

Supplementary Table S2. Summary Step 3 & 4: Balance table and Calculate Phi ‘Bona fide effect size’

Overlap	Unbalanced		Balanced		PAND	Re-scaled PAND
	A	B	A	B		
Higher (clusters of “2” of above)	21	11	21	5.5	21 + 73 = 94 21 + 84 = 105	0.80
Lower (clusters below “2”)	0	73	5.5	73	94/105= 90%	
Total:	21	84				

Table S2 provides an illustration of unbalanced and balanced data, totalled for each phase with higher scores (21) in Phase A and (11) in Phase B, and lower scores (0) in Phase A and (73) in Phase B. PAND equals the remaining data (Higher scores in Phase A & Lower scores in Phase B) divided by the total data observations N: $21 + 73 = 94 / 105 = 90\%$ where 50% is chance level [meaning that only 40% of self-esteem data in self-esteem overlap]. PAND is re-scaled on a zero-to-one scale rather than using the 0.50-to-one scale, by the formula $[(\text{non-overlap} / .5) - 1]$ to facilitate a comparison with more familiar indicators. For the example above: $N: (0.90 / .5 = 1.8) - 1 = \mathbf{0.80}$. The balanced values (in bold) were entered in a 2 x 2 contingency table, where a Pearson Phi effect size and its confidence intervals was calculated through the differences between cell ratios using an online resource *StatsPages.org* (Pezzullo, 2010). Parker et al. (2007) propose that PAND is closely related to Pearson’s Phi, and Phi coefficient, both bona fide effect sizes. Then, from StatPages.org the output given reads:

Phi Coefficient = Cramer's Phi, and = Cohen's w Index, for 2x2 table:	0.841	0.539	0.722
--	-------	-------	-------

Phi reads 0.722 with confidence intervals [0.539 – 0.841], a value similarly close to (0.80 from Re-scaled PAND).