IS PERSONALITY PATHOLOGY EGO-SYNTONIC? SELF- AND META-PERCEPTION OF MALADAPTIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS

by

BRINKLEY M. SHARPE

(Under the Direction of Joshua D. Miller)

ABSTRACT

Research has challenged the assumption that personality pathology is egosyntonic. The present study used correlational analysis, mean comparisons, and structural equation modeling in a community sample (n = 401) to examine relations between self-rated maladaptive personality and liking of maladaptive traits in self and others as well as meta-perception of personality pathology (i.e., how likable participants believe others find maladaptive traits). In general, individuals with higher self-rated maladaptive traits provided higher ratings of the likability of these traits in themselves and others. However, as hypothesized, comparison of liking ratings for high scorers and the rest of the sample revealed that individuals who score highly on most pathological personality traits do not "like" these traits (or rate others as "liking" them) but simply dislike them less. Results support a dimensional view of egosyntonicity.

INDEX WORDS: PID-5, personality pathology, maladaptive traits, likability, meta-perception

IS PERSONALITY PATHOLOGY EGO-SYNTONIC? SELF- AND META-PERCEPTION OF MALADAPTIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS

by

BRINKLEY SHARPE

BA, University of Virginia, 2013

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2022

IS PERSONALITY PATHOLOGY EGO-SYNTONIC? SELF- AND META-PERCEPTION OF MALADAPTIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS

by

Brinkley M. Sharpe

Major Professor:	Joshua D. Miller
Committee:	Nathan T. Carter
	Keith W. Campbell

Electronic Version Approved:

Ron Walcott
Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Traditional views of personality pathology (i.e., Hirschfeld, 1993) emphasize "egosyntonicity," implying that individuals with PDs hold favorable perceptions of these traits. Additionally, negative judgments about patients with PD diagnoses as well as biased beliefs regarding intentionality and controllability of their behaviors are unfortunately common among mental health professionals (e.g., Lewis & Appleby, 1988; Markham & Trower, 2003). These historical roots and modern prejudices, often couched in terms such as "treatment-resistance," "noncompliance," and insufficient desire for change, are likely limiting factors to the identification and implementation of effective treatment for PDs. Despite the importance and centrality of these notions, explicit or implied, the literature on evaluative judgments of personality pathology, including both personality disorders (PDs) and related maladaptive traits, is limited. This is somewhat surprising as evaluative judgments of maladaptive personality traits appear to feature prominently in theoretical models.

Borderline personality disorder (BPD) and psychopathy, for example, are widely stigmatized syndromes for which both lay persons and professionals carry strong assumptions of egosyntonicity. In the case of BPD, stigma related to beliefs regarding "un-treatability" and "powerlessness" against the disorder has been found across studies of patients and clinicians (Ring & Lawn, 2019). Similar attributions are likely at the root of deprivation of civil liberties for some individuals with psychopathic traits, such as the indefinite confinement of some criminal offenders in the United Kingdom in special "dangerous and severe personality disorder"

(DSPD) units (see Pickersgill, 2012). Individuals with PDs such as these are also likely to face barriers to receiving appropriate care including limited access to treatment (Hermens et al., 2011), denial of services (Sulzer, 2015), and treatment non-completion (McMurran et al., 2010). However, the existing literature does not support criminalization or gatekeeping. On the contrary, effect sizes for psychotherapeutic interventions appear to be similar for BPD versus forms of psychopathology thought to be egodystonic (e.g., depression, anxiety, psychosis). Although controlled studies of the treatment of psychopathy are limited, existing evidence suggests that the related behaviors of greatest social concern (i.e., violence, criminality) are changeable through psychotherapeutic intervention (Polaschek & Skeem, 2018). To the extent that these results can be generalized, they suggest that the egosyntonic view of personality pathology has outlived its utility as a guide for clinical priorities and thus should be subject to empirical scrutiny.

Perception of Maladaptive Personality Traits in Self and Others

Much of the existing literature on the perception of maladaptive personality focuses on the domain of Antagonism (i.e., low Agreeableness). From this work it appears that person perception of pathological personality traits follows the same general tenets as the perception of adaptative traits. For example, individuals tend to assume similarity between themselves and others in Agreeableness (e.g., strangers, Beer & Watson, 2008; friends and romantic partners, Watson et al., 2000) as well as the three antagonism-related personality styles sometimes grouped together as the "Dark Triad" (DT; Paulhus & Williams, 2002)—narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism (e.g., in heterosexual romantic dyads, Kardum et al., 2022). Also shared across both adaptive and maladaptive traits, are features of evaluative person perception, such as homophily. The adage that "birds of a feather [desire to] flock together,"

holds true for basic interpersonal traits as well as specific PD features. Just as increasing levels of Agreeableness associate with higher levels of the same trait in one's ideal romantic partner (Figueredo et al., 2006) so do higher scores on measures of trait narcissism correlate with liking of narcissistic others (Adams et al., 2015; Hart & Adams, 2014).

Several studies (Lamkin et al., 2018; Miller et al., 2018; Sleep et al., 2019) have examined likability of maladaptive traits more broadly, using measures of both the general Five-Factor Model (FFM) of personality (i.e., IPIP-NEO-60; Maples-Keller et al., 2019) as well as its pathological variant (i.e., Personality Inventory for *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition* [PID-5]; Krueger et al., 2012). Lamkin and colleagues (2018) also examined perceptions of the DT.

Convergent correlations between PID-5 scores and likability ratings for PID-5 traits were moderate in size (e.g., median r = .32, Lamkin et al., 2018; median r = .37, Miller et al., 2018), suggesting that individuals with greater personality pathology are more likely to make favorable evaluations of similar others. Similar results for liking of pathological traits emerged when considering rater's personality in terms of the FFM and DT (Lamkin et al., 2018). Self-reported "actual" trait levels were also associated with desired levels of the same traits (Miller et al., 2018; Sleep et al., 2019).

These findings appear consistent with an egosyntonic view of PDs; however, by describing relative levels of liking without considering their absolute context, they do not tell the complete story. Both Lamkin and colleagues (2018) and Miller and colleagues (2018) also conducted comparisons of mean likability ratings based on raters' own trait profiles to examine absolute liking. Specifically, they separated "high" scorers (i.e., those 1 SD or more above the mean score) on the self-report instruments from the rest of the sample to compare whether the

apparent homophily was truly indicative of *liking* these traits or rather reflective of tolerance. Individuals with high levels of a particular trait typically rated the same trait below the scale midpoint in likability (i.e., a rating of three on a five-point Likert scale, Lamkin et al., 2018; 50 out of 100, Miller et al., 2019), suggesting that they still viewed these traits as more "unlikable" than "likable." Sleep and colleagues (2017) demonstrated similar results for the relation between self-rated maladaptive traits and desirability of the same traits in a potential romantic partner, describing the moderate association as reflective of "tolerance … rather than attraction" (p. 321).

In these studies, judgments were directed toward a trait as expressed by some "other" (Lamkin et al., 2018; i.e., romantic partner, Sleep et al., 2017) or an unspecified perceptual target (Miller et al., 2018) rather than the self. It is conceivable that individuals who possess maladaptive traits may see those traits as favorable in others while simultaneously denigrating the same in themselves. As an example, an individual with a high level of Neuroticism might feel a sense of camaraderie with other anxious or depressed persons and thus value their company all the while wishing for their own emotional stability. Thus, to provide evidence for a trait's egosyntonicity, liking must be demonstrated when the self is both evaluator and target of evaluation, something that was not examined in the previously mentioned studies.

The assumption of PD egosyntonicity in its most pernicious form not only implies liking of constituent traits as previous studies have examined, but also presumes unwillingness, reluctance, or lack of desire to change. To better understand individuals' desires regarding their pathological traits, Sleep and colleagues (2022) compared reports of actual and desired levels of these traits, defining a discrepancy of 10 or more points (out of 100) as a meaningful interest in change. Across trait domains, less than half of participants desired change with the proportion ranging from 9% for Antagonism to 47% for Negative Affect. Among individuals wanting to

change their traits, moderate to large differences between the means for actual and desired levels were observed (median *d* = .72; range: .44 [Antagonism] to 1.47 [Negative Affect]). Individuals desiring change had a higher mean level of maladaptive traits than those denying this interest (median *d* = .81), suggesting that greater pathology may be associated with *more* desire for change rather than less. However, not all desired change was in the expected (i.e., adaptive) direction. For Antagonism, 23% of individuals desiring change wished to meaningfully *increase* their level of this trait.

Sleep and colleagues (2022) demonstrated high correlations (*r*s = .73 to .80) between self-reported maladaptive trait levels and perceived impairment (i.e., interpersonal and occupational problems) on the same traits. However, positive associations were also observed between maladaptive traits and perceived trait-related *benefits*. For several traits, this effect was small (i.e., Detachment, Negative Affect, and Disinhibition, *rs* = .16 to .31) but both Psychoticism (*r* = .48) and Antagonism (*r* = .51) showed a moderate to large relation. For Psychoticism, qualitative analyses revealed interpersonal, spiritual, and financial themes among perceived benefits. Antagonism was perceived to have occupational and health benefits. This dialectic—perceiving maladaptive traits as simultaneously impairing and beneficial—might imply a role of meta-perception in the internal evaluation of personality pathology.

Meta-perception relies upon the "theory of mind" or the ability to consider the mental states of others. If a person answers the questions "How narcissistic are you?" and "How narcissistic do others think you are?" they are providing descriptive self- and meta-perceptions of their level of narcissism, respectively. Much of the previous research in this area has focused on "meta-accuracy" or the association between informant ratings and meta-perceptions of those ratings. Kenny and DePaulo (1993) demonstrated that meta-perception ratings for general

personality traits levels and global evaluations are highly correlated with self-perceptions of the same, largely consistent across various informants, and more accurate to the consensus of others rather than for the rating of any specific other. Similar results have been demonstrated for PD features (Oltmanns et al., 2005) and the DT (Maples-Keller & Miller, 2018) with self- and meta-perceptions showing small-to-medium positive correlations with informant-reports as compared to large correlations with one another. However, meta-perceptions appear to outperform self-ratings in the prediction of informant-report (Maples-Keller & Miller, 2018; Oltmanns et al., 2015). Thus, an individual who might not personally view their traits as unpleasant may nevertheless understand their perspective as idiosyncratic and not shared with those around them. Even if this knowledge does not lead to a transformation in the individual's own evaluation, it might serve as a potent motivator for change, especially when self-liking is not high in an absolute sense.

Current Study

In the present study, I tested the hypothesis of egosyntonicity in personality pathology by examining perception and meta-perception of the favorability of PD traits separately as well as holistically via multilevel structural equation modeling (MSEM). Following previous research (Miller et al., 2018; Sleep et al., 2019), I expected both supporting (i.e., positive evidence of relative liking) and disconfirming (i.e., negative evidence of absolute liking) evidence for specific PD trait domains and facets. In this sense, I advanced an alternative view of egosyntonicity as a dimensional feature of personality pathology which exhibits variability between individuals and among traits.

First, I examined the extent to which individuals who score highly on a measure of maladaptive traits view these same traits as likable in themselves and others. Consistent with past

work (Miller et al., 2018; Sleep et al., 2019), I hypothesized that scores on pathological trait domains (e.g., PID-5 Disinhibition) would positively correlate with liking of these traits in oneself and others. Specifically, I expected that individuals with higher scores on a particular domain would rate that domain as more likable in themselves and others. However, I did not expect individuals who scored highly on pathological personality traits to actually "like" these traits or to rate others as "liking" the traits. Instead, I hypothesized that a comparison of likability ratings for high scorers (i.e., 1+ SD above the mean) versus the rest of the sample would reveal mean liking ratings at or below the mid-point (i.e., 4) of a Likert-style rating scale from 1 (Strongly Dislike) to 7 (Strongly Dislike) for both groups. In addition to providing conceptual replication of Miller and colleagues (2018) and Sleep and colleagues (2019), I extended the same analyses to the facet (e.g., PID-5 Impulsivity) level, hypothesizing a similar overall pattern of trait tolerance rather than liking among high scorers.

Next, I examined meta-perception of the favorability of PD traits or how likable individuals believe others find these traits in themselves (e.g., *"How much do you think other people like manipulativeness in themselves?"*) and others (e.g., *"How much do you think other people like grandiosity in others?"*) using both bivariate analyses (i.e., correlations) and comparison of means. People tend to "assume similarity" between themselves and others and make person perception ratings consistent with this assumption. It seems reasonable to extend this principle to meta-perception and thus I expected that meta-perceptions of trait liking would track with one's own trait liking ratings (i.e., positive correlation). However, it is possible that assumed similarity does not operate at the meta-cognitive level for trait liking.

Finally, I used MSEM to evaluate a within-person model of trait liking based on Kenny's (1994) social relations model (SRM). Specifically, for each domain or facet, I examined liking of

the PD trait as a function of the type of perception (i.e., own perception vs. meta-perception; *perceiver effect*) and target of perception (i.e., perceiver vs. others; *target effect*) before looking at the relation between individual differences in these effects and the participant's own level of the same trait.

The previously described analyses operationalize personality pathology as assessed using scores on the PID-5, a dimensional measure of maladaptive traits. However, it is possible that an egosyntonic view of PD would find better support when personality pathology is examined in terms of categorical self-identification. For example, an individual with a high PID-5 Impulsivity score, either relatively or absolutely, may or may not have insight into their own impulsive traits. In an additional, exploratory set of analyses, I operationalized maladaptive traits by asking participants to self-identify their core or "cardinal" trait (Allport, 1937). Analyses described above were repeated examining the relationship of this identification to trait liking.

Hypotheses and planned analyses were pre-registered on the Open Science Framework (OSF; https://osf.io/wbxaz/?view_only=0ef97ec4558441679a018bc6dcdb22cb). Data and syntax sufficient for reproduction of analyses are also available on the OSF (https://osf.io/42my7/?view_only=2d6a00e6b22b4c2f883db095ea50bc6d).

CHAPTER 2

METHODS

Procedure

Potential participants were recruited for a two-part study via Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Enrollment was limited to individuals 18 or older and living in the United States who had a HIT approval rate of 99% or better and more than 100 previously approved HITs[1]. All study procedures were approved by the relevant institutional review boards. Participants used Qualtrics to complete questionnaires at the location of their choosing. All participants provided electronic informed consent and had the chance to email the researchers to ask any clarifying questions.

Part 1

After reading a short description of the study, potential participants provided informed consent to participate in the first part of the study. Immediately following consent, two "botcha" questions were administered following the advice of Littrell (personal communication, October 2020). These items were designed to be difficult for both bots and individuals who are not fluent in written English.[2] To proceed to the survey, participants were required to pass both checks. Participants received $1.00 for completion of a survey addressing demographic information, personality, personal beliefs, and behaviors. Measures relevant to the present study included the

[1] This was a deviation from pre-registration (i.e., > 500 HITs) made to improve speed of recruitment.
[2] In the interest of preserving the utility of these items for future MTurk research their content is not listed here but is available upon request.

Iowa Personality Disorder Screen (IPDS; Langbehn et al., 1999) and items assessing the self-perceived likability of maladaptive personality traits.

Part 2

Individuals providing attentive, quality responses (e.g., passing "botcha" checks, completing captcha; see *Sample*) to Part 1 were invited to participate in a follow-up approximately one week later. As in Part 1, participants read a short description of the study and proceeded to a Qualtrics survey to provide consent. Participants received $2.00 for the completion of additional surveys addressing demographic information, personality, personal beliefs, and behaviors (i.e., $3.00 overall). The two-part study protocol was employed to minimize potential reactivity through temporal separation of likability ratings for self-perceived maladaptive personality traits and formal assessment of these same traits. Participants also provided additional likability ratings (i.e., other-perception, meta-perception) at this time.

Sample

A total of 799 participants completed Part 1.[3] Following pre-registered criteria[4] for data exclusion, I removed 256 responses (32.04% of the initial sample) for one or more of the following indicators of invalidity or inattention: incomplete responding (< 50% of questions answered; $n = 1$); rushing (responses completed in less than three minutes; $n = 3$); inattention (failure to respond as requested to embedded attention check; $n = 15$); invalid response style on the embedded Elemental Psychopathy Assessment (EPA; Lynam et al., 2011) Infrequency or

[3] Due to errors in study set-up, some participants were able to attempt or complete Part 1 more than once (i.e., allowing for multiple tries to pass "botcha" items). Of the 979 responses which could be matched with a submitted HIT (i.e., 803 unique participants), 708 were associated with one attempt to complete Part 1. 51 HITs were associated with two attempts, 22 with three attempts, 10 with four, five with five, five with six, and one HIT was associated with eight attempts. No attempts could be located for one participant. Only data from a participant's most complete attempt was retained. In the case of multiple equally complete attempts, the first of these was retained.

[4] Data exclusion deviated from pre-registration in the following ways: 1) an embedded attention check item was used and 2) the writing prompt was changed during the study due to the identification of excessive plagiarized responses to the original prompt (i.e., exact text from the first page of Google search results for the prompt).

Virtue scales (i.e., EPA Infrequency ≥ 4 or EPA Virtue ≥ 3; *n* = 129); and failure to provide a coherent response to a brief writing prompt (*n* = 220). Part 2 was made available to the remaining 543[5] participants approximately one week after completion of Part 1. Approximately 86% (*n* = 467) of eligible participants completed Part 2. Sixty-six responses were removed based on incompleteness (*n* = 3), rushing (*n* = 3), inattention (*n* = 15), inconsistency between Part 1 and Part 2 (i.e., discrepancies in demographic information; *n* = 50), or lack of variance on PID-5 items (*n* = 6).[6]

The remaining 401 participants had a mean age of 40.67 (*SD* = 12.35) and reported gender as female (*n* = 201, 50.12%), male (*n* = 198, 49.38%), or non-binary/third gender (*n* = 2, 0.50%). One (0.25%) participant identified as transgender. Participants reported race as one or more of the following: White (*n* = 337, 84.04%); Asian (*n* = 51, 12.72%); Black or African American (*n* = 26, 6.48%); American Indian or Alaskan Native (*n* = 3, 0.75%); Other (*n* = 3, 0.75%; e.g., "Hispanic," "Latino," "Indigenous Mexican"). Participants also reported on their ethnicity (i.e., "Do you consider yourself to be Hispanic or Latino?"; Yes, *n* = 23, 5.74%) and sexual orientation (heterosexual: *n* = 353, 88.03%; gay: *n* = 6, 1.50%; lesbian: *n* = 4, 1.00%; bisexual: *n* = 34, 8.48%; questioning or unsure: *n* = 1, 0.25%; other [i.e., "asexual," "queer"]: *n* = 3, 0.75%). The median delay between completion of the two surveys was 8.81 days (range = 6.54 to 121.58).

[5] An error occurred in which a participant who was ineligible due to a failed attention check was allowed to complete Part 2. Their response is excluded.
[6] Lack of variance on PID-5 items was not a pre-registered exclusion criterion.

