**Evaluating the Psychological and Social Nature of Actual and Perceived Liking Gaps**
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# **Overview of the Hypothesized Possibilities**

**Figure S1***Plotted Regression Surfaces Illustrating The Hypothesized Possibilities*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Liking gaps are maladaptive | 1. Felt liking only |
|  |  |
| 1. Liking only | 1. Joint effect |
|  |  |

*Note.* These graphs are based on the regression model . Each panel depicts a different constellation of the coefficients and . Panel (a) illustrates the liking gaps are maladaptive hypothesis ( > 0 and < 0), where the highest liking gaps are related to the lowest outcome. Panel (b) reflects the feeling liked only hypothesis ( > 0 and = 0), where the outcome is only dependent on the levels of felt liking. Panel (c) reflects the liking only hypothesis ( = 0 and > 0), where the outcome is only dependent on the levels of liking. Panel (c) depicts the idea that both felt liking and liking matter ( > 0 and > 0), and the outcome is highest when both liking and felt liking are high.

# **The Distributions of Liking and Felt Liking Judgments**

**Figure S2**

*Density Plots of Felt Liking and Liking*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Study 1 | 1. Study 2 |
| 1. Study 3 | |

*Note.* All ratings of liking were single-items rated on a 7-point Likert scale. The dashed lines depict the sample means.

# **Variance Decomposition Results for Study 1 Using the Social Relations Model**

**Table S1**

*Variance Partitioning for the Dyadic Items in Study 1*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable of Interest |  | Variance | | |
| Target | Perceiver | Error |
| Liking | Estimate | .13\*\* | .25\*\* | .62 |
| Reliability | .52 | .67 | - |
| Felt Liking | Estimate | .09\*\* | .43\*\* | .48 |
| Reliability | .48 | .82 | - |
| Engagement and Interest | Estimate | .21\*\* | .19\*\* | .60 |
| Reliability | .65 | .62 | - |
| Closeness | Estimate | .11\*\* | .32\*\* | .56 |
| Reliability | .50 | .74 | - |
| Conversation Flow | Estimate | .20\*\* | .15\*\* | .66 |
| Reliability | .61 | .53 | - |
| Interaction Enjoyment | Estimate | .15\*\* | .18\*\* | .67 |
| Reliability | .53 | .58 | - |

*Note.* All variances reported here are standardized. The target is the person being rated. The perceiver is the person providing the rating. Notably, our single-item indices were relatively reliable. \*\* *p* < .001.

# **Analyses of the Second Interaction in Study 2**

In Study 2, participants completed 2 interactions with two separate interaction partners. The analyses reported in the primary manuscript reflect the results from the first interaction. Below, we report on the results from the second interaction.

Firstly, people again displayed a liking gap at the sample level, revealing that people are pessimistic about how much they feel liked by others as compared to how much people liked others, *b* = -0.59*, d* = -1.04, CI95% [-1.25, -0.82]*, t* = -10.11*, p* < .001. Secondly, we examined the adaptiveness of the liking gaps by examining their correlates (see Table S2 and S3 below). Overall, we closely replicate the results from the first interaction, as reported in the main manuscript. That is, self-esteem, our adjustment indicator from Study 2, was unrelated to an actual gap, but it was related to a perceived gap, independently of felt liking and liking. Larger perceived gaps were experienced by those with lower self-esteem, supporting the idea that a perceived gap might reflect a social insecurity. Further, interaction experiences were unrelated to an actual liking gap or a perceived liking gap with one exception: People reported greater willingness to talk to someone new when the perceived liking gap was larger. Besides this finding, people’s decisions about subsequent interactions appeared to depend on a joint effect of both felt liking and liking of the partner. In sum, all findings from the second interaction are consistent with those from the first interaction, as reported in the main manuscript.

