

Supplemental Results File

Ava Scott Clark Honors College Thesis

This document presents the comprehensive set of results from all analyses conducted for the honors thesis, which resulted in a total of 72 outputs. In consultation with my primary advisor (Dr. Jennifer Pfeifer) and second reader (Amala Someshwar), we concluded that the main manuscript would be more accessible if it included only the core results. Therefore, the remaining findings are provided in a supplemental file for readers who wish to explore them further.

Maladaptive Coping

Personality		
Variable	estimate	p-value
Extraversion	0.01 [-0.04,0.06]	.775
Agreeableness	-0.02 [-0.8,0.04]	.457
Conscientiousness	-0.02 [-0.07,0.03]	.387
Neuroticism	0.04 [-0.01,0.08]	.086
Openness	0.07 [0.02,0.12]	.012

Table A1. Table showing the regression coefficients for the association between personality traits and maladaptive coping.

Using a general linear model analysis, we found that openness positively predicted the use of maladaptive coping mechanisms, indicating that the more open one is to experience, the more likely they are to use maladaptive coping mechanisms, $b_1 = 0.07$, $F(1, 118) = 6.54$, $p = .012$, $PRE = 0.06$, $95\%CI[0.02, 0.12]$. Openness was the only personality trait that produced statistically significant results.

Trauma		
Variable	estimate	p-value
Emotional Abuse	0.09 [0.06,0.12]	<.001
Emotional Neglect	0.04 [-0.001,0.07]	.057
Physical Abuse	0.27 [0.21, 0.33]	<.001
Physical Neglect	0.23 [0.19,0.27]	<.001
Sexual Abuse	0.24 [0.17,0.31]	<.001

Table A2. Table showing the regression coefficients for the association between childhood trauma and maladaptive coping.

When analyzing the relationship between maladaptive coping and trauma, using a general linear model analysis, we found that emotional abuse ($b_I = 0.09$, $p < .001$), positively predicted the use of maladaptive coping mechanisms, indicating someone's experience with emotional abuse makes them more likely to use maladaptive coping mechanisms, $b_I = 0.09$, $F(1, 118) = 36.06$, $p = <.001$, $PRE = 0.27$, $95\%CI[0.06, 0.12]$. Physical abuse positively predicted the use of maladaptive coping mechanisms, $b_I = 0.27$, $F(1, 118) = 81.55$, $p = <.001$, $PRE = 0.45$, $95\%CI[0.21, 0.33]$. Sexual abuse abuse positively predicted the use of maladaptive coping mechanisms, $b_I = 0.24$, $F(1, 118) = 51.74$, $p = <.001$, $PRE = 0.34$, $95\%CI[0.17, 0.31]$. Physical neglect positively predicted the use of maladaptive coping mechanisms, $b_I = 0.23$, $F(1, 118) = 141.40$, $p = <.001$, $PRE = 0.59$, $95\%CI[0.19, 0.27]$. Emotional neglect was the only trauma type that did not produce statistically significant results.

Emotional Abuse		
Variable	estimate	p-value
Extraversion*Emotional Abuse	-0.01 [-0.09,0.06]	.720
Agreeableness*Emotional Abuse	0.08 [-0.01,0.17]	.089
Conscientiousness*Emotional Abuse	-0.11 [-0.15,-0.06]	<.001
Neuroticism*Emotional Abuse	-0.06 [-0.12,0.01]	.077
Openness*Emotional Abuse	0.003 [-0.06,0.07]	.923

Table A3. Table showing the interaction effects of personality traits and emotional abuse on maladaptive coping.

Physical Abuse		
Variable	estimate	p-value
Extraversion*Physical Abuse	-0.23 [-0.48,0.02]	.066
Agreeableness*Physical Abuse	0.13 [-0.11,0.36]	.287
Conscientiousness*Physical Abuse	-0.23 [-0.37,-0.09]	.001

Neuroticism*Physical Abuse	-0.15 [-0.32,0.01]	.060
Openness*Physical Abuse	0.10 [-0.09,0.28]	.299

Table A4. Table showing the interaction effects of personality traits and physical abuse on maladaptive coping.

Physical Neglect		
Variable	estimate	p-value
Extraversion*Physical Neglect	-0.01 [-0.12,0.09]	.909
Agreeableness*Physical Neglect	0.05 [-0.07,0.17]	.381
Conscientiousness*Physical Neglect	-0.10 [-0.18,-0.02]	.013
Neuroticism*Physical Neglect	-0.03 [-0.10,0.04]	.398
Openness*Physical Neglect	0.04 [-0.04,0.11]	.333

Table A5. Table showing the interaction effects of personality traits and physical neglect on maladaptive coping.

