collected by the Personality, Health, and Behavior Lab at Rutgers University–Camden in the fall 2015 and spring 2016 semesters. The data was from self-report questionnaires completed by participants at several sequential time points across two sessions and was examined using a within-subjects design.

Participants

The sample was college students at Rutgers University–Camden. This study did not aim to examine meta-accuracy in any way that is unique to Rutgers University–Camden students, and thus is expected to be generalizable to adults. The number of participants varied by the variables examined: Self as is (N = 110), Self’s perception of other’s perception (N = 102), Situational traits (N = 102), Target as perceived (N = 62). These disparities in participant numbers was due to participant dropouts at various points in the study and errors in data collection. Through listwise deletion, participants missing data from at least one of the variables examined were excluded from analyses, thereby reducing the overall sample size to N = 59. Participant mean age was 23.90 (SD = 7.97), and there were 15 males and 44 females. Participants were compensated $20 and entered into a drawing for a 100$ VISA gift card.

Measures

The HEXACO-60 Item personality inventory was used to measure participant’s personality traits throughout this study. The HEXACO-60 measures personality on six dimensions: Honesty-Humility (H), Emotionality (E), Extraversion (X), Agreeableness
(A), Conscientiousness (C), and Openness to Experience (O). The HEXACO-60 Item was chosen because it offers a more detailed inventory of personality than the Big Five Inventory (Ashton & Lee, 2009). It also takes less time to complete than its original version, the HEXACO-200 Item Personality Inventory, without compromising question diversity. The HEXACO-60 is a reliable measure, with an internal consistency reliability of $\alpha = .77$ to .80. This reliability is slightly lower than the HEXACO-200 Item’s reliability ($\alpha = .88$ to .91), but this is attributed to the HEXACO-60 being a shorter questionnaire (Ashton & Lee, 2009). The HEXACO-60 is positively correlated with the NEO-FFI Personality Inventory—a well-established measurement of personality—which is evidence of the HEXACO-60’s validity (Ashton & Lee, 2009). Each question of the HEXACO-60 measures a personality trait on a 9-point Likert scale, 1 being very uncharacteristic of the person and 9 being very characteristic of the person. Two versions of the HEXACO-60 were used in this study: one version was meant for the participant to rate their own personality, and the other version for the participant to rate their interaction partner. The Self’s perception of other’s perception, Target as perceived, and Self as is variables were measured along the six factors of the HEXACO-60, and an additional factor referred to as “Profile,” which is the aggregate of the six HEXACO factors. The HEXACO-60-Other was used to measure the Self’s perception of other’s perception variable—i.e., actors’ perception of partners’ perception of them along the seven factors—and Target as perceived variable—i.e., partners’ perception of actors along the seven factors. The HEXACO-60-Self was also used to measure the Self as is variable—i.e., actors’ perception of themselves along the seven factors. The HEXACO-60-Self and
Other versions of the HEXACO-60 can be seen in Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively.

The DIAMONDS questionnaire (Rauthmann et al., 2014) was used to measure actors’ perception of the Situational traits present during their interactions with partners. The DIAMONDS measures situational characteristics on eight dimensions: Duty (D), Intellect (I), Adversity (A), Mating (M), Positivity (O), Negativity (N), Deception (D), and Sociality (S). The DIAMONDS questionnaire was chosen because it is the only known taxonomy of situational characteristics formatted as a self-report questionnaire. The DIAMONDS taxonomy is positively correlated with the Riverside Situational Q-sort (RSQ)—a longstanding and established measurement used to code situational characteristics—which is evidence of the DIAMONDS validity—the fact the DIAMONDS is derived directly from items in the RSQ notwithstanding (Rauthmann et al., 2014). The RSQ measure defines eight overarching characteristics, which can be applied to almost any situation. Each facet of the DIAMONDS taxonomy is highly correlated with each of these eight overarching characteristics. The DIAMONDS measure has an internal consistency reliability of $\alpha = .57$ to .74. These moderate reliabilities may suggest at first glance that the DIAMONDS has low reliability, but these reliabilities are quite high considering that each of the eight factors have only four scale items (Rauthmann et al., 2014). Each question of the DIAMONDS questionnaire measures a situational trait on a 9-point Likert scale, 1 being very uncharacteristic of the situation and 9 being very characteristic of the situation. The DIAMONDS was used to measure the Situational traits variable—i.e., actors’ perception of the interaction with
partners along the eight factors. The complete DIAMONDS questionnaire can be seen in Appendix C.

**Procedure**

This study consisted of two sessions, each session occurring at a different scheduled date. Participants were randomly assigned a partner with whom they interacted in the second session. Each measurement was administered electronically via Qualtrics data collection software. In session 1, participants’ consent was obtained, and participants were randomly assigned a partner (with whom they were unacquainted) for session 2. Participants were then given the HEXACO-60 to measure their base level personality (*Self as is*) and to provide demographic information. In session 2, participants interacted for five minutes with their randomly assigned partner in a "getting-to-know-you" type of situation. After the interaction, participants were given the HEXACO-60 two more times. The first time, they were asked to complete it based on how they thought their partner perceived their personality (*Self’s perception of other’s perception*: meta-perception). The second time, they were asked to complete it based on their perception of their partner's true personality (*Target as perceived*). After completing the HEXACO questionnaires, participants were given the DIAMONDS questionnaire and instructed to fill it out based on how they perceived the interaction situation.

