

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Which way to well-being: More of the same or trying something novel? The association of comfortable and experimental behavior styles to well-being.

(Accepted by Personality and Individual Differences)

Authors: Jamie S Churchyard^{a*} & Kathryn Buchanan^b

Author note:

^a Department of Psychology, Sociology and Social Work, University of Suffolk, Ipswich, Suffolk, IP4 1QJ, UK.

^b Department of Psychology, University of Essex, Colchester, CO4 3SQ, UK.

***Present addresses:** Correspondence regarding this manuscript should be sent to Jamie Churchyard, Department of Psychology, Paragon House, University of West London, Brentford, TW8 9GA, UK. Email: Jamie.Churchyard@uwl.ac.uk.

Kathryn Buchanan: Department of Psychology, University of Essex, Colchester, CO4 3SQ, UK. Email: k.buchanan@essex.ac.uk.

Post-publication correspondence can be sent to either author.

This manuscript has not been published elsewhere, and it has not been submitted simultaneously for publication elsewhere.

25

Abstract

26 In this paper we describe the development of a measurement of tendency towards displaying
27 a comfortable behavior style, and/or an experimental behavior style across two studies. A
28 comfortable behavioral style involves sticking to habits and routines, while an experimental
29 behavior style involves being inclined to try out new ideas, actions or experiences. Study 1
30 involved developing the items, and determining the factor structure of the items using a
31 student sample ($N = 189$, 85 male and 104 female, aged between 18 and 51). This found the
32 expected two factor structure, reflecting factors for a comfortable behavior style, and an
33 experimental behavior style. Study 2 went on to further validate the measures via a second
34 exploratory factor analysis, and establish the relationship of these measures to a variety of
35 well-being outcomes using a sample collected via Amazon's Mechanical Turk ($N = 302$, 159
36 male and 138 female, aged between 18 and 68). The two factor structure was confirmed, and
37 these measures were found to be related to outcomes including satisfaction with life, positive
38 and negative affect, self-concept clarity, and sensation seeking. The potential applications for
39 these measures are discussed.

40

41

42 *Keywords:* Comfortable, Experimental, Behavior Styles; Habit, Flexibility, Psychological
43 Well-being.

44

45

46

47

48 **Which way to well-being: More of the same or trying something novel? The association**
49 **of comfortable and experimental behavior styles to well-being.**

50 **1. Introduction**

51 In the past decade, researchers have become increasingly interested in identifying
52 activities or behaviors that may increase subjective well-being¹ (see meta-analyses in
53 Mazzucchelli, Kane, & Rees, 2010; Sin & Lyubomirsky, 2009). The extent to which each of
54 these prescribed happiness enhancing activities is experienced as “normative” or “typical”
55 will vary depending on the individual and their personal characteristics (i.e., their traits,
56 values, goals) and present repertoire of behavior. For example, one activity prolifically
57 associated with happiness is performing acts of kindness (e.g., Schueller & Parks, 2014).
58 While this may be something that one person does on a regular basis, this behavior may be
59 considered out of the ordinary for another person. This raises an important and as yet,
60 unanswered question: Is happiness more likely to be increased by sticking with what we
61 know (i.e., enacting habitual, familiar and comfortable behaviors) or by trying something
62 novel (enacting a broader range of more varied and experimental behaviors)? Such
63 knowledge may have practical implications for optimizing the choice of well-being
64 interventions. Consequently, we present the results of two studies in which we develop and
65 validate a questionnaire that operationalizes each of these approaches (Studies 1 and 2) and
66 examines the associations between each of the resulting constructs and subjective well-being
67 (Study 2).

68

69

70

¹ We follow other authors (e.g., Kahneman, Diener, & Schwartz, 1999) in using the terms “happiness” and “subjective wellbeing” interchangeably.

71 ***1.1. Two distinct behavioral routes to well-being: Sticking with what we know or trying***
72 ***something novel***

73 In the following section we discuss two distinct approaches to improving well-being
74 derived from existing theory and research: sticking with what we know (comfortable
75 behaviors) and trying something novel (experimental behaviors).

76

77 ***1.1.1. Sticking with what we know: A comfortable behavior style***

78 Within the positive psychology literature, only more recently has attention been given
79 to the conditions needed to optimize the effectiveness of well-being interventions. According
80 to person-activity fit theory the largest gains in happiness will be reached when there is a
81 ‘match’ or ‘good fit’ between the type of activity and the type of person and their enduring
82 characteristics such as their strengths, interests, values and inclinations (Lyubomirsky, King,
83 & Diener., 2005; Lyubomirsky, 2008; Sheldon & Lyubomirsky, 2007). While there are
84 different approaches as to what constitutes a ‘match’ or a ‘good fit’, in the positive
85 psychology literature the dominant conceptualisation utilizes the capitalization approach
86 (Schueller, 2014) which contends that a ‘good fit’ is an activity that is consistent with a
87 person’s personal characteristics (Cronbach & Snow, 1977; Lyubomirsky, 2008). Such an
88 approach appears to advocate that well-being is more likely to be increased when a person
89 stays within their existing behavioral range through enacting activities that fit within the
90 scope of their characteristics (e.g., enacting kind acts will benefit someone who values
91 kindness).

92 Aside from the fact that such matching hypotheses make intuitive sense and are
93 backed by anecdotal evidence (Schueller, 2014), other literature also alludes to the benefits of
94 “sticking with what we know”. For instance, enacting habitual behavior (Verplanken &
95 Orbell, 2003) keeps cognitive resources free for other self-regulatory activities (Baumeister,

96 Galliot, DeWall, & Oaten, 2006), while constructs such as self-concordance (pursuing a
97 goal/activity that fits with one's value/interests) and authentic living (i.e., acting in
98 accordance with one's values and beliefs) are consistently associated with higher subjective
99 and psychological well-being (Sheldon et al., 2004; Wood, Linley, Maltby, Baliousis, &
100 Joseph, 2008).

101 To date, empirical support for person-activity fit theory has been mixed. Support can
102 be found in research that has revealed that; value-environment fit is associated with higher
103 well-being (see review in Sagiv, Roccas, & Hazan, 2004); there is between-individual
104 variability in benefits gained from different happiness enhancing activities (Fordyce, 1977,
105 1983; Sergeant & Mongrain, 2011); practising signature strengths (i.e., behaving in
106 accordance with primary positive traits) can increase well-being (Seligman, Steen, Park, &
107 Peterson, 2005; Wood, Linley, Maltby, Kashdan, & Hurling, 2011); and that person-activity
108 fit indirectly affects well-being through increasing adherence to the assigned activity
109 (Sheldon & Lyubomirsky, 2006). However, support for the tenets of person-activity fit theory
110 is not evident in other research findings. Across four correlational studies, person-activity fit
111 did not significantly predict either subjective or psychological well-being (Buchanan &
112 Bardi, 2015). Participants assigned to a matched activity were not any happier than those
113 randomly assigned to an activity (Schueller, 2011; Silberman, 2007). Happiness enhancing
114 activities were most effective when they differed from an individual's dominant orientation
115 (Giannopoulos & Vella-Brodrick, 2011).

116 One of the likely reasons for these mixed findings is that researchers have differed in
117 how they have conceptualized person-activity fit. This is because an activity can fit a person
118 in number of ways, it might fit their motives, basic needs, or core values (Lyubomirsky et al.,
119 2005).

120

121 ***1.1.2. Trying something novel: an experimental behavior style***

122 While the dominant notion of person-activity fit within positive psychology is based
123 on “capitalization” (i.e., practising activities that are consistent with personal characteristic),
124 person-activity fit may also be conceptualised as involving “compensation” defined as
125 practising activities that overcome weaknesses or deficits and so help ‘balance’ an individual
126 (Cronbach & Snow, 1977). But is it theoretically possible to behave in ways that substantially
127 differ from our primary traits?

