

4.1 Participant Demographics and Trait Distribution

Table 1. Sample Demographics (N=348)

| Variable | Category | Count | % |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-------|------|
| Education | | | |
| | Bachelor's degree | 106 | 30.5 |
| | Complete high school | 71 | 20.4 |
| | Graduate degree | 66 | 19.0 |
| | Some college | 63 | 18.1 |
| | Some graduate school | 23 | 6.6 |
| | Incomplete high school | 19 | 5.5 |
| Music Enthusiast | | | |
| | Agree | 149 | 42.8 |
| | Strongly agree | 121 | 34.8 |
| | Neutral | 60 | 17.2 |
| | Disagree | 13 | 3.7 |
| | Strongly disagree | 5 | 1.4 |
| Region | | | |
| | Southeast | 184 | 52.9 |
| | South | 70 | 20.1 |
| | Northeast | 55 | 15.8 |
| | Center-West | 29 | 8.3 |
| | North | 10 | 2.9 |
| Gender | | | |
| | Female | 303 | 87.1 |
| | Male | 40 | 11.5 |
| | Other | 5 | 1.4 |

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the study sample. The majority of participants held a Bachelor's degree (30.5%), were female (87.1%), and resided in the Southeast region (52.9%). Additionally, 77.6% of participants identified as music enthusiasts (Agree or Strongly Agree).

Table 2 displays the distribution of participants across low/medium and high levels for each Big Five personality trait. The sample showed notably high levels of Agreeableness (93.1% scoring ≥ 15) and relatively low Extraversion (31.3% scoring ≥ 15). Openness, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism showed more balanced distributions.

**Table 2. Distribution of Personality Traits
(N=348)**

| Trait | Low/Med (< 15) | High (≥ 15) |
|-------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Openness | 107 | 241 |
| Conscientiousness | 130 | 218 |
| Extraversion | 239 | 109 |
| Agreeableness | 24 | 324 |
| Neuroticism | 231 | 117 |

Note: Trait scores are categorized as Low/Medium (< 15) and High (≥ 15) on a 20-point scale. Totals per row sum to N=348.

4.2 RQ1: Generating Personality-Aware Explanations at Scale

Table 3 summarizes the best-performing target trait within each explanation condition. Table 4 reports the full set of precision, recall, and F1-scores for all explanation-trait and target-trait combinations.

| Explanation trait | Best target trait (by F1) | Precision | Recall | F1-score |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-----------|--------|----------|
| Agreeableness | Agreeableness | 0.156 | 0.147 | 0.152 |
| Neuroticism | Neuroticism (Low) | 0.237 | 0.360 | 0.286 |
| Openness | Openness | 0.273 | 0.265 | 0.269 |
| Conscientiousness | Conscientiousness | 0.143 | 0.132 | 0.137 |
| Extraversion | Extraversion | 0.095 | 0.133 | 0.111 |

Note: The table reports the highest F1-score observed within each explanation-trait condition. Neuroticism is shown as two target classes (High, Low) because the metrics were computed separately by class.

Table 3. Best-performing target trait within each explanation-trait condition

| Target trait | Precision | Recall | F1-score |
|---|------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Explanation trait: Agreeableness | | | |
| Openness | 0.062 | 0.059 | 0.061 |
| Conscientiousness | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Extraversion | 0.062 | 0.067 | 0.065 |
| Agreeableness | 0.156 | 0.147 | 0.152 |
| Neuroticism (High) | 0.031 | 0.028 | 0.029 |
| Neuroticism (Low) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Explanation trait: Neuroticism | | | |
| Openness | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Conscientiousness | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Extraversion | 0.026 | 0.033 | 0.029 |
| Agreeableness | 0.079 | 0.088 | 0.083 |
| Neuroticism (High) | 0.053 | 0.056 | 0.054 |
| Neuroticism (Low) | 0.237 | 0.360 | 0.286 |
| Explanation trait: Openness | | | |
| Openness | 0.273 | 0.265 | 0.269 |
| Conscientiousness | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Extraversion | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Agreeableness | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Neuroticism (High) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Neuroticism (Low) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Explanation trait: Conscientiousness | | | |
| Openness | 0.086 | 0.088 | 0.087 |
| Conscientiousness | 0.143 | 0.132 | 0.137 |
| Extraversion | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Agreeableness | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Neuroticism (High) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Neuroticism (Low) | 0.057 | 0.080 | 0.067 |
| Explanation trait: Extraversion | | | |
| Openness | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Conscientiousness | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Extraversion | 0.095 | 0.133 | 0.111 |
| Agreeableness | 0.048 | 0.059 | 0.053 |
| Neuroticism (High) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Neuroticism (Low) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |

Note: Precision, recall, and F1-score are reported per target trait within each explanation-trait condition. Neuroticism is reported as two target classes (High, Low) because the evaluation outputs were class-specific.

