THE INKBLOT RE-CONCEPTUALIZED: DEVELOPING AN IMPLICIT SITUATIONAL

JUDGMENT TEST OF MULTIPLE COMPONENTS OF POOR AND OPTIMAL

FUNCTIONING

A Thesis
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the
North Dakota State University
of Agriculture and Applied Science

By

Roberta Linda Irvin

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

Major Department:
Psychology

September 2021

Fargo, North Dakota

North Dakota State University
Graduate School

Title

The Inkblot Re-conceptualized: Developing an Implicit Situational
Judgment Test of Multiple Components of Poor and Optimal Functioning

By

Roberta Linda Irvin

The Supervisory Committee certifies that this ***disquisition*** complies with North Dakota

State University's regulations and meets the accepted standards for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

Michael Robinson

Chair

Katherine Duggan

Jeremy M. Hamm

Jim Deal

Approved:

09/24/2021	Mark Nawrot
Date	Department Chair

ABSTRACT

Situation judgment tests (SJTs), which provide a balance between global personality measurement and context-specific social-cognitive processes, can be combined with implicit measurement approaches to limit some of the biases that are common in self-reports. Based on such considerations, the author developed an implicit SJT, called the Inkblot Scale, to investigate three components of optimal functioning – Happiness, Success, and Friendliness – that can be assessed from the same response set. Undergraduates completed the Inkblot Scale and various measures related to each component of optimal functioning ($n = 184$) before reporting their daily experiences and behaviors for two weeks ($n = 124$). Happiness, Friendliness, and Success, as measured by the Inkblot Scales, predicted global and daily outcomes and processes that were relevant to their respective constructs. The Inkblot Scale materials are therefore valid and have potential to assess a variety of important constructs in ways that bypass self-ascriptions of the relevant qualities.

Keywords: Situational Judgment, Optimal Functioning, Implicit Measurement, Daily

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

DEDICATION

To Dr.s Heather A. Haas, Professor of Psychology and H. Mark Krank, Emeritus Professor of

Psychology, whose advice and words of wisdom have provided encouragement throughout the

writing process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

A major goal of psychology is to predict important outcomes, such as whether a person is likely to be more successful or unsuccessful. Traditionally, this goal has been achieved through the measurement of personality traits, which are useful for describing stable and generalized thoughts, feelings, and behaviors (Baumert et al., 2017; Fleeson, 2004) in a summary-based manner (Cervone, 1997). Individual differences in personality can also predict important life outcomes, such as job performance (Corstjens et al., 2017), longevity (Bogg & Roberts, 2004), health (Jackson et al., 2010), and well-being (Lauriola & Iani, 2017). However, these measures rarely specify time or context, which places a high cognitive load on the reporters of the traits of interest (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986), and requires the ability to be introspective of one's own qualities (Mussel et al., 2018). The reliance on introspection is also problematic because those who are less competent in a given area tend to over-inflate their skills and abilities (Dunning et al., 2003). Personality measures also tend to be too abstract for reporters to recall specific behaviors relevant to the trait of interest (Klein et al., 1996), which can distort one's self-perceptions (Vazire & Carlson, 2011). Importantly, because personality measures lack specificity, broad personality traits fall short of predicting specific outcomes such as how people behave in specific roles and contexts (Fleeson, 2004).

To address the shortcomings of broad personality measures, social-cognitive theorists have sought to explain how situations influence behavior, particularly as people change their behavior across situations (Endler & Magnusson, 1976). More specifically, social-cognitive theory explains how situations trigger cognitive processes (Endler & Magnusson, 1976) – perceptions (Tett & Guterman, 2000), goals (Dunlop, 2015), and self-appraisals (Cervone, 1997) – and how these cognitive processes influence behavior (Cervone, 1997; Tett & Guterman,

2000). For example, social information processing theories have have used social cognitive processes to explain aggression by presenting individuals with scenarios (Chen et al., 2012; Coccaro et al., 2017), asking the individuals to report on their attributions (e.g., Coccaro et al., 2017; Gagnon & Rochat, 2017) and emotional reactions (e.g., Berkowitz, 1990; DeWall et al., 2011) to the scenarios, as well as beliefs about behaving aggressively (e.g., Coccaro et al., 2017; Crick & Dodge, 1996), then relating these responses to behavioral outcomes (e.g., Chen et al., 2012; Crick & Dodge, 1996). While social-cognitive theorists view behavior as predictable if its antecedents are known, they also believe that different situations constitute different antecedents (Baumert et al., 2017; Mischel, 2009). If so, situations and appraisals may be important to consider when trying to characterize a person's behavioral tendencies (Cervone et al., 2001).

Social-cognitive theory has important implications for measurement, but the relevant theorists have proposed assessment systems that are too idiosyncratic to a given person. For example, cognitive processes have been modeled as simulations of neural networks (Bandura, 2001) in which various internal processes interact with each other within individuals to produce behavior and personality (Baumert et al., 2017; Mischel, 2009). Although understanding a person by these networks may be useful for predicting one person's response to a given situation (Cervone, 1997, 2004), the relevant mechanisms may not generalize to other people (Robinson et al., 2019). Moreover, understanding behavior in particular domains (e.g., Bandura, 2004; Dunlop, 2015) or contexts (Mischel, 2009) could, potentially, fail to offer insights about the person's behavior in other domains (Funder, 2009). Such limitations encourage approaches that can make broader conclusions about an individual (Robinson et al., 2019).

One measurement approach that provides a balance between the social-cognitive approach's emphasis on context and the trait approach's emphasis on general tendencies is the

Situational Judgment Test (SJT; Lievens, 2017a). In this approach, participants are given specific

situational materials and asked to rate the effectiveness of responses or the likelihood that they

would emit them in the particular context (Corstjens et al., 2017; McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001),

and these responses are often compared to expert ratings of how effective each way of

responding is with respect to the situations that are presented (Corstjens et al., 2017; Mussel et

al., 2018). Owing to such procedures, SJTs, relative to typical personality tests, are thought to be

less vulnerable to faking and self-enhancement (Corstjens et al., 2017), as well as less dependent

on introspection (Mussel et al., 2018). The SJT scores still capture general tendencies as they are

summarized by a single score (Lievens, 2017b; Oostrom et al., 2019), but the contextualized

items also capture social-cognitive processes given that situational materials are a major part of

how the test operates (Corstjens et al., 2017). Importantly, SJTs have been used to predict a wide

variety of individual differences, including general cognitive ability (McDaniel & Nguyen,

2001), interpersonal skills (e.g., Christian et al., 2010), and the Big Five traits associated with

Stability (i.e., conscientiousness, emotional stability, and agreeableness: McDaniel et al., 2007).

Of particular relevance, construct-driven SJTs have been used as alternative measures of

personality traits (Lievens, 2017a), which can be done by ensuring the trait-relevance of the

situations and coding the responses such that they measure different levels of a trait construct

(Corstjens et al., 2017; Mussel et al., 2018). The participants within a study are then scored based

on expert ratings of trait levels for each of the behaviors (Lievens, 2017b). Construct-driven SJTs

have been created for the HEXACO traits (Oostrom et al., 2019), dark triad behavior (Wood et

al., 2019), and could be created to index personality disorders (Lievens, 2017a). Similarly,

related procedures have been used to assess competencies in various life domains – including

health (Irvin et al., 2020; Robinson, Persich, et al., 2020), social situations (e.g., Robinson et al.,

2013), romance (Robinson, Penzel, et al., 2020), friendships (Persich & Robinson, 2020), and emotional intelligence (e.g., Krishnakumar et al., 2016).

Prototype-based scoring (Block, 1961; Westen & Shedler, 2000) is another innovation that can be applied to SJT materials. As an example, we (Robinson, Irvin, et al., in press) recently used a version of prototype scoring to operationalize a construct termed ego effectiveness, which was defined in terms of the correlation between an individual's reported likelihood of engaging in a set of behaviors and perceptions of how effective those behaviors are. In this research, the ego effectiveness index predicted the extent to which participants engaged in a pattern of behaviors consistent with healthy self-regulation. Another project, and one that more closely followed typical prototype-scoring methods, focused on the secure attachment style. In this research (Robinson et al., 2021), what was scored was the extent to which participants' endorsed behaviors in response to romantic relationship situations correlated with a prototype of the securely attached individual, as determined by experts. This Implicit Security Index (ISI) was a positive predictor of relationship functioning according to both self- and peer-reported outcomes (Robinson et al., 2021). In short, SJT responses can be combined with prototype-based scoring to implicitly measure constructs that matter for everyday functioning.

Generally speaking, implicit measures can capture processes that individuals may be unable to report on directly (Shedler & Westen, 2004), such as adult attachment styles (e.g., Wampler et al., 2004) and personality disorders (e.g., Block, 1961; Calabrese et al., 2012). And several components of what makes a test implicit can be applied to materials such as the situational judgment test (Robinson et al., 2021). However, very little research of this type has been performed. Accordingly, the purpose of the present research was to turn the SJT technique into a sort of "Inkblot" that could be used to measure a variety of constructs. In more specific

terms, I intend to use the SJT method to assess multiple characteristics relevant to an individual's

levels of optimal functioning – particularly those associated with human flourishing, which is a

growing area of research that has traditionally been overlooked in psychological research

(Huppert, 2009; Keyes, 2005).

<h3 style="text-align:center">Conceptualizations of Flourishing and Optimal Functioning</h3>

Optimal functioning can be partly conceptualized through its relationship to flourishing

(Keyes, 2002) and well-being (Huppert, 2009). Flourishing has been defined in a variety of

ways, but in general it involves not only the absence of mental illness, but also the presence of

positive mental health (Catalino & Fredrickson, 2011; Huppert & So, 2013). In addition, there is

a hedonic component of flourishing, such that people who are flourishing should not only have

fewer negative experiences (e.g., negative affect: Fredrickson, 2001; Keyes, 2002) – but also

more positive experiences (e.g., positive affect: Fredrickson, 2001; Keyes, 2002; Seligman,

2018; life satisfaction: Keyes, 2002; and a sense of meaning in life: Seligman, 2018). The

flourishing tradition also insists on aspects of functioning – such as the pursuit of meaningful

goals – that extend beyond the mere balance of pleasures and pains (Deci & Ryan, 2008; Diener

et al., 1998).

Related points can be made about the concept of eudaimonia, which consists of living up

to one's full potential (Ryff & Singer, 2008; Waterman, 2008), engaging in purposeful activities

(Ryff & Singer, 2008; Waterman, 2007), and having meaningful social connections with others

(Ryff & Singer, 2008). Unlike hedonia, eudaimonia is not an endpoint (Waterman, 2007), but an

active process of reaching self-realization (Ryan et al., 2008; Waterman, 2008) – such as by

pursuing personally meaningful goals (Waterman, 2008) – which in turn leads to well-being

(Van den Broeck et al., 2010). Moreover, while hedonia emphasizes feeling good (Fredrickson,

<div style="text-align:center">5</div>

2001), eudaimonia places a greater emphasis on doing good (Fredrickson, 2001). Doing good encompasses two major yet distinct routes – doing good for others and doing good for oneself (Bakan, 1966; Fiske et al., 2006).

Doing good for others in the eudaimonia literature involves contributing to one's community and social relationships (Ryan et al., 2008; Ryff, 1989). Such orientations and behaviors have also been conceptualized as communion, which is a social motivation revolving around interdependence (Horowitz et al., 2006), maintaining social relationships (Trapnell & Paulhus, 2012), upholding moral values (Abele et al., 2016; Trapnell & Paulhus, 2012), managing impressions via conformity (Trapnell & Paulhus, 2012), and "getting along" with other people (Gurtman & Lee, 2009). Well-being theorists have also emphasized the need for social integration, as it relates to happiness and health (Reis et al., 2000). For example, some well-being researchers have developed measures of well-being that center on relatedness (Ryff & Singer, 2008; Van den Broeck et al., 2010) or social well-being (Keyes, 2002) and that involve questions regarding not only how an individual perceives oneself but also how they are perceived by others (e.g., Ryff, 1989; Keyes, 2002). At the same time, it must be realized that communion by itself can fall short of flourishing, especially in cases in which the person fails to achieve their own personal goals (Helgeson & Fritz, 2000; Mann et al., 2021).

That is, eudaimonia often involves doing good for oneself, such as following and accomplishing one's personal goals (Waterman, 2008), feeling autonomous and independent (e.g., Ryan et al., 2008), and achieving one's own potential (Ryff & Singer, 2008). These aspects of doing well for oneself align with the social goal of agency, which relates to competence and self-regulation (Fiske et al., 2006) and, in certain contexts, might allow one to gain positions of authority through expertise or status (Gurtman & Lee, 2009). In fact, there tend to be more well-

6

being constructs that are agentic rather than communal in nature (Mann et al., 2021). For example, two of Deci and Ryan's (2008) Basic Psychological Needs (i.e., autonomy and competence) are agentic in nature, and only one of Ryff's (1989) Scales of Psychological Well-Being is clearly communal, while other subscales, such as mastery over one's environment, the ability to develop and express ideas that are outside of the majority, and the tendency to develop and accept one's personal strengths (Ryff & Singer, 2008) are all self-oriented and therefore agentic. Moreover, how one is perceived by others could potentially reflect social status as well as social integration (Wojciszke et al., 2009).

Given the multiple dimensions, components, and theories surrounding optimal functioning, we decided to conceptualize optimal (v. poor) functioning in terms of three major constructs that summarize the approaches discussed above. Consistent with classic theories of well-being surrounding hedonia (e.g., Deci & Ryan, 2008), there is an experiential component of optimal functioning. More specifically, a well-functioning person could be described as happy – such that they may feel a greater sense of well-being (Catalino & Fredrickson, 2011; Huta & Ryan, 2010) – as opposed to miserable, which overlaps with measures related to psychopathology (Huppert & So, 2013; Keyes, 2005). There are also behavioral components of optimal functioning, which may reflect the two routes to happiness: agency and communion. People who achieve happiness though the communal route could be described as friendly, defined in terms of benevolent interactions with other people, greater prosociality (Ryan et al., 2008), lesser selfishness (Rushton et al., 1981; Ryan et al., 2008), and having higher-quality social relationships (Baumert et al., 2017; Persich & Robinson, 2020). By contrast, communal individuals would not be hostile, nor would they engage in aggressive and antisocial behaviors (Burt & Donnellan, 2009). Lastly, people who achieve eudaimonia through the agentic route

could be described as successful – such that they would accomplish (Seligman, 2018) more than the average person, express themselves effectively (Bar-On, 2006; Ryan et al., 2008), exercise more self-control (Arneklev et al., 1999; Boals et al., 2011), and cope more effectively with stress (Boals et al., 2011; Carver et al., 1989; Litman, 2006). Agentic individuals would not be incompetent (Fiske et al., 2006) and they would not engage in impulsive or risky behaviors (Dickman, 1990).

Following along these lines, we decided to create a measure that captures three major constructs: Happiness (v. Misery), Friendliness (v. Hostility), and Success (v. Incompetence). However, because there is some debate over whether positive versus negative affect (e.g., Watson et al., 1999), and communion versus hostility (e.g., Horowitz et al., 2006) follow one-dimensional structures, we decided to create six different Inkblot Scales – specifically, Inkblot Happiness, Inkblot Misery, Inkblot Friendliness, Inkblot Hostility, Inkblot Success, and Inkblot Incompetence. To the extent that the measures operate in a bipolar manner, the six scales could be collapsed into three. This is an empirical question that will be resolved during the course of data analysis.

Evaluating the Efficacy of the Inkblot Scales

The Inkblot Scales are not completely new because pilot versions of the test were evaluated. The pilot versions performed well in certain respects, but several flaws were also discerned and reliabilities were lower than desired. The current Inkblot Scales therefore increased the number of scenarios (and associated responses) to increase reliability. We also created new prototypes for each of the constructs of interest. The current research was designed to investigate both the reliability and validity of the new Inkblot Scales, which would involve

determining how well they relate to each other as well as other, previously-validated measures that tap into components of optimal functioning.

In addition, I sought to further expand evidence for the validity of the method by including a daily diary component to the research. In these types of designs, individuals report on their perceptions, experiences, and behaviors every day for multiple days in a row (Conner et al., 2009; Tennen et al., 2005). These repeated short-term assessments are less susceptible to retrospection bias than global self-reports because behavior is reported for a given day rather than for the past several days or longer (Iida et al., 2012). Daily measures also tend to be more valid and reliable than one-time self-report measures (Iida et al., 2012). Moreover, the repeated nature of daily diary measurement can be used to estimate not only individual differences in daily experiences, but also within-person relationships among events, feelings, and behaviors (Iida et al., 2012; Ohly et al., 2010).

A major purpose of the present study was to determine the reliability and validity of the new measures. If the Inkblot Scales are reliable, then they should have high internal consistencies (i.e., split-half correlations greater than .80 after Spearman-Brown corrections). If the Inkblot Scales are valid measures of their respective constructs, then the relationships between the scales should follow a particular pattern. Specifically, if poor functioning is the opposite of optimal functioning, as we posit, the positive Inkblot Scales (i.e., Happiness, Friendliness, and Success) should be negatively correlated with the negative Inkblot Scales (i.e., Misery, Hostility, and Incompetence). Moreover, we hoped that relations between a positive construct (e.g., Inkblot Happiness) and its presumed opposite (i.e., Inkblot Misery) would be stronger than non-corresponding positive-negative pairings (e.g., the Happiness-Misery correlation should be stronger than the Happiness-Incompetence correlation).

Another pattern that would support construct validity consists of the following. If Inkblot Success is most pertinent to agency and Inkblot Friendliness is most pertinent to communion, and agency and communion represent two distinct routes to happiness, then the correlations between (Inkblot) Success and Happiness as well as between Friendliness and Happiness should be higher than the correlation between Success and Friendliness. A similar pattern should characterize the low-standing poles of the dimensions as well. At the same time, these scales were designed to capture optimal versus poor functioning, which should encourage systematic correlations between the positive scales on the one hand, the negative scales on the other hand, and these correlations may be strong enough to load onto a single factor in exploratory factor analysis.

Given previous research linking the Big Five personality traits to different aspects of well-being and optimal functioning (e.g., DeYoung, 2010), each Inkblot Scale should have unique relationships with the Big Five personality traits. Specifically, Inkblot Happiness should be particularly related to Extraversion due to positive affect being a major component of Extraversion (Lucas et al., 2008). Conversely, Inkblot Misery should be particularly related to Neuroticism because negative affect is a major component of Neuroticism (DeYoung, 2010; Elliot & Thrash, 2002). Inkblot Success should be related to the agentic traits (Ghaed & Gallo, 2006) of (a) Conscientiousness, which has been linked to self-control (Bogg & Roberts, 2013) and long-term goal pursuit (DeYoung, 2010) and (b) Neuroticism, which can undermine skillful behaviors through emotionally impulsive processes (Mao et al., 2018). With respect to discriminant validity, we did not expect any of the scales to necessarily correlate with Openness/Intellect, which pertains to intellectual domains (Christensen et al., 2019) and preferences for abstract forms of thought (Fayn et al., 2017). Moreover, pronounced sex

differences were not expected, particularly given that the method focuses on implicit processes rather than ascriptions of traits to oneself (Nielson et al., 2017).

The Inkblot Scales should also display convergent validity with other well-validated measures of well-being and ill-being. In conjunction with the well-being literature, Inkblot Happiness should predict greater levels of positive affect relative to negative affect (i.e., affective balance: Diener et al., 2010; Sirois & Hirsch, 2015) and subjective well-being (e.g., Diener et al., 2010). In contrast, Inkblot Misery should predict higher levels of distress in the form of symptoms of depression and anxiety (Lee, 2019) and externalizing behaviors that are closely aligned with negative emotionality (e.g., impulsive eating: Selby & Joiner, 2013; alcohol and illicit drug use: Settles et al., 2012). Inkblot Friendliness should predict more prosocial behavior (Ryan et al., 2008), as well as general social behavior and functioning (e.g., in the form of social support: Shakespeare-Finch & Obst, 2011). Conversely, Inkblot Hostility should correspond with more antisocial behavior and aggression (Burt & Donnellan, 2009). Inkblot Success should predict measures related to general adaptive functioning, such as emotional intelligence (Anderson et al., 2017), which includes the ability to solve problems and change one's feelings and behaviors according to the situation (i.e., adaptability: Livingstone & Day, 2005); the ability to cope effectively (Livingstone & Day, 2005) and regulate one's emotions (Austin et al., 2010) in the face of stress (i.e., stress management); and the ability to understand and express one's thoughts and feelings (Bar-On, 2006; Livingstone & Day, 2005) and make decisions for oneself (i.e., intrapersonal intelligence: Dawda & Hart, 2000). Successful people should also perceive their lives to be more successful (Austin et al., 2010; Bandura, 2001), while incompetent people should report more impulsivity (Dickman, 1990), dysfunction in the form of cognitive failures (Broadbent et al., 1982), and specific outcomes such as criminal records (Jackson et al., 2010),

injuries (Bogg & Roberts, 2013; Broadbent et al., 1982), and financial (Moffitt et al., 2011) and academic (Garzón-Umerenkova et al., 2018) problems. Moreover, if the Inkblot Scales are discriminant from the Big Five personality traits, then each Inkblot Scale should predict its hypothesized outcomes beyond the Big Five personality traits.

In addition, individuals' Inkblot Scale scores should allow us to predict the extent to which one encounters various events and has certain experiences on a day-to-day basis. In particular, Inkblot Happiness should allow us to predict the extent to which an individual experiences positive affect (PA), psychological well-being (Keyes, 2002), approach motivation, and reward appraisal (which is a function of PA: Carver, 2006). Happy people should also describe themselves as happier, while miserable people should describe themselves as more miserable and they should experience more negative affect and threat appraisal (Schneider, 2004). Additionally, Inkblot Friendliness should predict daily friendly self-descriptions as well as prosocial motivations, feelings (Palder et al., 2013), and behaviors (Ryan et al., 2008), while Inkblot Hostility should predict more daily reports of hostility and antisocial feelings and behaviors (Habashi et al., 2016). Inkblot Success should also to predict more self-endorsements of success, successful goal pursuit and achievement (DeYoung, 2010), and approach-related coping, which is generally adaptive (Litman, 2006). Conversely, Inkblot Incompetence should predict more self-endorsements of incompetence and maladaptive behaviors such as avoidance coping (Litman, 2006), making mistakes (Broadbent et al., 1982), and engaging in risky daily behaviors (Bogg & Roberts, 2013).

I was also interested in whether the Inkblot Scales would predict individuals' affective and behavioral reactivity to different types of daily events. In particular, I predicted that happy people would experience more PA (Catalino & Fredrickson, 2011) and psychological well-being

12

(PWB; Patrick et al., 2007; Reis et al., 2000) in response to daily positive events, and that Inkblot

Misery would predict more NA (Carver, 1998; Tennen et al., 2005) and less PWB (Catalino &

Fredrickson, 2011) in response to negative events, as similar within-person relationships have

been linked to neuroticism (Suls & Martin, 2005; Tennen et al., 2005). We also predicted that

Friendly people would have a weaker relationship between positive events and prosocial

behavior, as agreeable peoples' prosocial behavior tends to be less contingent on the situation

(Fetterman et al., 2018; Ohly et al., 2010), and that hostile people would experience stronger

within-person relationships between provocative situations and antisocial behavior because

similar relationships have been linked to individual differences in anger and aggression

(Robinson et al., 2016; Robinson, Traurig, et al., 2020). Finally, I hypothesized that incompetent

people would respond to stress with more incompetent (Broadbent et al., 1982) and risky (Cyders

et al., 2010) behaviors.

      If the Inkblot Scales are valid measures of their respective constructs, then the magnitude

and direction of correlations with outcomes should mirror intuitive thoughts concerning how that

construct operates (e.g., Happiness should be a strong positive predictor of positive affect, a

weak to nonsignificant predictor of impulsivity, per se, and a strong negative predictor of

depression). Given that we see the constructs as overlapping in capturing optimal functioning, it

is reasonable to expect that any particular outcome may be significantly and reasonably predicted

by multiple Inkblot Scales (e.g., social support could be related to both Inkblot Happiness and

Inkblot Friendliness). On the other hand, if the Inkblot Scales are discriminant from each other,

then each Inkblot Scale, relative to the other Inkblot Scales, should be the strongest predictor of

its hypothesized outcomes.

In order to establish the utility of the Inkblot Scales in predicting one's thoughts, feelings, and behaviors both in general and on a daily level, we conducted an online study – due to COVID and social distancing guidelines – consisting of two parts. The first part of the study consisted of a series of "laboratory" measures and questionnaires that participants completed. These measures included the Inkblot Scales and other questionnaires for demographics, personality, well-being, and other markers of optimal functioning. After a period of data collection for these level-2 variables, we began the second part of the study, in which participants completed daily diaries by reporting on their experiences at the end of each day for 14 days.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Power Considerations and Sample Size

The rate at which participants completed the study was slower than we anticipated, and our initial recruitment procedures resulted in a relatively high attrition rate between the laboratory and daily portions of the study. Initially, we sought to recruit 180 participants so that after attrition (i.e., about 16%: Fetterman et al., 2017; Irvin et al., 2020), we would have data from 150 participants that would provide an average of 12 daily reports. Our planned sample size would have provided about .8 power to detect medium-sized effects in cross-level interactions, based on Figure 6 of Mathieu and colleagues (2012). We sought to recruit and collect laboratory data from all 180 participants from introductory psychology courses before launching the daily portion of the study.

However, after about four months of running the laboratory surveys, only 131 participants had completed the laboratory surveys, and we needed to launch the daily diary portion at this time to allow participants to be compensated. Of the participants who completed the laboratory surveys, only 84 of these participants completed an adequate number of daily reports. To compensate for the high attrition rate, we recruited participants from NDSU's entire student population, and we ran the daily diary portion of the study after 64 participants had completed the initial assessments, including the Inkblot Scales. Forty of these participants completed a sufficient number of daily reports. After data-cleaning procedures, a total of 184 participants had completed the laboratory portion of the study, and 124 of these participants had completed at least 8 daily reports ($M = 12.20$). The 124 participants provided approximately .9 power to detect medium-sized level-2 main effects (Scherbaum & Ferreter, 2009, Figure 1) and .7 power to detect cross-level interactions (Mathieu et al., 2012, Figure 6).

General Procedures

As described previously, data collection for this study was slow, and we recruited from two separate samples. We recruited Sample 1 from a pool of undergraduate students seeking course credit, and we planned to launch the daily portion once we had recruited a sufficient number of participants. However, we launched the daily diary portion of the study before reaching our goal of 180 participants due to an approaching deadline to assign course credit (i.e., about 2.5 weeks). Within the first week of launching the daily diary survey for Sample 1, there were over 50 participants who had not started the daily surveys despite receiving reminder emails and an offer for monetary compensation in place of research credits. We therefore recruited Sample 2 participants from two student listservs, in which a similar recruitment message as in SONA was posted in a mass student email.

For both participant samples, we advertised a "Personality and Daily Experiences Study" and provided a link to complete a Qualtrics-programmed baseline survey to interested students via recruitment software. We recruited Sample 1 using our psychology department's SONA system, encouraging students to only sign up if they could commit to completing the daily diary reports and offering up to 12 psychology research credits – 4 credits for completing the laboratory survey and up to 8 more for completing up to 14 of the daily surveys. The Sample 1 participants were provided a Qualtrics-generated link to the laboratory survey in the study's information page upon signing up. We recruited Sample 2 by sending an email to two student listervs – one of which was for undergraduate psychology majors, and the other of which was for the entire student population of the university. The email consisted of a Qualtrics link to the laboratory (or initial assessment) survey and an offer of $30 in compensation for completing both the laboratory survey and 10 daily reports.

The first page of the laboratory survey was an informed consent page, and participants had to indicate their agreement to participate before they could take part in the survey. Participants then provided their contact information, so they could receive the daily diary surveys through email, and they also reported on their demographics (Appendix A). Students also completed the Inkblot Scale and various measures of personality and well-being. We launched the laboratory surveys within a four-month window for Sample 1, and within a one-week window for Sample 2. After we had collected all of the participants of each sample, we launched the daily diary portion of the study for participants who had completed the laboratory survey in its entirety (131 Sample 1 participants, 64 Sample 2 participants). The reason for running all the participants at the same time was to equalize participants with respect to time-of-semester factors (e.g., Bardi et al., 2009; Folkman & Lazarus, 1985).

Prior to beginning the daily portion of the study, we sent out a mass email that notified the participants of the date that the daily diary surveys would begin, and we also reminded them of how many surveys they needed to complete to receive their full compensation (i.e., 14 days for Sample 1, 10 days for Sample 2). The email also included instructions for completing the daily dairy surveys (e.g., that participant number information would need to be entered for identification purposes and that we were interested in their experiences on the day in question). For Sample 1, we used this reminder email to provide a specific breakdown of credits participants could receive based on the number of daily surveys they completed (Appendix B). After this notification, we sent out individualized daily emails, which consisted of a participation number, a link to the daily survey, and instructions for completing the surveys. The emails were sent out via Qualtrics at 6:00 p.m., and participants had until 2:00 a.m. the next morning to

complete the surveys, based on recommendations from my thesis committee and undergraduate research assistants who provided insight into our samples' schedules.

