

# The Affective Profiles in the USA: Happiness, Depression, Life Satisfaction, and Happiness-Increasing Strategies

**Background.** The affective profile model categorizes individuals as self-fulfilling (high positive affect, low negative affect), high affective (high positive affect, high negative affect), low affective (low positive affect, low negative affect), and self-destructive (low positive affect, high negative affect). The model has been used extensively among Swedes to discern differences between profiles regarding happiness, depression, and also life satisfaction. The aim of the present study was to investigate such differences in a sample of residents of the USA. The study also investigated differences between profiles with regard to happiness-increasing strategies.

**Methods.** In Study I, 900 participants reported affect (Positive Affect Negative Affect Schedule; PANAS) and happiness (Happiness-Depression Scale). In Study II, 500 participants self-reported affect (PANAS), life satisfaction (Satisfaction With Life Scale), and how often they used specific strategies to increase their own happiness (Happiness-Increasing Strategies Scales).

**Results.** The results showed that, compared to the other profiles, self-fulfilling individuals were less depressed, happier, and more satisfied with their lives. Nevertheless, self-destructive were more depressed, unhappier, and less satisfied than all other profiles. The self-fulfilling individuals tended to use strategies related to agentic (e.g., instrumental goal-pursuit), communal (e.g., social affiliation), and spiritual (e.g., religion) values when pursuing happiness.

**Conclusion.** These differences suggest that promoting positive emotions can positively influence a depressive-to-happy state as well as increasing life satisfaction. Moreover, the present study shows that pursuing happiness through strategies guided by agency, communion, and spirituality is related to a self-fulfilling experience described as high positive affect and low negative affect.

Erica Schütz<sup>1, 2, 3</sup>, Uta Sailer<sup>1, 3</sup>, Ali Al Nima<sup>1, 3</sup>, Patricia Rosenberg<sup>3</sup>, Ann-Christine Andersson  
Arntén<sup>1, 3</sup>, Trevor Archer<sup>1, 2, 3</sup>, Danilo Garcia<sup>3, 4, 5\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

<sup>2</sup>Department of Psychology, Linneaus University, Kalmar, Sweden

<sup>3</sup>Network for Empowerment and Well-Being, Sweden

<sup>4</sup>Center for Ethics, Law and Mental Health (CELAM), University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg,  
Sweden

<sup>5</sup>Institute of Neuroscience and Physiology, The Sahlgrenska Academy, University of Gothenburg,  
Gothenburg, Sweden

\* Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to D. Garcia, CELAM, University  
of Gothenburg, Wallinsgatan 8, SE 431 41 Mölndal, Sweden. E-mail:

22 [danilo.garcia@neuro.gu.se](mailto:danilo.garcia@neuro.gu.se); [danilo.garcia@euromail.se](mailto:danilo.garcia@euromail.se).

## 23 **Introduction**

24 Besides being markers of well-being (Diener, 1984), positive (PA) and negative affect (NA) have  
 25 been shown to reflect stable emotional-temperamental dispositions (e.g., Watson and Clark, 1994;  
 26 Tellegen, 1993). Larsen and Ketelaar (1991), for example, showed that individuals who  
 27 experience high levels of PA, compared to individuals who experience low levels of PA, attend  
 28 and react more intensely to positive stimuli. Likewise, individuals who experience high levels of  
 29 NA, compared to individuals who experience low levels of NA, attend and react more intensely  
 30 to negative stimuli (see also Norris, Larsen and Cacioppo, 2007; Lucas, 2008; Lucas and Diener,  
 31 2008). One of the most used instruments to measure affect, is the Positive Affect and Negative  
 32 Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark and Tellegen, 1988), which was developed on the idea  
 33 that PA and NA represents two orthogonal independent dimensions: high PA versus low PA and  
 34 high NA versus low NA (see also Watson and Tellegen, 1985).

35 Presenting affect as being composed of two systems, each one of them categorized as high  
 36 and low, leads to four different combinations beyond the two-system approach (Garcia, 2011; for  
 37 a point of view on two-system theories see Keren and Schul, 2009). In this line of thinking,  
 38 Archer and colleagues have developed the affective profile model through self-reported  
 39 affectivity using the PANAS, generating four different profiles: self-fulfilling (high PA, low  
 40 NA,); high affective (high PA, high NA); low affective (low PA, low NA); and self-destructive  
 41 (low PA, high NA) (e.g., Norlander, Bood and Archer, 2002; Bood, Archer and Norlander, 2004;  
 42 Norlander, Johansson and Bood, 2005; Archer, Adriansson, Plancak and Karlsson, 2007;  
 43 Karlsson and Archer, 2007; Palomo, Kostrzewa, Beninger and Archer, 2007; Palomo, Beninger,  
 44 Kostrzewa, and Archer, 2008; Archer, Adolfsson and Karlsson, 2008).

45 Self-fulfilling individuals report feeling more energetic and optimistic than the other three  
 46 affective profiles (Archer et al., 2007), while all four profiles react differently to stress and have

different exercise habits and blood pressure. Self-fulfilling and high affective individuals show the best performance during stress, have a more active life, and lower blood pressure than individuals with low affective and self-destructive profiles (Norlander et al., 2002; 2005). Nevertheless, Kunst (2011) showed that high affective profiles, as self-destructive profiles, were strongly associated with increased posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms severity (for similar results among psychiatric patients see Zöller and Archer, 2009; Zöller, Karlsson and Archer, 2009). Moreover, while low affective profiles have responded maladaptively to induced stress, compared to self-fulfilling and high affective individuals (Norlander et al., 2002), they have at the same time reported less stress in their life, as the self-fulfilling profiles (Norlander et al., 2005). Thus, the affective profile model offers something unique over and above the single dimensional framework by taking into account how both dimension interact. These interactions can be used to investigate individual differences in cognitive and emotional aspects of health and well-being (for a review see Garcia, Ghiabi, Moradi, Siddiqui & Archer, 2013).

Most past research using the affective profile model among adults has focused on measures of ill-being. Nevertheless, other important aspects of mental health are positive measures of well-being (Cloninger, 2006). Happiness, for example, can be usefully understood as the opposite end of depression (e.g., Joseph, Linley, Harwood, Lewis & McCollam, 2004; Russell and Feldman Barrett, 1999; Watson, Wiese, Vaidya, and Tellegen, 1999; Yik, Russell, and Feldman Barrett, 1999). Life satisfaction, another positive measure of well-being (Diener, 1984; Bradburn, 1969; Diener, Suh, Lucas and Smith, 1999; Pavot, 2008), refers instead to a comparison process in which individuals assess the quality of their lives on the basis of their own self-imposed standard (Pavot & Diener, 1993).

