

Materials

The Positive and Negative Affect Scale (PANAS; Watson et al., 1988) was used to measure levels of positive and negative affect for this study. Each sub-scale (positive affect [PA] and negative affect [NA]) was assessed separately. Each sub-scale contained ten items and participants were required to give a response to each item according to how they felt either right now, at that present moment OR the extent to which they have felt that way over the past week. Responses were given on a 5-point Likert scale with scores equating as follows; 1= Very slightly or not at all, 2 = a little, 3 = moderately, 4 = quite a bit, and 5 = extremely. Each item, therefore, had a possible score ranging between one and five, with sub-scale scores ranging from ten to 50. Higher scores on the positive affect scale indicated greater subjective experience of positive moods, and lower scores on the negative affect scale indicated lower levels of negative emotions or mood. Cronbach's alpha for each sub-scale were reported to be .86 for PA and .84 for NA, similar to the reliabilities reported by Watson et al. (1995) (Cronbach's alphas = .84 and .85)

Materials

The Arnett Inventory of Sensation Seeking (AISS; Arnett, 1994) was used to measure levels of sensation seeking in participants. For the purpose of this study, a full scale score of sensation was gathered, as well individual sub-scale scores for both novelty seeking and intensity seeking.

The full scale contains 20 items, with ten items measuring both intensity and novelty seeking. The intensity sub-scale included items such as “when I listen to music, I like it to be loud” and “I can see how it would be exciting to be in a battle during a war”, with items such as “I think it’s better to order something familiar when eating in a restaurant” and “If I have to wait in a long line, I’m usually impatient about it” assessing levels of novelty seeking. Responses for all items in the scale were given on a 4-point Likert scale from 4 = describes me very well to 1 = does not describe me at all, with scores subsequently ranging from 1 to 4 for each item, making final scores obtained from the total scale between 20 and 80, and between ten and 40 for each of the two sub-scales. There were six negatively worded items contained within the full scale (three per sub-scale) which required reverse-scoring prior to analysis. Internal reliability for intensity seeking, novelty seeking, and overall sensation seeking were initiated to be .84, .76 and .81 respectively, which compares favourably to the reliability reported by previous studies utilising this scale (e.g., Arnett, 2001; Cronbach’s alphas of .85, .79 and .82)

Materials

The Big Five Inventory-10 (BFI-10; Rammstedt & John, 2007) was used to measure levels of the personality traits extraversion and conscientiousness (see appendix A). The full scale includes ten items, however only items related to the two selected personality traits were used in this study. Two items measured levels of extraversion and included items such as 'I am someone who is talkative'. Responses were given on a 5-point Likert scale anchored from 1= strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree with scores subsequently ranging from one to five for each item, making final scores obtained from this scale between two and ten. The scale contained one negatively worded item that required reverse-scoring prior to analysis. Higher scores for this personality trait indicate a more outgoing and sociable person. Internal reliability for the extraversion scale in this study was initiated to be .81, similar to the reliability reported by John, Donahue and Kentle (1991) (Cronbach's alpha = .83).

Levels of conscientiousness were measured using two items from the same scale. This scale included questions such as 'I am someone who tends to be disorganised'. Responses were again given on a 5-point Likert scale anchored between strongly disagree and strongly agree. Final scores obtained from this scale also ranged between two and ten, with higher scores indicating higher level of self-discipline. This sub-scale contained one negatively worded item that required reverse-scoring prior to analysis. Internal reliability for the conscientiousness scale in the current study was slightly lower than in previous literature (alpha = .63, compared to .79 in John, Donahue & Kentle, 1991).