# CODEBOOK

## SOKA x Speed-Dating 2018/19

## Data from the Graz Speed-Dating Study 2018

Project leads:

- G. Hofer, L. Langmann, R. Burkart, A. Neubauer

Data Collection: December 2018 – January 2019

Notes:

- Inclusion/Exclusion criteria
  - This data set only contains data from targets that were between 18 and 30 years old. All of them also stated speaking German as mother tongue or on a comparable level.
  - We have excluded data from 2 homosexual people (some of our research questions pertained to romantic attraction in heterosexual speed-dating), 2 people with missing data on key variables (= whole questionnaires that were skipped), and one person with low compliance (overly negative responses on scorecards, suspicious e-mail address for peer-rating (similar to own one), statement that only here for course credit + also missing data for one key variable)
- Final *N* = 175 targets
- Additional notes
  - Variables marked in light yellow constitute main study variables

**Procedure:**

- Pretesting
  - Sociodemographic questions
  - IST 2000 R
  - AUT
  - TEMT
  - Self-estimates of abilities
  - Self-worth contingencies
  - BFI-K, Dirty Dozen, SOI-R, MVS, Sapio-Q
- Online collection of informant-estimates
  - Sociodemographic questions
  - IOS
  - Informant-estimates of abilities
- Speed-dating
  - Up to 14 speed-dates per person incl. ratings of the person's characteristics by their interaction partners (score cards)

## Dataset 1: Individual-level data

SOKA_SpDa_IndivData_toshare.csv

### Main variables analyzed in…

Hofer, Gabriela, Laura Langmann, Roman Burkart, und Aljoscha Neubauer. „Who Knows What We Are Good at? Unique Insights of the Self, Knowledgeable Informants, and Strangers into a Person's Abilities". PsyArXiv, 21. Oktober 2021. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/u73xf.

| | |
|---|---|
| code | participant code |
| female | participant gender (0..male, 1..female) |
| | |
| | **Intelligence: I-S-T 2000 R** |
| | Liepmann, D., Beauducel, A., Brocke, B., & Amthauer, R. (2007). Intelligenz-Struktur-Test 2000 R (2nd ed.). Göttingen: Hogrefe. |
| | |
| verb_sum | Number of correctly solved items (0-20) on the I-S-T 2000 R verbal intelligence scale „Gemeinsamkeiten finden" (similiarities) |
| num_sum | Number of correctly solved items (0-20) on the I-S-T 2000 R numerical intelligence scale „Zahlenreihen" (number series) |
| spat_sum | Number of correctly solved items (0-20) on the I-S-T 2000 R spatial intelligence scale „Figurenauswahl" (figure selection) |
| | |
| verb01_k …. verb20_k | Correctness of response to respective I-S-T 2000 R verbal intelligence item (0.. incorrect, 1.. correct). Scale name: „Gemeinsamkeiten finden" (similiarities) |
| num01_k … num20_k | Correctness of response to respective I-S-T 2000 R numerical intelligence item (0.. incorrect, 1.. correct). Scale name: „Zahlenreihen" (number series) |
| spat01_k … spat20_k | Correctness of response to respective I-S-T 2000 R spatial intelligence item (0.. incorrect, 1.. correct). Scale name: „Figurenauswahl" (figure selection) |
| | |
| | **Creativity: AUT – Alternative Uses Task** |
| | Guilford, J. P. (1967). The nature of human intelligence. New York, NY, US: McGraw-Hill.<br>For max-three scoring see:<br>Smeekens, B. A., & Kane, M. J. (2016). Working memory capacity, mind wandering, and creative cognition: An individual-differences investigation into the benefits of controlled versus spontaneous thought. Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 10, 389–415. https://doi.org/10.1037/aca000004 |
| | |
| mean_max3orig | Mean originality (max-three scoring -> average of three highest-rated responses per item) over all three items (bottle, umbrella, shoe; 0 - 3) |
| mean_fluency | Mean fluency (number of responses per item) over all three items (bottle, umbrella, shoe; 0 - max) |
| bottle_max3 | Mean originality (max-three scoring -> average of three highest-rated responses) for the item "bottle" (0.. not creative – 3.. very creative) |
| umbrella_max3 | Mean originality (max-three scoring -> average of three highest-rated responses) for the item "umbrella" (0.. not creative – 3.. very creative) |
| shoe_max3 | Mean originality (max-three scoring -> average of three highest-rated responses) for the item "shoe" (0.. not creative – 3.. very creative) |
| bottle_fluency | Fluency (number of responses) for the item "bottle" (0 - max) |
| umbrella_fluency | Fluency (number of responses) for the item "umbrella" (0 - max) |
| shoe_fluency | Fluency (number of responses) for the item "shoe" (0 - max) |
| | |
| | **TEMT – Typical-Performance Emotional Management Test** |
| | Freudenthaler, H. H., & Neubauer, A. C. (2005). Emotional intelligence: The convergent and discriminant validities of intra- and interpersonal emotional abilities. Personality and Individual Differences, 39(3), 569–579. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.02.004 |

