An integrated dataset of self-report and behavioral measures of positive self

Authors: Sun,Xinru, Ding,Yi, Sun,Shuting, Hu,Chuanpeng, Ding,Yi, Hu,Chuanpeng

Date: 2026-03-25T14:28:16+00:00

Abstract

Positive self-view refers to the tendency to hold favorable beliefs and evaluations about oneself and to prioritize positive self-relevant information during information processing. Although various operationalizations of positive self-view (e.g., self-esteem, core self-evaluations, and optimistic self-beliefs) have been extensively studied, the relationships among different measurements remain insufficiently characterized. Here, we present a dataset designed to measure positive self-view through multiple instruments. The dataset includes item-level data from 12 self-report questionnaires and trial-level data from three behavioral tasks, collected from 771 adult participants (503 of them have valid data for all items). In total, these yield 161 measures of positive self-view, comprising 135 questionnaire items reflecting subjective self-evaluations and 26 behavioral indices capturing bias in self-related information processing. Moreover, the dataset included four scales to measure the psychological outcomes: depression, anxiety, subjective well-being, and procrastination, providing resources for investigating the role of positive self-view in psychological functioning. This dataset offers a comprehensive resource for investigating the construct of positive self-view and its associations with psychological outcomes.

Full Text

Preamble

integrated self-report behavioral measures positive self-view Xinru Shuting Chuan-Peng

1 School

Psychology, Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing, China

2 Adolescent

Education Intelligence Support Nanjing Normal University, Laboratory Philosophy Social Sciences Universities Jiangsu Province, Jiangsu, China

3 Cognitive

Neuroscience Application Center, Tohoku University, Sendai, Japan

4 Institute

Development, Aging Cancer, Tohoku University, Sendai, Japan These authors equally contributed work; authors:

Chuan-Peng, email: Ding, email:

Abstract

Positive self-view refers tendency favorable beliefs evaluations about oneself prioritize positive self-relevant information during information processing.

Although various operationalizations positive self-view (e.g., self-esteem, self-evaluations, optimistic self-beliefs) extensively studied, relationships among different measurements remain insufficiently characterized.

Here, present designed measure positive

self-view through multiple instruments. includes item-level self-report questionnaires trial-level three behavioral tasks, collected adult participants valid items). total, these yield measures positive self-view, comprising questionnaire items reflecting subjective self-evaluations behavioral indices capturing self-related information processing.

Moreover, included scales measure psychological outcomes: depression, anxiety, subjective well-being, procrastination, providing resources investigating positive self-view psychological functioning. offers comprehensive resource investigating construct positive self-view associations psychological outcomes.

Keywords

Positive self-view, Self-evaluation, Self-referential, Self-cognition, jingle fallacy.

Summary

Positive self-view refers tendency individuals favorable views (e.g., beliefs evaluations themselves relative objective standards social comparisons Beyond subjective evaluation ositive self-view manifests individuals process self-relevant information, including biases attention, perception, memory favor positive self-relevant content multi-faceted construct positive self-view documented across

social, cognitive, clinical psychology, operationalized using variety measurement approaches making central topic understanding self.

Positive self-view operationalized using multiple measurement measured self-report measures self-esteem, perceived self-worth, self-evaluations These measures capture individuals' subjective appraisals self.

Additionally, positive self-view assessed through behavioral tasks, which examine self-relevant information processed across cognitive domains including attentional orienting, perceptual discrimination, memory encoding These measures include self-referent encoding tasks, self-matching tasks, implicit association tests worth noting while self-report measures directly index individuals' positive self-view, performance-based measures capture self-referential processing biases broadly, positive self-view component specifically reflected processing advantage shown positive neutral negative self-relevant information. integration self-report measures performance-based behavioral tasks, therefore, enables comprehensive characterization positive self-view across conscious

appraisal and task-based cognitive processing. 59

However, relationships among these diverse measures extent which reflect coherent construct remain insufficiently examined, partly datasets simultaneously capture multiple operationalizations positive self-view reason these measures difficult integrate self-report scales behavioral tasks originate separate research traditions designed serve different theoretical purposes, resulting partially overlapping non-identical construct coverage. methodological divergence

reflected empirically consistently correlations observed between self-report performance-based measures construct, including positive self-view specifically example, associations between self-report scales (e.g., self-esteem self-efficacy measures) behavioral tasks small moderate because approaches operationalize different aspects positive self-view through ifferent response processes Moreover open-access datasets exist support systematic comparisons across self-report behavioral measures positive self-view. publicly available datasets provide aggregated measures, questionnaire total scores reaction times Although released large-scale open-access comprising behavioral multiple self-bias paradigms, sample relatively small.

Therefore, field still lacks large-scale datasets provide trial-level across self-report behavioral measures positive self-view, limiting researchers' ability conduct fine-grained analyses replication studies. address datasets apture self-report behavioral measures positive self-view, present open-access collected adult participants comprising trial-level self-report questionnaires three behavioral tasks spanning multiple operationalizations positive self-view. addition, includes measures depression, anxiety, subjective well-being, procrastination, providing empirical resource examining functional relevance positive self-view across diverse psychological outcomes.

publicly available intended support flexible reproducible research measurement

positive self-view.