**Table S2**

*Summary of Results Illustrating the Links Between Actual Liking Gaps, Their Components*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlate** | **Main Effect of Felt Liking**  **(c1)**  **[CI95%]** | **Main Effect of Being Liked**  **(c2)**  **[CI95%]** | **Joint Effect**  **c1 + c2**  **[CI95%]** | **Difference of Main Effects**  **c1 – c2**  **[CI95%]** | **Effect of the Gap**  **(abs)**  **[CI95%]** | **Pattern/**  **Hypothesis** |
| ***Adjustment indicator*** | | | | | | |
| Self-Esteem | **0.36\*\***  **[0.24, 0.48]** | 0.04  [-0.07, 0.16] | **0.40\*\***  **[0.26, 0.55]** | **0.32\*\***  **[0.14, 0.50]** | -0.09  [-0.31, 0.14] | *Feeling Liked* |
| ***Decisions about subsequent interactions*** | | | | | | |
| Desire to meet again | **0.67\*\***  **[0.57, 0.78]** | **0.27\*\***  **[0.17, 0.37]** | **0.94\*\***  **[0.82, 1.06]** | **0.40\*\***  **[0.23, 0.57]** | -0.54  [-0.74, -0.34] | *Joint effect* |
| Desire to meet someone new | -0.04  [-0.16, 0.08] | -0.02  [-0.14, 0.09] | -0.06  [-0.21, 0.08] | -0.02  [-0.20, 0.16] | -0.04  [-0.27, 0.19] | *None* |

*Note.*The coefficients were based on a linear regression: Outcome = c0 + c1FeltLiking + c2Liking + *e. abs*=|*c*1- *c*2|-| *c*1+ *c*2|. The significance of the *abs* value was based on a one-tailed p-value, examining whether *abs* > 0, whereas the significance of all other coefficient were based on two-tailed p-values. \*\**p*<.01, \**p*<.05, † *p*<.10. Bolded values remained significant (*p*<.05) after applying the False Discover Rate correction.

**Table S3**

*Summary of Results Illustrating the Links Between Perceived Liking Gaps, Their Components*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlate** | **Main Effect of Felt Liking**  **(c1)**  **[CI95%]** | **Main Effect of Being Liked**  **(c2)**  **[CI95%]** | **Joint Effect**  **c1 + c2**  **[CI95%]** | **Difference of Main Effects**  **c1 – c2**  **[CI95%]** | **Effect of the Gap**  **(abs)**  **[CI95%]** | **Pattern/**  **Hypothesis** |
| ***Adjustment indicator*** | | | | | | |
| Self-Esteem | **0.59\*\***  **[0.44, 0.73]** | **-0.32\*\***  **[-0.46, -0.19]** | **0.26\*\***  **[0.14, 0.38]** | **0.91\*\***  **[0.66, 1.16]** | **0.65\*\***  **[0.37, 0.92]** | *Perceived Gap* |
| ***Decisions about subsequent interactions*** | | | | | | |
| Desire to meet again | **0.18\*\***  **[0.08, 0.28]** | **0.85\*\***  **[0.76, 0.95]** | **1.03\*\***  **[0.94, 1.11]** | **-0.68\*\***  **[-0.85, -0.50]** | -0.35  [-0.55, -0.15] | *Joint effect* |
| Desire to meet someone new | 0.16\*  [0.02, 0.31] | **-0.32\*\***  **[-0.46, -0.18]** | **-0.15\***  **[-0.28, -0.03]** | **0.48\*\***  **[0.23, 0.74]** | **0.33\***  **[0.04, 0.62]** | *Perceived Gap* |

*Note.*The coefficients were based on a linear regression: Outcome = c0 + c1FeltLiking + c2Liking + *e. abs*=|*c*1- *c*2|-| *c*1+ *c*2|. The significance of the *abs* value was based on a one-tailed p-value, examining whether *abs* > 0, whereas the significance of all other coefficient were based on two-tailed p-values. \*\**p*<.01, \**p*<.05, † *p*<.10. Bolded values remained significant (*p*<.05) after applying the False Discover Rate correction.