**Data Analysis**

One of the ways meta-accuracy has typically been measured is by bivariate correlation (Carlson & Furr, 2009; Carlson, Furr, & Vazire, 2010; Carlson, Vazire, & Furr, 2011; Carlson, 2016a; Carlson, 2016b). The degree to which actors’ meta-perceptions are correlated with partners’ actual perceptions represents the degree of meta-
accuracy among actors. In the present study, the seven personality factors measured (i.e., H, E, X, A, C, O, Profile) on Target as perceived was analyzed with each congruent factor on Self’s perception of other’s perception (e.g., H with H, E with E, etc.). A correlation between non-congruent personality factors is superfluous in regards to meta-accuracy—e.g., how extraverted a partner perceives an actor should not have any influence on that actors’ perception of how agreeable the partner perceives them (Carlson & Furr, 2009; Carlson, Furr, & Vazire, 2010). The degree to which the variables Self’s perceptions of other’s perception and Target as perceived are significantly, positively correlated represents actors’ degree of meta-accuracy.

After a correlational analysis was conducted between Self’s perceptions of other’s perception and Target as perceived, a set of linear multiple regression analyses examined Self as is as a moderator of the relationship between Target as perceived and Self’s perception of other’s perception, which were the predictor and dependent variables, respectively. It is important to note that the Target as perceived variable’s treatment as the predictor variable and the Self’s perception of other’s perception variable’s treatment as the dependent variable was due to actors’ forming meta-perceptions based on their observations of partners’ actual perceptions of them (Carlson & Furr, 2009; Carlson & Kenny, 2012). Conceptually speaking, actors’ meta-perceptions are dependent on partners’ actual perceptions of them. Therefore, actors’ meta-perceptions should be predicted by partners’ actual perceptions of them—assuming, of course, actors’ meta-accuracy has already been established; it would be meaningless to suggest that partners’ perceptions predict actors’ meta-perceptions if the two are not significantly correlated (Kenny & DePaulo, 1993; Malloy et al., 1997). Since the three variables involved in this
particular analysis were measured along seven personality factors, several regression analyses were conducted for all combinations between each pair of congruent personality factors on *Target as perceived* and *Self's perceptions of other's perception*, and the seven personality factors measured on *Self as is*. Overall, 49 regression analyses were conducted—seven for each of the seven pairs of congruent personality factors. All regression analyses were analyzed using SPSS version 22 software, utilizing the PROCESS macro for moderation and mediation models, which automatically mean-centers inputted variables (Hayes, 2012). The regression models were constructed as follows: the predictor variable was a particular personality factor of *Target as perceived*, the moderator was a particular personality factor of *Self as is*, the interaction term was predictor variable x moderator, and the dependent variable was the *Self's perceptions of other's perception* congruent personality factor of *Target as perceived*. Any significant interaction effects indicated moderation occurred, and these effects were examined further using a simple slopes analysis—via PROCESS (Hayes, 2012)—to determine more discretely how the potential moderator influences the relationship between *Target as perceived* and *Self's perception of other's perception* at two levels (i.e., -/+1 SD) of the interaction (Aiken & West, 1991).

A second linear regression analysis examined *Situational traits* as a moderator on the relationship between *Target as perceived* and *Self's perceptions of other's perception*, which were the predictor and dependent variables, respectively. Again, several regression analyses were conducted for all combinations between each pair of congruent personality factors on *Target as perceived* and *Self's perceptions of other's perception*, and the eight situational factors (i.e., D, I, A, M, O, N, D, S) measured on *Situational traits*. Overall, 56
regression analyses were conducted—eight for each of the seven pairs of congruent personality factors. SPSS version 22 software, utilizing the PROCESS macro was used again for these analyses (Hayes, 2012). The regression models were constructed in the same manner as the aforementioned personality regression models, except for the *Situational traits* variable in place of the *Self as is* variable as the moderator. As with the personality trait regressions described previously, any significant interaction effects indicated moderation occurred. These effects were examined further using a simple slopes analysis—via PROCESS (Hayes, 2012)—to determine more discretely how the potential moderator influences the relationship between *Target as perceived* and *Self’s perception of other’s perception* at two levels (i.e., +/-1 SD) of the interaction (Aiken & West, 1991).
RESULTS

Correlations

Overall, Target as perceived was significantly correlated with Self's perceptions of other's perception. Specifically, each pair of congruent personality factors for the two variables were significantly, positively correlated, as summarized in Table 1. Specifically, partners' actual perceptions of actors' personalities across all factors were significantly related to actors' perceptions of how partners perceived them. All correlations were significant at the .01 level, and had moderate to large effect sizes, \( r(59) = .36 - .63 \). There were significant correlations between non-congruent personality factor pairs, but, to reiterate, such correlations are conceptually superfluous.

Personality Traits Regressions

The results of the regression analyses examining the interaction between Target as perceived and Self as is as a predictor of Self's perceptions of other's perception are presented in Table 2. Statistically significant main effects were found for Target as perceived in all regressions involving honesty/humility, emotionality, extraversion, and profile congruent factor pairs (\( p < .01 \)). Specifically, partners' actual perceptions of actors significantly predicted actors' meta-perceptions concerning honesty/humility, emotionality, extraversion, and personality traits overall (see Table 2). Out of the 21 regressions involving agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience congruent factor pairs, 16 main effects for Target as perceived were significant (\( p < .05 \)), four were marginally significant (\( p < .10 \)), and one was non-significant (\( p = .160 \)). Specifically, partners' actual perceptions of actors significantly predicted actors' meta-perceptions in the 16 regressions concerning agreeableness, conscientiousness, and
openness to experience (Table 2). The four marginally significant main effects and one non-significant effect is likely due to small sample size (N = 59) in conjunction with the moderator variable (i.e., *Self as is*), accounting for more of the variance in those particular regressions.