Methods

Participants Quality Control collected NAODAO online experimental platform (Chengdu Fangsel Technology Ltd., China). total participants responded recruitment.

Adult participants between years recruited within China. participants provided informed consent prior participation adapted version Brain Consent share their anonymously Participants monetary compensation completion study procedure Chinese person). study protocol adhered relevant ethical guidelines approved Institute Review Board Nanjing Normal

University (No. NNU202202034). 101

ensure quality, rigorous multi-stage quality control procedure implemented participant levels. screening followed serialized exclusion protocol:

Participants excluded failed minimal attention-check items embedded within questionnaires; Participants excluded their

results

following: Reaction times longer seconds Implicit Association (IAT), trials reaction times Overall accuracy lower below chance level accuracy specific experimental condition Self-Matching (SMT);

Accuracy lower during recognition Self-Referent Encoding (SRET), trials reaction times faster during source memory phase Self-Referent Encoding After applying these rigorous quality control criteria, participants (Mean years, years; range: years) inclusion criteria treated clean here.

Study Design, Questionnaires, Tasks Design collected using combination self-report questionnaires behavioral tasks, including questionnaires three behavioral tasks. tasks include Implicit Association (IAT), Self-Matching (SMT), Self-Referent Encoding (SRET). three behavioral tasks designed capture positive self-view across reference (self friend other), valence (positive negative), domain (morality competence). participant contributed trial-level responses across experimental conditions. morality competence selected because dominant dimensions social evaluation Implicit Association (IAT) Implicit Association (IAT) assess strength automatic associations between self-related concepts positive attributes structure stimulus selection followed established paradigms.

Target concepts consisted categories: other. category included

commonly Chinese self-referential words (e.g., whereas other category included words referring others (e.g., others Attribute concepts comprised Chinese adjectives selected covering levels valence (positive negative) social evaluative domains (morality competence). words selected experimental conditions. separate

effects morality competence domains, implemented sub-tasks, which words social evaluative domain. separate sub-tasks (morality competence) consist seven blocks target discrimination block (self other), attribute discrimination block (positive negative), practice combined block first compatibility condition, formal combined block first compatibility condition, reversed target discrimination block, practice combined block second compatibility condition, formal combined block second compatibility condition Figure These blocks formed compatible blocks (self positive other negative) incompatible blocks (self negative other positive). compatibility condition comprised practice block followed formal block, resulting blocks block structure followed standard procedure.

Participants instructed categorize stimuli quickly accurately possible. participants completed sub-tasks random order Table Reaction times recorded trial level, standardized scores computed based reaction differences between compatible incompatible

conditions following improved scoring algorithm proposed Greenwald Block Trials Function Left-key response Right-key response Valence practice Target practice Other Compatible practice Bad-Other Good-Self Compatible Bad-Other Good-Self Target practice (reversed) Other Incompatible practice Bad-Self Good-Other Incompatible Bad-Self Good-Other compatible blocks, paired Other Self. incompatible blocks, paired Other.

Practice blocks contained trials each, blocks Implicit Association Test.

Self-Matching (SMT) Self-Matching (SMT) adapted Simple geometric shapes visual stimulus minimize cognitive demands.

Before experiment, participants asked recall close friend known

least years interacted frequently daily life. friend surname gender recorded determine appropriate pronoun stimulus labels. stimulus included eight geometric shapes (equilateral triangle, square, diamond, trapezoid, circle, pentagon, ellipse, hexagon) eight labels: positive self, negative self, positive other, negative other morality competence. consisted three phases: learning phase, practice phase, formal phase Figure learning phase, shape consistently paired specific label, participants instructed memorize these associations.

During practice phase, participants judged whether presented shape label pairs matched learned associations proceeded formal phase after achieving accuracy above formal phase, participants presented shape label pairs trial required judge whether pairing matched learned association.

Trial-level reaction times accuracy recorded. Based these data, reaction differences sensitivity indices (e.g., under signal detection theory computed characterize perceptual matching performance across conditions Self-Matching

Self-Referent Encoding (SRET) Self-Referent Encoding (SRET) adapted classic paradigm developed Rogers stimuli Chinese trait adjectives consists three phases Figure encoding phase, participants instructed judge whether presented

adjective described themselves their friend. responded pairing adjective referent (self friend) presses response mapping counterbalanced across participants.

Participants first completed practice trials, followed formal encoding trials. first words filler words control primary recency effect excluded subsequent analyses.

Following encoding phase, participants completed 3-minute distraction involving simple arithmetic problems, designed prevent rehearsal maintenance previously evaluated words.

Subsequently, participants tested surprise recognition memory task.

Participants first completed short practice session consisting previously studied (old) words words presented random order. formal recognition test, total words presented random order, including previously studied (old) words words.

Participants instructed indicate presses whether appeared during encoding phase familiar, old). items judged familiar participants further required identify original referent (self friend) additional presses response mappings

counterbalanced across participants. generated include reaction times endorsement during encoding phase, accuracy measures recognition source memory phases.

