Multidimensional Iowa Suggestibility Scale (MISS)
Brief Manual

This manual includes:

A. Scale Construction
B. Overview of validation studies
C. Items listed by scale
D. Basic psychometric properties
E. Some validity data

Assessment forms for the full (95-item version) and the Short Suggestibility Scale (21 items) are available separately on Dr. Kotov's web page. The items-by-scale listing can be used to create custom-made version of the scale.

A. Scale Construction

Suggestibility is a personality trait that reflects a general tendency to accept messages. Suggestibility is distinct from compliance because it involves internalization of a message, not simply a behavioral change. We hypothesize that suggestibility reflects a balance between deliberate and automatic processing of information, as the automatic process is more likely to accept information uncritically. Even though the concept of suggestibility has been around for over a hundred years, this concept is not well-understood, and there are no self-report measures of suggestibility. The goal of this study was to develop and validate a self-report measure of suggestibility. Scale construction was performed in six stages:

1. Identification of the initial structure
2. Refinement (initial construct validation)
3. Development of preliminary scales
4. Development of final scales
5. Cross-validation

Stage 1. We started by defining suggestibility as a tendency to accept, without a particularly strong pressure, messages from self, another person, or any type of media, including messages regarding physiological states. Manifestations of suggestibility were defined by two parameters: source and content of the message. We considered three types of sources and three types of contents. These parameters were used to define a table of specification, and items were written to tap each cell. We also hypothesized that chameleon-like behaviors are a manifestation of suggestibility and we wrote four items to tap this content area. The resulting item pool included 77 items.

Message. Physiological **Source**	Consumer	Informational
Social	12	15	10
Media	5	9	7
Self	15	*NA*	**NA**

Sample 1 ($N = 674$) completed the questionnaire in group testing. First we eliminated redundant items ($r > .55$). Next, we preformed EFA on the remaining items. Scree-plot suggested that up to ten factors may be extracted. Eight-factor solution was found to be most interpretable. Items with the primary loading on a factor were tentatively assigned to a corresponding scale. Next, reliability analyses were used to prune items that did not contribute to scales alpha or lowered it.

	# items	CONSUM	SC	PHR	PC	PERSUAD	IMIT	PSC	SOP
CONSUMER	8	**0.83**							
SENSATION CONT	11	0.56	**0.69**						
PHYS REACTIVITY	8	0.37	0.31	**0.69**					
PEER CONFORM	7	0.49	0.28	0.46	**0.75**				
PERSUADABILITY	8	0.53	0.47	0.45	0.45	**0.69**			
IMITATION	6	0.46	0.46	0.48	0.48	0.51	**0.72**		
PSYCHSOM CONTROL	9	0.19	0.30	0.13	0.22	0.24	0.24	**0.65**	
STUBORN OPIN.	8	-0.07	0.14	0.11	-0.11	-0.02	0.01	0.29	**0.54**

Six scales correlated strongly enough to be considered components of a single construct, but mental control and unpersuadability were more independent and were therefore considered companion scales. This framework was used for further scale development, which proceeded primarily on the level of individual scales. The consumer subscale was reliable, but other scales required additional items.

METHOD: In the following two stages scale construction was conducted using correlational, reliability, and principal factor analyses. Correlational analysis was used to identify redundant items (r > .55). After redundant items were eliminated, robustness of the hypothesized structure was tested using exploratory factor analysis. All hypothesized subscales that emerged in the EFA were tested further. Principal factor analyses were performed on each scale individually. Items from other scales were included in the item pool, if they had the primary loading on the corresponding factor in the overall EFA. Items loading <.25 on the first unrotated factor were dropped from the scale. Reliability analyses were performed on the remaining items. Also factor analyses were performed on pairs and triplets of strongly correlated scales to identify cross-loaders. Reliability considerations were weighted against distinctiveness considerations. Items that did not improve reliability of the scales, or showed high cross-loadings were dropped.

Stage 2. Twelve poorly performing items were dropped, 57 new items were written to improve reliabilities of the scales. Although chameleon-like behaviors did not form a factor, we hypothesized that it may be due to the insufficient number of such items in the original item pool, so 15 items we written to tap this content area. The result was a 137-item measure. Sample 2 (N = 362) completed questionnaires in small groups. Factor analysis suggested the presence of eight factors, replicating the previous structure. However, the imitation factor has absorbed many chameleon-like items and relabeled as pliability. The previous pattern of scale intercorrelations was also replicated, but the correlation between pliability and persuadability was r = .69, suggesting redundancy. All scales had reliabilities of at least α = .75, with most being over .80, but additional items were still needed to ensure reliability of all scales.