Recent studies among adolescents have, indeed, focused on differences among profiles with respect to different measures of well-being, personality and self-regulation (e.g., Garcia and Siddiqui, 2009a b; Garcia, Rosenberg, Erlandsson and Siddiqui, 2010; Garcia, 2009, 2011,

2012a; Garcia and Archer, 2012; Garcia, Kerekes, Andersson-Arntén, and Archer, 2012; Garcia, 2013). Garcia and colleagues have found that, compared to the other profiles, individuals with a self-fulfilling profile reported higher satisfaction with life, higher psychological well-being, lower depressive symptoms, and scored higher in personality traits related to agentic values (i.e., autonomy, responsibility, self-acceptance, intern locus of control, self-control). Nevertheless, low affective individuals, compared to self-destructives, have reported being more satisfied with life and experiencing higher levels of psychological well-being (e.g., Garcia and Siddiqui, 2009b). These specific findings are also in line with the observations that low affectives and self-fulfilling individuals, report less stress in their lives (Norlander et al., 2005). Moreover, Garcia (2012a) also showed that high affective and self-destructive profiles, compared to self-fulfilling and low affectives, scored higher on Neuroticism. This is not surprising, because Neuroticism is almost synonymous with negative affectivity (Watson and Clark, 1984; Tellegen, 1985)—both the high affective and self-destructive profiles have high levels of NA as a common characteristic, PA is instead suggested as strongly positively related to Extraversion. These differences in personality and well-being among profiles are suggested to, in accordance to Higgins’ (1997) prevention and promotion focus principles, result in differences in how individuals increase their happiness levels (i.e., by approaching happiness or avoiding unhappiness). Although there are current measures of happiness-increasing strategies, this suggestion has not been investigated in earlier research using the affective profiles model.

### *Happiness-Increasing Strategies*

In order to intentionally pursue happiness, people seem to use different strategies. Tkach and Lyubomirsky (2006) have identified, using first an open-ended survey, 53 happiness-increasing strategies used by residents of the USA (for studies using this scale among Swedes see, Garcia, 2012b; Nima, Archer and Garcia, 2012, 2013). Tkach and Lyubomirsky (2006) found, using

factor analysis, eight factors: Social Affiliation (e.g. “Support and encourage friends”), Partying and Clubbing (e.g. “Drink alcohol”), Mental Control (e.g. “Try not to think about being unhappy”), Instrumental Goal Pursuit (e.g. “Study”), Passive Leisure (e.g. “Surf the internet”), Active Leisure (e.g. “Exercise”), Religion (e.g. “Seek support from faith”) and Direct Attempts (e.g. “Act happy/smile, etc.”).

Results have shown that these happiness-increasing strategies accounted for 52% of the variance in happiness, while the Big Five personality traits, which traditionally have been linked to happiness, accounted for 46%. Further, even after controlling for the contribution of personality, the happiness-increasing strategies accounted for 16% of the variance in happiness. However, these relationships might not be a direct one. For example, Extraversion, which is strongly related to high PA (Larsen & Ketelaar, 1991), is related to the use of the Social Affiliation strategy, which, in turn, is related to happiness. Tkach and Lyubomirsky (2006) suggested that the efficacy of the happiness-increasing strategies is also likely to vary to some extent. However, the strategy that was the most robust predictor of low levels of happiness was Mental Control, which was closely related to Neuroticism. This strategy is defined as ambivalent intentional efforts aimed, on one side and avoidance of negative thoughts and feelings as well as proneness towards contemplation of negative aspects of life on the other. Regarding the affective profiles, if the profiles differ in the way they pursue happiness (i.e., approaching happy experiences versus preventing unhappy experiences), then it could be expected that the profiles differ in the use of the strategies described here. For example, it could be expected that high PA profiles should score higher in strategies such as Social Affiliation and Active Leisure due to the close positive relationship between Extraversion and PA. High NA profiles could be expected to score higher in strategies such as Mental Control, because the positive relationship between Neuroticism and NA.

### ***The present study***

To the best of our knowledge, the affective profiles model has been mostly used among Swedish participants. Some cultures explain the world as good and controllable and others emphasize negative emotions as normal (Myers & Diener, 1995; Diener, Suh and Oishi, 1997). In this context, it is interesting noticing that the right to pursuit individual happiness is listed as an absolute right in the United States of America's declaration of independence (Tkach and Lyubomirsky, 2006). The model, however, has shown identical results in the few studies using other populations (for three studies using Dutch, Indonesian, respectively Iranian participants see Kunst, 2011; Adrianson, Djamaludin, Neila and Archer, 2013; Garcia and Moradi, 2013).

The aim of the present study was to investigate differences in happiness, depression, life satisfaction and use of strategies to increase happiness among affective profiles in residents of the United States of America (US-residents).

## Study I

### Method

#### *Ethics statement*

This research protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Gothenburg and written informed consent was obtained from all the study participants.

#### *Participants and procedure*

The participants ( $N = 900$ , age  $mean = 28.72$   $sd. = 19.10$ , 550 males and 350 females) were US-residents recruited through Amazons' Mechanical Turk (MTurk; <https://www.mturk.com/mturk/welcome>). MTurk allows data collectors to recruit participants (workers) online for completing different tasks in change for wages. This method for data collection online has become more common during recent years and it is an empirical tested valid tool for conducting research in the social sciences (see Buhrmester, Kwang & Gosling, 2011). Participants were recruited by the following criteria: US-resident and to both speak and write fluent in English. Participants were paid a wage of two American dollars for completing the task

and informed that the study was confidential and voluntary. The participants were presented with a battery of self-reports comprising the affect and happiness measures, as well as questions pertaining age and gender.

### **Instruments**

*Positive Affect and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson et al., 1988).* The PANAS instructs participants to rate to what extent they generally have experienced 20 different feelings or emotions (10 PA and 10 NA) during the last weeks, using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *very slightly*, 5 = *extremely*). The 10-item PA scale includes adjectives such as strong, proud, and interested. The 10-item NA scale includes adjectives such as afraid, ashamed and nervous. *Cronbach's  $\alpha$*  were .87 for PA and .89 for NA in the present study.

*The Short Depression-Happiness Scale (Joseph et al., 2004).* This instrument consists of six items, three items measuring happiness (e.g., "I felt happy") and three reverse coded items measuring depressive states (e.g., "I felt my life was meaningless"). Participants rate how frequently they feel the way described in the item on a four-point scale: "*never*", "*rarely*", "*sometimes*", "*often*". In the present study, *Cronbach's  $\alpha$*  was .85 for the happiness scale and .76 for the depression scale.

### **Statistical treatment**

We used participants' self-reported affect measured by the PANAS from both Study I and 2 ( $N = 1,400$ ) in order to classify participants in the four affective profiles. Participants' PA and NA scores were divided into high and low (*cut-off points*: low PA = 3.0 or less; high PA = 3.1 or above; low NA = 1.8 or less; and high NA = 1.9 or above).

For Study I, the two independent variables of the study were gender and affective profile: self-fulfilling ( $n = 241$ ; 153 males, 88 females), low affective ( $n = 236$ ; 137 males, 99 females), high affective ( $n = 180$ ; 115 males, 65 females), and self-destructive ( $n = 243$ ; 145 males, 98 females). The dependent variables were PA, NA, happiness, and depression.