# **Perceiver Reported Interaction Experiences**

**Table S4**

*Summary of Results Illustrating the Links Between Actual Liking Gaps, Their Components and Perceivers’ Interaction Experiences*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Interaction Experience** | **Study** | **Main Effect of Felt Liking**  **(c1)**  **[CI95%]** | **Main Effect of Being Liked**  **(c2)**  **[CI95%]** | **Joint Effect**  **c1 + c2**  **[CI95%]** | **Difference of Main Effects**  **c1 – c2**  **[CI95%]** | **Effect of the Gap**  **(abs)**  **[CI95%]** | **Pattern/**  **Hypothesis** |
| ***Impressions of the interaction partner*** | | | | | | | |
| Engagement and Interest | 1 | 0.02  [-0.02, 0.07] | **0.97\*\***  **[0.91, 1.03]** | **1.00\*\***  **[0.94, 1.06]** | **-0.95\*\***  **[-1.03, -0.86]** | -0.05  [-0.13, 0.04] | *Joint effect* |
| Closeness | 1 | **0.12\*\***  **[0.06, 0.18]** | **1.06\*\***  **[0.97, 1.14]** | **1.18\*\***  **[1.09, 1.26]** | **-0.94\*\***  **[-1.06, -0.82]** | -0.24  [-0.35, -0.12] | *Joint effect* |
| 3 | 0.05  [-0.01, 0.11] | **0.92\*\***  **[0.86, 0.98]** | **0.97\*\***  **[0.90, 1.05]** | **-0.87\*\***  **[-0.96, -0.78]** | -0.10  [-0.22, 0.02] | *Joint effect* |
| Desire to be Friends | 3 | 0.04†  [-0.01, 0.11] | **0.94\*\***  **[0.88, 1.00]** | **0.99\*\***  **[0.92, 1.07]** | **-0.89\*\***  **[-0.98, -0.80]** | -0.10  [-0.22, 0.01] | *Joint effect* |
| ***Impressions of the interaction*** | | | | | | | |
| Conversation Flow | 1 | 0.05†  [0.00, 0.11] | **0.98\*\***  **[0.90, 1.05]** | **1.03\*\***  **[0.95, 1.11]** | **-0.92\*\***  **[-1.03, -0.82]** | -0.10  [-0.21, 0.00] | *Joint effect* |
| Enjoyment | 1 | 0.02  [-0.01, 0.05] | **0.94\*\***  **[0.89, 0.98]** | **0.96\*\***  **[0.91, 1.00]** | **-0.92\*\***  **[-0.98, -0.86]** | -0.04  [-0.10, 0.02] | *Liking* |
| 3 | **0.04\*\***  **[0.02, 0.07]** | **1.11\*\***  **[1.09, 1.14]** | **1.16\*\***  **[1.12, 1.19]** | **-1.07\*\***  **[-1.11, -1.03]** | -0.09  [-0.14, -0.04] | *Joint effect* |
| Shared Reality | 3 | 0.03†  [0.00, 0.06] | **0.53\*\***  **[0.50, 0.56]** | **0.56\*\***  **[0.52, 0.60]** | **-0.50\*\***  **[-0.55, -0.46]** | -0.06  [-0.12, 0.00] | *Joint effect* |
| ***Decisions about subsequent interactions*** | | | | | | | |
| Desire to meet again | 2 | 0.13\*  [0.03, 0.24] | **0.67\*\***  **[0.56, 0.77]** | **0.80\*\***  **[0.67, 0.93]** | **-0.53\*\***  **[-0.69, -0.37]** | -0.27  [-0.47, -0.06] | *Joint effect* |
| 3 | 0.08\*  [0.02, 0.14] | **1.02\*\***  **[0.95, 1.08]** | **1.09\*\***  **[1.01, 1.17]** | **-0.94\*\***  **[-1.03, -0.84]** | -0.15  [-0.28, -0.03] | *Joint effect* |
| Desire to meet someone new | 2 | -0.05 [-0.18, 0.08] | -0.14\* [-0.28, -0.01] | -0.19\* [-0.36, -0.02] | 0.10 [-0.11, 0.30] | -0.10 [-0.36, 0.17] | *Liking* |

*Note.* The coefficients were based on a linear regression: Outcome = c0 + c1FeltLiking + c2Liking + *e. abs*=|*c*1- *c*2|-| *c*1+ *c*2|. The significance of the *abs* value was based on a one-tailed p-value, examining whether *abs* > 0, whereas the significance of all other coefficients were based on two-tailed p-values. \*\**p*<.01, \**p*<.05. Bolded values remained significant (*p*<.05) after applying the False Discover Rate correction.

