SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

PARTICIPANTS

The survey was started by 684 participants; however, 222 were excluded because they did not consent to participate (n = 2), did not finish the survey (n = 200), or failed one of the three attention checks (n = 20). The final sample consisted of 462 participants aged 18 to 79 years (M = 34.0, SD = 13.6). Women, whose ages ranged from 18 to 77 (M = 34.5, SD = 13.9), comprised 64.5% (N = 298) of our sample overall, while men, whose ages ranged from 18 to 77 (M = 33.1, SD = 12.94), comprised 35.3% (N = 163) of our sample, and one person (0.2%) indicated the "other" option for gender choice. The median time of completion was 15.53 minutes (min = 5.77 minutes).

A total of 146 participants started the retest, from which one participant failed one of the two attention-check items and 17 did not finish. The final retest sample consisted of 128 participants aged between 18 and 79 years (M = 36.51, SD = 14.84). The sample consisted of 39 men (aged 18-79, M = 35.44, SD = 13.89) and 89 women (aged 18-74, M = 36.98, SD = 15.30). The time between test and retest ranged from 14 to 56 days (Med = 14). The median time of completion for the retest was 4.56 minutes (min = 2.05 minutes). Logistic regression analyses examining attrition bias showed that younger age (p = .034) and higher agreeableness (p = .031) were associated with a marginally higher likelihood of retest participation. Detailed results are reported in Table S1.

Table S1

Logistic regression predicting retest participation

Predictor	Estimate	*SE*	*Z*	*p*	Odds ratio	95% CI	
						Lower	Upper
Intercept	−3.67	2.10	−1.82	.069	0.03	.00	1.33
Gender 2-1	.32	.26	1.23	.218	1.38	.83	2.31
Age	.02	.01	2.12	.034	1.02	1.00	1.04
Religiosity	−.04	.07	−0.53	.597	0.96	.83	1.11
Self-Certainty	.10	.20	0.48	.629	1.10	.74	1.63
Other-Certainty	−.17	.17	−0.98	.329	0.84	.60	1.19
SES	.09	.09	1.00	.315	1.09	.92	1.29
Satisfaction with life	.01	.13	0.11	.912	1.10	.78	1.32
Subjective happiness	.03	.14	0.22	.828	1.30	.78	1.36
Positive affect	.17	.25	0.69	.492	1.19	.72	1.96
Negative affect	−.17	.22	−0.79	.427	0.84	.55	1.29
Self-esteem	−.46	.33	−1.41	.159	0.63	.33	1.20
Extraversion	−.16	.20	−0.80	.424	0.85	.57	1.26
Agreeableness	.45	.21	2.16	.031	1.58	1.04	2.38
Conscientiousness	−.09	.18	−0.49	.626	0.92	.64	1.30
Negative emotionality	−.05	.21	−0.24	.813	0.95	.63	1.44
Open-mindedness	.13	.18	0.70	.483	1.14	.79	1.64
Machiavellianism	.30	.19	1.55	.122	1.35	.92	1.97
Narcissism	−.09	.22	−0.42	.675	0.91	.59	1.41
Psychopathy	.33	.24	1.39	.165	1.39	.87	2.20
Sadism	.02	.21	0.11	.916	1.02	.68	1.53

Note. Estimates represent log odds of retest participation (1 – retest, 0 – no retest). Gender was coded as 2 – women and 1 – men. The overall logistic regression model was not significant, $\chi^2(20) = 22.62$, p = .308, and explained little variance in retest participation. Pseudo-R^2 indices include McFadden's R^2 = .04, Cox-Snell R^2 = .05, Nagelkerke R^2 = .07, and Tjur R^2 = .05.