These trial- phase-level provide detailed record self-referential processing memory performance.

Self-Referential Encoding Paradigm Self-report Questionnaires self-report questionnaires assessed positive self-view across multiple dimensions, including self-evaluation, self-concept, personality-related constructs locus control, narcissism, socially desirable self-presentation. measures validated Chinese versions scored according their guidelines.

Internal consistency indices observed current sample reported below.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES), Chinese version translated consists items rated 4-point scale, including reverse-scored items.

Item-level responses total scores recorded. present sample, internal consistency Cronbach McDonald Domain-Specific Self-Esteem Scale (DSSE), Chinese version translated includes items assessing self-evaluations across competence, physical attractiveness, wealth, social competence, morality. rated scale.

Internal consistency present study Cronbach

McDonald ′ s $\omega = 0.889$. 232

Moral Identity Scale, Chinese version translated comprises items rated 5-point scale distinguishes implicit explicit dimensions.

Chinese version demonstrated internal consistency Cronbach

McDonald ′ s $\omega = 0.824$ in the current sample. 236

Moral Self-Image Scale, Chinese version translated contains items rated 9-point scale below expectations, above expectations), total scores ranging Internal consistency

Cronbach ′ s $\alpha = 0.948$ and McDonald ′ s $\omega = 0.949$. 240

Self-Evaluations Scale (CSES), Chinese version translated includes items rated 5-point scale, positively worded reverse-scored items.

Internal consistency present sample Cronbach

0.938 and McDonald ′ s $\omega = 0.941$. 244

Self-Concept Clarity Scale (SCC), Chinese version translated consists items rated 5-point scale, positively keyed items remaining items reverse-scored.

Internal consistency Cronbach

McDonald ′ s $\omega = 0.935$. 248

Orientation Revised (LOT-R), Chinese version translated includes items rated 5-point scale.

Pessimism items reverse-scored combined optimism items compute total score.

Internal consistency Cronbach McDonald Balanced Inventory Desirable Responding (BIDR) includes

subscales: Self-Deceptive Enhancement (SDE) Impression Management (IM). present study, internal consistency Cronbach McDonald Cronbach McDonald Internal Locus Control subscale Scale, Chinese version translated includes eight items rated 7-point scale ranging constant added compute total scores ranging Internal consistency Cronbach McDonald Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16 (NPI-16), Chinese version translated consists forced-choice items, yielding total scores Internal consistency present sample Cronbach McDonald

s $\omega = 0.845$. 264

Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale (HNS) includes items rated 5-point scale, total scores ranging Internal consistency

Cronbach ′ s $\alpha = 0.700$ and McDonald ′ s $\omega = 0.718$. 267

Psychological outcome questionnaires questionnaires assess psychological outcomes.

Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9), which measures depression level participants, includes items rated 4-point scale (0-3), total scores ranging Chinese version translated Internal consistency present sample Cronbach McDonald Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7 (GAD-7), which measures anxiety level participants, consists seven items rated 4-point scale (0-3), yielding total

scores Chinese version translated Internal consistency

was Cronbach ′ s $\alpha = 0.912$ and McDonald ′ s $\omega = 0.913$. 277

Satisfaction Scale (SWLS), Chinese version translated which measures overall satisfaction participants, includes items rated 7-point scale.

Internal consistency Cronbach

McDonald ′ s $\omega = 0.938.$ 281

Short General Procrastination Scale (SGPS), Chinese version translated Zhang consists items rated 5-point scale, including three reverse-scored items.

Procrastination measured because regarded negative behaviour Internal consistency Cronbach McDonald

$\omega = 0.957$ 286

Indicator Domain Calculation

Method

{morality} *Morality (Incongruent Congruent)* {competence} Competence *{{{RT}}}*{{morality}}}*{positive}* {{{RT}}}*{{morality}}}*{negative} Morality difference: (self friend) *{{{RT}}}*{{competence}}}*{positive}* {{{RT}}}*{{competence}}}*{negative} Competence *d*{{{morality}}}*{{positive}}}* d*{{{morality}}}*{{negative}}} Morality difference: friend where Z(hit) Z(FA) *d*{{{competence}}}*{{positive}}}* d*{{{competence}}}*{{negative}}} Competence SRET_{Encoding} *{{{encoding}}}*{{endorsement}}}*{{{morality}}}*{{positive}}}, *{{{encoding}}}*{{endorsement}}}*{{{morality}}}*{{negative}}} Morality Frequency difference P(yes P(yes friend *{{{encoding}}}*{{endorsement}}}*{{{competence}}}*{{positive}}}, *{{{encoding}}}*{{endorsement}}}*{{{competence}}}*{{negative}}} Competence *{{{encoding}}}*{{RT}}}*{{{morality}}}*{{positive}}}, *{{{encoding}}}*{{RT}}}*{{{morality}}}*{{negative}}} Morality difference friend *{{{encoding}}}*{{RT}}}*{{{competence}}}*{{positive}}}, *{{{encoding}}}*{{RT}}}*{{{competence}}}*{{negative}}} Competence SRET_{Recognition} *RJ1*{{{morality}}}*{{positive}}}*, RJ1*{{{morality}}}*{{negative}}} Morality difference: friend where Z(hit) Z(FA) *RJ1*{{{competence}}}*{{positive}}}*, RJ1*{{{competence}}}*{{negative}}} Competence *RJ2*{{{morality}}}*{{positive}}}*, RJ2*{{{morality}}}*{{negative}}} Morality difference: friend where Z(hit) Z(FA) SRET_{Source} Memory *RJ2*{{{competence}}}*{{positive}}}*, RJ2*{{{competence}}}*{{negative}}} Competence Note.