## Results and discussion

A Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) indicated a significant effect for gender ( $F(4, 889) = 4.32; p = .002, \eta^2 = 0.02, power = 0.93$ ) as well as for affective profile ( $F(12, 2673) = 162.19; p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.42, power = 1.00$ ). The interaction of gender and affective profile was not significant ( $p = .236$ ). A between-subjects ANOVA showed significant gender effects for happiness ( $F(1, 892) = 7.60; p = 0.006$ ), whereby the female participants expressed a higher level of happiness ( $M = 9.66, SD = 2.13$ ) than the male participants ( $M = 9.35, SD = 2.33$ ).

A between-subject ANOVA indicated significant affective profile effects for PA ( $F(3, 892) = 513.78; p < .001$ ), NA ( $F(3, 892) = 503.58; p < .001$ ), happiness ( $F(3, 892) = 68.20; p < .001$ ), and depression ( $F(3, 892) = 71.50; p < .001$ ). A Bonferroni correction to the alpha level of .01 showed that the self-destructive group had significantly higher scores in NA and depression as well as lower scores in happiness in comparison to the other affective profiles. The self-fulfilling group differed significantly from the self-destructive profiles in all measured variables; PA, NA, happiness and depression. As expected, the high affective ones differed significantly from the self-fulfilling group in all variables except PA and the low affective ones differed significantly from the self-fulfilling group in all variables except NA. Which is not so strange since both the self-fulfilling group and the high affective group are characterized as high in PA and the same goes for self-fulfilling individuals and low affective individuals who are characterized by low NA. For further details, see table 1.

Table 1 here

## Study II

### Method

#### *Participants and procedure*

As in Study I, participants ( $N = 500$ , age  $mean = 34.08$   $sd. = 12.55$ ; 217 male and 283 female)

were recruited from MTurk by the following criteria: resident of the USA and to both speak and write fluent in English. Participants were paid a wage of two American dollars for completing the task and informed that the study was confidential and voluntary. The participants were presented with a battery of self-reports comprising the affect, life satisfaction, and happiness-increasing strategies measures, as well as questions pertaining age and gender.

## **Instruments**

The same instrument as in Study I was used in Study II to measure PA and NA (i.e., the PANAS). *Cronbach's  $\alpha$*  were .88 for PA and .90 for NA in Study II.

*Satisfaction with Life Scale* (Diener, Emmons, Larsen and Griffin, 1985). The instrument consists of 5 statements (e.g., "In most of my ways my life is close to my ideal") for which participants are asked to indicate degree of agreement in a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). The life satisfaction score was established by summarizing the 5 statements for each participant. *Cronbach's  $\alpha$*  were .90 in the present study.

*Happiness-Increasing Strategies Scales* (Tkach and Lyubomirsky, 2006). In the present study, participants were asked to rate (1 = *never*, 7 = *all the time*) how often they used the strategies identified by Tkach and Lyubomirsky (2006). The happiness-increasing strategies are organized in eight clusters: Social Affiliation (e.g., "Support and encourage friends"; *Cronbach's  $\alpha$*  = 0.79), Partying and Clubbing (e.g., "Drink alcohol"; *Cronbach's  $\alpha$*  = 0.74), Mental Control (e.g., "Try not to think about being unhappy"; *Cronbach's  $\alpha$*  = 0.43), Instrumental Goal Pursuit (e.g. "Study"; *Cronbach's  $\alpha$*  = 0.76), Passive Leisure (e.g. "Surf the internet"; *Cronbach's  $\alpha$*  = 0.63), Active Leisure (e.g. "Exercise"; *Cronbach's  $\alpha$*  = 0.65), Religion (e.g. "Seek support from faith"; *Cronbach's  $\alpha$*  = 0.70), and Direct Attempts (e.g. "Act happy/smile, etc."; *Cronbach's  $\alpha$*  = 0.56).

## **Statistical treatment**

As detailed in Study I, both samples were used in the classification of the four affective profiles.

The number of participants in each profile for Study II were as follows: 158 self-fulfilling (75 males, 83 females), 92 low affective (42 males, 50 females), 123 high affective (54 males, 69 females), and 127 self-destructive (46 males, 81 females). The affective profiles and gender were the independent variables, PA, NA, life satisfaction, and the happiness-increasing strategies were the dependent variables. An important observation here is the gender distribution between profiles. For example, in Study I there were more self-destructive males than females, while in Study II there were more self-destructive females than males. This difference might mirror the gender distribution across Study I (550 males and 350 females) and Study II (217 male and 283 females). Across both samples of females, the prevalence of the self-destructive profile was 28%, while among men was 25%. The prevalence of this profile reported here among males and females is the same that was observed among Swedes (Schütz, Garcia & Archer, 2013).

## Results and discussion

First a MANOVA (3 x 2 factorial design) was applied with affective profiles and gender as independent variables and with PA, NA and life satisfaction as dependent variables. The analysis did not indicate any significant interaction effect ( $p = 0.14$ ), but did indicate a significant effect for gender ( $F(3, 490) = 4.91$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ,  $Eta^2 = 0.03$ ,  $power = 0.91$ ) as well as for affective profiles ( $F(9, 1476) = 119.15$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ,  $Eta^2 = 0.42$ ,  $power = 1.00$ ). Secondly, a MANOVA (1 x 2 factorial design) was applied with affective profiles and gender as independent variables and with happiness-increasing strategies as dependent variables. The analysis did not indicate any significant interaction effect ( $p = 0.93$ ), but did indicate a significant effect for gender ( $F(8, 485) = 5.85$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ,  $Eta^2 = 0.09$ ,  $power = 1.00$ ) as well as for affective profiles ( $F(24, 1461) = 8.64$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ,  $Eta^2 = 0.12$ ,  $power = 1.00$ ).

A between-subjects ANOVA was conducted in order to test gender differences in PA, NA and life satisfaction. The result indicated significant gender effects for: NA ( $F(1, 492) = 10.89$ ;  $p$