**Table S5**

*Summary of Results Illustrating the Links Between Perceived Liking Gaps, Their Components and Perceivers’ Interaction Experiences*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Interaction Experience** | **Study** | **Main Effect of Felt Liking**  **(c1)**  **[CI95%]** | **Main Effect of Being Liked**  **(c2)**  **[CI95%]** | **Joint Effect**  **c1 + c2**  **[CI95%]** | **Difference of Main Effects**  **c1 – c2**  **[CI95%]** | **Effect of the Gap**  **(abs)**  **[CI95%]** | **Pattern/**  **Hypothesis** |
| ***Impressions of the interaction partner*** | | | | | | | |
| Engagement and Interest | 1 | **0.15\*\***  **[0.07, 0.22]** | **0.22\*\***  **[0.13, 0.31]** | **0.37\*\***  **[0.29, 0.44]** | -0.08  [-0.23, 0.08] | -0.29  [-0.44, -0.14] | *Joint effect* |
| Closeness | 1 | **0.23\*\***  **[0.14, 0.32]** | **0.28\*\***  **[0.16, 0.40]** | **0.51\*\***  **[0.42, 0.60]** | -0.05  [-0.24, 0.14] | -0.46  [-0.64, -0.28] | *Joint effect* |
| 3 | **0.23\*\***  **[0.13, 0.33]** | **0.51\*\***  **[0.41, 0.61]** | **0.74\*\***  **[0.66, 0.82]** | **-0.28\*\***  **[-0.46, -0.10]** | -0.46  [-0.66, -0.26] | *Joint effect* |
| Desire to be Friends | 3 | 0.12\*  [0.01, 0.22] | **0.59\*\***  **[0.48, 0.69]** | **0.70\*\***  **[0.62, 0.78]** | **-0.47\*\***  **[-0.66, -0.28]** | -0.23  [-0.44, -0.03] | *Joint effect* |
| ***Impressions of the interaction*** | | | | | | | |
| Conversation Flow | 1 | **0.18\*\***  **[0.10, 0.27]** | **0.20\*\***  **[0.09, 0.31]** | **0.39\*\***  **[0.30, 0.47]** | -0.02  [-0.19, 0.16] | -0.37  [-0.54, -0.20] | *Joint effect* |
| Enjoyment | 1 | **0.12\*\***  **[0.05, 0.18]** | **0.25\*\***  **[0.17, 0.33]** | **0.37\*\***  **[0.31, 0.43]** | -0.14\*  [-0.27, -0.01] | -0.23  [-0.36, -0.10] | *Joint effect* |
| 3 | **0.29\*\***  **[0.25, 0.34]** | **0.75\*\***  **[0.70, 0.79]** | **1.04\*\***  **[1.01, 1.07]** | **-0.46\*\***  **[-0.54, -0.37]** | -0.59  [-0.67, -0.50] | *Joint effect* |
| Shared Reality | 3 | **0.09\*\***  **[0.04, 0.14]** | 0.04  [-0.01, 0.09] | **0.13\*\***  **[0.09, 0.17]** | 0.05  [-0.04, 0.14] | -0.08  [-0.18, 0.01] | *Feeling Liked* |
| ***Decisions about subsequent interactions*** | | | | | | | |
| Desire to meet again | 2 | **0.23\*\***  **[0.09, 0.37]** | 0.16\*  [0.01, 0.31] | **0.39\*\***  **[0.25, 0.52]** | 0.07  [-0.19, 0.33] | -0.32  [-0.61, -0.02] | *Joint effect* |
| 3 | **0.21\*\***  **[0.12, 0.31]** | **0.16\*\***  **[0.06, 0.25]** | **0.37\*\***  **[0.29, 0.44]** | 0.06  [-0.12, 0.23] | -0.31  [-0.51, -0.12] | *Joint effect* |
| Desire to meet someone new | 2 | -0.06  [-0.22, 0.09] | -0.01  [-0.18, 0.15] | -0.08  [-0.23, 0.07] | -0.05  [-0.33, 0.23] | -0.03  [-0.35, 0.29] | *None* |