MEASURES

Mentalizing, personality traits, and well-being were assessed using the following self-report measures. Internal consistency across measures was acceptable to excellent. McDonald's ω values reported in parentheses refer to reliability estimates obtained in the current sample, ranging from .66 to .90 (see Table S2 for all descriptives). Certainty About Mental States Questionnaire (Müller et al., 2023) is a 20-item questionnaire that measures certainty about mental states of self (Self-Certainty; ω = .87) and certainty about mental states of others (Other-Certainty; ω = .86). Each domain is measured with 10 items on a 7-point Likert scale from 1 (*never*) to 7 (*always*). Other-Self Discrepancy score can be computed as the difference between Other-Certainty and Self-Certainty. However, simple difference scores may confound overall certainty with the imbalance between the two dimensions. Therefore, following the authors' recommendations, discrepancy effects were examined using condition-based regression analysis (CRA; Humberg et al., 2018), which separates the magnitude component (overall level of Self- and Other-Certainty) from the imbalance component (their deviation from one another), providing a more rigorous test of discrepancy effects. The translation of the CAMSQ into Slovak was done after obtaining the consent of Dr. Sascha Müller, one of the CAMSQ authors, and accepting the conditions concerning the translation procedure. The final version, prepared by two English teachers and two graduates of a bilingual grammar school, was produced as a reconciled translation based on two independent draft versions and subsequently reviewed by a Slovak language expert; a back-translation into English was then completed by an independent professional. This was then sent for review to original author (Sascha Müller), who pointed out that one word had probably multiple possible meanings. Based on this feedback, we replaced it with a more precise word. After incorporating feedback on the back-translation, we finalized the Slovak version of the CAMSQ, which is available on Open Science Framework together with other translated versions: https://osf.io/4rbmg/.

The Big Five Inventory-2 Short Form (Soto & John, 2017) was used to measure individual personality traits according to the Five Factor Theory of Personality [extraversion (ω = .73), agreeableness (ω = .71), conscientiousness (ω = .74), negative emotionality (ω = .82) and open-mindedness (ω = .68)] to examine

Table S2

Descriptives, statistics and internal consistency of used measures

	M	*SD*	Med	Min	Max	Skew	Kurt	ω
Other-Certainty	4.61	0.80	4.60	2.10	6.70	−.17	−.06	.86
Self-Certainty	5.14	0.84	5.20	2.90	7.00	−.31	−.28	.87
Other-Self Discrepancy	−0.53	0.81	−0.50	−2.90	2.40	.13	.76	–
Extraversion	3.28	0.79	3.33	1.00	5.00	−.20	−.45	.73
Agreeableness	3.66	0.70	3.67	1.17	5.00	−.38	−.05	.71
Conscientiousness	3.52	0.76	3.50	1.17	5.00	−.16	−.35	.74
Negative emotionality	2.97	0.89	3.00	1.00	5.00	.07	−.60	.82
Open-mindedness	3.60	0.70	3.67	1.33	5.00	−.32	−.18	.68
Life satisfaction	4.65	1.18	4.80	1.20	7.00	−.57	−.30	.85
Happiness	4.76	1.23	4.75	1.25	7.00	−.48	−.04	.85
Positive affect	3.34	0.63	3.40	1.40	5.00	−.22	−.02	.69
Negative affect	2.37	0.80	2.30	1.00	5.00	.55	−.02	.82
Self-esteem	2.91	0.60	3.00	1.20	4.00	−.46	−.17	.90
Machiavellianism	3.37	0.65	3.43	1.00	5.00	−.36	.48	.66
Narcissism	2.55	0.73	2.57	1.00	4.57	.17	−.45	.77
Psychopathy	2.06	0.62	1.93	1.00	4.29	.72	.36	.67
Sadism	2.02	0.73	1.86	1.00	4.57	.83	.36	.72
SES	6.28	1.41	6.00	2.00	10.00	−.26	.28	–

Note. SES – subjective socioeconomic status.

expected convergent validity, while also reflecting its widespread use and established validity in Slovak (Kohút et al., 2020). It consists of 30 items, each beginning with "I am someone who" (e.g., "is dominant, acts as a leader"), and is answered on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

The Short Dark Tetrad Scale (Paulhus et al., 2021) was employed due to its conceptual overlap with the Dark Core (Moshagen et al., 2020) measured in original study and its suitability for reliably assessing socially aversive traits in non-clinical populations. It contains 28 items (e.g. "It's not wise to let people know your secrets") designed to measure the degree of Machiavellianism (ω = .66), psychopathy (ω = .67), narcissism (ω = .77) and sadism (ω = .72). Items are answered on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). We used the Slovak translation employed by Teličák et al. (2024).

