

Focusing on the positive or the negative: Self-construal moderates negativity bias in impression updating

Dandan Xie¹  | Suya Chen¹ | Yanhong Wu^{1,2} 

¹Department of Psychology, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China

²Beijing Key Laboratory of Behavioral and Mental Health, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China

Correspondence

Yanhong Wu, Department of Psychology, Beijing Normal University, 19, Zhongguo Daajie, Haidian District, Beijing 100871, China.
E-mail: wuyanhong@bnu.edu.cn

Funding information

This research was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant/Award Numbers: 31771205, 32171050, 61690205).

Abstract

Abstract text describing the study's findings on self-construal and negativity bias in impression updating.

...
...
... (2006), ...
... (J. ...
... 2013; K. ... 2020). E ...
... (C. ... 1995; ...
... 2020; ... & ... 2013). I ...
...
...
... " ..."
... (F. ...
... 2012; ... 2009).
...
... F. ...
... C. ... (2021) ...
... -285.87, ... -289.84 ... -6.75 ...

... -254.64 ... -254.6(...)-45433(...)J0-

...
...

... K) ... $(K = 0.8)$... 0.2 ... 0.5 ... $4C$... D ... 1 ... $4C$... $0.25C$... $1C$... H ... 32 ... K ... 0.5 ... $K = 0.5$...

... IID, ... (L ... 2018; M ... 2014; ... 2021). ...

3: ... A ... A ... B ... 3 ... C ... (... 1994) ... $\alpha = 0.821$... 12 ... $\alpha = 0.725$... 7 ... $(1 = \dots, 7 = \dots)$...

LMM

LMM $\beta_0 = 351.11$, $\beta_1 = -0.351$, $F_{(1, 104.85)} = 4.328$, $r = .040$. AIC = 351.11. IIDI $\beta_0 = 0.507$, $F_{(1,57)} = 9.593$, $r = .003$. I $\beta_0 = 0.653$, $F_{(1,56)} = 9.593$, $r = .003$. IIDI $\beta_0 = 1.041$, $D = 0.901$; $\beta_1 = 1.212$, $D = 1.031$; $\beta_2 = -0.029$, $\beta_3 = -0.123$, $r = .903$; IIDI $\beta_0 = 0.713$, $D = 0.903$; $\beta_1 = 1.568$, $D = 1.413$; $\beta_2 = 1.043$, $\beta_3 = 4.500$, $r < .001$ (F-table 3).

DGM

DGM $\beta_0 = 0.43$; $\beta_1 = 43\%$. ICC = 0.43; $\beta_0 = 0.43$; $\beta_1 = 43\%$. $\beta_2 = -2$.

0.0 1.0 2.0 3.0 4.0 5.0 6.0 7.0 8.0 9.0 10.0 11.0 12.0 13.0 14.0 15.0 16.0 17.0 18.0 19.0 20.0 21.0 22.0 23.0 24.0 25.0 26.0 27.0 28.0 29.0 30.0 31.0 32.0 33.0 34.0 35.0 36.0 37.0 38.0 39.0 40.0 41.0 42.0 43.0 44.0 45.0 46.0 47.0 48.0 49.0 50.0 51.0 52.0 53.0 54.0 55.0 56.0 57.0 58.0 59.0 60.0 61.0 62.0 63.0 64.0 65.0 66.0 67.0 68.0 69.0 70.0 71.0 72.0 73.0 74.0 75.0 76.0 77.0 78.0 79.0 80.0 81.0 82.0 83.0 84.0 85.0 86.0 87.0 88.0 89.0 90.0 91.0 92.0 93.0 94.0 95.0 96.0 97.0 98.0 99.0 100.0

மேற்கோள்: (L.H. & F., 2009).
 2...
 1...

Method

மாதிரி

250
 (C., 2023)
 3
 2019).
 231
 (104
 18-48
 (= 24
 D= 5.44). A,
 C,
 81.6%
 10.8%
 E,
 2772
 (A,
 H
 A,
 C,

Method

B,
 166,
 M,
 C,
 C,
 A,
 40,
 206,
 H,
 E,
 (22
 18-
 28
 (= 22
 D= 2.99)
 A,

3()0(2811.9),-79.2(,4(4)1..9(7(,)-1()-- 0()211.16

Sharma and Bhatia, 2021). The results are summarized in Table 2. The model estimates show that the variables are stationary at the 1% level. The estimated parameters are 0.721 and 0.789, respectively.

The model estimates are reported in Table 2. The model estimates show that the variables are stationary at the 1% level. The estimated parameters are 0.721 and 0.789, respectively. The model estimates are reported in Table 2. The model estimates show that the variables are stationary at the 1% level. The estimated parameters are 0.721 and 0.789, respectively.