Across all regressions, two significant main effects for *Self as is* were found for the effect of openness to experience on *Self’s perception of other’s perception* involving emotionality ($p = .003$), and for conscientiousness involving conscientiousness ($p = .039$). Specifically, actors' personality trait of openness to experience significantly predicted actors' meta-perceptions concerning emotionality, and the trait of conscientiousness significantly predicted actors' meta-perceptions concerning conscientiousness. The higher actors are in openness, the less they perceived that partners perceived them as emotional, and the higher actors are in conscientiousness the more they perceived partners perceived them as conscientious (Table 2). One marginally significant main effect emerged for *Self as is* for the effect of openness to experience involving openness to experience ($p = .052$). The higher actors are in openness, the more they perceived that partners perceived them as open (Table 2). This marginally significant effect is, again, likely due to small sample size.

A single statistically significant interaction effect emerged for the interaction of *Self as is* involving conscientiousness and *Target as perceived* involving the profile factor ($p = .006$). The interaction of partners' perception of actors involving the profile factor and actors' personality trait of conscientiousness significantly predicted actors' meta-perceptions concerning the profile factor (Table 2). Simple slopes were examined at $-/+1$ SD of *Self as is* involving conscientiousness and *Target as perceived* involving the
profile factor, which revealed that the relationship between *Target as perceived* and *Self’s perception of other’s perception* both involving the profile factor was significantly moderated by *Self as is* involving conscientiousness. More specifically, the higher partners perceived actors low in conscientiousness across all personality traits, the higher actors perceived partners perceived them across all personality traits (*b* = .366, *SE* = .172, *p* = .038). The higher partners perceived actors high in conscientiousness across all personality traits, the higher actors perceived partners perceived them across all personality traits, but this effect was weaker compared to actors low in conscientiousness (*b* = 1.128, *SE* = .182, *p* = .000) (see Figure 2).

**Figure 2**: Interaction effect of *Target as perceived* involving the profile factor and *Self as is* involving conscientiousness on *Self’s perception of other’s perception* involving the profile factor
Situational Traits Regressions

The results of the regression analyses examining the interaction between Target as perceived and Situational traits as a predictor of Self’s perceptions of other’s perception are presented in Table 3. The main effects of Target as perceived resemble the ones found in the personality regressions described previously. Statistically significant main effects were found for Target as perceived in all regressions involving emotionality, extraversion, openness to experience and profile congruent factor pairs ($p < .05$). Specifically, partners’ actual perceptions of actors significantly predicted actors' meta-perceptions concerning emotionality, extraversion, openness to experience, and personality traits overall (see Table 3). Out of the 24 regressions involving honesty/humility, agreeableness, and conscientiousness congruent factor pairs, 16 main effects for Target as perceived were significant ($p < .05$), seven were marginally significant ($p < .10$), and one was non-significant ($p = .426$). Specifically, partners’ actual perceptions of actors significantly predicted actors' meta-perceptions in the 16 regressions concerning honesty/humility, agreeableness, and conscientiousness (Table 3). The seven marginally significant main effects and one non-significant effect are, again, likely due to small sample size ($N = 59$) in conjunction with the moderator variable (i.e., Situational traits) accounting for more of the variance in those particular regressions.

Across all regressions, four significant main effects for Situational traits were found for the effect of negativity involving honesty/humility, agreeableness, and the profile factor ($p = .022; p = .015; p = .045$), and duty involving conscientiousness ($p = .050$). More specifically, for each of these main effects, actors' perceptions of the interaction with partners concerning these Situational traits significantly predicted actors’
meta-perceptions involving the respective personality traits. The less actors perceived
their interaction with partners as negative, the more actors perceived partners perceived
them as honest/humble, agreeable, and across all personality traits in general; the more
actors perceived their interaction with partners as dutiful, the more they perceived
partners perceived them as conscientious (Table 3).

A single statistically significant interaction effect emerged for the interaction of
Situational traits involving negativity and Target as perceived involving emotionality (p
= .006) (Table 3). Specifically, the interaction of partners' perception of actors involving
the emotionality and actors' perception of the situation concerning negativity significantly
predicted actors' meta-perceptions concerning emotionality. Simple slopes were
examined at -/+1 SD of Situational traits involving negativity and Target as perceived
involving emotionality, which revealed that the relationship between Target as perceived
and Self's perception of other's perception both involving emotionality was significantly
moderated by Situational traits involving negativity. More specifically, for actors who
perceived the interaction with partners low on negativity, the higher partners perceived
these actors in emotionality, the higher actors perceived partners perceived them in
emotionality (b = .852, SE = .126, p = .000). However, this effect was not significant for
actors who perceived the interaction high in negativity (b = .071, SE = .218, p = .745)
(see Figure 3).
Figure 3: Interaction effect of Target as perceived involving emotionality and Situational traits involving negativity on Self’s perception of other’s perception involving emotionality
DISCUSSION

Meta-accuracy

Significant, positive correlations between partners’ actual perceptions of actors and actors’ meta-perceptions provide evidence for high meta-accuracy among participants in this study. Correlations between congruent personality factor pairs indicate that for every personality trait, as well as the profile factor, actors accurately perceived how partners perceived them—e.g., if partners perceived actors high on extraversion, actors accurately perceived that partners perceived them as such. These findings are consistent with prior meta-accuracy research which found similar evidence for meta-accuracy by way of correlation (Carlson & Furr, 2009; Carlson, Furr, & Vazire, 2010; Carlson, Vazire, & Furr, 2011; Carlson, 2016a; Carlson, 2016b).