*Note.* The coefficients were based on a linear regression: Outcome = c0 + c1FeltLiking + c2Liking + *e. abs*=|*c*1- *c*2|-| *c*1+ *c*2|. The significance of the *abs* value was based on a one-tailed p-value, examining whether *abs* > 0, whereas the significance of all other coefficients were based on two-tailed p-values. \*\**p*<.01, \**p*<.05. Bolded values remained significant (*p*<.05) after applying the False Discover Rate correction.

# **Analyses with Personality Traits**

**Table S6**

*Summary of Results Illustrating the Links Between Personality Traits, the Actual Gap, and Their Components*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Personality Trait** | **Study** | **Main Effect of Felt Liking**  **(c1)**  **[CI95%]** | **Main Effect of Being Liked**  **(c2)**  **[CI95%]** | **Joint Effect**  **c1 + c2**  **[CI95%]** | **Difference of Main Effects**  **c1 – c2**  **[CI95%]** | **Effect of the Gap**  **(abs)**  **[CI95%]** | **Pattern/**  **Hypothesis** |
| Agreeableness | 1 | **0.40\*\***  **[0.32, 0.48]** | 0.10†  [-0.02, 0.21] | **0.50\*\***  **[0.38, 0.61]** | **0.30\*\***  **[0.15, 0.46]** | -0.19  [-0.42, 0.03] | *Feeling Liked* |
| 3 | **0.13\*\***  **[0.11, 0.15]** | 0.02  [0.00, 0.04] | **0.15\*\***  **[0.12, 0.18]** | **0.11\*\***  **[0.08, 0.15]** | -0.04  [-0.09, 0.01] | *Feeling Liked* |
| Extraversion | 1 | **0.45\*\***  **[0.34, 0.55]** | **0.31\*\***  **[0.16, 0.46]** | **0.75\*\***  **[0.60, 0.90]** | 0.14  [-0.07, 0.35] | -0.61  [-0.91, -0.31] | *Joint effect* |
| 3 | **0.15\*\***  **[0.12, 0.18]** | -0.01  [-0.04, 0.02] | **0.14\*\***  **[0.10, 0.18]** | **0.16\*\***  **[0.11, 0.20]** | 0.02  [-0.04 0.07] | *Feeling Liked* |
| Conscientiousness | 1 | **0.33\*\***  **[0.24, 0.41]** | 0.03  [-0.10, 0.15] | **0.35\*\***  **[0.23, 0.48]** | **0.30\*\***  **[0.12, 0.47]** | -0.06  [-0.31, 0.20] | *Feeling Liked* |
| 3 | **0.08\*\***  **[0.05, 0.11]** | 0.00  [-0.03, 0.03] | **0.08\*\***  **[0.04, 0.12]** | **0.08\*\***  **[0.03, 0.12]** | 0.00  [-0.06, 0.06] | *Feeling Liked* |
| Openness | 1 | **0.17\*\***  **[0.07, 0.26]** | -0.08  [-0.21, 0.05] | 0.08  [-0.05, 0.21] | **0.25\*\***  **[0.06, 0.43]** | 0.17  [-0.10, 0.43] | *Feeling Liked* |
| 3 | **0.06\*\***  **[0.04, 0.09]** | 0.03\*  [0.00, 0.05] | **0.09\*\***  **[0.06, 0.12]** | 0.04  [0.00, 0.07] | -0.05  [-0.10, 0.00] | *Joint effect* |

*Note.* Neuroticism does not appear here because it is reported in the main manuscript. The coefficients were based on a linear regression: Outcome = c0 + c1FeltLiking + c2Liking + *e. abs*=|*c*1- *c*2|-| *c*1+ *c*2|. The significance of the *abs* value was based on a one-tailed p-value, examining whether *abs* > 0, whereas the significance of all other coefficient were based on two-tailed p-values. \*\**p*<.01, \**p*<.05, † *p*<.10. Bolded values remained significant (*p*<.05) after applying the False Discover Rate correction.