244 <0.01), whereby the female participants expressed a higher level of NA ( $M = 1.94$ ,  $SD = 0.83$ )  
 245 than the male participants ( $M = 1.72$ ,  $SD = 0.67$ ). This specific result stands in contrast to the  
 246 results from Study I, which showed that females reported higher happiness than males.  
 247 Nevertheless, this is a well-known paradox in the literature—females seem to experience positive  
 248 and negative emotions equally intensive, explaining why female often report both experiencing  
 249 more negative moods and depressive symptoms and also higher levels of happiness than males  
 250 (Fujita, Diener & Sandvik, 1991). A between-subjects ANOVA was conducted to investigate  
 251 gender differences in happiness-increasing strategies. The result indicated significant gender  
 252 effects for: Social Affiliation ( $F(1, 492) = 17.67$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), whereby the female participants  
 253 expressed a higher level of Social Affiliation ( $M = 3.43$ ,  $SD = 0.56$ ) than the male participants ( $M$   
 254  $= 3.27$ ,  $SD = 0.65$ ); Instrumental Goal Pursuit ( $F(1, 492) = 6.60$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), whereby the female  
 255 participants expressed a higher level of Instrumental Goal Pursuit ( $M = 3.33$ ,  $SD = 0.81$ ) than the  
 256 male participants ( $M = 3.19$ ,  $SD = 0.82$ ); Religion ( $F(1, 492) = 23.18$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), whereby the  
 257 female participants expressed a higher Religion ( $M = 3.08$ ,  $SD = 1.13$ ) than the male participants  
 258 ( $M = 2.63$ ,  $SD = 1.04$ ); Passive Leisure ( $F(1, 492) = 9.25$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), whereby the female  
 259 participants expressed a higher level of Passive Leisure ( $M = 3.30$ ,  $SD = 0.55$ ) than the male  
 260 participants ( $M = 3.16$ ,  $SD = 0.60$ ); Direct Attempts ( $F(1, 492) = 4.06$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ), whereby the  
 261 female participants expressed a higher level of Direct Attempts ( $M = 3.66$ ,  $SD = 0.58$ ) than the  
 262 male participants ( $M = 3.60$ ,  $SD = 0.64$ ). The differences presented here are a replication of the  
 263 original study conducted by Tkach and Lyubomirsky (2006): females focus on behaviour such as  
 264 maintaining relationships (i.e., Social Affiliation), pursuing career goals (i.e., Instrumental Goal  
 265 Pursuit), performing religious activities (i.e., Religion), and watching TV (i.e., Passive Leisure)  
 266 more frequently than males when they try to increase their happiness. As suggested by Tkach and  
 267 Lyubomirsky (2006, pp. 214), the gender differences replicated here “are consistent with the

gender differences reported for behaviors used to combat bad moods (Thayer et al., 1994)”.

In order to test differences in life satisfaction for each of the four affective profiles a between-subject ANOVA was conducted. The result indicated significant effects for life satisfaction ( $F(3, 492) = 49.26; p < 0.001$ ). Further, a between-subject ANOVA was conducted in order to test differences in happiness-increasing strategies for each of the four affective profiles. The mean scores of life satisfaction as well as for happiness-increasing strategies for all four affective profiles are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 here

A Bonferroni test, with alpha level set to .01, was conducted to compare the mean differences in life satisfaction as well as for happiness-increasing strategies between affective profiles. The results showed, replicating earlier findings, among Swedes, that the self-destructive group had lower scores in life satisfaction compared to all the other affective profiles. The self-fulfilling group had higher scores in life satisfaction compared to all the other affective profiles. Regarding happiness-increasing strategies the results showed that the self-destructive group had lower scores in all happiness-increasing strategies except for Mental Control. For further details, see Table 3.

Table 3 here

## General discussion

The aim of this set of studies was to examine the connections between the four types of affective profiles (self-fulfilling, high affective, low affective, self-destructive) to happiness and depression (Study I), satisfaction with life and happiness-increasing strategies (Study II) in US-residents. The results showed that the self-fulfilling group reported a significantly higher level of happiness and a significantly lower level of depression than all the three other groups (high affective, low affective, self-destructive). Furthermore, the self-destructive group reported a significantly higher

level of depression and lower level of happiness than all the other three groups (self-fulfilling, high and low affective). The results also show that the high affective and low affective reported higher level of happiness and lower level of depression than the self-destructive group. But at the same time these groups (high and low affective) also showed significantly lower levels of happiness and significantly higher levels depression than the self-fulfilling group. As suggested by Garcia (2011), low PA among low affectives seems to influence happiness negatively as high NA influences happiness negatively among high affectives. The results presented here are corresponding to the results found in research with Swedish populations showing that high PA is related to less stress, depression, and anxiety (e.g., Garcia et al., 2012; Lindahl & Archer, 2013; Nima, Rosenberg, Archer & Garcia, 2013). Moreover, self-fulfilling, high affective and low affective participants all have higher life satisfaction compared with self-destructive participants. This result also replicates findings among Swedish pupils where self-fulfilling, high and low affective participants showed higher level of life satisfaction compared with self-destructives (e.g., Garcia & Archer, 2012). As suggested by Lindahl and Archer (2013; see also Archer & Kostrzewa, 2013; Archer, Oscar-Berman, Blum & Gold, 2013), positive affect might serve as an anti-depressive factor and, as suggested here, also as protective factor for happiness and life satisfaction.

The self-fulfilling participants showed significantly higher results than all other profiles on the direct attempts strategy. Suggesting that in order to increase their happiness the self-fulfilling individuals are more prone to directly attempt to smile, get them selves in a happy mood, improve their social skills, and work on their self-control. Indeed, Garcia (2012a) showed that self-fulfilling score higher in personality traits related to agentic values (i.e., autonomy, responsibility, self-acceptance, intern locus of control, self-control) as measured by the Temperament and Character Inventory (Cloninger, Svrakic & Przybeck, 1993). Moreover, self-fulfilling individuals scored lower than high NA individuals (high affectives and self-

destructives) in the strategy of mental control. The mental control scale has been defined as ambivalent behavior, that is, the individual using this happiness-increasing strategy make efforts to avoid negative experiences by suppressing negative thoughts and feelings but also ruminating about negative aspects of life (Tkach and Lyubomirsky, 2006). These tendencies may not only prolong unhappiness, suppressing negative thoughts actually may end up in maintaining these thoughts and thereby aggravate negative affect (Tkach & Lyubomirsky, 2006), which may explain why these tendencies are more frequent among high affective and self-destructive than self-fulfilling individuals.

Compared to low PA individuals (i.e., low affectives and self-destructives), the self-fulfilling individuals also reported using more often three of the other happiness-increasing strategies: social affiliation, instrumental goal pursuit, active leisure. Social affiliations activities comprise communal (i.e., cooperation) values to guide behavior such as: supporting and encouraging friends, helping others, trying to improve one self, interacting with friends, and receiving help from friends (Tkach & Lyubomirsky, 2006). Instrumental goal pursuit includes activities directed to achieving goals by trying to reach one's full potential, studying, organizing one's life and goals, and striving for the accomplishment of tasks (Tkach & Lyubomirsky, 2006). Finally, the use of active leisure comprises a proness to wellness through fitness and flow, that is, exercising and working on hobbies or activities in which the individual uses her/his strengths and becomes absorbed by the activity itself (Tkach & Lyubomirsky, 2006). In other words, both instrumental goal pursuit and active leisure comprises agentic (i.e., autonomous, self-directed) values guiding behavior in order to approach well-being. Indeed, among Swedes (Nima et al., 2012, 2013), these three strategies (social affiliation, instrumental goal pursuit, and active leisure) have been found to be positively related to subjective well-being. Agency and cooperation are also related to mental health, dysfunction and suffering (Cloninger & Zohar, 2011; Garcia, Anckarsäter & Lundström, 2013; Garcia, Lundström, Brändström, Raastam, Cloninger, et al.,



2013; Garcia, Nima & Archer, 2013) and are suggested to help the individual to become happier and healthier (Cloninger, 2013; see also Johansson Lyssarides, Andersson & Rousseau, 2013, who showed that increases in agency and cooperation are associated to improvement in depression). Moreover, compared to the self-destructives, the self-fulfilling individuals reported more frequently seeking support from faith, performing religious activities, praying, and drinking less alcohol (i.e., the religion happiness-increasing strategy). Indeed, Cloninger (2013) has suggested that while agency and cooperation might lead to happiness and health, spiritual values might be needed for becoming a self-fulfilled individual that lives in harmony with the changing world. See Figure 1 for a summary of the results.