Effect of Personality Traits on Meta-accuracy

Conceptually, if actors show evidence of meta-accuracy, then actors' meta-perceptions should be predicted by partners’ actual perceptions of them. The significant main effects found for partners’ actual perceptions of actors is consistent with this meta-accuracy schema. These main effects also provide further evidence for meta-accuracy among participants. Given the correlational evidence for meta-accuracy found in this study, these effects would be expected.

The main effects found for actors' personality trait of openness to experience suggests that this trait affects actors’ meta-perceptions concerning the personality traits of emotionality and openness to experience. The main effect found for conscientiousness suggests that this trait affects actors’ meta-perceptions concerning conscientiousness. One explanation for these findings is that actors think that partners are perceiving them similar
to how actors perceive themselves. Actors' perceptions of their own personality are shown to be highly related to their meta-perceptions, suggesting that the formation of meta-perceptions may be based in part on self-perceptions (Carlson & Kenny, 2012). The caveat of this explanation is that it can only account for congruent pairs of personality factors. That is to say, actors who perceive themselves as high in a particular personality trait may think that partners also perceive them as high in that particular trait—e.g., actors who perceive themselves high in extraversion will likely perceive partners also perceive them as high in extraversion. When forming a meta-perception concerning another trait, actors will refer to their self-perception of that trait—actors’ self-perception of being high in extraversion will not affect their perceptions of partners’ perceptions concerning agreeableness. Therefore, the theory of actors using self-perceptions as a basis for their meta-perceptions can only account for the main effects of actors' openness to experience involving their meta-perceptions of openness, and conscientiousness involving meta-perceptions of conscientiousness. Perhaps the effect of actors' openness on their meta-perception concerning emotionality may be explained by the social desirability of emotionality, and the association between openness and optimism.

Personality traits carry different weights in terms of their social desirability—i.e., how valued a particular trait is in a given social context (John & Robins, 1993). Some personality traits are more desirable in certain social contexts than others, such as conscientiousness, which is more valued in professional/business-like settings, and extraversion, which is more valued in social gatherings. Typically, being high in emotionality is socially undesirable in small, interpersonal settings; therefore, being perceived low in emotionality may be socially desirable for many people. There is some
evidence of an association between openness to experience and optimism, such that those higher in openness tend to be more optimistic (Zoellner, Rabe, Karl, & Maercker, 2008). Actors high in openness to experience, with social desirability in mind, may have been more optimistic in their perceptions of partners’ perceptions of them, thinking that their partners perceived them lower in emotionality. 

It is important to note that none of the main effects found for actors' personality traits interacted with partners’ perceptions of actors to affect actors’ meta-perceptions. Although certain personality traits may be involved in the formation of actors’ meta-perceptions, their involvement is not so much so that it affects the accuracy of actors' meta-perceptions. The effects of certain personality traits on meta-perceptions may partly explain the formation of actors' meta-perceptions involving those specific personality traits, but they do not account for actors’ meta-accuracy involving those traits.

The significant interaction effect between partners' perceptions of actors’ personality in general across all traits (i.e., the profile factor) and actors' personality trait of conscientiousness suggests that conscientiousness affects the relationship between partners' perceptions of actors and actors' meta-perception. That is to say, actors’ levels of conscientiousness moderated their meta-accuracy, which was consistent with my first hypothesis. After discretely examining this interaction effect, it became clear that actors low in conscientiousness tended to have stronger meta-accuracy compared to actors’ high in conscientiousness. When partners perceived actors low in general across all personality traits, high-conscientious actors were more meta-accurate than low-conscientiousness actors; however, when partners perceived actors high in general across all personality traits, high-conscientious actors were less meta-accurate compared to low-conscientious
actors. These findings may be explained by the nature of conscientiousness. The characteristics of conscientiousness include being highly organized, goal-oriented, mindful of details, and self-aware (McCrae & Costa, 2008). Perhaps the mindfulness and self-awareness aspects of conscientiousness help actors to perceive and more accurately interpret indicators of partners’ perceptions—e.g., facial expressions and behavioral cues. Potential drawbacks of conscientiousness may be overthinking and overanalyzing information. Perhaps the reason high-conscientious actors have overall weaker meta-accuracy than low-conscientious actors is because high-conscientious actors are overanalyzing the indicators of partners’ perceptions, which may lead them to form slightly inaccurate meta-perceptions. Low-conscientious actors, in comparison, may be discretely perceiving indicators of partners’ perceptions but are not second-guessing their perceptions, which are likely to be accurate to begin with.

The moderating effect of conscientiousness on actors’ meta-accuracy was consistent with my first hypothesis, but only partially supports it. An unclear assumption in my hypothesis was that all, if not at least several, personality traits would moderate actors’ meta-accuracy. Finding a single personality trait that affects actors’ meta-accuracy was supporting evidence for my hypothesis, but I cannot conclude that “all” or “some” personality traits affect meta-accuracy. I can conclude that only conscientiousness affects meta-accuracy based upon the evidence gathered in this study.

**Effect of Situational traits on Meta-accuracy**

Regarding the *Situational traits* analyses, the main effects of partners' actual perceptions of actors resemble the main effects found in the personality traits analyses, and therefore reflect and further support participants’ meta-accuracy.
The main effects found for the situational trait (*Situational traits*) of negativity suggest that this trait affect actors’ meta-perceptions involving honesty/humility, agreeableness, and the profile factor. The main effect found for duty suggests that this trait affects actors’ meta-perceptions involving conscientiousness. Perhaps, since actors did not perceive their interaction as negative, they perceived that partners viewed them more favorably. Social desirability may be involved here again, such that, in small interpersonal settings, being an honest/humble and agreeable person is socially desirable (John & Robins, 1993). Actors may have wanted to be perceived as socially desirable, and since actors perceived that their interaction with partners did not involve much conflict or dissension (i.e., negativity), they may have thought that there was no reason for partners to perceive them unfavorably. This explanation may account for the effects of negativity on honesty/humility and agreeableness in particular, and across all personality traits in general. The effect of duty on conscientiousness may be due to the association between the task-oriented aspect of duty and the goal-oriented aspect of conscientiousness (Rauthmann et al., 2014; McCrae & Costa, 2008). Perhaps, for actors who thought that their interaction with partners involved a series of tasks they needed to complete (e.g., asking a series of questions about them, providing detailed answers to questions asked, etc.), partners perceived actors as being task/goal-oriented, or simply as conscientious.

