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**Implicit Theories of Personality Measures and Standardized Factor Loadings**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Study 1b | Study 2 |
| 1. You can’t change people who are jerks in school.
 | .58\*\*\* | .69\*\*\* |
| 1. Some people are just jerks, and not much can be done to change them.
 | .70\*\*\* | .72\*\*\* |
| 1. Bullies and victims are types of people that really can’t be changed.
 | .73\*\*\* | .72\*\*\* |
| 1. Bullies can try acting nice, but deep down they’re just bullies.
 | .63\*\*\* | .55\*\*\* |
| 1. You can't change whether or not people respect you in school.
 | .52\*\*\* | .51\*\*\* |
| 1. Some people are just not cool, and not much can be done to change that.
 | .56\*\*\* | .63\*\*\* |
| 1. Popular people and unpopular people are types of people that really can’t be changed.
 | .52\*\*\* | .53\*\*\* |
| 1. Some people in high school will never be respected by anyone.
 | .43\*\*\* | .56\*\*\* |

**Intercorrelations among Key Variables (Study 1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | *N* (Study 1a) |
| 1. Entity theory of personality | --- | .18\*\*\* | .14\*\*\* | 3,282 |
| 2. Depressive symptoms | .28\*\*\* | --- | .59\*\*\* | 3,406 |
| 3. Global psychological distress | .20\*\*\* | .66\*\*\* | --- | 2,994 |
| *N* (Study 1b) | 3,051 | 3,046 | 3,018 | --- |
| Mean (Study 1b) | 2.95 | 0.40 | 2.64 | --- |
| Standard deviation (Study 1b) | 0.92 | 0.31 | 0.87 | --- |

*Note*. Variables are standardized in Study 1 with means of 0 and standard deviations of 1. Correlations for Study 1a/Study 1b are shown above/below diagonal.

\* *p* < .05. \*\* *p* < .01. \*\*\* *p* < .001.

**The Association Between an Entity Theory of Personality and**

**Fixed Trait Attribution About the Self**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sample | Attribution Measure |  *r* | *n* |
| 1 | Recall, Scenario | .26\*\* | 150 |
| 2 | Cyberball | .25\*\*\* | 303 |
| 3 | Cyberball | .23\*\*\* | 211 |
| 4 | Social media | .16\*\* | 251 |
| 5 | Social media | .16 | 84 |
| 6 | Social media | .25\* | 62 |
| 7 | Social media | .17\*\* | 320 |
| 8 | Scenario | .14\*\*\* | 2,877 |

*Note*. Recall = Attribution about recalled personal experiences of peer conflict. Scenario = Attribution about a hypothetical scenario of peer conflict. Cyberball = Attribution about social exclusion during the online Cyberball game (e.g., Williams & Jarvis, 2006). Social media = Attribution about few “likes” on an experimental social media interaction (e.g., Lee et al., 2019).

\* *p* < .05. \*\* *p* < .01. \*\*\* *p* < .001.

**The Path Coefficients for the Association of Entity Theory of Personality to**

**Internalizing Symptoms After Controlling for Gender**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable |  | *b* | *SE* |
| **Person-level (level 2)** |  |  |  |
| Internalizing symptoms  |  |  |  |
|  Threat appraisals |  |  .12\*\*\* | .03 |
|  Female |  |  .05\* | .02 |
|  Baseline internalizing symptoms  |  |  .15\*\*\* | .02 |
| Threat appraisals  |  |  |  |
|  Fixed trait attribution |  |  .25\*\*\* | .05 |
|  Female |  | -.05 | .09 |
|  Baseline internalizing symptomsa |  |  .39\*\*\* | .05 |
| Fixed trait attribution |  |  |  |
|  Entity theory |  |  .24\*\* | .08 |
|  Female |  |  .21 | .13 |
|  Baseline internalizing symptomsa  |  |  .33\*\*\* | .06 |
| **Day-level (level 1)** |  |  |  |
| Threat appraisals |  |  |  |
|  Daily stressor intensity |  |  .31\*\*\* | .08 |
| Random slope  × fixed trait attribution |  |  .07\* | .03 |

*Note*. *N* = 474 (2,998 daily reports).Female: 0 = *male*, 1 = *female*. Standardized coefficients were not calculated because the random effects model assumes no single variance/covariance matrix for the entire sample. Dummy-coded day variables were included as covariates (Reference day = Monday) to control for the potential day-of-the week effect (Chow, Ram, Boker, Fujita, & Clore, 2005). acovariance path

+ *p* < .10. \* *p* < .05. \*\* *p* < .01. \*\*\* *p* < .001.

**Modeling Syntax**

 **TITLE: Multilevel Model Syntax**

 DATA: FILE IS daily data long.dat;

 VARIABLE: NAMES ARE

 school !school ID

 nid !student ID

 gender

 itp1 !an entity theory personality item 1

 itp2 !an entity theory personality item 2

 itp3 !an entity theory personality item 3

 itp4 !an entity theory personality item 4

 itp5 !an entity theory personality item 5

 itp6 !an entity theory personality item 6

 itp7 !an entity theory personality item 7

 itp8 !an entity theory personality item 8

 str !intensity of daily stressor

 fixself !fixed trait attribution about the self

 negcontrol\_r !daily threat appraisal item 1 (reverse coded)

 neghelpless !daily threat appraisal item 2

cditotal !depressive symptoms total scores

psstotal !global psychological stress total scores

 INTb !baseline internalizing symptoms

 Tuesday

 Wednesday

 Thursday

 Friday

 ;

 USEVARIABLES ARE

 !Person-level var:

 itp1 itp2 itp3 itp4

 itp5 itp6 itp7 itp8

 fixself

 cditotal

 psstotal

 INTb

 !Day-level var:

 str

 negcontrol\_r

 neghelpless

 Tuesday

 Wednesday

 Thursday

 Friday

 ;

 WITHIN =

 str

 Tuesday

 Wednesday

 Thursday

 Friday

 ;

 BETWEEN =

 itp1 itp2 itp3 itp4

 itp5 itp6 itp7 itp8

 fixself

 cditotal

 psstotal

 INTb

 ;

 CLUSTER IS nid;

 MISSING ARE ALL (-99999);

DEFINE: CENTER str (GROUPMEAN);

 CENTER itp1 itp2 itp3 itp4

 itp5 itp6 itp7 itp8 INTb

 (GRANDMEAN);

 ANALYSIS:

 ESTIMATOR=MLR;

 TYPE=TWOLEVEL RANDOM;

 MODEL:

 %WITHIN%

 !day-level measurement model;

 TAPPw BY negcontrol\_r neghelpless;

 !day-level structural model:

 s | TAPPw ON str;

 TAPPw ON Tuesday

 Wednesday

 Thursday

 Friday;

 %BETWEEN%

 !person-level measurement mode:

 ITP BY itp1 itp2 itp3 itp4

 itp5 itp6 itp7 itp8;

 TAPPb BY negcontrol\_r neghelpless;

 INT BY cditotal psstotal;

 itp1 WITH itp2;

 itp6 WITH itp7;

 !person-level structural model:

 INT ON TAPPb (a)

 INTb;

 TAPPb ON fixself (b);

 fixself ON ITP (c);

 s ON fixself;

 ITP WITH INTb;

 fixself WITH INTb;

 TAPPb WITH INTb;

 MODEL CONSTRAINT:

 NEW(abc);

 abc=a\*b\*c;

 OUTPUT: SAMPSTAT CINTERVAL;
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