	# items	PER	COS	SC	PC	PHR	MB	PSC	SOP
PERSUADABILITY	13	**0.82**							
CONSUM	14	0.55	**0.89**						
SENSATION CONT.	14	0.52	0.60	**0.82**					
PEER CONFORM	11	0.54	0.38	0.30	**0.75**				
PHYS REACTIVITY	13	0.52	0.35	0.42	0.53	**0.80**			
MALLEB. BEHAVIOR	13	0.69	0.53	0.56	0.44	0.46	**0.83**		
PSYCHOS CONTROL	12	0.17	0.20	0.22	0.09	0.04	0.11	**0.76**	
STUBBORN OPINION	15	-0.10	-0.13	-0.05	-0.09	0.01	-0.18	0.34	**0.75**

Stage 2 (construct validation). Participants also completed measures of Big Five, dependency, absorption, dissociation, obsessive-checking, self-concept clarity, and self-monitoring. Correlations with these self-report measures indicated that the suggestibility scales are distinct from the Big Five traits (all |r| < .32). Also, suggestibility scales showed meaningful associations with other constructs, but they were not redundant with any of them (|r| < .48). Pliability was found to have the least unique content.

	COS	SC	PHR	PC	PER	MB	PSC	SOP
Neuroticism	0.17	0.28	0.30	0.10	0.19	**0.32**	**-0.31**	-0.19
Extraversion	0.01	-0.03	0.03	0.10	-0.12	-0.12	0.01	0.17
Agreeableness	-0.13	-0.22	0.10	0.15	-0.06	-0.16	-0.09	-0.17
Conscientious	-0.21	-0.25	-0.09	-0.03	-0.16	-0.30	-0.06	0.04
Openness	-0.07	-0.05	0.06	-0.04	0.06	-0.05	0.19	**0.37**
Dependency	0.27	0.28	0.17	0.21	**0.31**	**0.43**	-0.09	**-0.37**
Dissociation	**0.31**	**0.47**	0.21	0.10	**0.30**	**0.39**	0.23	0.15
Checking	0.28	**0.35**	0.28	0.19	**0.30**	**0.32**	0.09	0.07
Self-concept	**0.31**	**0.36**	0.19	0.10	**0.32**	**0.47**	-0.02	-0.06
Self-monitor	0.23	0.15	0.22	0.21	0.24	**0.34**	0.08	0.01
Absorption	0.17	0.28	0.24	0.12	0.26	0.23	0.26	0.18
Unique var.	**77%**	**71%**	**76%**	**77%**	**75%**	**58%**	**68%**	**67%**

Stage 3. The purpose of this stage was to further improve reliabilities of the scales and finalize the measure. Thirty-nine poorly performing items were dropped and 37 new items were written, resulting in a 135-item measure. Sample 3 (N = 712) completed the questionnaire in group testing. Factor analysis replicated the earlier structure, except that Pliability items did not form a tight factor and migrated to various other scales. Because of this lack of robustness, certain redundancy with Persuadability, and overlap with such constructs as self-concept clarity and dependency, we decided to eliminate the Pliability scale, but the items were considered for inclusion on other scales. All resulting scales had reliabilities >.80, except physical reactivity and mental control (α = .74 and .76). Interscale correlations for the five suggestibility subscales were acceptable (no redundancies), and factor analysis of these scales clearly supported a single-factor solution. Thus, the five scales can be summed to form the overall suggestibility index.

	# items	TOT	SSS	COS	PER	SC	PHR	PC	PSC	SOP
SUG TOTAL	61	**0.93**								
SHORT SCALE	21	0.94	**0.87**							
CONSUM	11	0.78	0.81	**0.84**						
PERSUADABILITY	14	0.77	0.72	0.54	**0.80**					
SENSATION CONT.	12	0.73	0.75	0.62	0.46	**0.83**				
PHYS REACTIVITY	10	0.72	0.63	0.43	0.43	0.36	**0.74**			
PEER CONFORM	14	0.70	0.65	0.45	0.48	0.29	0.48	**0.83**		
PSYCHOS CONTROL	14	0.15	0.14	0.16	0.11	0.31	0.02	-0.02	**0.76**	
STUBBORN OPINION	15	-0.19	-0.24	-0.16	-0.25	-0.13	-0.03	-0.19	0.27	**0.81**

Forty-five poorly performing items were dropped thus resulting in a preliminary 90-item version of the MISS. Physical reactivity and mental control scales needed additional items.