It is important to note that none of the *Situational traits* interacted with partners’ perceptions of actors to affect actors’ meta-perceptions. That is to say, although certain *Situational traits* may be involved in the formation of actors’ meta-perceptions, their involvement is not so much so that it affects the accuracy of actors’ meta-perceptions.
The effects of certain situational traits on meta-perceptions may partly explain the formation of actors’ meta-perceptions involving those specific personality traits, but they do not account for actors’ meta-accuracy involving those traits.

The significant interaction effect between partners' perceptions of actors’ personality involving emotionality and actors' perception of their interaction with partners involving negativity suggests that negativity affects the relationship between partners' perceptions of actors and actors' meta-perception. Actors’ levels of perceived negativity moderated their meta-accuracy, which was consistent with my second hypothesis. After discretely examining this interaction effect, actors who perceived the interaction low in negativity tended to have stronger meta-accuracy, while perceiving the interaction high on negativity had no effect on meta-accuracy. The effect of negativity on meta-perceptions involving emotionality may be explained by the characteristic negativity and emotionality have in common, namely anxiety, which is a primary aspect of each trait individually. Measuring the level of negativity in a situation is in part measuring actors’ perception if the situation aroused feelings of anxiety for themselves or partners (Rauthmann et al., 2014). Similarly, measuring actors’ meta-perceptions concerning emotionality is in part measuring actors’ perception of partners perceiving them as feeling anxious and or behaving anxiously (Ashton & Lee, 2009). If negativity and emotionality are interpreted in terms of anxiety, then actors who thought the interaction with partners did not arouse feelings of anxiety may have thought they did not display any indicators that they were anxious. It may be that if actors perceived that their interaction with partners did not involve any anxiety (i.e., negativity), then actors may not have even considered if they displayed indicators of being anxious (i.e., emotional), and
therefore such thoughts did not affect the formation, and subsequent accuracy, of their perceptions about how partners perceived them concerning emotionality.

The moderating effect of negativity on actors’ meta-accuracy was consistent with my second hypothesis, but only partially supports it. Similar to my first hypothesis, an unclear assumption in my second hypothesis was that all, if not at least several, situational traits would moderate actors’ meta-accuracy. Finding a single situational trait that affects actors’ meta-accuracy is supporting evidence for my hypothesis, but I cannot conclude that “all” or “some” situational traits affect meta-accuracy. I can conclude that only negativity affects meta-accuracy based upon the evidence gathered in this study.

**Limitations**

One of the limitations of this study was the small sample of participants (N = 59). As discussed in the methods section, several of the variables had data for at least 100 participants, but, due to one of the variables having a sample size of only 59 participants, the sample size for all variables was reduced to 59. Past studies on meta-accuracy, and on personality more broadly, have tended to use a sample size of at least 80, because a sample of this size provides the statistical power needed to detect significant results involving personality (Carlson & Furr, 2009; Burusic & Ribar, 2014; Funder, 1995). Perhaps the reason several of the effects found only approached significance is the small number of participants. It is possible that the effects found would not differ, given a larger sample. Nevertheless, replicating the study with a larger sample would provide further and stronger evidence for the results of this study.

A second limitation of this study was that evidence found supporting meta-accuracy reflected actors’ GMA more than their DMA. One of the key characteristics of
the research on DMA is that actors interacted with at least two or more partners. Interacting with at least two partners allows participants to assess how partner-1 views them on a particular trait compared with partner-2. Since this study only had actors interact with one partner, DMA can only be supported to the extent that actors accurately perceived how their partner perceived them on each personality trait compared to each other trait (i.e., person-centered, rather than trait-centered DMA). Carlson and Kenny (2012) suggest that actors who are not able to make comparisons between people's perceptions of them—perhaps because they have interacted with only one person—will tend to perceive that partners have perceived them as they are generally perceived. As it turns out, partners without other people to compare actors to will also perceive actors how they tend to perceive most people. The evidence gathered for meta-accuracy in this study, therefore, is supportive more of actors' GMA than DMA. Replicating this study with actors interacting with two or more partners would address this gap in the evidence for meta-accuracy gathered in this study.

**Future Directions**

The present study furthered meta-accuracy research by specifically investigating two possible moderators of meta-accuracy, namely actors’ personality traits and actors’ perceptions of an interaction situation with partners. One possibility not addressed in this study is the joint effect of actors’ personality and situational perceptions on their meta-accuracy. The effects found for personality traits and situational traits suggest that the two play a role in actors’ formation of meta-perceptions. Perhaps, if analyzed together, both personality and situational perceptions will not only be involved in the formation of actors' meta-perceptions, but the accuracy of those perceptions, as well.
Another direction future meta-accuracy research can take is to examine specifically the indicators actors perceive and reflect on when forming meta-perceptions of partners. I have suggested that partners may display indicators of their perceptions of actors which actors are then perceiving and reflecting on to form their meta-perceptions of partners. There has been little-to-no research that has investigated these perception "indicators"—perhaps facial expressions or behavioral cues—that are involved in the meta-accuracy process between actors and partners. Isolating and examining these indicators involved in meta-accuracy will further our understanding of exactly how people form accurate or inaccurate perceptions of how others perceive them.
DIRECTIONS

On the following pages you will find a series of statements about you. Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement. Then write your response in the space next to the statement using the following scale:

5 = strongly agree  
4 = agree  
3 = neutral (neither agree nor disagree)  
2 = disagree  
1 = strongly disagree

Please answer every statement, even if you are not completely sure of your response.