Measures

Iowa Personality Disorder Screen

The IPDS is a brief instrument which screens for general symptoms of a personality disorder. Following recommendations from Langbehn and colleagues (1999) for the maximization of specificity, endorsement of three or more criteria out of seven IPDS items (#1, 3-8) was considered indicative of personality pathology. The IPDS was administered to ensure that the sample was enriched for personality pathology (i.e., one-third or greater). Following the pre-registered data collection plan, the distribution of IPDS scores was examined after collection of 200 valid participants (50% of intended sample) to determine whether quota sampling would be necessary to reach this benchmark. As expected from prior data collection using MTurk (Sleep et al., 2022), no alteration to our sampling plan was necessitated by this check. The final sample contained 125 participants (31.17% of sample) who scored ≥ 3 on the IPDS.

Personality Inventory for DSM-5

The PID-5 is a self-report assessment of pathological personality traits (i.e., facets) across the domains of Negative Affect, Detachment, Antagonism, Disinhibition, and Psychoticism. Each item (e.g., *"I often make up things about myself to help me get what I want"*) is rated on a four-point Likert scale (0 – Very False or Often False; 1 – Sometimes or Somewhat False; 2 – Sometimes or Somewhat True; 3 – Very True or Often True). A 100-item short-version of the PID-5 (Maples et al., 2015) was administered during Part 2. Although the PID-5 provides scores for 25 traits, only the 15 which contribute to domain scoring as articulated in the official scoring recommendations (American Psychiatric Association [APA], 2013) will be used in analyses: Emotional Lability, Anxiousness, Separation Insecurity, Withdrawal, Anhedonia, Intimacy Avoidance, Manipulativeness, Deceitfulness, Grandiosity, Irresponsibility, Impulsivity,

Distractibility, Unusual Beliefs, Eccentricity, and Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations. Reliability for the PID-5 was acceptable (domain-level α range = .92 to .95[7]; facet-level α range = .64 to .94).

Trait Perceptions

Participants were presented with the names and descriptions of the 15 personality traits (facets) which contribute to domain scoring on the PID-5. Trait descriptions were derived from the DSM-5 Clinicians' Personality Trait Rating Form (APA, 2010) and modified to increase lay understanding (e.g., emotional lability originally defined as, "unstable emotional experiences and frequent mood changes; emotions that are easily aroused, intense, and/or out of proportion to events and circumstance," and modified as "unstable emotions and frequent mood changes; emotions that are intense and out of control"). This modified measure was successfully used by Sleep and colleagues (2019).

For each trait, participants answered four questions regarding likability on a scale from 1 (Strongly Dislike) to 7 (Strongly Like). Two questions addressed the participant's own perceptions of the trait:1) *"How much do you like TRAIT in yourself?"* (Liking in Self; S/S) in Part 1; and 2) *"How much do you like TRAIT in others?* (Liking in Others; S/O) in Part 2. The other two questions (both in Part 2) assessed meta-perceptions of trait likability: 3) *"How much do you think other people like TRAIT in themselves?"* (Perception of Others Liking in Self; O/S) and 4) *"How much do you think other people like TRAIT in others?"* (Perception of Others Liking in Others; O/O). Instructions specified that all questions referred to liking of an *elevation* in the trait, not its absence or reverse. For ratings of likability in oneself (i.e., S/S), participants were asked to select "N/A" for traits which they did not perceive themselves to have.

[7] Calculated as the reliability of a linear composite following Nunnally (1978).

Trait Cardinality

In Part 2, participants also indicated which (if any) of the 15 facets was their cardinal trait, as defined by Allport (1937):

> In every personality there are traits of major significance and traits of minor significance. Occasionally some trait is so pervasive and so outstanding in a life that it deserves to be called the cardinal trait. It is so dominant that there are few activities that cannot be traced directly or indirectly to its influence. (pp. 337-338)

Analytic Plan

First, I performed bivariate analyses (i.e., correlations) to examine the relations between self-rated pathological personality traits (i.e., PID-5 domains and facets) and liking of maladaptive traits in self and others as well as with perceptions of others' liking of those traits in themselves and others. Both convergent and divergent relations were examined. Next, I compared mean likability ratings for each perceiver/target combination (i.e., S/S, S/O, O/S, and O/O) in those with high (i.e., ≥ 1 SD above sample mean) scores on the rated trait versus the rest of the sample using independent *t*-tests ($p \leq .001$)[8]. Similar analyses were conducted to compare mean ratings between those who endorsed a trait as "cardinal" and the rest of the sample.

Finally, to examine perception of the likability of maladaptive personality traits across perceiver and target, I estimated multilevel structural equation models (MSEMs). Specifically, for each trait, I estimated a two-level model with random effects. Bayesian estimation was used to decompose within- and between-subjects variance and to provide standardized effect estimates. At Level 1, I simultaneously regressed likability rating (*liking*) on *perceiver* (self vs. other), *target* (self vs. other), and the *perceiver* × *target* interaction. A random intercept was

[8] A more stringent alpha value than that specified in pre-registration (i.e., $\alpha = .01$) was employed for correlations and *t*-tests to reduce Type I error inherent when conducting large numbers of comparisons.

included to model the between-subjects mean of *liking* and random slopes to model individual differences in perceiver (*liking* ON *perceiver; PE*) and target effects (*liking* ON *target; TE*) and their interaction (*liking* ON *perceiver* × *target; IE*). At Level 2, I regressed the random intercept (i.e., between-subjects mean) of *liking* and individual differences in within-person effects (i.e., random slopes; *PE, TE,* and *IE*) on *trait level* (i.e., PID-5 facet or domain; Model 1). I additionally estimated similar MSEMs for the effect of trait cardinality on liking (Model 2), replacing PID-5 score at Level 2 with cardinality (yes/no). Effects with a 95% credibility interval excluding zero were interpreted as significant.[9]

MSEMs were estimated using Mplus (Version 8.7; Muthén & Muthén, 2021). Representative syntax is presented in Appendix A. All other data manipulation including cleaning, recoding, and other substantive analyses was conducted using R (Version 4.2.1; R Core Team, 2022)[10] and RStudio (Version 2022.07.1+554; Rstudio Team, 2022).

Power Analysis

The sample size of 401 substantially exceeds the minimum recommendations for stable estimates of correlations (n = 250; Schönbrodt & Perugini, 2013) and provides 77.45% power to detect correlations as small as .20 at α = .001 (or 92.94% at α = .01). Assuming normality of PID-5 scores within the sample, approximately 64 participants (~16%) should fall one or more standard deviations above the mean. Thus, for *t*-tests comparing mean likability ratings for individuals high in a trait and all other participants, this sample provides 63.74% power (or

[9] Deviation from pre-registered alpha (i.e., α = .01) due to the unavailability of 99% credibility intervals for Bayesian estimates for Level 1 effects in Mplus output.

[10] The following packages were employed in addition to base R: *interactions* (Version 1.1.5; Long, 2019), *lme4* (Version 1.1-30; Bates et al., 2015), *lmerTest* (Version 3.1-3; Kuznetsova et al., 2017), *Matrix* (Version 1.4-1; Bates et al., 2022), *matrixStats* (Version 0.62.0; Bengtsson, 2022), *MplusAutomation* (Version 1.1.0; Hallquist & Wiley, 2018), *psych* (Version 2.2.5; Revelle, 2022), *pwr* (Version 1.3-0; Champely, 2020), and *tidyverse* (Version 1.3.1, Wickham et al., 2019).

85.90% at $\alpha = .01$) to detect medium size ($d = .50$) effects. Assuming a uniform distribution across trait cardinality, approximately 25 participants should endorse each trait (or the "*None of the above*" option), providing 71.11% power (or 90.00% at $\alpha = .01$) to detect large differences ($d = .80$) in mean likability ratings for participants with and without that cardinal trait. The Level 2 sample size (i.e., participants) is also appropriate for MSEM, exceeding minimum recommendations for unbiased standard errors (Maas & Hox, 2005).

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Before running substantive analyses all variables were examined for violations of normality (i.e., skew > 2; kurtosis ≥ 7). PID-5 Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations; S/O Antagonism, Manipulativeness, Deceitfulness, Grandiosity, and Irresponsibility; O/S Anhedonia; and O/O Antagonism, Manipulativeness, Deceitfulness, and Irresponsibility were transformed logarithmically, adding a constant (i.e., + 1) where necessary to avoid log(0).[11] S/O Manipulativeness, S/O Deceitfulness, and O/O Deceitfulness continued to violate normality assumptions after transformation. Descriptive statistics for all variables are presented in Appendix B and correlations among trait liking ratings are presented in Appendix C.

Correlations Between Self-Reported Maladaptive Personality Trait Domains and Trait Liking

To examine relations between self-reported levels of personality pathology and liking of maladaptive traits in self and others (and meta-perceptions thereof), I first conducted a series of correlation analyses. Both convergent (e.g., PID-5 Negative Affect and liking of Negative Affect) and divergent (e.g., PID-5 Antagonism and liking of Disinhibition) correlations were calculated for all liking ratings (i.e., S/S, S/O, O/S, and O/O) for a total of 1,600 tests. Although correlations between different facets within the same trait domain were conducted, in the following text, "divergent" refers to an association between a PID-5 facet score from one domain with a facet liking rating from another domain (e.g., PID-5 Eccentricity with liking of

[11] These transformations were not pre-registered but are standard for assuring data conforms to normality assumptions.

Grandiosity) unless otherwise specified (i.e., "within-domain divergent correlation"; e.g., PID-5 Manipulativeness and liking of Grandiosity).

Liking in Self (S/S)

At the domain level (Table 1), moderate correlations were observed between liking of Antagonism (r = .49) and Psychoticism (r = .36) in oneself and PID-5 scores in these domains. A small convergent correlation also emerged for Disinhibition (r = .20). Self-reported trait levels were unassociated with liking Negative Affect (r = -.01, p = .903) and the small association for Detachment did not reach stringent criteria for statistical significance (r = .16, p = .002). Several divergent relations were also observed, the largest of which was between PID-5 Psychoticism and S/S Antagonism (r = .31). S/S Antagonism was also related to PID-5 Disinhibition (r = .25) and Detachment (r = .20); S/S Negative Affect was related to Antagonism (r = .22) and Psychoticism (r = .19); and S/S Disinhibition was related to Psychoticism (r = .24).

At the facet level (Table 2), the median convergent r was .22 (range = -.09 to .46). Moderate sized convergent correlations emerged for Withdrawal, Manipulativeness, Deceitfulness, Grandiosity, and Eccentricity (rs = .33 to .46). Smaller significant associations were observed for Intimacy Avoidance, Irresponsibility, Impulsivity, and Unusual Beliefs (rs = .21 to .28). Overall, a median r of .12 (range = -.06 to .34) was observed for divergent correlations, with the largest relation between PID-5 Eccentricity and S/S Grandiosity. The only significant relation observed for PID-5 Separation Insecurity was a negative divergent correlation with S/S Withdrawal (r = -.18). PID-5 Distractibility also had only a single significant divergent correlation with S/S Grandiosity (r = .24). For PID-5 Anxiousness, no significant relations with liking of maladaptive traits in oneself were observed.

Liking in Others (S/O)

At the domain level (Table 1), all convergent associations between PID-5 scores and liking of maladaptive traits in others showed moderate-to-large effects (*r*s = .24 [Negative Affect] to .50 [Psychoticism]). PID-5 Disinhibition and Psychoticism scores were associated with liking of all maladaptive trait domains in others. PID-5 Antagonism was not significantly associated with S/O Detachment (r = .14, p = .005). PID-5 Negative Affect and Detachment did not have any significant divergent associations.

A similar pattern was seen at the facet level (Table 3), with most convergent correlations evidencing small-to-moderate significant effects (median r = .26, range = .15 to .46). However, the correlation between PID-5 Anxiousness and S/O Anxiousness was not significant (r = .15, p = .002). Most divergent associations were small-to-moderate in size (median r = .14, range = -.05 to .38) with the largest effect for the association of participants' Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations scores and liking Grandiosity in others.

Perception of Others Liking in Self (O/S)

At the domain level (Table 4), self-reported trait levels of Psychoticism were moderately associated with the perception of others liking this trait in themselves (r = .31). Smaller, non-significant convergent associations were seen for Antagonism (r = .15, p = .003) and Disinhibition (r = .14, p = .004). No significant convergent relations were seen between PID-5 Negative Affect or Detachment and perception of others liking the same traits in themselves. However, PID-5 Negative Affect had small correlations with meta-perception of liking Antagonism (r = .17) and Psychoticism (r = .19) in oneself and PID-5 Detachment was associated with O/S Psychoticism (r = .16). PID-5 Antagonism and Disinhibition had small associations with meta-perception of all other domains (*rs* = .14 to .26, *p*s < .01). PID-5

Psychoticism was associated with meta-perceptions of liking for all domains except Antagonism (r = .12, p = .013).

At the facet level (Table 5), significant convergent relations between maladaptive trait scores and O/S liking ratings were only observed for Unusual Beliefs, Eccentricity, and Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations (median convergent r = .11, range = -.01 to .23). No convergent relations (or within-domain divergent relations) were observed for Detachment facets. Both Antagonism and Disinhibition exhibited a single within-domain effect: PID-5 Manipulativeness with O/S Grandiosity (r = .17) and PID-5 Irrationality with O/S Distractibility (r = .20). PID-5 Negative Affect had two within-domain effects, both of which were with PID-5 Emotionality Lability (rs = .19 and .17, with O/S Anxiousness and Separation Insecurity, respectively). Overall, a median divergent r of .12 (range = -.04 to .37) was observed. Among all facet level correlations between maladaptive trait scores and meta-perceptions of liking in oneself (i.e., O/S ratings), the largest observed effect was the divergent association between PID-5 Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations and O/S Anxiousness (r = .37). No significant facet level associations with meta-perceptions of self-liking were observed for PID-5 Separation Anxiety, Withdrawal, Anhedonia, or Intimacy Avoidance.

Perception of Others Liking in Others (O/O)

At the domain level (Table 4), small-to-moderate convergent associations between self-reported maladaptive traits and meta-perceptions of others liking of these traits in others emerged for Negative Affect (r = .18), Antagonism (r = .24), Disinhibition (r = .32), and Psychoticism (r = .29). PID-5 Detachment did not exhibit any significant effects (rs = .08 to .15, ps > .001). PID-5 Negative Affect, Antagonism and Disinhibition had divergent relations with O/O ratings in all domains (rs = .17 to .25) except Detachment (rs = .03 to .14, ps > .001). PID-5 Psychoticism was

related to the perception of others liking all other maladaptive trait domains in others (*r*s = .16 to .31).

At the facet level (Table 6), the median convergent *r* was .15 (range = .01 to .25). Small effects were observed for all convergent and within-domain divergent correlations among Disinhibition facets (*rs* = .15 to .27, *p*s > .01). Similar effects were seen in the divergent relations between PID-5 Psychoticism facets and perceptions of others' liking of Disinhibition facets in others (*r*s = .13 to .29, *p*s > .01). In contrast, no relations with O/O ratings were observed for PID-5 Withdrawal or PID-5 Intimacy Avoidance at a stringent alpha (*p*s > .001) and PID-5 Anhedonia was only associated with O/O Grandiosity (*r* = .16). Overall, a median *r* of .12 (range = -.05 to .30) was observed for divergent correlations.

Mean Comparison of Trait Likability Ratings

Trait liking ratings (i.e., S/S, S/O, O/S, and O/O) were compared between individuals with high (i.e., ≥ 1 SD above sample mean) PID-5 scores on the convergent trait and the rest of the sample. Observed mean differences were considered to reflect greater *liking* of maladaptive personality traits (rather than merely greater *tolerance*) in individuals with greater levels of personality pathology when the group's mean liking rating exceeded the scale midpoint (i.e., 4.00).

Trait Level and Likability

At the domain level (Table 7), a large mean difference (*d* = 1.15) in ratings of liking Antagonism in oneself (S/S Antagonism) was observed between individuals with high (i.e., ≥ 1 SD above mean) PID-5 scores in this trait domain and the rest of the sample. Smaller effects were observed for S/S Psychoticism (*d* = 0.66) and S/S Disinhibition (*d* = 0.47). Mean differences in liking of pathological personality traits in others (i.e., S/O) emerged between high

PID-5 scores and the rest of the sample for all five domains. These effects ranged in size from medium (S/O Negative Affect d = .43; S/O Disinhibition d = .68; S/O Detachment d = .70) to large (S/O Antagonism d = 1.13; S/O Psychoticism d = 1.13). A significant difference in the perception of others liking maladaptive traits in themselves (i.e., O/S) between individuals with high trait levels and the rest of the sample was only observed for Psychoticism (d = 0.65). Medium-sized differences in mean meta-perception ratings of others liking maladaptive trait domains in others (i.e., O/O) emerged for Antagonism (d = .63), Disinhibition (d = .64), and Psychoticism (d = .67). Except for S/S Psychoticism (M high = 4.56 vs. M other = 3.57) and S/O Psychoticism (M high = 4.48 vs. M other = 3.01), these differences reflected greater tolerance rather than liking of the pathological traits.

At the facet level (Table 8), Unusual Beliefs was the only trait for which a high level was associated with a significantly greater mean for all liking ratings (i.e., S/S, S/O, O/S, and O/O; ds = .44 to .876. The largest mean differences in liking ratings were observed for S/S Manipulativeness (d = 1.04) and S/S Eccentricity (d = 1.00). Individuals with high PID-5 scores in Withdrawal, Intimacy Avoidance, Deceitfulness, Grandiosity, Impulsivity, and Unusual Beliefs also reported rated these traits as more likable in themselves (i.e., S/S) than did than the remainder of the sample (ds = .53 to .99). For S/S Anxiousness, this effect was in the opposite direction, reflecting *less* liking of this trait in oneself for individuals with high trait levels versus others (d = -0.41). Although the difference for Separation Insecurity did not reach our stringent significance criteria (d = .45, p = .002), Anxiousness was also the only facet for which there appeared to be no group difference in liking the trait in others (d = -.05, p = .689). For the remaining 13 facets, individuals with high levels of the trait provided higher mean ratings of likability of the trait in others (i.e., S/O; ds = .46 to .95). For meta-perceptions of liking of

pathological trait facets in self (i.e., O/S) or others (i.e., O/O), the observed mean differences between participant with high trait levels and the remainder of the sample were mostly null to medium in size (O/S mean d = .24; O/O mean d = .30). Regarding differences indicative of absolute liking, rather than mere tolerance or *relative* liking, mean comparison revealed that individuals with high PID-5 Withdrawal scores liked this trait in themselves (as compared to the rest of the sample, d = .62). High PID-5 Unusual Beliefs and Eccentricity scores were each associated with liking of the trait in self and others as well as meta-perception of others liking the trait in themselves (Unusual Beliefs ds = .53 to .86; Eccentricity ds = .53 to 1.00). On average, individuals with high levels of Grandiosity perceived others as liking grandiosity in themselves (O/S; M = 4.26) but not significantly more so than the remainder of the sample (M = 3.72, p = .043).