Stage 4. The preliminary MISS and 14 experimental items were administered in group testing (N = 638). Five of the 14 experimental items were added to the instrument based on their correlations with the preliminary scales and reliability analyses. Three items were added to physical reactivity, one to mental control, and one to unpersuadability. No items were dropped,

thus resulting in the 95-item final measure. All final scales had reliabilities >.80, except persuadability and mental control (α = .79 each). Interscale correlations for the five suggestibility subscales were acceptable. Scale-level factor analysis again suggested that suggestibility is best captured by a single higher-order factor.

	# items	TOT	SSS	COS	PER	SC	PHR	PC	PSC	SOP
SUG TOTAL	64	**0.91**								
SHORT SCALE	21	0.93	**0.85**							
CONSUM	11	0.77	0.80	**0.82**						
PERSUADABILITY	14	0.75	0.67	0.47	**0.79**					
SENSATION CONT.	12	0.72	0.73	0.59	0.37	**0.85**				
PHYS REACTIVITY	13	0.71	0.60	0.37	0.51	0.34	**0.80**			
PEER CONFORM	14	0.67	0.57	0.41	0.41	0.25	0.36	**0.79**		
PSYCHOS CONTROL	15	0.16	0.12	0.16	0.11	0.33	0.02	-0.06	**0.80**	
STUBBORN OPINION	16	-0.12	-0.16	-0.09	-0.13	-0.06	0.02	-0.16	0.29	**0.81**

Short Suggestibility Scale was developed using items from the five preliminary suggestibility subscales. Factor analysis was performed in Sample 3 on the 61 suggestibility items. Scale construction balanced the goals of selecting best markers of the general factor with preserving diversity of content. It was achieved using the following selection rules: (1) items with highest loadings on the first unrotated factor were selected, but (2) no subscale could be represented by more than five items and (3) each subscale had to be represented by at least three items. The resulting short scale included five items from consumer and physiological suggestibility (each), four items from persuadability and peer conformity (each), and three items from physiological reactivity, thus resulting in a 21-item scale. Reliability analysis confirmed item selection. Psychometric properties of the Short Suggestibility Scale were also evaluated in Sample 4. The scale was reliable in both samples and correlated .93 or above with the general factor score and the total suggestibility index, again in both samples.

SUMMARY. We have developed a multi-dimensional measure of suggestibility and two companion constructs. The structure is replicable and the scales are reliable. Initial evidence of construct validity suggests that suggestibility is clearly distinct from established personality traits, but shows meaningful associations with conceptually similar constructs. Suggestibility is likely to moderate a number of cognitive and social processes. For instance, high suggestibility is expected to be associated with yielding to messages and thus to increased responding on persuasion tasks.

Stage 5. The MISS was administered in fall 2004 and spring 2005 group testing sessions (N = 1,308). The results closely replicated structure identified in Sample 4. All scales had acceptable reliabilities. The scale was also administered to a sample of community volunteers solicited by advertisements (N = 275). The structure and psychometric properties replicated in this sample also. **For final psychometric properties, see section D.**

B. Overview of Validation Studies

1. We validated the structure using CFA in sample 5. Also evaluated the structure in a community sample. Data are not included.

2. Associations with relevant self-report measures were re-evaluated. We dropped some oddity measures (e.g., checking) and added measures of compliance, response styles, unusual sleep experiences and need for cognition. These results are available in Section E of the manual.

3. A random portion of Samples 4 and 5 participated in the construct-validation study, thus allowing evaluation of stability of the MISS. For results see Section E.

4. We investigating whether the MISS contributes to hypnotizability above and beyond absorption. Participants completed Stanford Hypnotic Susceptibility Scale (SHSS), the MISS, a measure of absorption, and a measure of the Big Five. For results see Section E.