Table S3

Standardized factor loadings with 90% CI, item rest correlation and ω if item dropped

Items	Std. loading	Lower	Upper	Item rest correlation	ω if item dropped
Self-Certainty					
1. I know my innermost wishes and desires.	.64	.58	.71	.59	.86
4. I understand why certain things make me happy.	.64	.57	.72	.59	.86
5. I know what I am trying to achieve with my behavior.	.68	.62	.75	.63	.86
7. I know why I am interested in certain things.	.62	.55	.70	.58	.86
9. I understand my feelings.	.76	.71	.82	.71	.85
11. I know what my virtues are.	.67	.61	.73	.62	.86
13. I know why I have a strong opinion on a subject.	.54	.46	.62	.50	.87
14. When I'm in a bad mood, I know the reason why.	.52	.44	.60	.49	.87
16. I know the reasons for my behavior.	.71	.63	.78	.67	.86
20. I know what the best decision is for me in a difficult life situation.	.58	.51	.66	.54	.87
Other-Certainty					
2. I can tell whether another person is at peace with themselves.	.65	.59	.72	.59	.85
3. I know how other people will react to something.	.60	.54	.67	.56	.85
6. I can tell when a person in a group is feeling awkward.	.61	.54	.69	.57	.85
8. I can tell when other people don't give their honest opinions.	.74	.69	.79	.68	.84
10. I know when other people are hiding their thoughts.	.69	.63	.76	.62	.84
12. I can tell when other people are just pretending to find something funny.	.59	.51	.66	.55	.85
15. I know if a person is trustworthy.	.56	.48	.64	.51	.85
17. I can tell when other people are taking advantage of someone.	.63	.57	.69	.59	.85
18. I can tell if another person is bored by what I am saying.	.46	.36	.56	.44	.86
19. I know how a person feels when I look at their face.	.65	.59	.72	.59	.85

Note. p-value of all factor loadings < .001.

Table S4

Gender and age measurement invariance of the CAMSQ

	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR	ΔCFI	ΔRMSEA	ΔSRMR
Age: emerging adults (*N* = 210) / older adults (*N* = 252)						
Configural invariance	.902	.059	.060			
Metric invariance	.900	.058	.066	−.002	.001	−.006
Scalar invariance	.891	.059	.069	−.009	−.001	−.003
Gender: men (*N* = 163) / women (*N* = 298)						
Configural invariance	.898	.060	.059			
Metric invariance	.899	.058	.063	.001	.002	−.004
Scalar invariance	.889	.060	.065	−.010	−.002	−.002

Note. Negative values of Δ alternative fit indices indicate worsening of model fit after the constraint was imposed.

The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener et al., 1985) was selected to ensure continuity with the original study and to assess the cognitive-evaluative component of subjective well-being (ω = .85). It is a brief 5-item questionnaire that captures individuals' satisfaction with their lives. The scale was translated into Slovak by Halama and Dědová (2007). Items (e.g. "The conditions of my life are excellent") are rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

The Subjective Happiness Scale (SHS; Lyubomirsky & Lepper, 1999, Slovak translation Babinčák, 2018) was included to broaden the assessment of well-being by capturing a global perception of subjective happiness (ω = .85). This scale contains 4 items through which respondents compare themselves with other people (e.g. "Some people are generally very happy. They enjoy life regardless of what is going on, getting the most out of everything. To what extent does this characterization describe you?"). Each item is answered using a 7-point Likert scale.

The International Positive and Negative Affect Schedule – Short Form (I-PANAS; Thompson, 2007; Slovak translation Ficková, 2002) was used to assess feelings of positive and negative affect. Unlike maladaptive negative affectivity conceptualized in pathological personality frameworks (e.g. PID5BF+M; Bach et al., 2020), the I-PANAS captures normative affectivity as a component of emotional well-being. This scale, through which respondents express how they usually feel, consists of ten items, 5 of which measure positive affect (e.g. "Determined"; ω = .69), and 5 items measure negative affect (e.g. "Nervous"; ω = .82). Each item is answered using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely*).

The Slovak version of the *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale* (RSES; Rosenberg, 1965; Halama & Bieščad, 2006) was used to determine the extent of respondents' self-esteem and was included to ensure direct comparability with the original study (ω = .90). This scale contains 10 items (e.g. "I feel that I have a number of good qualities") that are rated on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*).

The MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status (Adler et al., 1994) is single-item instrument to measure the subjective socioeconomic status of the respondents, and it was included on an exploratory basis to examine whether socioeconomic status is associated with mentalizing. Respondents compare themselves to other people, using a 10-step ladder, and are asked to mark the step that they feel best describes their status relative to others.

References

Adler, N. E., Boyce, T., Chesney, M. A., Cohen, S., Folkman, S., Kahn, R. L., & Syme, S. L. (1994). Socioeconomic status and health: The challenge of the gradient. *American Psychologist, 49*, 15–24. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.49.1.15

Babinčák, P. (2018). Subjective happiness in Slovakia. *European Journal of Mental Health, 13*, 111–132. https://doi.org/10.5708/EJMH.13.2018.2.1

Bach, B., Kerber, A., Aluja, A., Bastiaens, T., Keeley, J. W., Claes, L., Fossati, A., Gutierrez, F., Oliveira, S. E. S., Pires, R., Riegel, K. D., Rolland, J. P., Roskam, I., Sellbom, M., Somma, A., Spanemberg, L., Strus, W., Thimm, J. C., Wright, A. G. C., & Zimmermann, J. (2020). International assessment of DSM-5 and ICD-11 personality disorder traits: Toward a common nosology in DSM-5.1. *Psychopathology, 53*, 179–188. https://doi.org/10.1159/000507589

Diener, E. D., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*, 71–75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13

Halama, P., & Bieščad, M. (2006). Psychometrická analýza Rosenbergovej škály sebahodnotenia s použitím metód klasickej teórie testov (CTT) a teórie odpovede na položku (IRT) [Psychometric analysis of Rosenberg's self-esteem scale by using methods of classical test theory (CTT) and item response theory (IRT)]. *Československá psychologie, 50*, 588–603.

Humberg, S., Dufner, M., Schönbrodt, F. D., Geukes, K., Hutteman, R., Van Zalk, M. H., Denissen, J. J. A., Nestler, S., & Back, M. D. (2018). Enhanced versus simply positive: a new condition-based regression analysis to disentangle effects of self-enhancement from effects of positivity of self-view. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 114*, 303–322. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000134

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton University Press.

Müller, S., Wendt, L. P., & Zimmermann, J. (2023). Development and validation of the Certainty About Mental States Questionnaire (CAMSQ): a self-report measure of mentalizing oneself and others. *Assessment, 30*, 651–674. https://doi.org/10.1177/10731911211061280

Moshagen, M., Zettler, I., & Hilbig, B. E. (2020). Measuring the dark core of personality. *Psychological Assessment, 32*, 182–196. https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000778

Ficková, E. (2002). Pozitívna a negatívna afektivita – mediátory preferencie copingových strategii [Positive and negative affectivity – mediators of coping strategy preference]. In F. Baumgartner, M. Frankovský, & M. Kentoš (Eds.), *Sociálne procesy a osobnosť 2002* [Social processes and personality 2002] (pp. 90–96). Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV.

Halama, P., & Dědová, M. (2007). Meaning in life and hope as predictors of positive mental health: Do they explain residual variance not predicted by personality traits? *Studia Psychologica, 49*, 191–200.

Kohút, M., Halama, P., Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2020). Psychometric properties of Slovak short and extra-short forms of Big Five Inventory-2 (BFI-2). *Československá Psychologie, 64*, 550–563.

Lyubomirsky, S., & Lepper, H. S. (1999). A measure of subjective happiness: Preliminary reliability and construct validation. *Social Indicators Research, 46*, 137–155. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006824100041

Paulhus, D. L., Buckels, E. E., Trapnell, P. D., & Jones, D. N. (2021). Screening for dark personalities: The Short Dark Tetrad (SD4). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 37*, 208–222. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000602

Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2017). Short and extra-short forms of the Big Five Inventory-2: The BFI-2-S and BFI-2-XS. *Journal of Research in Personality, 68*, 69–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.02.004

Teličák, P., Halama, P., & Kohút, M. (2024). The relationship between dark tetrad and conspiracy beliefs. No consistent results across three different samples from Slovakia. *Current Psychology, 43*, 10448–10457. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-05171-2

Thompson, E. R. (2007). Development and validation of an internationally reliable short-form of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS). *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 38*, 227–242. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022106297301