**Table S7**

*Summary of Results Illustrating the Links Between Personality Traits, the Perceived Gap, and Their Components*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Personality Trait** | **Study** | **Main Effect of Felt Liking**  **(c1)**  **[CI95%]** | **Main Effect of Being Liked**  **(c2)**  **[CI95%]** | **Joint Effect**  **c1 + c2**  **[CI95%]** | **Difference of Main Effects**  **c1 – c2**  **[CI95%]** | **Effect of the Gap**  **(abs)**  **[CI95%]** | **Pattern/**  **Hypothesis** |
| Agreeableness | 1 | **0.31\*\***  **[0.21, 0.40]** | **0.23\*\***  **[0.11, 0.35]** | **0.54\*\***  **[0.44, 0.63]** | 0.08  [-0.12, 0.27] | -0.46  [-0.70, -0.22] | *Joint Effect* |
| 3 | **0.12\*\***  **[0.08, 0.15]** | 0.03†  [0.00, 0.06] | **0.14\*\***  **[0.12, 0.17]** | **0.09\*\***  **[0.03, 0.15]** | -0.06  [-0.12, 0.01] | *Feeling Liked* |
| Extraversion | 1 | **0.69\*\***  **[0.56, 0.82]** | **-0.33\*\***  **[-0.49, -0.17]** | **0.36\*\***  **[0.23, 0.48]** | **1.02\*\***  **[0.76, 1.28]** | **0.66\*\***  **[0.35, 0.98]** | *Perceived Gap* |
| 3 | **0.24\*\***  **[0.20, 0.28]** | **-0.14\*\***  **[-0.18, -0.10]** | **0.10\*\***  **[0.07, 0.13]** | **0.39\*\***  **[0.31, 0.46]** | **0.29\*\***  **[0.21, 0.36]** | *Perceived Gap* |
| Conscientiousness | 1 | **0.42\*\***  **[0.31, 0.53]** | -0.17\*  [-0.31, -0.04] | **0.25\*\***  **[0.14, 0.35]** | **0.59\*\***  **[0.38, 0.81]** | 0.35\*\*  [0.08, 0.61] | *Perceived Gap* |
| 3 | **0.11\*\***  **[0.07, 0.15]** | **-0.05\***  **[-0.09, -0.01]** | **0.06\*\***  **[0.03, 0.09]** | **0.17\*\***  **[0.09, 0.24]** | **0.10\*\***  **[0.02, 0.18]** | *Perceived Gap* |
| Openness | 1 | **0.21\*\***  **[0.10, 0.32]** | -0.12†  [-0.26, 0.02] | 0.09  [-0.02, 0.19] | **0.33\*\***  **[0.11, 0.56]** | 0.25\*  [-0.03, 0.53] | *Perceived Gap* |
| 3 | 0.02  [-0.01, 0.05] | **0.07\*\***  **[0.04, 0.10]** | **0.09\*\***  **[0.07, 0.12]** | -0.05  [-0.11, 0.01] | -0.36  [-0.11, 0.02] | *Liking* |

*Note.* Neuroticism does not appear here because it is reported in the main manuscript. The coefficients were based on a linear regression: Outcome = c0 + c1FeltLiking + c2Liking + *e. abs*=|*c*1- *c*2|-| *c*1+ *c*2|. The significance of the *abs* value was based on a one-tailed p-value, examining whether *abs* > 0, whereas the significance of all other coefficient were based on two-tailed p-values. \*\**p*<.01, \**p*<.05, † *p*<.10. Bolded values remained significant (*p*<.05) after applying the False Discover Rate correction.