128 The average individual does have a tendency to display variation in their behavior in
129 addition to a habitual trait personality (McCrae & Costa, 1996). Indeed, research by Fleeson
130 (Fleeson & Gallagher, 2009) examining the density distribution of personality states
131 demonstrates that the individual tends to display a dispositional trait personality, but with
132 variation in personality states distributed around the trait personality. This tends to be
133 performed to adapt to particular situations or goals (Bleidorn, 2009; Heller, Komar & Lee,
134 2007). This is also reflected at the personality questionnaire response level, with previous
135 research (Biderman & Reddock, 2012) suggesting that within-subject standard deviations in
136 responding to particular personality traits or facets, calculated as measures of individual
137 variation in specific item ratings within a trait/facet (an index of traitedness), are related to
138 outcomes including life satisfaction and depression (Churchyard, Pine, Sharma & Fletcher,
139 2014).

140 This capacity allows for the idea of practising compensation, to try behaviors that may
141 be outside of the individual’s behavioral norm for that situation in order to improve
142 adaptation and well-being. Taking advantage of this capacity, Fletcher and Pine’s (2012)
143 approach to behavior change is based on giving the individual novel behavior suggestions to
144 try that fall outside of their behavioral norm. This is in order to receive different feedback
145 from their social environment (from the self and/or others) or to engage with completely new

146 environments, and break habits. It is designed to widen the individual's behavioral repertoire
147 of responses to a variety of situations, old and new. Other researchers sharing this philosophy
148 of expansion over habituation include Fredrickson (2001) with the Broaden and Build theory.
149 This theory suggests that experiencing different types of positive emotions allows the
150 individual to expand their social and psychological resources, while negative emotions are
151 useful only for responding to threatening situations, but otherwise hold the individual back
152 and leave them prone to stagnation and habituation.

153 In terms of empirical support for the "trying something new" approach to well-being,
154 several intervention studies show that enacting novel behaviors can help increase cognitive
155 well-being, in terms of increased life satisfaction (Buchanan & Bardi, 2010) and physical and
156 psychological well-being, in terms of decreased BMI, anxiety and depression (Fletcher,
157 Hanson, Page & Pine, 2011). This suggests that compensation approaches to behavior
158 change are valid options as well as capitalization approaches.

159 *1.1.3. Which way to happiness?*

160 So on the one hand there is evidence that comfort can be found in familiarity, and
161 pleasure can be gained from practising our strengths (Seligman et al., 2005; Wood, Linley,
162 Maltby, Kashdan, & Hurling, 2011), yet on the other hand, there is also evidence that without
163 doing anything different or experimenting we cannot reasonably expect our happiness to
164 change (Buchanan & Bardi, 2010; Fletcher, Hanson, Page & Pine, 2011; Fletcher & Pine,
165 2012). Schueller (2014) discusses the question of "Which strategy to choose?" within the
166 context of person-activity fit. Schueller suggests that the decision concerning which
167 intervention strategy to use should be influenced not only by the preference of the individual,
168 but also their personality, motivation, and culture.

169 In the present research we aim to help advance the use of assessing personality
170 characteristics in making the choice of a familiar behavioral strengths, or increased
171 behavioral repertoire (novelty) intervention strategy. In particular, this research presents an
172 important and novel contribution by establishing a measure of an experimental behavior style
173 (liking to do something different or novel) and a comfortable behavior style (liking doing
174 more of the same).

175 ***1.2. Operationalizing comfortable and experimental behavior styles***

176 Based on the research reviewed in this introduction, we operationalized these two
177 psychological constructs as follows:

178 1. Having a comfortable behavioral style, in which people stick to habits and routines for
179 their own comfort and predictability,

180 2. An experimental behavior style, in which people are inclined to try out new ideas, actions
181 or experiences to learn from them, and are flexible in their approach to life.

182 When designing an item pool to measure the comfortable behavior style, we were aware of
183 the existence of Verplanken and Orbell (2003) Self Report Habit Index (SRHI), and Fletcher
184 and Pine's (2012) Habit Rater. Although some of the items in this pool may bear resemblance
185 to those in these two measures, there are important conceptual differences between this item
186 pool and these two measures. While Verplanken and Orbell's SRHI focuses on general items
187 tailored to fit a specific habit, Fletcher and Pine's Habit Rater asks more about tendencies
188 towards specific instances of habitual or non-habitual behavior within a more general
189 questionnaire format, we have focused on developing a measure without the focus on specific
190 habitual behaviors in any way. This was important to distinguish as we were looking to assess
191 a comfortable behavior style. This is a modified measure of general habitual tendencies that

192 also accounts for the degree to which individuals take comfort in patterns, routines or
193 habitual behavior, rather than focusing on assessing tendency towards specific habits.
194 Fletcher and Pine also assess the flexibility to display different types of behavior as a separate
195 construct, with a Behaviour Rater using a checklist format, rather than a statement based
196 format. We also treat comfortable and experimental behavior styles as two separate and
197 distinct constructs, rather than as opposing ends of a single dimension. In adopting this
198 approach we acknowledge the capacity for the individual to display a balance of both
199 behavior styles to some extent. Assessing this via the midpoint on a unidimensional scale (of
200 total scores or specific items) may allow the individual to identify their behavior style as
201 somewhere in between comfortable and experimental. However, treating these styles as two
202 separate constructs allows the individual to directly identify and acknowledge that they
203 display both behavior styles in a balance. It is also possible that the individual only weakly or
204 strongly identifies with both styles, in cases where the individual perhaps has limited self-
205 concept clarity with regards to their behavior style. Treating these styles as two separate
206 constructs allows the individual opportunity to make these distinctions much more clearly in
207 their responses. These separate constructs are also measured using the same measurement
208 scale. This has advantages in making the two constructs more easily comparable.

209

210

211

212

213

214

215 **2. Study 1: Developing a measure of comfortable and experimental behavior styles**

216 In Study 1 we aimed to develop a measure of people's tendency towards comfortable
217 and experimental behavior styles – using the aforementioned operationalisations in the
218 introduction. Accordingly we generated an initial item pool and analyzed the results using
219 Exploratory Factor analysis (EFA) to examine whether we would find support for the
220 anticipated two-factor structure.

221 Following examination of the newly developed scale's structural integrity, we then
222 tested the scales' convergent and discriminant validity against a selection of potentially
223 related constructs, namely, sensation seeking (Zuckerman, Eysenck, & Eysenck, 1978),
224 impulsiveness (Patton, Stanford, & Barratt, 1995), and behavioral approach and inhibition
225 (Carver & White, 1994). We expected to find that a comfortable behavior style would be
226 negatively related to sensation seeking and impulsiveness, and positively related to
227 behavioral inhibition, while an experimental behavior style would be positively related to
228 sensation seeking, impulsiveness and behavioral approach, and negatively related to
229 behavioral inhibition.

230

231 **2.1. Study 1 Method**

232 **2.1.1. Participants and procedure**

233 A total of 189 participants (85 male and 104 female) aged between 18 and 51 (Mean =
234 28.29, $SD = 8.09$) were recruited using a convenience sampling method to complete an online
235 survey. All were native English speakers, recruited in Great Britain. To minimize the chances
236 of finding positive spurious associations, we randomized the order in which we presented

237 each of the measures. To avoid participant fatigue occurring for conceptually similar scales
238 we presented participants with either the sensation seeking scale or the impulsiveness scale.

239 ***2.1.2. Development of the item pool for comfortable and experimental behavior style items***

240 Items were developed in line with the operationalized definitions of comfortable and
241 experimental behavior styles stated in the introduction to Study 1. During the scale
242 development phase the authors generated a pool of statement items and discussed the extent
243 to which each item accurately represented the construct in question and where necessary
244 reworded items to avoid ambiguity. Only items that both authors agreed upon were included
245 in the final 20 items, ten of which were expected to assess an experimental behavior style
246 (e.g., “I would describe myself as someone who tests out new ideas”) and 10 of which were
247 expected to measure a comfortable behavior style (e.g., “I take comfort in familiarity”).
248 Participants were asked to indicate to what extent each statement described them using a 5-
249 point Likert scale (from 1=“Not at all like me” to 5 = “Just like me”). To avoid, differing
250 interpretations of the Likert scale each scale point was labelled (e.g., 2 referred to “Not much
251 like me”).