For Sample 1, we sent out the daily surveys for a period of 18 days, although on the 14th day, we removed all of the participants who had either completed (a) all 14 days or (b) fewer than 4 days. All of the Sample 1 participants received credit through SONA after we had closed out their daily surveys. For Sample 2, we sent out the daily surveys for 17 days. After the 10th day of Sample 2's data collection, we removed participants who had completed too few reports (i.e., 5 or fewer) or a sufficient number of daily reports and notified them that their participation was complete. At that time, they signed up for their compensation. If they wanted cash, they scheduled the in-person pickup or they received an Amazon.com gift card via email. The remaining participants, who had yet to complete all required surveys, were sent an email with their progress toward completing their 10 required daily reports and the deadline for completing these reports. On each subsequent day, we removed participants who had completed all 10 reports from the daily diary survey and notified them that they were eligible to receive their compensation. We also provided partial compensation to participants who competed between 8 and 9 daily reports because their data was analyzable. A total of 132 participants completed a minimum of 8 daily reports, and there were a total of 1716 daily reports prior to data cleaning and exclusion.

As part of the data cleaning process, we excluded all laboratory surveys that were incomplete and/or previously completed by the same participant from all analyses. There were 11 participants who had failed at least one of two attention checks that were placed in the laboratory survey questions, and we only used their data for the following attrition analysis. One-way ANOVAs revealed that the participants who failed the attention checks had significantly

lower Inkblot Happiness, $F(1,192) = 10.00$, $p = .002$, and Inkblot Success, $F(1,192) = 9.40$, $p = .003$, scores – which is reasonable considering that participants who fail attention checks tend to display lesser rating variability, which would reduce correlation-based scores (Cohen et al., 2003). However, there were no significant differences between the dropped and retained participants in terms of Inkblot Friendliness, demographics, or any of the Big 5 Scales, ps > .096. In total, 184 participants provided data of sufficient quality to be used in the laboratory-based analyses ($M_{Age} = 20.47$, 69.57% female, 83.70% Caucasian).

The data cleaning for the daily surveys involved removing any surveys that were incomplete or completed by the same participant on the same night, and we neither counted these surveys toward the participants' survey completion nor used them in any kind of analysis. We also excluded participants who had completed fewer than 8 daily reports (71 participants total), so we ultimately analyzed data from 124 participants and 1608 daily reports in the multilevel models. The participants we retained had completed an average of 12.20 daily surveys. The participants we dropped had significantly lower Inkblot Happiness, $F(1,192) = 4.67$, $p = .032$ and Inkblot Success scores, $F(1,192) = 4.88$, $p = .028$, but they did not significantly differ in Inkblot Friendliness, demographics, or the Big 5 Personality traits, ps > .208.

Because the participants from each sample were recruited from slightly different populations and were recruited within different portions of the semester, we found it worthwhile to investigate potential differences between our samples using one-way ANOVAs. Sample 2 was significantly older than Sample 1, $F(1,182) = 22.53$, $p < .001$, and this was due to the presence of more non-traditional students (i.e., outliers) in Sample 2. There were no significant differences in proportions related to sex, $F(1,182) = 0.83$, $p = .363$, or ethnicity (Caucasian v. not), $F(1,182) = 0.05$, $p = .817$, and mean Inkblot Scale scores did not vary by sample, $F(1,182) < 1.56$, ps > .214.

There were some sample differences in personality: Sample 2 had significantly higher Intellect scores, $F(1,182) = 4.15$, $p = .043$. Sample 2 also had slightly higher levels of Agreeableness, though this comparison was not significant, $F(1,182) = 3.80$, $p = .053$. The samples did not significantly differ in Extraversion, Conscientiousness, or Neuroticism levels, $F(1,182)s < 2.04$, ps > 089.

<h2 style="text-align:center">Laboratory Outcome Measures</h2>

Inkblot Scales

The primary measures of the current study were the Inkblot Scales, which used the same responses to simultaneously measure various components of optimal functioning. In previous research, our lab had developed measures of health competence (e.g., Robinson, Persich, et al., 2020), romantic competence (e.g., Robinson, Penzel, et al., 2020), friendship competence (e.g., Persich & Robinson, 2020), and work-related emotional intelligence (e.g., Krishnakumar et al., 2016). However, the primary model for the current project was an in-development measure of Life Competence, which encompasses a wide variety (some social, some work-related, some practical, etc.) of everyday challenges and how one might respond to them.

Prior to the thesis, we had selected 20 of the Life Competence scenarios (and corresponding responses) for a pilot version of the Inkblot Scale. These items were selected based on the highest item-total correlations, $M = .46$, ranging from .37 to .60, that were obtained from an unpublished Life Competence study ($n = 87$) that utilized consensus-based scores. We then developed situational response prototypes for Happiness, Competence, and Friendliness by asking well-trained researchers to rate the extent (7-point scales) to which each given way of responding to a scenario could be characterized in terms of low, medium, or high levels of the construct of interest (e.g., Happiness). A group of 125 participants were then asked to rate the

extent (1 = extremely unlikely, 5 = very likely) to which they, personally, would perform each response to each situation. Additionally, we assessed various components of personality and well-being. We then scored Inkblot Happiness, Inkblot Competence, and Inkblot Friendliness by correlating each participant's self-likelihood ratings with each prototype. The distribution for each resulting Inkblot Scale exhibited meaningful variability and these scores also correlated with well-being and personality in expected manners. The Inkblot Scales were also highly correlated with each other, rs between .75 and .90, ps <.001, suggesting that they all belonged to a latent construct of optimal functioning.

Although the pilot results were promising, the measures still had features that were worth improving. Specifically, only one prototype was rated on a bipolar scale, and the prototypes were based on ratings of different targets (i.e., the person v. the behavior) and used response scales that were different from those used by the participants. Given the potential unipolarity of the construct dimensions (e.g., Horowitz et al., 2006) and our desires to assess poor versus optimal functioning with consistent rating formats, we decided to create six prototypes – three each for the positive and negative Inkblot Scales – and to consistently target the person in all cases (Appendix C). Additionally, the reliability estimates of the Inkblot Scales, based on Spearman-Brown corrections of split-half correlations, were adequate (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 2008) but still fairly low, rs < .76. On the basis of the reliability estimates from the pilot study, we used the Spearman-Brown prediction formula to estimate reliabilities for measures that were twice as long. Because these predicted estimates exceeded .79, we decided to double the length of the test. We therefore retained the pilot scenarios and selected 20 more from the 30 remaining Life Competence scenarios that were most rated as most relevant to the Inkblot Scales we sought to create.

In total, the current test consists of 40 scenarios and 160 ways of responding, presented in the same randomized order to all participants and expert raters. It is worth noting that we used a 1 to 7 Likert scale for both participants and raters (see Appendix C for endpoints), which would make the participant responses more comparable to the prototypes and allow for multiple ways of scoring. We obtained expert ratings for the prototypes from a Qualtrics survey that we emailed to research assistants, psychology faculty members, graduate students, and colleagues outside of NDSU. The experts were presented with scenarios involving a named character and four ways of responding to each scenario. A total of 9 Judges were asked to consider that their knowledge of an individual only consisted of one response to one situation (prior to moving on to rate another response). They were then asked to make their best estimate of whether the person would score high in a given quality (e.g., Happiness), low in a given quality, or whether the response reflects medium levels of the quality in question and/or is not very diagnostic concerning that quality. Six ratings were made: Happy (v. Unhappy), Miserable (v. Non-Miserable), Friendly (v. Unfriendly), Hostile (v. Non-Hostile), Successful (v. Unsuccessful), and Incompetent (v. Competent; Appendix C). Cronbach αs across judges indicated high levels of inter-rater agreement, so the prototype scores averaged across judges. To be clear, a prototype consists of 160 means that can be correlated with a given participant's ratings to index the extent of prototype matching. For each of the 6 rating dimensions, means for a given prototype varied considerably across particular responses, suggesting that the construct had been meaningfully targeted. Means (across the 160 ways of responding), standard deviations (across the 160 ways of responding), and αs (across judges) for each prototype are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Inkblot Scale Prototypes

Construct	M	SD	α
1a. Inkblot Happiness	3.74	1.22	.87
1b. Inkblot Misery	3.92	1.33	.82
2a. Inkblot Friendliness	4.28	1.15	.92
2b. Inkblot Hostility	2.96	1.11	.86
3a. Inkblot Success	4.40	1.44	.91
3b. Inkblot Incompetence	3.48	1.34	.90

Note: Means and standard deviations are computed across 160 ways of responding and αs are computed across judges.

The participants of the present study rated their behavioral likelihood of responding to the same scenarios as the expert judges, but the scenarios and response options were presented in a second-person format instead of featuring a named character (Appendix C). Because we sought to compare two different scoring methods, we gave participants two scores for each Inkblot construct, one of which involved a Pearson r correlation between the participant ratings and the prototypes (e.g., a participant's Inkblot Happiness Pearson score is the Pearson correlation between the participant's behavioral likelihood ratings for each way of responding and the Happiness prototype), and the other of which involved a 1-1 intra-class correlation (ICC) between the participant ratings and the prototypes (e.g., a participant's Inkblot Misery ICC score is the ICC between the participant's behavioral likelihood ratings and the Misery prototype ratings of the same ways of responding to the scenarios). The Pearson scores for each Inkblot Scale were computed using MATLAB's built-in corrcoef.m function, and the ICC scores for each Inkblot Scale were computed from a third-party ICC.m function for MATLAB (Salarian, 2021). Further quantifications and information of the Inkblot Scales will be described in the results section.

The Big 5 Personality Traits

We hypothesized that the Inkblot Scales would correlate with somewhat unique personality traits, but also predict the outcome measures after controlling for personality. We therefore measured the Big 5 personality traits using the Mini-IPIP (Donnellan et al., 2006), which is a brief, 20-item measure that uses 4 items for each of the Big 5 traits and a 1 to 5 rating scale (Appendix D). Each personality trait is scored by averaging across 4 responses after reverse-scoring the negatively-keyed items, providing separate scores for Extraversion, $M = 3.19$, $SD = .97$, $\alpha = .80$, Agreeableness, $M = 4.07$, $SD = .72$, $\alpha = .76$, Conscientiousness, $M = 3.60$, $SD = 0.89$, $\alpha = .72$, Neuroticism, $M = 2.96$, $SD = 0.84$, $\alpha = .64$, and Intellect, $M = 3.71$, $SD = .74$. This short measure both reduces participant burden and has high reliability and convergent validity with other widely-used personality scales (Donnellan et al., 2006).

Measures of Happiness

We hypothesized that Inkblot Happiness would predict affect balance, or the tendency to experience more positive than negative emotion (Diener et al., 2010; Sirois & Hirsch, 2015). We measured affect balance using the Scale of Positive and Negative Emotions (SPANE: Diener et al., 2010), which uses a 1 to 5 frequency scale for 6 items for Positive Emotion and 6 items for Negative Emotion (Appendix E) that are averaged to create their respective scores. In particular, we were interested in the Affect Balance score, which is computed by subtracting the Negative Emotion score from the Positive Emotion score, $M = 1.32$, $SD = 1.19$ $\alpha = .88$.

We also hypothesized that Inkblot Happiness would predict other components of well-being aside from affect balance. Accordingly, we included two brief scales of psychological well-being. The first of these scales was the Brief Inventory of Thriving (BIT: Su et al., 2014), which consisted of 10 items that participants rated on a 1 to 5 agreement scale (Appendix F). We

averaged across the items to compute a single Thriving score, $M = 4.06$, $SD = 0.65$, $\alpha = .91$.

Items in the BIT are related to various areas of well-being, including relationships, accomplishment, meaning, and life satisfaction (Su et al., 2014).

The second brief well-being scale used was the Flourishing Scale (Diener et al., 2010), which is relevant to perceived life success and eudaimonic happiness. Participants rated their agreement with 8 items on a 1 to 7 scale (Appendix G), and their responses were averaged to compute a total score, $M = 5.76$, $SD = 0.65$, $\alpha = .86$. The Flourishing Scale has high internal and test-retest reliabilities and convergent validity with other well-being scales (Diener et al., 2010).

Along with the brief psychological well-being measures, we were interested in a more comprehensive measure of subjective well-being (Diener et al., 1998; Springer & Hauser, 2006). We specifically used Ryff's (1989) Scales of Psychological Well-Being (SPWB), which measure eudaimonic well-being (Ryff, 1989) and self-realization (Ryff & Singer, 2008) in various domains. Participants rated their agreement with a total of 42 items, on a 1 to 6 scale, and these items were averaged to compute a total score, $M = 4.35$, $SD = 0.61$, $\alpha = .91$ (Ryff & Singer, 2008; Appendix H). The SPWB is a valid and reliable measure (Ryff & Singer, 2006) that has predicted important health outcomes in previous studies (e.g., Morozink et al., 2010).

Measures of Distress

We hypothesized that Inkblot Misery would predict various aspects of distress, including experiences that are relevant to depression and anxiety, which were measured via the 21-item Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scale (DASS21: Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995). More specifically, we used the Depression and Anxiety subscales, each of which consists of 7 items that participants rated their agreement with on a 1 to 4 scale (Appendix I). We averaged across responses to compute scores on the Anxiety subscale, $M = 1.48$, $SD = 0.52$, $\alpha = .83$, which

focuses on physiological components of distress, and on the Depression subscale, $M = 1.54$, $SD = 0.61$, $\alpha = .91$, which focuses on the feeling component of distress and reflects feelings that are opposite to those of the psychological well-being scales. The DASS has been found to be a valid measure of psychological distress (Lee, 2019).

We had also hypothesized that Inkblot Misery would predict externalizing behaviors, which often follow from reactivity to negative emotions (Miller et al., 2012). In particular, we used the Risky, Impulsive, and Self-Destructive Behaviors Questionnaire (RISQ), which has been used as a marker of externalizing behavior and is related to lower distress tolerance (Sadeh & Baskin-Sommers, 2017). The RISQ has a total 34 items in which participants rate the frequencies of engaging in various risky behaviors on a 1 to 7 scale (Appendix J). For the purpose of the present research, we focused on some of the subscales that were most relevant to responding to distress, which were scored by averaging across their respective items: impulsive eating (2 items; Selby & Joiner, 2013), $M = 2.33$, $SD = 1.75$, $\alpha = .84$, heavy alcohol use (2 items; Settles et al., 2012), $M = 2.49$, $SD = 1.67$, $\alpha = .86$, and illegal behavior, including drug use (8 items; Settles et al., 2012), $M = 1.30$, $SD = 0.55$, $\alpha = .84$. We also measured RISQ aggression, which will be described in the Measures of Antisocial Behavior section due to its relevance to Hostility.

Measures of (Pro)Social Behavior

We were also interested in the Inkblot Friendliness Scale, which should be related to prosocial behavior. We measured prosocial behavior using two questionnaires, the first of which was the Prosocialness Scale for Adults, which measures prosocial personality by having participants rate the extent to which 16 items are true of them on a 1 to 5 scale (Caprara et al., 2005; Appendix L). We averaged across these responses to compute a total score, $M = 3.82$, SD

= 0.67, α = .92. The second measure of prosocial tendencies was the Self-Report Altruism Scale

(SRA: Rushton et al., 1981), which consists of 20 behavioral items that participants rated on a 1

to 5 frequency scale. Responses on the SRA were averaged to create a total score, $M = 2.40$, SD

= 0.57, α = .86. The SRA is reliable and valid as it predicts altruistic behaviors and personality

traits such as sensitive attitudes and nurturance (Rushton et al., 1981; Appendix L).

We also hypothesized that Inkblot Friendliness would predict social support, as it relates

to social functioning. We measured social support using the 2-Way Social Support Scale

(Shakespeare-Finch & Obst, 2011), which asks the individuals to indicate how true 21 items are

of their social support networks (Appendix M). For present purposes, we quantified the 5-item

Giving Emotional Support and 7-item Receiving Emotional Support subscales, which were

scored by averaging participant responses across the subscales' respective items. The Giving

Emotional Support subscale, $M = 4.32$, $SD = 0.62$, α = .83, and Receiving Emotional Support

subscale, $M = 4.45$, $SD = 0.74$, α = .92, have good internal reliabilities and have been found to

correlate with the other social support scales (Shakespeare-Finch & Obst, 2011).

Measures of Antisocial Behavior

As a contrast to Inkblot Friendliness, we hypothesized that Inkblot Hostility would

predict antisocial behavior. We therefore selected a modified version of the Subtypes of

Antisocial Behavior Questionnaire (STAB), which is related to a variety of criminal activities

(Burt & Donnellan, 2009). In particular, the Antisocial Behavior Scale (ASB) requires

individuals to indicate whether (yes/no) they have engaged in 25 activities related to criminal

behavior, drinking, and negative relationship outcomes, with a total score computed by

averaging across a participant's responses (Appendix N), $M = 0.18$, $SD = 0.13$, α = .79.

We also hypothesized that Inkblot Hostility would predict measures of aggression, the first of which was the 4-item aggression subscale of the RISQ (scoring described in the Measures of Distress section), $M = 1.29$, $SD = 0.59$, $\alpha = .73$ (Appendix I). We also measured two more specific forms of aggression using the 23-item Raine Proactive and Reactive Aggression Questionnaire, which requires individuals to rate their frequencies, on a 1 to 3 scale, of engaging in aggressive behaviors for various reasons (Raine et al., 2006; Appendix O). Specifically, we averaged participant responses across 11 items to compute a Reactive Aggression score, $M = 1.56$, $SD = 0.33$, $\alpha = .82$ and an additional 12 items to compute a Proactive Aggression score, $M = 1.02$, $SD = 0.16$, $\alpha = .74$ (Raine et al., 2006). The Reactive Aggression and Proactive Aggression measures are both reliable and valid predictors of aggressive behavior, although Proactive Aggression has been particularly related to criminal activity, and Reactive Aggression has been more strongly linked to impulsivity (Raine et al., 2006).

Measures of Success

The last component of optimal functioning we wanted to assess was Inkblot Success, which we hypothesized would predict multiple aspects of emotional intelligence. We assessed emotional intelligence using a questionnaire adapted from the Emotional Quotient Inventory - Short Form (EQ-i:S; Parker et al., 2011) by transforming the 35 abbreviated items published by Parker and colleagues (2011) into complete sentences (Appendix P). More specifically, participants rated how true each statement was on a 1 to 5 scale (Appendix P), and we averaged the participants' responses across items to compute scores for four separate subscales: Stress Management (8 items), $M = 3.79$, $SD = 0.74$, $\alpha = .79$, Adaptability (7 items), $M = 3.57$, $SD = 0.57$, $\alpha = .63$, Intrapersonal Intelligence (10 items), $M = 3.51$, $SD = 0.73$, $\alpha = .82$, and Interpersonal Intelligence (10 items), $M = 4.27$, $SD = 0.52$, $\alpha = .78$ (Appendix P). The EQ-i:S is

a reliable and valid measure that has been linked to better academic performance, persistence, adaptive coping, lower inattention and hyperactivity, as well as other measures of emotional intelligence (Parker et al., 2011).

We also hypothesized that successful people would perceive themselves as successful. We therefore administered the Life Domain Success Scale, which was created following the life domain satisfaction literature (e.g., Seligson et al., 2003). The Life Domain Success Scale consists of eight life domain items that participants rate in terms of how successful they have been in those domains of their life on a 1 to 7 scale (Appendix Q), and their responses were averaged to compute a single score, $M = 5.25$, $SD = 0.93$, $\alpha = .75$.

Measures of Incompetence

In contrast to Inkblot Success, we hypothesized that Inkblot Incompetence would correlate with various measures of dysfunction. The first of these measures was the Cognitive Failures Questionnaire (CFQ), which assesses deficits in memory, perception, and motor control – particularly in response to stress (Broadbent et al., 1982). Participants rated 25 items on a 1 to 5 frequency-based scale (Appendix R) and these responses were averaged to compute a total score, $M = 2.81$, $SD = 0.59$, $\alpha = .91$. The CFQ is a reliable and valid measure, and it has been correlated with informant reports of the same cognitive failures (Broadbent et al., 1982).

We also hypothesized that Inkblot Incompetence would predict impulsive behavior, which we measured using the Dickman Impulsivity Scale – a 23-item true (1)/false (0) questionnaire related to fast decision-making (Dickman, 1990; Appendix S). In particular, we used the 12-item Dysfunctional Impulsivity scale, which was scored by averaging across participant responses, $M = 0.20$, $SD = 0.21$, $\alpha = .77$. This subscale has been found to be reliable

29

and convergent with other measures of impulsivity, disorderliness, and lack of forethought (Dickman, 1990).

We also hypothesized that Inkblot Incompetence would predict more concrete and specific outcomes than our general tendency measures of incompetence, so we developed two purpose-built scales that were designed to tap unskilled living. Because the items of each measure use various response scales (Appendices T and U), total scores were computed by z-scoring each item then averaging the z-scores together. The first outcome focused on Crimes and Misdemeanors, which consisted of 10 items relevant to engaging in – and facing consequences for – criminal behavior (Appendix T), $M = 0.00$, $SD = 0.63$, $\alpha = .81$. The second outcome measure was a 12-item Indicators of Incompetence and participants reported on the number of times that they had faced various predicaments, including injuries, negative financial events, and consequences of poor academic performance, $M = 0.00$, $SD = 0.47$, $\alpha = .67$ (Appendix U).

Daily Diary Measures

We were not only interested in how the Inkblot Scales would predict general behaviors and outcomes in the context of general self-reports, but also how the Inkblot Scales would predict individuals' thoughts, feelings, and behaviors, as well as individuals' reactivity to various events, on a daily level. We therefore asked participants to complete a number of daily surveys that involved identity verification followed by a number of reports of daily events and experiences. Participants first reported on their most transient and subjective experiences (e.g., feelings), then reported on progressively more objective and easily-remembered events (Bolger et al., 2003). We also calculated the reliabilities of each scale by computing Cronbach αs of the daily variables, with participants as rows and days as columns. All of the daily scales can be found in Appendix V.

Daily Events

We hypothesized that the Inkblot Scales would predict individuals' reactivity to various types of events. We therefore asked participants to report the number of times, on a 1 to 4 scale, that they had encountered the events of interest. We averaged the participant responses across items within each event category to compute scores for Stressful Events (4 items; Compton et al., 2008; Klein et al., 2017), M = 1.89, SD = 0.81, α = .94, Provocative Events (3 items; Wilkowski et al., 2010), M = 1.33, SD = 0.56, α = .92, Positive Events (3 items), M = 2.31, SD = 0.86, α = .93, Negative Events (3 items; Robinson & Liu, 2013), M = 1.30, SD = 0.45, α = .92, and Affiliative Events (3 items), M = 2.69, SD = 0.96, α = .95. Each event score will be used as an outcome in the level 2 main effect models to explore whether the Inkblot Scales predict the kinds of events individuals encounter (e.g., Tennen et al., 2005). In addition, the Stressful, Provocative, and Positive Event frequencies will be used as level 1 predictors in cross-level models to test whether the Inkblot Scores predict differential reactivity to classes of life events.

Daily Personalities

We hypothesized that each Inkblot Scale would predict self-endorsements of personality traits that corresponded to the particular construct that was targeted. We therefore created single-item measures for 6 daily personality traits that participants rated on a 1 to 5 scale, and these ratings produced daily scores for Happy Personality, $M = 3.71$, $SD = 1.09$, α = .96, Miserable Personality, $M = 1.70$, $SD = 1.02$, α = .89, Friendly Personality, $M = 3.73$, $SD = 1.02$, α = .93, Hostile Personality, $M = 1.48$, $SD = 0.82$, α = .92, Successful Personality, $M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.11$, α = .90, and Incompetent Personality, $M = 1.58$, $SD = 0.90$, α = .93. The single-item method has been used in previous research (e.g., Fetterman et al., 2018), and represents personality at a more abstract and broad level than do daily behaviors (Schell et al., 1996).

Daily Motivations

We hypothesized that Inkblot Happiness would predict daily approach motivation and that Inkblot Friendliness would predict daily prosocial motivation. We therefore used two single-item bipolar scales, labeled as such, that contrasted Approach (9) versus Avoidance (1) Motivation, $M = 6.30$, $SD = 2.39$, $\alpha = .83$, and Prosocial (9) versus Antisocial (1) Motivation (Robinson, Persich, et al., in press), $M = 7.16$, $SD = 1.65$, $\alpha = .94$. We used bipolar scales because previous research in the lab suggested that there are daily variations in global motivation that create difficulties when interpreting unipolar motivation scales.

Daily Cybernetic Goal Pursuit

We hypothesized that Inkblot Success would predict how well individuals make progress toward their goals each day, so we used a Goal Profile questionnaire to measure components of goal progress/success. Participants used a 1 to 5 scale to report on their Cybernetic Self-Efficacy (1 item), $M = 3.61$, $SD = 1.15$, $\alpha = .91$, and Cybernetic Success (1 item), $M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.15$ $\alpha = .90$, in their goal achievement. Similar questions have been used to measure goal profiles in previous daily diary research (Moeller et al., 2015).

Daily Appraisals

We hypothesized that Inkblot Happiness would predict daily reward appraisal and that Inkblot Misery would predict daily threat appraisal. We therefore created single-item measures with a 1 to 5 agreement scale to assess individuals' Threat Appraisal, $M = 1.51$, $SD = 0.93$, $\alpha = .91$, and Reward Appraisal, $M = 3.31$, $SD = 1.20$, $\alpha = .91$.

Daily Feelings

We hypothesized that the Inkblot Scales would predict daily levels of feelings that are relevant to their constructs. Specifically, Inkblot Happiness and Inkblot Misery should predict

greater levels of positive affect (PA) and negative affect (NA), respectively. We also believed

that Inkblot Friendliness and Inkblot Hostility would predict higher levels of prosocial and

antisocial feelings, respectively. The daily feelings will also be used as outcomes of the cross-

level models because we hypothesized that the Inkblot Scales will predict affective reactivity to

particular kinds of events. Participants therefore rated their feelings using 10 items on a 1 to 5

scale, and we averaged these ratings within a given feeling type to compute scores for Antisocial

Feeling (2 items), $M = 1.69$, $SD = 0.78$, $\alpha = .87$, Prosocial Feeling (2 items; Fetterman et al.,

2017), $M = 3.46$, $SD = 0.96$, $\alpha = .94$, PA (3 items; Robinson, Irvin, et al., in press), $M = 3.26$, SD

$= 0.98$, $\alpha = .93$, and NA (3 items; Robinson, Irvin, et al., in press), $M = 1.79$, $SD = 0.81$, $\alpha = .94$.

Daily Well-Being

Because well-being is a major component of optimal functioning, we used two daily

well-being scales. The first of these scales was a shortened version of the SPWB (Ryff, 1989), in

which we selected one item from each subscale that would be most likely to fluctuate across

days, and the items were reworded to make them relevant to the particular day in question.

Participants rated their agreement with most of the 6 items on a 1 to 6 scale, and each item was

used as the score for its respective subscale. Due to an error in programming, the Purpose in Life

and Self-Acceptance items were rated on a 1 to 7 scale, so to keep items consistent, we

subtracted 1 from the participants' ratings and then transformed the resulting 0s into 1s. This

allowed us to compute a total score by averaging across the items. The daily version of the

SPWB produced separate scores for Autonomy, $M = 3.66$, $SD = 1.56$ $\alpha = .93$, Environmental

Mastery, $M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.42$, $\alpha = .94$, Personal Growth, $M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.51$, $\alpha = .90$, Positive

Relations, $M = 4.45$, $SD = 1.42$, $\alpha = .96$, Purpose in Life, $M = 3.48$, $SD = 1.71$, $\alpha = .96$, Self-

Acceptance, $M = 3.41$, $SD = 1.73$, $\alpha = .95$, and the PWB total score, $M = 3.73$, $SD = 1.17$, $\alpha =$

.96. The second measure of well-being was a 4-item version of the Flourishing Scale (Diener et al., 2010), which asked participants to rate their agreement with each item on a 1 to 7 scale. These ratings were averaged to obtain a single Flourishing score, $M = 4.55$, $SD = 1.57$, $\alpha = .96$.

Daily Coping

We hypothesized that Inkblot Success would predict more effective and approach-oriented coping strategies and that Inkblot Incompetence would predict more ineffective and avoidance-oriented coping strategies. We therefore measured approach coping and avoidance coping using 2 items each (Litman, 2006) from the COPE scale (Carver et al.,1989), and participants rated their agreement with each item on a 1 to 5 scale. The responses of each scale were averaged to compute a score for Approach Coping, $M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.02$, $\alpha = .93$, and Avoidance Coping, $M = 1.88$, $SD = 0.86$, $\alpha = .94$.

Daily Behaviors

We hypothesized that Inkblot Friendliness would predict greater levels of prosocial behavior, and that such behavior would be less contingent on positive events. In contrast, we hypothesized that Inkblot Hostility would predict antisocial behavior, especially after experiencing provocation-related events. We therefore assessed both Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior using 3-item scales in which participants rated the frequency, on a 1 to 4 scale, with which they had engaged in different prosocial or antisocial behaviors. The ratings were averaged within behavior types to obtain separate scores for Prosocial Behavior (Robinson et al., 2017), $M = 2.25$, $SD = 0.72$, $\alpha = .95$, and Antisocial Behavior (Robinson & Liu, 2013; Wilkowski & Robinson, 2010), $M = 1.25$, $SD = 0.40$, $\alpha = .93$. We chose Likert scales for these behaviors because we suspected that they would be relatively common and that one could reasonably enact each behavior multiple times per day.