Trait Cardinality and Likability

Comparison of trait liking ratings were also conducted based on self-identification with pathological personality traits or endorsement of a trait as "cardinal" (Allport, 1937). Overall, 74.81% of the sample (n = 300) identified their cardinal trait among the fifteen trait facets examined. The most endorsed cardinal traits were Anxiousness (n = 79, 19.70%) and Withdrawal (n = 69, 17.21%). The thirteen remaining traits each characterized 0.25% (n = 1; Deceitfulness) to 5.99% (n = 24; Eccentricity) of the sample. Aggregated by domain, facets of Negative Affect were the most endorsed as cardinal (n = 100, 24.94%) followed by those of Detachment (n = 91, 22.69%), Psychoticism (n = 56, 13.97%) Disinhibition (n = 42, 10.47%), and Antagonism (n = 11, 2.74%).

At the domain level (Table 9), a large difference in mean S/S Antagonism ratings was observed such that individuals with cardinal traits in this domain showed relatively greater liking

of Antagonism in themselves than did the rest of the sample (d = 1.05). A relative effect was also observed for having a cardinal Detachment trait and liking of Detachment in others (d = .50). Individuals with cardinal traits in the Psychoticism domain evidenced relative and absolute liking of this trait in self and others (ds = .98 and 1.07, respectively). No domain-level effects were observed for trait cardinality and meta-perceptions of liking.

At the facet level (Table 10), the largest difference emerged between individuals with Manipulativeness as their cardinal trait versus the rest of the sample in liking the trait in oneself (i.e., S/S; d = 1.55). Other large differences were seen for S/S and S/O Unusual Beliefs (ds = 1.36 and 1.26, respectively), S/S Impulsivity (d = 1.01), S/S Eccentricity (d = .98), and S/S Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations (d = .96). Smaller differences emerged for S/O Eccentricity (d = .78) and S/S Withdrawal (d = .53). All these comparisons reflected true liking (i.e., mean liking rating greater than 4) in the cardinal group. Tolerance (i.e., relative liking) was observed for S/O Impulsivity (d = .70). No effects were observed for trait cardinality and meta-perceptions of liking at α = .001. However, individuals with Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations as their cardinal trait provided meta-perceptions of others liking this trait in others (M = 3.23) that were greater than those ratings for the rest of the sample (M = 2.26) at a more relaxed significance criterion (d = .75, p = .008).

Multilevel Structural Equation Modeling

Bayesian estimation was used to provide standardized values for multilevel structural equation models (MSEMs) of trait liking based on Kenny's (1994) SRM. Two models were examined per trait, including at Level 2 either dimensional personality pathology (i.e., PID-5 score) or categorical self-identification with a pathological cardinal trait. Except where otherwise noted, effect sizes are reported from models including PID-5 score at Level 2.

Within-Subjects (Level 1)

As shown in Table 11, all domain-level perceiver effects (*PE*) were significant at a 95% credibility interval (CI). For models of liking Negative Affect, Detachment, and Psychoticism this effect was positive (βs = .13 to .33), representing providing higher liking ratings when reporting on one's own perceptions. Negative effects were seen for Antagonism and Disinhibition (βs = -.11 and -.16, respectively), meaning that participants tended to rate these traits as more likable when taking the perspective of another (i.e., meta-perception). Positive target effects (*TE*) were observed for Detachment, Antagonism, Disinhibition, and Psychoticism (βs = .14 to .88), suggesting that individuals tend to find these traits more likeable in themselves than others and believe that others feel similarly. *TE* was not significant for Negative Affect (β = -.01, 95% CI = -.05, .02). *IE* was significant for all trait domains, suggesting that perception of likability is a function of both perceiver and target, but effects were uniformly small (βs = -.10 to .09). To probe the nature of these significant interactions, mixed effects models including random intercepts of liking were estimated using the R package *lme4* (Version 1.1-30; Bates et al., 2015) and simple slopes analyses were conducted using the *interactions* packages (Version 1.1.5; Long, 2019; see Appendix D).[12]

At the facet level, *PE* was significant for all traits except Emotional Lability and Irresponsibility.[13] The strongest positive effect for *PE* was observed for Anhedonia (β = .52) such that taking one's own perspective when providing ratings of this trait was associated with over one-quarter standard deviation increase in liking. The strongest negative effect was

[12] This set of analyses was not pre-registered.
[13] In the model including trait cardinality at Level 2, *PE* for Deceitfulness was not significant (β = -.03, 95% CI = -0.07, 0.01).

observed for Grandiosity (β = -.41). *TE* was significant for 12 of 15 facet-level traits[14]. Except for Anhedonia (β = -.36) and Anxiousness (β = -.14), all these effects were positive. Facets of Antagonism showed especially large effects with nearly one standard deviation boosts to liking of a trait in oneself (or the meta-perception thereof; βs = .65 to .89). Apart from a large effect for Anhedonia (β = .45, 95% C.I. = .40, .50), *IE*s at the facet level were similar in magnitude to those observed for trait domains (median β = -.01; range = -.16 to .45). Using mixed effects models to probe the nature of the Anhedonia interaction effect, significant simple slopes were observed in three of four perceiver × target conditions. A moderating effect of target on the association of liking and perceiver was seen such that *PE* was enhanced when the target was self (simple slope = .82, $p < .001$) versus other (simple slope = .08, $p = .002$). Moderation of *TE* by perceiver was also observed such that a significant effect was observed for meta-perception (simple slope = -.73, $p < .001$) but not for one's own liking of Anhedonia (simple slope = .00, $p = .969$).

Significant between-subjects variability was observed in all estimated paths as demonstrated by significant random effects (see Table 12 for fixed and random effects in unstandardized models).

Between-Subjects (Level 2)

Level 2 relations among effects from within-subjects models of trait liking (i.e., *PE*, *TE*, *IE*, and the latent mean *liking*) and between-subjects measures of personality pathology (i.e., PID-5 scores and cardinality) are summarized in Table 13. The direction of effects was largely consistent between model pairs as well as between and among domains and their constituent facets. However, fewer effects reached significance in the cardinality models, likely due to the

[14] In the model including trait cardinality at Level 2, *TE* for Intimacy Avoidance was significant (β = .06, 95% CI = .02 to .10).

switch from a continuous score with an approximately normal distribution to a zero-inflated (i.e., > 80%) binary variable. A positive association between the perceiver effect (*PE*) and participant personality pathology was observed for the domains of Detachment, Antagonism, and Psychoticism and several of their constituent facets. For Negative Affect and its constituent facets of Anxiousness and Separation Insecurity *TE* and PID-5 scores were negatively associated (not significant for Emotional Lability). This effect was also significant in the negative direction for PID-5 Anhedonia, Disinhibition, Distractibility as well as for Intimacy Avoidance as a cardinal trait. For Antagonism and its facets, a positive relation was observed. Relations between personality pathology and *IE* were largely null with the largest effect size for PID-5 Grandiosity (β = .16). The latent mean of trait perception ratings (*liking)* was positively associated with PID-5 scores (βs = .11 to .37) for all domains as well as in several facet models. Associations also emerged between individual differences in *liking* and between-person estimates of SRM path strength. Most notable of these were the medium-to-large correlations observed between *liking* and *TE* for Antagonism and its facets (βs = .54 to .91), suggesting that the robust target effects were particularly strong in those who held this trait in higher favor across the different ratings. Within the Negative Affect, Detachment, Disinhibition, and Psychoticism domains, individual differences in *PE, TE*, and *IE* exhibited mostly moderate-to-large positive correlations with one another (domain *r*s = .38 to .82, facet *rs* = .05 [n.s.] to .97). For Antagonism and its facets, *PE* and *IE* showed a large positive correlation (*rs* = .78 to .98), however, *TE* had small-to-moderate negative associations with the other within-person liking effects (*r*s = -.35 to -.12).

Table 1

Correlations between Self-Reported Pathological Personality Trait Domains and Liking of Pathological Trait Domains

	Liking in Self (S/S)					Liking in Others (S/O)				
Self-Reported Trait Level	NA	DET	ANT	DIS	PSY	NA	DET	ANT	DIS	PSY
Negative Affect (NA)	-0.01	-0.04	*0.17*	0.10	0.05	**0.24**	0.11	*0.13*	*0.14*	*0.13*
Detachment (DET)	0.02	*0.16*	**0.20**	0.09	0.12	0.09	**0.38**	0.10	0.08	*0.16*
Antagonism (ANT)	**0.22**	0.10	**0.49**	0.13	*0.17*	**0.20**	*0.14*	**0.44**	**0.22**	**0.20**
Disinhibition (DIS)	0.13	0.05	**0.25**	**0.20**	0.14	**0.28**	**0.21**	**0.29**	**0.33**	**0.22**
Psychoticism (PSY)	**0.19**	0.08	**0.31**	**0.24**	**0.36**	**0.31**	**0.27**	**0.33**	**0.32**	**0.50**

Note. **Bolded** correlation coefficients are significant at $p \leq .001$. *Italicized* correlation coefficients are significant at $p < .01$. Convergent correlations are represented on the diagonals.

Table 2

Correlations between Self-Reported Maladaptive Personality Trait Facets and Liking of Maladaptive Trait Facets in Oneself

Self-Reported Trait Level	Liking in Self (S/S)														
	EMO	ANX	SEP	WDL	ANH	INT	MNP	DCT	GRA	IRR	IMP	DST	UNB	ECC	CPA
EMO	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.10	0.09	*0.15*	*0.17*	*0.20*	**0.25**	**0.18**	*0.17*	0.14	0.13	0.14	0.11
ANX	-0.07	-0.09	-0.07	0.08	0.00	0.07	0.13	*0.19*	0.15	0.10	0.07	0.00	0.10	0.10	0.06
SEP	0.06	-0.06	-0.02	**-0.18**	-0.01	-0.06	0.08	0.11	0.13	0.07	0.12	0.00	0.00	-0.03	-0.02
WDL	-0.02	0.04	0.07	**0.33**	0.12	**0.29**	0.09	*0.18*	**0.21**	0.11	0.00	0.10	*0.17*	0.15	0.13
ANH	0.02	-0.02	0.03	0.05	0.05	**0.21**	*0.18*	**0.25**	*0.20*	*0.17*	0.01	0.07	0.12	0.10	0.11
INT	0.00	0.03	0.09	*0.15*	0.07	**0.28**	0.08	0.15	0.13	0.12	0.01	0.09	0.10	0.05	0.11
MNP	0.11	0.08	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.05	**0.43**	**0.34**	**0.37**	0.10	0.07	0.05	*0.16*	0.12	**0.20**
DCT	*0.17*	*0.15*	0.09	0.13	*0.17*	*0.16*	**0.40**	**0.38**	**0.39**	0.15	0.13	0.09	**0.19**	0.15	**0.20**
GRA	**0.26**	**0.28**	**0.23**	0.10	**0.29**	**0.21**	**0.31**	**0.22**	**0.46**	**0.19**	0.01	0.14	0.03	0.06	0.12
IRR	0.15	0.12	0.10	0.05	**0.20**	**0.19**	**0.22**	*0.18*	**0.30**	**0.21**	*0.18*	**0.19**	**0.22**	*0.16*	*0.17*
IMP	0.12	0.09	0.14	0.08	0.12	0.07	**0.23**	*0.17*	**0.30**	0.13	**0.25**	0.09	*0.17*	*0.15*	0.14
DST	0.05	0.04	0.09	0.10	0.14	0.13	0.12	0.15	**0.24**	*0.18*	*0.18*	0.08	0.10	0.11	0.07
UNB	**0.21**	*0.15*	0.02	0.06	0.11	0.06	0.15	0.15	**0.23**	**0.18**	**0.21**	0.08	**0.22**	**0.19**	**0.21**
ECC	0.10	0.11	0.09	*0.17*	0.11	*0.17*	**0.28**	**0.31**	**0.34**	**0.19**	**0.28**	*0.16*	**0.43**	**0.45**	**0.37**
CPA	**0.25**	**0.19**	**0.19**	0.04	**0.20**	*0.17*	**0.21**	*0.16*	**0.23**	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.06	0.08	0.10

Note. **Bolded** correlation coefficients are significant at $p \leq .001$. *Italicized* correlation coefficients are significant at $p < .01$. Convergent correlations are represented on the diagonal. EMO = Emotional Lability, ANX = Anxiousness, SEP = Separation Insecurity, WDL = Withdrawal, ANH = Anhedonia, INT = Intimacy Avoidance, MNP = Manipulativeness, DCT = Deceitfulness, GRA = Grandiosity, IRR = Irresponsibility, IMP = Impulsivity, DST = Distractibility, UNB = Unusual Beliefs, ECC = Eccentricity, CPA = Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations.

Table 3

Correlations between Self-Reported Maladaptive Personality Trait Facets and Liking of Maladaptive Trait Facets in Others

Self-Reported Trait Level	Liking in Others (S/O)														
	EMO	ANX	SEP	WDL	ANH	INT	MNP	DCT	GRA	IRR	IMP	DST	UNB	ECC	CPA
EMO	**0.21**	**0.17**	**0.21**	*0.14*	0.08	0.10	*0.15*	0.13	*0.16*	*0.15*	*0.14*	*0.13*	**0.20**	0.11	**0.17**
ANX	0.05	*0.15*	*0.15*	*0.16*	0.09	0.11	0.02	-0.02	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.06	0.09	0.06	0.09
SEP	**0.16**	0.13	**0.20**	-0.04	0.03	-0.05	0.10	0.11	**0.18**	0.09	*0.14*	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.08
WDL	0.02	0.09	0.05	**0.30**	*0.16*	**0.38**	0.08	0.00	0.02	0.08	0.00	0.09	**0.17**	0.13	*0.14*
ANH	0.08	0.10	0.10	0.12	**0.24**	**0.25**	**0.17**	*0.15*	*0.15*	*0.14*	0.03	0.05	0.11	0.06	0.11
INT	0.02	0.02	0.06	**0.21**	**0.18**	**0.38**	0.05	0.07	0.03	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.12	0.07	0.10
MNP	0.11	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.05	**0.30**	**0.16**	**0.28**	*0.15*	**0.27**	0.05	**0.17**	**0.16**	*0.13*
DCT	***0.16***	0.12	0.11	*0.14*	0.12	**0.20**	**0.34**	**0.24**	**0.26**	**0.20**	**0.21**	0.06	**0.20**	**0.18**	**0.20**
GRA	**0.23**	*0.13*	0.11	0.04	0.07	*0.14*	**0.33**	**0.18**	**0.40**	**0.17**	0.10	0.05	0.12	0.03	0.09
IRR	**0.21**	**0.20**	**0.17**	**0.19**	0.12	**0.26**	**0.28**	**0.26**	**0.24**	**0.22**	**0.26**	**0.21**	**0.23**	**0.17**	**0.20**
IMP	**0.25**	**0.16**	**0.19**	*0.14*	0.04	0.08	**0.25**	**0.22**	**0.23**	**0.18**	**0.33**	*0.15*	**0.20**	**0.16**	**0.20**
DST	*0.14*	**0.17**	*0.15*	**0.16**	*0.14*	**0.18**	**0.18**	*0.14*	**0.16**	**0.18**	**0.20**	**0.23**	*0.14*	0.10	*0.14*
UNB	**0.31**	*0.15*	0.10	0.11	0.10	**0.17**	*0.16*	**0.18**	**0.31**	**0.27**	**0.19**	*0.15*	**0.34**	**0.21**	**0.40**
ECC	**0.18**	**0.20**	*0.15*	**0.26**	**0.17**	**0.30**	*0.16*	0.09	**0.19**	**0.19**	**0.24**	**0.19**	**0.50**	**0.46**	**0.47**
CPA	**0.30**	**0.22**	**0.21**	0.09	0.09	*0.13*	**0.27**	**0.30**	**0.38**	**0.27**	**0.21**	**0.17**	**0.18**	0.11	**0.26**

Note. **Bolded** correlation coefficients are significant at $p \leq .001$. *Italicized* correlation coefficients are significant at $p < .01$. Convergent correlations are represented on the diagonal. EMO = Emotional Lability, ANX = Anxiousness, SEP = Separation Insecurity, WDL = Withdrawal, ANH = Anhedonia, INT = Intimacy Avoidance, MNP = Manipulativeness, DCT = Deceitfulness, GRA = Grandiosity, IRR = Irresponsibility, IMP = Impulsivity, DST = Distractibility, UNB = Unusual Beliefs, ECC = Eccentricity, CPA = Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations.

Table 4

Correlations between Self-Reported Maladaptive Personality Trait Domains and Meta-Perceptions of Liking of Maladaptive Trait Domains

Self-Reported Trait Level	Perception of Others Liking in Self (O/S)					Perception of Others Liking in Others (O/O)				
	NA	DET	ANT	DIS	PSY	NA	DET	ANT	DIS	PSY
Negative Affect (NA)	0.12	0.10	**0.17**	0.10	**0.19**	**0.18**	0.03	**0.17**	**0.19**	**0.19**
Detachment (DET)	0.07	0.10	*0.13*	0.11	**0.16**	0.11	0.08	0.10	*0.15*	0.08
Antagonism (ANT)	**0.26**	**0.19**	*0.15*	*0.15*	*0.15*	**0.21**	*0.14*	**0.24**	**0.25**	**0.19**
Disinhibition (DIS)	**0.21**	**0.17**	**0.20**	*0.14*	**0.21**	**0.24**	*0.14*	**0.24**	**0.32**	**0.21**
Psychoticism (PSY)	**0.29**	**0.22**	0.12	**0.22**	**0.31**	**0.27**	**0.16**	**0.25**	**0.31**	**0.29**

Note. **Bolded** correlation coefficients are significant at $p \leq .001$. *Italicized* correlation coefficients are significant at $p < .01$. Convergent correlations are represented on the diagonals.