Sexual Abuse

Variable	estimate	p-value
Extraversion*Sexual Abuse	-1.22 [-2.10,-0.33]	.007
Agreeableness*Sexual Abuse	1.02 [0.18,1.85]	.018
Conscientiousness*Sexual Abuse	-0.16 [-0.55,0.23]	.415
Neuroticism*Sexual Abuse	-0.29 [-0.10,0.04]	.398
Openness*Sexual Abuse	-0.33 [-0.73,0.07]	.104

Table A6. Table showing the interaction effects of personality traits and sexual abuse on maladaptive coping.

Emotional Neglect		
Variable	estimate	p-value
Extraversion*Emotional Neglect	0.002 [-0.12,0.13]	.972
Agreeableness*Emotional Neglect	0.07 [-0.07,0.20]	.330
Conscientiousness*Emotional Neglect	-0.07 [-0.18,0.04]	.219
Neuroticism*Emotional Neglect	-0.01 [-0.12,0.09]	.816

Openness*Emotional Neglect	-0.001 [-0.12,0.12]	.990
----------------------------	---------------------	------

Table A7. Table showing the interaction effects of personality traits and emotional neglect on maladaptive coping.

Adaptive Coping

Personality		
Variable	estimate	p-value
Extraversion	0.01 [-0.05,0.06]	.843
Agreeableness	-0.04 [-0.10,0.02]	.227

Conscientiousness	-0.04 [-0.09,0.01]	.125
Neuroticism	0.03 [-0.01,0.08]	.149
Openness	0.18 [0.13,0.23]	<.001

Table B1. Table showing the regression coefficients for the association between personality traits and adaptive coping.

Using a general linear model analysis, we found that openness positively predicted the use of adaptive coping mechanisms, indicating that the more open one is to experience, the more likely they are to use adaptive coping mechanisms, $b_1 = 0.18$, $F(1, 118) = 49.47$, $p = <.001$, $PRE = 0.30$, $95\%CI[0.13, 0.23]$. Openness was the only personality trait that produced statistically significant results.

Trauma		
Variable	estimate	p-value
Emotional Abuse	0.20 [0.13,0.26]	<.001

Emotional Neglect	0.16 [0.08,0.24]	<.001
Physical Abuse	0.16 [0.03, 0.30]	.015
Physical Neglect	0.09 [0.002,0.17]	.045
Sexual Abuse	0.21 [0.06,0.35]	.006

Table B2. Table showing the regression coefficients for the association between childhood trauma and adaptive coping.

When analyzing the relationship between adaptive coping and trauma, using a general linear model analysis, we found that emotional abuse positively predicted the use of adaptive coping mechanisms, indicating someone's experience with emotional abuse makes them more likely to use adaptive coping mechanisms, $b_I = 0.20$, $F(1, 118) = 37.77$, $p = <.001$, $PRE = 0.27$, $95\%CI[0.13, 0.26]$. Physical abuse positively predicted the use of adaptive coping mechanisms, $b_I = 0.61$, $F(1, 118) = 6.13$, $p = .015$, $PRE = 0.06$, $95\%CI[0.03, 0.29]$. Sexual abuse positively predicted the use of adaptive coping mechanisms, $b_I = 0.21$, $F(1, 118) = 7.75$, $p = .006$, $PRE = 0.07$, $95\%CI[0.06, 0.35]$. Physical neglect positively predicted the use of adaptive coping mechanisms, $b_I = 0.09$, $F(1, 118) = 4.14$, $p = .045$, $PRE = 0.04$, $95\%CI[0.002, 0.17]$. Emotional neglect positively predicted the use of adaptive coping mechanisms, $b_I = 0.13$, $F(1, 118) = 16.02$, $p < .001$, $PRE = 0.14$, $95\%CI[0.08, 0.24]$.

Emotional Neglect		
Variable	estimate	p-value
Extraversion*Emotional Neglect	0.003 [-0.11,0.11]	.959
Agreeableness*Emotional Neglect	0.06 [-0.06,0.18]	.324
Conscientiousness*Emotional Neglect	-0.05 [-0.15,0.05]	.359
Neuroticism*Emotional Neglect	0.03 [-0.06,0.12]	.545
Openness*Emotional Neglect	0.01 [-0.10,0.12]	.852

Table B3. Table showing the interaction effects of personality traits and emotional neglect on adaptive coping.