252 ***2.1.3. Measures***

253 *Sensation Seeking*

254 The Sensation Seeking V Scale (SSS-V Zuckerman, Eysenck, & Eysenck, 1978) is
255 comprised of 40 items. Each item contains two options and participants are required to make
256 a forced choice and select the option which most describes their likes or feelings.

257 Alternatively, in cases where neither option is liked, then participants are asked to choose the
258 item that they dislike the least. The scale produces an overall score which can be further
259 subdivided into four subscales: thrill and adventure seeking (TAS), experience seeking (ES),

260 disinhibition (Dis) and boredom susceptibility (BS). In the present study the total SSS-V
261 score $\alpha = .83$, ES $\alpha = .62$, TAS $\alpha = .75$ for, Dis $\alpha = .75$, and BS $\alpha = .49$.

262

263 *Impulsiveness*

264 The Barratt Impulsivity Scale (BIS-II; Patton, Stanford & Barratt, 1995) is a 30-item self-
265 report measure used to assess the personality construct of impulsiveness. The items are
266 scored on a 4-point scale (1 = “Rarely/Never”, 2 = “Occasionally”, 3 = “Often”, 4 =
267 “Almost always/Always”) and the scale measures three facets of impulsiveness: Cognitive
268 Impulsiveness, Motor Impulsiveness, and Non-Planning Impulsiveness (Barratt, 1985).
269 Cronbach’s alpha for the total score was $\alpha = .84$, and for each of the subscales of cognitive
270 impulsiveness $\alpha = .69$, motor impulsiveness = $.64$, and non-planning impulsiveness = $.68$.

271

272 *Behavioral Inhibition/Approach Scales (BIS/BAS)*

273 The Behavioral Inhibition/Approach Scales (Carver & White, 1994) is comprised of 20 items
274 that assess sensitivity to the behavioral inhibition system and behavioral approach system. In
275 total, seven items measure BIS (i.e., the predisposition to avoid threatening or punishing
276 stimuli), five items measure reward responsiveness (BAS-RR), four items measure drive
277 (BAS-D) and four items measure fun seeking (BAS-FS). Participants indicate the degree to
278 which they agree with statements on a Likert scale from 1=“Very true for me” to 4=“Very
279 false for me”. Cronbach’s alpha for these scales were as follows: BIS-Total: $\alpha = .76$, BAS-
280 RR: $\alpha = .75$, BAS-D: $\alpha = .77$, BAS-FS: $\alpha = .75$.

281

282

283 **2.2. Study 1 Results**284 **2.2.1. Data screening**

285 The descriptive statistics for each item of the comfortable and experimental behavior
286 style scales were examined (see Table 1). All items used the full range of the Likert scale.
287 Tests of normality indicated that the data were approximately normally distributed for each
288 item. Specifically, the visual examinations of the box-plots (see Figure 1 in the
289 supplementary analysis), skewness and kurtosis values, as well as values of skewness and
290 kurtosis divided by their respective standard errors² all suggested that many of the items,
291 although not perfectly normally distributed, were close enough to utilise a maximum
292 likelihood estimation approach to EFA.

293

294

295

² The values for asymmetry and kurtosis between -2 and +2 are considered acceptable in order to prove normal univariate distribution (George & Mallery, 2010).

Insert table 1 here.

1 *2.2.2. Scale structure with exploratory factor analysis*

2 To assess the structural integrity of the comfortable and experimental behavior styles
3 scale we first conducted parallel analysis (PA; Horn, 1965) using the SPSS syntax developed
4 by O'Connor (2000) to determine how many factors to extract. Previous studies have found
5 that PA is one of the most accurate methods for deciding how many factors to retain (e.g.,
6 Zwick & Velicer, 1986). We performed PA to generate 1000 random data sets that had the
7 same number of cases ($N=189$) and variables ($N=20$) as our sample. The results showed that
8 only the first two mean eigenvalues of our data were substantively greater than the first two
9 mean eigenvalues in the randomly generated data set, indicating a two-factor solution.
10 Further support for the two factor structure was obtained by running Velicer's MAP test
11 (O'Connor, 2000; Velicer, Eaton, & Fava, 2000). The findings showed that the smallest
12 average squared partial correlation (.0153) was associated with the second component,
13 providing further support for a two factor solution.

14 As our data was approximately normally distributed we conducted maximum
15 likelihood estimation and on the basis of the PA and scree plot (see Figure 2 in the
16 supplementary analysis), we specified a two factor solution. We also applied an oblimin
17 rotation on the basis that the two components were likely to be empirically related. The
18 results of Bartlett's test ($\chi^2(190)=1270.15, p < .001$) and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (.84) test
19 indicated that the data were suitable for EFA. The extracted eigenvalue for the first factor
20 using maximum likelihood estimation was 4.52 and accounted for 22.58% of the variance.
21 The eigenvalue for the second factor was 2.77 and this accounted for an additional 13.87% of
22 the variance. After the oblimin rotation the eigenvalue for the first factor became 4.25, and
23 the eigenvalue for the second factor became 3.24. In the oblimin rotated solution, the first
24 factor represented an experimental behavior style and the second factor represented a
25 comfortable behavior style. Table 2 displays the pattern and structure matrices from the

26 oblimin rotated solution, as well as the item-total correlations for each subscale. All items
27 loaded at .40 or close to .40 on the expected factors in the pattern and structure matrices. In
28 the one case where the item “I often do things on autopilot without even realizing” loaded
29 close to .40, the Cronbach alpha if the item was deleted and corrected item-total correlations
30 were also examined. This suggested that no improvements of substance (of .005 or greater)
31 could be made to the comfortable behavior style factor by removing the item. The corrected
32 item-total correlations suggested that this item also demonstrated a reasonable item-total
33 correlation (greater than .30), indicating that it could be retained in the final measure. The
34 internal consistencies of each behavior subscale were good (experimental: $\alpha = .86$;
35 comfortable: $\alpha = .81$). The factor correlation after oblimin rotation ($r(190) = -.14, p = .054$)
36 suggests a borderline significant relationship between the two factors.

37 The total scores for each of the two behavior styles were calculated. The descriptive
38 statistics for the comfortable behavior style total scores suggest an average around the
39 midpoint of the 10 to 50 total score range, with moderate deviation around this mean ($M =$
40 $30.82, SD = 6.36$). For the experimental behavior style the descriptive statistics suggest an
41 average just above the midpoint of the total score range, with moderate deviation around this
42 mean ($M = 32.53, SD = 7.14$). To determine whether sex had an impact on either of these
43 measures we conducted independent t-tests. The findings revealed only a significant
44 difference for the experimental behavior style with male participants scoring significantly
45 higher ($M = 33.85$) than female participants ($M = 31.46$), $t(187) = 2.31, p = .022$. To see
46 whether age was associated with displaying either behavior style, correlations between age
47 and each of the behavior style were conducted. Age did not significantly correlate with either
48 behavior style at the .05 alpha level.

Insert table 2 here

1 **2.2.3. Convergent and Discriminant Validity**

2 Partial correlation analyses (two-tailed, partialling out sex and age³) confirmed our
3 expectations regarding the relations of experimental and comfortable styles to sensation
4 seeking, impulsiveness, and behavioral inhibition and approach (see Table 3, zero order
5 correlations are provided in Table 4 in the supplementary analysis). Specifically, sensation
6 seeking and impulsiveness were significantly negatively correlated with a comfortable style
7 and significantly positively correlated with an experimental style.

8

9

10

11

³ Age was partialled out in all these analyses as well as sex, as age was found to significantly correlate in zero order correlations with cognitive impulsiveness, $r(124) = -.32, p < .001$, and non-planning impulsiveness, $r(124) = -.26, p = .001$. Sex was partialled out, as a significant difference in experimental behavior style scores was found between male and female participants.