Table 5

Correlations between Self-Reported Maladaptive Personality Trait Facets and Meta-Perceptions of Liking of Maladaptive Trait Facets in Oneself

Self-Reported Trait Level	Perception of Others Liking in Self (O/S)														
	EMO	ANX	SEP	WDL	ANH	INT	MNP	DCT	GRA	IRR	IMP	DST	UNB	ECC	CPA
EMO	0.11	**0.19**	**0.17**	0.13	0.06	0.13	*0.15*	*0.14*	**0.17**	0.08	0.05	0.13	**0.17**	0.12	**0.18**
ANX	-0.01	-0.01	0.05	0.10	-0.04	0.07	*0.14*	*0.14*	**0.17**	0.04	0.10	0.03	*0.14*	*0.13*	0.12
SEP	0.11	*0.15*	0.11	-0.01	0.00	0.09	0.05	0.04	0.12	0.00	0.09	0.10	*0.14*	0.08	0.09
WDL	0.01	-0.01	0.09	0.04	0.02	0.08	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.07	0.05	0.10	0.09	0.09	*0.16*
ANH	0.05	0.06	0.09	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.11	*0.13*	*0.13*	0.05	0.09	0.05	*0.15*	*0.14*	0.12
INT	0.08	-0.01	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.10	0.06	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.10	0.13	0.05	0.09
MNP	**0.16**	0.12	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.12	*0.15*	*0.13*	**0.17**	0.08	0.13	0.06	**0.17**	0.10	0.11
DCT	0.12	*0.15*	**0.17**	*0.13*	*0.14*	*0.14*	0.12	0.11	*0.15*	0.10	0.09	*0.14*	**0.18**	0.11	**0.17**
GRA	**0.27**	**0.30**	**0.20**	*0.13*	0.10	0.11	0.03	0.04	0.11	0.12	0.02	*0.14*	0.06	-0.03	0.10
IRR	0.12	*0.16*	**0.17**	0.12	**0.16**	**0.16**	0.10	*0.13*	**0.16**	0.06	0.11	**0.20**	**0.19**	0.10	*0.15*
IMP	*0.15*	**0.18**	**0.22**	0.07	0.06	0.09	0.11	0.11	**0.17**	0.05	0.04	0.12	**0.20**	0.12	0.12
DST	0.08	*0.13*	*0.15*	0.13	*0.14*	0.10	**0.18**	**0.16**	**0.20**	0.09	0.09	*0.14*	**0.19**	**0.16**	0.13
UNB	**0.25**	**0.26**	**0.18**	*0.16*	**0.17**	*0.16*	0.00	0.03	0.09	*0.16*	0.07	**0.20**	**0.22**	0.11	**0.25**
ECC	0.13	0.10	*0.16*	*0.14*	0.05	*0.13*	0.11	**0.17**	*0.14*	*0.15*	*0.15*	0.11	**0.26**	**0.23**	**0.30**
CPA	**0.25**	**0.37**	**0.27**	*0.15*	*0.14*	0.10	0.03	0.08	0.08	**0.19**	0.06	**0.25**	**0.17**	0.06	**0.22**

Note. **Bolded** correlation coefficients are significant at $p \leq .001$. *Italicized* correlation coefficients are significant at $p < .01$. Convergent correlations are represented on the diagonal. EMO = Emotional Lability, ANX = Anxiousness, SEP = Separation Insecurity, WDL = Withdrawal, ANH = Anhedonia, INT = Intimacy Avoidance, MNP = Manipulativeness, DCT = Deceitfulness, GRA = Grandiosity, IRR = Irresponsibility, IMP = Impulsivity, DST = Distractibility, UNB = Unusual Beliefs, ECC = Eccentricity, CPA = Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations.

Table 6

Correlations between Self-Reported Maladaptive Personality Trait Facets and Meta-Perceptions of Liking of Maladaptive Trait Facets in Others

Self-Reported Trait Level	Perception of Others Liking in Others (O/O)														
	EMO	ANX	SEP	WDL	ANH	INT	MNP	DCT	GRA	IRR	IMP	DST	UNB	ECC	CPA
EMO	**0.19**	*0.16*	**0.19**	0.08	0.08	0.06	*0.15*	*0.14*	**0.18**	**0.17**	0.13	**0.17**	**0.21**	0.11	**0.18**
ANX	0.03	0.04	0.12	-0.01	-0.03	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.05	0.05	0.12	0.05	0.11	0.10	0.08
SEP	*0.13*	0.11	*0.13*	0.00	0.00	0.01	**0.18**	0.12	**0.21**	0.15	*0.14*	0.08	0.12	*0.14*	*0.13*
WDL	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.01	0.03	0.10	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.10	0.12	0.11	0.04	-0.02	0.12
ANH	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.02	0.09	0.07	0.06	0.05	**0.16**	0.07	*0.14*	0.11	*0.16*	0.09	0.09
INT	0.07	0.04	0.08	0.03	0.07	0.09	0.03	0.03	0.06	0.03	0.10	0.05	0.05	-0.05	0.07
MNP	0.11	0.11	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.09	0.10	0.04	**0.18**	**0.21**	**0.22**	0.10	*0.15*	0.09	*0.14*
DCT	*0.15*	0.11	*0.15*	0.09	0.09	0.11	**0.17**	0.12	**0.17**	**0.19**	**0.19**	0.10	**0.19**	0.12	**0.20**
GRA	**0.23**	**0.18**	0.07	0.07	0.11	0.10	**0.18**	*0.14*	**0.25**	**0.20**	0.06	*0.14*	0.09	0.05	0.12
IRR	**0.19**	**0.19**	0.12	0.09	*0.14*	*0.14*	**0.20**	**0.21**	**0.21**	**0.20**	**0.23**	**0.27**	**0.19**	0.09	**0.17**
IMP	**0.22**	**0.18**	*0.15*	0.09	0.10	0.07	0.11	*0.15*	**0.18**	**0.17**	*0.15*	**0.19**	**0.18**	*0.14*	**0.20**
DST	*0.13*	0.11	*0.14*	0.07	0.11	0.08	*0.15*	*0.15*	**0.17**	**0.19**	**0.19**	**0.24**	*0.16*	0.12	0.13
UNB	**0.28**	*0.15*	*0.14*	0.09	0.13	**0.18**	0.07	0.11	**0.26**	**0.26**	**0.18**	**0.21**	**0.17**	0.11	**0.29**
ECC	*0.16*	*0.15*	0.09	0.07	0.07	0.12	0.10	0.10	**0.16**	*0.16*	**0.21**	*0.13*	**0.18**	**0.19**	**0.29**
CPA	**0.27**	**0.26**	0.13	0.08	*0.15*	0.10	**0.16**	**0.22**	**0.30**	**0.29**	*0.15*	**0.25**	*0.14*	0.10	**0.24**

Note. **Bolded** correlation coefficients are significant at $p \leq .001$. *Italicized* correlation coefficients are significant at $p < .01$. Convergent correlations are represented on the diagonal. EMO = Emotional Lability, ANX = Anxiousness, SEP = Separation Insecurity, WDL = Withdrawal, ANH = Anhedonia, INT = Intimacy Avoidance, MNP = Manipulativeness, DCT = Deceitfulness, GRA = Grandiosity, IRR = Irresponsibility, IMP = Impulsivity, DST = Distractibility, UNB = Unusual Beliefs, ECC = Eccentricity, CPA = Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations.

Table 7

Domain-Level Comparison of Liking Ratings between Participants with High (≥ 1 SD) Self-Reported Maladaptive Personality Traits and the Rest of the Sample

PID-5 Score	**Liking Ratings** Mean (SD)			
Negative Affect	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
High (≥ 1 SD)	2.15 (1.26)	2.24 (0.98)	1.87 (0.93)	2.02 (0.86)
< 1 SD	2.10 (1.12)	1.87 (0.82)	1.76 (0.87)	1.86 (0.86)
d (99.9% CI)	0.04 (-0.38, 0.47)	**0.43** (0.01, 0.85)	0.12 (-0.30, 0.54)	0.19 (-0.23, 0.61)
Detachment				
High (≥ 1 SD)	3.18 (1.45)	3.05 (1.12)	2.19 (1.01)	2.01 (0.85)
< 1 SD	2.88 (1.41)	2.33 (1.01)	2.14 (0.89)	2.07 (0.88)
d (99.9% CI)	0.21 (-0.24, 0.66)	**0.70** (0.25, 1.15)	0.06 (-0.38, 0.50)	-0.07 (-0.51, 0.37)
Antagonism				
High (≥ 1 SD)	3.44 (1.43)	1.67 (1.58) *	3.48 (1.59)	1.65 (1.57) *
< 1 SD	2.06 (1.14)	1.17 (1.34) *	2.97 (1.60)	1.31 (1.43) *
d (99.9% CI)	**1.15** (0.64, 1.66)	**1.13** (0.64, 1.62)	0.32 (-0.16, 0.79)	**0.63** (0.15, 1.11)
Disinhibition				
High (≥ 1 SD)	2.72 (1.32)	2.57 (0.98)	2.75 (0.94)	2.65 (0.98)
< 1 SD	2.22 (0.99)	2.00 (0.81)	2.56 (1.02)	2.13 (0.77)
d (99.9% CI)	**0.47** (0.03, 0.90)	**0.68** (0.25, 1.12)	0.18 (-0.25, 0.61)	**0.64** (0.21, 1.08)
Psychoticism				
High (≥ 1 SD)	4.56 (1.55)	4.48 (1.37)	4.25 (1.32)	3.37 (1.28)
< 1 SD	3.57 (1.48)	3.01 (1.29)	3.41 (1.29)	2.67 (1.00)
d (99.9% CI)	**0.66** (0.21, 1.12)	**1.13** (0.67, 1.58)	**0.65** (0.21, 1.09)	**0.67** (0.22, 1.11)

Note. **Bolded** *d* values are significant at $p \leq .001$. S/S = Liking in Self; S/O = Liking in Others; O/S = Perceptions of Others Liking in Self; O/O = Perceptions of Others Liking in Others.

* Values are exponentiated for interpretation of log-transformed variable.

Table 8

Facet-Level Comparison of Liking Ratings between Participants with High (≥ 1 SD) Self-Reported Maladaptive Personality Traits and the Rest of the Sample

PID-5 Score	**Liking Ratings** *M* (*SD*)			
Emotional Lability	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
High (≥ 1 SD)	2.64 (1.71)	2.42 (1.51)	2.42 (1.57)	2.44 (1.63)
< 1 SD	2.20 (1.57)	1.68 (1.08)	1.90 (1.22)	1.73 (1.14)
d (99.9% CI)	0.28 (-0.21, 0.76)	**0.64** (0.18, 1.10)	*0.40* (-0.05, 0.86)	**0.58** (0.12, 1.04)
Anxiousness	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
High (≥ 1 SD)	1.51 (1.04)	2.00 (1.12)	1.48 (0.97)	1.73 (0.99)
< 1 SD	2.01 (1.28)	2.05 (1.08)	1.58 (0.91)	1.92 (1.05)
d (99.9% CI)	**-0.41** (-0.83, 0.00)	-0.05 (-0.46, 0.36)	-0.11 (-0.52, 0.30)	-0.18 (-0.59, 0.23)
Separation Insecurity	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
High (≥ 1 SD)	2.09 (1.26)	2.45 (1.55)	1.88 (1.22)	2.24 (1.23)
< 1 SD	2.17 (1.34)	1.92 (1.10)	1.78 (0.98)	1.90 (1.04)
d (99.9% CI)	-0.06 (-0.56, 0.44)	*0.45* (-0.02, 0.92)	0.10 (-0.37, 0.57)	0.32 (-0.15, 0.78)
Withdrawal	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
High (≥ 1 SD)	4.43 (2.10)	3.58 (1.58)	2.51 (1.42)	2.17 (1.13)
< 1 SD	3.31 (1.74)	2.79 (1.36)	2.61 (1.31)	2.37 (1.17)
d (99.9% CI)	**0.62** (0.18, 1.06)	**0.57** (0.14, 1.00)	-0.07 (-0.50, 0.36)	-0.17 (-0.60, 0.25)
Anhedonia	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
High (≥ 1 SD)	2.00 (1.49)	2.39 (1.35)	1.49 (1.68) *	1.84 (1.12)
< 1 SD	2.01 (1.27)	1.86 (1.12)	1.35 (1.60) *	1.77 (1.08)
d (99.9% CI)	-0.01 (-0.47, 0.45)	**0.46** (0.03, 0.88)	0.22 (-0.21, 0.64)	0.06 (-0.36, 0.49)
Intimacy Avoidance	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
High (≥ 1 SD)	3.17 (1.78)	3.39 (1.45)	2.43 (1.42)	2.21 (1.19)
< 1 SD	2.35 (1.47)	2.27 (1.29)	2.25 (1.23)	2.04 (1.10)
d (99.9% CI)	**0.54** (0.05, 1.02)	**0.85** (0.40, 1.30)	0.14 (-0.30, 0.58)	0.15 (-0.29, 0.59)

Manipulativeness	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
High (≥ 1 SD)	3.48 (1.76)	1.45 (1.70) *	3.57 (1.94)	1.38 (1.68) *
< 1 SD	1.99 (1.36)	1.11 (1.36) *	2.77 (1.80)	1.21 (1.48) *
d (99.9% CI)	**1.04** (0.50, 1.57)	**0.78** (0.31, 1.24)	*0.44* (-0.02, 0.90)	0.32 (-0.14, 0.77)
Deceitfulness	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
High (≥ 1 SD)	2.75 (1.67)	1.26 (1.57) *	2.82 (1.65)	1.28 (1.57) *
< 1 SD	1.71 (1.08)	1.05 (1.22) *	2.33 (1.56)	1.14 (1.36) *
d (99.9% CI)	**0.83** (0.34, 1.32)	**0.69** (0.27, 1.12)	0.31 (-0.11, 0.73)	*0.35* (-0.07, 0.77)
Grandiosity	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
High (≥ 1 SD)	3.72 (1.63)	1.92 (1.80) *	4.26 (1.78)	2.35 (1.40)
< 1 SD	2.27 (1.43)	1.25 (1.54) *	3.72 (2.00)	1.66 (1.04)
d (99.9% CI)	**0.99** (0.48, 1.50)	**0.93** (0.48, 1.39)	0.28 (-0.17, 0.72)	**0.63** (0.17, 1.08)
Irresponsibility	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
High (≥ 1 SD)	2.24 (1.52)	1.58 (1.68) *	2.17 (1.34)	1.58 (1.79) *
< 1 SD	1.77 (1.08)	1.25 (1.46) *	1.98 (1.22)	1.26 (1.46) *
d (99.9% CI)	*0.40* (-0.05, 0.85)	**0.58** (0.15, 1.00)	0.16 (-0.26, 0.58)	**0.54** (0.12, 0.97)
Impulsivity	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
High (≥ 1 SD)	3.67 (1.98)	3.80 (1.57)	3.76 (1.48)	3.45 (1.26)
< 1 SD	2.73 (1.38)	2.54 (1.30)	3.72 (1.55)	3.02 (1.31)
d (99.9% CI)	**0.62** (0.12, 1.12)	**0.94** (0.45, 1.43)	0.03 (-0.45, 0.51)	0.34 (-0.14, 0.82)
Distractibility	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
High (≥ 1 SD)	2.30 (1.52)	2.56 (1.21)	2.17 (1.14)	2.55 (1.33)
< 1 SD	2.19 (1.16)	2.05 (1.11)	2.02 (1.12)	2.03 (1.06)
d (99.9% CI)	0.09 (-0.35, 0.53)	**0.45** (0.03, 0.87)	0.14 (-0.29, 0.56)	**0.46** (0.04, 0.89)
Unusual Beliefs	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
High (≥ 1 SD)	4.44 (1.91)	4.49 (1.6)	4.44 (1.45)	3.30 (1.41)
< 1 SD	3.51 (1.73)	3.14 (1.58)	3.57 (1.61)	2.73 (1.29)
d (99.9% CI)	**0.53** (0.04, 1.02)	**0.86** (0.4, 1.32)	**0.55** (0.1, 1.01)	**0.44** (-0.01, 0.89)
Eccentricity	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
High (≥ 1 SD)	5.32 (1.41)	4.96 (1.54)	4.83 (1.67)	3.53 (1.48)
< 1 SD	3.66 (1.72)	3.48 (1.57)	3.95 (1.64)	3.19 (1.31)
d (99.9% CI)	**1.00** (0.55, 1.46)	**0.95** (0.52, 1.39)	**0.53** (0.11, 0.96)	0.26 (-0.17, 0.68)

Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
High (≥ 1 SD)	3.39 (1.65)	3.33 (1.65)	3.31 (1.54)	2.75 (1.46)
< 1 SD	3.27 (1.76)	2.51 (1.50)	2.71 (1.46)	2.18 (1.23)
d (99.9% CI)	0.07 (-0.39, 0.53)	**0.53** (0.12, 0.94)	**0.41** (0, 0.82)	**0.45** (0.04, 0.86)

Note. **Bolded** *d* values are significant at $p \leq .001$. *Italicized d* values are significant at $p < .01$. S/S = Liking in Self; S/O = Liking in Others; O/S = Perceptions of Others Liking in Self; O/O = Perceptions of Others Liking in Others.

* Values are exponentiated for interpretation of log-transformed variable.

Table 9

Comparison of Liking Ratings between Participants Endorsing a Facet within Domain as Their Cardinal Trait and the Rest of the Sample

Trait Cardinality	**Liking Ratings** *M* (*SD*)			
Negative Affect	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal Facet	1.97 (1.11)	2.09 (0.84)	1.73 (0.90)	1.87 (0.82)
Not Cardinal	2.16 (1.16)	1.90 (0.87)	1.79 (0.87)	1.90 (0.87)
d (99% CI)	-0.17 (-0.56, 0.22)	0.22 (-0.16, 0.60)	-0.07 (-0.45, 0.31)	-0.03 (-0.41, 0.35)
Detachment	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal Facet	3.23 (1.36)	2.86 (1.07)	2.21 (0.91)	2.18 (0.80)
Not Cardinal	2.83 (1.43)	2.33 (1.03)	2.13 (0.91)	2.03 (0.90)
d (99% CI)	0.28 (-0.12, 0.68)	**0.50** (0.11, 0.90)	0.09 (-0.31, 0.48)	0.18 (-0.22, 0.57)
Antagonism	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal Facet	3.62 (1.35)	1.46 (1.60) *	2.76 (1.48)	1.46 (1.57) *
Not Cardinal	2.27 (1.29)	1.22 (1.39) *	3.05 (1.61)	1.35 (1.46) *
d (99% CI)	**1.05** (0.03, 2.07)	0.52 (-0.49, 1.53)	-0.18 (-1.19, 0.82)	0.23 (-0.78, 1.23)
Disinhibition	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal Facet	2.65 (1.29)	2.35 (1.17)	2.67 (1.26)	2.53 (1.26)
Not Cardinal	2.27 (1.05)	2.07 (0.83)	2.59 (0.97)	2.19 (0.76)
d (99% CI)	0.35 (-0.19, 0.89)	0.32 (-0.22, 0.86)	0.09 (-0.45, 0.62)	0.41 (-0.13, 0.95)
Psychoticism	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal Facet	4.96 (1.32)	4.49 (1.34)	3.81 (1.28)	3.1 (1.00)
Not Cardinal	3.54 (1.47)	3.06 (1.33)	3.51 (1.34)	2.74 (1.09)
d (99% CI)	**0.98** (0.48, 1.48)	**1.07** (0.58, 1.56)	0.22 (-0.25, 0.70)	0.33 (-0.14, 0.81)

Note. **Bolded** *d* values are significant at $p \leq .001$. S/S = Liking in Self; S/O = Liking in Others; O/S = Perceptions of Others Liking in Self; O/O = Perceptions of Others Liking in Others.

* Values are exponentiated for interpretation of log-transformed variable.