Please provide the following information about yourself.

Sex (circle): Female  Male

Age: _______ years
1. I would be quite bored by a visit to an art gallery.
2. I plan ahead and organize things, to avoid scrambling at the last minute.
3. I rarely hold a grudge, even against people who have badly wronged me.
4. I feel reasonably satisfied with myself overall.
5. I would feel afraid if I had to travel in bad weather conditions.
6. I wouldn’t use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought it would succeed.
7. I’m interested in learning about the history and politics of other countries.
8. I often push myself very hard when trying to achieve a goal.
9. People sometimes tell me that I am too critical of others.
10. I rarely express my opinions in group meetings.
11. I sometimes can’t help worrying about little things.
12. If I knew that I could never get caught, I would be willing to steal a million dollars.
13. I would enjoy creating a work of art, such as a novel, a song, or a painting.
14. When working on something, I don’t pay much attention to small details.
15. People sometimes tell me that I’m too stubborn.
16. I prefer jobs that involve active social interaction to those that involve working alone.
17. When I suffer from a painful experience, I need someone to make me feel comfortable.
18. Having a lot of money is not especially important to me.
19. I think that paying attention to radical ideas is a waste of time.
20. I make decisions based on the feeling of the moment rather than on careful thought.
21. People think of me as someone who has a quick temper.
22. On most days, I feel cheerful and optimistic.
23. I feel like crying when I see other people crying.
24. I think that I am entitled to more respect than the average person is.
25. If I had the opportunity, I would like to attend a classical music concert.
26. When working, I sometimes have difficulties due to being disorganized.
27. My attitude toward people who have treated me badly is “forgive and forget”.
28. I feel that I am an unpopular person.
29. When it comes to physical danger, I am very fearful.
30. If I want something from someone, I will laugh at that person’s worst jokes.
31. I’ve never really enjoyed looking through an encyclopedia.
32. I do only the minimum amount of work needed to get by.
I tend to be lenient in judging other people.

In social situations, I’m usually the one who makes the first move.

I worry a lot less than most people do.

I would never accept a bribe, even if it were very large.

People have often told me that I have a good imagination.

I always try to be accurate in my work, even at the expense of time.

I am usually quite flexible in my opinions when people disagree with me.

The first thing that I always do in a new place is to make friends.

I can handle difficult situations without needing emotional support from anyone else.

I would get a lot of pleasure from owning expensive luxury goods.

I like people who have unconventional views.

I make a lot of mistakes because I don’t think before I act.

Most people tend to get angry more quickly than I do.

Most people are more upbeat and dynamic than I generally am.

I feel strong emotions when someone close to me is going away for a long time.

I want people to know that I am an important person of high status.

I don’t think of myself as the artistic or creative type.

People often call me a perfectionist.

Even when people make a lot of mistakes, I rarely say anything negative.

I sometimes feel that I am a worthless person.

Even in an emergency I wouldn’t feel like panicking.

I wouldn’t pretend to like someone just to get that person to do favors for me.

I find it boring to discuss philosophy.

I prefer to do whatever comes to mind, rather than stick to a plan.

When people tell me that I’m wrong, my first reaction is to argue with them.

When I’m in a group of people, I’m often the one who speaks on behalf of the group.

I remain unemotional even in situations where most people get very sentimental.

I’d be tempted to use counterfeit money, if I were sure I could get away with it.
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DIRECTIONS

On the following pages you will find a series of statements about the person that you are rating now. Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement. Then write your response in the space next to the statement using the following scale:

5 = strongly agree
4 = agree
3 = neutral (neither agree nor disagree)
2 = disagree
1 = strongly disagree

Please answer every statement, even if you are not completely sure of your response.

Please provide the following information about the person that you will be rating.

Number of years that you have been acquainted with this person: ______ years

Sex of the person that you will be rating (circle): Female  Male

Age of the person that you will be rating: ______ years

B. HEXACO-60 “Other”
1. He/she would be quite bored by a visit to an art gallery.

2. He/she plans ahead and organizes things, to avoid scrambling at the last minute.

3. He/she rarely holds a grudge, even against people who have badly wronged him/her.

4. He/she feels reasonably satisfied with himself/herself overall.

5. He/she would feel afraid if he/she had to travel in bad weather conditions.

6. He/she wouldn't use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if he/she thought it would succeed.

7. He/she is interested in learning about the history and politics of other countries.

8. He/she often pushes himself/herself very hard when trying to achieve a goal.

9. People sometimes say that he/she is too critical of others.

10. He/she rarely expresses his/her opinions in group meetings.

11. He/she worries about little things.

12. If he/she knew that he/she could never get caught, he/she would be willing to steal a million dollars.

13. He/she would enjoy creating a work of art, such as a novel, a song, or a painting.

14. When working on something, he/she doesn't pay much attention to small details.

15. People sometimes think that he/she is too stubborn.

16. He/she prefers jobs that involve active social interaction to those that involve working alone.

17. When he/she suffers from a painful experience, he/she needs someone to make him/her feel comfortable.

18. Having a lot of money is not especially important to him/her.

19. He/she thinks that paying attention to radical ideas is a waste of time.

20. He/she makes decisions based on the feeling of the moment rather than on careful thought.

21. People think of him/her as someone who has a quick temper.

22. On most days, he/she feels cheerful and optimistic.

23. He/she feels like crying when he/she sees other people crying.

24. He/she thinks that he/she is entitled to more respect than the average person is.

25. If he/she had the opportunity, he/she would like to attend a classical music concert.

26. When working, he/she sometimes has difficulties due to being disorganized.

27. His/her attitude toward people who have treated him/her badly is “forgive and forget.”

28. He/she feels that he/she is an unpopular person.

29. When it comes to physical danger, he/she is very fearful.

30. If he/she wants something from someone, he/she will laugh at that person’s worst jokes.

31. He/she has never really enjoyed looking through an encyclopedia.
He/she does only the minimum amount of work needed to get by.