5. We investigated relations of suggestibility and susceptibility to social influence in the following paradigms:
   - Interrogative suggestibility
   - Exposure to norms
   - Paltry contribution
   - Attitudes toward psychology
   - Strong vs. weak message persuasion paradigm
   - Ink blot suggestibility test

   Significant associations were identified. Data are not included.

C. Items Listed by Scale

Overview: The MISS includes five suggestibility subscales and two companion scales. The five suggestibility subscales can be summed to give the suggestibility total score. Short suggestibility scale is composed of items drawn from the five subscales and provides a good index of the general suggestibility trait. Please include copyright information on all reproductions of the scale. If selected subscales are administered, rather than the entire scale, please include copyright information and names of the subscales. Do not modify the instrument without authors' permission. If you have any questions contact Dr. Roman Kotov at Stony Brook University: roman.kotov@stonybrook.edu

Consumer Suggestibility (COS 11 items)

Commercials sometimes make me want products that I did not know I needed
I often get information about products from commercials
I can be influenced by a good commercial
After someone I know tries a new product, I will usually try it too
Sometimes I want a product because I like the person endorsing it
When a salesperson explains advantages of their service, I am usually pretty convinced
A good salesperson can really make me want their product
I get a lot of good practical advice from magazines or TV
If a product is nicely displayed, I usually want to buy it
I get my style from certain celebrities
I use advertisements as a guide for shopping

Persuadability (PER 14 items)

A logical argument can make me change my mind
I can be convinced by a good argument
I find other people's advice helpful in making decisions
When making a decision, I often follow other people's advice
I don't mind changing my opinion after hearing a different point of view
The more I am exposed to other people's views, the more my own view of the world changes
I get many good ideas from others
I trust the advice of experts
If I had an opinion that no one else shared, I would seriously question it
I usually can be persuaded by a well-written editorial
I am easily influenced by other people's opinions
In a discussion I often use arguments that I've heard other people make
When discussing politics I often find myself using arguments that I recently read or heard on TV
I frequently change my opinion after talking with others

Sensation Contagion (SC 12 items)

After watching deodorant commercials, I sometimes notice that I smell
If I am told I don't look well, I start feeling ill
I sometimes don't realize that I am tired until someone tells me I look tired
When someone clears their throat, I often notice that my throat feels scratchy
After hearing about an illness, I sometimes start feeling symptoms of that illness
When someone coughs or sneezes, I usually feel the urge to do the same
When I see someone shiver, I often feel a chill myself
When people tell me how they feel, I often notice that I feel the same way
When someone describes an experience, I sometimes feel as if I am having it
I sometimes don't realize that a room is too hot until someone else mentions it
Being in a room where someone is sleeping makes me sleepy
After I see a commercial for lotion, sometimes my skin feels dry

Physiological Reactivity (PHR 13 items)

After seeing a scary movie I feel jumpy for a while
A touching scene can make my eyes water
Thinking about something scary can make my heart pound
After seeing something striking, the image often comes back to me
When someone yawns, I usually yawn myself
I feel more attractive if someone compliments me on my appearance
Reading descriptions of tasty dishes can make my mouth water
Imagining a refreshing drink can make me thirsty
The smell of food usually makes me hungry
When I listen to music my mood usually changes accordingly
When I think about something pleasant I sometimes notice that I am smiling
When I read a story I sometimes feel what the character goes through
I often get emotionally involved in a good movie

Peer Conformity (PC 14 items)

My friends and I like all the same things
My friends and I like the same stores
I like the style of clothes that my friends wear
I dress very differently from my friends **[R]**
I don't like most of the movies my friends like **[R]**
I seem to have a perspective on life that is quite similar to the people around me
I often buy things that my friends have
I share many of my friends' opinions
My friends and I have similar music tastes
I like the same celebrities as my friends
I discovered many of my favorite things through my friends
I follow current fashion trends
It is important for me to fit in
I have picked-up many habits from my friends

COMPANION SCALES

Psychosomatic Control (PSC 15 items)