Table 10

Comparison of Liking Ratings between Participants Endorsing Facet as Cardinal Trait and the Rest of the Sample

Trait Cardinality	**Liking Ratings** *M* (*SD*)			
Emotional Lability	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal	3.27 (2.49)	2.00 (1.34)	1.91 (1.58)	1.73 (1.42)
Not Cardinal	2.26 (1.56)	1.79 (1.18)	1.98 (1.29)	1.84 (1.25)
d (99.9% CI)	0.64 (-0.38, 1.65)	0.18 (-0.83, 1.18)	-0.06 (-1.06, 0.95)	-0.09 (-1.10, 0.92)
Anxiousness	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal	1.62 (1.30)	2.20 (1.17)	1.42 (0.87)	1.86 (0.96)
Not Cardinal	1.97 (1.22)	2.00 (1.06)	1.60 (0.93)	1.89 (1.06)
d (99.9% CI)	-0.29 (-0.71, 0.14)	0.18 (-0.23, 0.60)	-0.20 (-0.61, 0.22)	-0.03 (-0.44, 0.39)
Separation Insecurity	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal	2.50 (1.65)	2.70 (1.70)	2.20 (1.40)	2.30 (0.95)
Not Cardinal	2.15 (1.31)	1.98 (1.17)	1.78 (1.01)	1.94 (1.08)
d (99.9% CI)	0.27 (-0.79, 1.33)	0.61 (-0.44, 1.67)	0.41 (-0.64, 1.47)	0.33 (-0.72, 1.39)
Withdrawal	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal	4.32 (1.79)	3.35 (1.44)	2.63 (1.33)	2.41 (1.12)
Not Cardinal	3.35 (1.84)	2.84 (1.41)	2.58 (1.33)	2.32 (1.17)
d (99.9% CI)	**0.53** (0.08, 0.98)	*0.36* (-0.08, 0.80)	0.04 (-0.40, 0.47)	0.08 (-0.36, 0.52)
Anhedonia	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal	1.80 (1.23)	2.50 (1.18)	1.38 (1.54) *	1.80 (1.03)
Not Cardinal	2.02 (1.33)	1.95 (1.18)	1.36 (1.62) *	1.78 (1.09)
d (99.9% CI)	-0.17 (-1.23, 0.9)	0.47 (-0.59, 1.53)	0.01 (-1.05, 1.06)	0.02 (-1.04, 1.07)
Intimacy Avoidance	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal	2.00 (1.10)	3.33 (1.37)	2.42 (1.24)	2.50 (1.09)
Not Cardinal	2.54 (1.58)	2.43 (1.37)	2.28 (1.27)	2.05 (1.11)
d (99.9% CI)	-0.34 (-1.35, 0.67)	0.66 (-0.31, 1.63)	0.11 (-0.86, 1.07)	0.40 (-0.56, 1.37)
Manipulativeness	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal	4.60 (1.34)	1.38 (2.05) *	3.20 (2.17)	1.38 (2.05) *
Not Cardinal	2.24 (1.53)	1.15 (1.43) *	2.89 (1.84)	1.23 (1.51) *

d (99.9% CI)	**1.55** (0.05, 3.05)	0.50 (-0.98, 1.98)	0.17 (-1.31, 1.65)	0.27 (-1.21, 1.76)
Deceitfulness	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal	1.00 (N/A)	1.00 (N/A) *	4.00 (N/A)	1.99 (N/A) *
Not Cardinal	1.98 (1.33)	1.09 (1.32) *	2.42 (1.58)	1.16 (1.40) *
d (99.9% CI)	†	†	†	†
Grandiosity	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal	4.60 (2.30)	2.46 (1.82) *	3.60 (1.95)	2.60 (1.52)
Not Cardinal	2.57 (1.56)	1.34 (1.62) *	3.81 (1.98)	1.76 (1.13)
d (99.9% CI)	*1.29* (-0.21, 2.78)	*1.29* (-0.20, 2.78)	-0.11 (-1.59, 1.37)	0.74 (-0.74, 2.22)
Irresponsibility	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal	1.00 (0.00)	1.15 (1.36) *	1.40 (0.55)	0.14 (0.31)
Not Cardinal	1.89 (1.21)	1.31 (1.52) *	2.02 (1.25)	0.28 (0.43)
d (99.9% CI)	-0.74 (-2.23, 0.75)	-0.31 (-1.79, 1.17)	-0.50 (-1.98, 0.98)	-0.32 (-1.80, 1.16)
Impulsivity	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal	4.32 (2.06)	3.74 (1.66)	4.26 (1.82)	3.68 (1.38)
Not Cardinal	2.80 (1.46)	2.66 (1.38)	3.70 (1.52)	3.05 (1.30)
d (99.9% CI)	**1.01** (0.22, 1.80)	**0.77** (-0.01, 1.55)	0.37 (-0.41, 1.14)	0.49 (-0.29, 1.26)
Distractibility	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal	2.00 (1.03)	2.33 (1.37)	2.06 (1.11)	2.28 (1.23)
Not Cardinal	2.23 (1.26)	2.14 (1.14)	2.05 (1.13)	2.12 (1.13)
d (99.9% CI)	-0.18 (-0.98, 0.62)	0.17 (-0.62, 0.96)	0.01 (-0.79, 0.8)	0.14 (-0.65, 0.93)
Unusual Beliefs	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal	5.89 (1.18)	5.26 (1.48)	3.95 (1.72)	2.79 (1.18)
Not Cardinal	3.55 (1.75)	3.25 (1.61)	3.70 (1.61)	2.82 (1.33)
d (99.9% CI)	**1.36** (0.55, 2.18)	**1.26** (0.47, 2.04)	0.16 (-0.62, 0.93)	-0.02 (-0.80, 0.75)
Eccentricity	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal	5.62 (1.38)	4.96 (1.46)	4.58 (1.72)	3.67 (1.40)
Not Cardinal	3.93 (1.77)	3.68 (1.65)	4.08 (1.68)	3.23 (1.34)
d (99.9% CI)	**0.98** (0.27, 1.69)	**0.78** (0.08, 1.48)	0.30 (-0.40, 0.99)	0.33 (-0.37, 1.02)
Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations	**S/S**	**S/O**	**O/S**	**O/O**
Cardinal	4.85 (1.34)	3.85 (1.41)	3.54 (1.51)	3.23 (1.64)
Not Cardinal	3.23 (1.71)	2.64 (1.56)	2.81 (1.49)	2.26 (1.27)

d (99.9% CI)	**0.96** (0.02, 1.90)	*0.78* (-0.16, 1.71)	0.49 (-0.44, 1.42)	*0.75* (-0.18, 1.68)

Note. **Bolded** *d* values are significant at $p \leq .001$. *Italicized d* values are significant at $p < .01$. S/S = Liking in Self; S/O = Liking in Others; O/S = Perceptions of Others Liking in Self; O/O = Perceptions of Others Liking in Others.

* Values are exponentiated for interpretation of log-transformed variable

† Only one participant selected Deceitfulness as their cardinal trait, therefore *d* could not be calculated.

Table 11

A Social Relations Model of Maladaptive Trait Liking: Perceiver, Target, and Perceiver × Target Effects

Path	Negative Affect	Emotional Lability	Anxiousness	Separation Insecurity
Level 1		*β* (95% C.I.)		
PE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver	**.13** (.09, .17)	.06 (00, .11)	**.15** (.10, .19)	**.11** (.07, .16)
TE*: *Liking* ON *Target	-.01 (-.05, .02)	**.17** (.11, .23)	**-.14** (-.18, -.10)	.00 (-.04, .04)
IE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver* × *Target	**.09** (.05, .13)	**.07** (.02, .13)	**.05** (.01, .08)	**.09** (.04, .13)
Path	**Detachment**	**Withdrawal**	**Anhedonia**	**Intimacy Avoidance**
Level 1		*β* (95% C.I.)		
PE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver	**.33** (.28, .37)	**.28** (.24, .32)	**.52** (.48, .57)	**.14** (.09, .18)
TE*: *Liking* ON *Target	**.14** (.10, .17)	**.15** (.11, .19)	**-.36** (-.41, -.32)	.05 (.00, .09)
IE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver* × *Target	**.07** (.03, .10)	.02 (-.01, .06)	**.45** (.40, .50)	**-.07** (-.12, -.03)
Path	**Antagonism**	**Manipulativeness**	**Deceitfulness**	**Grandiosity**
Level 1		*β* (95% C.I.)		
PE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver	**-.11** (-.14, -.09)	**-.06** (-.10, -.03)	**-.05** (-.09, -.02)	**-.41** (-.44, -.38)
TE*: *Liking* ON *Target	**.88** (.58, .90)	**.89** (.85, .92)	**.89** (.55, .92)	**.65** (.62, .69)
IE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver* × *Target	**-.08** (-.10, -.06)	**-.04** (-.07, -.01)	-.03 (-.07, .00)	**.15** (.12, .19)
Path	**Disinhibition**	**Irresponsibility**	**Impulsivity**	**Distractibility**
Level 1		*β* (95% C.I.)		
PE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver	**-.16** (-.19, -.12)	-.02 (-.05, .01)	**-.24** (-.28, -.20)	**.06** (.02, .10)
TE*: *Liking* ON *Target	**.19** (.15, .22)	**.88** (.57, .91)	**.17** (.13, .21)	-.01 (-.05, .03)
IE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver* × *Target	**-.07** (-.11, -.04)	-.02 (-.05, .00)	**-.12** (-.16, -.08)	.04 (.00, .07)
Path	**Psychoticism**	**Unusual Beliefs**	**Eccentricity**	**Cog. Percep. Aberr.**
Level 1		*β* (95% C.I.)		
PE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver	**.14** (.10, .18)	**.09** (.04, .12)	**.06** (.02, .10)	**.18** (.13, .23)
TE*: *Liking* ON *Target	**.31** (.27, .34)	**.23** (.18, .27)	**.21** (.17, .25)	**.26** (.22, .31)
IE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver* × *Target	**-.10** (-.14, -.06)	**-.15** (-.18, -.10)	**-.16** (-.20, -.12)	-.01 (-.06, .04)

Note. **Bolded** values are significant at a 95% credibility interval (C.I.). All pathways estimated as random effects. Bayesian estimation is used to provide standardized values. Results are reported from models including PID-5 scores at Level 2. Cog. Percep. Aberr. = Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations.

Table 12

Fixed and Random Effects for Unstandardized Models of Liking of Maladaptive Personality Traits

Path	**Negative Affect**		**Emotional Lability**		**Anxiousness**		**Separation Insecurity**	
Level 1	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.
PE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver	**0.11**	**0.30**	0.05	**0.46**	**0.11**	**0.33**	**0.12**	**0.39**
TE*: *Liking* ON *Target	**0.08**	**0.30**	**0.18**	**0.42**	-0.04	**0.44**	0.06	**0.41**
IE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver* × *Target	**0.11**	**0.25**	0.07	**0.40**	**0.09**	**0.29**	**0.12**	**0.33**
Path	**Detachment**		**Withdrawal**		**Anhedonia**		**Intimacy Avoidance**	
Level 1	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.
PE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver	**0.16**	**0.40**	0.08	**0.51**	**0.42**	**0.36**	0.00	**0.50**
TE*: *Liking* ON *Target	**0.17**	**0.39**	**0.13**	**0.48**	**-0.31**	**0.51**	0.06	**0.46**
IE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver* × *Target	**0.14**	**0.34**	0.02	**0.42**	**0.40**	**0.36**	-0.03	**0.41**
Path	**Antagonism**		**Manipulativeness**		**Deceitfulness**		**Grandiosity**	
Level 1	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.
PE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver	**-0.32**	**0.48**	**-0.30**	**0.57**	**-0.20**	**0.48**	**-0.76**	**0.67**
TE*: *Liking* ON *Target	**1.04**	**0.51**	**1.00**	**0.58**	**0.92**	**0.52**	**0.99**	**0.61**
IE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver* × *Target	**-0.26**	**0.44**	**-0.23**	**0.53**	**-0.17**	**0.45**	-0.05	**0.60**
Path	**Disinhibition**		**Irresponsibility**		**Impulsivity**		**Distractibility**	
Level 1	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.
PE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver	**-0.12**	**0.36**	**-0.06**	**0.41**	**-0.41**	**0.60**	0.05	**0.42**
TE*: *Liking* ON *Target	**0.18**	**0.33**	**0.80**	**0.39**	**0.23**	**0.45**	0.06	**0.45**
IE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver* × *Target	-0.05	**0.30**	**-0.07**	**0.40**	**-0.14**	**0.39**	0.04	**0.35**
Path	**Psychoticism**		**Unusual Beliefs**		**Eccentricity**		**Cog. Percep. Aberr.**	
Level 1	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.	F.E.	*SD* of R.E.
PE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver	0.02	**0.48**	0.04	**0.57**	**-0.15**	**0.61**	**0.19**	**0.53**
TE*: *Liking* ON *Target	**0.30**	**0.35**	**0.29**	**0.46**	**0.20**	**0.42**	**0.30**	**0.42**
IE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver* × *Target	-0.03	**0.33**	**-0.12**	**0.37**	**-0.17**	**0.49**	0.03	**0.41**

Note. **Bolded** values are significant at a 95% credibility interval (C.I.). Results are reported from models including PID-5 scores at Level 2. F.E. = Fixed Effect, R.E. = Random Effect, Cog. Percep. Aberr. = Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations.

Table 13

Effects of PID-5 Scale Score and Trait Cardinality on Social Relations Model of Maladaptive Trait Liking

Trait	**Negative Affect**		**Emotional Lability**		**Anxiousness**		**Separation Insecurity**	
Model	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality
PE ON Trait	n.s. (−)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	+	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (−)	n.s. (+)
TE ON Trait	−	−	n.s. (−)	n.s. (+)	−	−	−	n.s. (−)
IE ON Trait	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)	n.s.	n.s. (+)	−	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)
Liking ON Trait	+	n.s. (−)	+	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (−)	+	n.s. (+)
Liking WITH *PE*	n.s. (−)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)
Liking WITH *TE*	+	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	−	−	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)
Liking WITH *IE*	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s.	n.s. (−)
PE WITH *TE*	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
PE WITH *IE*	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
TE WITH *IE*	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Trait	**Detachment**		**Withdrawal**		**Anhedonia**		**Intimacy Avoidance**	
Model	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality
PE ON Trait	+	+	+	+	+	n.s. (+)	+	n.s. (−)
TE ON Trait	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	−	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)	−
IE ON Trait	−	n.s.	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)
Liking ON Trait	+	+	+	+	+	n.s. (+)	+	n.s. (+)
Liking WITH *PE*	+	+	+	+	+	+	n.s. (+)	+
Liking WITH *TE*	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	−	−	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)
Liking WITH *IE*	+	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	+	+	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)
PE WITH *TE*	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
PE WITH *IE*	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
TE WITH *IE*	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Path	**Antagonism**		**Manipulativeness**		**Deceitfulness**		**Grandiosity**	
Model	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality
PE ON Trait	+	+	+	n.s. (+)	+	n.s. (−)	+	n.s. (+)
TE ON Trait	+	n.s. (+)	+	+	+	n.s.	+	n.s. (+)
IE ON Trait	+	+	+	n.s. (+)	+	n.s. (−)	+	+

Liking ON Trait	+	+	+	+	+	n.s. (+)	+	+
Liking WITH *PE*	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
Liking WITH *TE*	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Liking WITH *IE*	−	−	−	−	−	−	n.s. (−)	n.s.
PE WITH *TE*	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	n.s. (−)
PE WITH *IE*	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
TE WITH *IE*	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
Path	**Disinhibition**		**Irresponsibility**		**Impulsivity**		**Distractibility**	
Model	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality
PE ON Trait	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (−)	+	+	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)
TE ON Trait	−	n.s. (−)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)	n.s. (+)	−	n.s. (−)
IE ON Trait	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	+	n.s. (−)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)
Liking ON Trait	+	+	+	n.s. (−)	+	+	+	n.s. (+)
Liking WITH *PE*	−	n.s. (−)	−	−	−	−	−	−
Liking WITH *TE*	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	+	+	n.s. (+)	n.s. (−)	−	−
Liking WITH *IE*	−	−	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)	−	−	−	−
PE WITH *TE*	+	+	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	+	+	+	+
PE WITH *IE*	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
TE WITH *IE*	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Path	**Psychoticism**		**Unusual Beliefs**		**Eccentricity**		**Cog. Percep. Aberr.**	
Model	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality
PE ON Trait	+	+	+	+	+	+	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)
TE ON Trait	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)
IE ON Trait	−	n.s. (+)	−	n.s. (+)	n.s. (−)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)
Liking ON Trait	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Liking WITH *PE*	+	n.s. (+)	+	n.s. (+)	n.s. (−)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)
Liking WITH *TE*	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	n.s. (−)	n.s. (−)
Liking WITH *IE*	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
PE WITH *TE*	+	+	+	+	n.s. (+)	n.s. (+)	+	+
PE WITH *IE*	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
TE WITH *IE*	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Note. When significant at a 95% credibility interval, the direction of effect is summarized. Otherwise, the effect is reported as n.s. (i.e., non-significant) with the direction in parentheses. Effects reported as n.s. without parentheses were estimated at 0.00. Italicized path

terms refer to random effects from Level 1 models: random slopes: *PE* = Perceiver Effect (i.e., liking ON perceiver), *TE* = Target Effect (i.e., liking on target), *IE* = Interaction Effect (i.e., liking ON perceiver × target); *Liking* (random intercept). "Trait" refers to observed trait level (i.e., PID-5 score) or cardinality (i.e., yes/no). Cog. Percep. Aberr. = Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The present study investigated the nature and extent of egosyntonicity among pathological personality traits. Evaluative perceptions of PID-5 maladaptive trait domains and constituent facets were gathered from 401 English-speaking adults residing in the United States recruited using MTurk. Correlational analysis, mean level comparison (i.e., independent samples *t*-tests), and multilevel structural equation modeling (MSEM) were employed to examine trait liking as a function of perceiver role (i.e., self- vs. meta-perception), target of judgment (i.e., self vs. other), self-reported trait level (i.e., PID-5 score), and trait cardinality.

Perceptions of Maladaptive Personality Traits in Self and Others

Relative Liking

Consistent with hypotheses, individuals with higher self-reported levels of maladaptive personality traits generally provided higher liking ratings for these traits in self and others. Associations between PID-5 domain scores and the mean of items assessing external perceptions of constituent facets (i.e., S/O, e.g., "*How much do you like grandiosity in others?*") are most analogous to bivariate analyses conducted in previous research on maladaptive trait likability. A median *r* of .33 was observed at the domain-level for S/O. Facet-level associations were somewhat weaker on average (median *r* = .26) but covered a similar range of effect sizes (domain *r* range = .24 to .50; facet *r* range = .15 to .46). Overall, the results for relative liking of pathological personality traits in others were remarkably consistent with those previously observed. (e.g., median *r* = .32 in Lamkin et al., 2018; median *r* = .37 in Miller et al., 2018).

Comparisons of mean liking ratings for individuals with high levels (i.e., 1+ SD) of pathological traits with the rest of the sample were also consistent with previous findings. Domain-level (median d = .70) and facet-level (median d = .64) comparisons showed greater liking among individuals high in all examined pathological traits except for Anxiousness (d = -.05, 99.9% CI = -.46, .36).

Although a general pattern of liking was also seen for one's own pathological traits, several traits emerged as exceptions. This underscores the important contribution of assessing trait likability specifically in reference to the individual providing the rating (i.e., S/S, e.g., *"How much do you like unusual beliefs in yourself?"*). The median domain-level convergent correlation between self-reported personality pathology and S/S ratings was r = .20 with a maximum value of r = .49 (Antagonism), however no such relation was observed for Negative Affect. Among the 359 individuals for whom S/S Negative Affect could be calculated (i.e., who perceived themselves to exhibit some degree of this pathological trait and thus provided a rating for at least one of three constituent facets; 89.53% of total sample), no correlation was observed between PID-5 score and trait liking. Convergent correlations were also non-significant for the facets of Emotional Lability, Anxiousness, and Separation Insecurity, providing strong evidence against egosyntonicity in the domain of Negative Affect. Relative liking effects were not observed for Anhedonia, Distractibility, and Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations facets either. The median difference between S/S liking ratings for individuals with high PID-5 domain scores and the rest of the sample was d = .47, however, comparisons were nonsignificant for both Negative Affect and Detachment. At the facet level, the median d = .53 but an egosyntonic effect (i.e., significantly greater liking for high PID-5 scores) was only observed for 60% (9 of 15) of the examined traits. For Anxiousness, an *egodystonic* effect was observed such that individuals

with high levels found this trait to be *less* likable in themselves than did the rest of the sample (*d* = -.41). These findings are consistent with previous work demonstrating that Negative Affectivity is strongly linked with perceived impairment and only modestly with perceived benefits (*r*s = .79 and .21, respectively) unlike some other domains (e.g., Antagonism, *r*s = .80 and .51, respectively; Sleep et al., 2022).