Emotional Abuse		
Variable	estimate	p-value
Extraversion*Emotional Abuse	-0.01 [-0.08,0.05]	.703
Agreeableness*Emotional Abuse	0.03 [-0.04,0.11]	.368
Conscientiousness*Emotional Abuse	-0.05 [-0.10,-0.01]	.010
Neuroticism*Emotional Abuse	-0.04 [-0.09,0.01]	.122
Openness*Emotional Abuse	0.003 [-0.05,0.05]	.900

Table B4. Table showing the interaction effects of personality traits and emotional abuse on adaptive coping.

Physical Abuse		
Variable	estimate	p-value
Extraversion*Physical Abuse	-0.34 [-0.64,-0.05]	.024
Agreeableness*Physical Abuse	0.126 [-0.15,0.41]	.375
Conscientiousness*Physical Abuse	-0.18 [-0.35,-0.01]	.037
Neuroticism*Physical Abuse	-0.16 [-0.36,0.03]	.104
Openness*Physical Abuse	0.05 [-0.17,0.27]	.660

Table B5. Table showing the interaction effects of personality traits and physical abuse on adaptive coping.

Sexual Abuse		
Variable	estimate	p-value
Extraversion*Sexual Abuse	-1.24 [-2.23,-0.25]	.015
Agreeableness*Sexual Abuse	1.09 [0.15,2.03]	.024
Conscientiousness*Sexual Abuse	-0.15 [-0.59,0.28]	.492
Neuroticism*Sexual Abuse	-0.24 [-0.61,0.12]	.189
Openness*Sexual Abuse	-0.41 [-0.85,0.04]	.075

Table B6. Table showing the interaction effects of personality traits and sexual abuse on adaptive coping.

Physical Neglect		
Variable	estimate	p-value
Extraversion*Physical Neglect	-0.02 [-0.14,0.10]	.721
Agreeableness*Physical Neglect	0.004 [-0.14,0.15]	.952
Conscientiousness*Physical Neglect	-0.07 [-0.16,0.03]	.186
Neuroticism*Physical Neglect	-0.01 [-0.09,0.07]	.818
Openness*Physical Neglect	0.03 [-0.06,0.12]	.489

Table B7. Table showing the interaction effects of personality traits and physical neglect on adaptive coping.

Avoidant Coping

Personality		
Variable	estimate	p-value
Extraversion	0.003 [-0.04,0.04]	.901
Agreeableness	-0.03 [-0.8,0.02]	.271
Conscientiousness	0.08 [0.04,0.12]	<.001
Neuroticism	0.14 [0.10,0.17]	<.001
Openness	0.14 [0.10,0.18]	<.001

Table C1. Table showing the regression coefficients for the association between personality traits and avoidant coping.

Using a general linear model analysis, we found that conscientiousness positively predicted the use of avoidant coping mechanisms, indicating that the more conscious one is, the more likely they are to use avoidant coping mechanisms $b_I = 0.08$, $F(1, 118) = 15.78$, $p < .001$, $PRE = 0.12$, $95\%CI[0.04, 0.12]$.

Neuroticism positively predicted the use of avoidant coping mechanisms, $b_1 = 0.14$, $F(1, 118) = 61.76$, $p < .001$, $PRE = 0.35$, $95\%CI[0.10, 0.17]$. Openness positively predicted the use of avoidant coping mechanisms, $b_1 = 0.14$, $F(1, 118) = 46.52$, $p < .001$, $PRE = 0.29$, $95\%CI[0.10, 0.18]$. Extraversion and agreeableness did not produce statistically significant results.

Trauma		
Variable	estimate	p-value
Emotional Abuse	0.24 [0.15,0.33]	<.001
Emotional Neglect	0.015 [-0.10,0.13]	.797
Physical Abuse	0.17 [-0.01, 0.36]	.060
Physical Neglect	0.05 [-0.07,0.17]	.391
Sexual Abuse	-0.003 [-0.21,0.20]	.979

Table C2. Table showing the regression coefficients for the association between childhood trauma and avoidant coping.

When analyzing the relationship between avoidant coping and trauma, using a general linear model analysis, we found that emotional abuse positively predicted the use of avoidant coping

mechanisms, indicating someone's experience with emotional abuse makes them more likely to use avoidant coping mechanisms, $b_1 = 0.24$, $F(1, 118) = 28.43$, $p = <.001$, $PRE = 0.221$, 95%CI[0.15, 0.33]. Emotional abuse was the only trauma type that produced statistically significant results.