Insert Table 3 here.

1 **2.3. Study 1 Discussion**

2 In Study 1 we aimed to validate our measure of comfortable and experimental
3 behavior styles. Analyses showed that the scale consisted of the expected two factors. All
4 items loaded on the anticipated factors and there were no substantive cross loadings in the
5 pattern matrix. The two factors were also found to have good internal consistency and the
6 findings from the partial correlation analyses provide support for the scales convergent and
7 discriminant validity.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 **3. Study 2: Establishing relationships between a comfortable style, an experimental**
27 **style, openness to experience and psychological well-being**

28 In Study 1 we developed a questionnaire to measure both comfortable and
29 experimental behavior styles as discriminant constructs. In Study 2, we had two aims. First,
30 we sought to further test the structural integrity of our newly developed scale with EFA to see
31 whether the two-factor structure would be replicated in a second sample. Second, we aimed
32 to examine the relations of experimental and comfortable behavior to a selection of
33 psychological well-being outcomes. In doing so, we sought to test our hypothesis that both
34 behavior styles would be positively correlated with positive psychological outcomes (positive
35 affect, satisfaction with life, self-concept clarity) and negatively correlated with negative
36 psychological outcomes. We anticipated these correlations on the basis that intervention
37 studies that encourage either an experimental behavior style (e.g., performing acts of novelty)
38 or a comfortable behavior style (e.g., practising signature strengths) have been found to
39 increase well-being (Buchanan & Bardi, 2010; Fletcher et al., 2011; Seligman et al., 2005).

40 In addition, in Study 2 we improved on Study 1 by measuring traitedness. We
41 calculated the conceptual standard deviation in within-person item responses for items
42 tapping into the comfortable behavior style, and also the experimental behavior style, referred
43 to as the within subject standard deviations (WSSD).

44

45

46

47

48

49 **3.1. Study 2 Method**

50 **3.1.1. Participants and procedure**

51 A total of 332 participants completed a brief online survey through Amazon's
52 Mechanical Turk⁴ (MTurk) for a nominal payment. All were native English speakers, who
53 were recruited in the US. Of these, we analysed the data from only the 302 participants who
54 passed the attention response check in place. These participants were aged between 18 and 68
55 (Mean = 35.07, SD = 11.88). Of these participants, 297 chose to report their sex as either
56 male ($n = 159$) or female ($n = 138$). To minimize the chances of finding spurious
57 associations, we randomized the order in which we presented each of the measures.

58 **3.1.2. Measures**

59 *Comfortable and Experimental Behavior Styles scale.* This was the final version of
60 the measure we designed in Study 1. This consisted of 10 items to tap into a comfortable
61 behavior style (e.g., "I take comfort in familiarity"), and 10 items to tap into an experimental
62 behavior style (e.g., "I would describe myself as someone who tests out new ideas").
63 Participants were asked to indicate to what extent each statement described them using a
64 Likert scale from from 1="Not at all like me" to 5="Very much like me"

65 *Subjective Well-Being.* Respondents completed measures of affective and cognitive
66 well-being. Affective well-being was assessed using the Positive and Negative Affect Scale
67 (PANAS, Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). The PANAS consists of 20 adjectives
68 comprising two subscales, positive affect and negative affect. Participants used a 5-point

⁴ Past research suggests that the data obtained from M-turk is at least as reliable as the data obtained via traditional methods, and reflect a more diverse sample than either internet or college student samples (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011; Mason & Suri, 2012; Paolacci, Chandler, & Ipeirotis, 2010; Rand, 2012).

69 scale, from 1 (“Very slightly”) to 5 (“Extremely”), to indicate the extent to which they
70 currently felt this way.

71 Cognitive well-being was assessed using the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS;
72 Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). The SWLS consists of 5 unidirectional attitude
73 expressions (e.g., “The conditions of my life are excellent”) conveying cognitive evaluations
74 of global happiness. Participants rated the expressions using a 7-point Likert scale, from 1
75 (“Strongly disagree”) to 7 (“Strongly agree”). Both the PANAS and SWLS had excellent
76 reliability (PA $\alpha = .92$, NA $\alpha = .94$, SWLS $\alpha = .93$).

77 *Self-Concept Clarity.* The self-concept clarity (SCC) scale consists of 12 statements
78 which measure the extent to which self-beliefs are clearly and confidently defined, internally
79 consistent, and stable (Campbell, Trapnell, Heine, Katz, Lavalley, & Lehman, 1996).
80 Participants used a 5-point rating scale from 1 (“Strongly disagree”) to 5 (“Strongly agree”).
81 The SCC scale displayed good reliability ($\alpha = .85$).

82 *Trait Openness to Experience.* Openness to experience will be measured using the 20
83 item International Personality Item Pool (IPIP, Goldberg et al., 2006) version of the openness
84 to experience questionnaire based on the NEO-PI-R broad trait (Costa & McCrae, 1992).
85 Participants used a 5-point scale, from 1 (“Very inaccurate”) to 5 (“Very accurate”). The
86 OTE had excellent reliability ($\alpha = .91$).

87 *Sensation Seeking.* We assessed sensation seeking using the eight item Brief
88 Sensation Seeking Scale (BSSS; Hoyle, Stephenson, Palmgreen, Lorch, & Donohew, 2002).
89 Participants used a 5-point scale, from 1 (“Strongly disagree”) to 5 (“Strongly agree”). Two
90 items each are included to measure experience seeking, boredom susceptibility, thrill and
91 adventure seeking and disinhibition. The BSSS had good reliability ($\alpha = .87$).

92 *Curiosity.* The Curiosity and Exploration inventory-II contains 10 items (Kashdan et
93 al. 2009). Five items assess stretching (motivation to seek new knowledge and experiences)

94 and five items assess embracing (willingness to embrace the uncertain and unpredictable
95 nature of everyday life). Responses are given on a 5-point scale from 1 (“Very slightly”) to 5
96 (“Extremely”). The scale had excellent reliability ($\alpha = .91$).

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113 3.2. *Study 2 Results*

114 We first determined whether the two factor solution found in Study 1 could be
115 replicated with the data collected from Study 2 by performing an EFA using the same
116 strategy applied in Study 1.

117 3.2.1. *Exploratory factor analysis of the comfortable and experimental behavior items*

118 As our data was approximately normally distributed we conducted maximum likelihood
119 estimation. On the basis of the findings from Study 1, we specified a two factor solution. We
120 also applied an oblimin rotation on the basis that the two components were likely to be
121 empirically related, even if only weakly as suggested by Study 1. The results of Bartlett's test
122 ($\chi^2(190) = 2743.39, p < .001$) and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (.92) test indicated that the data
123 were suitable for EFA. The extracted eigenvalue for the first factor using maximum
124 likelihood estimation was 7.13 and accounted for 35.67% of the variance. The eigenvalue for
125 the second factor was 1.77 and this accounted for an additional 8.84% of the variance. After
126 the oblimin rotation the eigenvalue for the first factor became 5.98, and the eigenvalue for the
127 second factor became 5.69. In the oblimin rotated solution, the first factor represented an
128 experimental behavior style and the second factor represented a comfortable behavior style.
129 Table 2 displays the pattern and structure matrices from the oblimin rotated solution, as well
130 as the item-total correlations for each subscale. All items loaded at .40 on the expected
131 factors in the pattern matrix, except for the "I often do things on autopilot without even
132 realizing" item. Removing this item would increase the Cronbach alpha by .01, and the
133 corrected item-total correlation suggested that this item did not demonstrate an adequate
134 item-total correlation (lower than .30). This item was not retained in the final measure. A
135 strong negative factor correlation was found after oblimin rotation ($r(190) = -.52, p < .001$),
136 suggesting it was correct to follow the two factor solution with oblimin rotation strategy

137 utilised in Study 1. Based on the second EFA conducted, it is apparent that a broad nine item
138 comfortable style factor and ten item experimental style factor solution provides the strongest
139 model fit, whilst maintaining validity of the measures. Accordingly, we report all subsequent
140 analyses using the nine item measure for comfortable behavior style and the ten item measure
141 for the experimental behavior style. The reliability of each behavior style subscale was good
142 (experimental: $\alpha = .89$; comfortable: $\alpha = .88$).