He/she tends to be lenient in judging other people.

In social situations, he/she is usually the one who makes the first move.

He/she worries a lot less than most people do.

He/she would never accept a bribe, even if it were very large.

He/she has a good imagination.

He/she always tries to be accurate in his/her work, even at the expense of time.

He/she is usually quite flexible in his/her opinions when people disagree with him/her.

The first thing that he/she always does in a new place is to make friends.

He/she can handle difficult situations without needing emotional support from anyone else.

He/she would get a lot of pleasure from owning expensive luxury goods.

He/she likes people who have unconventional views.

He/she makes a lot of mistakes because he/she doesn’t think before he/she acts.

Most people tend to get angry more quickly than he/she does.

Most people are more upbeat and dynamic than he/she generally is.

He/she feels strong emotions when someone close to him/her is going away for a long time.

He/she wants people to know that he/she is an important person of high status.

I don’t think of him/her as the artistic or creative type.

People often call him/her a perfectionist.

Even when people make a lot of mistakes, he/she rarely says anything negative.

He/she sometimes feels that he/she is a worthless person.

Even in an emergency he/she wouldn’t feel like panicking.

He/she wouldn’t pretend to like someone just to get that person to do favors for him/her.

He/she finds it boring to discuss philosophy.

He/she prefers to do whatever comes to mind, rather than stick to a plan.

When people tell him/her that he/she is wrong, his/her first reaction is to argue with them.

When he/she is in a group of people, he/she is often the one who speaks on behalf of the group.

He/she remains unemotional even in situations where most people get very emotional.

He/she’d be tempted to use counterfeit money, if he/she were sure he/she could get away with it.
| Description | Item | 003 | 006 | 011 | 025 | 013 | 012 | 015 | 017 | 019 | 023 | 031 | 032 | 033 | 034 | 035 | 036 | 037 | 038 | 039 | 041 | 048 | 053 | 057 | 063 | 070 | 073 | 076 |
|-------------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| A job needs to be done. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Situation includes intellectual or cognitive stimuli. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Situation includes stimuli that could be construed sexually. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Situation includes opportunities to demonstrate intellectual capacity. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Situation includes opportunities to express unusual ideas or points of view. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Situation affords an opportunity to demonstrate intellectual capacity. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Situation offers an opportunity to express unusual ideas or points of view. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Situation offers an opportunity to demonstrate intellectual capacity. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Situation offers an opportunity to express unusual ideas or points of view. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Situation includes opportunities to demonstrate intellectual capacity. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Situation includes opportunities to express unusual ideas or points of view. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Situation includes opportunities to demonstrate intellectual capacity. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Situation includes opportunities to express unusual ideas or points of view. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
### D. TABLES

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target as perceived</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self's perception of other's perception

**p < .01**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>R^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>0.290 (0.138)*</td>
<td>2.098</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>0.013 - 0.568</td>
<td>0.556 (0.114)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAI</td>
<td>0.098 (0.107)</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.117 - 0.314</td>
<td>0.007 (0.105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP x SAI</td>
<td>0.215 (0.164)</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.113 - 0.543</td>
<td>0.014 (0.207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>0.335 (0.157)*</td>
<td>2.131</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>0.020 - 0.649</td>
<td>0.537 (0.123)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAI</td>
<td>-0.161 (0.114)</td>
<td>-1.404</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.390 - 0.069</td>
<td>0.081 (0.098)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP x SAI</td>
<td>0.348 (0.218)</td>
<td>1.593</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.090 - 0.785</td>
<td>0.100 (0.186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>0.376 (0.142)**</td>
<td>2.645</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>0.091 - 0.661</td>
<td>0.490 (0.115)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAI</td>
<td>0.080 (0.107)</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.135 - 0.294</td>
<td>-0.073 (0.092)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP x SAI</td>
<td>-0.050 (0.232)</td>
<td>-0.174</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.626 - 0.448</td>
<td>-0.093 (0.167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>0.396 (0.141)**</td>
<td>2.799</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>0.112 - 0.679</td>
<td>0.516 (0.139)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAI</td>
<td>0.024 (0.113)</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.202 - 0.249</td>
<td>-0.248 (0.079)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP x SAI</td>
<td>-0.018 (0.282)</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.483 - 0.449</td>
<td>-0.093 (0.167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>0.346 (0.166)*</td>
<td>2.079</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>0.013 - 0.679</td>
<td>0.524 (0.117)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAI</td>
<td>0.181 (0.250)</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.320 - 0.682</td>
<td>-0.341 (0.206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP x SAI</td>
<td>0.045 (0.499)</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.955 - 1.046</td>
<td>0.294 (0.114)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Dependent variable = Self's perception of other's perception of self. Gender = Personality factor pair
†*p* < .10, *p* < .05, **p* < .01, ***p* < .001
### Table 2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>TAP</th>
<th>SAI</th>
<th>TAP x SAI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td><strong>3.65</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.11</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.93</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td><strong>3.22</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.10</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Dependent variable = Self's perception of other's perception. Predictors are unstandardized regression coefficients (N = 59).

