Supporting Information for: ***Do they like me? Exploring the role of metaperception in L1–L2 speaker interaction***

Appendix A

Background Information for Speaker Pairs

	Speaker A			Speaker B		
Pair	Gender	L1	Age	Gender	L1	Age
1	Female	Mandarin	18	Male	English	18
2	Male	Portuguese	22	Female	English	18
3	Female	Arabic	42	Female	English	22
4	Female	Mandarin	24	Male	English	34
5	Male	Nepali	25	Female	English	53
6	Male	Persian	25	Female	English	21
7	Female	Mandarin	27	Female	English	19
8	Male	Nepali	30	Male	English	19
9	Female	Mandarin	28	Female	English	19
10	Female	Turkish	21	Female	English	24
11	Female	Persian	25	Male	English	22
12	Female	Mandarin	25	Male	English	19
13	Female	Arabic	20	Female	English	21
14	Male	French	28	Female	English	19
15	Male	Spanish	21	Male	English	22
16	Male	Persian	33	Male	English	24
17	Male	Arabic	29	Female	English	19
18	Male	Mandarin	19	Male	English	20

19	Female	Turkish	20	Male	English	23
20	Female	Portuguese	36	Female	English	18
21	Male	Spanish	25	Male	English	20
22	Female	Turkish	21	Female	English	30
23	Female	Persian	39	Female	English	20
24	Male	Mandarin	33	Male	English	20
25	Male	Mandarin	21	Male	English	30
26	Male	Persian	22	Male	English	21
27	Male	Arabic	25	Male	English	25
28	Female	Mandarin	20	Female	English	20
29	Male	French	22	Male	English	21

Appendix B

Interaction Task: Nature vs. Nurture Debate

Text 1. *Happy families: A twin study of humour*

How do you respond to cartoons? Would you respond the same way as your family members or other students in your degree program? Cherkas, Hochberg, MacGregor, Snieder, & Spector (2000) conducted a twin study to test whether an individual's appreciation of humour is influenced by genetic factors or by one's shared family environment or unique environment. Their participants included 127 pairs of female twins (71 identical twins who share 100% of their genes, and 56 non-identical twins who share 50% of their genes), ages 20-75. Five cartoons were used in the questionnaire which both twins were asked to rate on a scale from 0 ("This cartoon was a waste of paper") to 10 ("This cartoon was one of the funniest I have ever seen"). The researchers hypothesized that humour is influenced by genetics, and therefore they expected that the identical twins would be more similar in their appreciation for humour than the non-identical twins, since they share more genes. However, they found that all twins (whether identical or not) had considerably similar responses to their twin. Therefore, the study's results did not support the idea of genetic contribution to humour, and instead suggested that humour appreciation is largely affected by an individual's shared environment.

> Adapted from Cherkas, L., Hochberg, F., MacGregor, A., Snieder, H., & Spector, T. (2000). Happy families: A twin study of humour. *Twin Research*, *3*, 17–22.

Text 2. *Sources of human psychological differences: The Minnesota study of twins reared apart*

Starting in 1979, Bouchard, Lykken, McGue, Segal, & Tellegen (1990) conducted one of the most famous studies on the influence of genetics on human traits by studying more than 100 sets of identical twins who were separated at birth. This allowed the researchers to investigate the traits the twins shared despite growing up in different environments. The researchers found many striking similarities of mannerisms (e.g., both twins read magazines backwards), personal choices (e.g., both twins chose the same name for their child), and expressive social behaviour (e.g., shyness). As these aspects are related to one's personality, it is possible that there are strong influences of genetics on personality. One incredible example was two twins who were separated at 4 weeks old and were reunited at age 39, but they learned that they both married a woman named Betty and divorced a woman named Linda, both named their son James and their dog Toy, both did carpentry, mechanical drawing, and had law-enforcement training, and both vacation on the same beach in Florida. Therefore, the findings of their study support the hypothesis that genetic similarity contributes to individuals' similarities in personality.

> Adapted from Bouchard, T., Lykken, D., McGue, M., Segal, N., Tellegen, A. (1990). Sources of human psychological differences: The Minnesota study of twins reared apart. *Science*, *250*(4978), 223–228.

One of the most famous debates in the history of psychology is the nature vs. nurture debate, where nature refers to the influence *genetics* has on one's appearance and personality

characteristics, and nurture refers to the role our experiences and *environment* play in who we are.

Discuss with your partner:

1. Summarize for your partner the study you read about and explain which side of the nature vs. nurture debate it supports.