143 The descriptive statistics for the comfortable behavior style total scores suggest an
144 average around the midpoint of the 10 to 50 total score range, with moderate deviation
145 around this mean ($M = 30.16$, $SD = 6.04$). For the experimental behavior style total scores,
146 the descriptive statistics suggest an average just above the midpoint of the total score range,
147 with moderate deviation around this mean ($M = 28.61$, $SD = 7.04$). To determine whether sex
148 had an impact on either of these measures we conducted two independent t-tests. However,
149 we did not find significant differences in scores for either behavior style. To see whether age
150 correlated with either behavior style, we ran zero order correlations between age and each of
151 the behavior styles. Age correlated positively with the comfortable behavior style, $r(297) =$
152 $.12$, $p = .032$, and negatively with the experimental behavior style, $r(297) = -.15$, $p = .01$,
153 although both were weak correlations.

154 **3.2.2. Multiple regression analyses of convergent outcomes onto the comfortable and**
155 **experimental behavior styles**

156 We next conducted analyses to determine the variance in each behavior style
157 explained by the convergent measures: openness to experience, curiosity, and the four
158 sensation seeking subscales (experience seeking, boredom susceptibility, disinhibition). As
159 age was correlated with each behavior style we included it as a predictor.

160 When the comfortable behavior style total score was examined as the dependent
161 variable, the convergent measures predicted 27.3% of the variance in Comfortable behavior
162 style scores, $F(7, 291) = 16.98, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .273$. The predictors of this variance
163 were Openness to experience ($\beta = -.21, p < .001$), and Boredom susceptibility ($\beta = -.34,$
164 $p < .001$).

165 When the experimental behavior style total score was considered as the dependent
166 variable, the convergent measures predicted 60% of the variance in experimental behavior
167 style scores, $F(7, 291) = 64.33, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .60$. The predictors of this variance
168 were curiosity ($\beta = .38, p < .001$), openness to experience ($\beta = .09, p = .036$), experience
169 seeking ($\beta = .14, p = .004$), boredom susceptibility ($\beta = .31, p < .001$) and disinhibition ($\beta =$
170 $.15, p = .006$).

171 This suggests that portions of the variance can be explained by other convergent
172 measures, however as only a maximum of 60% was explained there is still variance in each
173 behavior style that remains unique.

174

175

176 **3.2.3. *Partial correlations of comfortable or experimental behavior styles with***
177 ***psychological outcomes***

178 Partial correlation analyses were conducted to determine the relationships between the
179 total scores of the behavior style scales (the final versions), indices of traitedness (WSSDs)
180 the behavior styles measures and the psychological outcomes measured (positive and
181 negative affect, satisfaction with life, and self-concept clarity). Based on the findings of the
182 analyses across Studies 1 and 2, age, sex, and the convergent measures collected in Study 2
183 were all partialled out of these correlations. This was performed to ensure the findings of any
184 correlation analyses could be considered independent of the potential impact of other
185 convergent measures. The results are shown in Table 3. The comfortable behavior style
186 correlated at the $p < .001$ alpha level with the experimental behavior style negatively, and the
187 experimental behavior style WSSD positively. The comfortable behavior style was also
188 positively correlated with positive affect and satisfaction with life at $p < .05$. The experimental
189 behavior style correlated negatively at the $p < .001$ alpha level with self-concept clarity. The
190 experimental behavior style was also positively correlated with negative affect, and
191 negatively correlated with satisfaction with life at $p < .05$. The comfortable behavior style
192 WSSD and experimental behavior style WSSD were positively correlated at $p < .001$. When
193 the comfortable style WSSD was examined, it was found to positively correlate at the $p < .05$
194 alpha level with positive affect.

195 When the behavior style total score partial correlations are compared to the zero-order
196 correlations (provided in Table 5 of the supplementary analysis), this found that a significant
197 correlation surfaced between the comfortable behavior style and positive affect only after
198 partialling out the previously mentioned variables. Significant correlations between the
199 experimental behavior style with negative affect, and also with satisfaction with life only
200 surface after partialling out the previously mentioned variables. However, a zero order

201 correlation between the experimental behavior style and positive affect ($r(300) = .24, p < .001$)
202 lost significance when the previously mentioned variables were partialled out.

203 An interaction variable between the comfortable and experimental behavior style total
204 scores was computed to see if the possibility of displaying both styles was related to
205 psychological well-being (the same convergent measures, age, sex and also the total scores of
206 each behavior style were partialled out). This found that an interaction of the two styles was
207 related to self-concept clarity ($r(287) = -.15, p = .012$). This interaction was also found to
208 positively correlate with the experimental behavior style WSSD ($r(287) = .18, p = .002$) and
209 negatively with the comfortable behavior style WSSD ($r(287) = -.19, p = .001$).

210 **3.3. *Study 2 Discussion***

211 Study 2 found through EFA that a nine item comfortable behavior style measure, and
212 a 10 item experimental behavior style measure provided a superior solution for these
213 measures. Total scores and traitedness indices based on these measures were then examined
214 in relation to a variety of psychological outcomes, when partialling out sex, age and other
215 convergent outcomes. Some unique correlations to other psychological outcomes surfaced for
216 both comfortable (positive affect and satisfaction with life), and experimental behavior styles
217 (negative affect, satisfaction with life and self-concept clarity), independent of the convergent
218 outcomes. These will also be discussed in comparison to findings when zero-order
219 correlations were conducted between behavior styles and the well-being outcomes.

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235 4. General Discussion

236 In this research we aimed to develop a measure of comfortable and experimental
237 behavior styles, and examine how these constructs are related to psychological well-being.
238 In Study 1, we developed a pool of 20 items, and then administered it to participants. The
239 findings from Study 1 supported a two factor structure, with two 10 item measures
240 assessing comfortable and experimental behavior styles. Study 2 provided further validity
241 for these measures, and found relationships to several psychological well-being outcomes.

242 In Study 1 the two constructs were found to be only weakly negatively correlated, in
243 comparison to Study 2 where they were displayed a strong negative correlation. Although
244 we have developed measures of comfortable and experimental behavior styles as separate,
245 but comparable constructs, we tested the idea in Study 2 that it is possible for people to
246 potentially act with a balance of both comfortable and experimental styles. Calculating an
247 interaction variable between the two styles in Study 2 found a negative relationship to self-
248 concept clarity, suggesting that those who display both styles to some degree may lack a
249 stable self-concept. However, culture may have an influence on the strength of the
250 correlations between the two constructs, as Study 1 used a British sample, while Study 2
251 used an American sample. This suggests that the British sample may display more of a
252 balance of comfortable and experimental behavior styles, while the American sample are
253 more likely to display either a comfortable or an experimental behavior style, with it being
254 less likely that there is an interaction between the two behavior styles. Further research in
255 both British and American samples using this measure is required to see if an interaction of
256 the two styles has any wider ranging impact on psychological well-being outcomes. One
257 good reason for displaying a balance of the two styles is that we found each behavior style
258 to be related to different aspects of well-being in Study 2. The comfortable behavior style
259 related to positive affect and satisfaction with life (when other convergent measures were

260 partialled out), while the experimental behavior style related only to positive affect, but only
261 when other convergent outcomes were not partialled out. A significant positive relationship
262 was found between the experimental behavior style and negative affect, and a significant
263 negative relationship with satisfaction with life, but only when the other convergent
264 outcomes were partialled out. This suggests partialling out the convergent outcomes may be
265 removing the positive components of displaying an experimental behavior style, and merely
266 leaving the instability element of experimenting with new behaviors.