Absolute Liking

As predicted, most of the relative liking effects observed were better characterized as *tolerance* effects. Even significantly elevated means found for participants with high trait levels rarely reached the scale midpoint (i.e., 4.00) and thus reflected less *dislike* rather than true liking. Consistent with prior work at the domain level (e.g., Lamkin et al., 2018; Miller et al., 2018), only Psychoticism bucked this trend with mean liking ratings among those with high PID-5 scores of 4.56 and 4.48 for self and others, respectively. Among facets, individuals with high PID-5 scores on the convergent pathological trait were found to *like* Unusual Beliefs and Eccentricity in others (*M*s = 4.49 and 4.96, respectively) and themselves (*M*s = 4.44 and 5.32). Individuals high in PID-5 Withdrawal appeared to like this trait in themselves (*M* High = 4.43). The same pattern of absolute effects was seen when comparing perception between individuals endorsing these traits as cardinal versus those who did not. Actual *liking* of one's cardinal trait in oneself (i.e., S/S) was also observed for Manipulativeness, Grandiosity, Distractibility, and Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations.

Meta-Perception of Maladaptive Personality Traits

Relative Liking

Based on the principle of assumed similarity, hypotheses regarding trait liking were extended to meta-perceptions of the same. Specifically, I expected that individuals with higher

levels of pathological personality traits would not only show relative liking for these traits in themselves and others, but that these individuals would assume that other individuals would share these perspectives. This hypothesis found some support when it came to meta-perceptions of liking pathological personality traits in others (i.e., O/O, e.g., *"How much do you think other people like anxiousness in others?").* The median convergent correlation between PID-5 domain score and O/O ratings was r = .24 (range = .08 to .32) and the median r for facet-level relations was .15 (range = .01 to .25). However, no significant effects were observed for Detachment (or any of its facets), Anxiousness, Manipulativeness, or Deceitfulness. Comparisons between mean liking ratings for individuals with high PID-5 scores versus the rest of the sample were significant for Antagonism, Disinhibition, and Psychoticism (median domain level d = .63, range = -.07 to .67) and 7 of 15 facet-level traits (46.67%; median d = .34, range = -.18 to .63).

The hypothesis of relative trait liking found weak support among meta-perceptions of liking maladaptive traits in oneself (i.e., O/S, e.g., *"How much do you think other people like withdrawal in themselves?"*). Correlations between PID-5 score and O/S ratings for the same domain were predominantly small (median r = .14). At the domain level, only the convergent association for Psychoticism (r = .31) was outside of the range of effect sizes observed for divergent relations (rs = .07 to .29). This was also the only trait domain for which a significant difference in group means (d = .65) was observed between high scorers and the rest of the sample. At the facet level, the median convergent correlation was non-significant (r = .11) and the median d for mean comparisons was .22. Overall, except for Psychoticism (and its constituent traits), pathological personality trait levels in our participants did not appear to associate with egosyntonic meta-perceptions.

Absolute Liking

Among significant meta-perception effects, few reflected perceived *liking* of these traits. Consistent with an extension of assumed similarity to meta-perception, just as effects emerged reflecting absolute liking of Psychoticism in self and others, individuals with high levels of this trait also appeared to perceive others as liking this trait in themselves (M = 4.25). However, the meta-perception effect of liking Psychoticism in others was only relative to the rest of the sample (M high = 3.37). At the facet level, individuals with high levels of convergent personality pathology believed that others didn't just have greater tolerance for but *liked* Unusual Beliefs (M high = 4.44) and Eccentricity (M high = 4.83) in themselves. A mean O/S liking rating above the midpoint was also observed for individuals with high levels of Grandiosity (M = 4.26); however, this was not significantly different from the mean for the remainder of the sample (M = 3.72, d = .28, 99.9% CI = -.17, .72).

A Social Relations Model of Maladaptive Personality Trait Perception

Multilevel structural equation models (MSEMs) were used to conceptualize individual differences in maladaptive trait perceptions holistically using a within-person instantiation of a SRM (Kenny, 1994) and to examine relations of these differences to trait level and trait cardinality. In unstandardized models of trait likability at the domain level, most fixed and all random effects were significant at a 95% credibility interval, providing support for general trends in trait perception around which individual variation exists. Using Antagonism as an example, individuals tended to provide higher liking ratings when taking a meta-perceptive role than when reporting on their own perceptions (i.e., perceiver effect). Liking ratings also tended to be higher for Antagonism in the individual doing the perceiving (self or meta-self, i.e., target effect). A significant interaction effect (*IE*) was also present. Simple slopes analyses revealed significant

simple slopes in three of four perceiver × target conditions. A moderating effect of target on the association of liking and perceiver was seen such that *PE* was only significant when the target of the rating was self or meta-self rather than others. Moderation of *TE* by perceiver was also observed such that a stronger effect was observed for meta-perception than for liking of Antagonism in oneself.

At Level 2, both perceiver and target effects were strengthened by high PID-5 Antagonism scores (and the former by cardinality). General egosyntonicity for this trait was demonstrated by the positive association between the random intercept (i.e., latent mean) of liking and PID-5 Antagonism as well as between liking and endorsement of a constituent facet as cardinal. Associations between liking and trait level or cardinality were also significant for Detachment, Disinhibition, and Psychoticism. For Negative Affect, only the effect of PID-5 score was significant. At the facet level, this relation was significant and positive in at in all models including PID-5 scores at Level 2 except for the model of liking Anxiousness (β = .02, 95% C.I. = -.04, .10).

Is Personality Pathology Egosyntonic?

The results of the present study build upon previous work examining likability (e.g., Lamkin et al., 2018; Miller et al., 2018; Sleep et al., 2019) of maladaptive personality traits as well as research which investigated desired levels of these traits and perceptions of their associated risks and benefits (Sleep et al., 2022). Altogether, the literature supports a nuanced answer to the question of egosyntonicity: whether personality pathology "is egosyntonic" depends on the trait in question, level of associated pathology, strength of self-identification with the trait, and individual differences in the internalized social relations model of evaluative trait perception.

Among the traits examined, the least evidence of egosyntonicity emerged for Anxiousness. Correlations between PID-5 Anxiousness scores and likability ratings for this trait were null to small (*r*s = -.09 to .15). In fact, individuals with high scores on this trait liked this trait *less* than their relatively less anxious counterparts. Anxiousness' frequent endorsement as a cardinal trait for participants indicates that self-identification does not depend on egosyntonicity. That is, many individuals identify trait anxiety as a "dominant, pervasive, and outstanding" self-description while acknowledging that they perceive it to be a largely unhelpful feature. Although Anxiousness is mentioned in the text for several *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5th ed., *DSM-5*; APA, 2013) personality disorders (e.g., "excessive social anxiety that does not diminish with familiarity" in Schizotypal Personality Disorder; Anxiousness as a constituent pathological trait in the Alternative DSM-5 Model for Personality Disorders [AMPD] criteria for Avoidant Personality Disorder and Borderline Personality Disorder), it is perhaps unsurprising to find results for the trait running contrary to traditional theories of personality pathology. Anxiousness, along with Emotional Lability, Separation Insecurity, and Anhedonia (which all demonstrated little evidence of egosyntonicity in the present study), are key aspects of the manifestation of mood and anxiety disorders. Using Halaj and Huppert's (2022) model of insight in nonpsychotic disorders, these conditions and their associated pathological personality traits are characterized by good clinical insight (i.e., awareness that one's symptoms constitute psychopathology) and moderate-to-poor (but not absent) cognitive insight (i.e., awareness of dysfunction in one's thoughts, feelings, and behaviors). Among these traits, meta-perception of tolerance in others was only seen for Emotional Lability (i.e., significantly higher mean O/O Emotional Lability among individuals with high PID-5 Emotional Lability), suggesting a greater role of assumed similarity in this particular trait.

At the other end of the spectrum of egosyntonicity sits Psychoticism, especially its Unusual Beliefs and Eccentricity facets. Individuals with higher levels of these traits (or cardinal identification with them) showed not only *greater* liking, but also liking of these traits in self and others in an absolute sense (i.e., ratings over the scale midpoint, 4.00). The median liking rating for the high PID-5 score or cardinal trait group across all Psychoticism facets and target-perceiver combinations was 4.20 (range = 2.75 to 5.89). The egosyntonicity of Psychoticism has been previously demonstrated in terms of trait likability (Lamkin et al., 2018; Miller et al., 2018) and congruence between actual and desired levels of the trait (Miller et al., 2018). Overall, individuals desire minimal change in their own level of Psychoticism. In fact, Sleep and colleagues (2022) observed individuals who desired an *increased* level of Psychoticism. However, 90.91% of their sample desired a change of less than 10-points (i.e., out of 100) in either direction. Liking of Psychoticism may be related to a favorable evaluation of perceived benefits of the trait (e.g., enhancing spirituality, offering new experiences) versus problems (e.g., isolation, legal/criminal consequences) as well as the difficulty of change (Sleep et al., 2022).

Based on group mean comparisons for ratings of liking the trait in oneself, Withdrawal also appeared to be egosyntonic. Withdrawal, as conceptualized by the DSM-5 Clinicians' Personality Trait Rating Form (APA, 2010) refers to a "preference for being alone to being with others; reticence in social situations; avoidance of social contacts and activity, and lack of initiation of social contact" (p. 4). This effect was distinguished by its relative specificity, particularly the isolation of actual *liking* to S/S ratings, whereas results reflected only *tolerance* in others, as well as a lack of extension of to the domain of meta-perception. Despite liking the trait in themselves, individuals with high levels of Withdrawal (or who identify it as their cardinal trait) do not appear to believe that others share their perspective. Although individuals

high in Intimacy Avoidance only showed relative liking of this trait in self and others, they also showed no meta-perception effects. It is possible that lack of assumed meta-cognitive similarity might be part of the constellation of emotional, cognitive, and behavioral processes undergirding the domain of Detachment. Alternatively, having low propensity to engage socially with others may alter typical developmental trajectories for meta-cognition. Metacognitive impairments appear to be characteristic of Avoidant Personality Disorder (Moroni et al., 2016) which is characterized by anxious detachment in the *DSM-5* AMPD.

As reviewed in the introduction, Antagonism (and, to a lesser degree, Disinhibition, specifically in its contribution to psychopathy) has received most of the attention in the literature on perception of maladaptive personality and present study results are largely consistent with earlier findings. Assumed similarity between oneself and others (e.g., Beer & Watson, 2008; Kardum et al., 2022; Watson et al., 2010) is reflected in the consistency between reported (relative) liking of Antagonism and Disinhibition facets in others and meta-perceptions of the same on behalf of others. The present study also supports previous observations of homophily (e.g., Adams et al., 2015, Figueredo et al., 2006, Hart & Adams, 2014), operationalized as a positive bivariate association between trait level and trait-liking in others in these domains. As for egosyntonicity, the evidence is mixed. Individuals with these styles of personality pathology appear to have less strongly negative views of their traits, both as demonstrated by themselves and others, but, for the most part do not actually *like* them. However, in contrast to this general pattern, and to results for mean comparisons based on PID-5 score, individuals who selected Manipulativeness, Grandiosity, or Impulsivity as their cardinal trait tended to like that trait in themselves both relatively (*d* range = 1.01 to 1.55) and absolutely (*M* cardinal range = 4.32 to

4.60). However, the number of participants endorsing each of these traits as cardinal was low overall (*n* range = 5 to 19) so these conclusions should be viewed more tentatively.

Implications for Clinical Practice

These findings directly challenge the view of personality pathology as categorically egosyntonic still held by lay individuals and mental health professional alike. If heeded, this refutation of clinical lore and stereotypes should lead to improvements in care for individuals with personality disorders. However, there are two sets of findings which appear to support specific recommendations for intervention. First, liking (or tolerance) of a specific trait in oneself did not necessarily imply a similar meta-perception. For example, a tolerance effect was observed for self-perception of Antagonism, such that individuals with higher levels of this trait report relatively greater liking ratings. However, only a small relation was observed between PID-5 Antagonism score and meta-perceptions of others liking the trait in themselves. This suggests that tolerating (or liking) one's own maladaptive traits can coexist with insight regarding others' relative distaste for the same traits. For the trait domain of Antagonism as well as the Irresponsibility and Impulsivity facets of Disinhibition, this insight may provide a point of vulnerability or potential buy-in regarding change to be addressed in therapeutic settings using techniques of motivational interview. As an example, a clinician could approach intervention on a client's Antagonism by exploring both perceived benefits and problems related to these traits. Meta-perceptions, especially those which are negative or less strongly tolerant, could then be elicited to increase their salience for the client. A client who may not initially wish to change their personality traits might find motivation to do so based on a desire for social approval, consideration of the reasons for others' dissimilar views, or simply to minimize associated impairment (e.g., relational conflict).

The second finding with implication for clinical practice is the reported tolerance of personality pathology in others. Despite not showing increased tolerance of these traits in themselves, individuals with elevated PID-5 scores in the Negative Affect domain and its facets (i.e., Emotional Lability, Anxiousness, and Separation Insecurity) or for the traits of Anhedonia or Distractibility provided relatively higher liking ratings (compared to the rest of the sample) for the corresponding traits in others. If one of these traits is the focus of treatment, group therapy or peer support might be employed to capitalize on the combination of personal insight and desire for change with empathy for others with the same struggles.

Study Limitations and Future Research Directions

The present study has several limitations which should be addressed in future work. First, although the sample was of a decent size and balanced in terms of men and women, it was selected using convenience methods (i.e., MTurk) and does not reflect a random, representative sample of United States population, especially in terms of race and ethnicity. Although these demographic characteristics were not measured, it is likely that the sample is relatively homogenous in terms of educational attainment and socioeconomic status as well due to the inherent study requirements of English literacy and Internet access. Additionally, although over 30% of the sample met criteria for a personality disorder based on a brief screen (i.e., IPDS), the intended level of overrepresentation was not achieved. Future research should seek to confirm these results in more diverse samples and in samples from populations with higher base-rates of personality pathology such as those found in inpatient clinical settings or correctional facilities. Another area in which limitations exist is measurement. In the future, observational methods or informant-reports could be used to supplement an otherwise single-rater, self-report protocol. Thirdly, for liking ratings of maladaptive personality traits in oneself (i.e., S/S), participants were

permitted to opt-out of providing a rating by indicating that they did not possess the given trait to any degree. It is possible that individuals who clinicians would identify as exhibiting at least some degree of a particular maladaptive trait chose this option instead, especially if these individuals subscribe to categorical ideas of personality (e.g., being "Distractible" or not, rather than having a degree of "Distractibility"), possibly attenuating observed effects. Finally, no directions were given regarding who "others" referred to and the assumption was made that participants would provide answers based on some amalgamation of previous experiences or a generalized "other" in their lives. Future studies may wish to gather information regarding both generalized others and specific important others such as romantic partners, friends, or co-workers. Additional direction regarding meta-perception might also be given, instructing participants to take the perspective of either "the average person" or a specific other.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. M., Hart, W., & Burton, K. A. (2015). I only like the idea of you: Narcissists tolerate others' narcissistic traits but not their corresponding behaviors. *Personality and Individual Differences, 82,* 232-236.

Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation.* Holt.

American Psychiatric Association (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Author.

American Psychiatric Association (2013). *The personality inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5) – Adult.* Author.

American Psychiatric Association (2010). *DSM–5 clinicians' personality trait rating form.* Author.

Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software, 67*(1), 1-48.

Bates, D., Maechler, N., & Jagan, M. (2022). *Matrix: Sparse and dense matrix classes and methods* (Version 1.4-1) [R package].

Beer, A. & Watson, D. (2008). Personality judgment at zero acquaintance: Agreement, assumed similarity, and implicit simplicity. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 90*(3), 250-260.

Bengtsson, H. (2022). *matrixStats: Functions that apply to rows and columns of matrices (and to vectors)* (Version 0.62.0) [R package].

Carlson, E. N., & Oltmanns, T. F. (2015). The role of metaperception in personality disorders:

Do people with personality problems know how others experience their personality? *Journal of Personality Disorders, 29*(4), 449-467.

Champley, S. (2020). *pwr: Basic functions for power analysis* (Version 1.3-0) [R package].

Figueredo, A. J., Sefcek, J. A., & Jones, D. N. (2006). The ideal romantic partner personality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 41*(3), 431-441.

Halaj, A., & Huppert, J. D. (2022). Insight in nonpsychotic disorders: A new model of insight and a systematic review of measures. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 56*(1), 28-38.

Hallquist, M. N. & Wiley, J. F. (2018). MplusAutomation: An R package for facilitating large-scale latent variable analyses in Mplus. *Structural Equation Modeling, 25,* 621-638.

Hart, W., & Adams, J. M. (2014). Are narcissists more accepting of others' narcissistic traits? *Personality and Individual Differences, 64*, 163-167.

Hermens, M. L. M., van Splunteren P. T., van den Bosch, A., & Verheul, R. (2011). Barriers to implementing the clinical guideline on borderline personality disorder in the Netherlands. *Psychiatric Services, 62*(11), 1381-1383.

Hirschfeld, R. M. (1993). Personality disorders: Definition and diagnosis. *Journal of Personality Disorders, Suppl 1,* 9–17.

Kenny, D. A. (1994). *Interpersonal perception: A social relations analysis.* Guilford Press.

Kenny, D. A., & DePaulo, B. M. (1993). Do people know how others view them? An empirical and theoretical account. *Psychological Bulletin, 114*(1), 145-161.

Kardum, I., Hudek-Knezevic, J., & Mehic, N. (2022). Similarity indices of the Dark Triad traits based on self and partner-reports: Evidence from variable-centered and couple-centered approaches. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 111626.

Krueger, R. F., Derringer, J., Markon, K. E., Watson, D., & Skodol, A. E. (2012). Initial construction of a maladaptive personality trait model and inventory for DSM-5. *Psychological Medicine, 42*, 1879-1890.

Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoof, P. B., & Christensen, R. H. B. (2017). lmerTest package: Tests in linear mixed effects models. *Journal of Statistical Software, 82*(13), 1-26.

Lamkin, J., Maples-Keller, J. L., & Miller J. D. (2018). How likable are personality disorder and general personality traits to those who possess them? *Journal of Personality, 86*(2), 173-185.

Langbehn, D. R., Pfohl, B. M., Reynolds, S., Clark, L. A., Battaglia, M., Bellodi, L., Cadoret, R., Grove, W., Pilkonis, P., & Links, P. (1999). The Iowa Personality Disorder Screen: Development and preliminary validation of a brief screening interview. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 13*(1), 75-89.