Results

LMM Estimation Results

As shown in Table 1, the LMM model with I series as the dependent variable is estimated. The results are summarized in Table 1. The model estimates show that the variables are stationary at the 1% level. The estimated parameters are 0.721 and 0.789, respectively.

The LMM model is estimated with 2 series as the dependent variable. The results are summarized in Table 1. The model estimates show that the variables are stationary at the 1% level. The estimated parameters are 0.721 and 0.789, respectively.

The results are summarized in Table 1. The model estimates show that the variables are stationary at the 1% level. The estimated parameters are 0.721 and 0.789, respectively. The model estimates are reported in Table 2. The model estimates show that the variables are stationary at the 1% level. The estimated parameters are 0.721 and 0.789, respectively.

Convergence of the LMM Model

As shown in Table 1, the LMM model with I series as the dependent variable is estimated. The results are summarized in Table 1. The model estimates show that the variables are stationary at the 1% level. The estimated parameters are 0.721 and 0.789, respectively.

Discussion

1. \mathbb{R}^n ໃນ $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|_2)$ ແມ່ນ ຂະນະ n ຂອງ \mathbb{R} ທີ່ມີ ຂະໜາ n ຂອງ \mathbb{R} . ມັນ ເປັນ ຂະໜາ n ຂອງ \mathbb{R} ທີ່ມີ ຂະໜາ n ຂອງ \mathbb{R} . ມັນ ເປັນ ຂະໜາ n ຂອງ \mathbb{R} ທີ່ມີ ຂະໜາ n ຂອງ \mathbb{R} . ມັນ ເປັນ ຂະໜາ n ຂອງ \mathbb{R} ທີ່ມີ ຂະໜາ n ຂອງ \mathbb{R} .

2. \mathbb{R}^n ໃນ $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|_1)$ ແມ່ນ ຂະນະ n ຂອງ \mathbb{R} ທີ່ມີ ຂະໜາ n ຂອງ \mathbb{R} . ມັນ ເປັນ ຂະໜາ n ຂອງ \mathbb{R} ທີ່ມີ ຂະໜາ n ຂອງ \mathbb{R} . ມັນ ເປັນ ຂະໜາ n ຂອງ \mathbb{R} ທີ່ມີ ຂະໜາ n ຂອງ \mathbb{R} . ມັນ ເປັນ ຂະໜາ n ຂອງ \mathbb{R} ທີ່ມີ ຂະໜາ n ຂອງ \mathbb{R} .

... (H ... 2017; ... 2019).
...
... DGM, ...
... C ...
... DGM, ...
... LMM. ...

- C. ... M. J., K. ... J., D. ... & D. ... J. (2014). H. ... *N. ...* 111(48), 17320–17325. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1408988111>
- C. ... E., H. ... E. E., & G. ... B. (2011). ... *R. ...* 15(2), 142–179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868310373752>
- D. ... & J. ... K. (2019). I. ... A. ... *J. ...* 104(3), 433–447. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0000372>
- F. ... D., ... D. G., & D. ... A. (2012). ... *A. ... R. ...* 102(2), 720–749. <https://doi.org/10.1257/a.102.2.720>
- F. ... C. A., & G. ... M. J. (2015). ... *R. ...* 5(2), 109–131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21515581.2015.1051050>
- G. ... J. D., ... B., ... L. E., D. ... J. M., & C. ... J. D. (2001). A. M. I. ... *R. ...* 293(5537), 2105–2108. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1062872>
- H. ... J. K., ... K., & B. ... (2010). ... *D. ...* 13(6), 923–929. <https://doi.org/10.1111/l.1467-7687.2010.00951>
- H. ... E., ... C. A. M., F. ... J. K., & ... M. L. (2017). ... *J. ...* 113(4), 513–529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/s.0000090>
- H. ... & H. ... E. (2021). L. ... *R. ...* 32(12), 1907–1917. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09567976211019950>
- H. ... M. (2019). G. ... *J. ...* 104(6), 796–813. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0000379>
- H. ... B. L., & ... J. (2015). ... *C. ...* 19(2), 62–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.2014.12.006>
- H. ... B. L., ... J., & A. ... (2017). M. ... *C. ...* 12(1), 49–60. <https://doi.org/10.1093/a.147>
- J. ... D. D., ... B. ... D. ... F. ... J. H., & H. ... M. G. (2013). ... *E. ...* 28(8), 474–481. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.2013.05.014>
- J. ... D. D., & ... D. (2018). B. ... *I. ...* 43(3), 96–140. <https://doi.org/10.1162/a.00336>
- K. ... E. A., & C. ... (2003). M. ... *C. ...* 31, 1169–1180. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03195800>
- K. ... M. J., M. ... A. ... & ... L. (2021). ...