If I convince myself something is not going to hurt, I will not really feel it
If I had a sharp pain, I could make it better by imagining something pleasant
If my heart is racing, I can slow it down just by thinking about it
If I tell myself to lighten up, my mood usually improves
Even when I am worked up, I can calm myself down pretty quickly
If I had to walk on a narrow ledge high above the ground, I could convince myself not to think about the height
Even when I am really worried, I can put concerns out of my mind
If I decide not to think about something, I can easily put it out of my mind
I am good at controlling my thoughts
If I wanted to I could become very good at meditation
When my clothes are not warm enough, I can make myself not feel the cold
I think I could learn to hypnotize myself
I agree with the idea of "mind over matter"
When I feel that I am getting sick, I sometimes can stop the illness with my willpower
In a scary situation I can make feelings of fear go away

Stubborn Opinionatedness (SOP 16 items)

People think that I am opinionated
I question what I see on the news
It takes a lot to persuade me
I am very certain about my likes and dislikes
I am strong-willed
My opinions are very slow to change
I do things my own way
People would say that I am stubborn
I am seldom persuaded by other people's arguments
I have a unique style
I would describe myself as an "independent thinker"
It is no use trying to argue with me
I have strong opinions on most issues
I am not easily influenced
I am comfortable holding unpopular opinions
People may disagree with me, but it usually turns out that I was right

Short Suggestibility Scale (SSS 21 items)

I am easily influenced by other people's opinions
I can be influenced by a good commercial
When someone coughs or sneezes, I usually feel the urge to do the same
Imagining a refreshing drink can make me thirsty
A good salesperson can really make me want their product
I get a lot of good practical advice from magazines or TV
If a product is nicely displayed, I usually want to buy it
When I see someone shiver, I often feel a chill myself
I get my style from certain celebrities
When people tell me how they feel, I often notice that I feel the same way
When making a decision, I often follow other people's advice
Reading descriptions of tasty dishes can make my mouth water
I get many good ideas from others
I frequently change my opinion after talking with others
After I see a commercial for lotion, sometimes my skin feels dry
I discovered many of my favorite things through my friends
I follow current fashion trends
Thinking about something scary can make my heart pound
I have picked-up many habits from my friends
If I am told I don't look well, I start feeling ill
It is important for me to fit in

D. Basic Psychometric Properties

Administration instructions:

Please indicate **to what extent the following statements apply to you**. Use the following scale to record your answers:

1	2	3	4	5
not at all or very slightly	a little	somewhat	quite a bit	a lot

Interscale correlations and reliabilities

	TOT	SSS	COS	PER	SC	PHR	PC	PSC	SOP
TOT	**(.92|.94)**	0.94	0.83	0.75	0.74	0.76	0.75	0.13	-0.13
SSS	0.93	**(.86|.89)**	0.87	0.66	0.77	0.65	0.70	0.07	-0.18
COS	0.77	0.80	**(.83|.90)**	0.50	0.64	0.50	0.58	0.05	-0.17
PER	0.75	0.67	0.47	**(.79|.86)**	0.40	0.46	0.47	0.18	-0.20
SC	0.72	0.75	0.60	0.42	**(.83|.82)**	0.51	0.37	0.16	0.04
PHR	0.72	0.57	0.36	0.49	0.34	**(.79|.81)**	0.43	0.09	0.11
PC	0.68	0.60	0.42	0.39	0.25	0.39	**(.82|.84)**	0.04	-0.17
PSC	0.13	0.13	0.16	0.14	0.28	0.00	-0.06	**(.79|.87)**	0.35
SOP	-0.11	-0.15	-0.09	-0.16	-0.06	0.05	-0.13	0.30	**(.81|.89)**

Note. Community data above the diagonal, undergraduate data below the diagonal, reliabilities are on the diagonal (undergraduate reliabilities first).

	Undergraduate Norms				*Community Norms*	
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
TOT	64	320	179.32	26.49	156.11	29.46
SSS	21	105	53.80	10.90	44.29	11.63
COS	11	55	26.05	6.85	21.10	7.65
PER	14	70	40.80	6.93	37.92	8.20
SC	12	60	25.18	7.31	19.70	6.30
PHR	13	65	43.91	7.68	39.63	8.49
PC	14	70	43.30	7.76	37.82	8.25
PSC	15	75	37.64	7.92	34.99	9.88
SOP	16	80	49.68	8.44	49.75	10.75

Note. N = 1957 undergraduates, $r > .06$ is significant at .01,
N = 275 community volunteers, $r > .15$ is significant at .01
TOT = sum of the five suggestibility subscales, SSS = short suggestibility scale, COS = consumer suggestibility, PER = persuadability, SC = sensation contagion, PHR = physiological reactivity, PC = peer conformity, SOP = stubborn opinionatedness, PSC = psychosomatic control.