Implicit Association Test; Self-Matching Task; Self-Referent Encoding Task; Reaction Time; Standard Deviation; Proportion Sensitivity index Signal Detection Theory; False Alarm rate; Self-Prioritization Effect. -scores indices calculated using standardized algorithms facilitate cross-domain cross-task comparisons.

Morality Competence represent dimensions self-evaluation.

Positive values difference scores differences generally indicate stronger positive self-view processing positive information.

Collection Procedure jsPsych 7.3.1) program questionnaires behavioral tasks uploaded Naodao platform. ensure temporal precision reaction measurements,

jsPsych plugin psychophysics implement program. collection distributed across sessions conducted participants completed informed consent filled demographic questionnaire, followed Self-Concept Clarity Scale (SCC), Generalized Anxiety Disorder Scale (GAD-7), Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9). participants completed Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES), Self-Evaluations Scale (CSES), Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16 (NPI-16), Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale (HNS), Short General Procrastination Scale (SGPS), subsequently performed Implicit Association (IAT). participants completed Satisfaction Scale (SWLS), Internal Control subscale Internal-Powerful Others-Chance Scale (IPC-I), Orientation Test-Revised (LOT-R), Self-Referent Encoding (SRET), Self-Matching (SMT), Moral Identity Scale (MIS), Moral Self-Image Scale (MSIS), Self-Deceptive Enhancement scale (SDE), Impression Management scale (IM). participants re-invited complete self-report

questionnaires again test-retest reliability. control order effects between behavioral tasks administered participants randomly assigned sequences: followed followed SRET.

Attention-check items embedded within questionnaire batteries These items consisted logically implausible clearly incorrect statements (e.g., three years graduated school Moon.

Responses these items during subsequent processing evaluate response quality).

Preprocessing questionnaires behavioral preprocessed. quality control implemented participant levels ensure reliability reusability final dataset.

Behavioral Processing Derived Indices Implicit Association processing followed standardized procedures described Greenwald preprocessing included following steps: trials classified compatible incompatible conditions; trials single-discrimination blocks excluded, trials combined categorization blocks retained; compatible incompatible combined blocks identified; trials reaction times exceeding 10,000 excluded; participants trials faster excluded further analyses; reaction times

standard deviations computed separately remaining combined blocks practice blocks).

Reaction times incorrect trials replaced block correct trials reaction differences computed between practice combined blocks between combined blocks; standardized scores calculated based reaction differences between compatible incompatible conditions.

Domain-specific scores morality competence conditions *{morality}* {competence} retained derived indices. total, indices positive self-view derived task.

Self-Matching processing followed procedures described trials formal phase included analysis.

Trials reaction times shorter longer 1,200 excluded, missing accuracy responses treated incorrect. categories derived indicators computed: reaction-time-based sensitivity-based. reaction-time-based indices, trials analyzed separately positive negative valence conditions. participant, reaction times friend conditions computed separately morality competence domains friend positive self-view effect defined difference between conditions friend sensitivity-based indices, discrimination performance quantified under framework Signal Detection Theory, correct responses classified incorrect responses misses whereas under mismatching condition, correct responses classified correct rejections

incorrect responses false alarms Sensitivity indices computed Z(Hit) Z(FA).

Sensitivity analyses conducted separately positive negative valence conditions, domain-specific self-prioritization effects calculated difference between condition friend condition morality competence domains.

Domain-specific indices *{{{RT}}}*{{morality}}}*{positive}* {{{RT}}*{{morality}}}*{negative} *{{{RT}}}*{{competence}}}*{positive}* {{{RT}}*{{competence}}}*{negative} *d*{{{morality}}*{{positive}}}* d*{{{morality}}*{{negative}}} *d*{{{competence}}*{{positive}}}* d*{{{competence}}*{{negative}}} retained. total, eight indices derived task.

Self-Referent Encoding resulted multiple indices capture different aspects positive self-processing across encoding phase, recognition phase, source memory phases. encoding phase, there dependent measures computed: proportion responses reaction times (RT), eight indices encoding phase total.