| | |
|---|---|
| | |
| TEKintra_mean | Mean intrapersonal emotional management abilities |
| TEKinter_mean | Mean interpersonal emotional management abilities |
| | |
| TEKintra1r .. TEKinter24r | Recoded items measuring interpersonal („inter") or intrapersonal („intra") emotional management abilities, indicating adequateness of answers (as rated by experts on emotional management abilities; 1..least adequate answer – 4..most adequate answer) |
| | |
| | **Self-estimated abilities** |
| | Neubauer, A. C., Pribil, A., Wallner, A., & Hofer, G. (2018). The self–other knowledge asymmetry in cognitive intelligence, emotional intelligence, and creativity. Heliyon, 4(12), e01061. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2018.e01061<br>Neubauer, A. C., & Hofer, G. (2021). Self-estimates of abilities are a better reflection of individuals' personality traits than of their abilities and are also strong predictors of professional interests. Personality and Individual Differences, 169, 109850. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.109850 |
| | |
| SEverb_mean | Mean self-estimated verbal intelligence (1-5) |
| SEnum_mean | Mean self-estimated numerical intelligence (1-5) |
| SEspat_mean | Mean self-estimated spatial intelligence (1-5) |
| SEcrea_mean | Mean self-estimated creativity (1-5) |
| SEintra_mean | Mean self-estimated intrapersonal emotional management abilities (1-5) |
| SEinter_mean | Mean self-estimated interpersonal emotional management abilities (1-5) |
| | |
| SE_verbal_1.. SE_verbal_10 | Items measuring self-estimated verbal intelligence (1.. "not true at all", 5.. "exactly true") |
| SE_numeric_1.. SE_numeric_9 | Items measuring self-estimated numerical intelligence (1.. "not true at all", 5.. "exactly true") |
| SE_spatial_1.. SE_spatial_9 | Items measuring self-estimated spatial intelligence (1.. "not true at all", 5.. "exactly true") |
| SE_crea_1.. SE_crea_9 | Items measuring self-estimated creativity (1.. "not true at all", 5.. "exactly true") |
| SE_intra_1.. SE_intra_9 | Items measuring self-estimated intrapersonal emotional management abilities (1.. "not true at all", 5.. "exactly true") |
| SE_inter_1.. SE_inter_9 | Items measuring self-estimated interpersonal emotional management abilities (1.. "not true at all", 5.. "exactly true") |
| | |
| | **Informant-estimated abilities** |
| | Neubauer, A. C., Pribil, A., Wallner, A., & Hofer, G. (2018). The self–other knowledge asymmetry in cognitive intelligence, emotional intelligence, and creativity. Heliyon, 4(12), e01061. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2018.e01061<br>Neubauer, A. C., & Hofer, G. (2021). Self-estimates of abilities are a better reflection of individuals' personality traits than of their abilities and are also strong predictors of professional interests. Personality and Individual Differences, 169, 109850. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.109850 |
| | |
| PEverb_mean | Mean informant-estimated verbal intelligence (1-5) |
| PEnum_mean | Mean informant-estimated numerical intelligence (1-5) |
| PEspat_mean | Mean informant-estimated spatial intelligence (1-5) |
| PEcrea_mean | Mean informant-estimated creativity (1-5) |
| PEintra_mean | Mean informant-estimated intrapersonal emotional management abilities (1-5) |
| PEinter_mean | Mean informant-estimated interpersonal emotional management abilities (1-5) |
| | |
| PEverbal_1.. PEinter_9 | Items measuring informant-estimated abilities (1.. "not true at all", 5.. "exactly true") |
| | |
| | **Stranger-estimated abilities** |
| | Neubauer, A. C., Pribil, A., Wallner, A., & Hofer, G. (2018). The self–other knowledge asymmetry in cognitive intelligence, emotional intelligence, and creativity. Heliyon, 4(12), e01061. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2018.e01061 |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Neubauer, A. C., & Hofer, G. (2021). Self-estimates of abilities are a better reflection of individuals' personality traits than of their abilities and are also strong predictors of professional interests. Personality and Individual Differences, 169, 109850. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.109850 |
| | |
| *NOTE: For all speed-dating stranger estimates see the dyadic data set. For the scorecard presented to strangers see https://osf.io/wd3kh/* | |
| | |
| verb_t_mean .. inter_t_mean | Speed-dating ability estimates as target means (1-5; i.e., mean ratings across all speed-dating partners) for responses to global ability estimate items (e.g., "I think this person is generally very talented in the verbal domain."). |
| verb_t_eff .. inter_t_eff | Speed-dating ability estimates as target effects (speed-dating-group-mean-centered target means) for responses to global ability estimate items (e.g., "I think this person is generally very talented in the verbal domain."). |
| | |
| FE_verb_acq_s_1 .. FE_inter_acq_s_15 | Speed-dating ability estimates from 15 randomly drawn partners (using slice_sample with replacement and the seed 879851) who were not previously acquainted to the target = responses to global ability estimate items (e.g., "I think this person is generally very talented in the verbal domain."). |
| | |
| | **Self-worth contingencies** |
| | unpublished measure; items see https://osf.io/wd3kh/ |
| | |
| SSWK_verbal .. SSWK_inter | Self-worth contingency rating for the respective ability domain (1-10) |
| | |
| | **Strangers' judgment certainty** |
| | unpublished measure; items see scorecard https://osf.io/wd3kh/ |
| obs_verb_t_mean .. obs_inter_t_mean | Speed-dating partners' judgment certainty as target means (1-5; i.e., mean ratings across all speed-dating partners) for responses to "How certain are you about this estimate?" for each of their ability estimates |
| obs_verb_t_eff .. obs_inter_t_eff | Speed-dating partners' judgment certainty as target effects (speed-dating-group-mean-centered target means) for responses to "How certain are you about this estimate?" for each of their ability estimates. |