We also hypothesized that Inkblot Incompetence would predict a greater frequency of incompetent and risky behaviors, particularly under conditions of stress. We thought incompetent and risky behaviors would be relatively uncommon, so we used checklist scales of specific behaviors, which were scored by summing the number of different behavioral items that participants reported engaging in. The 15-item checklist for Incompetent Behavior, $M = 1.05$, $SD = 1.42$. $\alpha = .95$, was modeled from the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (Brown & Ryan, 2003) for behaviors that reflected mindlessness. The 7-item checklist for Risky Behaviors, $M = 0.21$, $SD = 0.54$, $\alpha = .93$, has been used in previous studies (Irvin et al., 2020) and the items generally reflect dangerous or incautious behaviors.

Order of Daily Measures

As mentioned previously, the daily scales were presented in an order such that the first ratings participants provided pertained to the most subjective, transient experiences (Bolger et al., 2003). The subsequent scales were progressively more concrete, specific, and objective, with the event-related measures completed last (Bolger et al., 2003). Specifically, questionnaires were presented in the following order: Emotions, Appraisals, Motivations, Well-Being, Goal Profile, Personality, Coping, Likert Behaviors, Checklist Behaviors, and Events.

Plan of Analyses

Because the current Inkblot Scales were new measures, it was important to first quantify them in terms of their descriptive statistics (e.g., means, standard deviations) and reliabilities. The reliabilities of the Inkblot Scales were evaluated through split-half correlational methods, which are practical for correlation-based scores rather than mean-based scores that are typical of most self-reported outcomes. These descriptive statistics would also be used to determine whether to use the Pearson or ICC scoring method prior to key analyses.

We also had hypotheses regarding the convergent and discriminant validity of the Inkblot Scales, and these hypotheses were tested through Pearson r correlations (a) between the prototypes of each Inkblot Scale and (b) between the actual participant scores of each Inkblot Scale. The correlations were also used to decide which Inkblot Scales would be used in subsequent analyses. We also wanted to determine whether all of the Inkblot Scales would load onto a single latent factor of optimal functioning, and we investigated this through exploratory factor analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

We were also interested in the relationships between the Inkblot Scales with sex and personality. We tested sex differences between the Inkblot Scales using ANOVAs with sex as a categorical predictor of each Inkblot Scale. To test whether the Inkblot Scales were meaningfully related to personality, we used Pearson r correlations. By contrast, when exploring predictor-outcome relationships, we used the simple regression method. I will highlight cases in which the predictor and the outcome are thought to reflect the same construct (e.g., Happiness), but regressions were also performed in examining cross-construct relationships. Lastly, with respect to regressions, the utility of the Inkblot Scales in predicting their hypothesized outcomes beyond personality was tested using multiple regressions that included all of the Big 5 personality traits.

We also developed special techniques to appreciate patterns of correlations and these specialized techniques additionally spoke to questions concerning convergent and discriminant validity. The first of these techniques was a vector-based analysis, which assesses the predictive validity of each Inkblot Scale by comparing the observed pattern of correlations to a hypothesized pattern of correlations that one would expect based on the construct that is purportedly targeted. The second technique involved a horizontal sign test and this test was designed to determine whether outcomes were best (i.e., largest correlation) predicted by the

36

Inkblot Scale deemed to be most relevant to that outcome. The sign test worked by comparing observed rates of hits and misses to expected rates that would occur at random.

We tested the relationships between the Inkblot Scales and daily outcomes through multilevel modeling (MLM), which can characterize the relationships between level-2 predictors (i.e., individual differences in the Inkblot Scale scores) and daily outcomes (Aguinis et al., 2013; Mathieu et al., 2012). In addition, we explored cross-level interactions (Singer, 1998) to examine relationships between Inkblot scores and within-person slopes (Aguinis et al., 2013). Intercepts and slopes were allowed to vary randomly, in accordance with a focus on individual differences.

RESULTS

Quantification of Inkblot Scales

Before conducting the main analyses, we characterized the psychometric properties of our scales to determine which scales would be appropriate to use in further analysis. We also wanted to determine which scores would ultimately be worth using in our analyses while speaking to questions of convergent and discriminant validity.

Descriptive Statistics and Reliabilities

We scored the Inkblot Scales in 12 different ways, using the same participant ratings but different prototypes and scoring methods, in order to decide which scores to retain for the main analyses. One of the scoring methods involved Pearson r correlations and the other involved ICCs, and both scoring methods were applied to each of the six Inkblot Scale constructs. The means, standard deviations, and skew statistics for the resulting analyses are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics and Reliabilities of All Inkblot Scale Scores for Participants

Scoring Method and Construct	*M*	*SD*	Skew	Reliability *r*	S-B
Pearson's *r*					
Inkblot Happiness	.2374	.1176	-0.29	.68	.81
Inkblot Friendliness	.1590	.1250	-0.49	.67	.80
Inkblot Success	.2943	.1432	-0.14	.70	.83
Inkblot Misery	-.2206	.1257	0.18	.66	.79
Inkblot Hostility	-.2071	.1197	0.50	.60	.75
Inkblot Incompetence	-.2873	.1508	0.17	.73	.85
ICC					
Inkblot Happiness	.1686	.1059	-0.09	.64	.78
Inkblot Friendliness	.1262	.1074	-0.42	.64	.78
Inkblot Success	.2609	.1343	-0.06	.67	.80
Inkblot Misery	-.2085	.1137	0.16	.66	.79
Inkblot Hostility	-.3019	.1148	0.49	.69	.82
Inkblot Incompetence	-.3086	.1388	0.17	.75	.85

Note: Pearson's *r* = Pearson's *r* correlation between participant's ratings and prototype ratings; ICC = intra-class correlation between participant's ratings and prototype ratings of same scenarios; *r* = odd-even correlation; *S-B* = Spearman-Brown correction for odd-even correlation

Of note, the means for each Inkblot Scale are decently high, with the absolute value of each magnitude being greater than .15 for the Pearson *r* scores and .12 for the ICC scores. Moreover, people tended to respond in ways that the expert raters characterized as more optimally functioning (i.e., their scores on the positive constructs were typically positive) and less poorly functioning (i.e., their scores on the negative constructs were typically negative). More importantly, the *SD*s of each Inkblot Scale score were appreciable (i.e., greater than .10), indicating that there were meaningful individual differences in the Inkblot Scale scores and that the Inkblot Scales could reasonably be used as predictors of poor and optimal functioning. Moreover, the low skew statistics (i.e., the absolute values were less than 1.00) suggested that there was no need for transforming the Inkblot Scale distributions.

It is also worth noting that the Pearson and ICC versions of each Inkblot Scale were highly correlated with each other. Specifically, the Inkblot Happiness Pearson and Inkblot Happiness ICC scores were correlated at $r = .89$, and similar ICC-Pearson correlations were found for the Inkblot Friendliness, $r = .98$, Success, $r = .98$, Misery, $r = .96$, Hostility, $r = .80$, and Incompetence, $r = .95$, scores. Moreover, we computed the reliabilities of the Inkblot Scales by first creating odd-even correlations, then correcting these correlations using the Spearman-Brown formula for artificial truncation (see Table 2). All reliability coefficients were reasonably high and did not appreciably differ by scoring method. Furthermore, we considered the fact that discrepancy-based scores such as those based on the ICC can sometimes penalize individuals with different response styles in a construct-irrelevant manner (Legree et al., 2014). In all key analyses, we therefore used the Pearson scoring method, which assesses the extent to which the shape of the participant's responses – rather than the specific ratings – matches the prototypes of each construct (Legree et al., 2014).

Measures of Convergent and Discriminant Validity

After deciding which scoring method of the Inkblot Scales to use in the analyses, it was important to determine whether the Inkblot Scales (a) corresponded to an overarching theme of optimal versus poor well-being (i.e., convergent validity) and (b) measured distinct aspects of optimal and/or poor functioning (i.e., discriminant validity). To make such determinations, we obtained correlations between the Inkblot Scale scores across participants (Table 3). Consistent with the Inkblot Scales being measures of optimal versus poor functioning, all of the positive Inkblot Scales were positively correlated with each other, all of the negative Inkblot Scales were positively correlated with each other, and the positive Inkblot Scales were negatively correlated

with the negative Inkblot Scales. Very similar results were obtained when we correlated judge

rating means across the 160 ways of responding used in the Inkblot test (Table 4).

Table 3

Correlations Between the Inkblot Scale Scores

	2	3	4	5	6
1. Happiness	.78	.72	-.95	-.69	-.73
2. Friendliness	--	.53	-.77	-.84	-.56
3. Success		--	-.82	-.54	-.97
4. Misery			--	.65	.83
5. Hostility				--	.60
6. Incompetence					

Note: All *p*s < .001

Table 4

Correlations Between the Inkblot Prototype Ratings (Judge Rating Means)

	2	3	4	5	6
1. Happiness	.59	.61	-.88	-.56	-.58
2. Friendliness	--	.39	-.61	-.78	-.44
3. Success		--	-.70	-.44	-.95
4. Misery			--	.53	.70
5. Hostility				--	.50
6. Incompetence					

Note: All *p*s < .001

There was also evidence that each of the Inkblot Scales measured distinct components of

optimal functioning because the scales were not correlated with each other at unity. Also,

consistent with expectation, the Inkblot Friendliness and Inkblot Success scores were much less

strongly correlated with each other than they were with Inkblot Happiness, both for the

participant scores (Table 3) and construct prototypes (Table 4), which is consistent with the idea

of both agentic and communal routes to happiness (Horowitz et al., 2006). Moreover, each

positive Inkblot Scale exhibited a more inverse relationship with its purported opposite than with

the presumed low poles of the other constructs (see Tables 3 and 4). The former correlations were also so large that it did not make sense to retain the negative Inkblot Scales. That is, all analyses henceforth will involve the positive Inkblot Scales.

<div align="center">**Factor Analysis**</div>

As another test of convergent validity, we decided to run an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on the positive Inkblot Scales, using SAS FACTOR with orthogonal rotation. The resulting first factor had an eigenvalue of 1.99 and the second factor had an eigenvalue of 0.04, indicating that the 3 Inkblot Scales can be considered to operationalize components of a single factor, which was characterized using statistics resulting from the principle factors analysis (i.e., prior to rotation). The factor loadings of each Inkblot Scale on the factor are reported in Table 5. This general factor explained about 71.57% of the variance and 95.01% of the covariance of the Inkblot Scales. The fact that the Inkblot Scales loaded so highly onto one factor supports our reasoning concerning a general component of optimal functioning. These results also suggest that creating residual scores for the Inkblot Scales would factor out too much common variance, resulting in misleading residual scores (Lynam et al., 2006).

Table 5

Factor Loadings on General Factor (Principle Factors Extraction)

Inkblot Scale	Loading
Inkblot Happiness	.98
Inkblot Friendliness	.73
Inkblot Success	.80

<div align="center">**Relationships of Inkblot Scales with Sex and Personality**</div>

Before running the main laboratory regression analyses with the Inkblot Scales, we wanted to determine how the Inkblot Scales corresponded with sex and personality. To

determine whether there are sex differences in Inkblot scores, we used SAS ANOVA with sex as the predictor and each Inkblot Scale as an outcome. There were no significant sex differences for Inkblot Happiness, $F(1,182) = 1.23$, $p = .269$, Inkblot Friendliness, $F(1,182) = 0.01$, $p = .912$, or Inkblot Success, $F(1,182) = 0.24$, $p = .622$, indicating that the Inkblot Scales favor neither men nor women with respect to the social-cognitive elements assessed by the Inkblot method.

We next examined the relationships between the Inkblot Scales and the Big 5 personality traits using correlations between the measures (Table 6). As hypothesized, Inkblot Happiness was most strongly correlated with Extraversion (positive) and Neuroticism (negative), which are the two Big 5 traits that have been implicated in temperament-related influences on well-being (Elliot & Thrash, 2002). Inkblot Happiness was also significantly and positively correlated with Agreeableness, perhaps because agreeable individuals have more rewarding interpersonal relationships, which are also key to happiness (Myers, 2000).

Inkblot Friendliness was significantly correlated with Extraversion (positive) and Agreeableness (positive), both of which are traits implicated in social behavior (Jensen-Campbell et al., 2010). Inkblot Friendliness also correlated negatively with Neuroticism (Table 6), which has negative implications in relationship functioning (Harris & Vazire, 2016). Inkblot Friendliness was not significantly correlated with Conscientiousness or Intellect, which tend to be less relevant to relationship outcomes (Harris & Vazire, 2016).

Inkblot Success was significantly correlated with Conscientiousness (positive) and Neuroticism (negative) (Table 6), both of which are part of the meta-trait Stability and have implications for important life outcomes such as job performance (Jackson et al., 2010) and longevity (Sirois & Hirsch, 2015) through mechanisms such as self-control (Sirois & Hirsch,

2015). Consistent with Inkblot Success reflecting an agentic route to happiness, Inkblot Success was not significantly correlated with Agreeableness.

In sum, each Inkblot Scale exhibited a different pattern of correlations with the Big 5 personality traits, providing further support for discriminant validity between the scales. Moreover, and consistent with our hypotheses, none of the Inkblot Scales were significantly correlated with Intellect (Table 6), a trait that seems to be more relevant to cognitive and aesthetic realms (Christensen et al., 2019) than the social-emotional realms of interest in the current project. The lack of correlation with Intellect also suggests that reading and reasoning abilities do not play a large role in the scores produced by the Inkblot method. Finally, it is worth stating that none of the personality-Inkblot correlations were high enough to suggest redundant constructs.

Table 6

Correlations Between Inkblot Scales, Demographics, Personality, Laboratory Outcomes, and Average Daily Responses

	Predictor							
Outcome Category & Outcome	Hap.	Friend.	Suc.	Extra.	Agree.	Consc.	Neuro.	Intel.
Laboratory Outcomes								
Age	-.13	-.07	.00	-.19*	.00	.03	-.04	.04
Sex	-.08	-.01	-.04	.05	.20**	.14	.22**	-.18*
Caucasian	-.12	-.02	-.21**	.19**	.01	-.05	.09	-.09
Extra.	.34***	.41***	.13	--	.19**	.11	-.18*	-.01
Agree.	.15*	.29***	.13	.19**	--	-.06	.15*	.22**
Consc.	.13	.14	.28***	.11	-.06	--	-.07	-.12
Neuro.	-.39***	-.26***	-.35***	-.18*	.15*	-.07	--	.04
Intel.	.08	.01	.06	-.01	.22**	-.12	.04	--
SPANE B.	.45***	.30***	.42***	.23**	-.06	.18*	-.58***	-.01
Thriving	.39***	.29***	.40***	.30***	.07	.25***	-.43***	.07
Flourishing	.43***	.37***	.40***	.30***	.14	.24**	-.42***	.05
PWB	.44***	.32***	.51***	.31***	.11	.23**	-.49***	.18*
DASS Anx.	-.21**	-.11	-.19*	-.09	.22**	.01	.40***	-.01
DASS Dep.	-.32***	-.23**	-.33***	-.18*	.12	-.13	.50***	.05
RISQ Eating	-.32***	-.21**	-.23**	-.01	.09	-.06	.28***	.00
RISQ Alc.	-.13	-.14	-.30***	.21**	.00	-.12	.06	.00
RISQ Illegal	-.30***	-.28***	-.43***	-.01	-.13	-.14	.21**	.03
Prosocial P.	.22**	.23**	.20**	.19**	.45***	.11	.05	.23**
Altruism	.22**	.17*	.19**	.24**	.14	.05	-.04	.08
Giving SS	.27***	.27***	.26***	.33***	.33***	.10	-.02	.10
Receiving SS	.28***	.29***	.19**	.22**	.07	.12	-.23**	-.04
ASB	-.20**	-.20**	-.36***	.19*	-.03	-.14	.12	.00
RISQ Agg	-.18*	-.21**	-.21**	.02	-.26***	-.13	.12	.05
React. Agg.	-.24***	-.27***	-.29***	-.03	-.09	-.21**	.33***	.09

45

Table 6. *Correlations Between Inkblot Scales, Demographics, Personality, Laboratory Outcomes, and Average Daily Responses (continued)*

Outcome Category & Outcome	Hap.	Friend.	Suc.	Extra.	Agree.	Consc.	Neuro.	Intel.
Proact. Agg.	-.23**	-.26***	-.33***	-.01	-.25***	-.23**	.21**	.04
EQIS SM	.37***	.31***	.37***	.02	.05	.19**	-.50***	.09
EQIS Adapt.	.24**	.07	.23**	-.05	.13	.07	-.11	.24**
EQIS Intra.	.28***	.15*	.35***	.21**	.09	.13	-.35***	.21**
EQIS Inter.	.29***	.40***	.21**	.36***	.64***	.04	.05	.11
Life Success	.33***	.32***	.29***	.32***	.05	.31***	-.33***	-.07
CFQ	-.31***	-.21**	-.32***	-.15*	.17*	-.34***	.38***	.09
Dysfunc.	-.16*	-.12	-.28***	.26***	-.10	-.29***	.02	-.07
Crimes	-.10	-.06	-.15*	.07	-.09	-.01	.01	-.12
Indicators	-.25***	-.24**	-.27***	-.04	.06	-.26***	.25***	.06
Daily Outcomes								
Pos. Events	.20*	.20*	.20*	.38***	.28**	.19*	-.19*	.02
Prov. Events	-.26**	-.29**	-.29**	.01	.01	.00	.31***	.11
Str. Events	-.08	-.11	-.05	.05	.15	-.03	.18*	.19*
Aff. Events	.10	.13	.08	.26**	.27**	.03	-.10	.04
Neg. Events	-.19*	-.23**	-.26**	.01	.10	.02	.37***	.18*
Hap. P.	.31***	.24**	.34***	.31***	.07	.09	-.34***	-.16
Mis. P.	-.27**	-.27**	-.26**	-.03	-.07	.00	.34***	.20*
Friend. P.	.33***	.33***	.33***	.34***	.21*	.13	-.21*	-.09
Host. P.	-.15	-.18*	-.27**	-.02	-.14	.10	.32***	.10
Success. P.	.31***	.27**	.38***	.33***	.10	.23*	-.30***	-.08
Incomp. P.	-.21*	-.22*	-.32***	-.09	-.11	-.07	.32***	.07
App. Mot.	.37***	.30***	.42***	.19*	.02	.15	-.30***	-.17
Prosoc. Mot.	.17	.13	.29**	.00	.25**	.09	-.16	-.04
Cyber. S.-Eff.	.29**	.24**	.37***	.15	.16	.08	-.29**	-.12
Cyber. Suc.	.26**	.22*	.35***	.20*	.07	.22*	-.32***	-.15

46

Table 6. *Correlations Between Inkblot Scales, Demographics, Personality, Laboratory Outcomes, and Average Daily Responses (continued)*

Outcome Category & Outcome	Hap.	Friend.	Suc.	Extra.	Agree.	Consc.	Neuro.	Intel.
				Predictor				
Threat Cog.	-.27**	-.24**	-.33***	-.04	.01	-.04	.36***	.16
Reward Cog.	.22*	.20*	.20*	.35***	.15	.03	-.22*	-.07
Anti. Feel.	-.28**	-.20*	-.30***	-.08	-.03	.06	.41***	.18*
Prosoc. Feel.	.31***	.30***	.35***	.36***	.26**	.18	-.16	-.04
PA	.29**	.27**	.33***	.40***	.11	.14	-.30***	-.14
NA	-.26**	-.22*	-.34***	-.03	.01	-.07	.44***	.19*
PWB Aut.	.19*	.03	.17	.18*	.14	-.01	-.12	.07
PWB Env. Mast.	.22*	.16	.23*	.23*	.14	.08	-.21*	.02
PWB Pers. Gro.	.37***	.27**	.41***	.33***	.20*	.21*	-.20*	-.03
PWB Pos. Rel.	.26**	.23*	.26**	.15	.15	.07	-.25**	-.07
PWB Purp.	.28**	.25**	.39***	.29**	.06	.18*	-.28**	-.11
PWB Self Acc.	.33***	.27**	.36***	.26**	.02	.13	-.37***	-.13
PWB Total	.33***	.25**	.37***	.29**	.13	.13	-.30***	-.06
Flourishing	.31***	.28**	.37***	.28**	.12	.14	-.34***	-.12
App. Coping	.24**	.13	.31***	.16	.24**	.09	-.19*	.09
Avoid. Coping	-.17	-.15	-.33***	.01	-.21*	-.07	.15	-.04
Prosoc. Bhv.	-.05	-.01	.03	.20*	.18*	.09	-.06	-.06
Anti. Bhv.	-.34***	-.32***	-.38***	.08	-.06	-.08	.26**	.15
Incomp. Bhv.	-.18*	-.22*	-.28**	-.01	.06	-.25**	.24**	.24**
Risky Bhv.	-.09	-.11	-.30***	.05	-.06	-.04	.12	.10

47

Table 6. *Correlations Between Inkblot Scales, Demographics, Personality, Laboratory Outcomes, and Average Daily Responses (continued)*

Note: Variables in bold font were used in the vector analysis and horizontal sign test. Daily Outcomes consist of participant average scores across daily surveys. Age = age in years; Sex = higher for females; Caucasian = higher for Caucasian; Extra. = Extraversion, Agree. = Agreeableness; Consc. = Conscientiousness; Neuro. = Neuroticism; Intel. = Intellect; SPANE B. = SPANE Balance; PWB = Psychological Well-Being; DASS Anx. = DASS Anxiety; DASS Dep. = DASS Depression; RISQ Eating = RISQ Impulsive Eating; RISQ Alc. = RISQ Heavy Alcohol Use; RISQ Illegal = RISQ Illegal Behavior; Prosocial P. = Prosocial Personality; Altruism = Self-Reported Altruism; Giving SS = Giving Emotional Social Support; Receiving SS = Receiving Emotional Social Support; ASB = Antisocial Behavior; RISQ Agg. = RISQ Aggression; React. Agg. = Reactive Aggression; Proact. Agg. = Proactive Aggression; EQIS SM = Stress Management; EQIS Adapt = Adaptability; EQIS Intra = Intrapersonal Intelligence; EQIS Inter = Interpersonal Intelligence; Life Success = Life Domain Success; CFQ = Cognitive Failures Questionnaire; Dysfunc. = Dysfunctional Impulsivity; Crimes = Crimes and Misdemeanors; Indicators = Indicators of Incompetence; Pos. Events = Positive Events; Prov. Events = Provocative Events; Str. Events = Stressful Events; Aff. Events = Affiliative Events; Neg. Events = Negative Events; Hap. P. = Happy Personality; Mis. P. = Miserable Personality; Friend. P. = Friendly Personality; Host. P. = Hostile Personality; Success. P. = Successful Personality; Incomp. P. = Incompetent Personality; App. Mot. = Approach versus Avoidance Motivation; Prosoc. Mot. = Prosocial over Antisocial Motivation; Cyber. S.-Eff. = Cybernetic Self-Efficacy; Cyber. Success = Cybernetic Goal Success; Threat Cog. = Threat Appraisal; Reward Cognition = Reward Appraisal; Anti. Feel. = Antisocial Feeling; Prosoc. Feel. = Prosocial Feeling; PA = Positive Affect; NA = Negative Affect; PWB Aut. = Autonomy; PWB Env. Mast. = Environmental Mastery; PWB Pers. Gro. = Personal Growth; PWB Pos. Rel. = Positive Relations; PWB Purp. = Purpose in Life; PWB Self Acc. = Self Acceptance; App. Coping = Approach Coping; Avoid. Coping = Avoidance Coping; Prosoc. Bhv. = Prosocial Behavior; Ant. Bhv. = Antisocial Behavior; Incomp. Bhv. = Incompetent Behavior; Risky Bhv. = Risky Behavior; * = p < .05, ** = p < .01, *** = < .001

Relations Between Inkblot Scales and Laboratory Outcomes

There were many significant correlations between the Inkblot Scales and laboratory outcomes (Table 6), so we decided to run regressions with each Inkblot Scale as a single predictor of all of the laboratory outcomes. For example, we were interested in whether Inkblot Happiness predicted measures of happiness and distress, but we were also interested in whether Inkblot Friendliness and Inkblot Success predicted the same measures of happiness and distress. There was no centering of variables in the simple regressions.

As hypothesized, Inkblot Happiness was significantly and positively related to each of the measures of positive affect and well-being (Table 7). Inkblot Happiness was also a significant (negative) predictor of most of the measures of distress, which collectively focused on experiential, physiological, and behavioral outcomes thought to follow from high levels of negative affect (Carver & White, 1994). The only outcome that was not significantly predicted by Inkblot Happiness was Heavy Alcohol Use (Table 7). In hindsight, heavy alcohol use is probably not a good marker of distress because, while alcohol use has been implicated in coping with negative emotions (e.g., Settles et al., 2012), alcohol consumption can also be done within convivial social settings.

Table 7

Results of Regressions with Inkblot Happiness as a Predictor of Happiness and Distress Laboratory Outcomes

Category & Outcome	*b*	95% CI	β	*t*	*p*
Happiness					
SPANE B.	4.55	3.23, 5.87	.45	6.81	<.001
Thriving	2.14	1.40, 2.89	.39	5.71	<.001
Flourishing	3.14	2.16, 4.12	.43	6.34	<.001
PWB	2.29	1.60, 2.97	.44	6.59	<.001
Distress					
DASS Anx.	-0.92	-1.56, -0.29	-.21	-2.86	.005
DASS Dep.	-1.64	-2.37, -0.92	-.32	-4.49	<.001
RISQ Eating	-4.82	-6.87, -2.76	-.32	-4.63	<.001
RISQ Alcohol	-1.78	-3.84, 0.28	-.13	-1.70	.091
RISQ Illegal	-1.43	-2.09, -0.78	-.30	-4.32	<.001

Note: SPANE B. = Affect Balance; PWB = Psychological Well-Being; DASS Anx. = Anxiety; DASS Dep. = Depression; RISQ Eating = Impulsive Eating; RISQ Alcohol = Heavy Alcohol Use; RISQ Illegal = Illegal Behavior

Consistent with our hypotheses that Inkblot Friendliness would predict measures of sociability and prosocial behavior, Inkblot Friendliness was significantly predictive of measures of (pro)social behavior (Table 8). Moreover, Inkblot Friendliness was a significant negative predictor of all of the antisocial and aggressive behaviors we measured (Table 8), which is what we had predicted. Inkblot Friendliness was particularly related to social support outcomes, including the reception of social support, indicating that Inkblot Friendliness captures skills and processes that are beneficial for obtaining social resources (Feeney & Collins, 2015).

Table 8

Results of Regressions with Inkblot Friendliness as a Predictor of (Pro)social and Antisocial Laboratory Outcomes

Category & Outcome	*b*	95% CI	β	*t*	*p*
(Pro)social					
Prosocial P.	1.26	0.49, 2.03	.23	3.25	.001
Altruism	0.77	0.11, 1.42	.17	2.31	.022
Giving SS	1.34	0.64, 2.04	.27	3.76	<.001
Receiving SS	1.72	0.88, 2.55	.29	4.07	<.001
Antisocial					
ASB	-0.21	-0.36, -0.06	-.20	-2.71	.007
RISQ Agg.	-1.01	-1.68, -0.34	-.21	-2.97	.003
Reactive	-0.71	-1.08, -0.34	-.27	-3.82	<.001
Proactive	-0.32	-0.50, -0.14	-.26	-3.57	<.001

Note: Prosocial P. = Prosocial Personality; Giving SS = Giving Social Support; Receiving SS = Receiving Social Support; ASB = Antisocial Behavior; RISQ Agg. = Aggressive Behavior; Reactive = Reactive Aggression; Proactive = Proactive Aggression

Similar to Inkblot Happiness and Inkblot Friendliness, Inkblot Success was a strong predictor of all of its hypothesized outcomes, including higher life domain success and fewer indicators of incompetence and dysfunction (Table 9). Of particular note, Inkblot Success significantly predicted all of the of the EQ-i:S subscales, but it was more highly predictive of intrapersonal intelligence – which is a self-focused and therefore agentic component of emotional intelligence – than it was predictive of interpersonal intelligence – which includes several items related to empathy and therefore communion.