267 Indeed, in line with this explanation the experimental behavior style also negatively
268 correlated with self-concept clarity. Overall, this suggests that those with an experimental
269 behavioral style may be at a stage where they are testing out new ideas and behaviors as a
270 form of self-discovery. However, self-concept clarity was not found to be positively (or
271 negatively) related to a comfortable behavior style. This suggests that those with a routine,
272 invariable behavior style are not guaranteed to also have a clear understanding of their self-
273 concept. The fact that neither behavior style has a clear relationship to greater self-concept
274 clarity may have implications for person-activity fit. Having a preferred behavior style will
275 lead to certain activities, but this does not mean that these person-activity relationships
276 alone are enough for a fuller understanding of the self. Trying out a different behavior style
277 could impact upon our sense of self-understanding in the short-term, but perhaps only by
278 trying activities associated with an opposing behavior style can the individual develop a
279 greater long-term understanding of themselves. Across Studies 1 and 2 the expected
280 associations were found for both behavioral styles to sensation seeking, impulsiveness,
281 curiosity and openness to experience with a comfortable behavior style being negatively
282 related, and an experimental behavior style being positively related to sensation seeking and
283 impulsiveness. This was expected as those who are experimental feel the need to seek new

284 sensations or experiences, and act on impulse, while those who are comfortable with their
285 behavior patterns feel less need to seek sensation or act impulsively.

286

287 When the WSSD indices were calculated as measures of traitedness for the
288 comfortable and experimental behavior style constructs, the comfortable behavior style was
289 positively related to positive affect. This further supports traitedness indices as being a valid
290 option for assessing within-person variability in display of behavior for a particular
291 behavioral trait (Biderman & Reddock, 2012; Churchyard, Pine, Sharma & Fletcher, 2014).
292 The association of the comfortable behavior style WSSD with positive affect suggests that
293 some variability in our behavioral style is needed to maintain positive affect. One possibility
294 is that this reflects the need for a balance of comfortable behavioral style to maintain
295 comfort, but also an experimental behavioral style in order to try out new ideas or
296 behaviors, with a comfortable style to return to if the experience does not end as desired.

297 **4.1. *Strengths of the present research***

298 In developing and validating a measure that assesses both comfortable and
299 experimental behavior styles within the same measure we were able to go beyond past
300 research which has often examined person-activity fit theory at a far more specific level. E.g.,
301 Buchanan and Bardi (2015) looked for evidence of person-activity fit by examining whether
302 interactions between agency values and agency behaviors predicted well-being, while
303 Sergeant and Mongrain (2011) examined the moderating role of depressive personality styles
304 in influencing the efficacy of positive psychology exercises.

305 This specificity of past person-activity fit investigations may mean they say more
306 about the moderating role of the exact constructs investigated (e.g., agency, depressive
307 personality styles) as opposed to person-activity fit per se. In contrast, the non-specificity of

308 our newly developed measure enables examination of person activity fit at a broader level
309 while also allowing us to distinguish between conceptualisations of fit as capitalization (i.e., a
310 comfortable behavior style) or as compensation (i.e., an experimental behavior style).

311 Another strength of this research is that we collected large samples for both the
312 development and validation stages of the measure development. These two samples were
313 reasonably well-balanced for sex and age characteristics. This suggests that the measures are
314 suitable for general use in an adult population. Furthermore, we confirmed the existence of
315 the two constructs across two different populations (British and American).

316

317 **4.2. *Implications and future research***

318 The findings from this research have implications for determining what type of
319 intervention an individual should choose to engage with. Cronbach and Snow (1977)
320 described the two main approaches to interventions are “capitalization” (taking advantage of
321 current behavioral strengths) and “compensation” (attempting to balance out the individual
322 by tackling behavioral weaknesses). Those with a comfortable behavior style may be more
323 suited to interventions utilizing capitalization approaches, while those with an experimental
324 behavior style may be more suited to compensation approaches. The measure we developed
325 could be used to help determine what type of intervention the individual should be
326 administered, prior to the individual taking part in any intervention. Furthermore, these
327 findings have implications for what type of intervention should be administered to improve
328 particular aspects of well-being. For example, those wishing to boost their positive affect may
329 benefit more from participating in interventions that suit their particular behavior style, as
330 both styles were found to be positively related to positive affect, although under different
331 circumstances.

332 Future research should consider using a diary study with a multi-level modelling
333 approach to study the effect of displaying comfortable or experimental behavior on well-
334 being across repeated time occasions. This would allow for the assessment of both between
335 individual variation and context-specific individual variation in displaying a comfortable or
336 experimental behavior style. This would enable further understanding of when and why the
337 individual may choose to display a more comfortable or experimental behavior style.

338 An intervention study could also be conducted in which participants are assigned to
339 either a capitalization or compensation based intervention approach, depending on whether
340 the individual reports a predominantly comfortable or experimental behavior style. These two
341 groups would be examined in contrast to a group in which the intervention choice is
342 administered randomly as a control group. This would help determine whether interventions
343 chosen on the basis of person-fit are more successful than those assigned without
344 predetermining this preference.

345 The measures will also need to be validated against a selection of measures of specific
346 habits and routine such as the SRHI (Verplanken & Orbell, 2003) and the Habit Rater
347 (Fletcher & Pine, 2012), as in this study they have only been validated against measures of
348 pursuing more novel stimuli such as sensation seeking, curiosity and OTE.

349 **5. Conclusion**

350 In this paper we developed and validated a measure of comfortable and experimental
351 behavior styles across British and American samples. Comfortable and experimental behavior
352 styles were found to be related to a selection of relevant psychological outcomes including
353 sensation seeking, satisfaction with life, self-concept clarity and both positive and negative
354 affect. We hope that this measure will be utilised in future research to help determine the
355 suitability of specific individuals to take particular intervention strategies.

356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377

References

- Barratt, E. S. (1985). Impulsiveness subtraits: Arousal and information processing. *Motivation, Emotion, and Personality*, 5, 137-146.
- Baumeister, R. F., Gailliot, M., DeWall, C. N., & Oaten, M. (2006). Self-regulation and personality: How interventions increase regulatory success, and how depletion moderates the effects of traits on behavior. *Journal of Personality*, 74(6), 1773-1802.
- Biderman, M. D., & Reddock, C. M. (2012). The relationship of scale reliability and validity to respondent inconsistency. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52, 647-651.
- Bleidorn, W. (2009). Linking personality states, current social roles and major life goals. *European Journal of Personality*, 23(6), 509-530.
- Buchanan, K., & Bardi, A. (2015). The roles of values, behavior, and value-behavior fit in the relation of agency and communion to well-being. *Journal of Personality*, 83(3), 320-333.
- Buchanan, K. E., & Bardi, A. (2010). Acts of kindness and acts of novelty affect life satisfaction. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 150, (3), 235-237.
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk a new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(1), 3-5.
- Campbell, J. D., Trapnell, P. D., Heine, S. J., Katz, I. M., Lavallee, L. F., & Lehman, D. R. (1996). Self-concept clarity: Measurement, personality correlates, and cultural boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 141-156.

- 378 Carver, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and
379 affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS
380 scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 319-333.
381
- 382 Churchyard, J., Pine, K. J., Sharma, S., & Fletcher, B. (C). (2013). Same traits, different
383 variance: Item-level variation within personality measures. *SAGE Open*, 4 (1), 1-11.
- 384 Costa, P. T. Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-*
385 *R™) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL:
386 Psychological Assessment Resources.
- 387 Cronbach, L. J., & Snow, R. E. (1977). *Aptitudes and instructional methods: A handbook for*
388 *research interactions*. New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc.
- 389 Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life
390 scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49 (1), 71-75.
- 391 Fleeson, W., & Gallagher, P. (2009). The Implications of big five standing for the distribution
392 of trait manifestation in behavior: Fifteen experience-sampling studies and a meta-
393 analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97 (6), 1097-1114.
- 394 Fletcher, B (C), Hanson, J., Pine, K. J., & Page, N. (2011). FIT- do something different: A
395 new psychological intervention tool for facilitating weight loss. *Swiss Journal of*
396 *Psychology*, 70(1), 25-34.
- 397 Fletcher, B. (C)., & Pine, K. J. (2012). *Flex: How to use the other 9/10ths of your personality*.
398 Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.