- **p < .001
- *p < .05
- †p < .10

### Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R²</th>
<th>95% CI (SE)</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>95% CI (SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>3.95 **</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>3.79 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraversion and Agreeableness are significant predictors of TAP's perception of SAI.

**Note:** TAP = Target as perceived; SAI = Self as is; H, E, X, A, C, O, Profile = Self as is personality factor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>( b ) (SE)</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>0.363 (.215)</td>
<td>1.684</td>
<td>-0.069 to 0.794</td>
<td>0.565 (.208)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAI</td>
<td>0.005 (.088)</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>-0.172 to 0.182</td>
<td>-0.070 (.112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP x SAI</td>
<td>0.045 (.440)</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>-0.836 to 0.927</td>
<td>-0.330 (.355)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Dependent variable = Self's perception of other's perception; \( p < .10 \), \( * p < .05 \), \( ** p < .01 \), \( *** p < .001 \).

Profile: TAP = Target as perceived; SAI = Self as is; H, E, X, A, C, O, Profile = Self as is personality factor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>TAP</th>
<th>SAI</th>
<th>TAP x SAI</th>
<th>TAP x Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>.427***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>.409 (2.28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>.475***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>.501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>.475***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- Dependent variable = Self's perception of other's perception
- Data are unstandardized regression coefficients (N = 59)
- Model personality factor pair
- TAP = Target as perceived; SAI = Self as is
- H, E, X, A, C, O, Profile = Self as is personality factor
- † p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 2 continued
### Table 3

#### Table: HONESTY/HUMILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>b (SE)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>.414 (.148)**</td>
<td>2.807</td>
<td>.119 -.709</td>
<td>.594 (.124)**</td>
<td><strong>S</strong> as perceived; Data are unstandardized regression coefficients (N = 59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>.000 (.037)</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.073 -.074</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td>-.015 (.066)</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>.382 (.166)†</td>
<td>1.826</td>
<td>-.0291 .635</td>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>-.105 (.059)†</td>
<td>-1.791</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td>-.194 (.142)</td>
<td>-1.367</td>
<td>-.478</td>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>.384 (.148)*</td>
<td>2.604</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>-.071 (.039)†</td>
<td>-1.823</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td>-.018 (.085)</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>.326 (.127)*</td>
<td>1.951</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>-.083 (.035)*</td>
<td>-2.361</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td>-.069 (.065)</td>
<td>-1.226</td>
<td>-.231</td>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>.406 (.142)**</td>
<td>2.872</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>.007 (.055)</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td>-.021 (.130)</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>-.281</td>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Dependent variable = **Self's** perception of others'; Data are unstandardized regression coefficients (N = 59)

---

**Model personality factor pair**

- **TAP = Target as perceived**
- **ST = Situational traits**
- **D, I, A, M, O, N, D, S = Situational traits factors**

---

* † p < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

---

**Notes:** Dependent variable = Self's perception of other's perception; Data are unstandardized regression coefficients (N = 59).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>TAP</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>R^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.037 - .105</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.173 - .717</td>
<td>.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.056 - .753</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.056 - .753</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.056 - .753</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.056 - .753</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.056 - .753</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.056 - .753</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.056 - .753</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.056 - .753</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Dependent variable = Self's perception of other's perception; Data are unstandardized regression coefficients (N = 59); Model gender factor pair a; TAP = Target as perceived; ST = Situational traits; D, I, A, M, O, N, D, S = Situational traits factors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>TAP x ST</th>
<th>TAP</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TAP x ST</th>
<th>TAP</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TAP x ST</th>
<th>TAP</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TAP x ST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>1.888</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.783</td>
<td>0.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>1.888</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.783</td>
<td>0.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>1.888</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.783</td>
<td>0.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>1.888</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.783</td>
<td>0.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>1.888</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.783</td>
<td>0.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>1.888</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.783</td>
<td>0.545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Dependent variable = Self's perception of other's perception; Data are unstandardized regression coefficients (N = 59).
### Table 3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>b (SE)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td>.068 (1.38)</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>6.80 - 1.97</td>
<td>.425***</td>
<td><strong>Dependent variable = Self's perception of other's perception</strong>; Data are unstandardized regression coefficients (N = 59).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST x TAP</td>
<td>-2.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-2.90 - 0.00</td>
<td>.125 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-2.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-2.90 - 0.00</td>
<td>.125 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-2.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-2.90 - 0.00</td>
<td>.125 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-2.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-2.90 - 0.00</td>
<td>.125 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>-2.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-2.90 - 0.00</td>
<td>.125 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>-2.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-2.90 - 0.00</td>
<td>.125 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-2.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-2.90 - 0.00</td>
<td>.125 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>-2.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-2.90 - 0.00</td>
<td>.125 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP x ST</td>
<td>.068 (1.38)</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>6.80 - 1.97</td>
<td>.425***</td>
<td><strong>Dependent variable = Self's perception</strong>; Data are unstandardized regression coefficients (N = 59).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST x TAP</td>
<td>-2.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-2.90 - 0.00</td>
<td>.125 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-2.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-2.90 - 0.00</td>
<td>.125 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-2.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-2.90 - 0.00</td>
<td>.125 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-2.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-2.90 - 0.00</td>
<td>.125 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>-2.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-2.90 - 0.00</td>
<td>.125 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>-2.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-2.90 - 0.00</td>
<td>.125 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-2.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-2.90 - 0.00</td>
<td>.125 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>-2.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-2.90 - 0.00</td>
<td>.125 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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