D. Some Validity Data

Stability

Test-retest correlations

	SSS2	COS2	PER2	SC2	PHR2	PC2	PSC2	SOP2
SSS	**0.76**							
COS	0.62	**0.74**						
PER	0.57	0.43	**0.76**					
SC	0.54	0.37	0.33	**0.60**				
PHR	0.41	0.20	0.35	0.25	**0.71**			
PC	0.56	0.45	0.39	0.20	0.23	**0.79**		
PSC	-0.02	0.01	0.06	0.11	0.09	-0.16	**0.63**	
SOP	-0.25	-0.20	-0.19	-0.13	-0.02	-0.22	0.23	**0.78**

Note. $N = 258$. Average length of retest interval 63 days (range 32 – 93 days)

Mean-level change

	d
SSS	0.07
COS	0.04
PER	0.07
SC	0.10
PHR	-0.01
PC	0.16
PSC	0.03
SOP	-0.08

Note. $N = 258$. Effect size of Time 2 relative to Time 1

External Validity

Correlations with personality scales (construct validation sample)

	N	TOT	SSS	COS	PER	SC	PHR	PC	PSC	SOP
BFI Neuroticism	276	**0.31**	**0.36**	0.24	0.22	0.30	**0.33**	0.15	-0.29	-0.19
BFI Extraversion	276	-0.01	0.00	0.04	-0.09	-0.06	0.08	0.09	0.02	**0.34**
BFI Conscientiousness	276	-0.18	-0.17	-0.14	-0.25	-0.23	-0.06	0.04	-0.08	0.07
BFI Agreeableness	277	0.07	0.02	-0.04	0.03	-0.12	0.13	0.24	-0.12	-0.23
BFI Openness	274	-0.07	-0.12	-0.10	0.00	-0.03	0.10	-0.21	0.16	**0.39**
SNAP Rare Virtues (lie)	251	-0.17	-0.19	-0.16	-0.20	-0.11	-0.08	-0.05	0.02	-0.03
SNAP DRIN (soc. desirability)	248	0.14	0.14	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.05	0.17	-0.13	-0.09
Self Monitoring Scale	240	0.21	0.25	0.17	0.23	0.25	0.19	0.03	0.20	0.03
Tellegen Absorption Scale	254	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.12	0.24	0.18	-0.19	**0.40**	0.18
Need for Cognition Scale	271	-0.27	-0.30	**-0.33**	-0.13	-0.13	-0.08	**-0.31**	0.18	0.28
SNAP Dependency	250	**0.50**	**0.53**	**0.35**	**0.45**	**0.37**	0.26	**0.43**	-0.13	**-0.43**
Gudjonsson Compliance Scale	252	**0.48**	**0.50**	**0.33**	**0.46**	0.29	0.21	**0.47**	-0.09	**-0.52**
MSSI Social Adaptability	270	**0.50**	**0.49**	**0.40**	**0.48**	**0.39**	0.27	**0.36**	0.07	-0.31
MSSI Principled Autonomy	269	-0.30	**-0.33**	-0.27	-0.24	-0.25	0.00	**-0.33**	0.18	**0.69**
MSSI Social Friction	270	-0.21	-0.20	-0.13	-0.23	-0.01	-0.10	**-0.32**	0.14	**0.51**
Dissociative Processes Scale	271	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	**0.32**	0.21	-0.18	0.30	0.10
Iowa Sleep Experiences Survey	270	0.24	0.25	0.24	0.09	**0.38**	0.27	-0.04	0.23	0.02
Low Self-Concept Clarity Scale	261	0.23	0.27	0.17	0.26	**0.34**	0.09	-0.02	0.06	-0.19

Note. $N = 260$. $r > .30$ are bolded

Correlations with personality scales (social paradigms sample)