Table 9

Results of Regressions with Inkblot Success as a Predictor of Success and Incompetence
Laboratory Outcomes

Category & Outcome	*b*	95% CI	β	*t*	*p*
Success					
EQIS Stress Mgt.	1.90	1.20, 2.61	.37	5.32	<.001
EQIS Adaptability	0.92	0.36, 1.48	.23	3.23	.002
EQIS Intra.	1.78	1.08, 2.48	.35	5.01	<.001
EQIS Inter.	0.77	0.25, 1.30	.21	2.92	.004
Life Success	1.85	0.94, 2.76	.29	4.03	<.001
Incompetence					
Cog. Failures	-1.31	-.188, -0.74	-.32	-4.56	<.001
Dysfunctional	-0.40	-0.61, -0.20	-.28	-3.88	<.001
Crimes	-0.68	-1.31, -0.04	-.15	-2.10	.037
Indicators	-0.87	-1.33, -0.41	-.27	-3.75	<.001

Note: EQIS Stress Mgt. = Stress Management; EQIS Intra. = Intrapersonal Functioning; EQIS
Inter. = Interpersonal Functioning; Life Success = Life Domain Success; Cog. Failures =
Cognitive Failures; Dysfunctional = Dysfunctional Impulsivity; Crimes = Crimes and
Misdemeanors; Indicators = Indicators of Incompetence

There were quite a few correlations from one Inkblot measure to outcomes that had

initially been selected for another Inkblot measure (Tables 10-15). Many of these relationships

were expected; for example, all of the Inkblot Scales, not just Happiness, significantly predicted

measures of well-being (Tables 10-11), as these were all designed to tap elements of optimal

functioning. Moreover, Inkblot Success significantly and negatively predicted heavy alcohol use

(Table 11), indicating that successful people engage in fewer behaviors that produce dysfunction.

As another example, there was a negative relationship between Inkblot Happiness and aggression

(Table 12), which can occur for unhappy externalized reasons (Chen et al., 2012). Even the

relationships between Inkblot Success and prosocial behavior (Table 13) highlight the

importance of social behaviors in life success (Feeney & Collins, 2015). Additionally, Inkblot

Happiness should predict Stress Management (Table 14) as the construct involves mitigating

distress, and Inkblot Friendliness should predict Interpersonal Intelligence as it relates to empathy (Table 15).

Table 10

Results of Regressions with Inkblot Friendliness as a Predictor of Happiness and Distress Laboratory Outcomes

Category & Outcome	*b*	95% CI	β	*t*	*p*
Happiness					
SPANE B	2.86	1.53, 4.18	.30	4.25	<.001
Thriving	1.49	0.77, 2.22	.29	4.06	<.001
Flourishing	2.61	1.66, 2.55	.37	5.45	<.001
PWB	1.58	0.91, 2.26	.32	4.61	<.001
Distress					
DASS Anx.	-0.45	-1.06, 0.16	-.11	-1.46	.146
DASS Dep.	-1.14	-1.84, -0.45	-.23	-3.24	.001
RISQ Eating	-2.96	-4.96, -0.97	-.21	-2.93	.004
RISQ Alcohol	-1.86	-3.79, 0.08	-.14	-1.89	.060
RISQ Illegal	-1.23	-1.85, -0.61	-.28	-3.91	<.001

Note: SPANE B. = Affect Balance; PWB = Psychological Well-Being; DASS Anx. = Anxiety; DASS Dep. = Depression; RISQ Eating = Impulsive Eating; RISQ Alcohol = Heavy Alcohol Use; RISQ Illegal = Illegal Behavior

Table 11

Results of Regressions with Inkblot Success as a Predictor of Happiness and Distress Laboratory Outcomes

Category & Outcome	b	95% CI	β	t	p
Happiness					
SPANE B	3.52	2.43, 4.62	.42	6.33	<.001
Thriving	1.79	1.18, 2.40	.40	5.83	<.001
Flourishing	2.45	1.63, 3.26	.40	5.94	<.001
PWB	2.18	1.64, 2.72	.51	7.99	<.001
Distress					
DASS Anx.	-0.68	-1.20, -0.16	-.19	-2.57	.011
DASS Dep.	-1.39	-1.98, -0.80	-.33	-4.66	<.001
RISQ Eating	-2.85	-4.59, -1.13	-.23	-3.25	.001
RISQ Alcohol	-3.53	-5.16, -1.91	-.30	-4.29	<.001
RISQ Illegal	-1.65	-2.16, -1.14	-.43	-6.40	<.001

Note: SPANE B. = Affect Balance; PWB = Psychological Well-Being; DASS Anx. = Anxiety; DASS Dep. = Depression; RISQ Eating = Impulsive Eating; RISQ Alcohol = Heavy Alcohol Use; RISQ Illegal = Illegal Behavior

Table 12

Results of Regressions with Inkblot Happiness as a Predictor of Prosocial and Antisocial Laboratory Outcomes

Category & Outcome	b	95% CI	β	t	p
Prosocial					
Prosocial P	1.24	0.42, 2.06	.22	2.99	.003
Altruism	1.06	0.37, 1.75	.22	3.05	.003
Giving SS	1.41	0.66, 2.15	.27	3.72	<.001
Receiving SS	1.76	0.87, 2.65	.28	3.92	<.001
Antisocial					
ASB	-0.23	-0.39, -0.06	-.20	-2.76	.006
RISQ Agg.	-0.90	-1.61, -0.18	-.18	-2.47	.014
Reactive	-0.68	-1.07, -0.28	-.24	-3.40	<.001
Proactive	-0.31	-0.50, -0.12	-.23	-3.17	.002

Note: Prosocial P = Prosocial Personality; Giving SS = Giving Social Support; Receiving SS = Receiving Social Support; ASB = Antisocial Behavior; RISQ Agg. = Aggressive Behavior; Reactive = Reactive Aggression; Proactive = Proactive Aggression

Table 13

Results of Regressions with Inkblot Success as a Predictor of (Pro)social and Antisocial
Laboratory Outcomes

Category & Outcome	*b*	95% CI	β	*t*	*p*
(Pro)social					
Prosocial P.	0.92	0.24, 1.59	.20	2.68	.008
Altruism	0.75	0.18, 1.32	.19	2.61	.010
Giving SS	1.11	0.50, 1.73	.26	3.57	<.001
Receiving SS	0.97	0.23, 1.71	.19	2.57	.011
Antisocial					
ASB	-0.34	-0.47, -0.21	-.36	-5.27	<.001
RISQ Agg.	-0.85	-1.43, -0.26	-.21	-2.86	.005
Reactive	-0.66	-0.98, -0.34	-.29	-4.10	<.001
Proactive	-0.36	-0.51, -0.21	-.33	-4.69	<.001

Note: Prosocial P. = Prosocial Personality; Giving SS = Giving Social Support; Receiving SS = Receiving Social Support; ASB = Antisocial Behavior; RISQ Agg. = Aggressive Behavior; Reactive = Reactive Aggression; Proactive = Proactive Aggression

Table 14

Results of Regressions with Inkblot Happiness as a Predictor of Success and Incompetence
Laboratory Outcomes

Category & Outcome	*b*	95% CI	β	*t*	*p*
Success					
EQIS Stress Mgt.	2.37	1.51, 3.22	.37	5.44	<.001
EQIS Adaptability	1.14	0.46, 1.82	.24	3.29	.001
EQIS Intra.	1.74	0.86, 2.61	.28	3.91	<.001
EQIS Inter.	1.29	0.67, 1.92	.29	4.10	<.001
Life Success	2.63	1.55, 3.72	.33	4.77	<.001
Incompetence					
Cog. Failures	-1.54	-2.23, -0.84	-.31	-4.37	<.001
Dysfunctional	-0.28	-0.54, -0.03	-.16	-2.19	.030
Crimes	-0.54	-1.13, 0.24	-.10	-1.37	.172
Indicators	-0.99	-1.55, -0.43	-.25	-3.47	<.001

Note: EQIS Stress Mgt. = Stress Management; EQIS Intra. = Intrapersonal Functioning; EQIS Inter. = Interpersonal Functioning; Life Success = Life Domain Success; Cog. Failures = Cognitive Failures; Dysfunctional = Dysfunctional Impulsivity; Crimes = Crimes and Misdemeanors; Indicators = Indicators of Incompetence

Table 15

Results of Regressions with Inkblot Friendliness as a Predictor of Success and Incompetence Laboratory Outcomes

Category & Outcome	*b*	95% CI	β	*t*	*p*
Success					
EQIS Stress Mgt.	1.83	1.00, 2.65	.31	4.35	<.001
EQIS Adaptability	0.33	-0.33, 0.99	.07	1.00	.321
EQIS Intra.	0.86	0.01, 1.71	.15	1.99	.048
EQIS Inter.	1.67	1.11, 2.23	.40	5.86	<.001
Life Success	2.37	1.34, 3.40	.32	4.53	<.001
Incompetence					
Cog. Failures	-0.99	-1.66, -0.32	-.21	-2.90	.004
Dysfunctional	-0.20	-0.44, 0.05	-.12	-1.61	.110
Crimes	-0.32	-1.05, 0.42	-.06	-0.85	.397
Indicators	-0.90	-1.43, -0.37	-.24	-3.36	.001

Note: EQIS Stress Mgt. = Stress Management; EQIS Intra. = Intrapersonal Functioning; EQIS Inter. = Interpersonal Functioning; Life Success = Life Domain Success; Cog. Failures = Cognitive Failures; Dysfunctional = Dysfunctional Impulsivity; Crimes = Crimes and Misdemeanors; Indicators = Indicators of Incompetence

While the Inkblot Scales predicted outcomes outside of their respective constructs, the simple regressions also provided some evidence of discriminant validity between the measures. For instance, Inkblot Success was the only significant predictor of heavy alcohol use (Tables 7, 10-11) and criminal behavior (Tables 9, 14-15). Moreover, Inkblot Friendliness was more strongly predictive of Interpersonal Intelligence than were the other Inkblot Scales (Tables 9, 14-15) and it was the only Inkblot Scale that did not significantly predict anxiety (Tables 7, 10-11), nor would one expect it to. Finally, Inkblot Happiness was a noticeably stronger predictor of happiness than was Friendliness, as well as a much stronger predictor of impulsive eating than was Success (Tables 7, 10-11).

Controlling for Personality

There were a number of significant relationships between the Big 5 personality traits with the other laboratory and daily measures (Table 6). It was therefore worthwhile to test whether

our scales predicted their respective outcomes beyond personality via multiple regressions, with both an Inkblot Scale and all Big 5 traits as predictors, using SAS REG. None of the predictor variables were centered in the multiple regressions. In describing these results, we will focus on the laboratory outcomes most relevant to each Inkblot Scale (e.g., well-being and daily happiness/misery for Inkblot Happiness), though we did decide to run regressions for each Inkblot Scale in predicting average levels of daily well-being.

After controlling for personality, the relationships between Inkblot Happiness and self-reported well-being in the laboratory remained significant. Inkblot Happiness was also a significant negative predictor of the daily Miserable Personality measure. However, Happiness was no longer a significant predictor of Daily Happiness (Personality), which was better predicted by Neuroticism and Extraversion (Table 16).

Table 16

Results of Multiple Regressions with Inkblot Happiness and the Big 5 Personality Traits as Predictors of Laboratory and Daily Outcomes

Outcome & Predictor	*b*	β	*t*	*p*
Thriving				
Inkblot Happiness	0.90	.16	2.27	.025
Extraversion	0.10	.15	2.25	.025
Agreeableness	0.05	.06	0.88	.380
Conscientiousness	0.15	.21	3.29	.001
Neuroticism	-0.26	-.34	-4.84	<.001
Intellect	0.07	.08	1.31	.193
Flourishing				
Inkblot Happiness	1.55	.21	2.91	.004
Extraversion	0.11	.12	1.82	.070
Agreeableness	0.16	.14	2.02	.045
Conscientiousness	0.18	.19	2.97	.003
Neuroticism	-0.33	-.32	-4.63	<.001
Intellect	0.05	.04	0.69	.489
PWB				
Inkblot Happiness	0.95	.18	2.69	.008
Extraversion	0.09	.14	2.29	.023

Table 16. *Results of Multiple Regressions with Inkblot Happiness and the Big 5 Personality Traits as Predictors of Laboratory and Daily Outcomes (continued)*

Outcome & Predictor	*b*	β	*t*	*p*
Agreeableness	0.07	.08	1.28	.203
Conscientiousness	0.13	.19	3.30	.001
Neuroticism	-0.29	-.40	-6.15	<.001
Intellect	0.14	.19	3.15	.002
Daily Happy P.				
Inkblot Happiness	0.98	.15	1.58	.117
Extraversion	0.15	.20	2.29	.024
Agreeableness	0.08	.07	0.84	.402
Conscientiousness	0.02	.02	0.22	.827
Neuroticism	-0.20	-.23	-2.49	.014
Intellect	-0.15	-.16	-1.90	.059
Daily Miserable P.				
Inkblot Happiness	-1.04	-.20	-2.05	.042
Extraversion	0.06	.10	1.12	.266
Agreeableness	-0.11	-.13	-1.42	.158
Conscientiousness	0.04	.06	0.69	.494
Neuroticism	0.19	.27	2.92	.004
Intellect	0.17	.23	2.64	.010
Daily Flourishing				
Inkblot Happiness	1.43	.13	1.39	.168
Extraversion	0.21	.16	1.85	.066
Agreeableness	0.21	.12	1.34	.182
Conscientiousness	0.11	.08	0.93	.355
Neuroticism	-0.36	-.24	-2.68	.008
Intellect	-0.19	-.13	-1.48	.142
Daily PWB				
Inkblot Happiness	1.47	.18	1.84	.068
Extraversion	0.17	.17	1.95	.054
Agreeableness	0.14	.11	1.21	.227
Conscientiousness	0.08	.07	0.86	.393
Neuroticism	-0.21	-.19	-2.04	.044
Intellect	-0.08	-.07	-0.79	.431

Note: PWB = Psychological Well-Being; Happy P. = Happy Personality; Miserable P. = Miserable Personality

In contrast to Inkblot Happiness, Inkblot Friendliness did not significantly predict any of the laboratory (pro)social outcomes after controlling for personality, which were instead more strongly predicted by Extraversion, Agreeableness, and/or Neuroticism (Table 17). However,

Inkblot Friendliness predicted Receiving Social Support after controlling for personality (Table

17), indicating that Inkblot Friendliness may reflect a unique ability to obtain social resources

rather than a tendency toward prosocial behavior per se.

Table 17

Results of Multiple Regressions with Inkblot Friendliness and the Big 5 Personality Traits as Predictors of Laboratory and Daily Outcomes

Outcome & Predictor	b	β	t	p
Prosocial P.				
Inkblot Friendliness	0.45	.08	1.10	.275
Extraversion	0.05	.08	1.07	.286
Agreeableness	0.35	.37	5.17	<.001
Conscientiousness	0.10	.13	1.99	.048
Neuroticism	0.03	.04	0.53	.597
Intellect	0.13	.16	2.32	.021
Altruism				
Inkblot Friendliness	0.30	.07	0.78	.436
Extraversion	0.11	.19	2.41	.017
Agreeableness	0.05	.07	0.82	.416
Conscientiousness	0.02	.03	0.46	.646
Neuroticism	0.00	.01	0.07	.947
Intellect	0.05	.07	0.89	.374
Giving SS				
Inkblot Friendliness	0.45	.09	1.14	.257
Extraversion	0.15	.23	3.13	.002
Agreeableness	0.22	.25	3.37	<.001
Conscientiousness	0.06	.08	1.19	.237
Neuroticism	0.01	.01	0.11	.909
Intellect	0.04	.06	0.80	.424
Receiving SS				
Inkblot Friendliness	1.02	.19	2.25	.026
Extraversion	0.07	.10	1.26	.210
Agreeableness	0.04	.04	0.49	.627
Conscientiousness	0.06	.07	0.99	.325
Neuroticism	-.147	-.17	-2.21	.029
Intellect	-0.04	-.04	-0.54	.590
Daily Friendly P.				
Inkblot Friendliness	0.86	.15	1.53	.128
Extraversion	0.15	.22	2.38	.019
Agreeableness	0.17	.18	1.94	.055
Conscientiousness	0.06	.07	0.81	.417

Table 17. *Results of Multiple Regressions with Inkblot Friendliness and the Big 5 Personality Traits as Predictors of Laboratory and Daily Outcomes (continued)*

Outcome & Predictor	*b*	β	*t*	*p*
Neuroticism	-0.10	-.12	-1.44	.154
Intellect	-0.10	-.12	-1.43	.155
Daily Hostile P.				
Inkblot Friendliness	-0.59	-.14	-1.37	.174
Extraversion	0.06	.11	1.24	.218
Agreeableness	-0.12	-.16	-1.70	.092
Conscientiousness	0.08	.13	1.53	.129
Neuroticism	0.20	.31	3.56	<.001
Intellect	0.08	.13	1.44	.151
Daily Flourishing				
Inkblot Friendliness	1.01	.10	1.03	.307
Extraversion	0.20	.16	1.76	.082
Agreeableness	0.19	.11	1.20	.234
Conscientiousness	0.12	.08	0.99	.323
Neuroticism	-0.40	.27	-3.15	.002
Intellect	-0.18	-.12	-1.38	.171
Daily PWB				
Inkblot Friendliness	0.48	.06	0.62	.535
Extraversion	0.18	.19	2.05	.043
Agreeableness	0.15	.11	1.23	.222
Conscientiousness	0.10	.09	1.09	.279
Neuroticism	-0.27	-.24	-2.71	.008
Intellect	-0.07	-.06	-0.67	.507

Note: Prosocial P. = Prosocial Personality; Giving SS = Giving Social Support; Receiving SS = Receiving Social Support; Friendly P. = Friendly Personality; Hostile P. = Hostile Personality; Anti. Feel. = Antisocial Feeling; Pro. Feel. = Prosocial Feeling

Inkblot Success continued to significantly predict Stress Management, Adaptability, and Intrapersonal Intelligence, but not Interpersonal Intelligence after controlling for personality (Table 18). Interpersonal Intelligence was better explained by the social traits of Extraversion and Agreeableness (Jensen-Campbell et al., 2010), which supports the idea that Inkblot Success reflects a more agentic and less communal component of optimal functioning. Moreover, Inkblot Success was significantly predictive of both Daily Successful Personality (positive) and Incompetent Personality (negative) after controlling for the Big 5 traits (Table 18), providing

evidence for Inkblot Success as a unique predictor of optimal functioning beyond typical

assessments of personality.

Table 18

Results of Multiple Regressions with Inkblot Success and the Big 5 Personality Traits as Predictors of Laboratory and Daily Outcomes

Outcome & Predictor	b	β	t	p
EQIS Stress Mgt.				
Inkblot Success	0.82	.16	2.25	.026
Extraversion	-0.10	-.13	-1.94	.054
Agreeableness	0.11	.11	1.62	.107
Conscientiousness	0.13	.15	2.31	.022
Neuroticism	-0.42	-.48	-6.97	<.001
Intellect	0.08	.09	1.42	.157
EQIS Adaptability				
Inkblot Success	0.68	.17	2.15	.033
Extraversion	-0.07	-.12	-1.57	.119
Agreeableness	0.08	.10	1.27	.205
Conscientiousness	0.04	.06	0.87	.386
Neuroticism	-0.06	-.09	-1.19	.234
Intellect	0.15	.22	2.95	.004
EQIS Intra.				
Inkblot Success	1.04	.20	2.74	.007
Extraversion	0.09	.12	1.78	.076
Agreeableness	0.04	.04	0.50	.616
Conscientiousness	0.06	.07	1.01	.316
Neuroticism	-0.23	-.26	-3.63	<.001
Intellect	0.19	.21	3.14	.002
EQIS Inter.				
Inkblot Success	0.45	.12	1.98	.050
Extraversion	0.13	.24	4.13	<.001
Agreeableness	0.42	.58	9.82	<.001
Conscientiousness	0.01	.02	0.36	.721
Neuroticism	0.03	.05	0.89	.376
Intellect	-0.01	-.02	-0.35	.726
Daily Success. P.				
Inkblot Success	1.23	.26	2.84	.005
Extraversion	0.18	.26	3.08	.003
Agreeableness	0.06	.06	0.74	.460
Conscientiousness	0.09	.11	1.27	.208
Neuroticism	-0.11	-.14	-1.54	.125
Intellect	-0.07	-.09	-1.04	.303

Table 18. *Results of Multiple Regressions with Inkblot Success and the Big 5 Personality Traits as Predictors of Laboratory and Daily Outcomes (continued)*

Outcome & Predictor	*b*	β	*t*	*p*
Daily Incomp. P.				
Inkblot Success	-0.92	-.22	-2.26	.026
Extraversion	-0.00	.00	-0.01	.992
Agreeableness	-0.11	-.12	-1.34	.184
Conscientiousness	0.01	.02	0.16	.870
Neuroticism	0.17	.24	2.50	.014
Intellect	0.07	.09	1.04	.300
Daily Flourishing				
Inkblot Success	2.19	.27	2.84	.005
Extraversion	0.25	.20	2.38	.019
Agreeableness	0.17	.10	1.13	.261
Conscientiousness	0.02	.01	0.16	.874
Neuroticism	-0.28	-.19	-2.12	.036
Intellect	-0.21	-.14	-1.66	.099
Daily PWB				
Inkblot Success	1.79	.29	3.01	.003
Extraversion	0.21	.22	2.58	.011
Agreeableness	0.12	.09	1.03	.305
Conscientiousness	0.01	.01	0.12	.908
Neuroticism	-0.16	-.14	-1.56	.121
Intellect	-0.09	-.08	-0.95	.346

Note: EQIS Stress Mgt. = Stress Management; EQIS Intra = Intrapersonal Functioning; EQIS Inter = Interpersonal Functioning; Success. P. = Successful Personality; Incomp. P. = Incompetent Personality; PWB = Psychological Well-Being

Because each Inkblot Scale was developed to measure a component of well-being/optimal functioning, we also ran multiple regressions to determine if each of the Inkblot Scales could predict the average levels of well-being across daily reports beyond the Big 5 traits. Inkblot Happiness (Table 16) and Inkblot Friendliness (Table 17) did not significantly predict either Daily Flourishing or Daily PWB beyond the Big 5 personality traits (especially with Neuroticism as a predictor). However, Inkblot Success was a significant predictor of both Daily Flourishing and Daily PWB after controlling for personality (Table 18), indicating that Inkblot Success may be a particularly unique addition to the personality field.

Pattern-Based Analyses of Scale Validity

We sought to evaluate the convergent and discriminant validity of the Inkblot Scales as summarized by specialized techniques we developed for the current research. One technique, termed the vector analysis, seeks to determine whether each Inkblot Scale correlated with outcomes (across outcomes) in a manner consistent with the construct of interest. The other technique, termed the horizontal sign test, seeks to evaluate whether the strongest Inkblot predictor of particular outcomes (zero-order correlation) was the Inkblot that one would think would exhibit the strongest relationship with those outcomes.

Vector Analysis

We sought to examine the convergent validity of the Inkblot Scales in terms of whether they predicted the outcomes to the extent (and direction) that their respective constructs should, intuitively, predict said outcomes. For example, Inkblot Success should be a strong positive predictor of goal success, a relatively weak predictor of prosocial behavior, and a strong negative predictor of incompetent behavior. To accomplish such comparisons, we first selected which outcomes should be used or excluded as part of the general analysis set. We decided to exclude all of the demographic variables, which were not meant to tap the constructs of interest. We also excluded the Daily PWB total score because it was redundant with the PWB subscales. Otherwise, we included most of the outcomes that we measured in both the laboratory and daily portions of the studies. In total, the outcome space consisted of 65 variables and these variables are indicated in bold font in Table 6.

Prior to investigating actual correlations, we began by creating an expected pattern of correlations that would be consistent with the idea that the particular Inkblot is capturing what it intends to measure. For each of the 65 outcomes, and for each construct, my advisor and I

63

independently provided ratings for the expected correlation (-6 to +.6 scale, with 0 as a midpoint and .1 units between each rating) between the Inkblot Scale of interest and the particular outcome, if the Inkblot was actually capturing the quality in question. Our interrater agreement was quite high for Inkblot Happiness, $r = .92$, Inkblot Friendliness, $r = .95$, and Inkblot Success, $r = .91$, so we averaged our ratings to create a single value for the expected Inkblot-outcome correlation. The pattern of these estimated correlations constitutes the "expected" vector across the outcome space (e.g., the expected vector for Inkblot Happiness represents the hypothesized pattern of correlations between Inkblot Happiness and the outcomes that were selected).

We then correlated the expected pattern of correlations, for a given Inkblot construct, with the actual pattern of correlations for that Inkblot construct. These correlations were very high for Inkblot Happiness, $r = .91$, $p < .001$, Inkblot Friendliness, $r = .83$, $p < .001$, and Inkblot Success, $r = .92$, $p < .001$. That the correlations are so high suggests that all of the Inkblots measure what they were expected to measure.

Horizontal Sign Test

A recurrent question has been whether each Inkblot Scale predicts the outcomes that it is supposed to predict better than the other two Inkblot Scales. To provide a broad answer to this question, we created a sign test method that will count how many times each Inkblot Scale predicted its hypothesized outcomes better than the other Inkblot Scales and whether this number was greater than one would expect by chance. We began by making decisions concerning which Inkblot Scale we expected to correlate most highly with each outcome (e.g., we expected Extraversion to be most highly correlated with Happiness and we expected Agreeableness to be most highly correlated with Friendliness). Next, we examined a matrix of the actual (observed)

correlations between the Inkblot Scales (columns) and the same 65 outcomes (rows) that we selected for the vector analysis.

For each outcome, we first identified the Inkblot Scale that displayed the largest-magnitude absolute value correlation. Then, we labeled the row as 1 if the largest magnitude correlation was the expected one, and we labeled the row as 0 if this was not the case. For example, we expected Extraversion to be most strongly correlated with Happiness, but instead it was most strongly correlated with Friendliness, so we counted this row/outcome as 0. As another example, we expected Agreeableness to be most strongly correlated with Friendliness and this did occur, so we counted this row/outcome as 1.

As a final step, we reasoned that the probability of an outcome being most strongly predicted by any given Inkblot Scale due to random chance is 1/3 or 33.33% because there were 3 different Inkblot Scales that could predict a given outcome. We therefore tested whether the hit rate we observed from adding all of the signs (i.e., 47.69%) was significantly higher than the expected hit rate, using a one-tailed χ^2 test. The observed hit rate was greater than chance, $\chi^2(1,65) = 7.39$, $p = .007$, which provided some, albeit modest, support for the idea that each Inkblot Scale may be capturing a distinct component of functioning.

Daily Diary Analyses

We were also interested in how the Inkblot Scales predicted daily events, thoughts, feelings, and behaviors, as well as the relationships between events, affect, and well-being. We answered these questions using a series of multilevel models, described in the following sections.

Level 2 Main Effects

We ran a series of multilevel models to explore the level 2 main effects of the Inkblot scales on various events and experiences. The level 2 predictors were not centered in the level 2

models. We reasoned that the tendencies captured by the Inkblot Scales might predispose individuals to certain types of life events and, consistent with this idea, all three Inkblot Scales exhibited significant relationships with the event measures. None of the Inkblot measures predicted stressful events or affiliative events (Table 19), perhaps because these event types were very common. However, remaining correlations were significant and the event-related profile was similar for all Inkblot measures: Individuals thought to be operating in more optimal manners (high scores) experienced fewer provocation events, fewer negative events, and more frequent positive events.

Table 19

Level 2 Main Effects of the Inkblot Scales on Daily Events and Construct-Relevant Personality Measures

	Predictor								
	Inkblot Happiness			Inkblot Friendliness			Inkblot Success		
Outcome	*b*	*t*	*p*	*b*	*t*	*p*	*b*	*t*	*p*
Events									
Prov.	-0.89	-3.06	.003	-0.93	-3.40	<.001	-0.74	-3.35	.001
Str.	-0.45	-0.94	.351	-0.58	-1.29	.200	-0.23	-0.63	.531
Aff.	0.60	1.06	.291	0.76	1.43	.156	0.36	0.83	.406
Neg.	-0.50	-2.13	.035	-0.58	-2.65	.009	-0.53	-3.00	.003
Pos.	1.07	2.25	.026	0.99	2.20	.030	0.84	2.32	.022
Construct-Relevant Personality									
Hap.	2.02	3.59	<.001	1.50	2.77	.006	1.71	4.04	<.001
Mis.	-1.46	-3.18	.002	-1.36	-3.13	.002	-1.06	-3.02	.003
Friend.	2.01	3.82	<.001	1.88	3.80	<.001	1.56	3.91	<.001
Host.	-0.71	-1.72	.088	-0.80	-2.08	.039	-0.94	-3.08	.003
Success	1.89	3.57	.001	1.58	3.13	.002	1.79	4.58	<.001
Incomp.	-1.13	-2.36	.020	-1.12	-2.50	.014	-1.31	-3.71	<.001

Note: Prov. = Provocative Events; Str. = Stressful Events; Aff. = Affiliative Events; Neg. = Negative Events; Pos. = Positive Events; Hap. = Happy Personality; Mis. = Miserable Personality; Friend. = Friendly Personality; Host. = Hostile Personality; Success = Successful Personality; Incomp. = Incompetent Personality

We next examined the relations between the Inkblot Scales and the construct-related personality measures (i.e., Daily Happiness, Misery, Friendliness, Hostility, Success, and

Incompetence). As expected, Inkblot Happiness predicted Daily Happiness and Misery, Inkblot Friendliness predicted Daily Friendliness and Hostility, and Inkblot Success predicted Daily Success and Incompetence (Table 19). In addition, most of the other relationships (e.g., that between Inkblot Success and Daily Happiness) were significant as well. These results support the idea that scores on the Inkblot Scales predict construct-relevant thoughts, feelings, and behaviors in one's daily life.