First, differences number endorsed adjectives between self- friend-referential conditions computed positive negative words morality competence. example, endorsement' s effect positive words morality calculated *{{{encoding}}}*{{endorsement}}}*{{{morality}}}*{{positive}}} number endorsed positive moral words number endorsed positive moral words friend friend Second, reaction differences between self-referential friend-referential conditions computed positive negative words morality competence. example, reaction times effect positive words morality

calculated *{{{encoding}}}*{{RT}}}*{{{morality}}}*{{positive}}} positive moral words positive moral words friend friend indices obtained recognition phase SERT: domain-specific recognition accuracy derived signal detection (SDT) sensitivity Trials classified follows: previously studied (old) words judged familiar coded hits, words judged coded misses, words judged familiar coded false alarms, words judged coded correct rejections.

Sensitivity indices computed Z(Hit) Z(FA). Domain valence specific self-processing indices derived computing differences between self-referenced friend-referenced positive conditions morality competence domains: friend Additionally, there indices source memory phase.

Source memory performance quantified using signal detection theory sensitivity defined correctly identifying encoding source previously presented items, false

alarms defined incorrectly attributing items target source. source positive self-view score computed friend Positive values indicate accurate source memory self-encoded traits friend-encoded traits. total, under conditions valence (positive negative) domain (morality competence), measurement indicators collectively generate indices.

Standardization Derived Measures harmonize measures across different scales modalities, derived indices standardized using -score transformation based participant-level means standard deviations.

Specifically, total behavioral indices included, comprising indices Implicit Association (IAT), eight indices Self-Matching (SMT), indices Self-Referent Encoding (SRET) Table item-level scores self-report scales included standardization procedure. total, standardized -score variables derived questionnaires behavioral tasks constitute finalized positive self-view indicators included dataset.

Records final comprises multiple levels granularity. de-identified includes item-level responses questionnaires trial-level behavioral tasks. cleaned included processed data, i.e., scale-level composite scores questionnaires derived indices behavioral tasks mentioned above. strictly anonymized.

Sensitive identifiers, names, addresses, specific contact information, removed. hosted Science (SciDB, adopts structured hierarchical folder system facilitate navigation reproducibility researchers. organized three primary folders: 01_{Code}:

Contains complete

analysis

code; 02_{Data}: Contains complete unprocessed

deidentified participants clean participants; 03_{Figure}:

Contains visualization scripts dataset. scripts processing generating derived indices (organized project: directory. files stored comma-separated values (.csv) format ensure cross-platform compatibility. directory provides metadata descriptions operational guidelines entire dataset.

Technical Validation 432

Self-bias Behavioral Tasks verify validity behavioral indicators dataset, examined whether cognitive produced expected other differences reflecting self-bias. specifically, focused whether self-versus-other differences non-zero positive conditions across competence morality domains, yielding total indices indices other differences negative conditions, reported statistics, which reflect self-bias general instead positive self-view.

Given non-significant -values cannot distinguish between evidence effect insufficient evidence effect,

results

primarily based Bayes factor Implicit Association (IAT) One-sample -tests Bayesian one-sample -tests conducted examine D-scores morality competence domain Figure

Results

showed D-scores significantly deviated morality domain,

(502) 28.41, .001, Cohen 0.46, [0.43, 0.50], 5.70e+102, competence domain, (502) 22.74, .001, Cohen 1.01, [0.93, 1.10],

BF 10 = 3.76e+75. 449

Higher D-scores indicate stronger implicit associations between positive attributes relative others.

Self-Matching (SMT) Self-bias assessed using indices: sensitivity indices derived signal detection theory Figure competence domain, values significantly higher self- friend-related trials positive valence condition, (502) 10.64, .001, Cohen 0.47, [0.38, 0.57], 5.43e+20. negative valence condition, values significantly deviated zero, consistent presence broader self-bias, (502) 4.61, .001, Cohen 0.21, [0.12, 0.29], 1.53e+3. similar pattern observed morality domain, values significantly higher self-related friend-related stimuli positive valence condition, (502) 14.04, .001, Cohen 0.63, [0.53, 0.72], 4.43e+34. contrast, negative valence condition, values significantly differ between self-related

friend-related stimuli, (502) 0.18, .858, Cohen -0.008, 0.10,

0.08], BF 01 = 20. 467

Response times significantly faster self-related other-related stimuli competence domain, (502) 12.32, .001, Cohen 0.55, 0.64, 0.46], 2.30e+27, moral domain, (502) 14.06, .001, Cohen 0.63, 0.72, 0.53], 5.18e+34. negative valence condition, response times significantly faster self-related other-related stimuli competence domain, (502) 7.81, .001, Cohen 0.35, 0.44, 0.26], 1.33e+11. morality domain, however, significant difference observed, (502) 1.57, .118, Cohen 0.07, 0.16,

0.02], BF 01 = 5.88. 476

Self-view Self-Matching Task. positive self-view (self friend) source-stage competence morality traits under positive negative valence conditions. positive self-view (self friend) adjective labeling task.

Negative values indicate faster responses compared friend.