Figure 1 should be here

### ***Limitations and future research***

One limitation of the present set of studies is that the results are based on MTurk workers' self-reports. Nevertheless, consistent with earlier research suggesting MTurk as a valid tool for collecting data using personality scales (Buhrmester et al., 2011), other researchers have found that health measures using MTurk data shows satisfactory internal reliability and test-retest reliability (Shapiro, Chandler & Mueller, 2013). Furthermore, the prevalence of depression among MTurk workers matches the prevalence of this illness in the general population; which makes MTurk a valid tool even for clinical research (Shapiro et al., 2013). The measures used here are validated and reliable measures of happiness, depression, life satisfaction, and affect; however, there are other established measures that could have been used for the measurement of depression (e.g., The Patient Health Questionnaire; Kroenke, Spitzer & Williams, 2001). The Short Depression-Happiness Scale (Joseph et al., 2004), used in Study I, was found appropriate firstly because it was developed as a short easy-to-distribute scale based on the increasing awareness of the therapeutic potential of the positive psychological perspective (e.g. Cloninger, 2006, Joseph & Linley, 2004; Keyes & Lopez, 2002). This scale has shown good psychometric



properties of internal consistency reliability (*Cronbach's  $\alpha$*  between .77-.92), test-retest reliability ( $r = .68$  in a 2-week interval), and convergent and discriminant validity with measures of depression (Beck's Depression Inventory), happiness (Oxford's Happiness Inventory) and personality (NEO Five Factor Inventory) (Joseph et al., 2004).

The lack of studies in adult populations using the affective profiles model and positive measures of well-being did not permit comparison of the results presented to other than earlier research among adolescents and young adults, thus, showing the need for further studies on adults regarding these factors. The reliability coefficients for some of the happiness-increasing strategies were low (e.g., Direct Attempts showed an *Cronbach's  $\alpha$*  = .56). In studies among Swedes this scales have been modified through factor analyses (Nima et al., 2013). Although most of the scales in the present study showed alphas above .63, further studies focusing in the validation of these scales are needed. Furthermore, specific emotions vary widely across the lifespan. Findings among men and women in the US, for example, show that as people age they become less stressed and angry, although worry seems to persist as a negative emotion in peoples lives during middle age (Stone, Schwartz, Broderick & Deaton, 2010). Positive emotions such as happiness and enjoyment along with negative emotions such as sadness, however, show very limited change with age (Stone et al., 2010). Although the present study did not aim to investigate variations in specific emotions with respect to age, further studies exploring increases/decreases in PA and NA are needed.

Finally, since median splits distort the meaning of high and low, it is plausible to criticize the validity of the procedure used here to create the different affective profiles—scores just-above and just-below the median become high and low by fiat, not by reality (Schütz, Archer & Garcia, 2013). Nevertheless, a recent study (MacDonald & Kormi-Nouri, 2013) used k-means cluster analysis to test if the affective profiles model emerged as theorized by Archer and colleagues. The

affective profile model was replicated using the k-means cluster analysis and the four affective profiles emerged as the combinations of high vs. low affectivity. The procedure used by these researchers is useful for person-oriented analyses (see Bergman, Magnusson et al., 2003), thus, suggesting the original procedure by Archer as valid.

### **Conclusion**

The present set of studies expands earlier results among Swedes to a relative large sample of US-residents. The results suggest that the affective profile model distinguish important differences in happiness, depression, and life satisfaction between individuals. These differences suggest that promoting positive emotions can positively influence a depressive-to-happy state as well as increasing life satisfaction. Moreover, the present study describes further how affective profiles differ with regard to happiness-increasing strategies. These specific results suggest that the pursue of happiness through agentic, communal, and spiritual values leads to a self-fulfilling experience defined as frequently experiencing positive emotions and infrequently experiencing negative emotions.

*“It was right then that I started thinking about  
Thomas Jefferson on the Declaration of Independence  
and the part about our right to life, liberty, and  
the pursuit of happiness. And I remember thinking  
how did he know to put the pursuit part in there?”  
Will Smith as Christopher Gardner in The Pursuit of Happyness*

## Legends and Captions

**Table 1.** Mean scores in PA, NA, happiness, and depression for each affective profile in Study I.

**Table 2.** Means in life satisfaction and happiness-increasing strategies among affective profiles in Study II.

**Table 3.** Mean differences in life satisfaction and happiness-increasing strategies between affective profiles.

**Figure 1.** Summary of the results from Study I and II showing the differences between affective profiles in happiness, depression, life satisfaction, and the happiness-increasing strategies.

## References

- Adrianson, L., Djumaludin, A., Neila, R., & Archer, T. (2013). Cultural influences upon health, affect, self-esteem and impulsiveness: An Indonesian-Swedish comparison. *International Journal of Research Studies in Psychology*. DOI: 10.5861/ijrsp.2013.228.
- Archer, T., Adolfsson, B., & Karlsson, E. (2008). Affective personality as cognitive-emotional presymptom profiles regulatory for self-reported health predispositions. *Neurotoxicity Research*, 14, 21-44.
- Archer, T., Adrianson, L., Plancak, A., & Karlsson, E. (2007). Influence of affective personality on cognitive-mediated emotional processing: Need for empowerment. *European Journal of Psychiatry*, 21, 21-44.
- Archer, T., & Kostrzewa, R. M. (2013). *The inductive agency of stress: From perinatal to adolescent induction*. In G. Laviola & S. Macrì (Eds.), *Adaptive and maladaptive aspects of developmental stress, current topics in neurotoxicity* (Vol. 3, pp. 1-20). New York: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-5605-6\_1.
- Archer, T., Oscar-Berman, M., Blum, K., & Gold, M. S. (2013). Epigenetic modulation of mood disorders. *Journal of Genetic Syndromes & Gene Therapy*, 4, 120-133. doi:10.4172/2157-7412.1000120.
- Bergman, L. R., Magnusson, D., & El-Khoury, B. M. (2003). *Studying individual development in an interindividual context: A person-oriented approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- 463 Bood, S. Å., Archer, T., & Norlander, T. (2004). Affective personality in relation to general  
464 personality, self-reported stress, coping and optimism. *Individual Differences Research*, 2,  
465 26-37.
- 466 Bradburn, N. M. (1969). *The structure of psychological well-being*. Chicago: Aldine.
- 467 Buhrmester, M. D., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A New  
468 Source of Inexpensive, yet High-Quality, Data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6,  
469 3-5.
- 470 Cloninger, C. R. (2004). *Feeling good: The science of well-being*. New York: Oxford University  
471 Press.
- 472 Cloninger, C. R. (2006). Fostering spirituality and well-being in clinical practice. *Psychiatric*  
473 *Annals*, 36, 1-6.
- 474 Cloninger, C. R. (2013). What makes people healthy, happy, and fulfilled in the face of current  
475 world challenges? *Mens Sana Monographs*, 1, 16-24.
- 476 Cloninger, C. R., Svrakic, D. M., & Przybeck, T. R. (1993). A Psychobiological model of  
477 temperament and character. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 50, 975–989.
- 478 Cloninger, C. R., & Zohar, A. H. (2011). Personality and the perception of health and happiness.  
479 *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 128, 24–32.
- 480 Diener, E (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 542-575.
- 481 Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale.  
482 *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71–75.
- 483 Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., and Smith, H. L. (1999) Subjective well-being: Three  
484 decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 276–302
- 485 Diener, E, Suh, E. & Oishi, S. (1997). Recent findings on subjective well being. *Indian Journal*  
486 *of Clinical Psychology*, 24, 25–41.
- 487 Fujita, F., Diener, E., Sandvik, E. (1991). Gender differences in negative affect and well- being:

- 488           The case for emotional intensity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 427-  
489           434.
- 490   Garcia, D. (2009). Interpretation and Recognition for Words in a Short Story [Database record].  
491           Retrieved from the American Psychological Association's PsycTESTS. DOI:  
492           10.1037/t00401-000.
- 493   Garcia, D. (2011) *Adolescents' happiness: The role of the affective temperament model on*  
494           *memory and apprehension of events, subjective well-being, and psychological well-being*.  
495           Ph.D. Thesis, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg.
- 496   Garcia, D. (2012a). The Affective Temperaments: Differences between Adolescents in the Big  
497           Five Model and Cloninger's Psychobiological Model of Personality. *Journal of*  
498           *Happiness Studies*, 13, 999- 1017. DOI: 10.1007/s10902-011-9303-5.
- 499   Garcia, D. (2012b) Adolescents' happiness-increasing strategies and well-being. *6th European*  
500           *Conference on Positive Psychology*, Moscow, 26-29 June 2012, 34.
- 501   Garcia, D. (2013). La vie en Rose: High Levels of Well-Being and Events Inside and Outside  
502           Autobiographical Memory. *Journal of Happiness Studies*. DOI: 10.1007/s10902-013-  
503           9443-x.
- 504   Garcia, D., Anckarsäter, H., & Lundström, S. (2013). Self-directedness and Cooperativeness,  
505           psychosocial dysfunction and suffering in ESSENCE. *The Scientific World Journal*. DOI:  
506           10.1155/2013/416981.
- 507   Garcia, D., & Archer, T. (2012). Adolescent Life Satisfaction and Well-Being. *Journal of*  
508           *Alternative Medicine Research*, 4, 271-279.
- 509   Garcia, D., Ghiabi, B., Moradi, S., Siddiqui, A., & Archer, T. (2013). The Happy Personality: A  
510           Tale of Two Philosophies. In E. F. Morris & M-A. Jackson (Eds.), *Psychology of*  
511           *Personality* (pp. 41-59). New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- 512   Garcia, D., Kerekes, N., Andersson-Arntén, A-C., & Archer, T. (2012). Temperament, Character,

- 513 and Adolescents' Depressive Symptoms: Focusing on Affect. *Depression Research and*  
514 *Treatment*. DOI:10.1155/2012/925372.
- 515 Garcia, D., Nima, A. A., & Archer, T. (In press). Temperament and Character's Relationship to  
516 Subjective Well-Being in Salvadorian Adolescents and Young Adults. *Journal of*  
517 *Adolescence*.
- 518 Garcia, D., Lundström, S., Brändström, S., Råstam, M., Cloninger, C. R., Kerekes, N., Nilsson,  
519 T., Anckarsäter, H. (2013). Temperament and Character in the Child and Adolescent Twin  
520 Study in Sweden (CATSS): Comparison to the General Population, and Genetic Structure  
521 Analysis. *PLoS ONE* 8(8): e70475. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0070475.
- 522 Garcia, D., & Moradi, S. (2013). The Affective Temperaments and Well-Being: Swedish and  
523 Iranian Adolescents' Life Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of*  
524 *Happiness Studies*, 14, 689-707. DOI: 10.1007/s10902-012-9349-z.
- 525 Garcia, D., & Siddiqui, A. (2009a). Adolescents' Affective Temperaments: Life Satisfaction,  
526 Interpretation and Memory of events. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 4, 155–167.  
527 DOI: 10.1080/17439760802399349.
- 528 Garcia, D., & Siddiqui, A. (2009b). Adolescents' Psychological Well-Being and Memory for Life  
529 Events: Influences on Life Satisfaction with Respect to Temperamental Dispositions.  
530 *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10, 387–503. DOI: 10.1007/s10902-008-9096-3.
- 531 Garcia, D., Rosenberg, P., Erlandsson, A., & Siddiqui, A. (2010). On Lions and Adolescents:  
532 Affective Temperaments and the Influence of Negative Stimuli on Memory. *Journal of*  
533 *Happiness Studies*, 11, 477–495. DOI: 10.1007/s10902-009-9153-6.
- 534 Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1280-1300.
- 535 Johansson, R., Lyssarides, C., Andersson, G., & Rousseau, A. (2013). Personality change after  
536 internet-delivered cognitive behavior therapy for depression. *PeerJ* 1:e39. DOI:  
537 10.7717/peerj.39.

- 538 Joseph, S., & Linley, P. A. (2004). Positive therapy: A positive psychological theory of  
539 therapeutic practice. In P. A. Linley & S. Joseph (Eds), Positive psychology in practice  
540 (pp. 354–368). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- 541 Keyes, C. L. M., & Lopez, S. J. (2002). Toward a science of mental health: Positive directions in  
542 diagnosis and interventions. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds), Handbook of positive  
543 psychology (pp.45–59). New York: Oxford University Press.
- 544 Joseph, S., Linley, P. A., Harwood, J., Lewis, C. A., & McCollam, P. (2004). Rapid assessment of  
545 well-being: The Short Depression–Happiness Scale. *Psychology and Psychotherapy:  
546 Theory, Research, and Practice*, 77, 1–14.
- 547 Karlsson, E., & Archer, T. (2007). Relationship between personality characteristics and affect:  
548 Gender and affective personality. *Individual Differences Research*, 5, 44-58.
- 549 Keren, G., & Schul, Y. (2009). Two is not always better than one. A critical evaluation of two-  
550 system theories. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4, 533–550.
- 551 Kunst, M. J. J. (2011). Affective personality type, post-traumatic stress disorder symptom  
552 severity and post-traumatic growth in victims of violence. *Stress and Health*, 27, 42-51.
- 553 Larsen, R. J., & Ketelaar, T. (1991). Personality and susceptibility to positive and negative  
554 emotional states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 132–140.
- 555 Lindahl, M., & Archer, T. (2013). Depressive expression and anti-depressive protection in  
556 adolescence: Stress, positive affect, motivation and self-efficacy. *Psychology*, 4, 495-505.
- 557 Lucas, R. E. (2008). Personality and Subjective Well-Being. In M. Eid, & R.J. Larsen (Eds.). *The  
558 science of subjective well-being* (pp. 171-194). New York: The Guilford Press.
- 559 Lucas, R. E., & Diener, E. (2008) Personality and Subjective Well-Being. In O. P. John, R. W.  
560 Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.). *Handbook of Personality – Theory and Research* (pp. 795-  
561 814). New York: The Guilford Press.
- 562 MacDonald, S., & Kormi-Nouri, R. (2013). The affective personality, sleep, and autobiographical