We were also interested in how the Inkblot Scales predicted motivations and goal progress. All of the Inkblot Scales significantly and positively predicted approach (v. avoidance) motivation (Table 20), which suggests that optimal functioning tends to be approach-oriented in nature (Elliot, 2006). Contrary to our hypothesis that Inkblot Friendliness would predict prosocial motivation, however, Inkblot Success was the only significant predictor of daily prosocial motivation (Table 20). All the Inkblot Scales predicted higher levels of goal progress, such that each Inkblot Scale significantly predicted cybernetic self-efficacy and cybernetic success (Table 20), supporting the idea that the Inkblot Scales capture goal-directed processes that are important for optimal daily functioning.

Table 20

Level 2 Main Effects of the Inkblot Scales on Daily Motivations and Cybernetic Goal Pursuit

				Predictor					
	Inkblot Happiness			Inkblot Friendliness			Inkblot Success		
Outcome	*b*	*t*	*p*	*b*	*t*	*p*	*b*	*t*	*p*
Motivations									
App.	4.17	4.34	<.001	3.22	3.47	<.001	3.66	5.16	<.001
Prosoc.	1.65	1.82	.071	1.20	1.41	.162	2.22	3.33	.001
Cybernetic Goal Pursuit									
S. Eff.	1.88	3.32	.001	1.47	2.72	.008	1.83	4.38	<.001
Success	1.65	3.00	.003	1.29	2.47	.015	1.69	4.17	<.001

Note: App. = Approach versus Avoidance Motivation; Prosoc. = Prosocial over Antisocial Motivation; S. Eff. = Cybernetic Self-Efficacy; Success = Cybernetic Success

We also hypothesized that Inkblot Happiness would predict daily appraisals as well as positive and negative affect, while Inkblot Friendliness would predict daily levels of prosocial and antisocial feeling. These hypotheses were supported in the multilevel models as all of the Inkblot Scales significantly predicted these feeling and appraisal outcomes (Table 21). Moreover, all of the Inkblot Scales were significant positive predictors of most of the single-item SPWB subscales, the SPWB total score, and Flourishing (Table 22). There was only one exception to these relationships: Inkblot Happiness was the only significant predictor of daily Autonomy, indicating that the Inkblot Scales, and especially Inkblot Happiness, are important predictors of daily experiences and well-being.

Table 21

Level 2 Main Effects of the Inkblot Scales on Daily Appraisals and Feeling/Affect

| | Predictor | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome | Inkblot Happiness | | | Inkblot Friendliness | | | Inkblot Success | | |
	b	*t*	*p*	*b*	*t*	*p*	*b*	*t*	*p*
Appraisals									
Threat	-1.60	-3.18	.002	-1.31	-2.73	.007	-1.46	-3.90	<.001
Reward	1.55	2.50	.014	1.32	2.24	.027	1.08	2.27	.025
Feelings/Emotions/Affect									
Anti.	-1.08	-3.20	.002	-0.73	-2.27	.025	-0.89	-3.53	<.001
PA	1.76	3.36	.001	1.56	3.16	.002	1.52	3.88	<.001
NA	-1.29	-3.01	.003	-1.01	-2.49	.014	-1.28	-4.02	<.001
Prosoc.	1.89	3.57	<.001	1.76	3.53	<.001	1.62	4.09	<.001

Note: Threat = Threat Appraisal; Reward = Reward Appraisal; Anti. = Antisocial Feeling; PA = Positive Affect; NA = Negative Affect; Prosoc. = Prosocial Behavior.

Table 22

Level 2 Main Effects of the Inkblot Scales on Daily Well-Being

| | Predictor | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome | Inkblot Happiness | | | Inkblot Friendliness | | | Inkblot Success | | |
	b	*t*	*p*	*b*	*t*	*p*	*b*	*t*	*p*
Well-Being									
PWB Aut.	1.87	2.19	.031	0.28	0.34	.732	1.23	1.88	.063
PWB Mast.	1.94	2.54	.012	1.28	1.76	.081	1.52	2.62	.010
PWB Gro.	3.13	4.42	<.001	2.13	3.08	.003	2.66	5.05	<.001
PWB Rel.	2.62	3.01	.003	2.12	2.57	.011	1.97	2.98	.004
PWB Purp.	3.29	3.17	.002	2.82	2.87	.005	3.51	4.64	<.001
PWB Acc.	3.66	3.82	<.001	2.83	3.08	.003	3.09	4.30	<.001
PWB Tot.	2.75	3.90	<.001	1.91	2.80	.006	2.33	4.40	<.001
Flourish.	3.34	3.58	<.001	2.81	3.17	.002	3.02	4.36	<.001

Note: PWB. Aut. = Autonomy; PWB Mast. = Environmental Mastery; PWB Gro. = Personal Growth; PWB Rel. = Positive Relations; PWB Purp. = Purpose in Life; PWB Acc. = Self-Acceptance; PWB Tot. = PWB Total Score; Flourish. = Flourishing.

A class of outcomes that we found particularly relevant to the Inkblot Scales was daily behavior. Inkblot Success and Inkblot Happiness were both significant and positive level 2 predictors of approach coping, and Inkblot Success was a significantly negative predictor of

avoidance coping (Table 23), indicating that Inkblot Success captured more adaptive and less

maladaptive coping strategies. None of the Inkblot Scales significantly predicted prosocial

behavior (Table 23), which was inconsistent with our hypothesis that Inkblot Friendliness would

predict prosocial behaviors on a day-to-day level. However, all of the Inkblot Scales significantly

and negatively predicted antisocial behavior (Table 23), which indicates that antisocial behavior

may be an important marker of success and well being (in addition to not being friendly).

Finally, Inkblot Success was a significant negative predictor of both incompetent and risky

behaviors (Table 23). Inkblot Happiness and Inkblot Friendliness were also negatively predictive

of incompetent behaviors, although neither significantly predicted risky behaviors (Table 23).

Table 23

Level 2 Main Effects of the Inkblot Scales on Daily Coping and Behavior

| | Predictor | | | | | | | | |
| | Inkblot Happiness | | | Inkblot Friendliness | | | Inkblot Success | | |
Outcome	b	t	p	b	t	p	b	t	p
Coping Strategies									
App.	1.44	2.72	.008	0.73	1.44	.154	1.41	3.59	<.001
Avoid.	-0.88	-1.97	.052	-0.70	-1.66	.099	-1.27	-3.91	<.001
Behaviors									
Prosoc.	-0.26	-0.58	.565	-0.05	-0.13	.898	-0.11	0.32	.753
Anti.	-0.73	-3.98	<.001	-0.64	-3.66	<.001	-0.62	-4.51	<.001
Incomp.	-1.72	-2.01	.047	-1.97	-2.47	.015	-2.06	-3.25	.002
Risky	-0.26	-0.95	.346	-0.31	-1.23	.222	-0.69	-3.47	<.001

Note: App. = Approach Coping; Avoid. = Avoidance Coping; Prosoc. = Prosocial Behavior;
Anti. = Antisocial Behavior; Incomp. = Incompetent Behavior; Risky = Risky Behavior.

Cross-Level Interactions

In addition to predicting daily levels of events, experiences, and behaviors, we wanted to

determine whether the Inkblot Scales as individual differences moderated the extent to which

events predicted affect, well-being, and behavior (i.e., event reactivity). To examine the

possibility of moderating effects of this type, we ran a series of cross-level interaction models in

which the Inkblot Scales were entered as level 2 predictors, daily events as level 1 predictors, and affect, well-being, and behavior as outcomes. All level 2 predictors were z-scored, and all level 1 predictors were person-centered for all of the cross-level interaction models (Enders & Tofighi, 2007). In the following sections, I will highlight interactions, but results regarding the main effects of the Inkblot Scales and daily events on the outcomes (as well as the interactions) are presented in Table 24. In describing these results, each collection of variables is referred to as a Model, which has its own Model number, in both the text and Table 24.

Table 24

Results of Cross-Level Interactions of the Inkblot Scales and Daily Events on Daily Experiences and Behaviors

Model & Outcome	Parameters	*b* [95% CI]	*t*	*p*
1: PA	Intercept	3.30 [3.18, 3.41]	56.28	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	-0.02 [-0.07, 0.02]	-1.10	.274
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	0.20 [0.09, 0.32]	3.49	.001
	Interaction	0.02 [-0.03, 0.06]	0.75	.453
2: PA	Intercept	3.29 [3.18, 3.41]	55.58	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	-0.02 [-0.07, 0.02]	-1.07	.285
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	0.18 [0.06, 0.3]	3.01	.003
	Interaction	-0.01 [-0.05, 0.04]	-0.35	.723
3: PA	Intercept	3.30 [3.18, 3.41]	57.08	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	-0.02 [-0.07, 0.02]	-1.12	.263
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	0.23 [0.12, 0.34]	3.98	<.001
	Interaction	0.05 [0.00, 0.09]	2.15	.032
4: NA	Intercept	1.76 [1.66, 1.85]	36.58	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	0.06 [0.03, 0.10]	3.61	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	-0.15 [-0.25, -0.06]	-3.15	.002
	Interaction	-0.04 [-0.07, 0.00]	-2.13	.034
5: NA	Intercept	1.76 [1.66, 1.86]	35.98	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	0.06 [0.03, 0.10]	3.56	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	-0.12 [-0.21, -0.02]	-2.35	.021
	Interaction	-0.01 [-0.05, 0.02]	-0.79	.430

Table 24. *Results of Cross-Level Interactions of the Inkblot Scales and Daily Events on Daily Experiences and Behaviors (continued)*

Model & Outcome	Parameters	*b* [95% CI]	*t*	*p*
6: NA	Intercept	1.76 [1.67, 1.85]	37.57	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	0.06 [0.03, 0.10]	3.63	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	-0.19 [-0.29, -0.10]	-4.13	<.001
	Interaction	-0.04 [-0.08, -0.01]	-2.49	.013
7: PWB	Intercept	3.79 [3.64, 3.95]	47.74	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	0.05 [0.01, 0.10]	2.27	.023
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	0.32 [0.16, 0.48]	4.00	<.001
	Interaction	0.00 [-0.05, 0.04]	-0.05	.961
8: PWB	Intercept	3.79 [3.63, 3.95]	46.14	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	0.05 [0.01, 0.10]	2.31	.021
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	0.22 [0.06, 0.39]	2.68	.008
	Interaction	-0.02 [-0.07, 0.02]	-0.99	.321
9: PWB	Intercept	3.79 [3.64, 3.95]	48.43	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	0.05 [0.01, 0.10]	2.27	.023
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	0.35 [0.20, 0.51]	4.47	<.001
	Interaction	0.02 [-0.02, 0.07]	0.97	.334
10: Prosoc. Bhv.	Intercept	2.26 [2.16, 2.36]	44.91	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	0.03 [0.00, 0.06]	1.77	.077
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	-0.03 [-0.13, 0.07]	-0.59	.555
	Interaction	0.03 [-0.01, 0.06]	1.61	.107
11: Prosoc. Bhv.	Intercept	2.26 [2.16, 2.36]	44.84	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	0.03 [0.00, 0.06]	1.74	.082
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	0.00 [-0.11, 0.1]	-0.10	.924
	Interaction	0.01 [-0.02, 0.04]	0.59	.552
12: Prosoc. Bhv.	Intercept	2.26 [2.16, 2.36]	44.86	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	0.03 [0.00, 0.06]	1.78	.075
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	0.02 [-0.08, 0.12]	0.30	.761
	Interaction	0.03 [0.00, 0.06]	2.09	.037
13: Antisoc. Bhv.	Intercept	1.24 [1.20, 1.28]	59.77	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	0.02 [0.00, 0.03]	1.67	.094
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	-0.08 [-0.12, -0.04]	-3.96	<.001
	Interaction	-0.01 [-0.03, 0.01]	-0.66	.511

Table 24. *Results of Cross-Level Interactions of the Inkblot Scales and Daily Events on Daily Experiences and Behaviors (continued)*

Model & Outcome	Parameters	*b* [95% CI]	*t*	*p*
14: Antisoc. Bhv.	Intercept	1.24 [1.20, 1.28]	59.42	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	0.02 [0.00, 0.03]	1.67	.094
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	-0.08 [-0.12, -0.04]	-3.73	<.001
	Interaction	0.00 [-0.02, 0.02]	0.16	.872
15: Antisoc. Bhv.	Intercept	1.24 [1.20, 1.28]	60.71	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	0.02 [0.00, 0.03]	1.69	.092
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	-0.09 [-0.13, -0.05]	-4.50	<.001
	Interaction	-0.01 [-0.03, 0.00]	-1.52	.129
16: Incomp. Bhv.	Intercept	1.02 [0.83, 1.21]	10.56	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	0.17 [0.10, 0.24]	4.59	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	-0.2 [-0.39, -0.01]	-2.07	.041
	Interaction	-0.05 [-0.12, 0.02]	-1.34	.179
17: Incomp. Bhv.	Intercept	1.02 [0.83, 1.22]	10.65	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	0.17 [0.10, 0.24]	4.54	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	-0.23 [-0.42, -0.04]	-2.36	.020
	Interaction	0.00 [-0.08, 0.07]	-0.10	.917
18: Incomp. Bhv.	Intercept	1.02 [0.84, 1.21]	10.83	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	0.17 [0.10, 0.24]	4.78	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	-0.31 [-0.50, -0.12]	-3.29	.001
	Interaction	-0.12 [-0.19, -0.05]	-3.35	.001
19: Risky Bhv.	Intercept	0.21 [0.15, 0.27]	6.71	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	-0.01 [-0.03, 0.02]	-0.65	.519
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	-0.03 [-0.09, 0.03]	-0.92	.360
	Interaction	-0.02 [-0.04, 0.01]	-1.56	.118
20: Risky Bhv.	Intercept	0.21 [0.15, 0.27]	6.75	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	-0.01 [-0.03, 0.02]	-0.63	.528
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	-0.04 [-0.10, 0.02]	-1.29	.200
	Interaction	-0.02 [-0.04, 0.01]	-1.35	.177
21: Risky Bhv.	Intercept	0.21 [0.15, 0.27]	7.00	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Stressful Events	-0.01 [-0.03, 0.02]	-0.65	.515
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	-0.10 [-0.16, -0.04]	-3.44	.001
	Interaction	-0.01 [-0.04, 0.01]	-0.86	.391

Table 24. *Results of Cross-Level Interactions of the Inkblot Scales and Daily Events on Daily Experiences and Behaviors (continued)*

Model & Outcome	Parameters	b [95% CI]	t	p
22: PA	Intercept	3.27 [3.14, 3.39]	52.78	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	-0.10 [-0.15, -0.05]	-4.22	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	0.23 [0.11, 0.35]	3.67	<.001
	Interaction	-0.03 [-0.08, 0.02]	-1.32	.186
23: PA	Intercept	3.27 [3.14, 3.39]	52.02	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	-0.10 [-0.15, -0.05]	-4.22	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	0.20 [0.07, 0.32]	3.12	.002
	Interaction	-0.03 [-0.08, 0.02]	-1.29	.197
24: PA	Intercept	3.27 [3.15, 3.39]	53.88	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	-0.10 [-0.15, -0.05]	-4.29	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	0.26 [0.14, 0.38]	4.31	<.001
	Interaction	-0.05 [-0.10, -0.01]	-2.33	.020
25: NA	Intercept	1.80 [1.70, 1.90]	35.24	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	0.13 [0.09, 0.17]	6.83	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	-0.16 [-0.26, -0.06]	-3.10	.002
	Interaction	-0.01 [-0.05, 0.03]	-0.38	.706
26: NA	Intercept	1.80 [1.70, 1.90]	34.71	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	0.13 [0.09, 0.17]	6.83	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	-0.13 [-0.23, -0.03]	-2.48	.015
	Interaction	-0.01 [-0.05, 0.03]	-0.46	.648
27: NA	Intercept	1.80 [1.70, 1.90]	36.39	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	0.13 [0.09, 0.17]	6.82	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	-0.21 [-0.30, -0.11]	-4.20	<.001
	Interaction	0.00 [-0.04, 0.04]	-0.07	.945
28: PWB	Intercept	3.74 [3.57, 3.91]	43.84	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	-0.08 [-0.13, -0.03]	-3.26	.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	0.32 [0.15, 0.49]	3.69	<.001
	Interaction	-0.05 [-0.10, 0.00]	-2.14	.032
29: PWB	Intercept	3.74 [3.56, 3.91]	42.63	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	-0.08 [-0.13, -0.03]	-3.24	.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	0.23 [0.05, 0.40]	2.61	.010
	Interaction	-0.04 [-0.09, 0.01]	-1.76	.079

Table 24. *Results of Cross-Level Interactions of the Inkblot Scales and Daily Events on Daily Experiences and Behaviors (continued)*

Model & Outcome	Parameters	*b* [95% CI]	*t*	*p*
30: PWB	Intercept	3.74 [3.57, 3.90]	44.57	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	-0.08 [-0.13, -0.03]	-3.33	.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	0.35 [0.19, 0.52]	4.23	<.001
	Interaction	-0.07 [-0.12, -0.02]	-2.91	.004
31: Prosoc. Bhv.	Intercept	2.25 [2.15, 2.36]	42.81	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	0.02 [-0.01, 0.05]	1.53	.125
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	-0.01 [-0.11, 0.10]	-0.13	.894
	Interaction	0.01 [-0.02, 0.04]	0.49	.626
32: Prosoc. Bhv.	Intercept	2.25 [2.15, 2.36]	42.82	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	0.02 [-0.01, 0.05]	1.53	.126
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	0.02 [-0.09, 0.12]	0.29	.775
	Interaction	0.00 [-0.03, 0.03]	0.07	.941
33: Prosoc. Bhv.	Intercept	2.25 [2.15, 2.36]	42.91	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	0.02 [-0.01, 0.05]	1.53	.126
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	0.04 [-0.07, 0.14]	0.73	.466
	Interaction	-0.01 [-0.04, 0.02]	-0.36	.721
34: Antisoc. Bhv.	Intercept	1.25 [1.21, 1.30]	57.51	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	0.13 [0.11, 0.16]	11.04	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	-0.08 [-0.12, -0.04]	-3.65	<.001
	Interaction	-0.04 [-0.07, -0.02]	-3.44	.001
35: Antisoc. Bhv.	Intercept	1.25 [1.21, 1.30]	57.11	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	0.13 [0.11, 0.16]	10.79	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	-0.08 [-0.12, -0.03]	-3.42	.001
	Interaction	-0.03 [-0.06, -0.01]	-2.63	.009
36: Antisoc. Bhv.	Intercept	1.25 [1.21, 1.30]	58.61	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	0.13 [0.11, 0.16]	10.85	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	-0.09 [-0.13, -0.05]	-4.28	<.001
	Interaction	-0.03 [-0.06, -0.01]	-2.80	.005
37: Incomp. Bhv.	Intercept	1.08 [0.88, 1.29]	10.38	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	0.10 [0.05, 0.16]	3.64	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	-0.21 [-0.42, -0.01]	-2.03	.045
	Interaction	-0.04 [-0.09, 0.02]	-1.30	.194

Table 24. *Results of Cross-Level Interactions of the Inkblot Scales and Daily Events on Daily Experiences and Behaviors (continued)*

Model & Outcome	Parameters	b [95% CI]	t	p
38: Incomp. Bhv.	Intercept	1.08 [0.88, 1.29]	10.42	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	0.10 [0.05, 0.16]	3.62	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	-0.24 [-0.45, -0.04]	-2.35	.020
	Interaction	0.01 [-0.05, 0.07]	0.34	.731
39: Incomp. Bhv.	Intercept	1.09 [0.88, 1.29]	10.70	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	0.10 [0.05, 0.16]	3.63	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	-0.34 [-0.54, -0.13]	-3.32	.001
	Interaction	-0.04 [-0.1, 0.01]	-1.43	.152
40: Risky Bhv.	Intercept	0.21 [0.15, 0.28]	6.42	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	0.03 [0.00, 0.06]	1.70	.090
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	-0.03 [-0.09, 0.04]	-0.77	.440
	Interaction	0.00 [-0.03, 0.03]	-0.17	.862
41: Risky Bhv.	Intercept	0.21 [0.15, 0.28]	6.43	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	0.03 [0.00, 0.06]	1.70	.090
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	-0.03 [-0.10, 0.03]	-1.00	.319
	Interaction	0.00 [-0.03, 0.03]	-0.25	.805
42: Risky Bhv.	Intercept	0.21 [0.15, 0.28]	6.69	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Provocative Events	0.03 [0.00, 0.06]	1.70	.090
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	-0.10 [-0.16, -0.04]	-3.20	.002
	Interaction	0.00 [-0.03, 0.03]	-0.17	.862
43: PA	Intercept	3.29 [3.17, 3.40]	55.59	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	0.32 [0.28, 0.37]	14.74	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	0.20 [0.08, 0.32]	3.35	.001
	Interaction	0.01 [-0.04, 0.05]	0.34	.732
44: PA	Intercept	3.29 [3.17, 3.40]	55.32	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	0.33 [0.28, 0.37]	14.74	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	0.19 [0.07, 0.31]	3.15	.002
	Interaction	0.00 [-0.04, 0.04]	-0.01	.994
45: PA	Intercept	3.29 [3.17, 3.40]	56.38	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	0.33 [0.28, 0.37]	14.75	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	0.23 [0.11, 0.34]	3.87	<.001
	Interaction	-0.01 [-0.05, 0.04]	-0.25	.800

Table 24. *Results of Cross-Level Interactions of the Inkblot Scales and Daily Events on Daily Experiences and Behaviors (continued)*

Model & Outcome	Parameters	b [95% CI]	t	p
46: NA	Intercept	1.77 [1.67, 1.86]	36.41	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	-0.14 [-0.18, -0.11]	-8.25	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	-0.15 [-0.24, -0.05]	-3.00	.003
	Interaction	0.02 [-0.02, 0.05]	1.07	.284
47: NA	Intercept	1.77 [1.67, 1.87]	36.00	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	-0.14 [-0.18, -0.11]	-8.25	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	-0.12 [-0.22, -0.02]	-2.48	.015
	Interaction	0.02 [-0.02, 0.05]	1.05	.294
48: NA	Intercept	1.77 [1.67, 1.86]	37.39	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	-0.14 [-0.18, -0.11]	-8.22	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	-0.19 [-0.29, -0.10]	-4.02	<.001
	Interaction	0.01 [-0.02, 0.05]	0.73	.467
49: PWB	Intercept	3.78 [3.62, 3.94]	47.44	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	0.31 [0.25, 0.36]	11.55	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	0.31 [0.15, 0.47]	3.90	<.001
	Interaction	-0.01 [-0.06, 0.04]	-0.43	.670
50: PWB	Intercept	3.78 [3.62, 3.94]	46.15	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	0.31 [0.25, 0.36]	11.56	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	0.23 [0.07, 0.39]	2.80	.006
	Interaction	-0.01 [-0.07, 0.04]	-0.49	.626
51: PWB	Intercept	3.78 [3.63, 3.94]	48.16	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	0.31 [0.25, 0.36]	11.57	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	0.35 [0.19, 0.50]	4.40	<.001
	Interaction	0.02 [-0.03, 0.08]	0.85	.395
52: Prosoc. Bhv.	Intercept	2.26 [2.16, 2.36]	45.28	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	0.16 [0.13, 0.19]	9.98	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	-0.03 [-0.13, 0.07]	-0.58	.566
	Interaction	-0.01 [-0.04, 0.02]	-0.48	.631
53: Prosoc. Bhv.	Intercept	2.26 [2.16, 2.36]	45.22	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	0.16 [0.13, 0.19]	9.97	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	-0.01 [-0.11, 0.09]	-0.13	.896
	Interaction	0.00 [-0.03, 0.03]	-0.20	.844

Table 24. *Results of Cross-Level Interactions of the Inkblot Scales and Daily Events on Daily Experiences and Behaviors (continued)*

Model & Outcome	Parameters	b [95% CI]	t	p
54: Prosoc. Bhv.	Intercept	2.26 [2.16, 2.36]	45.24	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	0.16 [0.13, 0.19]	9.97	<.001
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	0.02 [-0.08, 0.12]	0.32	.753
	Interaction	-0.01 [-0.04, 0.03]	-0.37	.714
55: Antisoc. Bhv.	Intercept	1.24 [1.20, 1.28]	60.15	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	-0.01 [-0.02, 0.01]	-0.58	.564
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	-0.08 [-0.12, -0.04]	-3.98	<.001
	Interaction	0.00 [-0.02, 0.02]	-0.03	.972
56: Antisoc. Bhv.	Intercept	1.24 [1.20, 1.28]	59.61	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	-0.01 [-0.02, 0.01]	-0.58	.562
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	-0.08 [-0.12, -0.04]	-3.66	<.001
	Interaction	0.00 [-0.02, 0.02]	0.26	.791
57: Antisoc. Bhv.	Intercept	1.24 [1.20, 1.28]	61.07	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	0.00 [-0.02, 0.01]	-0.57	.567
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	-0.09 [-0.13, -0.05]	-4.51	<.001
	Interaction	-0.01 [-0.03, 0.01]	-1.18	.240
58: Incomp. Bhv.	Intercept	1.03 [0.84, 1.22]	10.67	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	-0.01 [-0.06, 0.05]	-0.30	.763
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	-0.20 [-0.39, 0.00]	-2.01	.047
	Interaction	0.03 [-0.02, 0.08]	1.08	.282
59: Incomp. Bhv.	Intercept	1.03 [0.84, 1.22]	10.76	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	-0.01 [-0.06, 0.05]	-0.30	.764
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	-0.24 [-0.43, -0.05]	-2.47	.015
	Interaction	0.02 [-0.03, 0.08]	0.81	.421
60: Incomp. Bhv.	Intercept	1.03 [0.85, 1.22]	10.95	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	-0.01 [-0.06, 0.05]	-0.28	.781
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	-0.31 [-0.50, -0.12]	-3.25	.002
	Interaction	-0.02 [-0.07, 0.03]	-0.73	.466
61: Risky Bhv.	Intercept	0.21 [0.15, 0.27]	6.71	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	0.02 [-0.01, 0.04]	1.26	.209
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Happiness	-0.03 [-0.09, 0.03]	-0.95	.344
	Interaction	-0.03 [-0.05, 0.00]	-2.11	.035

Table 24. *Results of Cross-Level Interactions of the Inkblot Scales and Daily Events on Daily Experiences and Behaviors (continued)*

Model & Outcome	Parameters	*b* [95% CI]	*t*	*p*
62: Risky Bhv.	Intercept	0.21 [0.15, 0.27]	6.73	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	0.02 [-0.01, 0.04]	1.22	.223
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Friendliness	-0.04 [-0.10, 0.02]	-1.24	.219
	Interaction	-0.01 [-0.04, 0.01]	-0.88	.379
63: Risky Bhv.	Intercept	0.21 [0.15, 0.26]	7.00	<.001
	Lvl. 1: Positive Events	0.02 [-0.01, 0.04]	1.25	.210
	Lvl. 2: Inkblot Success	-0.10 [-0.16, -0.04]	-3.47	.001
	Interaction	-0.03 [-0.06, -0.01]	-2.42	.016

Note: Lvl. 1 = Level 1 Predictor; Lvl. 2 = Level 2 Predictor; PA = Positive Affect; NA = Negative Affect; PWB = Psychological Well-Being Total Score; Prosoc. Bhv. = Prosocial Behavior; Antisoc. Bhv. = Antisocial Behavior; Incomp. Bhv. = Incompetent Behavior; Risky Bhv. = Risky Behavior.

Reactions to Stressful Events

Stressful Event-PA Relationships

Inkblot Success (Model 3), but not Happiness (Model 1) nor Friendliness (Models 2) significantly moderated the daily relationship between stress and positive affect (PA). At low levels (-1 *SD*) of Inkblot Success, stressful events predicted decreased levels of PA, *b* [95% *CI*] = -0.37 [-0.13, -0.01], *t* = -2.31, *p* = .021, but the relationship between stress and PA was nonsignificant at high levels (+1 *SD*) of Inkblot Success, *b* [95% *CI*] = 0.02 [-0.04, 0.08], *t* = 0.74, *p* = .458. These findings suggest that individuals with low levels of Inkblot Success may experience difficulty in managing stressful events.

Stressful Event-NA Relationships

Consistent with previous research on individual differences in stress reactivity (e.g., Cyders et al., 2010), Inkblot Happiness moderated the relationship between stressful events and negative affect (NA) (Model 4) such that people with low (-1 *SD*) Happiness experienced higher levels of NA in response to stress, *b* [95% *CI*] = 0.10 [0.05, 0.15], *t* = 4.03, *p* < .001. At high

levels (+1 *SD*) of Inkblot Happiness, stress did not significantly predict NA, *b* [95% *CI*] = 0.03 [-0.02, 0.07], *t* = 1.03, *p* = .303. Inkblot Friendliness did not significantly interact with stress to predict NA (Model 5), but Inkblot Success significantly interacted with stressful events to predict NA (Model 6). At low levels (-1 *SD*) of Inkblot Success, stressful events significantly and positively predicted NA, *b* [95% *CI*] = 0.11 [0.06, 0.15], *t* = 4.21, *p* < .001, but the relationship between stressful events and NA was nonsignificant at high levels (+1 *SD*) of Inkblot Success, *b* [95% *CI*] = 0.03 [-0.03, 0.07], *t* = 1.03, *p* = .303. These results suggest that unsuccessful people may experience difficulty in managing their affect under stressful circumstances.