Self-Referent Encoding (SRET) multiple indices captur different aspects positive self-bias across

encoding phase, recognition phase, source memory phases Figure encoding phase, positive self-view assessed using encode rates reaction times. encoding

rates, competence domain, encode rates indices indicated participants endorsed fewer positive words self-descriptive friend-descriptive, (502) 5.82, .001, Cohen 0.26, 0.35, 0.17], 6.01e+5, negative words self-descriptive friend-descriptive, (502) 7.42, .001, Cohen 0.33, [0.24, 0.42], 9.60e+9. morality domain, negative words, encode rates indices showed strong evidence higher self-endorsement compared friend-endorsement, (502) 3.41, 0.001, Cohen 0.15, [0.06, 0.24], However, positive morality words, although -value significant, Bayes factor indicated inconclusive evidence, (502) 2.40, .017, Cohen 0.11, 0.20, 0.02], 1.16, suggesting insufficient support either presence absence difference. reaction times, offer evidence self- friend- differences conditions. recognition phase, sensitivity indices derived signal detection theory assess memory performance. competence domain, indices provided moderate evidence supporting absence differences between friend positive words, (502) 1.35, .180, Cohen 0.06, 0.02, 0.13], negative words, evidence self-bias inconclusive, (502) 2.44, .015, Cohen 0.11, [0.02, 0.18],

1.06. In

morality domain, indices showed moderate-to-strong evidence

friend differences positive, (502) 1.24, .214, Cohen 0.06, 0.03, 0.13], 9.10, negative word, (502) 1.14, .253, Cohen

d = 0.05, 95 % CI [− 0.03, 0.12], BF 01 = 10. 508

source memory phase, indices showed strong evidence self-bias across domains. competence domain, higher values observed self-related friend-related conditions positive words, (502) 16.85, .001, Cohen 0.75, [0.59, 0.75], 2.27e+47, under negative valence, similar pattern extreme evidence supported effect self-bias, (502) 17.73, .001, Cohen 0.79, [0.61, 0.77], 2.83e+51. similar pattern extreme evidence observed morality domain, higher values self-related friend-related conditions positive words, (502) 17.25, .001, Cohen 0.77, [0.57, 0.72], 1.68e+49.

There extreme evidence self-bias under negative valence, (502) 13.88, .001, Cohen 0.62, [0.46, 0.61], 8.00e+33.

Self-view Self-Referent Encoding Task. ositive self-bias endorsement responses during encoding phase (EW), calculated difference proportion responses between friend conditions (Self Friend).

Positive self-bias reaction times during encoding phase, computed difference response latency between friend judgments friend ositive self-bias recognition sensitivity, quantified using signal detection theory ositive self-bias source memory sensitivity, measured using

Effect Sizes for Positive Self-View in Three Cognitive Tasks Cross Two Domains 528

Domain Indicator Positive Negative Cohen' s Cohen' s Morality *{morality} [0.43, 0.50] 5.70e Competence* {morality} [0.93, 1.10] 3.76e+75 Morality

{{{RT}}}{{morality}}} [-0.72, -0.53] 5.18e+34 [-0.16, 0.02] Competence *{{{RT}}}*{{competence}}} [-0.64, -0.46] 2.30e+27 [-0.44, -0.26] 1.33e+11 Morality *d*{morality} [0.53, 0.72] 4.43e+34 [-0.10, 0.08] Competence *d*{competence} [0.38, 0.57] 5.43e+20 [0.12, 0.29] 1.53e+3 Morality *{{{encoding}}}*{{endorsement}}}*{morality} [-0.20,-0.02] [0.06, 0.24] Competence* {{{encoding}}*{{endorsement}}}*{competence} [-0.35, -0.17] 6.01e+5 [0.24, 0.42] 9.60e+9 Morality *{{{encoding}}}*{{RT}}}*{competence} [-0.17, 0.01] [-0.02, 0.15] Competence* {{{encoding}}*{{RT}}}*{competence} [-0.17, 0.01] [-0.02, 0.16] Morality *RJ1*{morality} [-0.03, 0.13] [-0.03, 0.12] Competence *RJ1*{competence} [-0.02, 0.13] [0.02, 0.18] Morality *RJ2*{morality} [0.57, 0.72] 1.68e+49 [0.46, 0.61] 8.00e+33 Competence *RJ2*{competence} [0.59, 0.75] 2.27e+47 [0.61, 0.77] 2.83e+51 Note. represents Cohen' s effect difference between friend conditions. denotes Bayes.

Values square brackets indicate confidence intervals effect size.

Reliability Self-report Scales Behavioral Tasks reliability self-report measures behavioral task-derived indices assessed using internal consistency coefficients test-retest reliability.

Self-Report Scales internal consistency positive self-view scales assessed evaluate reliability questionnaire-based measures. scales demonstrated internal consistency, indicating items within scale coherently related.

Internal consistency assessed self-report scales. Cronbach' s coefficients ranged across scales.

Test-retest reliability evaluated using retest session conducted after initial assessment.

Spearman correlation coefficients ranged Regarding test-retest reliability, Spearman correlation analyses conducted using retest session. variables measured multiple points, test-retest reliability interval ranged between These

results

suggest scales demonstrated acceptable reliability, supporting their suitability future analyses.