## Additional variables

| **Informants** | |
|---|---|
| | |
| Pfemale | informant gender (0..male, 1..female) |
| | |
| | **Relationship closeness (IOS)** |
| | Aron, A., Aron, E. N., & Smollan, D. (1992). Inclusion of Other in the Self Scale and the structure of interpersonal closeness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63, 596–612. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.63.4.596<br>Gächter, S., Starmer, C., & Tufano, F. (2015). Measuring the closeness of relationships: A comprehensive evaluation of the "Inclusion of the Other in the Self" scale. PLOS ONE, 10(6), e0129478. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0129478 |
| PEiosscale | Closeness of the relationship between the rater and informant, as rated by the informant (1.. minimal closeness, 7 .. maximal closness) |
| | |
| **Physical attractiveness (externally rated)** | |
| | see https://osf.io/3wtvf/ |
| PA_mean | Mean attractiveness rating across all 10 raters (0– 5) |
| PA_1_W:PA_10_M | Attractiveness ratings by single raters (raters 1-10; "W" = female rater; "M" = male rater; 0..not attractive at all – 5..very attractive) |
| | |

| Other speed-dating variables | |
|---|---|
| *NOTE: For all speed-dating stranger estimates see the dyadic data set. For the scorecard presented to strangers see https://osf.io/wd3kh/* | |
| | |
| humor_t_mean | Target mean for "I find this person funny." (1-5) |
| attract_t_mean | Target mean for "I find this person attractives." (1-5) |
| symp_t_mean | Target mean for "I find this person likable." (1-5) |
| STR_t_mean | Target mean for "How much would you like to have a short-term relationship with this person?" (1-5) |
| LTR_t_mean | Target mean for "How much would you like to have a long-term relationship with this person?" (1-5) |
| Match_t_mean | Target mean for "Are you interested in meeting this person again?" (= proportion of speed-dating partners stating that they want to meet the target again; 0-1) |
| | |
| humor_t_eff .. Match_t_eff | Target effects for speed-dating ratings of humor etc. |
| | |
| **Other individual-difference variables** | |
| | |
| | **Big 5: BFI-k** |
| | Rammstedt, B., & John, O. P. (2005). Kurzversion des Big Five Inventory (BFI-K): Entwicklung und Validierung eines ökonomischen Inventars zur Erfassung der fünf Faktoren der Persönlichkeit. [Short version of the Big Five Inventory (BFI-K): Development and validation of an economic inventory for assessment of the five factors of personality.]. *Diagnostica*, *51*(4), 195–206. https://doi.org/10.1026/0012-1924.51.4.195 |
| | |
| BFI_O_mean | Mean openness (1-5) |
| BFI_C_mean | Mean conscientiousness (1-5) |
| BFI_E_mean | Mean extraversion (1-5) |
| BFI_A_mean | Mean agreeableness (1-5) |
| BFI_N_mean | Mean neuroticism (1-5) |
| | |
| SBFI_1:SBFI21 | Responses to single BFI-k items (1-5). Note: Items 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 17, and 21 need to be reversed. |
| | |
| | **Dark Triad: Dirty Dozen** |
| | Küfner, A. C. P., Dufner, M., & Back, M. D. (2014). Das Dreckige Dutzend und die Niederträchtigen Neun. *Diagnostica*, *61*(2), 76–91. https://doi.org/10.1026/0012-1924/a000124 |
| | |
| DT_N_mean | Mean narcissism (1-9) |
| DT_M_mean | Mean machiavellism (1-9) |
| DT_P_mean | Mean psychopathy (1-9) |
| | |
| SDD_M1:SDD_N4 | Responses to single Dirty Dozen items (1-9). Note: "_M" = machiavellism, "_N" = narcissism, "_P" = psychopathy. |
| | |
| | **Sociosexuality: SOI-R-9** |
| | Penke, L., & Asendorpf, J. B. (2008). Beyond global sociosexual orientations: A more differentiated look at sociosexuality and its effects on courtship and romantic relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95(5), 1113–1135. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.5.1113 |
| | |
| SOI_R_TOTAL_mean | Sociosexual orientation (mean across all SOI-R-9 items; 1-9) |
| | |
| SOI_R_B_mean | Mean sociosexual behavior (1-9) |
| SOI_R_A_mean | Mean sociosexual attidudes (1-9) |
| SOI_R_D_mean | Mean sociosexual desires (1-9) |
| | |