Stressful Event-PWB Relationships

Although stressful events interacted with the Inkblot scores to predict positive and negative affect (see above), similar interactions were not observed for PWB (Models 7-9). These results were inconsistent with our hypothesis that miserable people would experience lesser PWB as a consequence of negative events.

Stressful Event-Prosocial Behavior Relationships

In the Inkblot Scale by stressful event cross-level interaction models, neither Inkblot Happiness (Model 10) nor Inkblot Friendliness (Model 11) interacted with stressful events to predict prosocial behavior, but Inkblot Success significantly moderated the relationship between stressful events and prosocial behavior (Model 12). At low levels (-1 *SD*) of Inkblot Success, stressful events did not significantly predict prosocial behavior, *b* [95% *CI*] = -0.01 [-0.05, 0.04], *t* = -0.23, *p* = .821. At high levels (+1 *SD*) of Inkblot Success, individuals engaged in more prosocial behavior on more stressful days, *b* [95% *CI*] = 0.06 [0.02 to 0.10], *t* = 2.74, *p* = .006, suggesting that successful people may use tend-and-befriend strategies to cope with stress (Taylor, 2006).

Stressful Event-Antisocial Behavior Relationships

In the Inkblot Scale by stressful event interactions on antisocial behavior, none of the Inkblot Scales moderated the relationship between stress and antisocial behavior (Models 13-15).

Stressful Event-Incompetent Behavior Relationships

Upon investigating the Inkblot Scale by stressful event interactions on incompetent behavior, we found that Inkblot Success (Model 18), but not Happiness (Model 16) or Friendliness (Model 17), significantly moderated the relationship between stressful events and incompetent behaviors. Specifically, people with low (-1 *SD*) Inkblot Success engaged in more incompetent behaviors on days with more stressful events, b [95% *CI*] = 0.29 [0.19, 0.39], $t =$ 9.99, $p < .001$. However, stressful events did not significantly predict daily incompetent behavior at high (+1 *SD*) levels of Inkblot Success, b [95% *CI*] = 0.05 [-0.05, 0.15], $t = 0.99$, $p = .321$. These results suggest that successful people may be better at controlling their behaviors, in competent ways, under stressful circumstances.

Stressful Event-Risky Behavior Relationships

In cross-level interaction models with the Inkblot Scales and stressful events as predictors, there were no significant interactions (Models 19-21). Risky behaviors were probably initiated for appetitive reasons rather than because of event reactivity processes (Frijda, 2010).

Reactions to Provocative Events

Provocative Event-PA Relationships

We were also interested in whether the Inkblot Scales predicted individuals' reactivity to provocation. In the Inkblot Scale by provocative event interaction models with PA as an outcome, neither Inkblot Happiness (Model 22) nor Inkblot Friendliness (Model 23) significantly moderated the daily relationships between stress and positive affect, though Inkblot Success did

significantly moderate the relationship between provocation-oriented events and PA (Model 24). At low levels (-1 *SD*) of Inkblot Success, provocation did not significantly predict PA, *b* [95% *CI*] = -0.05 [-0.11, 0.02], *t* = 1.38, *p* = .168. However, at high levels (+1 *SD*) of Inkblot Success, provocation significantly reduced PA, *b* [95% *CI*] = -0.16 [-0.22, -0.09], *t* = -4.69, *p* < .001. Successful people may recognize the problematic nature of interpersonal conflicts, relative to more ego-endorsed forms of stress and challenge.

Provocative Event-NA Relationships

There were no significant Inkblot Scale by provocative event cross-level interactions on daily NA (Models 25-27), which was inconsistent with our hypotheses that unhappy people would experience more NA in the context of negative events.

Provocative Event-PWB Relationships

In cross-level interaction models with the Inkblot Scales and provocative events as predictors, Inkblot Happiness (Model 28) significantly moderated the provocative event-PWB relationship such that provocative events did not significantly predict PWB at low (-1 *SD*) levels of Inkblot Happiness, *b* [95% *CI*] = -0.03 [-0.09, 0.04], *t* = -0.76, *p* = .448. At high (+1 *SD*) levels of Inkblot Happiness, provocative events were significantly associated with reduced PWB, *b* [95% *CI*] = -0.13 [-0.20, -0.06], *t* = -3.83, *p* < .001. Additionally, Inkblot Success (Model 30), but not Inkblot Friendliness (Model 29), significantly moderated the provocative event-PWB relationship. At low (-1 *SD*) levels of Inkblot Success, daily provocation did not significantly predict PWB, *b* [95% *CI*] = -0.01 [-0.08, 0.06], *t* = -0.29, *p* < .001. At high (+1 *SD*) levels of Inkblot Success, provocation significantly undermined PWB, *b* [95% *CI*] = -0.15 [-0.22, -0.08], *t* = -4.42, *p* < .001. These results suggest that happy and successful people may find interpersonal provocations to be counter to their goals.

Provocative Event-Prosocial Behavior Relationships

In the Inkblot Scale by provocation cross-level interactions involving prosocial behavior, none of the Inkblot Scales significantly moderated the effects of provocative events on prosocial behavior (Models 31-33).

Provocative Event-Antisocial Behavior Relationships

Each of the Inkblot Scales significantly moderated the relationship between provocative events and antisocial behavior (Models 34-36). Specifically, the relationship between provocation and antisocial behavior was significant for unhappy (-1 *SD* Inkblot Happiness) people, b [95% *CI*] = 0.17 [0.14, 0.21], t = 10.20, p < .001, and the provocation-antisocial behavior relationship was weaker though still significant for happy (+1 *SD* Inkblot Happiness) people, b [95% *CI*] = 0.09 [0.06, 0.12], t = 5.32, p < .001. Furthermore, at low levels (-1 *SD*) of Inkblot Friendliness, provocative events significantly predicted antisocial behavior, b [95% *CI*] = 0.16 [0.13, 0.20], t = 9.48, p < .001. At high levels (+1 *SD*) of Inkblot Friendliness, provocative events were less predictive of antisocial behavior, although the relationship was still evident b [95% *CI*] = 0.10 [0.07, 0.03], t = 5.73, p < .001. These findings are consistent with our hypothesis that Friendliness would buffer the relationship between provocation and antisocial behavior. Finally, at low levels (-1 *SD*) of Inkblot Success, provocation significantly predicted antisocial behavior, b [95% *CI*] = 0.17 [0.13, 0.20], t = 9.65. At high levels (+1 *SD*) of Inkblot Success, provocation was more weakly related to antisocial behavior, even though the relationship was still significant, b [95% *CI*] = 0.10 [0.06, 0.13], t = 5.70, p < .001.

Provocative Event-Incompetent Behavior Relationships

None of the Inkblot Scales significantly interacted with provocation-oriented events to predict incompetent behavior (Models 37-39).

Provocative Event-Risky Behavior Relationships

Across the Inkblot Scale by provocation-oriented event cross-level interaction models for risky behavior, none of the Inkblot Scales significantly moderated the relationship between provocative events and risky behaviors (Models 40-42).

Reactions to Positive Events

Positive Event-PA Relationships

We were also interested in how the Inkblot Scales would predict individuals' reactivity to daily positive events. Across the Inkblot Scale by positive event cross-level interaction models, none of the Inkblot Scales significantly interacted with positive events to predict PA (Models 43-45), which was inconsistent with our hypothesis that happy people would display greater positive reactivity to positive events.

Positive Event-NA Relationships

In the Inkblot Scale by positive event cross-level interaction models with daily NA as the outcome, none of the Inkblot Scales significantly moderated the relationship between positive events and NA (Models 46-48).

Positive Event-PWB Relationships

In the positive event by Inkblot Scale cross-level interactions, none of the Inkblot Scales moderated the relationship between positive events and PWB (Models 49-51). We had thought that happy would experience more PWB on days with more positive events, but this was not the case.

Positive Event-Prosocial Behavior Relationships

Across the Inkblot Scale by positive event interaction models on prosocial behavior, none of the interactions were significant (Models 52-54). We had thought that friendly individuals

would be friendly, regardless of positive events, resulting in an interaction, but the slope linking positive events to prosocial behavior was not moderated in this manner.

Positive Event-Antisocial Behavior Relationships

In the Inkblot Scale by positive event cross-level interaction models with antisocial behavior as the outcome, none of the Inkblot Scales significantly moderated the effects of positive events on antisocial behavior (Models 55-57).

Positive Event-Incompetent Behavior Relationships

In the Inkblot Scale by positive event interaction models involving incompetent behavior, none of the Inkblot Scales moderated the relationship between positive events and incompetent behavior (Models 58-60).

Positive Event-Risky Behavior Relationships

In the Inkblot Scale by positive event interaction models looking at risky behavior (Models 61-63), both Inkblot Happiness (Model 61) and Inkblot Success (Model 63) significantly moderated the relationship between positive events and risky behavior (Friendliness did not: Model 62). At low levels (-1 SD) of Inkblot Happiness, positive events elicited a higher frequency of risky behaviors, b [95% CI] = 0.04 [0.01 to 0.08], t = 2.37, p = .018, but this relationship was not significant at high levels (+1 SD) of Inkblot Happiness, b [95% CI] = -0.01 [-0.05, 0.02], t = -0.62, p = .537. Furthermore, at low (-1 SD) levels of Inkblot Success, daily positive events were associated with more frequent risky behaviors as well, b [95% CI] = 0.05 [-0.05, 0.02], t = 2.60, p = .010. At high (+1 SD) levels of Inkblot Success, positive events did not significantly predict risky behaviors, b [95% CI] = -0.02 [-0.05, 0.02], t = -0.85, p = .398. These results are consistent with the idea that unhappy and unsuccessful people may exhibit dysregulation within the positive emotion system (Weiss et al., 2015).

DISCUSSION

We sought to use implicit scoring methods that were applied to diverse responses to written scenarios as a way of diagnosing likely tendencies toward optimal functioning. The resulting Inkblot Scales were both successful measures of their respective constructs and decided improvements over pilot test versions (e.g., in the form of higher internal reliabilities and lower redundancies between the constructs). Inkblot Success and Inkblot Friendliness seemed to capture agentic versus communal routes to well-being as these measures were more strongly correlated with Inkblot Happiness than they were with each other, although the correlations between the Inkblot Scales were high enough to allow each measure to load onto a general factor of optimal functioning or eudaimonic happiness. The high correlations between the Inkblot Scales were similar to the correlations between latent measures of Ryff's Scales of Psychological Well-Being (Springer & Hauser, 2006), yet there was also discriminant validity for each scale in the form of distinct relationships with personality and well-being outcomes.

Each Inkblot Scale correlated with the Big Five traits that seemed most relevant to it (i.e., Happiness related to temperament-related traits: Elliot & Thrash, 2002; Friendliness related to social traits: Harris & Vazire, 2016; and Success related to self-control traits: DeYoung, 2010). Moreover, the Inkblot Scales tended to significantly predict outcomes in manners consistent with theorizing (e.g., Success was related to emotional intelligence), both before and after controlling for personality, though there were some exceptions that will be discussed below. Of particular importance, each Inkblot Scale predicted both global self-reports and specific daily measures of individuals' thoughts, feelings, and behaviors (e.g., happy people reported greater levels of positive affect and approach-related cognitions; friendly people reported greater levels of prosocial feelings, motivations, and behaviors; and successful people reported more effective

86

coping and goal pursuit). The Inkblot Scales also interacted with daily situations to predict

relevant daily outcomes, suggesting that the Inkblot Scales may capture dynamic components of

the person as well as general behavioral tendencies.

We not only found the prototype-based scoring method to be effective for measuring

multiple constructs with the same contextualized items, but we also discovered that the Pearson *r*

scoring method seems to be relatively simple and effective for assessing one's similarity to a

prototype, based both on previous research (e.g., Legree et al., 2014) and the psychometric

properties evident in the present research. Moreover, our measure used responses that reflected

various levels (e.g., low, medium, high) of our constructs of interest, which was both unique and

advantageous from the construct-driven SJT approach – which relies on response items that

reflect either high or low levels of a construct of interest (Lievens, 2017b) – because such varied

responses (that one could reasonably engage in) provide a more nuanced perspective on exactly

what level of a given construct a person is likely to possess. It may therefore be worthwhile to

apply the Inkblot scoring method to a host of other constructs, such as masculinity versus

femininity (Nielson et al., 2017), the Big Five personality traits, the Dark Triad (Wood et al.,

2019), or dominance versus submissiveness (Gurtman & Lee, 2009), although the situations and

responses selected would still need to be relevant to the construct of interest (Lievens, 2017b).

Additional Implications

While there were some unique predictions that each Inkblot Scale made relative to the

other Inkblot Scales, there was still considerable overlap in the laboratory outcomes that each

Inkblot Scale predicted. Most notably, Inkblot Success was designed to measure an agentic

component of optimal functioning, but it predicted prosocial behavior about as well as Inkblot

Friendliness did. These relationships between Inkblot Success and prosocial behavior could

reflect limitations to the method, but I think a different interpretation is probable. Specifically, being successful probably requires being friendly, much of the time. Consistent with this point, getting along with other people is a societal expectation (Robinson et al., 2013) and is often required for obtaining resources (e.g., social support: Feeney & Collins, 2015) that are necessary for achieving status and/or success in life. Moreover, friendly behavior can be determined by both communal and agentic motivations (Magee & Langner, 2008), so the relationship between Inkblot Success and friendly behavior is consistent with the idea that prosocial behavior can have practical utility.

It is also possible that Inkblot Success targets optimal functioning in a way that is more direct than the other Inkblot Scales do, thus accounting for links between Inkblot Success and a large array of findings. Consistent with such thinking, there is a general factor of success – namely, sufficient self-control (Moffitt et al., 2011; Tangney et al., 2004) – that seems to matter for a wide variety of outcomes, including everyday dysfunction (Dickman, 1990), poor relationships (Hofmann et al., 2009), antisocial behavior (Raine et al., 2006), and externalizing symptoms of distress (Miller et al., 2012). Note that many of these outcomes would overlap with those that are relevant to one's happiness and/or social functioning.

While Inkblot Success was the most effective measure of its respective outcomes, Inkblot Happiness was also a successful measure of happiness. Specifically, Inkblot Happiness not only significantly predicted most of its hypothesized outcomes (and the one non-significant relationship was one that, in retrospect, seems quite optional), but also continued to predict most of these outcomes beyond the Big Five traits. Furthermore, the fact that Inkblot Success and Inkblot Happiness were highly correlated could be explained by the fact that happiness and success seem to have many of the same correlates and consequences, such as the use of

approach-oriented coping (Carver, 2006; Litman, 2006) and a high sense of self-efficacy (Bandura, 2001). Even so, it is worth pointing out that Inkblot Happiness and Inkblot Success were not correlated at unity, indicating that Inkblot Happiness could, with sufficient attempts to dissociate happiness and success on the outcome side, exhibit some relationships that are not shared with Inkblot Success.

In contrast, Inkblot Friendliness was less successful in its predictions than were Happiness and Success even though it was the most reliable Inkblot Scale. Specifically, Inkblot Friendliness significantly predicted prosocial behavior in simple regressions, but it failed to significantly predict most of these same behaviors after controlling for the Big Five traits. These results may reflect the strong and particularly close relationships that Agreeableness has with social functioning (Jensen-Campbell et al., 2010) and prosocial behavior (Habashi et al., 2016), which could render our measure of friendliness somewhat redundant (Flake & Fried, 2020). Another potential problem with Friendliness was that it (along with Hostility) had lower absolute means than the other Inkblot Scales did – despite the fact that North Dakota residents (and students) tend to have very high levels of agreeableness (Rentfrow et al., 2008). These low means could be partly explained by the lower SDs of the Friendliness and Hostility prototypes compared to the other Inkblot prototypes, which can contribute to lower correlation coefficients, the basic unit of the Inkblot approach. It is nonetheless possible that the measure could be improved by closer attention to variability along the friendliness dimension (Lievens, 2017b).

In addition to predicting global self-reports, the Inkblot Scales also moderated individuals' situational reactivity. For example, Success did not predict the frequency of encountering stressful events, but it buffered the relationships of stress with negative affect and incompetent behavior, perhaps due to mechanisms such as emotion regulation (Garofalo et al.,

89

2018). In addition to avoiding problematic behaviors, successful people seemed to utilize a tend-and-befriend coping strategy (Taylor, 2006), as they were more prosocial on stressful days. Such strategies would likely be valuable in that other people can provide information and social support, which can be beneficial within situations that are stressful (Achat et al., 1998). A more thorough investigation of these down- and up-regulation processes merits further research attention.

Another pattern that was notable was that successful and happy people experienced reduced levels of psychological well-being and positive affect on days with more provocation. Such reductions in well-being could be functional in the context of interpersonal conflict because interpersonal conflicts have a tendency to escalate if one does not respond in a skilled manner (Anderson & Bushman, 2002). In fact, there are certain groups of people – such as alexithymic individuals (Garofalo et al., 2018) – who do not become aware of their aversive reactions to being provoked until it is too late to check the automatic aggressive behavioral responses that tend to be triggered by such events (Berkowitz, 1990). Clearly, this analysis would benefit from a more concentrated focus on provocation reactivity phenomena in future research, perhaps by utilizing techniques developed by Wilkowski et al. (2010).

The last cross-level interaction models of interest involved individuals' reactivity to positive events because we had hypothesized that happy people would experience greater positive affect on days with positive events (Catalino & Fredrickson, 2011). Such a moderation effect was non-significant; instead, Happiness and Success significantly buffered the relationship between positive events and risky behaviors, such that only unhappy and unsuccessful people engaged in more frequent risky behaviors on days with more positive events. Despite the deviations from our hypotheses, these findings are consistent with research centered on

dysregulated behavior in the context of positive affect (e.g., Cyders et al., 2010). Individuals who are not used to feeling happy sometimes exhibit unusually impulsive reactions to positive experiences, such as in cases of bipolar disorder (Weiss et al., 2015). Such interpretations of the results would be bolstered by additional research, some of which would be very easy to conduct (e.g., one could correlate Inkblot Happiness and Success with the Difficulties in Regulating Positive Emotion Scale: Weiss et al., 2015).

Caveats and Future Directions

The timing of the daily diary surveys introduced some major limitations to the current research. In particular, finals week is associated with high levels of stress (Folkman & Lazarus, 1985) and could limit one's opportunities to engage in certain kinds of behaviors, which might have reduced our capacity for observing other cross-level interactions (Aguinis et al., 2013). Launching the daily diary surveys at the end of the semester may have also contributed to the high attrition rate that we observed with respect to Sample 1. Not only were students potentially more likely to prioritize preparing for finals over completing the surveys, but the students may have been de-incentivized by the lag between the start of the laboratory surveys and the launch of the daily surveys because it gave them the chance to get their required credits from participating in other studies. We recruited a second sample to make up for the attrition, but future studies may nevertheless benefit from running the daily diary surveys earlier in the semester and/or in separate waves if recruitment is slow.

The correlations we observed between the Inkblot Scales supported their status as components of optimal functioning, but those same correlations may be too high to ensure their discriminant validity. Ideally, the correlations between the Inkblot Scales would have been more in the range of .40 (Springer & Hauser, 2006) rather than .70, which was a value that was

observed with two of the three correlations. One way of working on this problem might involve more detailed instructions to prototype raters. Specifically, raters could be warned that there is a tendency to think that all desirable properties (e.g., happiness and success) are strongly correlated with each other, but this tendency toward halo effects should be resisted if possible. Alternatively, ratings along the different dimensions could be obtained at different times to preclude making inferences about one quality on the basis of another. At the same time, it may be important to avoid procedures that force orthogonality among constructs that are actually highly correlated in real life (Lynam et al., 2006).

All of the Inkblot Scales failed to significantly predict at least one of their hypothesized outcomes after controlling for personality. One reason for this could have been that both the Big Five personality traits and the outcomes (especially the laboratory outcomes) involved global self-report, which may have contributed to correlations that are partly method-based (Meyer et al., 2001). From this perspective, it is actually quite promising that the Inkblot Scales significantly predicted any of the laboratory outcomes after controlling for (Big Five) personality. However, relying exclusively on self-reported outcomes is still a limitation, so future research on the Inkblot Scales should strive to collect different types of outcomes (Meyer et al., 2001). For example, the Inkblot Scales, if they are truly reflective of peoples' behaviors, should predict how friendly, happy, and successful one's peers perceive the individual to be. Additionally, if the Inkblot Scales measure outcomes related to life success, the measures should be able to predict objective outcomes such as academic records (e.g., end-of-semester GPA), job performance (e.g., employment terminations), criminal records, and medical records (e.g., psychiatric incidents). It may also be worthwhile to track longitudinal processes or focus on samples different from the samples that were used in the present research.

Conclusion

The Inkblot Scales were derived from a situational judgment measure that models everyday situations and everyday responses to those situations. Such raw material can be used to diagnose key trends in an individual's behaviors and functioning, as the Inkblot Scales predicted both global self-reports and daily outcomes related to happiness, friendliness, and success, including in a situation-contingent manner. Based on the promise of the present research, the Inkblot Scales have a high potential for assessing various constructs in ways that bypass some of the limitations of traditional assessment approaches.

REFERENCES

Abele, A. E., Hauke, N., Peters, K., Louvet, E., Szymkow, A., & Duan, Y. (2016). Facets of the fundamental content dimensions: Agency with competence and assertiveness—Communion with warmth and morality. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/t54377-000

Achat, H., Kawachi, I., Levine, S., Berkey, C., Coakley, E., & Colditz, G. (1998). Social networks, stress, and health-related quality of life. *Quality of Life Research, 7*(8), 735-750. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1008837002431

Aguinis, H., Gottfredson, R. K., & Culpepper, S. A. (2013). Best-practice recommendations for estimating cross-level interaction effects using multilevel modeling. *Journal of Management*, *39*(6), 1490-1528. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206313478188

Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human Aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*(1), 27-51. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135231

Anderson, R., Thier, M., & Pitts, C. (2017). Interpersonal and intrapersonal skill assessment alternatives: Self-reports, situational-judgment tests, and discrete-choice experiments. *Learning and Individual Differences, 53*, 47-60. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2016.10.017

Arneklev, B. J., Grasmick, H. G., & Bursik, R. J. (1999). Evaluating the dimensionality and invariance of "low self-control". *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *15*(3), 307-331. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1007528515341

Austin, E. J., Saklofske, D. H., & Mastoras, S. M. (2010). Emotional intelligence, coping and exam-related stress in Canadian undergraduate students. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 62*(1), 42-50. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00049530903312899

Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence: An essay on psychology and religion*. Oxford.

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *52*, 1-26. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1

Bandura, A. (2004). Health promotion by social cognitive means. *Health Education & Behavior*, *31*(2), 143-164. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1090198104263660

Bardi, A., Guerra, V. M., & Ramdeny, G. S. D. (2009). Openness and ambiguity tolerance: Their differential relations to well-being in the context of an academic life transition. *Personality and Individual Differences, 47*(3), 219-223. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.03.003

Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Psicothema, 18*, 13-25.

Baumert, A., Schmitt, M., Perugini, M., Johnson, W., Blum, G., Borkenau, P. Costantini, G., Denissen, J. J. A., Fleeson, W., Grafton, B., Jayawickreme, E., Kurzius, E., MacLeod, C., Miller, L. C., Read, S. J., Roberts, B., Robinson, M. D., Wood, D., & Wrzus, C. (2017). Integrating personality structure, personality process, and personality development. *European Journal of Personality*, *31*(5), 503-528. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/per.2115

Berkowitz, L. (1990). On the formation and regulation of anger and aggression: A cognitive-neoassociationistic analysis. *American Psychologist, 45*(4), 494-503. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.45.4.494

Block, J. (1961). *The Q-sort method in personality assessment and psychiatric research*. Charles C. Thomas Publisher. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/13141-000

Boals, A., vanDellen, M. R., & Banks, J. B. (2011). The relationship between self-control and

    health: The mediating effect of avoidant coping. *Psychology & Health*, *26*(8), 1049-1062.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08870446.2010.529139

Bogg, T., & Roberts, B. W. (2004). Conscientiousness and health-related behaviors: A meta-

    analysis of the leading behavioral contributors of mortality. *Psychological Bulletin*,

    130(6), 887-919. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.130.6.887

Bogg, T., & Roberts, B. W. (2013). The case for conscientiousness: Evidence and implications

    for a personality trait marker of health and longevity. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine,*

    45(3), 278-288. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12160-012-9454-6

Bolger, N., Davis, A., & Rafaeli, E. (2003). Diary methods: Capturing life as it is lived. *Annual*

    Review of Psychology, *54*, 579-616.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145030

Broadbent, D. E., Cooper, P. F., FitzGerald, P., & Parkes, K. R. (1982). The Cognitive Failures

    Questionnaire (CFQ) and its correlates. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 21*(1), 1-

    16. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8260.1982.tb01421.x

Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role in

    psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*(4), 822-848.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.822

Burt, A. S., & Donnellan, M. B. (2009). Development and validation of the Subtypes of

    Antisocial Behavior Questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior*, *35*(5), 376-398.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ab.20314

Calabrese, W. R., Rudick, M. M., Simms, L. J., & Clark, L. A. (2012). Development and

    validation if Big Four personality scales for the Schedule for Nonadaptive and Adaptive

Personality—Second Edition (SNAP-2). *Psychological Assessment*, *24*(3), 751-763. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0026915

Caprara, G. V., Steca, P., Zelli, A., & Capanna, C. (2005). A new scale for measuring adults' prosocialness. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 21*(2), 77-89. http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.21.2.77

Carver, C. S. (1998). Resilience and thriving: Issues, models, and linkages. *Journal of Social Issues*, *54*(2), 245-266. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.641998064

Carver, C. S. (2006). Approach, avoidance, and the self-regulation of affect and action. *Motivation and Emotion, 30*(2), 105-110. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11031-006-9044-7

Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Weintraub, J. K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *56*(2), 267-283. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.2.267

Carver, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(2), 319-333. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.2.319

Catalino, L. I., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2011). A Tuesday in the life of a flourisher: The role of positive emotional reactivity in optimal mental health. *Emotion*, *11*(4), 938-950. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0024889

Cervone, D. (1997). Social-cognitive mechanisms and personality coherence: Self-knowledge, situational beliefs, and cross-situational coherence in perceived self-efficacy. *Psychological Science*, *8*(1), 43-50. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1997.tb00542.x

Cervone, D. (2004). The architecture of personality. *Psychological Review*, *111*(1), 183-204. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.111.1.183

Cervone, D., Shadel, W. G., & Jencius, S. (2001). Social-cognitive theory of personality assessment. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *5*(1), 33-51. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0501_3

Chen, P., Coccaro, E. F., & Jacobson, K. C. (2012). Hostile attributional bias, negative emotional responding, and aggression in adults: Moderating effects of gender and impulsivity. *Aggressive behavior, 38*(1), 47-63. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21407

Christensen, A. P., Cotter, K. N., & Silvia, P. J. (2019). Reopening openness to experience: A network analysis of four openness to experience inventories. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 101*(6), 574-588. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2018.1467428

Christian, M. S., Edwards, B. D., & Bradley, J, C (2010). Situational judgment tests: Constructs assessed and a meta-analysis of their criterion-related validities. *Personnel Psychology*, *63*(1), 83-117.http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2009.01163.x

Coccaro, E. F., Fanning, J. R., Fisher, E., Couture, L., & Lee, R. J. (2017). Social emotional information processing in adults: Development and psychometrics of a computerized video assessment in healthy controls and aggressive individuals. *Psychiatry research, 248*, 40-47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2016.11.004

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Compton, R. J., Robinson M. D., Ode, S., Quandt, L. C., Fineman, S. L., & Carp, J. (2008). Error-monitoring ability predicts daily stress regulation. *Psychological Science*, *19*(7), 702-708. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02145.x

Conner, T. S., Tennen, H., Fleeson, W., & Barrett, L. F. (2009). Experience sampling methods: A modern idiographic approach to personality research. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *3*(3), 292-313. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2009.00170.x

Corstjens, J., Lievens, F., & Krumm, S. (2017). Situational judgement tests for selection. In H. W. Goldstein, E. D. Pulakos, J. Passmore, & C. Semedo (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell handbook of the psychology recruitment, selection, and employee retention* (pp. 226-246). Wiley-Blackwell. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781118972472.ch11

Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. (1996). Social information-processing mechanisms on reactive and proactive aggression. *Child Development, 67*(3), 993-1002. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1131875

Cyders, M. A., Zapolski, T. C. B., Combs, J. L., Settles, R. F., Fillmore, M. T., & Smith, G. T. (2010). Experimental effect of positive urgency on negative outcomes from risk taking and on increased alcohol consumption. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 24*(3), 367-375. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0019494

Dawda, D., & Hart, S. D. (2000). Assessing emotional intelligence: reliability and validity of the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) in university students. *Personality and Individual Differences, 28*(4), 797-812. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00139-7

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Hedonia, eudaimonia, and well-being: An introduction. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *9*(1), 1-11. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10902-006-9018-1