Lewis, G. L., & Appleby, L. (1988). Personality Disorder: The patients psychiatrists dislike. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 153,* 44-49.

Long, J. A. (2019). *interactions: Comprehensive, user-friendly toolkit for probing interactions* (Version 1.1.5) [R package].

Lynam, D. R., Gaughan, E. T., Miller, J. D., Miller D. J., Mullins-Sweatt, S., & Widiger, T. A. (2011). Assessing the basic traits associated with psychopathy: Development and validation of the Elemental Psychopathy Assessment. *Psychological Assessment, 23*(1), 108-124.

Maas, C. J. M., & Hox, J. J. (2005). Sufficient sample sizes for multilevel modeling. *Methodology, 1*(3), 86-92.

Maples, J. L., Carter, N. T., Few, L. R., Crego, C., Gore, W. L., Samuel, D. B., Williamson, R.

L., Lynam, D. R., Widiger, T. A., Markon, K. E., Krueger, R. F., & Miller, J. D. (2015). Testing whether the DSM-5 personality disorder trait model can be measured with a reduced set of items: An item response theory investigation of the Personality Inventory for DSM-5. *Psychological Assessment, 27*(4), 1195-1210.

Maples-Keller, J. L., & Miller, J. D. (2018). Insight and the Dark Triad: Comparing self- and meta-perceptions in relation to psychopathy, narcissism, and Machiavellianism. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 9*(1), 30-39.

Maples-Keller, J. L., Williamson, R. L., Sleep, C. E., Carter, N. T., Campbell, W. K., & Miller, J. D. (2019). Using item response theory to develop a 60-item representation of the NEO PI-R using the International Personality Item Pool: Development of the IPIP-NEO-60. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 101*(1), 4-15.

Markham, D., & Trower, P. (2003). The effects of the psychiatric label 'borderline personality disorder' on nursing staff's perceptions and causal attributions for challenging behaviours. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 42,* 243-256.

McMurran, M., Huband, N., & Overton, E. (2010). Non-completion of personality disorder treatments: A systematic review of correlates, consequences, and interventions. *Clinical Psychology Review, 30*(3), 277-287.

Miller, J. D., Sleep, C. E., Lamkin, J., Vize, C., Campbell, W. K., & Lynam, D. R. (2018). Personality disorder traits: Perceptions of likability, impairment, and ability to change as correlates and moderators of desired level. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 9*(5), 478–483.

Muthén, L.K., & Muthén, B.O. (2021). *Mplus* (Version 8.7) [Computer software].

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). McGraw Hill.

Oltmanns, T. F., Gleason, M. E. J., Klonsky, E. D. K., & Turkheimer, E. (2005). Meta-perception for pathological personality traits: Do we know when others think that we are difficult? *Consciousness and Cognition, 14,* 739-751.

Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*(6), 556-563.

Pickersgill, M. (2012). How personality became treatable: The mutual constitution of clinical knowledge and mental health law. *Social Studies of Science, 43*(1), 30-53.

Polaschek, D. L., & Skeem, J. L. (2018). Treatment of adults and juveniles with psychopathy. In C. J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of Psychopathy* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

R Core Team (2022). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing* (Version 4.2.1) [Programming language]. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

Revelle, W. (2022). *Psych: Procedures for psychological, psychometric, and personality research* (Version 2.2.5) [R package]. Northwestern University.

Ring, D., & Lawn, S. (2019). Stigma perpetuation at the interface of mental health care: A review to compare patient and clinician perspectives of stigma and borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Mental Health.*

Rstudio Team (2022). *Rstudio: Integrated development for R* (Version 2022.07.1+554) [Computer software]. Rstudio, PBC.

Schönbrodt, F. D., & Perugini, M. (2013). At what sample size do correlations stabilize? *Journal of Research in Personality, 47*(5), 609-612.

Sleep, C. E., Lamkin, J., Lynam, D. R., Campbell, W. K., & Miller, J. D. (2019). Personality disorder traits: Testing insight regarding presence of traits, impairment, and desire for change. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 10*(2), 123-131.

Sleep, C. E., Lavner, J. A., & Miller, J. D. (2017). Do individuals with maladaptive personality traits find these same traits desirable in potential romantic partners? *Personality and Individual Differences, 119*, 317-322.

Sleep, C. E., Lynam, D. R., & Miller, J. D. (2022). Understanding individuals' desire for change, perception of impairment, benefits, and barriers of change for pathological personality traits. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 13*(3), 245-253.

Sulzer, S. H. (2015). Does "difficult patient" status contribute to de factor demedicalization? The case of borderline personality disorder. *Social Science & Medicine, 142*, 82-89.

Watson, D., Hubbard, B., & Wiese, D. (2000). Self-other agreement in personality and affectivity: The role of acquaintanceship, trait visibility, and assumed similarity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*(3), 546-558.

Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L. D., François, R., Grolemund, G., Hayes, A., Henry, L., Hester, J., Kuhn, M., Pedersen, T., Miller, E., Bache, S., Müller, K., Ooms, J., Robinson, D., Seidel, D., Spinu, V., … Yutani, H. (2019). Welcome to the Tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software*, *4*(43), 1686.

APPENDIX A

REPRESENTATIVE MPLUS SYNTAX FOR MULTILEVEL STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODELS

```
DATA:

     FILE = data.csv;

VARIABLE:

     NAMES = id percvr target liking traitlvl;
     MISSING = ALL(9999);
     CLUSTER = id;
     WITHIN = percvr target int;
     BETWEEN = traitlvl;
     USEVARIABLES = id percvr target liking traitlvl int;

ANALYSIS:

     TYPE = TWOLEVEL RANDOM;
     ESTIMATOR = BAYES;

DEFINE:

    int = percvr * target;

MODEL:

    %WITHIN%

    liking;
    PE | liking ON percvr;
    TE | liking ON target;
    IE | liking ON int;

    %BETWEEN%

    liking PE TE IE ON traitlvl;
    liking PE TE IE WITH PE TE IE liking;

OUTPUT: STDYX TECH1 CINTERVAL TECH8;
```

APPENDIX B

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR SELF-REPORTED MALADAPTIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS AND TRAIT LIKING RATINGS

Variable	***n***	***M***	***SD***	**Min**	**Max**	**Skew**	**Kurt**
PID-5							
Negative Affect	401	0.77	0.69	0.00	2.83	0.72	-0.45
Emotional Lability	401	0.62	0.74	0.00	3.00	1.14	0.41
Anxiousness	401	1.09	1.02	0.00	3.00	0.45	-1.20
Separation Insecurity	401	0.61	0.70	0.00	3.00	1.27	0.94
Detachment	401	0.74	0.67	0.00	2.75	0.95	0.19
Withdrawal	401	1.00	0.85	0.00	3.00	0.48	-0.87
Anhedonia	401	0.51	0.70	0.00	2.75	1.36	0.87
Intimacy Avoidance	401	0.70	0.85	0.00	3.00	1.15	0.31
Antagonism	401	0.44	0.48	0.00	2.33	1.42	1.88
Manipulativeness	401	0.56	0.60	0.00	2.75	1.26	1.20
Deceitfulness	401	0.41	0.55	0.00	2.75	1.50	1.85
Grandiosity	401	0.35	0.58	0.00	3.00	1.96	3.42
Disinhibition	401	0.48	0.54	0.00	2.50	1.16	0.71
Irresponsibility	401	0.27	0.42	0.00	2.25	1.67	2.44
Impulsivity	401	0.42	0.62	0.00	3.00	1.57	1.82
Distractibility	401	0.73	0.84	0.00	3.00	1.00	-0.12
Psychoticism	401	0.44	0.49	0.00	2.58	1.27	1.15
Unusual Beliefs	401	0.35	0.54	0.00	2.75	1.80	2.94
Eccentricity	401	0.76	0.84	0.00	3.00	0.91	-0.25
Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations [a]	401	0.14	0.25	0.00	1.25	1.84	2.83
S/S Liking							
Negative Affect	359	2.11	1.15	1.00	6.67	1.20	1.17
Emotional Lability	284	2.30	1.61	1.00	7.00	1.32	0.85
Anxiousness	340	1.89	1.24	1.00	7.00	1.79	3.30
Separation Insecurity	301	2.16	1.32	1.00	7.00	1.03	0.48
Detachment	359	2.94	1.42	1.00	7.00	0.48	-0.39
Withdrawal	351	3.54	1.87	1.00	7.00	0.14	-1.05
Anhedonia	274	2.01	1.33	1.00	7.00	1.35	1.16
Intimacy Avoidance	289	2.52	1.57	1.00	7.00	0.95	0.20
Antagonism	287	2.32	1.32	1.00	6.50	1.02	0.42
Manipulativeness	251	2.28	1.56	1.00	7.00	1.05	0.12
Deceitfulness	249	1.97	1.33	1.00	7.00	1.39	1.26
Grandiosity	242	2.62	1.60	1.00	7.00	0.78	-0.19
Disinhibition	359	2.32	1.08	1.00	6.33	0.93	0.93

Irresponsibility	305	1.88	1.21	1.00	7.00	1.60	2.40
Impulsivity	294	2.90	1.55	1.00	7.00	0.58	-0.44
Distractibility	331	2.21	1.25	1.00	7.00	1.05	0.86
Psychoticism	316	3.78	1.54	1.00	7.00	-0.08	-0.75
Unusual Beliefs	278	3.71	1.81	1.00	7.00	0.03	-0.92
Eccentricity	300	4.06	1.80	1.00	7.00	-0.23	-0.84
Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations	261	3.31	1.73	1.00	7.00	0.39	-0.65
S/O Liking							
Negative Affect	400	1.94	0.87	1.00	6.33	0.97	1.19
Emotional Lability	400	1.79	1.19	1.00	7.00	2.00	4.36
Anxiousness	400	2.04	1.08	1.00	7.00	0.84	0.19
Separation Insecurity	400	2.00	1.19	1.00	7.00	1.15	0.82
Detachment	400	2.45	1.06	1.00	6.33	0.33	-0.44
Withdrawal	400	2.93	1.43	1.00	7.00	0.18	-0.75
Anhedonia	400	1.96	1.18	1.00	7.00	1.06	0.62
Intimacy Avoidance	400	2.46	1.38	1.00	7.00	0.55	-0.50
Antagonism [a]	400	0.21	0.34	0.00	1.85	1.84	3.34
Manipulativeness [a]	400	0.14	0.36	0.00	1.95	2.58	6.03
Deceitfulness [a]	400	0.09	0.28	0.00	1.95	3.51	13.28
Grandiosity [a]	400	0.29	0.48	0.00	1.95	1.37	0.61
Disinhibition	400	2.10	0.87	1.00	6.00	0.59	0.45
Irresponsibility [a]	400	0.26	0.42	0.00	1.79	1.30	0.65
Impulsivity	400	2.71	1.41	1.00	7.00	0.38	-0.77
Distractibility	400	2.15	1.15	1.00	7.00	0.62	-0.44
Psychoticism	400	3.26	1.42	1.00	7.00	0.21	-0.44
Unusual Beliefs	400	3.35	1.66	1.00	7.00	0.11	-0.80
Eccentricity	400	3.76	1.66	1.00	7.00	-0.11	-0.74
Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations	400	2.68	1.57	1.00	7.00	0.76	-0.03
O/S Liking							
Negative Affect	400	1.78	0.88	1.00	5.67	1.46	2.26
Emotional Lability	400	1.98	1.29	1.00	7.00	1.51	1.86
Anxiousness	400	1.56	0.92	1.00	6.00	2.00	4.18
Separation Insecurity	400	1.79	1.02	1.00	6.00	1.27	1.08
Detachment	400	2.15	0.91	1.00	5.00	0.67	0.02
Withdrawal	400	2.59	1.33	1.00	7.00	0.60	-0.12
Anhedonia [a]	400	0.31	0.48	0.00	1.95	1.21	0.22
Intimacy Avoidance	400	2.28	1.27	1.00	7.00	0.77	-0.19
Antagonism	400	3.04	1.61	1.00	7.00	0.37	-0.94
Manipulativeness	400	2.90	1.84	1.00	7.00	0.49	-1.04
Deceitfulness	400	2.42	1.58	1.00	7.00	0.84	-0.39
Grandiosity	400	3.81	1.98	1.00	7.00	-0.10	-1.26
Disinhibition	400	2.60	1.00	1.00	7.00	0.46	0.41
Irresponsibility	400	2.02	1.24	1.00	7.00	1.29	1.42
Impulsivity	400	3.72	1.54	1.00	7.00	-0.20	-0.65
Distractibility	400	2.05	1.13	1.00	7.00	0.95	0.39
Psychoticism	400	3.55	1.34	1.00	7.00	-0.12	-0.57

Unusual Beliefs	400	3.71	1.62	1.00	7.00	-0.16	-0.69
Eccentricity	400	4.11	1.68	1.00	7.00	-0.18	-0.72
Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations	400	2.84	1.50	1.00	7.00	0.37	-0.70
O/O Liking							
Negative Affect	400	1.89	0.86	1.00	6.00	1.16	1.68
Emotional Lability	400	1.84	1.26	1.00	7.00	1.88	3.32
Anxiousness	400	1.88	1.04	1.00	7.00	1.29	1.95
Separation Insecurity	400	1.95	1.08	1.00	7.00	1.13	1.00
Detachment	400	2.06	0.88	1.00	6.33	0.83	0.88
Withdrawal	400	2.33	1.16	1.00	6.00	0.54	-0.53
Anhedonia	400	1.78	1.09	1.00	7.00	1.50	2.20
Intimacy Avoidance	400	2.07	1.11	1.00	7.00	0.86	0.31
Antagonism [a]	400	0.30	0.38	0.00	1.85	1.22	0.95
Manipulativeness [a]	400	0.21	0.41	0.00	1.79	1.83	2.41
Deceitfulness [a]	400	0.15	0.34	0.00	1.95	2.32	5.27
Grandiosity	400	1.77	1.13	1.00	7.00	1.77	3.06
Disinhibition	400	2.23	0.83	1.00	6.67	0.89	2.43
Irresponsibility [a]	400	0.28	0.43	0.00	1.95	1.37	1.15
Impulsivity	400	3.08	1.31	1.00	6.00	0.00	-0.89
Distractibility	400	2.13	1.13	1.00	7.00	0.83	0.31
Psychoticism	400	2.79	1.08	1.00	7.00	0.36	0.26
Unusual Beliefs	400	2.82	1.32	1.00	7.00	0.31	-0.55
Eccentricity	400	3.26	1.35	1.00	7.00	0.01	-0.73
Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations	400	2.30	1.30	1.00	7.00	1.07	1.07

Note. PID-5 = Personality Inventory for DSM-5; S/S = Liking in Self; S/O = Liking in Others; O/S = Perceptions of Others Liking in Self; O/O = Perceptions of Others Liking in Others

[a] Variable has been logarithmically transformed.

APPENDIX C

CORRELATIONS AMONG TRAIT LIKING RATINGS

Trait	S/S with S/O	S/S with O/S	S/S with O/O	S/O with O/S	S/O with O/O	O/S with O/O
Negative Affect	0.35	0.40	0.36	0.63	0.73	0.76
Emotional Lability	0.32	0.28	0.30	0.71	0.76	0.77
Anxiousness	0.22	0.32	0.25	0.42	0.71	0.55
Separation Insecurity	0.24	0.33	0.21	0.49	0.55	0.63
Detachment	0.33	0.25	0.23	0.56	0.72	0.70
Withdrawal	0.35	0.22	0.18	0.46	0.58	0.59
Anhedonia	0.20	0.25	0.23	0.51	0.77	0.58
Intimacy Avoidance	0.37	0.19	0.22	0.47	0.65	0.62
Antagonism	0.34	0.20	0.18	0.13	0.65	0.23
Manipulativeness	0.32	0.21	0.17	0.17	0.60	0.32
Deceitfulness	0.21	0.19	0.09	0.13	0.56	0.30
Grandiosity	0.37	0.13	0.25	0.19	0.63	0.27
Disinhibition	0.22	0.18	0.17	0.55	0.72	0.68
Irresponsibility	0.18	0.13	0.18	0.43	0.69	0.50
Impulsivity	0.32	0.21	0.18	0.41	0.52	0.71
Distractibility	0.18	0.15	0.12	0.55	0.77	0.67
Psychoticism	0.54	0.31	0.26	0.58	0.61	0.64
Unusual Beliefs	0.51	0.34	0.22	0.49	0.55	0.55
Eccentricity	0.52	0.24	0.28	0.50	0.52	0.60
Cog. Percep. Aberr.	0.40	0.25	0.24	0.60	0.68	0.68

Note. Cog. Percep. Aberr. = Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations

APPENDIX D

FULL STANDARDIZED RESULTS OF MULTILEVEL STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODELS

Trait	**Negative Affect**		**Emotional Lability**		**Anxiousness**		**Separation Insecurity**	
Model	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality
Level 1				*β* (95% C.I.)				
PE**:** *Liking* ON *Perceiver*	**.13** (.09, .17)	**.13** (.09, .17)	.06 (00, .11)	.06 (.00, .11)	**.15** (.10, .19)	**.14** (.10, .18)	**.11** (.07, .16)	**.11** (.06, .15)
TE**:** *Liking* ON *Target*	-.01 (-.05, .02)	-.02 (-.05, .02)	**.17** (.11, .23)	**.17** (.11, .22)	**-.14** (-.18, -.10)	**-.14** (-.18, .11)	.00 (-.04, .04)	-.01 (-.05, .03)
IE**:** *Liking* ON *Perceiver* × *Target*	**.09** (.05, .13)	**.09** (.05, .12)	**.07** (.02, .13)	**.07** (.02, .13)	**.05** (.01, .08)	**.04** (.01, .08)	**.09** (.04, .13)	**.09** (.04, .13)
Level 2				*β*/*r* (95% C.I.)				
PE ON Trait	-.02 (-.11, .06)	.03 (-.06, .12)	.01 (-.08, .09)	**.10** (.02, .18)	.03 (-.05, .12)	.01 (-.06, .10)	-.04 (-.12, .05)	.01 (-.06, .09)
TE ON Trait	**-.15** (-.22, -.06)	**-.10** (-.18, -.01)	-.09 (-.17, .01)	.06 (-.02, .15)	**-.12** (-.19, -.03)	**-.12** (-.19, .03)	**-.12** (-.19, -.06)	-.02 (-.09, .05)
IE ON Trait	-.11 (-.20, .00)	-.10 (-.18, .00)	.00 (-.10, .10)	.06 (-.03, .14)	**-.12** (-.20, -.02)	-.09 (-.17, .00)	-.11 (-.22, .00)	-.03 (-.11, .07)
Liking ON Trait	**.11** (.03, .19)	-.01 (-.08, .06)	**.13** (.06, .21)	.03 (-.04, .11)	.02 (-.04, .10)	-.03 (-.10, .04)	**.11** (.05, .17)	.07 (-.01, .15)
Liking WITH *PE*	.04 (-.09, .16)	.03 (-.09, .16)	-.08 (-.21, .05)	-.09 (-.21, .05)	.08 (-.04, .22)	.09 (-.03, .22)	.08 (-.07, .18)	.07 (-.08, .17)
Liking WITH *TE*	**.12** (.01, .24)	.08 (-.04, .20)	.04 (-.08, .17)	.01 (-.11, .14)	**-.13** (-.24, -.01)	**-.14** (-.26, -.02)	-.04 (-.14, .07)	-.06 (-.16, .04)
Liking WITH *IE*	.13 (.00, .24)	.10 (-.03, .22)	.02 (-.12, .14)	.01 (-.11, .13)	.12 (-.01, .26)	.12 (-.02, .25)	.00 (-.16, .11)	-.01 (-.18, .09)