- 563 memories. *The Journal of Positive Psychology: Dedicated to furthering research and*  
564 *promoting good practice*, 8, 305-313.
- 565 Myers, D. G., & Diener, E. (1995). Who is happy? *Psychological Science*, 6, 10-19.
- 566 Nima, A. A., Archer, T., & Garcia, D. (2012). Adolescents' happiness-increasing Strategies,  
567 Temperament, and Character: Mediation models on Subjective Well-Being. *Health*, 4,  
568 802-810. DOI: 10.4236/health.2012.410124.
- 569 Nima, A. A., Archer, T., & Garcia, D. (2013). The Happiness-Increasing Strategies Scales in a  
570 Sample of Swedish Adolescents. *International Journal of Happiness and Development*, 1,  
571 196–211.
- 572 Nima, A. A., Rosenberg, P., Archer, T., & Garcia, D. (2013). Anxiety, Affect, Self-esteem, and  
573 Stress: Mediation and Moderation Effects on Depression. *PLOS ONE*. DOI:  
574 10.1371/journal.pone.0073265.
- 575 Norris, C. J., Larsen, J. T., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2007). Neuroticism is associated with larger and  
576 more prolonged electrodermal responses to emotionally evocative pictures.  
577 *Psychophysiology*, 44, 823–826.
- 578 Norlander, T., Bood, S.-Å., & Archer, T. (2002). Performance during stress: Affective personality  
579 age, and regularity of physical exercise. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 30, 495–508.
- 580 Norlander, T., Johansson, Å., & Bood, S.-Å. (2005). The affective personality: Its relation to  
581 quality of sleep, well-being and stress. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 33, 709–722.
- 582 Palomo, T., Beninger, R. J., Kostrzewa, R. M., & Archer, T. (2008). Focusing on symptoms rather  
583 than diagnoses in brain dysfunction: Conscious and nonconscious expression in  
584 impulsiveness and decision making. *Neurotoxicity Research*, 14, 1-20.
- 585 Palomo, T., Kostrzewa, R. M., Beninger, R. J., & Archer, T. (2007). Treatment consideration and  
586 manifest complexity in comorbid neuropsychiatric disorders. *Neurotoxicity Research*, 12,  
587 43-60.

- 588 Pavot, W. (2008). The assessment of subjective well-being: Successes and shortfalls. In M. Eid &  
589 R. J. Larsen (Eds.), *The science of subjective well-being* (pp. 124–167). New York: The  
590 Guilford Press.
- 591 Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (1993). Review of the satisfaction with life scale. *Psychological*  
592 *Assessment*, 2, 164–172.
- 593 Russell, J. A., & Feldman Barrett, L. (1999). Core affect, prototypical emotional episodes, and  
594 other things called emotion: Dissecting the elephant. *Journal of Personality and Social*  
595 *Psychology*, 76, 805–819.
- 596 Schütz, E., Garcia, D., & Archer, T. (2013). Affective State, Stress and Type A-personality as a  
597 Function of Gender and Affective Profiles. Manuscript under editorial evaluation.
- 598 Shapiro, D. N., Chandler, J., & Mueller, P. A. (2013). Using Mechanical Turk to Study Clinical  
599 Populations. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 1, 213-220.
- 600 Stone, A. A., Schwartz, J. E., Broderick, J. E., Deaton, A. (2010). A snapshot of the age  
601 distribution of psychological well-being in the United States. *PNAS*, 107, 9985-9990.
- 602 Thayer, R. E., Newman, R., & McClain, T. M. (1994). Self-regulation of mood: Strategies for  
603 changing a bad mood, raising energy, and reducing tension. *Journal of Personality and*  
604 *Social Psychology*, 67, 910–925.
- 605 Tkach, C., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2006) How do people pursue happiness? Relating personality,  
606 happiness-increasing strategies, and well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 7, 183-225.  
607 doi:10.1007/s10902-005-4754-1.
- 608 Tellegen, A. (1985). Structures of mood and personality and their relevance to assessing anxiety,  
609 with an emphasis on self-report. In A. H. Tuma & J. D. Maser (Eds.), *Anxiety and the*  
610 *Anxiety disorders*, (pp. 681-706), Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- 611 Tellegen, A. (1993). Folk concepts and psychological concepts of personality and personality  
612 disorder. *Psychological Inquiry*, 4, 122–130.

- 613 Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1984). Negative affectivity: The disposition to experience negative  
614 aversive emotional states. *Psychological Bulletin*, 96, 465–490.
- 615 Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1994). *The PANAS-X: Manual for the positive and negative affect*  
616 *schedule—Expanded form*. Boise: University of Iowa Press.
- 617 Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of  
618 positive and negative affect: The PANAS scale. *Journal of Personality and Social*  
619 *Psychology*, 54, 1063-1070.
- 620 Watson, D., & Tellegen, A. (1985). Toward a consensual structure of mood. *Psychological*  
621 *Bulletin*, 98, 219–235.
- 622 Watson, D., Wiese, D., Vaidya, J., & Tellegen, A. (1999). The two general activation systems of  
623 affect: Structural findings, evolutionary considerations, and psychobiological evidence.  
624 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 820–838.
- 625 Yik, M. S. M., Russell, J. A., & Feldman Barrett, L. (1999). Structure of self reported current  
626 affect: Integration and beyond. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 600–  
627 619.
- 628 Zöller, M., & Archer, T. (2009). Predicting stress in male and female psychiatric patients and  
629 healthy volunteers. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 7, 1081-1094.
- 630 Zöller, M., Karlsson, E., & Archer, T. (2009). Self-rated affect among adults presenting  
631 psychiatric diagnosis. *Individual Differences Research*, 7, 14-28.

# Table 1 (on next page)

## Table 1

Mean scores in PA, NA, happiness, and depression for each affective profile in Study I.