Stability Behavioral Indices examined stability behavioral indices analyzing their overall correlational structure across participants.

Specifically, computed pairwise correlations among indices summarized distribution these associations.

Across behavioral indices, pairwise correlations ranged

0.06), indicating substantial variability strength direction associations. pattern suggests while indices share common variance, others capture distinct opposing

aspects positive self-view. further assess robustness, conducted bootstrap resampling analyses, which showed overall correlational structure remained stable across resamples

(mean correlation = 0.06, 95% CI = [0.05, 0.08]). 559

Together, these

results

suggest behavioral indices provide stable heterogeneous representation positive self-view, capturing shared distinct components across tasks.

Reliability and Validity of Positive Self-View Scales. 564

Variable Total Score Internal Consistency Test-Retest Reliability(Internal Locus Control Optimism Explicit Narcissism Hypersensitive Narcissism Self-Evaluations Rosenberg Self-Esteem Self-Concept Clarity Moral Identity Moral Self-Image Self-Deceptive Enhancement Impression Management Domain-Specific Self-Esteem Note. table presents psychometric properties scales measure various facets positive Consistency:

Measured using Cronbach Reliability: Calculated using Spearman correlation coefficients between measurements taken Test-retest reliability calculated Domain-Specific Self-Esteem (measured Subjective Socioeconomic Status (measured

Usage Notes Researchers interested measurement positive self-view choose either self-report behavioral indices depending their theoretical framework. present provides comprehensive standardized indicators derived measurement approaches enabling systematic comparisons across paradigms (e.g., explicit implicit measures).

Researchers these indicators examine heterogeneity positive self-view evaluate consistency findings across different operationalizations. investigate associations between positive self-view mental health related constructs. linking positive self-view indicators measures depression, anxiety, satisfaction, researchers assess relative predictive utility different operationalizations positive self-view.

Given relatively large sample size, well-suited examining individual differences positive self-view self-referential information processing. example, researchers explore variability behavioral indices (e.g., reaction time, signal detection measures) function trait-level characteristics. addition, although current descriptor focuses cleaned data, original preprocessing pipeline allow researchers explore alternative quality control strategies. include testing different criteria handling missing comparing online-collected in-lab samples.

Finally, serve valuable resource educational purposes.

high-resolution, trial-level structure makes suitable teaching preprocessing (e.g., outlier detection, trial exclusion) computation psychometric indices (e.g., sig-

nal detection theory measures). demonstrate advanced statistical modeling approaches, including confirmatory factor

analysis

(CFA) structural equation modeling (SEM), spanning pipeline item-level latent constructs.

Availability processing validation scripts publicly available contains

analysis

code, project configuration files (Measuring_{{{posit}}_{{self}}}.Rproj), visualization scripts. analyses performed using 4.4.1) statistical programming language. packages utilized project include tidyverse 2.2.0), psych 2.5.3), foreign (0.8.86).

Acknowledgements Funding study supported grants National Natural Science Foundation China (32471097 Chuan-Peng) Contributions authors conceptualized study.

Y.D., responsible collection quality control. conducted statistical analyses. implemented processing pipeline reproducible

analysis

scripts. wrote original draft. H.C.P. supervised project contributed

manuscript revision. authors contributed approved final version manuscript.

References

1. Abele, Wojciszke, Agency communion perspective versus others.

Pers. Psychol. 93(5), (2007). 2. Taylor, Brown, Illusion well-being: social psychological perspective mental health.

Psychol. Bull. (1988). 3. Sedikides, Gregg, Self-enhancement: thought.

Perspect. Psychol. (2008). 4. Wojciszke, Morality competence person- self-perception.

Psychol. (2005). 5. Hu, C.-P., Macrae, Prioritization good-self during perceptual decision-making.

Collabra Psychol. (2020). 6. Hofmann, Gawronski, Gschwendner, Schmitt, meta-analysis correlation between Implicit Association explicit self-report measures.

Pers. Psychol. Bull. (2005). 7. Markus, Self-schemata processing information about self.

Pers. Psychol. (1977). 8. Rogers, Kuiper, Kirker, Self-reference encoding personal information.

Pers. Psychol. (1977). 9. Greenwald, Farnham, Using Implicit Association measure self-esteem self-concept.

Pers. Psychol. (2000).

10. Robins, Tracy, Trzesniewski, Potter, Gosling, Personality correlates self-esteem.

Pers. (2001). 11. Judge, Erez, Bono, Thoresen, self-evaluations scale:

Development measure. Pers. Psychol. (2003). 12. Rosenberg, Society adolescent self-image. (Princeton Univ.

Press, 1965). 13. Sedikides, Gaertner, Toguchi, Pancultural self-enhancement.

Pers. Psychol. (2015). 14. Sui, Humphreys, Perceptual effects social salience:

Evidence self-prioritization effects perceptual matching.

Psychol. Percept. Perform. (2012). 15. Eisenberg, Uncovering structure self-regulation through data-driven ontology discovery.

Commun. (2017). 16. Vazire, Carlson, Others sometimes better ourselves.