2. Why have scientists been debating this question for centuries? In other words, why is it important to investigate whether nature or nurture is more dominant in determining a person's personality?

3. Which side do you agree with in the nature vs. nurture debate? Are personality traits the result of nature or nurture?

4. Can you think of a human characteristic for which genetic differences would play almost no role? Defend your choice.

5. To what extent are each of the following items influenced by nature or nurture? Why?
    - Accent or what language you speak
    - Intelligence
    - Temper (aggressive behavior)
    - Body size
    - Language acquisition
    - Artistic or musical ability
    - Alcoholism
    - Political opinions

Appendix C

Interpersonal Ratings

Part 1. *Answer some questions about how you felt about the student.*

I liked the student.
I would like to get to know the student better.
I would like to interact with the student again.
I could see myself becoming friends with the student.

I liked how accurately the student spoke.
I liked how fluently the student spoke.
I liked how easy the student was to understand.
I liked the student's pronunciation.

I liked how well the student collaborated with me.
I liked how well the student responded to my ideas.
I liked how the student gave me chances to talk.
I liked how comfortable the student made me feel.

Part 2. *Now answer some questions about how you think the student felt about you.*

I think the student liked me.
I think the student would like to get to know me better.
I think the student would want to interact with me again.
I think the student could see themselves becoming friends with me.

I think the student liked how accurately I spoke.
I think the student liked how fluently I spoke.
I think the student liked how easy I was to understand.
I think the student liked my pronunciation.

I think the student liked how well I collaborated with them.
I think the student liked how well I responded to their ideas.
I think the student liked how I gave them chances to talk.
I think the student liked how comfortable I made them feel.

Part 3. *If you had class with the student you just met during the discussion activity, would you want to…*

join group discussions with them in class?
do a presentation with them?
belong to a study group with them?
ask them to explain a concept or term?
text or email them a question about course content?

ask them for feedback on your paper?
ask them to share their notes with you?
spend free time with them outside class?
give them open and honest feedback?

Appendix D

Summary of Final Mixed-Effects Models

Interpersonal liking

Parameter	*Estimate*	*SE*	*95% CI*	*t*	*p*
(Intercept)	43.39	20.08	[3.57, 83.22]	2.16	.033
Rating type (perceived vs. actual)	–14.89	2.39	[–19.62, –10.16]	–6.24	< .001
Speaker status (L2 vs. L1)	–3.93	3.41	[–10.69, 2.84]	–1.15	.252
Speaker-level covariates					
Extraversion	2.80	2.26	[–1.68, 7.28]	1.24	.218
Negative emotion	–0.50	1.61	[–3.69, 2.69]	–0.31	.757
Open-mindedness	2.44	2.40	[–2.32, 7.21]	1.02	.311
Conscientiousness	3.00	1.80	[–0.57, 6.57]	1.67	.099
Agreeableness	3.29	2.64	[–1.95, 8.54]	1.25	.215
Age	–0.28	0.22	[–0.72, 0.17]	–1.22	.223
Weekly use of English	0.02	0.08	[–0.14, 0.18]	0.22	.824
Random effects	*Variance*	*SD*	*Criterion*	*Estimate*	
Speaker (intercept)	23.19	3.49	Log-likelihood	–452.721	
Pair (intercept)	29.25	5.41	AIC	931.442	
Marginal R^2/Conditional R^2	.29/.40		BIC	935.011	

Note. AIC = Akaike information criterion, BIC = Bayesian information criterion. LikingRating ~ RatingType + EnglishStatus + Extraversion + Agreeableness + Conscientiousness + NegativeEmotionality + OpenMindedness + Age + EnglishUse + (1 | Speaker) + (1 | Pair)

Speaking skill

Parameter	*Estimate*	*SE*	*95% CI*	*t*	*p*
(Intercept)	55.15	22.61	[10.31, 99.98]	2.44	.016
Rating type (perceived vs. actual)	–8.59	2.79	[–14.13, –3.06]	–3.08	.003
Speaker status (L2 vs. L1)	–14.76	4.01	[–22.72, –6.80]	–3.68	< .001
Speaker-level covariates					
Extraversion	2.63	2.60	[–2.53, 7.79]	1.01	.314
Negative emotion	0.79	1.84	[–2.86, 4.43]	0.43	.668
Open-mindedness	1.25	2.79	[–4.28, 6.78]	0.45	.655
Conscientiousness	1.44	2.04	[–2.60, 5.49]	0.71	.481
Agreeableness	0.93	3.07	[–5.15, 7.02]	0.30	.762
Age	–0.27	0.26	[–0.79, 0.25]	–1.03	.308
Weekly use of English	0.15	0.09	[–0.03, 0.33]	1.65	.102
Random effects	*Variance*	*SD*	*Criterion*	*Estimate*	
Speaker (intercept)	11.94	3.46	Log-likelihood	–467.52	
Pair (intercept)	13.41	3.66	AIC	961.05	
Marginal R^2/Conditional R^2	.35/.42		BIC	964.62	