DeWall, C. N., Finkel, E. J., & Denson, T. F. (2011). Self-control inhibits aggression. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 5*(7), 458-472. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2011.00363.x

DeYoung, C. G. (2010). Toward a theory of the big five. *Psychological Inquiry, 21*(1), 26-33. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10478401003648674

Dickman, S. J. (1990). Functional and dysfunctional impulsivity: Personality and cognitive correlates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*(1), 95-102. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.1.95

Diener, E., Sapyta, J. J., & Suh, E. (1998). Subjective well-being is essential to well-being. *Psychological Inquiry*, *9*(1), 33-37. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1207/s15327965pli0901_3

Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2010). New well-being measures: Short scales to assess flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social Indicators Research*, *97*(2), 143-156. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1007/s11205-009-9493-y

Donnellan, M. B., Oswald, F. L., Baird, B. M., & Lucas, R. E. (2006). The Mini-IPIP Scales: Tiny-yet-effective measures of the Big Five Factors of Personality. *Psychological Assessment*, *18*(2), 192-203. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1037/1040-3590.18.2.192

Dunlop, W. L. (2015). Contextualized personality, beyond traits. *European Journal of Personality*, *29*(3), 310-325. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1002/per.1995

Dunning, D., Johnson, K., Ehrlinger, J., & Kruger, J. (2003). Why people fail to recognize their own incompetence. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *12*(3), 83-87. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1111/1467-8721.01235

Elliot, A. J. (2006). The hierarchical model of approach-avoidance motivation. *Motivation and Emotion, 30*(2), 111-116. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11031-006-9028-7

Elliot, A. J., & Thrash, T. M. (2002). Approach-avoidance motivation in personality: Approach and avoidance temperaments and goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(5), 804-818. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.5.804

Enders, C. K., & Tofighi, D. (2007). Centering predictor variables in cross-sectional multilevel models: A new look at an old issue. *Psychological Methods*, *12*(2), 121-138. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1037/1082-989X.12.2.121 ; http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1037/1082-989X.12.2.121.supp

Endler, N. S., & Magnusson, D. (1976). Toward an interactional psychology of personality. *Psychological Bulletin*, *83*(5), 956-974. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1037/0033-2909.83.5.956

Fayn, K., Silvia, P. J., MacCann, C., & Tiliopoulos, N. (2017). Interested in different things or in different ways? Exploring the engagement distinction between openness and intellect. *Journal of Individual Differences, 38*(4), 265-273. http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001/a000243

Feeney, B. C., & Collins, N. L. (2015). Thriving through relationships. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 1*, 22-28. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2014.11.001

Fetterman, A. K., Meier, B. P., & Robinson, M. D. (2017). Dispositional properties of metaphor: The predictive power of the sweet taste metaphor for trait and daily prosociality. *Journal of Individual Differences*, *38*(3), 175-188. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1027/1614-0001/a000234

Fetterman, A. K., Wilkowski, B. M., & Robinson, M. D. (2018). On feeling warm and being warm: Daily perceptions of physical warmth fluctuate with interpersonal warmth. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *9*(5), 560-567. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1177/1948550617712032

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., & Glick, P. (2006). Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth and competence. *TRENDS in Cognitive Sciences, 11*(2), 77-83. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2006.11.005

Flake, J. K., & Fried, E. I. (2020). Measurement schmeasurement: Questionable measurement practices and how to avoid them. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science, 3*(4), 456-465. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2515245920952393

Fleeson, W. (2004). Moving personality beyond the person-situation debate: The challenge and the opportunity of within-person variability. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *13*(2), 83-87. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0963-7214.2004.00280.x

Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1985). If it changes it must be a process: Study of emotion and coping during three stages of college examination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48*(1), 150-170. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.48.1.150

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, *56*(3), 218-226. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218

Frijda, N. H. (2010). Impulsive action and motivation. *Biological Psychology, 84*(3), 570-579. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2010.01.005

Funder, D. C. (2009). Persons, behaviors, and situations: An agenda for personality psychology in the postwar era. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*(2), 120-126. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.12.041

Gagnon, J., & Rochat, L. (2017). Relationships between hostile attribution bias, negative urgency, and reactive aggression. *Journal of Individual Differences, 38*(4), 211-219. http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001/a000238

Garofalo, C., Velotti, P., & Zavattini, G. C. (2018). Emotion regulation and aggression: The incremental contribution of alexithymia, impulsivity, and emotion dysregulation facets. *Psychology of Violence, 8*(4), 470-483. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/vio0000141

Garzón-Umerenkova, A., de la Fuente, J., Amate, J., Paoloni, P. V., Fadda, S., & Pérez, J. F. (2018). A linear empirical model of self-regulation on flourishing, health, procrastination, and achievement, among university students. Frontiers in Psychology, 9. http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00536

Ghaed, S. G., & Gallo, L. C. (2006). Distinctions among agency, communion, and unmitigated agency and communion according to the interpersonal circumplex, five-factor model, and social-emotional correlates. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 86*(1), 77-88. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa8601_09

Gurtman, M. B., & Lee, D. L. (2009). Sex differences in interpersonal problems: A circumplex analysis. *Psychological Assessment, 21*(4), 515-527. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017085

Habashi, M. M., Graziano, W. G., & Hoover, A. E. (2016). Searching for the prosocial personality: A big five approach to linking personality and prosocial behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 42*(9), 1177-1192. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167216652859

Harris, K., & Vazire, S. (2016). On friendship development and the Big Five personality traits. Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 10(11), 647-667. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12287

Helgeson, V. S., & Fritz, H. L. (2000). The implications of unmitigated agency and unmitigated communion for domains of problem behavior. *Journal of Personality, 68*(6), 1031-1057. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.00125

Hofmann, W., Friese, M., & Strack, F. (2009). Impulse and self-control from a dual-systems perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 4*(2), 162-176. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01116.x

Horowitz, L. M., Wilson, K. R., Turan, B., Zolotsev, P., Constantino, M. J., & Henderson, L. (2006). How interpersonal motives clarify the meaning of interpersonal behavior: A revised circumplex model. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*(1), 67-86. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1001_4

Huppert, F. A. (2009). Psychological well-being: Evidence regarding its causes and consequences. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, *1*(2), 137-164. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1111/j.1758-0854.2009.01008.x

Huppert, F. A., & So, T. T. C. (2013). Flourishing across Europe: Application of a new conceptual framework for defining well-being. *Social Indicators Research*, *110*(3), 837-861. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1007/s11205-011-9966-7

Huta, V., & Ryan, R. M. (2010). Pursuing pleasure or virtue: The differential and overlapping well-being benefits of hedonic and eudaimonic motives. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *11*(6), 735-762. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1007/s10902-009-9171-4

Iida, M., Shrout, P. E., Laurenceau, J., & Bolger, N. (2012). Using diary methods in
psychological research. In H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A. T. Planter, D.
Rindskopf, & K. J. Sher (Eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, 1:*
Foundations, planning, measures, and psychometrics (pp. 277-305). American
Psychological Association. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1037/13619-
016

Irvin, R. L., Persich, M. R., & Robinson, M. D. (2020). *From ability to behavior: A scenario-*
based assessment of health competence predicts daily behavior [Manuscript submitted
for publication]. Department of Psychology, North Dakota State University.

Jackson, J. J., Wood, D., Bogg, T., Walton, K. E., Harms, P. D., & Roberts, B. W. (2010). What
do conscientious people do? Development and validation of the Behavioral Indicators of
Conscientiousness (BIC). *Journal of Research in Personality*, *44*(4), 501-511.
http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1016/j.jrp.2010.06.005

Jensen-Campbell, L. A., Knack, J. M., & Gomez, H. L. (2010). The psychology of nice people.
Social and Personality Psychology Compass, *4*(11), 1042-1056.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00307.x

Keyes, C. L. M. (2002). The mental health continuum: From languishing to flourishing in life.
Journal of Health and Social Behavior, *43*(2), 207-222.
http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3090197

Keyes, C. L. M. (2005). Mental illness and/or mental health? Investigating axioms of the
complete state model of health. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *73*(3),
539-548. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.73.3.539

Klein, R. J., Liu, T., Diehl, D., & Robinson, M. D. (2017). The personality-related implications of Stroop performance: Stress-contingent self-control in daily life. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *70*, 156-165. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.07.006

Klein, S. B., Sherman, J.W., & Loftus, J. (1996). The role of episodic and semantic memory in the development of trait self-knowledge. *Social Cognition*, *14*(4), 277-291. http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/soco.1996.14.4.277

Krishnakumar, S., Hopkins, K., Szmerekovsky, J. G., & Robinson, M. D. (2016). Assessing workplace emotional intelligence: Development and validation of an ability-based measure. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, *150*(3), 371-404. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2015.1057096

Lauriola, M., & Iani, L. (2017). Personality, positivity, and happiness: A mediation analysis using a bifactor model. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *18*(6), 1659-1682. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10902-016-9792-3

Lee, D. (2019). The convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales-21 (DASS-21). *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *259*, 136-142. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1016/j.jad.2019.06.036

Legree, P. J., Psotka, J., Robbins, J., Roberts, R. D., Putka, D. J., & Mullins, H. M. (2014). Profile similarity metrics as an alternate framework to score rating-based tests: MSCEIT reanalyses. *Intelligence, 47*, 159-174. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2014.09.005

Lievens, F. (2017a). Assessing personality-situation interplay in personnel selection: Toward more integration in personality research. *European Journal of Personality*, *31*(5), 424-440. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1002/per.2111

Lievens, F. (2017b). Construct-driven SJTs: Toward an agenda for future research. *International Journal of Testing, 17*(3), 269-276. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1080/15305058.2017.1309857

Litman, J. A. (2006). The COPE inventory: Dimensionality and relationships with approach- and avoidance-motives and positive and negative traits. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *41*(2), 273-284. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1016/j.paid.2005.11.032

Livingstone, H. A., & Day, A. L. (2005). Comparing the construct and criterion-related validity of ability-based and mixed-model measures of emotional intelligence. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 65*(5), 757-779. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013164405275663

Lovibond, P.S. & Lovibond, S.H. (1995). The structure of negative emotional states: Comparison of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) with the Beck Depression and Anxiety Inventories. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *33*(3), 335-343. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967(94)00075-U

Lucas, R. E., Le, K., & Dyrenforth, P. S. (2008). Explaining the extraversion/positive affect relation: Sociability cannot account for extraverts' greater happiness. *Journal of Personality, 76*(3), 385-414. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00490.x

Lynam, D. R., Hoyle, R. H., & Newman, J. P. (2006). The perils of partialling: Cautionary tales from aggression and psychopathy. *Assessment, 13*(3), 328-341. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1073191106290562

Magee, J. C., & Langner, C. A. (2008). How personalized and socialized power motivation

　　facilitate antisocial and prosocial decision-making. *Journal of Research in Personality,*

　　42(6), 1547-1559. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.07.009

Mann, F. D., DeYoung, C. G., Tiberius, V., & Krueger, R. F. (2021). Stability and well-being:

　　Associations among the Big Five domains, metatraits, and three kinds of well-being in a

　　large sample. *Journal of Personality, 00*. DOI: 10.1111/jopy.12611

Mao, T., Pan, W., Zhu, Y., Yang, J., Dong, Q., & Zhou, G. (2018). Self-control mediates the

　　relationship between personality trait and impulsivity. *Personality and Individual*

　　Differences, 129, 70-75. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.03.013

Mathieu, J. E., Aguinis, H., Culpepper, S. A., & Chen, G. (2012). Understanding and estimating

　　the power to detect cross-level interaction effects in multilevel modeling. *Journal of*

　　Applied Psychology, *97*(5), 951-966.

　　http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1037/a0028380

McDaniel, M. A., Hartman, N. S., Whetzel, D. L., & Grubb, W. L. (2007). Situational judgment

　　test, response instructions, and validity: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, *60*(1),

　　63-91. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00065.x

McDaniel, M. A., & Nguyen, N. T. (2001). Situational judgment tests: A review of practice and

　　constructs assessed. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *9*(1-2), 103-113.

　　http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1111/1468-2389.00167

Meyer, G. J., Finn, S. E., Eyde, L. D., Kay, G. G., Moreland, K. L., Dies, R. R., Eisman, E. J.,

　　Kubiszyn, T. W., & Reed, G, M. (2001). Psychological testing and psychological

　　assessment: A review of evidence and issues. *American Psychologist, 56*(2), 128-165.

　　http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//0003-066X.56.2.128

Mischel, W. (2009). From Personality and Assessment (1968) to personality science, 2009. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *43*, 282-290. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.12.037

Miller, J. D., Zeichner, A., & Wilson, L. F. (2012). Personality correlates of aggression: Evidence from measures of the Five-Factor Model, UPPS Model of Impulsivity, and BIS/BAS. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(14). http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886260512438279

Moeller, S. K., Troop-Gordon, W., & Robinson, M. D. (2015). When the going gets tough, the differentiated keep going: Cybernetic self-determination, daily obstacles, and persistent goal pursuit. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, *149*(5), 472-442. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1080/00223980.2013.837022

Moffitt, T. E., Arseneault, L., Belsky, D., Dickson, N., Hancox, R. J., Harrington, H., Houts, R., Poulton, R., Roberts, B. W., Ross, S., Sears, M. R., Thomson, W. M., & Caspi, A. (2011). A gradient of childhood self-control predicts health, wealth, and public safety. *PNAS, 108*(7), 2693-2698. http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1010076108

Morozink, J. A., Friedman, E. M., Coe, C. L., & Ryff, C. D. (2010). Socioeconomic and psychosocial predictors of interleukin-6 in the MIDUS national sample. *Health Psychology*, *29*(6), 626-635. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1037/a0021360

Mussel, P, Gatzka, T., & Hewig, J. (2018). Situational judgment tests as an alternative measure for personality assessment. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *34*(5), 328-335. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1027/1015-5759/a000346

Myers, D. G. (2000). The funds, friends, and faith of happy people. *American Psychologist,*
55(1), 56-67. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.56

Nielson, M. G., Padilla-Walker, L., & Holmes, E. K. (2017). How do men and women help?
Validation of a multidimensional measure of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Adolescence,*
56, 91-106. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2017.02.006

Ohly, S., Sonnentag, S., Niessen, C., & Zapf, D. (2010). Diary studies in organizational research:
An introduction and some practical recommendations. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*,
9(2), 79-93. http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000009

Oostrom, J. K., de Vries, R. E., & de Wit, M. (2019). Development and validation of a
HEXACO situational judgment test. *Human Performance*, *32*(1), 1-29.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2018.1539856

Palder, S. L., Ode, S., Liu, T., & Robinson, M. D. (2013). Living large: Affect amplification in
visual perception predicts emotional reactivity to events in daily life. Cognition and
Emotion, 27(3), 453-464. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2012.724011

Parker, J. D. A., Keefer, K. V., & Wood, L. M. (2011). Toward a brief multidimensional
assessment of emotional intelligence: Psychometric properties of the Emotional Quotient
Inventory—Short Form. *Psychological Assessment*, *23*(3), 762-777.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023289

Patrick, H., Knee, C. R., Canevello, A., & Lonsbary, C. (2007). The role of need fulfillment in
relationship functioning and well-being: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal*
of Personality and Social Psychology, *92*(3), 434-457. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-
3514.92.3.434

Persich, M. R., & Robinson, M. D. (2020). The person in context: Using situational judgment to

gain insight into social functioning. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *37*(1),

302-324. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265407519864447

Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and

prospects. *Journal of Management*, *12*(4), 531-544.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920638601200408

Raine, A., Dodge, K., Loeber, R., Gatzke-Kopp, L., Lynam, D., Reynolds, C., Stouthamer-

Loeber, M., & Liu, J. (2006). The reactive–proactive aggression questionnaire:

Differential correlates of reactive and proactive aggression in adolescent boys.

Aggressive Behavior, *32*(2), 159-171. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ab.20115

Reis, H. T., Sheldon, K. M., Gable, S. L., Roscoe, J., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). Daily well-being:

The role of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. *Personality and Social Psychology

Bulletin*, *26*(4), 419-435. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167200266002

Rentfrow, P. J., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2008). A theory of the emergence, persistence, and

expression of geographic variation in psychological characteristics. *Perspectives on

Psychological Science, 3*(5), 339-369. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01691.x

Robinson, M. D., Bair, J. L., Liu, T., Scott, M. J., & Penzel, I. B. (2017). Of tooth and claw:

Predator self-identifications mediate gender differences in interpersonal arrogance. *Sex

Roles, 77*(3), 272-286.

Robinson, M. D., Boyd, R. L., & Persich, M. R. (2016). Dispositional anger and the resolution of

the approach-avoidance conflict. *Emotion*, *16*(6), 838-849.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/emo0000189

Robinson, M. D., Fetterman, A. K., Hopkins, K., & Krishnakumar, S. (2013). Losing one's cool:

Social competence as a novel inverse predictor of provocation-related aggression.

Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39(10), 1268-1279.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167213490642

Robinson, M. D., Irvin, R. I., & Persich, M. R. (in press). Ego effectiveness: A novel individual

difference approach to health behavior and coping. *Journal of Health Psychology*.

Robinson, M. D., Klein, R. J., & Persich, M. R. (2019). Personality traits in action: A cognitive

behavioral version of the social cognitive paradigm. *Personality and Individual*

Differences, *147*, 214-222. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.04.041

Robinson, M. D., & Liu, T. (2013). Perceptual negativity predicts greater reactivity to negative

events in daily life. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *55*(8), 926-930.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.07.468

Robinson, M. D., Penzel, I. B., & Persich, M. R. (2020). What if your partner…? A situated

decision-making approach to romantic competence. *Journal of Research in Personality*,

88, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2020.104012

Robinson, M. D., Persich, M. R., & Krishnakumar, S. (2020). What would you do? A new

approach to health competence based on situational judgment. *Journal of Personality*,

88(4), 621-855. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12518

Robinson, M. D., Persich, M. R., & Krishnakumar, S. (in press). Happy and engaged: Synergies

among mindfulness and ability-related emotional intelligence. *Journal of Happiness*

Studies.

Robinson, M. D., Persich, M. R., Towers, C. M., Sjoblom-Schmidt, S., & Penzel, I. B. (2021).

The implicit security index: A social-cognitive model of attachment security in romantic

relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences, 171*.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110530

Robinson, M. D., Traurig, E., & Klein, R. J. (2020). On looking versus leaping: A situated

multilevel approach to trait anger and the anger-aggression relationship. *Personality and*

Individual Differences, *164*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110130

Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L. (2008). *Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data*

analysis (3rd ed.). McGraw Hill.

Rushton, J. P., Chrisjohn, R. D., & Fekken, G. C. (1981). The altruistic personality and the Self-

Report Altruism Scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *2*(4), 293-302.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(81)90084-2

Ryan, R. M., Huta, V., & Deci, E. L. (2008). Living well: A self-determination theory

perspective on eudaimonia. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *9*(1), 139-170.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10902-006-9023-4

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of

psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*(6), 1069-

1081. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069

Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. H. (2006). Best news yet on the six-factor model of well-being. *Social*

Science Research, *35*(4), 1103-1119. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2006.01.002.

Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. H. (2008). Know thyself and become what you are: A eudaimonic

approach to psychological well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *9*(1), 13-39.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10902-006-9019-0

Sadeh, N., & Baskin-Sommers, A. (2017). Risky, Impulsive, and Self-Destructive Behavior

Questionnaire (RISQ): A validation study. *Assessment*, *24*(8), 1080-1094.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1073191116640356

Salarian, A. (2021, May 31) *Intraclass Correlation coefficient (ICC)*. MATLAB Central File

Exchange. https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/22099-intraclass-

correlation-coefficient-icc

Schell, T. L., Klein, S. B., & Babey, S. H. (1996). Testing a hierarchical model of self-

knowledge. *Psychological Science*, *7*(3), 170-173. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-

9280.1996.tb00351.x

Scherbaum, C. A., & Ferreter, J. M. (2009). Estimating statistical power and required sample

sizes for organizational research using multilevel modeling. *Organizational Research

Methods*, *12*(2), 347-367. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1094428107308906

Schneider, T. R. (2004). The role of neuroticism on psychological and physiological stress

responses. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40*(6), 795-804.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2004.04.005

Selby, E. A., & Joiner, T. E. (2013). Emotional cascades as prospective predictors of

dysregulated behaviors in borderline personality disorder. *Personality Disorders: Theory,

Research, and Treatment, 4*(2), 168-174. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029933

Seligman, M. (2018). PERMA and the building blocks of well-being. *The Journal of Positive

Psychology*, *13*(4), 333-335. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2018.1437466

Seligson, J. L., Huebner, E. S., & Valois, R. F. (2003). Preliminary validation of the Brief

Multidimensional Students' Life Satisfaction Scale (BMSLSS). *Social Indicators

Research, 61*(2), 121-145.

Settles, R. E., Fischer, S., Cyders, M. A., Combs, J. L., Gunn, R. L., & Smith, G. T. (2012).

    Negative urgency: A personality predictor of externalizing behavior characterized by

    neuroticism, low conscientiousness, and disagreeableness. *Journal of Abnormal*

    Psychology, 121(1), 160-172. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0024948

Shakespeare-Finch, J., & Obst, P. L. (2011). The development of the 2-Way Social Support

    Scale: A measure of giving and receiving emotional and instrumental support. *Journal of*

    Personality Assessment, *93*(5), 483-490.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2011.594124

Shedler, J., & Westen, D. (2004). Dimensions of personality pathology: An alternative to the

    five-factor model. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, *161*(10), 1743-1754.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.161.10.1743

Singer, J. D. (1998). Using SAS PROC MIXED to fit multilevel models, hierarchical models,

    and individual growth models. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, *23*(4),

    323-355. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1165280

Sirois, F. M., & Hirsch, J. K. (2015). Big Five traits, affect balance and health behaviors: A self-

    regulation resource perspective. *Personality and Individual Differences, 87*, 59-64.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.07.031

Springer, K. W., & Hauser, R. M. (2006). An assessment of the construct validity of Ryff's

    Scales of Psychological Well-Being: Method, mode, and measurement effects. *Social*

    Science Research, 35(4), 1080-1102. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2005.07.004

Su, R., Tay, L., & Diener, E. (2014). The development and validation of the Comprehensive

    Inventory of Thriving (CIT) and the Brief Inventory of Thriving (BIT). *Applied*

Psychology: Health and Well-Being, 6(3), 251-279.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/aphw.12027

Suls, J., & Martin, R. (2005). The daily life of the garden-variety neurotic: Reactivity, stressor

exposure, mood spillover, and maladaptive coping. *Journal of Personality*, *73*(6), 1485-

1510. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00356.x

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson.

Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. F., & Boone, A. L. (2004). High self-control predicts good

adjustment, less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal success. *Journal of*

Personality, 72(2), 271-322. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00263.x

Taylor, S. E. (2006). Tend and befriend: Biobehavioral bases of affiliation under stress. *Current*

Directions in Psychological Science, 15(6), 273-277. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-

8721.2006.00451.x

Tennen, H., Affleck, G., & Armeli, S. (2005). Personality and daily experience revisited. *Journal*

of Personality, *73*(6), 1465-1484. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00355.x

Tett, R. P., & Guterman, H. A. (2000). Situation trait relevance, trait expression, and cross-

situational consistency: Testing a principle of trait activation. *Journal of Research in*

Personality, *34*(4), 397-423. http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.2000.2292

Trapnell, P. D., & Paulhus, D. L. (2012). Agentic and communal values: Their scope and

measurement. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 94*(1), 39-52.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2011.627968

Van den Broeck, A., Vansteenkiste, M., De Witte, H., Soenens, B., & Lens, W. (2010).

Capturing autonomy, competence, and relatedness at work: Construction and initial

validation of the Work-related Basic Need Satisfaction Scale. *Journal of Occupational*

and Organizational Psychology, *83*(4), 981-1002.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/096317909X481382

Vazire, S., & Carlson, E. N. (2011). Others sometimes know us better than we know ourselves. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *20*(2), 104-108.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721411402478

Wampler, K. S., Riggs, B. & Kimball, T. G. (2004). Observing attachment behavior in couples: The Adult Attachment Behavior Q-Set (AABQ). *Family Process*, *43*(3), 315-335.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.2004.00025.x

Waterman, A. S. (2007). On the importance of distinguishing hedonia and eudaimonia when contemplating the hedonic treadmill. *American Psychologist*, *62*(6), 612-613.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X62.6.612

Waterman, A. S. (2008). Reconsidering happiness: A eudaimonist's perspective. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *3*(4), 234-252. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17439760802303002

Watson, D., Wiese, D., Vaidya, J., & Tellegen, A. (1999). The two general activation systems of affect: Structural findings, evolutionary considerations, and psychobiological evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*(5), http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.76.5.820

Weiss, N. H., Gratz, K. L., & Lavender, J. M. (2015). Factor structure and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of difficulties in the regulation of positive emotions: The DERS-Positive. *Behavior Modification, 39*(3), 431-453.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0145445514566504

Westen, D., & Shedler, J. (2000). A prototype matching approach to diagnosing personality

 disorders: Toward DSM-V. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *14*(2), 109-126.

 http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/pedi.2000.14.2.109

Wilkowski, B. M., & Robinson, M. D. (2010). Associative and spontaneous appraisal processes

 independently contribute to anger elicitation in daily life. *Emotion, 10*(2), 181-189.

 http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017742

Wilkowski, B. M., Robinson, M. D., & Troop-Gordon, W. (2010). How does cognitive control

 reduce anger and aggression? The role of conflict monitoring and forgiveness processes.

 Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *98*(5), 830-840.

 http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018962

Wood, D., Lowman, G. H., Harms, P. D., & Spain, S. M. (2019). Using functional fields to

 formally represent the meaning and logic of behavior: A worked example using Dark

 Triad-related actions. *Personality and Individual Differences, 136*, 24-37.

 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.09.002

Wojciszke, B., Abele, A. E., & Wieslaw, B. (2009). Two dimensions of interpersonal attitudes:

 Liking depends on communion, respect depends on agency. *European Journal of Social

 Psychology, 39*(6), 973-990. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.595

APPENDIX A. DEMOGRAPHICS

1. What is your name? (Please type carefully; we need this for the daily part of the study.)

   _____

2. What is your email address? (Please type carefully; we need this for the daily portion of the study.)

   _____

3. What is your age? _____

4. What was your sex assigned at birth?:   **Male**   **Female**

5. Please indicate your race by selecting one or more of the following:

   African American   Asian or Pacific Islander   Hispanic   White/Caucasian

   Native American Other (Please Specify: _____)

APPENDIX B. DAILY COMPENSATION FOR SAMPLE 1 PARTICIPANTS

Daily Surveys Completed	*Credits Earned*
1-2 Days	1 Credit
3-4 Days	2 Credits
5-6 Days	3 Credits
7-8 Days	4 Credits
9 Days	5 Credits
10-11 Days	6 Credits
12-13 Days	7 Credits
14 Days	8 Credits

Instructions

We will describe different situations. You should read each situation, imagine yourself in the

situation (even though the exact situation may not have happened to you, similar situations

surely have), and then rate how likely it is that YOU would respond in each of the indicated

ways, if YOU were in the situation. Each of the situations will be paired with 4 consecutive

responses, and you should rate each of these potential ways of responding independently.

*Note: These instructions are for the participant ratings. For the researcher ratings, please make

the following changes to the instructions, scenarios, and endpoints.

Rater Instructions

Instructions:

> Thank you for your time in making these ratings. For the survey, you will be presented
>
> with characters in various situations and their potential responses to these situations. For
>
> each way of responding in the given situations, you will be asked to rate the person on 6
>
> dimensions based on that response (i.e., if all you knew about the person was that one
>
> response).
>
> One judgment will ask you whether the response is something that a HAPPY person
>
> would do, an UNHAPPY person would do, or is not very diagnostic of HAPPINESS.As
>
> you consider the response, you could think about a HAPPY person and an UNHAPPY
>
> person (e.g., that you know) in guiding your rating.
>
> One judgment will ask you whether the response is something that a SUCCESSFUL
>
> person would do, an UNSUCCESSFUL person would do, or is not very diagnostic of

SUCCESS. As you consider the response, you could think about a SUCCESSFUL person and an UNSUCCESSFUL person (e.g., that you know) in guiding your rating.

One judgment will ask you whether the response is something that a FRIENDLY person would do, an UNFRIENDLY person would do, or is not very diagnostic of FRIENDLINESS. As you consider the response, you could think about a FRIENDLY person and an UNFRIENDLY person (e.g., that you know) in guiding your rating.

One judgment will ask you whether the response is something that a COMPETENT person would do, an INCOMPETENT person would do, or is not very diagnostic of COMPETENCE. As you consider the response, you could think about a COMPETENT person and an INCOMPETENT person (e.g., that you know) in guiding your rating.

One judgment will ask you whether the response is something that a HOSTILE person would do, a NON-HOSTILE person would do, or is not very diagnostic of HOSTILITY. As you consider the response, you could think about a HOSTILE person and a NON-HOSTILE person (e.g., that you know) in guiding your rating.

One judgment will ask you whether the response is something that a MISERABLE person would do, a NON-MISERABLE person would do, or is not very diagnostic of MISERY. As you consider the response, you could think about a MISERABLE person and a NON-MISERABLE person (e.g., that you know) in guiding your rating.