# **Analyses with Close Other Ratings in Study 1**

**Table S8**

*Summary of Results Illustrating the Links Between Actual Liking Gaps, Their Components and Adjustment*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Adjustment Indicator** | **Main Effect of Felt Liking**  **(c1)**  **[CI95%]** | **Main Effect of Being Liked**  **(c2)**  **[CI95%]** | **Joint Effect**  **c1 + c2**  **[CI95%]** | **Difference of Main Effects**  **c1 – c2**  **[CI95%]** | **Effect of the Gap**  **(abs)**  **[CI95%]** | **Pattern/**  **Hypothesis** |
| Self-Esteem | **0.48\*\***  **[0.31, 0.64]** | 0.09  [-0.14, 0.33] | **0.57\*\***  **[0.33, 0.81]** | 0.38\*  [0.05, 0.71] | -0.19  [-0.66, 0.29] | *Feeling Liked* |
| Neuroticism | **-0.28\*\***  **[-0.42, -0.15]** | -0.02  [-0.22, 0.17] | **-0.31\*\***  **[-0.50, -0.11]** | -0.26\*  [-0.53, 0.01] | -0.05  [-0.43, 0.33] | *Feeling Liked* |
| Agreeableness | **0.20\*\***  **[0.10, 0.30]** | 0.12  [-0.02, 0.26] | **0.32\*\***  **[0.17, 0.47]** | 0.08  [-0.12, 0.28] | -0.24  [-0.53, 0.05] | *Feeling Liked* |
| Extraversion | **0.20\*\***  **[0.09, 0.32]** | **0.30\*\***  **[0.13, 0.47]** | **0.50\*\***  **[0.33, 0.67]** | -0.09  [-0.33, 0.14] | -0.41  [-0.65, -0.17] | *Joint Effect* |
| Conscientiousness | **0.21\*\***  **[0.09, 0.32]** | -0.01  [-0.17, 0.15] | 0.20\*  [0.04, 0.36] | 0.21  [-0.01, 0.43] | 0.01  [-0.31, 0.33] | *Feeling Liked* |
| Openness | 0.01  [-0.08, 0.11] | -0.04  [-0.18, 0.10] | -0.02  [-0.16, 0.12] | 0.05  [-0.14, 0.25] | 0.03  [-0.17, 0.23] | *None* |
| Positive Relations with Others (SR) | **0.63\*\***  **[0.51, 0.74]** | 0.14†  [-0.02, 0.31] | **0.77\*\***  **[0.61, 0.93]** | **0.48\*\***  **[0.26, 0.71]** | -0.29  [-0.61, 0.03] | *Feeling Liked* |

*Note.* We report on the self-reports (SR) for the positive relations with others here but see the main manuscript for results with close other informant-reports (IR). The coefficients were based on a linear regression: Outcome = c0 + c1FeltLiking + c2Liking + *e. abs*=|*c*1- *c*2|-| *c*1+ *c*2|. The significance of the *abs* value was based on a one-tailed p-value, examining whether *abs* > 0, whereas the significance of all other coefficient were based on two-tailed p-values. \*\**p*<.01, \**p*<.05, † *p*<.10. Bolded values remained significant (*p*<.05) after applying the False Discover Rate correction.

**Table S9**

*Summary of Results Illustrating the Links Between Perceived Liking Gaps, Their Components and Adjustment*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Adjustment Indicator** | **Main Effect of Felt Liking**  **(c1)**  **[CI95%]** | **Main Effect of Being Liked**  **(c2)**  **[CI95%]** | **Joint Effect**  **c1 + c2**  **[CI95%]** | **Difference of Main Effects**  **c1 – c2**  **[CI95%]** | **Effect of the Gap**  **(abs)**  **[CI95%]** | **Pattern/**  **Hypothesis** |
| Self-Esteem | **0.76\*\***  **[0.56, 0.97]** | **-0.51\*\***  **[-0.76, -0.26]** | 0.25\*  [0.06, 0.45] | **1.27\*\***  **[0.86, 1.68]** | **1.02\*\***  **[0.52, 1.51]** | *Perceived Gap* |
| Neuroticism | **-0.40\*\***  **[-0.56, -0.23]** | 0.21\*  [0.01, 0.41] | **-0.19\***  **[-0.35, -0.03]** | **-0.61\*\***  **[-0.94, -0.27]** | 0.42\*  [0.01, 0.82] | *Perceived Gap* |
| Agreeableness | 0.08  [-0.04, 0.21] | **0.28\*\***  **[0.13, 0.43]** | **0.36\*\***  **[0.24, 0.48]** | -0.20  [-0.45, 0.05] | -0.16  [-0.41, 0.08] | *Liking* |
| Extraversion | **0.46\*\***  **[0.32, 0.61]** | **-0.36\*\***  **[-0.54, -0.18]** | 0.10  [-0.04, 0.24] | **0.82\*\***  **[0.53, 1.12]** | **0.73\*\***  **[0.37, 1.08]** | *Perceived Gap* |
| Conscientiousness | 0.16\*  [0.02, 0.30] | 0.09  [-0.08, 0.26] | **0.25\*\***  **[0.11, 0.38]** | 0.07  [-0.21, 0.35] | -0.18  [-0.52, 0.16] | *Feeling Liked* |
| Openness | -0.03  [-0.15, 0.09] | 0.07  [-0.08, 0.22] | 0.04  [-0.08, 0.16] | -0.10  [-0.35, 0.14] | 0.06  [-0.18, 0.31] | *None* |
| Positive Relations with Others (SR) | **0.63\*\***  **[0.49, 0.77]** | 0.07  [-0.11, 0.24] | **0.69\*\***  **[0.56, 0.83]** | **0.56\*\***  **[0.28, 0.84]** | -0.13  [-0.48, 0.21] | *Feeling Liked* |