Note. AIC = Akaike information criterion, BIC = Bayesian information criterion. SpeechRating ~ RatingType + EnglishStatus + Extraversion + Agreeableness + Conscientiousness + NegativeEmotionality + OpenMindedness + Age + EnglishUse + (1 | Speaker) + (1 | Pair)

Interactional behavior

Parameter	*Estimate*	*SE*	*95% CI*	*t*	*p*
(Intercept)	93.28	19.44	[54.73, 131.83]	4.80	< .001
Rating type (perceived vs. actual)	–8.84	2.14	[–13.09, –4.60]	–4.13	< .001
Speaker status (L2 vs. L1)	–4.91	3.19	[–11.24, 1.42]	–1.54	.127
Speaker-level covariates					
Extraversion	1.05	2.14	[–3.19, 5.30]	0.49	.623
Negative emotion	–0.33	1.54	[–3.39, 2.72]	–0.22	.829
Open-mindedness	–0.28	2.26	[–4.75, 4.20]	–0.12	.903
Conscientiousness	0.25	1.73	[–3.17, 3.68]	0.15	.883
Agreeableness	–0.83	2.49	[–5.77, 4.10]	–0.33	.739
Age	–0.02	0.21	[–0.44, 0.40]	–0.10	.922
Weekly use of English	–0.03	0.08	[–0.18, 0.12]	–0.39	.697
Random effects	*Variance*	*SD*	*Criterion*	*Estimate*	
Speaker (intercept)	36.24	7.56	Log-likelihood	–445.62	
Pair (intercept)	46.83	6.84	AIC	917.24	
Marginal R^2/Conditional R^2	.13/.35		BIC	920.81	

Note. AIC = Akaike information criterion, BIC = Bayesian information criterion.

InteractionRating ~ RatingType + EnglishStatus + Extraversion + Agreeableness + Conscientiousness + NegativeEmotionality + OpenMindedness + Age + EnglishUse + (1 | Speaker) + (1 | Pair)

Future consequences of interaction for L1 speakers

Parameter	*Estimate*	*SE*	*95% CI*	*t*	*p*
Interpersonal liking (R^2 = .57)					
(Intercept)	27.80	9.57	[8.01, 47.59]	2.91	.008
Perceived rating	0.68	0.23	[0.22, 1.15]	3.03	.006
Actual rating of partner (covariate)	0.03	0.22	[–0.43, 0.49]	0.13	.897
Speaking skill (R^2 = .54)					
(Intercept)	18.87	11.56	[–5.05, 42.79]	1.63	.116
Perceived rating	0.30	0.17	[–0.06, 0.65]	1.73	.098
Actual rating of partner (covariate)	0.47	0.13	[0.21, 0.74]	3.70	.001
Interactional behavior (R^2 = .23)					
(Intercept)	25.34	18.84	[–13.64, 64.32]	1.34	.192
Perceived rating	0.34	0.29	[–0.27, 0.94]	1.16	.259
Actual rating of partner (covariate)	0.24	0.31	[–0.41, 0.88]	0.76	.456

Future consequences of interaction for L2 speakers

Parameter	*Estimate*	*SE*	*95% CI*	*t*	*p*
Interpersonal liking (R^2 = .08)					
(Intercept)	47.39	19.70	[6.63, 88.15]	2.41	.025
Perceived rating	0.07	0.18	[–0.31, 0.45]	0.38	.706
Actual rating of partner (covariate)	0.32	0.23	[–0.16, 0.80]	1.36	.186
Speaking skill (R^2 = .23)					
(Intercept)	27.61	17.69	[–8.99, 64.20]	1.56	.132
Perceived rating	0.17	0.12	[–0.06, 0.41]	1.51	.145
Actual rating of partner (covariate)	0.45	0.18	[0.08, 0.83]	2.51	.020
Interactional behavior (R^2 = .29)					
(Intercept)	28.75	16.81	[–6.03, 63.52]	1.71	.101
Perceived rating	0.13	0.17	[–0.22, 0.48]	0.77	.448
Actual rating of partner (covariate)	0.44	0.22	[–0.00, 0.89]	2.05	.052