Or, you could just try match the response to mental prototypes of HAPPINESS, SUCCESS, FRIENDLINESS, COMPETENCE, HOSTILITY, and MISERY.

Each page of the survey will feature 1 situation and 4 ways of responding to the situation that you will rate on the 6 dimensions.

This survey is estimated to take up to 1.5 hours in total to complete. If you need to stop at any point, you should be able to exit the survey and continue where you left off at a later time as long as you use the same device.

Thank you for your input!

Scenario: Replace "you" with a character name in parentheses, and correct the grammar accordingly.

Happiness Ratings

Scenarios: "Is this something that a HAPPY person would do or an UNHAPPY person would do? (if the behavior is not very diagnostic of whether someone is happy or unhappy, you could quite reasonably give a 4 rating)"

Endpoints: 1 = unhappy, 7 = happy

Friendliness Ratings

Scenarios: "Is this something that a FRIENDLY person would do or an UNFRIENDLY person would do? (if the behavior is not very diagnostic of whether someone is friendly or unfriendly, you could quite reasonably give a 4 rating)"

Endpoints: 1 = unfriendly, 7 = friendly (if the behavior is not very diagnostic of whether someone is friendly or hostile, you could quite reasonably give a 4 rating)

Success Ratings

Scenarios: "Is this something that a SUCCESSFUL (i.e., high-achieving) person would do or an UNSUCCESSFUL person (or loser) would do? (if the behavior is not very diagnostic of whether someone is successful or unsuccessful, you could quite reasonably give a 4 rating)"

Endpoints: 1 = unsuccessful, 7 = successful

Misery Ratings

Scenarios: "Is this something that a MISERABLE person would do or an NON-MISERABLE person would do? (if the behavior is not very diagnostic of whether someone is miserable or non-miserable, you could quite reasonably give a 4 rating)"

Endpoints: 1 = non-miserable, 7 = miserable

Hostility Ratings

Scenarios: "Is this something that a HOSTILE person would do or an NON-HOSTILE person would do? (if the behavior is not very diagnostic of whether someone is hostile or non-hostile, you could quite reasonably give a 4 rating)"

Endpoints: 1 = non-hostile, 7 = hostile

Incompetence Ratings

Scenarios: "Is this something that a COMPETENT person would do or an INCOMPETENT person would do? (if the behavior is not very diagnostic of whether someone is competent or incompetent, you could quite reasonably give a 4 rating)"

Endpoints: 1 = incompetent, 7 = competent

Scenario 1 (Samuel)

You have developed romantic feelings for a long-time friend. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Start flirting with the friend	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Talk to another friend about the situation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Tell the friend about the feelings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Hope the feelings go away	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 2 (Jackson)

You have a good job offer but in a city where you do not know anyone. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Take the job and make new friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Decline the job offer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Take the job and concentrate on work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Take the job but come home frequently	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 3 (Chloe)

You were stopped by the police officer for speeding but you were not speeding. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Make a decision not to pay the ticket	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Ask to be let off with a warning	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Complain about the situation later	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Assertively state that speeding did not occur	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 4 (Addison)

You have a group project worth a lot of points. Group members are not participating. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Threaten to tell the instructor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Ask to change groups	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Take over the group project personally	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Hope they come through	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 5 (Avery)

You received a low grade on an assignment after a lot of hard work. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely						**Extremely likely**
a. Work harder the next time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Talk to the teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Resolve to give a poor course evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Drop the course	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 6 (Anthony)

You have healthy food at home but it takes longer to prepare. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely						**Extremely likely**
a. Buy nutritious food that does not take time to prepare	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Prepare healthy food ahead of time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Sacrifice the time for the sake of healthy eating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Save healthier eating for the weekends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 7 (Natalie)

You are tempted to steal something and will not get caught. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Confess to the temptation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Think about how wrong it would be to steal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Only steal something small	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Steal it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 8 (Lily)

You feel uncertain about what to do in life. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Take a vacation to think about things	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Pursue interests and see where they lead	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Plug away on current plans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Make a career change	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 9 (Daniel)

You have been gaining too much weight recently. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Stabilize the weight gain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Take diet supplements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Consider a radical diet restriction	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Exercise harder	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 10 (Liam)

You feel abnormally tired and exhausted. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Slow down and take it easy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Drink caffeine to boost energy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Sleep more	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. See the doctor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 11 (Zoey)

You often get rowdy and disruptive at parties. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Continue having fun at parties	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Only go to parties that are likely to be rowdy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Stop drinking alcohol	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Stop attending parties	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 12 (Emily)

You keep skipping lunch because of a really busy schedule. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Cut back on tasks so there is time to eat	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Consider the situation a diet plan	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Start eating large breakfasts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Eat lunch no matter what	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 13 (Mason)

You have a social life that is so active that it often interferes with other tasks and duties. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Get rid of some less central acquaintances	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Make no changes as social life is very important	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Cut back on other tasks and duties	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Cut back on socializing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 14 (Michael)

You want to be honest but doing so will hurt someone's feelings. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Be honest even at the risk of hurting feelings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Realize that being honest is not always the best policy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Avoid saying anything	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Preserve the person's feelings no matter what	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 15 (Benjamin)

You would like to make some significant life changes. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Work harder on current life plans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Make the changes immediately	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Postpone the changes, but not indefinitely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Think about what to do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 16 (Isabella)

You think a roommate has depression. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Act especially cheerful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Call his/her parents	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Advise seeking professional help	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Let the roommate sort things out	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 17 (Ella)

You are not making sufficient progress on some important life goals. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Redouble efforts after the goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Change your life goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Turn to other goals instead	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Realize that slumps sometimes happen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 18 (David)

You did not get a raise you were hoping for. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Complain to a co-worker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Quit the job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Work harder in the hope of a future raise	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Seek an explanation from the boss	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 19 (Grace)

You have recently been making a lot of impulse purchases. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Take time to enjoy these purchases	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Analyze whether there is a deeper problem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Set a budget and stick to it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Get another job to pay for expenses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 20 (Mia)

You find public speaking to be nerve-wracking. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Avoid public speaking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Gravitate toward solitary endeavors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Face the fear and speak in public as often as possible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Research anxiety-relieving strategies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 21 (Logan)

You forgot an important meeting. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that

YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely						**Extremely likely**
a. Send an apology by email	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Buy a daily planner	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Hope no one noticed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Make excuses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 22 (Aubrey)

You broke up with a romantic partner but are regretting the breakup. ***If you were in this

situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely						**Extremely likely**
a. Try to find a new partner right away	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Wait to see if these feelings subside	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Get back together	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Resolve to stick it out longer in the next relationship	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 23 (Andrew)

You cannot fall asleep at night. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely						Extremely likely
a. Take up late-night reading	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. See the doctor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Start taking sleeping medication	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Take advantage of the extra time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 24 (Amelia)

You do not feel as close to your parents as desired. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely						Extremely likely
a. Make a phone call	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Visit parents more often	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Convince yourself that this is part of growing up	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Recall happier times	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 25 (Alexander)

You have a rather unfulfilling job that earns a lot of money. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Ask the employer for a different job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Try to find entertaining aspects of the job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Quit the job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Only do what is necessary at the job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 26 (Aiden)

You like to stay up very late at night. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Sleep later in the morning	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Find productive things to work on at night	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Get in bed by 12 no matter what	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Set the alarm clock earlier to try to break the habit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 27 (Harper)

You enjoy drinking but sometimes drink too much. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely						**Extremely likely**
a. Stop drinking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Keep drinking but hopefully with some moderation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Buy 6 packs rather than 12 packs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Drink only at parties	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 28 (Matthew)

You received a poor performance evaluation. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely						**Extremely likely**
a. Blame yourself	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Work harder prior to the next evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Confront the evaluator	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Ignore the evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 29 (Lillian)

You received a good job offer but wonder whether there might be a better job at another company. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Accept the job because any job is worth having	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Request extra time to decide	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Accept the job but immediately begin searching for another one	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Decline the job because there is likely to be a better one	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 30 (Elijah)

You would like to make extra spending money but a part-time job may interfere with studies. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Sell some belongings instead	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Wait until summer to work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Avoid a job but take out more student loans	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Take fewer classes to allow time for a job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 31 (Madison)

You could save money by moving in with parents. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Find some additional roommates	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Move in with the parents	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Accept being poor as the price of independence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Look for other ways to save money	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 32 (Sophia)

You do not have enough quality friends. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Try to become closer to current friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Try meeting new people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Concentrate on other areas of life	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Hang out in public places	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 33 (Abigail)

You have been a witness to a crime. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Try to forget what happened	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Make an anonymous tip	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Tell a friend about it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Try to stop the crime	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 34 (Elizabeth)

You are not getting along with a sibling. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Try to argue it out	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Avoid the sibling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Tell parents about the issue	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Seek counseling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 35 (William)

You are sick with the flu but are supposed to go to work. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely						**Extremely likely**
a. Call in sick	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Take medications and go to work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Stay in bed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Go to work but avoid breathing on others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 36 (Christopher)

Your doctor recommends an expensive medical treatment to avoid a potential illness. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely						**Extremely likely**
a. Skip the treatment but try to act healthier	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Wait to see if any further symptoms occur	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Do whatever the doctor says	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Look for other options	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 37 (Olivia)

You are deciding whether to drop a class because of bad grades. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Explain to the teacher that a poor grade would be problematic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Talk to a friend about what to do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Continue with the class	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Drop the class	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 38 (Sofia)

You have been feeling somewhat high-strung and tense. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Think about life worries	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Try to hang out with friends more	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Take up yoga	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Look into anti-anxiety medication	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 39 (Emma)

You are deciding whether to hang out and relax or to get some work done. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Start working	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Deliberate on the costs and benefits of each option	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Work for an hour and then take a break	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Choose to relax and find time for work later	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Scenario 40 (Hannah)

Your mom keeps bothering you about getting married. ***If you were in this situation, how likely would it be that YOU would do the following?:

	Extremely unlikely					**Extremely likely**	
a. Agree to a blind date your mom set up	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Ignore mom	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Start looking for a potential marital partner	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. State the desire not to get married	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX D. MINI-IPIP

Citation is included in-text.

Instructions: You will see a series of statements that may describe you well, or not at all. Indicate how well each statement describes you by choosing an option from the scale provided.

1 = Very inaccurate

2 = Moderately inaccurate

3 = Neither inaccurate nor accurate

4 = Moderately accurate

5 = Very accurate

1. I am the life of the party

2. I do not talk a lot

3. I talk to a lot of different people at parties

4. I keep in the background

5. I sympathize with others' feelings

6. I am not interested in other people's problems

7. I feel others' emotions

8. I am not really interested in others

9. I get chores done right away

10. I often forget to put things back in their proper place

11. I like order

12. I make a mess of things

13. I have frequent mood swings

14. I am relaxed most of the time

15. I get upset easily

16. I seldom feel blue

17. I have a vivid imagination

18. I am not interested in abstract ideas

19. I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas

20. I do not have a good imagination

APPENDIX E. SCALE OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EMOTIONS

Citation is included in-text.

Instructions: Please think about what you have been doing and experiencing during the past four weeks. Then report how much you experienced each of the following feelings, using the scale provide. For each item, select a number from 1 to 5.

1 = Very rarely or never

2 = Rarely

3 = Sometimes

4 = Often

5 = Very often or always

1. Positive

2. Good

3. Pleasant

4. Happy

5. Joyful

6. Contented

7. Negative

8. Bad

9. Unpleasant

10. Sad

11. Afraid

12. Angry

APPENDIX F. BRIEF INVENTORY OF THRIVING

Citation is included in-text.

Instructions: Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements.

1 = strongly disagree

2 = disagree

3 = neither agree nor disagree

4 = agree

5 = strongly agree

1. My life has a clear sense of purpose.

2. I am optimistic about my future.

3. My life is going well.

4. I feel good most of the time.

5. What I do in life is valuable and worthwhile.

6. I can succeed if I put my mind to it.

7. I am achieving most of my goals.

8. In most activities I do, I feel energized.

9. There are people who appreciate me as a person.

10. I feel a sense of belonging in my community.

APPENDIX G. FLOURISHING SCALE

Citation is included in-text.

Instructions: The following are eight statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the 1-7 scale provided, indicate your agreement with each item by indicating that response for each statement.

1 = Strongly disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Slightly disagree

4 = Mixed or neither agree nor disagree

5 = Slightly agree

6 = Agree

7 = Strongly agree

1. I lead a purposeful and meaningful life

2. My social relationships are supportive and rewarding

3. I am engaged and interested in my daily activities

4. I actively contribute to the happiness and well-being of others

5. I am competent and capable in the activities that are important to me

6. I am a good person and live a good life

7. I am optimistic about my future

8. People respect me

APPENDIX H. THE SCALES OF PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING

Please see the following reference source for scale description:

Springer, K. W., & Hauser, R. M. (2006). An assessment of the construct validity of Ryff's Scales of Psychological Well-Being: Method, mode, and measurement effects. *Social Science Research, 35*(4), 1080-1102. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2005.07.004

APPENDIX I. DEPRESSION, ANXIETY, AND STRESS SCALE

Citation is included in-text.

Instructions: Please read each statement and choose a response which indicates how much the statement applied to you over the past week. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any statement.

1 = Did not apply to me at all

2 = Applied to me to some degree, or some of the time

3 = Applied to me a considerable degree, or a good part of the time

4 = Applied to me very much, or most of the time

1. I felt that life was meaningless.

2. I felt that I had nothing to look forward to.

3. I couldn't seem to experience any positive feeling at all.

4. I was unable to become enthusiastic about anything.

5. I felt that I wasn't worth much as a person.

6. I felt down-hearted and blue.

7. I found it difficult to work up the initiative to do things.

8. I was aware of the action of my heart in the absence of physical exertion.

9. I experienced breathing difficulties.

10. I experienced trembling.

11. I felt I was close to panic.

12. I felt scared without any good reason.

13. I was worried about situations in which I might panic and make a fool of myself.

14. I was aware of dryness of my mouth.

APPENDIX J. RISKY, IMPULSIVE, AND SELF-DESTRUCTIVE BEHAVIOR

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please see the following reference source for scale description:

Sadeh, N., & Baskin-Sommers, A. (2017). Risky, Impulsive, and Self-Destructive Behavior

Questionnaire (RISQ): A validation study. *Assessment*, *24*(8), 1080-1094.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1073191116640356

APPENDIX K. PROSOCIALNESS SCALE FOR ADULTS

Please see the following reference source for scale description:

Caprara, G. V., Steca, P., Zelli, A., & Capanna, C. (2005). A new scale for measuring adults'

prosocialness. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 21*(2), 77-89.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.21.2.77

APPENDIX L. THE SELF-REPORT ALTRUISM SCALE

Citation is included in-text.

Instructions: For the following items, please select how often you have carried out the following acts.

1 = Never

2 = Once

3 = More than once

4 = Often

5 = Very Often

1. I have helped push a stranger's car out of the snow.

2. I have given directions to a stranger.

3. I have made change for a stranger.

4. I have given money to charity.

5. I have given money to a stranger who needed it (or asked me for it).

6. I have donated goods or clothes to charity.

7. I have done volunteer work for a charity.

8. I have donated blood.

9. I have helped carry a stranger's belongings (books, parcels, etc.).

10. I have delayed an elevator and held the door open for a stranger.

11. I have allowed someone to go ahead of me in a lineup (at Xerox machine, in the supermarket).

12. I have given a stranger a lift in my car.

13. I have pointed out a clerk's error (in a bank, at the supermarket) in undercharging me for an item.

14. I have let a neighbor whom I didn't know too well borrow an an item of some value to me (e.g., a dish, tools, etc.).

15. I have bought 'charity' Christmas cards deliberately because I knew it was a good cause.

16. I have helped a classmate who I did not know that well with a homework assignment when my knowledge was greater than his or hers.

17. I have, before being asked, voluntarily looked after a neighbor's pets or children without being paid for it.

18. I have offered to help a handicapped or elderly stranger across the street.

19. I have offered my seat on a bus or train to a stranger who was standing.

20. I have helped an acquaintance to move households.

APPENDIX M. TWO-WAY SOCIAL SUPPORT SCALE

Please see the following reference source for scale description:

Shakespeare-Finch, J., & Obst, P. L. (2011). The development of the 2-Way Social Support

Scale: A measure of giving and receiving emotional and instrumental support. *Journal of*

Personality Assessment, *93*(5), 483-490. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2011.594124

APPENDIX N. ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR SCALE

Instructions: You will be asked a series of yes/no questions about activities and behaviors in which you may or may have not been involved. Please indicate "yes" if the question is true for you and "no" if it is not.

0 = No   1 = Yes

1. Have you ever been convicted of a felony?

2. Have you ever committed a felony?

3. Have you ever been convicted of a misdemeanor?

4. Have you ever committed a misdemeanor?

5. Have you ever punched someone when they did not want to be punched?

6. Have you ever stolen something?

7. Have you ever gotten a speeding ticket?

8. Have you ever been fired from a job?

9. Have you ever quit a job?

10. Have you ever consumed illegal drugs?

11. Have you ever sold illegal drugs?

12. Have you ever intentionally injured another person?

13. Have you ever gambled excessively?

14. Have you ever blacked out from drinking too much?

15. Have you ever dumped someone?

16. Have you ever been warned for public drunkenness?

17. Have you ever had to pay a fine for late payments?

18. Have you ever borrowed more money than you had?

19. Have you ever been drunk in a public place?

20. Have you ever broken into a building just for fun?

21. Have you ever sneaked into a movie or event without paying?

22. Have you ever pulled a weapon (knife, gun, etc.) on someone?

23. Have you ever cheated on a test or a paper?

24. Have you ever knowingly written a bad check?

25. Have you ever been kicked out of a school?

APPENDIX O. RAINE PROACTIVE AND REACTIVE AGGRESSION

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please see the following reference source for scale description:

Raine, A., Dodge, K., Loeber, R., Gatzke-Kopp, L., Lynam, D., Reynolds, C., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., & Liu, J. (2006). The reactive–proactive aggression questionnaire: Differential correlates of reactive and proactive aggression in adolescent boys. *Aggressive Behavior*, *32*(2), 159-171. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ab.20115

APPENDIX P. EMOTIONAL QUOTIENT INVENTORY—SHORT FORM

Please see the following reference source for scale description:

Parker, J. D. A., Keefer, K. V., & Wood, L. M. (2011). Toward a brief multidimensional assessment of emotional intelligence: Psychometric properties of the Emotional Quotient Inventory—Short Form. *Psychological Assessment*, *23*(3), 762-777.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023289

APPENDIX Q. LIFE DOMAIN SUCCESS SCALE

Instructions: Please indicate how successful you have been in the following life domains.

1 = Not at all   7 = Extremely

1. How successful have you been with your work?

2. How successful have you been with your academic performance?

3. How successful have you been with your friends?

4. How successful have you been with your family?

5. How successful have you been with your romantic relationships?

6. How successful have you been with your financial situation?

7. How successful have you been with your health?

8. How successful have you been with your career goals?

APPENDIX R. COGNITIVE FAILURES QUESTIONNAIRE

Please see the following reference source for scale description:

Broadbent, D. E., Cooper, P. F., FitzGerald, P., & Parkes, K. R. (1982). The Cognitive Failures Questionnaire (CFQ) and its correlates. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 21*(1), 1-16. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8260.1982.tb01421.x

APPENDIX S. DICKMAN IMPULSIVITY SCALE

Please see the following reference source for scale description:

Dickman, S. J. (1990). Functional and dysfunctional impulsivity: Personality and cognitive

correlates. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58(1), 95-102.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.1.95

APPENDIX T. CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

Instructions: Carefully answer each of the following questions using the scales provided.

1. How many traffic tickets have you received?

      0 = 0

      1 = 1

      2 = 2

      3 = 3

      4 = 4

      5 = 5

      6 = 6

      7 = 7 or more

2. How many times have you been to jail?

      0 = 0

      1 = 1

      2 = 2

      3 = 3

      4 = 4

      5 = 5 or more

3. How many times have you been fined by the city or police?

0 = 0

1 = 1

2 = 2

3 = 3

4 = 4

5 = 5 or more

4. How many times have you had to go to court because of something you did?

0 = 0

1 = 1

2 = 2

3 = 3

4 = 4

5 = 5 or more

5. How many times have you been given a warning by the police?

0 = 0

1 = 1

2 = 2

3 = 3

4 = 4

5 = 5

6 = 6

7 = 7 or more

6. How many times have you been cited for misdemeanor?

        0 = 0

        1 = 1

        2 = 2

        3 = 3

        4 = 4

        5 = 5 or more

7. How many times have you been convicted of a felony?

        0 = 0

        1 = 1

        2 = 2

        3 = 3

        4 = 4

        5 = 5 or more

8. How many times has car been towed because of an infraction or parking violation?

        0 = 0

        1 = 1

        2 = 2

        3 = 3

        4 = 4

        5 = 5

        6 = 6

        7 = 7 or more

9. How many hours of community service have you been assigned due to misbehavior?

      0 = 0 hours

      1 = 0-20 hours

      2 = 20-40 hours

      3 = 40-60 hours

      4 = 60-80 hours

      5 = 80-120 hours

      6 = 120-160 hours

      7 = 160-200 hours

      8 = more than 200 hours

10. How many times have you been cited for an alcohol-related infraction?

      0 = 0

      1 = 1

      2 = 2

      3 = 3

      4 = 4

      5 = 5

      6 = 6

      7 = 7 or more

APPENDIX U. INDICATORS OF INCOMPETENCE

Instructions: Carefully answer each of the following questions using the scales provided.

1. How many times have you been penalized for an overdraft at the bank?

      0 = 0

      1 = 1

      2 = 2

      3 = 3

      4 = 4

      5 = 5

      6 = 6

      7 = 7 or more

2. How many times have you been contacted by a bill collector?

      0 = 0

      1 = 1

      2 = 2

      3 = 3

      4 = 4

      5 = 5

      6 = 6

      7 = 7 or more

3. How many times have you been fired?

       0 = 0

       1 = 1

       2 = 2

       3 = 3

       4 = 4

       5 = 5 or more

4. How many times have you had to drop a class due to poor performance?

       0 = 0

       1 = 1

       2 = 2

       3 = 3

       4 = 4

       5 = 5

       6 = 6

       7 = 7 or more

5. How many courses have you failed, either in college or high school?

0 = 0

1 = 1

2 = 2

3 = 3

4 = 4

5 = 5

6 = 6

7 = 7 or more

6. How many vehicle-based accidents have you been in?

0 = 0

1 = 1

2 = 2

3 = 3

4 = 4

5 = 5

6 = 6

7 = 7 or more

7. How many times have you failed a test or an assignment?

0 = 0

1 = 1

2 = 2

3 = 3

4 = 4

5 = 5

6 = 6

7 = 7 or more

8. How many times have you locked yourself out of your house or apartment?

0 = 0

1 = 1

2 = 2

3 = 3

4 = 4

5 = 5

6 = 6

7 = 7 or more

9. How many times have you broken bones due to careless behavior?

       0 = 0

       1 = 1

       2 = 2

       3 = 3

       4 = 4

       5 = 5

       6 = 6

       7 = 7 or more

10. How many times have you been treated at the ER (emergency room)?

       0 = 0

       1 = 1

       2 = 2

       3 = 3

       4 = 4

       5 = 5

       6 = 6

       7 = 7 or more

11. How many times has a romantic partner dumped you?

0 = 0

1 = 1

2 = 2

3 = 3

4 = 4

5 = 5

6 = 6

7 = 7 or more

12. How many times have you had to borrow money (e.g., from parents) to make ends meet?

0 = 0 times

1 = 1-2 times

2 = 3-5 times

3 = 6-7 times

4 = 8-10 times

5 = 11-15 times

6 = 16-20 times

7 = more than 20 times

APPENDIX V. DAILY DIARY SURVEY

Identity Verification

1. What is your name? _____

2. What is your email address? _____

3. What is your participant identification number? _____

Events

How many times did the following events occur to you today? Use this scale:

> **1 = not a single time**
>
> **2 = one time**
>
> **3 = two times**
>
> **4 = more than two times**

Stressful Events

1. I had a deadline to worry about today

2. I had a lot of responsibilities today

3. I did not have enough time to meet obligations today

4. I had too many things to do at once today

Provocative Events

1. someone criticized me today

2. someone treated me unfairly today

3. someone argued with me today

Positive Events

1. I accomplished something important today

2. Something very positive and meaningful happened to me today

3. I encountered something that was very pleasant and enjoyable today

Negative Events

1. Someone rejected me today

2. I performed poorly on an important task today

3. A very unpleasant or upsetting event happened to me today

Affiliative Events

1. I had a good conversation with somebody today

2. I shared my thoughts and feelings today

3. I felt accepted today

Personality

To what extent do the following statements characterize you TODAY?

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
strongly disagree				**strongly agree**

Happy Personality

1. Today, I was happy

Miserable Personality

2. Today, I was miserable

Friendly Personality

3. Today, I was friendly

Hostile Personality

4. Today, I was hostile

Successful Personality

5. Today, I was successful

Incompetent Personality

6. Today, I was incompetent

Daily Motivation

Some days, your motivation might be more of one type and other days, it might be more of another type. For each motivation contrast, indicate which motivation was stronger for you TODAY.

1. Approach Motivation [Motivation Contrast 1]

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

I was much more motivated to AVOID negative outcomes today.

equally motivated to approach and avoid

I was much more motivated to APPROACH positive outcomes today.

2. Prosocial Motivation [Motivation Contrast 2]

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

I was much more motivated to HURT people today.

equally motivated to help and hurt people

I was much more motivated to HELP people today.

Goal Profile

Rate the extent to which each behavior occurred when you were trying to achieve your goals.

While working on my goals today, I…

Cybernetic Self-Efficacy

	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1.	Felt I Lacked the Skills to Achieve Them				Felt Like I Had What It Takes to Achieve Them

Cybernetic Success

	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
2.	Was Not Successful in Achieving Them				Was Very Successful in Achieving them

Appraisals

How much do you agree with each of the following statements about your day today?

1 = strongly disagree   5 = strongly agree

Threat Appraisal

1. I viewed events as THREATENING today.

Reward Appraisal

2. I viewed events as REWARDING today.

Feelings

To what extent did you feel each of the following today? Use the scale below:

1 = Not at All, 2 = A Little, 3 = Moderately, 4 = Quite A Bit, 5 = Extremely

Antisocial Feelings

1. Irritated

2. Angry

Prosocial Feelings

3. Caring

4. Friendly

Positive Affect

5. Happy

6. Positive

7. Excited

Negative Affect

8. Sad

9. Negative

10. Distressed

Well-Being

Psychological Well-Being

To what extent are the following statements indicative of your day today?

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**

strongly disagree   **strongly agree**

Autonomy

1. Today, I was not afraid to voice my opinions even if they were controversial.

Environmental Mastery

2. Today, I was in charge of the situations I was in.

Personal Growth

3. Today, I sought new experiences that would help me grow.

Positive Relations

4. Today, I knew I could trust the people in my life.

Purpose in Life

5. Today, I had a sense of direction and purpose in my life.

Self-Acceptance

6. Today, I felt confident and positive about myself.

Flourishing

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

strongly disagree   **strongly agree**

1. Today, my life seemed purposeful and meaningful.

2. Today, my social relationships were supportive and rewarding.

3. Today, I was engaged and interested in my daily activities.

4. Today, I was optimistic about the future.

Coping

Think back to the times that you encountered problems or stressful events today and indicate the extent to which you coped with the events in each of the following ways.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

strongly disagree   **strongly agree**

Approach Coping

1. I concentrated my efforts on doing something about the situation

2. I thought about what steps to take concerning the situation

Avoidance Coping

3. I denied that I had any challenges with the situation

4. I just gave up in trying to reach my goals

Likert Behaviors

How many times did you do the FOLLOWING BEHAVIORS TODAY? Use the scale provided:

1 = not a single time

2 = 1-2 times

3 = 3-5 times

4 = more than 5 times (i.e., often)

Prosocial Behavior

1. helped someone

2. expressed affection to someone

3. did a favor for someone

Antisocial Behavior

1. criticized someone

2. argued with someone

3. threatened someone

Checklist Behaviors

Check all of the following behaviors that you did today:

Incompetent Behavior

[1] ☐ Lost something

[2] ☐ Was late to something

[3] ☐ Missed class

[4] ☐ Was unprepared for class

[5] ☐ Forgot to turn in an assignment

[6] ☐ Forgot something important

[7] ☐ Didn't do something I was supposed to do

[8] ☐ Got lost

[9] ☐ Made mistakes at work or school

[10] ☐ Forgot to bring something to school or work

[11] ☐ Broke something

[12] ☐ Missed an exit or turn while driving

[13] ☐ Tripped or fell

[14] ☐ Spilled or dropped something

[15] ☐ Was tricked or fooled

Risky Behaviors

[1] ☐ Got drunk or high

[2] ☐ Had casual or unplanned sex

[3] ☐ Got into a physical fight

[4] ☐ Did or used drugs

[5] ☐ Engaged in risky sports (e.g., skateboard tricks)

[6] ☐ Engaged in impulsive spending

[7] ☐ Went somewhere (e.g., a bar) where safety could be a concern