*Note.* We report on the self-reports (SR) for the positive relations with others here but see the main manuscript for results with close other informant-reports (IR). The coefficients were based on a linear regression: Outcome = c0 + c1FeltLiking + c2Liking + *e. abs*=|*c*1- *c*2|-| *c*1+ *c*2|. The significance of the *abs* value was based on a one-tailed p-value, examining whether *abs* > 0, whereas the significance of all other coefficient were based on two-tailed p-values. \*\**p*<.01, \**p*<.05, † *p*<.10. Bolded values remained significant (*p*<.05) after applying the False Discover Rate correction.

# **Analyses Comparing the Linear Model Against the Polynomial Model for All Primary Variables**

**Table S10**

*Summary of Results for the Model Comparison*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Study** | **Actual Gap** | | **Perceived Gap** | |
| **Chi Square or F-value** | **p-value** | **Chi Square or F-value** | **p-value** |
| Self-Esteem | 1 | **4.94** | **.002** | **3.87** | **.009** |
| 2 | 0.58 | .901 | 0.66 | .884 |
| Social Anxiety | 1 | 0.60 | .617 | 0.43 | .734 |
| Neuroticism | 1 | 1.55 | .200 | 2.03 | .109 |
| 3 | **13.56** | **.004** | 3.48 | .324 |
| Loneliness | 1 | 1.73 | .160 | 1.24 | .296 |
| 3 | 5.36 | .148 | 1.83 | .608 |
| Life Satisfaction | 1 | 1.15 | .329 | 0.97 | .406 |
| Positive Relations with Others (IR) | 1 | 1.73 | .161 | 2.19 | .088 |
| Engagement and Interest | 1 | **5.91** | **.001** | 0.78 | .504 |
| Closeness | 1 | 2.42 | .065 | 1.79 | .147 |
| 3 | 0.69 | .877 | 0.19 | .979 |
| Desire to be Friends | 3 | 0.93 | .819 | 0.37 | .947 |
| Conversation Flow | 1 | **4.91** | **.002** | 1.33 | .263 |
| Enjoyment | 1 | **7.61** | **<.001** | 1.23 | .298 |
| 3 | **41.14** | **<.001** | **10.12** | **.018** |
| Shared Reality | 3 | **14.65** | **.002** | 6.44 | .092 |
| Desire to meet again | 2 | 3.45 | .327 | 5.01 | .171 |
| 3 | **10.36** | **.016** | **48.15** | **<.001** |
| Desire to meet someone new | 2 | 1.54 | .673 | 1.46 | .692 |

*Note.* For Study 1, we report the F-Value and for Studies 2 & 3, we report the chi-square value. This is because studies 2 & 3 were modelled using multilevel modelling. Bolded values were significant at the level of p *<* .05. A significant p-value here suggests that the second-order polynomial model is a better fit for the data.