| | |
|---|---|
| SSOIRa_ … SSOIRc9 | Responses to single SOI-R-9 items (1-9). Note: "a" = behavior, "b" = attitude, "c" = desire. Item SSOIRb_6 needs to be reversed. |
| | |
| | **Mate Value: Mate Value Scale** |
| | Edlund, J. E., & Sagarin, B. J. (2014). The Mate Value Scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *64*, 72–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.02.005<br>German translation by the present authors. |
| | |
| MV_mean | Mean self-assessed mate value (1-7) |
| | |
| SMVSA_1 … SMVSc_1 | Responses to single Mate Value Scale items (1-7) |
| | |
| | **Sapiosexuality: Sapiosexuality Questionnaire** |
| | Gignac, G. E., Darbyshire, J., & Ooi, M. (2018). Some people are attracted sexually to intelligence: A psychometric evaluation of sapiosexuality. Intelligence, 66, 98–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2017.11.009<br>German translation by the present authors. |
| | |
| SAPIO_mean | Mean sapiosexuality (1..5) |
| | |
| SSapioQ_SPQ1 … SSapioQ_SPQ9 | Responses to single sapiosexuality items (1-5). Note: Due to a programming error, only the items 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, and 9 of the original questionnaire were presented. Comparability to the original questionnaire might therefore limited. |

## Dataset 2: Dyadic speed-dating data

SOKA_SpDa_SpeedDateData_toshare.csv

**In combination with dataset 1, base for all analyses reported in…**

Hofer, Gabriela, Roman Burkart, Laura Langmann, und Aljoscha C. Neubauer. „What You See Is What You Want to Get: Perceived Abilities Outperform Objective Test Performance in Predicting Mate Appeal in Speed Dating". Journal of Research in Personality 93 (1. August 2021): 104113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2021.104113.

Each row represents the ratings given by one perceiver about one target

| **Dyadic speed-dating variables** | |
|---|---|
| *For the scorecard presented to all speed-dating partners see https://osf.io/wd3kh/* | |
| | |
| PercID | Code of perceiver providing ratings |
| TargID | Code of target (of ratings) |
| GroupID | Speed-dating session (1-7) |
| | |
| known_either | Did either party indicate to know the other personally? (0..no, 1..yes) |
| | |
| FE_seen | Response to "Have you seen this person before?" (0..no, 1..yes) |
| FE_known | Response to "Do you know this person personally?" (0..no, 1..yes) |
| | |
| FE_verb | Response to "I think this person is generally very talented in the verbal domain." (1..5) |
| FE_num | Response to "I think this person is generally very talented in logical-mathematical thinking." (1..5) |
| FE_spat | Response to "I think this person is generally very talented in spatial thinking." (1..5) |
| FE_crea | Response to "I think this person is generally very talented in the creative domain." (1..5) |

| | |
|---|---|
| FE_intra | Response to "I think this person is generally very talented in handling their own feelings." (1..5) |
| FE_inter | Response to "I think this person is generally very talented in dealing with other people." (1..5) |
| | |
| FE_obs_verb .. FE_obs_inter | Responses to "How certain are you about this estimate?" (1..5) with regards to the estimates provided in FE_verb to FE_inter |
| | |
| FE_humor | Response to "I find this person funny." (1..5) |
| FE_attract | Response to "I find this person attractive." (1..5) |
| FE_symp | Response to "I find this person likable." (1..5) |
| | |
| FE_STR | Response to "How much would you like to have a short-term relationship with this person? (e.g., something sexual, a one-night stand, friends-with-benefits, etc.)" (1..5) |
| FE_LTR | Response to "How much would you like to have a long-term relationship with this person?" (1..5) |
| FE_Match | Response to "Are you interested in meeting this person again? " (0..no, 1..yes) |
| | |
| FE_verb_acq .. FE_Match_acq | Responses to scorecard items corrected for prior acquaintance (= response is NA if known_either = 1). |
| | |
| | |