PE WITH *TE*	**.56** (.42, .68)	**.56** (.42, .68)	**.72** (.60, .80)	**.71** (.59, .80)	**.35** (.22, .50)	**.35** (.21, .50)	**.41** (.24, .50)	**.41** (.25, .50)
PE WITH *IE*	**.74** (.66, .80)	**.74** (.66, .80)	**.85** (.76, .90)	**.85** (.76, .90)	**.66** (.49, .78)	**.66** (.49, .79)	**.34** (.21, .50)	**.34** (.22, .49)
TE WITH *IE*	**.81** (.72, .87)	**.80** (.72, .87)	**.80** (.71, .86)	**.80** (.70, .86)	**.60** (.45, .73)	**.60** (.46, .74)	**.72** (.63, .81)	**.73** (.64, .82)
Trait	**Detachment**		**Withdrawal**		**Anhedonia**		**Intimacy Avoidance**	
Model	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality
Level 1					*β* (95% C.I.)			
PE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver	**.33** (.28, .37)	**.33** (.29, .37)	**.28** (.24, .32)	**.30** (.25, .33)	**.52** (.48, .57)	**.52** (.47, .56)	**.14** (.09, .18)	**.15** (.11, .20)
TE*: *Liking* ON *Target	**.14** (.10, .17)	**.14** (.10, .18)	**.15** (.11, .19)	**.16** (.12, .20)	**-.36** (-.41, -.32)	**-.36** (-.40, -.32)	.05 (.00, .09)	**.06** (.02, .10)
IE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver* × *Target	**.07** (.03, .10)	**.06** (.03, .10)	.02 (-.01, .06)	.03 (-.01, .06)	**.45** (.40, .50)	**.44** (.39, .49)	**-.07** (-.12, -.03)	**-.06** (-.11, -.02)
Level 2					*β*/*r* (95% C.I.)			
PE ON Trait	**.21** (.13, .27)	**.13** (.05, .21)	**.33** (.24, .40)	**.16** (.08, .24)	**.11** (.03, .19)	.03 (-.05, .10)	**.24** (.16, .33)	-.01 (-.09, .06)
TE ON Trait	-.06 (-.14, .01)	-.03 (-.10, .04)	.09 (.00, .16)	.06 (-.03, .15)	**-.10** (-.18, -.03)	-.04 (-.12, .03)	-.03 (-.12, .06)	**-.11** (-.20, -.04)
IE ON Trait	**-.09** (-.17, -.01)	.00 (-.08, .07)	.07 (-.03, .15)	.09 (.00, .16)	-.07 (-.15, .01)	-.06 (-.14, .02)	-.07 (-.16, .04)	-.08 (-.17, .00)
Liking ON Trait	**.18** (.12, .25)	**.11** (.04, .18)	**.20** (.13, .27)	**.11** (.04, .19)	**.11** (.04, .19)	.01 (-.06, .08)	**.22** (.15, .28)	.03 (-.04, .10)
Liking WITH *PE*	**.22** (.10, .33)	**.26** (.14, .37)	**.18** (.06, .31)	**.25** (.14, .37)	**.40** (.29, .50)	**.42** (.31, .52)	.06 (-.06, .21)	**.17** (.05, .27)
Liking WITH *TE*	.08 (-.03, .17)	.06 (-.06, .16)	.12 (-.02, .24)	.13 (-.02, .26)	**-.35** (-.45, -.24)	**-.38** (-.47, -.27)	-.04 (-.14, .09)	-.04 (-.16, .08)
Liking WITH *IE*	**.13** (.03, .23)	.10 (-.02, .20)	.01 (-.11, .15)	.01 (-.12, .15)	**.35** (.24, .46)	**.34** (.22, .45)	-.08 (-.20, .06)	-.11 (-.24, .03)
PE WITH *TE*	**.56** (.44, .65)	**.54** (.41, .63)	**.42** (.28, .55)	**.44** (.29, .57)	**.46** (.36, .57)	**.44** (.34, .54)	**.32** (.16, .42)	**.27** (.16, .40)

PE WITH *IE*	**.82** (.74, .87)	**.77** (.69, .84)	**.74** (.62, .81)	**.72** (.60, .80)	**.56** (.45, .67)	**.56** (.46, .65)	**.72** (.62, .79)	**.62** (.51, .73)
TE WITH *IE*	**.78** (.71, .86)	**.81** (.72, .88)	**.74** (.61, .82)	**.76** (.62, .84)	**.59** (.50, .69)	**.61** (.51, .69)	**.58** (.47, .66)	**.54** (.42, .67)
Path	**Antagonism**		**Manipulativeness**		**Deceitfulness**		**Grandiosity**	
Model	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality
Level 1				*β* (95% C.I.)				
PE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver	**-.11** (-.14, -.09)	**-.10** (-.13, .08)	**-.06** (-.10, -.03)	**-.05** (-.08, -.01)	**-.05** (-.09, -.02)	-.03 (-.07, .01)	**-.41** (-.44, -.38)	**-.40** (-.43, -.37)
TE*: *Liking* ON *Target	**.88** (.58, .90)	**.89** (.59, .91)	**.89** (.85, .92)	**.90** (.86, .94)	**.89** (.55, .92)	**.91** (.72, .95)	**.65** (.62, .69)	**.66** (.63, .70)
IE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver* × *Target	**-.08** (-.10, -.06)	**-.07** (-.09, -.05)	**-.04** (-.07, -.01)	-.03 (-.06, .01)	-.03 (-.07, .00)	-.01 (-.05, .03)	**.15** (.12, .19)	**.16** (.13, .20)
Level 2				*β*/*r* (95% C.I.)				
PE ON Trait	**.15** (.07, .21)	**.10** (.04, .18)	**.13** (.05, .20)	.08 (.00, .15)	**.11** (.04, .18)	-.06 (-.13, .01)	**.09** (.02, .16)	.07 (-.01, .14)
TE ON Trait	**.21** (.14, .28)	.05 (-.02, .12)	**.22** (.15, .30)	**.08** (.02, .15)	**.18** (.11, .25)	.00 (-.08, .08)	**.11** (.03, .18)	.02 (-.06, .09)
IE ON Trait	**.12** (.06, .18)	**.10** (.04, .17)	**.10** (.02, .17)	.08 (.00, .15)	**.10** (.04, .18)	-.04 (-.11, .04)	**.16** (.08, .23)	**.09** (.01, .16)
Liking ON Trait	**.33** (.26, .39)	.07 (.00, .14)	**.27** (.20, .34)	**.09** (.02, .16)	**.23** (.15, .29)	.02 (-.06, .09)	**.29** (.22, .36)	**.08** (.01, .15)
Liking WITH *PE*	**-.33** (-.41, -.21)	**-.22** (-.32, -.10)	**-.28** (-.38, -.17)	**-.21** (-.32, -.09)	**-.28** (-.37, -.16)	**-.20** (-.33, -.10)	**-.44** (-.53, -.35)	**-.36** (-.45, -.26)
Liking WITH *TE*	**.87** (.83, .90)	**.88** (.85, .90)	**.88** (.85, .91)	**.90** (.87, .92)	**.91** (.88, .93)	**.91** (.89, .93)	**.54** (.46, .62)	**.56** (.48, .64)
Liking WITH *IE*	**-.29** (-.40, -.16)	**-.20** (-.31, -.07)	**-.24** (-.34, -.13)	**-.20** (-.30, -.07)	**-.24** (-.34, -.11)	**-.16** (-.28, -.06)	-.10 (-.20, .02)	.00 (-.11, .11)
PE WITH *TE*	**-.30** (-.39, -.18)	**-.23** (-.32, -.11)	**-.24** (-.34, -.12)	**-.18** (-.29, -.06)	**-.22** (-.31, -.10)	**-.16** (-.28, -.05)	**-.15** (-.26, -.03)	-.12 (-.23, .00)
PE WITH *IE*	**.98** (.97, .99)	**.98** (.98, .99)	**.98** (.97, .99)	**.98** (.97, .99)	**.98** (.97, .99)	**.98** (.97, .99)	**.78** (.72, .83)	**.78** (.72, .83)

TE WITH *IE*	**-.31** (-.39, -.18)	**-.25** (-.33, -.12)	**-.23** (-.34, -.11)	**-.19** (-.30, -.07)	**-.21** (-.30, -.07)	**-.15** (-.28, -.05)	**-.35** (-.45, -.24)	**-.30** (-.40, -.19)
Path	**Disinhibition**		**Irresponsibility**		**Impulsivity**		**Distractibility**	
Model	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality
Level 1	*β* (95% C.I.)							
PE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver	**-.16** (-.19, -.12)	**-.15** (-.18, -.11)	-.02 (-.05, .01)	-.01 (-.04, .02)	**-.24** (-.28, -.20)	**-.24** (-.27, -.19)	**.06** (.02, .10)	**.06** (.02, 10)
TE*: *Liking* ON *Target	**.19** (.15, .22)	**.19** (.16, .22)	**.88** (.57, .91)	**.89** (.58, .92)	**.17** (.13, .21)	**.18** (.14, .22)	-.01 (-.05, .03)	-.01 (-.05, .03)
IE*: *Liking* ON *Perceiver* × *Target	**-.07** (-.11, -.04)	**-.07** (-.11, -.04)	-.02 (-.05, .00)	-.01 (-.04, .01)	**-.12** (-.16, -.08)	**-.12** (-.15, -.08)	.04 (.00, .07)	.04 (.00, .08)
Level 2	*β/r* (95% C.I.)							
PE ON Trait	.04 (-.04, .12)	.04 (-.03, .12)	.06 (-.01, .13)	-.02 (-.08, .06)	**.16** (.08, .24)	**.09** (.01, .17)	-.02 (-.10, .05)	-.02 (-.10, .06)
TE ON Trait	**-.11** (-.19, -.03)	-.02 (-.11, .06)	.06 (-.01, .14)	-.06 (-.13, .00)	-.09 (-.18, .00)	.03 (-.06, .13)	**-.11** (-.19, -.03)	-.05 (-.12, .04)
IE ON Trait	.03 (-.06, .11)	.07 (-.01, .15)	**.07** (.01, .13)	-.02 (-.07, .05)	.02 (-.09, .12)	.06 (-.03, .15)	-.02 (-.10, .07)	-.03 (-.10, .05)
Liking ON Trait	**.24** (.17, .30)	**.09** (.02, .15)	**.16** (.09, .23)	-.06 (-.13, .02)	**.19** (.12, .26)	**.15** (.07, 22)	**.17** (.10, .24)	.01 (-.07, .08)
Liking WITH *PE*	**-.16** (-.27, -.04)	-.13 (-.25, .00)	**-.16** (-.26, -.05)	**-.14** (-.24, -.03)	**-.20** (-.33, -.07)	**-.16** (-.29, -.03)	**-.16** (-.27, -.03)	**-.16** (-.27, -.03)
Liking WITH *TE*	.07 (-.05, .18)	.02 (-.11, .13)	**.77** (.72, .82)	**.77** (.71, .82)	.03 (-.09, .17)	-.02 (-.14, .12)	**-.20** (-.31, -.09)	**-.23** (-.33, -.12)
Liking WITH *IE*	**-.20** (-.32, -.07)	**-.19** (-.30, -.06)	-.12 (-.23, .01)	-.10 (-.21, .03)	**-.24** (-.38, -.09)	**-.24** (-.38, .10)	**-.19** (-.31, -.05)	**-.19** (-.31, -.05)
PE WITH *TE*	**.43** (.31, .55)	**.41** (.27, .52)	.05 (-.04, .20)	.06 (-.03, .20)	**.25** (.11, .39)	**.21** (.06, .35)	**.45** (.34, .58)	**.44** (.33, .58)
PE WITH *IE*	**.82** (.74, .87)	**.82** (.74, .87)	**.97** (.96, .98)	**.97** (.96, .98)	**.54** (.43, 67)	**.53** (.42, .65)	**.80** (.68, .90)	**.80** (.68, .90)
TE WITH *IE*	**.62** (.52, .72)	**.62** (.51, .70)	**.09** (.01, .21)	**.10** (.01, .22)	**.68** (.54, .80)	**.67** (.53, .80)	**.62** (.50, .75)	**.61** (.50, .75)

Path	**Psychoticism**		**Unusual Beliefs**		**Eccentricity**		**Cog. Percep. Aberr.**	
Model	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality	PID-5	Cardinality
Level 1				*β* (95% C.I.)				
PE**:** *Liking* ON *Perceiver*	**.14** (.10, .18)	**.14** (.10, .18)	**.09** (.04, .12)	**.09** (.05, .14)	**.06** (.02, .10)	**.07** (.03, .11)	**.18** (.13, .23)	**.18** (.12, .22)
TE**:** *Liking* ON *Target*	**.31** (.27, .34)	**.31** (.26, .34)	**.23** (.18, .27)	**.23** (.19, .28)	**.21** (.17, .25)	**.22** (.19, .26)	**.26** (.22, .31)	**.26** (.21, .31)
IE**:** *Liking* ON *Perceiver* × *Target*	**-.10** (-.14, -.06)	**-.10** (-.14, -.06)	**-.15** (-.18, -.10)	**-.14** (-.18, -.10)	**-.16** (-.20, -.12)	**-.14** (-.18, -.10)	-.01 (-.06, .04)	-.01 (-.06, .04)
Level 2				*β*/*r* (95% C.I.)				
PE ON Trait	**.20** (.11, .28)	**.31** (.22, .41)	**.12** (.02, .22)	**.27** (.19, .36)	**.27** (.19, .34)	**.15** (.07, .23)	-.01 (-.10, .07)	.08 (-.01, .16)
TE ON Trait	-.03 (-.13, .06)	-.01 (-.12, .10)	-.03 (-.11, .08)	.05 (-.04, .14)	.07 (-.02, .17)	.06 (-.04, .15)	-.09 (-.19, .00)	.02 (-.07, .12)
IE ON Trait	**-.14** (-.23, -.04)	.03 (-.08, .12)	**-.15** (-.27, -.05)	.01 (-.08, .09)	-.03 (-.12, .07)	.04 (-.05, .14)	**-.11** (-.20, -.01)	.06 (-.04, .16)
Liking ON Trait	**.37** (.31, .43)	**.21** (.15, .28)	**.23** (.16, .30)	**.15** (.08, .22)	**.34** (.27, .41)	**.14** (.06, .22)	**.20** (.13, .27)	**.13** (.06, .21)
Liking WITH *PE*	**.14** (.01, .25)	.12 (-.03, .26)	**.16** (.01, .29)	.12 (.00, .25)	-.03 (-.16, .07)	.10 (-.02, .22)	.11 (-.01, .24)	.07 (-.06, .21)
Liking WITH *TE*	.12 (-.04, .26)	.08 (-.08, .23)	.12 (-.03, .29)	.08 (-.05, .21)	.04 (-.11, .19)	.08 (-.07, .23)	-.03 (-.19, .13)	-.07 (-.23, .08)
Liking WITH *IE*	**-.21** (-.37, -.04)	**-.30** (-.44, -.12)	**-.20** (-.41, -.02)	**-.22** (-.38, -.09)	**-.20** (-.33, -.07)	**-.23** (-.36, -.09)	**-.23** (-.37, -.07)	**-.29** (-.42, -.12)
PE WITH *TE*	**.38** (.22, .55)	**.43** (.30, .55)	**.29** (.15, .43)	**.20** (.06, .37)	.14 (-.01, .31)	.16 (.00, .34)	**.50** (.32, .65)	**.49** (.32, .65)
PE WITH *IE*	**.68** (.54, .80)	**.65** (.51, .75)	**.58** (.42, .73)	**.42** (.28, .62)	**.51** (.36, .73)	**.48** (.32, .67)	**.78** (.68, .86)	**.77** (.66, .86)
TE WITH *IE*	**.56** (.35, .70)	**.56** (.40, .68)	**.37** (.19, .52)	**.27** (.12, .47)	**.30** (.15, .55)	**.31** (.14, .56)	**.78** (.62, .91)	**.78** (.62, .90)

APPENDIX E

SIMPLE SLOPES ANALYSES FOR PERCEIVER × TARGET EFFECTS

Trait	Simple Slopes for Perceiver as IV		Simple Slopes for Target as IV	
	Target Value	*β*	Perceiver Value	*β*
Negative Affect	-1	0.03	-1	-0.06
	+1	**0.15**	+1	*0.07*
Emotional Lability	-1	-0.02	-1	0.07
	+1	*0.11*	+1	**0.20**
Anxiousness	-1	*0.08*	-1	**-0.16**
	+1	**0.15**	+1	*-0.09*
Separation Insecurity	-1	0.02	-1	-0.08
	+1	**0.17**	+1	0.07
Detachment	-1	**0.19**	-1	0.04
	+1	**0.37**	+1	**0.22**
Withdrawal	-1	**0.30**	-1	*0.13*
	+1	**0.45**	+1	**0.29**
Anhedonia	-1	*0.09*	-1	**-0.73**
	+1	**0.82**	+1	0.00
Intimacy Avoidance	-1	**0.20**	-1	*0.11*
	+1	0.10	+1	0.01
Antagonism	-1	-0.05	-1	**1.37**
	+1	**-0.36**	+1	**1.06**
Manipulativeness	-1	-0.03	-1	**1.34**
	+1	**-0.31**	+1	**1.07**
Deceitfulness	-1	-0.03	-1	**1.13**
	+1	**-0.22**	+1	**0.95**
Grandiosity	-1	**-0.74**	-1	**1.02**
	+1	**-0.60**	+1	**1.16**
Disinhibition	-1	-0.06	-1	**0.18**
	+1	**-0.14**	+1	**0.10**
Irresponsibility	-1	-0.01	-1	**0.87**
	+1	-0.07	+1	**0.80**
Impulsivity	-1	**-0.18**	-1	**0.32**
	+1	**-0.42**	+1	0.09
Distractibility	-1	0.01	-1	-0.04
	+1	0.08	+1	0.03
Psychoticism	-1	**0.24**	-1	**0.38**
	+1	0.07	+1	**0.21**

Unusual Beliefs	-1	**0.27**	-1	**0.45**
	+1	-0.07	+1	0.11
Eccentricity	-1	**0.25**	-1	**0.43**
	+1	-0.07	+1	0.10
Cognitive and Perceptual Aberrations	-1	**0.19**	-1	**0.27**
	+1	**0.15**	+1	**0.23**

Note. **Bolded** correlation coefficients are significant at $p \leq .001$. *Italicized* correlation coefficients are significant at $p < .01$.