Table 4. Precision, recall, and F1-score by explanation-trait condition and target trait

4.3 RQ2: Personality Traits and Selection Preferences

Table 5 reports the chi-square tests assessing whether trait is associated with explanation type selection, with Holm-adjusted p-values across the five traits. Table 6 presents the Bonferroni-corrected pairwise comparisons between explanation types selection, and Table 7 summarizes which explanation types are most and least selected among participants in the High range based on standardized residuals.

| Trait | χ^2 | df | p | p_{adj} | Cramér's V | Sig. |
|-------------------|----------|----|---------|-----------|------------|------|
| Openness | 3.134 | 5 | 0.67936 | 1.00000 | 0.095 | ns |
| Conscientiousness | 8.959 | 5 | 0.11072 | 0.55358 | 0.160 | ns |
| Extraversion | 4.318 | 5 | 0.50462 | 1.00000 | 0.111 | ns |
| Agreeableness | 1.535 | 5 | 0.90895 | 1.00000 | 0.066 | ns |
| Neuroticism | 5.619 | 5 | 0.34508 | 1.00000 | 0.127 | ns |

Note: Trait levels were defined as Low/Medium (< 15) vs. High (≥ 15) on a 20-point scale. Holm-adjusted p-values are reported across the five omnibus tests. ns = not significant.

Table 5. Chi-square tests of independence between trait and explanation type (Holm-adjusted across five tests)

| Pair | χ^2 | Raw p | Corrected p | Significant | Sig. |
|------------------------------------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|------|
| Conscientiousness vs Feature-Based | 29.96 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | Yes | *** |
| Conscientiousness vs Neuroticism | 18.23 | 0.0000 | 0.0003 | Yes | *** |
| Feature-Based vs Openness | 12.65 | 0.0004 | 0.0056 | Yes | ** |
| Extraversion vs Feature-Based | 9.21 | 0.0024 | 0.0362 | Yes | * |
| Agreeableness vs Conscientiousness | 8.71 | 0.0032 | 0.0475 | Yes | * |
| Agreeableness vs Feature-Based | 6.38 | 0.0115 | 0.1728 | No | ns |
| Extraversion vs Conscientiousness | 5.97 | 0.0145 | 0.2182 | No | ns |
| Neuroticism vs Openness | 5.33 | 0.0210 | 0.3150 | No | ns |
| Conscientiousness vs Openness | 3.66 | 0.0559 | 0.8383 | No | ns |
| Extraversion vs Agreeableness | 0.17 | 0.6788 | 1.0000 | No | ns |
| Extraversion vs Neuroticism | 3.16 | 0.0755 | 1.0000 | No | ns |
| Extraversion vs Openness | 0.19 | 0.6669 | 1.0000 | No | ns |
| Agreeableness vs Neuroticism | 1.60 | 0.2061 | 1.0000 | No | ns |
| Agreeableness vs Openness | 0.90 | 0.3424 | 1.0000 | No | ns |
| Feature-Based vs Neuroticism | 1.38 | 0.2395 | 1.0000 | No | ns |

Note: Bonferroni-corrected p-values are reported. * $p_{corr} < .05$, ** $p_{corr} < .01$, *** $p_{corr} < .001$, ns = not significant.

Table 6. Pairwise chi-square comparisons between explanation types (Bonferroni-corrected)

| Trait (High only) | Most preferred | Least preferred |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| Openness | Feature-based | Conscientiousness |
| Conscientiousness | Feature-based; Neuroticism | Conscientiousness |
| Extraversion | Feature-based | Conscientiousness |
| Agreeableness | Feature-based | Conscientiousness |
| Neuroticism | Neuroticism | Conscientiousness |

Note: “Most preferred” and “Least preferred” indicate explanation types that occurred more or less often than expected among high scorers, based on standardized residuals. The threshold is $|Std\ Residual| \geq 2$.

Table 7. High scorers only ($\geq 15/20$): explanation types most and least represented (standardized residuals)