- 399 Fordyce, M. W. (1977). Development of a program to increase personal happiness. *Journal of*
400 *Counseling Psychology, 24*(6), 511-521.
- 401 Fordyce, M. W. (1983). A program to increase happiness: Further studies. *Journal of*
402 *Counseling Psychology, 30*(4), 483-498.
- 403 Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The Role of Positive Emotions in Positive Psychology: The
404 Broaden-and-Build Theory of Positive Emotions. *American Psychologist, 56*(3), 218-
405 224.
- 406 George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and*
407 *Reference, 17.0 update* (10a ed.) Boston: Pearson.
- 408 Giannopoulos, V. L., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2011). Effects of positive interventions and
409 orientations to happiness on subjective well-being. *The Journal of Positive*
410 *Psychology, 6*(2), 95-105.
- 411 Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., &
412 Gough, H. C. (2006). The International Personality Item Pool and the future of public-
413 domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*, 84-96.
- 414 Heller, D., Komar, J., & Lee, W. B. (2007). The dynamics of personality states, goals, and
415 well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*(6), 898-910.
- 416 Horn, J. L. (1965). A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor
417 analysis. *Psychometrika, 30*(2), 179-185.
- 418 Hoyle, R. H., Stephenson, M. T., Palmgreen, P., Lorch, E. P., & Donohew, R. L. (2002).
419 Reliability and validity of a brief measure of sensation seeking. *Personality and*
420 *Individual Differences, 32*, 401-414.

- 421 Kahneman, D., Diener, E., & Schwarz, N. (Eds.). (1999). *Well-being: Foundations of*
422 *hedonic psychology*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- 423 Kashdan, T. B., Gallagher, M. W., Silvia, P. J., Winterstein, B. P., Breen, W. E., Terhar, D.,
424 & Steger, M. F. (2009). The curiosity and exploration inventory-II: Development,
425 factor structure, and psychometrics. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 987–998.
- 426 Lyubomirsky, S. (2008). *The how of happiness: A scientific approach to getting the life you*
427 *want*. New York: Penguin Press.
- 428 Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect:
429 Does happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, 803–855.
- 430 Mason, W., & Suri, S. (2012). Conducting behavioral research on Amazon’s Mechanical
431 Turk. *Behavior Research Methods*, 44(1), 1-23.
- 432 Mazzucchelli, T. G., Kane, R. T., Rees, C. S. (2010). Behavioral activation interventions for
433 well-being: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 5(2), 105-121.
- 434 McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. Jr. (1996). Toward a new generation of personality theories:
435 Theoretical contexts for the five-factor model. In J. S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The five-factor*
436 *model of personality: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 51-87). New York: Guilford
437 Press.
- 438 O’Connor, B. P. (2000). SPSS and SAS programs for determining the number of components
439 using parallel analysis and Velicer’s MAP test. *Behavior Research Methods,*
440 *Instrumentation, and Computers*, 32, 396 – 402.
- 441 Paolacci, G., Chandler, J., & Ipeirotis, P. (2010). Running experiments on amazon
442 mechanical turk. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 5 (5), 411-419.

- 443 Patton, J. H., Stanford, M. S., & Barratt, E.S. (1995). Factor structure of the Barratt
444 impulsiveness scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 51 (6), 768-774.
- 445 Rand, D. G. (2012). The promise of mechanical turk: How online labor markets can help
446 theorists run behavioral experiments. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 299, 172-179.
- 447 Sagiv, L., Roccas, S., & Hazan, O. (2004). Value pathways to well-being: Healthy values,
448 valued goal attainment, and environmental congruence. In: A. Linley., & J. Stephen
449 (Eds.), *Positive psychology in practice*. NY: John Wiley.
- 450 Schueller, S. M. (2011). To each his own well-being boosting intervention: Using preference
451 to guide selection. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 6, 300-313.
- 452 Schueller, S. M. (2014). Person–activity fit in positive psychological interventions. In A. C.
453 Parks and S. M. Schueller (Eds.) *The Wiley Blackwell Handbook of Positive*
454 *Psychological Interventions* (pp 385-402). Blackwell Reference Online. Doi:
455 10.1111/b.9781119950561.2014.00023.x
- 456 Schueller, S. M., & Parks, A. C. (2014). The science of self-help: Translating positive
457 psychology research into increased individual happiness. *European Psychologist*, 19,
458 145-155. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000181>
- 459 Seligman, M. E. P., Steen, T. A., Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2005). Positive psychology
460 progress: Empirical validation of interventions. *American Psychologist*, 60(5), 410-
461 421.
- 462 Sergeant, S., & Mongrain, M. (2011). Are positive psychology exercises helpful for people
463 with depressive personality styles?. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 6(4), 260-
464 272.

- 465 Sheldon, K. M., Elliot, A. J., Ryan, R. M., Chirkov, V., Kim, Y., Wu, C., ... & Sun, Z.
466 (2004). Self-concordance and subjective well-being in four cultures. *Journal of*
467 *Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35(2), 209-223.
- 468 Sheldon, K. M., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2006). Achieving sustainable gains in happiness:
469 Change your actions, not your circumstances. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 7, 55-86.
- 470 Sheldon, K. M., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2007). Is it possible to become happier? (And if so,
471 how?). *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1 (1), 129-145.
- 472 Silberman, J. (2007). Positive intervention self-selection: Developing models of what works
473 for whom. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 2 (1), 70-77.
- 474 Sin, N. L., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2009). Enhancing well-being and alleviating depressive
475 symptoms with positive psychology interventions: A practice-friendly meta-analysis.
476 *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 65 (5), 467-487.
- 477 Velicer, W. F., Eaton, C. A., & Fava, J. L. (2000). *Construct explication through factor or*
478 *component analysis: A review and evaluation of alternative procedures for*
479 *determining the number of factors or components*. In R. D. Goffin & E. Helmes
480 (Eds.), *Problems and solutions in human assessment: Honoring Douglas N. Jackson*
481 *at seventy*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic.
- 482
- 483 Verplanken, B., & Orbell, S. (2003). Reflections on past behavior: A self-report index of
484 habit strength. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33(6). 1313-1330.
485 doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb01951.x

- 486 Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief
487 measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality
488 and Social Psychology, 54*, 1063-1070.
- 489 Wood, A. M., Linley, P. A., Maltby, J., Baliousis, M., & Joseph, S. (2008). The authentic
490 personality: a theoretical and empirical conceptualization and the development of the
491 Authenticity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 55* (3), 385-399.
- 492 Wood, A. M., Linley, P. A., Maltby, J., Kashdan, T. B., & Hurling, R. (2011). Using personal
493 and psychological strengths leads to increases in well-being over time: A longitudinal
494 study and the development of the Strengths Use Questionnaire. *Personality and
495 Individual Differences, 50*, 15-19.
- 496 Zuckerman, M., Eysenck, S., & Eysenck, H. J. (1978). Sensation seeking in England and
497 America: Cross-cultural age and sex comparisons. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical
498 Psychology, 46*, 139-149.
- 499 Zwick, W. R., & Velicer, W. F. (1986). Comparison of five rules for determining the number
500 of components to retain. *Psychological Bulletin, 99* (3), 432.
- 501
- 502
- 503
- 504
- 505
- 506
- 507
- 508
- 509

510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Paul Twyman for assisting with the data collection for Study 1 of this paper. This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

541 Table 1: *Descriptive statistics for each of the 20 item pool (Study 1).*
542

543 Table 2: *Exploratory Factor Analysis on the Experimental and Comfortable Behavior Style*
544 *Items using Oblimin Rotation, and the Corrected Item-Total correlations for each Item on the*
545 *Expected Factor in Studies 1 and 2.*

546

547

548 Table 3: *Partial Correlation Analyses of the Comfortable and Experimental Behavior Styles*
549 *total scores in Studies 1 and 2.*
550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

