

Supplemental Online Materials

These supplemental online materials are for the article, titled *Trait Attributions and Threat Appraisals Explain Why an Entity Theory of Personality Predicts Greater Internalizing Symptoms During Adolescence*. These materials are intended to appear only on a website linked to the article. The overall structure of the online supplemental materials is as follow:

1. Page S2: Implicit Theories of Personality Measures and Standardized Factor Loadings
2. Page S3: Intercorrelations among Key Variables (Study 1)
3. Page S4: The Association Between an Entity Theory of Personality and Fixed Trait Attribution About the Self by Each Sample
4. Page S5: The Path Coefficients for the Association of Entity Theory of Personality to Internalizing Symptoms after Controlling for Gender
5. Pages S6-S8: Study 2 Modeling syntax
6. Page S9: Supplemental References

Implicit Theories of Personality Measures and Standardized Factor Loadings

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

Intercorrelations among Key Variables (Study 1)

	1	2	3	<i>N</i> (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
<i>N</i> (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	<i>r</i>	<i>n</i>
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	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>
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 symptoms ^a	.39***	.05
Fixed trait attribution		
Entity theory	.24**	.08
Female	.21	.13
Baseline internalizing symptoms ^a	.33***	.06
Day-level (level 1)		
Threat appraisals		
Daily stressor intensity	.31***	.08
Random slope	.07*	.03
× fixed trait attribution		

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

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

IMPLICIT THEORIES AND INTERNALIZING SYMPTOMS

6

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
```

IMPLICIT THEORIES AND INTERNALIZING SYMPTOMS

7

```

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;

```

IMPLICIT THEORIES AND INTERNALIZING SYMPTOMS

8

!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;

Supplemental References

- Chow, S. M., Ram, N., Boker, S. M., Fujita, F., & Clore, G. (2005). Emotion as a thermostat: representing emotion regulation using a damped oscillator model. *Emotion, 5*, 208-225.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.5.2.208>
- Lee, H. Y., Jamieson, J. P., Reis, H. T., Beevers, C. G., Josephs, R. A., Mullarkey, M. C., ... & Yeager, D. S. (in press). Getting fewer “likes” than others on social media elicits emotional distress among victimized adolescents. *Child Development*.
- Williams, K. D., & Jarvis, B. (2006). Cyberball: A program for use in research on interpersonal ostracism and acceptance. *Behavior Research Methods, 38*, 174-180.
<https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03192765>