	TOT	SSS	COS	PER	SC	PHR	PC	PSC	SOP
BFI Neuroticism	0.18	0.22	0.19	0.13	0.18	0.16	0.06	**-0.39**	-0.09
BFI Extraversion	0.17	0.11	0.11	-0.01	0.09	0.23	0.21	0.16	0.22
BFI Conscientiousness	-0.09	-0.11	-0.08	-0.11	-0.13	-0.06	0.02	0.02	0.03
BFI Agreeableness	0.00	-0.04	-0.05	-0.02	-0.09	0.09	0.07	0.00	-0.14
BFI Openness	-0.12	-0.16	-0.26	-0.04	-0.06	0.10	-0.16	0.29	0.29
Gudjonsson Compliance Scale	**0.45**	**0.46**	**0.34**	**0.43**	**0.31**	0.25	**0.36**	-0.23	**-0.54**
MSSI Social Adaptability	**0.42**	**0.42**	**0.30**	**0.38**	**0.31**	0.27	**0.33**	-0.03	-0.22
MSSI Principled Autonomy	-0.28	**-0.33**	**-0.31**	-0.26	-0.23	-0.02	-0.23	0.25	**0.65**
MSSI Social Friction	-0.14	-0.11	-0.05	-0.20	-0.02	-0.05	-0.19	0.13	**0.54**

Note. $N = 382$ (312 for GCS). $r > .30$ are bolded

Correlations with personality scales (combined)

	TOT	SSS	COS	PER	SC	PHR	PC	PSC	SOP
BFI Neuroticism	0.23	0.28	0.21	0.17	0.23	0.23	0.10	**-0.35**	-0.13
BFI Extraversion	0.09	0.07	0.08	-0.04	0.03	0.17	0.16	0.10	0.27
BFI Conscientiousness	-0.13	-0.13	-0.10	-0.17	-0.17	-0.06	0.03	-0.02	0.05
BFI Agreeableness	0.03	-0.02	-0.04	0.00	-0.10	0.11	0.14	-0.05	-0.18
BFI Openness	-0.10	-0.14	-0.19	-0.02	-0.05	0.10	-0.18	0.24	**0.33**
Gudjonsson Compliance Scale	**0.46**	**0.48**	**0.33**	**0.45**	**0.30**	0.23	**0.41**	-0.17	**-0.53**
MSSI Social Adaptability	**0.45**	**0.45**	**0.34**	**0.42**	**0.34**	0.27	**0.34**	0.01	-0.26
MSSI Principled Autonomy	-0.29	**-0.33**	-0.29	-0.25	-0.24	-0.01	-0.27	0.22	**0.67**
MSSI Social Friction	-0.17	-0.15	-0.08	-0.21	-0.01	-0.07	-0.24	0.13	**0.53**

Note. $N = 658$ (564 for GCS). $r > .30$ are bolded

Correlations with Stanford Hypnotic Susceptibility Scale

	SHSS
Neuroticism	-0.03
Extraversion	0.12
Conscientiousness	0.09
Agreeableness	**0.21**
Openness	0.03
Absorption	**0.22**
MISS Total	**0.29**
Consumer Suggestibility	0.14
Persuadability	**0.20**
Sensation Contagion	**0.26**
Physiological Reactivity	**0.26**
Peer Conformity	**0.20**
Psychosomatic Control	-0.04
Stubborn Opinionatedness	0.06

Note. $N = 205$. Correlations significant at $p < .01$ are bolded

Multiple Regression of Absorption and MISS Total on SHSS

Model	R	R^2	ΔR	F Change	Sig.
Absorption	0.23	0.06	0.06	11.38	0.00
Absorption & MISS Total	0.33	0.11	0.06	12.33	0.00

	Beta	t	Sig
Constant		-1.15	0.25
Absorption	0.17	2.48	0.01
MISS Total	0.25	3.51	0.00

Note. $N = 205$.

Gender differences (correlations with gender)

	Student	Community
SSS	0.14	0.14
COS	0.08	0.10
PER	-0.02	-0.11
SC	0.01	0.04
PHR	**0.32**	**0.23**
PC	0.16	0.14
PSC	**-0.28**	**-0.29**
SOP	-0.13	-0.14

Note. N = 1912 (student), 278 (community). Male = 1, Female = 2.

Age differences (correlations with age)

	r
TOTAL	-0.13
SSS	-0.12
COS	-0.02
PER	-0.07
SC	-0.03
PHR	-0.16
PC	**-0.26**
PSC	0.03
SOP	-0.04

Note. N = 278 (community), r > .15 is significant at .01-level.