Curr. Psychol. (2011). 17. Humphreys, Attentional control self: self-attention network (SAN).

Cogn. Neurosci. (2016). 18. Dang, King, Inzlicht, self-report behavioral measures weakly correlated?

Psychol. Bull. (2020). 19. Zhu, Kang, C.-P. Measurement reliability cognitive tasks:

Progress prospects. Bull. (2025) Chinese).

20. Greenwald, McGhee, Schwartz, Measuring individual differences implicit cognition: implicit association test.

Pers. Psychol. (1998). 21. Qi, Chau, Zhou, Wang, Comprehensive Investigating Structure Self-Bias.

Data. (2025). 22. Bannier, brain consent: Informing biomedical imaging legal ethical considerations.

Brain Mapp. (2021). 23. Greenwald, research practices using implicit association test.

Behav. Methods. (2022). 24. Durbin, Mitchell, Johnson, differences intentional incidental self-referential source memory.

Psychol. Aging. (2017). 25. Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, model stereotype content:

Competence warmth follow perceived status competition.

Pers. Psychol. (2002). 26. Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, Universal dimensions social cognition:

Warmth competence. Trends Cogn. (2007). 27. Li, Chen, C.-P. extended Chinese social evaluative list.

Behav. Methods. (2025). 28. Greenwald, Nosek, Banaji, Understanding using implicit association test: improved scoring algorithm.

Pers. Psychol. (2003).

29. Sun, Revision self-esteem scale. Master thesis, Jinan Univ.

Chinese). 30. MacDonald, Saltzman, Leary, Social approval trait self-esteem.

Pers. (2003). 31. Aquino, Reed, self-importance moral identity.

Pers. Psychol. (2002). 32. Wan, psychological development construction moral identity.

Doctoral dissertation, Nanjing Normal Univ. (2008) Chinese). 33. Jordan, Leliveld, Tenbrunsel, moral self-image scale:

Measuring understanding malleability moral self. Front.

Psychol. (2015). 34. Judge, Erez, Bono, Thoresen, self-evaluations scale:

Development measure. Pers. Psychol. (2003). 35. Du, Zhang, Zhao, Structural validation scale revision self-evaluations.

Psychol. (2012) Chinese). 36. Campbell, Self-concept clarity:

Measurement, personality correlates, cultural boundaries.

Pers. Psychol. (1996). 37. Niu, influence adolescents social networking self-concept clarity: mediating social comparison.

Psychol. (2016) Chinese). 38. Scheier, Carver, orientation test-revised (LOT-R).

Pers. Psychol. (1994).

39. Wen, Zheng, Zhang, review optimism research abroad.

Psychol. (2007) Chinese). 40. Levenson, Differentiating among internality, powerful others, chance.

Locus Control Construct. (1981). 41. Xiao, Chen, Structure locus control among college students preliminary

analysis

scale. Appl. Psychol. (1989) Chinese). 42. Ames, Rose, Anderson, NPI-16 short measure narcissism.

Pers. (2006). 43. Wang, influence narcissistic personality self-esteem subje ctive well-being among college students.

Master thesis, Shaanxi Normal

Univ. (2008) (in Chinese). 732

44. Hendin, Cheek, Assessing hypersensitive narcissism: reexamination Murray Narcism scale.

Pers. (1997). 45. Bian, Application patient health questionnaire depression general hospitals.

Tongji Univ. (2009) Chinese). 46. Spitzer, Kroenke, Williams, brief measure assessing generalized anxiety disorder:

GAD-7. Arch. Intern. (2006).

47. He, Reliability validity generalized anxiety disorder general hospitals.

Shanghai Arch. Psychiatry. (2010) Chinese). 48. Diener, Emmons, Larsen, Griffin, satisfaction scale.

Pers. Assess. (1985). 49. Chen, relationship between social support subjective well-being among college students.

Master thesis, China Normal Univ. (2020) Chinese). 50. Sirois, Yang, Eerde, General procrastination scale version.

Pers. Individ. (2019). 51. Zhang, Reliability validity short general ocrastination scale Chinese college students.

Chin. Clin. Psychol. (2020) Chinese). 52. Steel, nature procrastination: meta-analytic theoretical review self-regulatory failure.

Psychol. Bull. (2007). 53. Kuroki, psychophysics plugin jsPsych.

Behav. Methods. (2021). 54. Green, Swets, Detection theory psychophysics. (Wiley, 1966). 55. Stanislaw, Todorov, Calculation signal detection theory measures.

Behav.

Methods

Instrum. Comput. (1999).

56. Sun, Ding, C.-P. Measuring Cognitive Self-Enhancement: dataset.

Science Bank. 57. Wagenmakers, E.-J. Bayesian inference psychology.

Example applications JASP. Psychon. Bull. (2018). 58. Wagenmakers, E.-J.

Bayesian inference psychology. Theoretical advantages practical ramifications.

Psychon. Bull. (2018). 59. Hu, Kong, Wagenmakers, E.-J., Peng, Bayes factors their implementation JASP.

Psychol. (2018) Chinese).

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.