Emotional Abuse		
Variable	estimate	p-value
Extraversion*Emotional Abuse	-0.01 [-0.06,0.04]	.590
Agreeableness*Emotional Abuse	0.03 [-0.03,0.09]	.327
Conscientiousness*Emotional Abuse	-0.04 [-0.08,-0.01]	.009
Neuroticism*Emotional Abuse	-0.03 [-0.07,0.01]	.103
Openness*Emotional Abuse	0.002 [-0.04,0.04]	.929

Table A3. Table showing the interaction effects of personality traits and emotional abuse on avoidant coping.

Factor	Item	standardized loading	SE	p-value
Healthy	Item 1	0.45	0.14	<.001
	Item 2	0.53	0.15	<.001
	Item 5	0.74	0.13	<.001
	Item 8	0.83	0.12	<.001
	Item 9	0.86	0.12	<.001
	Item 11	0.44	0.15	<.001
	Item 14	0.31	0.16	<.001
	Item 15	0.50	0.17	<.001
	Item 16	0.19	0.10	<.001

	Item 19	0.65	0.14	<.001
Unhealthy	Item 3	0.42	0.19	<.001
	Item 4	0.57	0.17	<.001
	Item 6	0.61	0.16	<.001
	Item 7	0.45	0.13	<.001
	Item 10	0.47	0.11	<.001
	Item 12	0.82	0.16	<.001
	Item 13	0.85	0.16	<.001
	Item 17	0.36	0.07	<.001
	Item 18	0.30	0.09	.003
	Item 20	0.48	0.15	<.001

Table D1. Standardized loadings from confirmatory factor analysis of healthy and unhealthy coping items

Factor	Item	standardized loading	SE	p-value
Active	Item 5	0.72	0.13	<.001
	Item 8	0.88	0.12	<.001
	Item 9	0.88	0.12	<.001
	Item 11	0.42	0.15	<.001
	Item 14	0.30	0.16	.001
	Item 16	0.14	0.10	.144
	Item 19	0.62	0.14	<.001
Avoidant	Item 1	0.62	0.13	<.001

	Item 2	0.62	0.15	<.001
	Item 3	0.41	0.18	<.001
	Item 4	0.56	0.17	<.001
	Item 12	0.82	0.15	<.001
	Item 13	0.86	0.15	<.001
	Item 15	0.53	0.17	<.001
Negative	Item 6	0.71	0.16	<.001
	Item 7	0.61	0.13	<.001
	Item 10	0.62	0.11	<.001
	Item 17	0.53	0.07	<.001
	Item 18	0.49	0.09	.003

Table D2. Standardized loadings from confirmatory factor analysis of active, avoidant, maladaptive coping items

Factor Loadings

	Factor			Uniqueness
	1	2	3	
Item 1	0.55			0.54
Item 2	0.61	0.35		0.45
Item 3	0.59			0.68
Item 4	0.74			0.49

Item 5		0.74		0.44
Item 6	0.49		0.32	0.53
Item 7			0.49	0.71
Item 8		0.84		0.33
Item 9		0.81		0.33
Item 10			0.64	0.54
Item 11		0.41		0.76
Item 12	0.70			0.46
Item 13	0.67			0.40
Item 14		0.35		0.88
Item 15	0.36	0.41		0.61
Item 16			0.57	0.68
Item 17			0.67	0.56
Item 18			0.47	0.74
Item 19		0.69		0.51
Item 20	0.44			0.75

Table E1. Exploratory factor analysis loadings and uniqueness estimates for coping items with three categories

Factor Loadings

	Factor				Uniqueness
	1	2	3	4	
Item 1	0.32	0.39			0.56
Item 2	0.40	0.38			0.47
Item 3				0.75	0.42
Item 4				0.71	0.34
Item 5	0.78				0.41
Item 6		0.42	0.31		0.54
Item 7		0.39	0.43		0.63
Item 8	0.82				0.32
Item 9	0.82				0.32
Item 10			0.59		0.56
Item 11	0.43				0.75
Item 12		0.81			0.32
Item 13		0.80			0.27
Item 14		0.33		-0.42	0.73
Item 15	0.41	0.32			0.61
Item 16			0.54		0.69
Item 17			0.67		0.54
Item 18			0.56		0.60
Item 19	0.69				0.51
Item 20		0.46			0.73

Table E2. Exploratory factor analysis loadings and uniqueness estimates for coping items with four categories