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**(1) Overview**

Title

The title of the data paper should focus on the data, e.g. “Psychology data from the X project”. If the data is closely linked to a specific research paper, then “Data from Paper Title” is appropriate.

Paper Authors (optional - only include this if you would like your identity to be known by the reviewers)

1. Condon, David

2. Coughlin, Joshua

3. Weston, Sara

Paper Author Contribution and Affiliations (optional - only include this if you would like your identity to be known by the reviewers)

1. Designed data collection paradigm and analyses; collected set of trait descriptive adjectives and definitions; collected data on Prolific and MTurk. Affiliation: University of Oregon.

2. Used TDA and definitions to randomly generate two tests of adjective recognition; built Qualtrics surveys. Affiliation: University of Oregon.

3. Calculated proportion correct for each item; identified poor items and readministered new items through Prolific; wrote data paper and build website. Affiliation: University of Oregon.

Abstract

A short (ca. 100 word) summary of the dataset being described: what the data covers, how it was collected, how it is stored, and its reuse potential.

Keywords

keyword 1; keyword 2; *etc.*

Context

???

**Collection Date(s)**

January 2020- April 2021

**Background**

A foundational theory in personality assessment – the “Lexical Hypothesis” – posits that all relevant psychological differences between people are marked by trait descriptive adjectives (TDAs), and thus these adjectives could serve as the universe of stimuli which would inform the structure of personality. The full number of TDAs is in the many thousands, and so cannot be administered to any single participant; as a result, early personality psychologists subjectively reduced the set of adjectives administered [1]. This is potentially problematic, as academic researchers may not recognize the obscure nature of some adjectives, especially to individuals with lower levels of education. Later research compounded such bias by using as participants homogenous samples of White, educated, and young individuals (e.g., the Eugene-Springfield Community Sample [2]).

The current study sought to quantify the knowledge of 2,819 TDAs using a sample of participants recruited to be (close to) representative in terms of age, race/ethnicity, gender, and education.

(2) Methods

***Sample***

Participants (*N* = 1,572; 57% female) were recruited from Prolific and Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Just over one third (39%) had only a high school diploma or GED or less education, while 12% had an associate degree or higher. A majority (74%) of participants identified as White, 9% identified as Black, 6% as Asian, 5% as Hispanic, 1% as American Indian or Alaskan Native, and 4% as mixed race. A majority (66%) had a household income of $60K or less.

***Materials***

Describe the test materials, stimuli, number of items, instructions, and, if applicable, factors in the experimental design.

Using a set of 2,819 TDA adjectives and their definitions, we randomly generated multiple-choice items to test recognition of each TDA. Each item took the following form: the definition was presented, and participants were asked to select the correct adjective from a list of six words. Participants were also given the options of “I don’t know” and “None of these.” The five distractor items were randomly chosen from the set of 2,819. Two items were randomly generated for each TDA, to avoid the possibility that item difficulty estimates were driven artificially low by the chance-inclusion of a similar word.

***Procedures***

Items were separated into Forms A and B (i.e., each TDA had one item on each form). Forms were administered as separate projects on Prolific and MTurk. When participants took the survey, they were presented with a random set of 75 adjective items, in addition to demographic questions.

Two forms of processed data are available. In the first, TDA items are recoded from 1-8 into Ans (correct answer), R1:R5 (distractor response options 1 through 5), I don’t know, and None of these. In the second, TDA items are coded as 1 (correct) or 0 (incorrect).

Participant were allowed to take the survey multiple times and also allowed to take both forms A and B. Across all 1,572 participants, we obtained 3,290 full responses to the survey. Approximately 44% (N = 691) participants took the survey one time, 35% (N = 554) took the survey twice, and the rest took the survey between 3 and 10 times. Given the relatively proportion of items administered to each response, there are very few instances in which a participant responded to the same item multiple times. More specifically, across the 241,506 item answers, there are only 2,419 times (1%) a participant saw the same item more than once.

***Quality Control***

Participants were ineligible to complete the survey if they did not speak English fluently or very well or lived or grew up outside the United States. Responses were excluded if participants took less than 3 minutes to complete the survey.

***Ethical issues***

Study rationale, including potential benefits and risks, were presented to participants prior to taking the survey. Participants were given the option to consent or not to the study as outlined by this document. Participants who did not consent did not go on to complete the survey. This procedure was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Oregon (Protocol #02012020.001).

**(3) Dataset description**

***Object name***

TDA\_data\_recoded

TDA\_data\_scored

Masterkey

***Data type***

Processed data (see procuedures for details)

***Format names and versions***

CSV

*Data Collectors*

David Condon, University of Oregon

Joshua Coughlin, University of Oregon

Sara Weston, University of Oregon

***Language***

English

***License***The open license under which the data has been deposited (e.g. CC0).

***Embargo***None.

***Repository location***

If already available, please include a permanent identifier such as a DOI that points to the online location of the dataset.

***Publication date***

If already known, the date the dataset was published in the repository (dd/mm/yyyy).

(4) Reuse potential

Item and trait difficulty tables could be used to identify commonly known (or uncommonly known) trait descriptive adjectives (TDAs) for use in vocabulary tests or scale development, as this was the primary rationale for data collection. Use of commonly known TDA is essential for ensuring generalizable assessments. However, use of uncommon TDAs may be a useful tool for developing vocabulary-based ability measures, as they allow a test creator to generate items at various levels of difficulty. These adjectives may be used for simple trait-recognition tasks (as used here) but also for more general reading comprehension type questions.

Just over half of participants completed the survey more than once – with a substantial number completing the survey 3 or more times – creating an opportunity to study consistency in performance over repeated attempts (improvement vs fatigue). Given that some repeat test-takers saw the same item multiple times, these data could also be used to examine consistency in response by Prolific/MTurk participants.

Because we provide both scored (0 and 1) and categorical (Ans, R1:R5, I don’t know, None), these data could be used to teach techniques such as binary logistic (multilevel) regression, chi-square tests, and point-biserial correlations.
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