**Table 1.** Mean scores in PA, NA, happiness and depression for each affective profile in Study I.

	Self-fulfilling <i>n</i> = 241	High affective <i>n</i> = 180	Low affective <i>n</i> = 236	Self-destructive <i>n</i> = 243
Positive Affect	3.66 ± 0.44 <sup>c, d</sup>	3.59 ± 0.41 <sup>c, d</sup>	2.37 ± 0.52 <sup>a, b</sup>	2.36 ± 0.50 <sup>a, b</sup>
Negative Affect	1.27 ± 0.21 <sup>b, d</sup>	2.20 ± 0.51 <sup>a, d</sup>	1.24 ± 0.21 <sup>b, d</sup>	2.45 ± 0.61 <sup>a, b, c</sup>
Happiness	10.65 ± 1.77 <sup>b, c, d</sup>	10.02 ± 1.94 <sup>a, c, d</sup>	9.37 ± 2.22 <sup>a, b, d</sup>	7.99 ± 2.12 <sup>a, b, c</sup>
Depression	4.80 ± 1.75 <sup>b, c, d</sup>	5.92 ± 1.85 <sup>a, d</sup>	5.75 ± 2.21 <sup>a, d</sup>	7.57 ± 2.35 <sup>a, b, c</sup>

Values represent mean scores ± SD. *p* < 0.01, Bonferroni test: <sup>a</sup> compared to self-fulfilling; <sup>b</sup> compared to the high affective; <sup>c</sup> compared to the low affective; <sup>d</sup> compared to the self-destructive.

## Table 2 (on next page)

Table 2

Means in life satisfaction and happiness-increasing strategies among affective profiles in Study II.

- 1 **Table 2.** Means in life satisfaction and happiness-increasing strategies among affective profiles in
- 2 Study II.

	Self-fulfilling	High affective	Low affective	Self-destructive
	N = 158	N = 123	N = 92	N = 127
Positive Affect	3.76 ± 0.49	3.59 ± 0.42	2.44 ± 0.52	2.30 ± 0.51
Negative Affect	1.25 ± 0.21	2.37 ± 0.58	1.20 ± 0.21	2.53 ± 0.67
Life satisfaction	5.17 ± 1.24	4.11 ± 1.32	4.42 ± 1.51	3.15 ± 1.49
Social Affiliation	3.56 ± 0.53	3.51 ± 0.42	3.28 ± 0.63	3.02 ± 0.67
Partying and Clubbing	2.12 ± 0.71	2.29 ± 0.75	2.18 ± 0.67	2.00 ± 0.64
Mental Control	2.12 ± 0.47	2.43 ± 0.50	2.20 ± 0.42	2.59 ± 0.49
Instrumental Goal Pursuit	3.47 ± 0.77	3.51 ± 0.67	3.07 ± 0.85	2.92 ± 0.83
Religion	3.11 ± 1.19	2.94 ± 1.04	2.88 ± 1.11	2.57 ± 1.02
Passive Leisure	3.22 ± 0.56	3.38 ± 0.51	3.17 ± 0.60	3.17 ± 0.63
Active Leisure	3.39 ± 0.54	3.28 ± 0.55	3.10 ± 0.65	2.90 ± 0.65
Direct Attempts	3.91 ± 0.50	3.68 ± 0.49	3.60 ± 0.60	3.27 ± 0.64

# **Table 3**(on next page)

Table 3

Mean differences in life satisfaction and happiness-increasing strategies between affective profiles.



**Table 3.** Mean differences, in life satisfaction and happiness-increasing strategies between affective temperaments.

Affective profiles	Self-fulfilling N = 158	High affective N = 123	Low affective N = 92	Self-destructive N = 127
<u>Self-fulfilling</u>				
Positive Affect		0.17*	1.32*	1.46*
Negative Affect		-1.12*	0.05 <i>ns</i>	-1.28*
Life satisfaction		1.05*	0.75*	2.01*
Social Affiliation		0.05 <i>ns</i>	0.28*	0.54*
Partying and Clubbing		-0.16 <i>ns</i>	-0.06 <i>ns</i>	0.12 <i>ns</i>
Mental Control		-0.31*	-0.09 <i>ns</i>	-0.47*
Instrumental Goal Pursuit		-0.04 <i>ns</i>	0.39*	0.54*
Religion		0.17 <i>ns</i>	0.23 <i>ns</i>	0.54*
Passive Leisure		-0.16 <i>ns</i>	0.05 <i>ns</i>	0.05 <i>ns</i>
Active Leisure		0.11 <i>ns</i>	0.29*	0.49*
Direct Attempts		0.24*	0.31*	0.64*
<u>High affective</u>				
Positive Affect	-0.17*		1.15*	1.29*
Negative Affect	1.11*		-1.17*	-0.16 <i>ns</i>
Life satisfaction	-1.05*		-0.31 <i>ns</i>	0.96*
Social Affiliation	-0.05 <i>ns</i>		0.24 <i>ns</i>	0.50*
Partying and Clubbing	0.16 <i>ns</i>		0.11 <i>ns</i>	0.29*
Mental Control	0.31*		0.23*	-0.16 <i>ns</i>
Instrumental Goal Pursuit	0.04 <i>ns</i>		0.43*	0.58*
Religion	-0.17 <i>ns</i>		0.05 <i>ns</i>	0.36 <i>ns</i>
Passive Leisure	0.16 <i>ns</i>		0.21 <i>ns</i>	0.20 <i>ns</i>
Active Leisure	-0.11 <i>ns</i>		0.18 <i>ns</i>	0.38*
Direct Attempts	-0.23*		0.07 <i>ns</i>	0.40 <i>ns</i>
<u>Low affective</u>				
Positive Affect	-1.32*	-1.15*		0.14 <i>ns</i>
Negative Affect	-0.05	-1.17*		-1.32*

Life satisfaction		-0.75*	0.31 $ns$		1.26*
Social Affiliation		-0.28*	-0.24 $ns$		0.26*
Partying and Clubbing		0.06 $ns$	-0.11 $ns$		0.18 $ns$
Mental Control		0.09 $ns$	-0.23*		-0.40*
Instrumental	Goal	-0.39*	-0.43*		0.15 $ns$
Pursuit					
Religion		-0.23 $ns$	-0.05 $ns$		0.31 $ns$
Passive Leisure		-0.05 $ns$	-0.21 $ns$		-0.00 $ns$
Active Leisure		-0.29*	-0.18 $ns$		0.20 $ns$
Direct Attempts		-0.31*	-0.07 $ns$		0.33*
<u>Self-destructive</u>					
Positive Affect		-1.46*	-1.29*	-0.14*	
Negative Affect		1.28*	0.16 $ns$	1.33*	
Life satisfaction		-2.01*	-0.96*	-1.26*	
Social Affiliation		-0.54*	-0.50*	-0.26*	
Partying and Clubbing		-0.12 $ns$	-0.29*	-0.18 $ns$	
Mental Control		0.47*	0.16 $ns$	0.39*	
Instrumental	Goal	-0.54*	-0.58*	-0.15 $ns$	
Pursuit					
Religion		-0.54*	-0.36 $ns$	-0.31 $ns$	
Passive Leisure		-0.05 $ns$	-0.20 $ns$	0.00 $ns$	
Active Leisure		-0.49*	-0.38*	-0.20 $ns$	
Direct Attempts		-0.64*	-0.40*	-0.33*	

3  $ns$  = non significant, \*  $p < 0.01$  with Bonferroni Correction.

# Figure 1

Figure 1

Summary of the results from Study I and II showing the differences between affective profiles in happiness, depression, life satisfaction, and the happiness-increasing strategies.