Table 1: *Descriptive statistics for each of the 20 item pool (Study 1).*

| | Mean | S.D. | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|---|------|------|----------|----------|
| 1. I have a daily routine that I stick to. | 2.94 | 1.12 | .08 | -.71 |
| 2. My day to day routine varies little. | 3.05 | 1.00 | -.14 | -.26 |
| 3. My friends say that I am predictable. | 2.59 | 1.02 | .23 | -.49 |
| 4. I like to stick to the things that I know. | 3.18 | 1.02 | -.03 | -.52 |
| 5. My views and preferences rarely change. | 3.03 | 1.13 | .02 | -.65 |
| 6. I take comfort in familiarity. | 3.52 | .99 | -.15 | -.45 |
| 7. I frequently do what is expected of me. | 3.42 | 1.02 | -.37 | -.28 |
| 8. I often do things on autopilot without even realizing. | 3.17 | 1.05 | .04 | -.76 |
| 9. I tend to know exactly what I will be doing at any given time. | 3.00 | 1.13 | .07 | -.74 |
| 10. I can easily predict what each new day will bring. | 2.93 | .98 | -.09 | -.50 |
| 11. I like to explore new ways of doing things. | 3.58 | 1.02 | -.44 | -.39 |
| 12. I get bored when every day is the same. | 3.62 | 1.20 | -.49 | -.80 |
| 13. I do things on the spur of the moment. | 3.21 | 1.05 | .07 | -.73 |
| 14. I would describe myself as someone who tests out new ideas. | 3.47 | 1.03 | -.18 | -.60 |
| 15. I believe that variety is the spice of life. | 3.59 | 1.08 | -.38 | -.57 |
| 16. I welcome change in my life. | 3.42 | 1.06 | -.27 | -.47 |
| 17. I actively pursue experiences that I've not had before. | 3.42 | 1.09 | -.14 | -.78 |
| 18. My friends are always surprised by my choices. | 2.70 | 1.00 | .66 | -.15 |
| 19. It would be unusual for me to follow a routine. | 2.54 | 1.07 | .54 | -.33 |
| 20. I can never be sure what will happen tomorrow. | 2.98 | 1.13 | .21 | .35 |

Note: Skewness SE = .18, Kurtosis SE = .35. Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for all items is significant at $p < .001$.

Table 2: *Exploratory Factor Analysis on the Experimental and Comfortable Behavior Style Items using Oblimin Rotation, and the Corrected Item-Total correlations for each Item on the Expected Factor in Studies 1 and 2.*

| | Pattern matrix (Study 1) | | Pattern matrix (Study 2) | | Structure matrix (Study 1) | | Structure matrix (Study 2) | | Corrected item-total correlations (Study 1) | | Corrected item-total correlations (Study 2) | |
|---|---|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------|--|------|--|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| | I believe that variety is the spice of life. | .784 | | .795 | | .785 | -.119 | .756 | -.334 | .701 | | .694 |
| I actively pursue experiences that I've not had before. | .760 | | .710 | | .755 | | .706 | -.360 | .681 | | .654 | |
| I would describe myself as someone who tests out new ideas. | .729 | .125 | .721 | | .711 | | .719 | -.367 | .627 | | .646 | |
| I like to explore new ways of doing things. | .719 | .110 | .822 | .133 | .704 | | .753 | -.291 | .609 | | .658 | |
| I get bored when every day is the same. | .597 | | .534 | -.160 | .604 | -.135 | .617 | -.436 | .562 | | .599 | |
| I welcome change in my life. | .595 | | .739 | | .598 | -.108 | .743 | -.390 | .562 | | .681 | |
| I do things on the spur of the moment. | .544 | | .525 | -.212 | .551 | -.130 | .635 | -.483 | .537 | | .635 | |
| My friends are always surprised by my choices. | .530 | | .500 | -.129 | .528 | | .566 | -.387 | .504 | | .565 | |
| It would be unusual for me to follow a routine. | .453 | -.179 | .447 | -.274 | .478 | -.242 | .588 | -.505 | .462 | | .591 | |
| I can never be sure what will happen tomorrow. | .441 | | .625 | | .450 | -.124 | .612 | -.297 | .459 | | .597 | |
| I take comfort in familiarity. | | .682 | | .741 | | .679 | -.425 | .763 | | .597 | | .699 |
| I like to stick to the things that I know. | -.260 | .674 | -.137 | .720 | -.354 | .710 | -.509 | .791 | .619 | | .732 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|-------------|------|------|
| I have a daily routine that I stick to. | -.154 | .612 | -.110 | .722 | -.240 | .633 | -.482 | .778 | .557 | .710 |
| My views and preferences rarely change. | | .558 | | .590 | -.152 | .568 | -.304 | .590 | .534 | .553 |
| I tend to know exactly what I will be doing at any given time. | | .549 | | .712 | | .549 | -.334 | .695 | .493 | .639 |
| I frequently do what is expected of me. | | .525 | | .645 | -.101 | .529 | -.302 | .629 | .470 | .574 |
| My day to day routine varies little. | .110 | .488 | -.241 | .492 | | .472 | -.495 | .616 | .426 | .579 |
| My friends say that I am predictable. | -.188 | .490 | | .562 | -.257 | .516 | -.382 | .609 | .479 | .584 |
| I can easily predict what each new day will bring. | | .486 | | .535 | | .462 | -.287 | .541 | .395 | .510 |
| I often do things on autopilot without even realizing. | .230 | .384 | | .304 | .176 | .352 | | .270 | .314 | .289 |

Note. Maximum likelihood estimation was applied as the initial extraction method in both studies. Loadings in bold are target loadings. Loadings Italicised are double loadings greater than .40. Loadings smaller than .10 are not shown.

Table 3: *Partial Correlation Analyses of the Comfortable and Experimental Behavior Styles total scores in Studies 1 and 2.*

| | Comfortable total | Experimental total | Comfortable WSSD | Experimental WSSD |
|---|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Study 1 (partialling out sex and age) | | | | |
| Sensation Seeking Scale Total (SSS-V, n = 122) | -.42*** | .39*** | | |
| Experience Seeking (ES) | -.43*** | .26** | | |
| Thrill and Adventure Seeking (Tas) | -.27** | .35*** | | |
| Disinhibition (Dis) | -.25** | .38*** | | |
| Boredom susceptibility (Bs) | -.28** | .07 | | |
| Barrett Impulsiveness Scale Total (BIS-II, n = 126) | -.39*** | .36*** | | |
| Cognitive Impulsiveness | -.26** | .19* | | |
| Motor Impulsiveness | -.26** | .38*** | | |
| Non Planning Impulsiveness | -.49*** | .38*** | | |
| Behavioral Inhibition System (BIS, n = 185) | .23** | -.14 | | |
| BAS Drive (n = 185) | -.04 | .32*** | | |
| BAS Fun Seeking (n = 185) | -.21** | .57*** | | |
| BAS Reward Responsiveness (n = 185) | .21** | .19* | | |
| Study 2 (partialling out sex, age, curiosity, OTE, Experience seeking, Thrill and adventure seeking, Boredom susceptibility and Disinhibition) | | | | |
| Comfortable behavior style total | 1 | | | |
| Experimental behavior style total | -.34*** | 1 | | |
| Comfortable behavior style WSSD | .02 | .07 | 1 | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|---------|--------|-----|
| Experimental behavior style WSSD | .25*** | .08 | .28*** | 1 |
| Positive Affect | .12* | -.01 | .13* | .03 |
| Negative Affect | .11 | .12* | .08 | .08 |
| Satisfaction with life | .16** | -.15* | .01 | .00 |
| Self-concept clarity | -.04 | -.23*** | .05 | .05 |

Note. **In Study 1** to avoid participant fatigue occurring for conceptually similar scales we presented participants with either the sensation seeking scale or Barrett's impulsiveness scale, resulting in different sample sizes for correlations using these measures. **In Study 2**, all $N = 302$. WSSD = Within subject standard deviation (i.e., traitedness indices), OTE = openness to experience, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.