



Development and validation of a short version of the Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory of Personality Questionnaire (RST-PQ-S)

Journal:	<i>Journal of Personality Assessment</i>
Manuscript ID	JPA-2020-209.R1
Manuscript Type:	General Submission
Keywords:	Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory, Personality Assessment

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Abstract

We conducted three studies (total $n = 998$) aimed at developing and validating a shortened version of the Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory of Personality Questionnaire (i.e., the RST-PQ-S). In Study 1 ($n = 341$), twenty-two items were selected from the original RST-PQ, based on both theoretical and empirical criteria. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on this short-form supported the six-factor structure comprising: FFFS, BIS, and four BAS components (Reward Interest, Goal Drive-Persistence, Reward Reactivity, and Impulsivity). The six scale scores showed adequate levels of internal consistency. Construct validity was supported by correlations with established personality measures. In Study 2 ($n = 340$), CFA results were cross-validated in an independent sample and construct validity was supported by correlations with BIS/BAS scales. In Study 3 ($n = 317$) test-retest correlations showed acceptable-to-good levels of temporal stability over a four-week interval. Results revealed a substantial overlap with original, full-length RST-PQ, providing evidence for the comparability of the two versions. Latent State-Trait analyses showed that the items of the RST-PQ-S mostly capture interindividual differences that are stable across situations. Taken together, findings indicate that the RST-PQ-S provides an efficient, valid and reliable alternative to the longer RST-PQ.

Keywords: reinforcement sensitivity theory, short-scale, revised RST

Development and Validation of a Short Version of the Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory of Personality Questionnaire (RST-PQ-S)

The reinforcement sensitivity theory (RST) of personality (Corr, 2008; Gray & McNaughton, 2000) postulates three major neuropsychological systems underlying individual differences in reaction to classes of repulsor and attractor stimuli (Corr & McNaughton, 2012): The Fight-Flight-Freeze System (FFFS), the Behavioural Inhibition System (BIS), and the Behavioural Approach System (BAS).

According to revised RST (McNaughton & Corr, 2004), the FFFS is activated by frustrating, punishing, and threatening stimuli that require immediate defensive action. When there is no motivation to approach a danger, this system elicits *active avoidance*, *flight*, and, for threats that cannot be easily avoided, *freezing*. Its activity is accompanied by the emotions of fear and, at very short (actual or perceived) defensive distance, panic. In contrast, the BIS is activated by conflicting stimuli, which elicit *cautious approach* to assess potential threat or *passive avoidance* (Gray & McNaughton, 2000). It is responsible for passively avoiding of and the withholding entry to a potentially dangerous field (Corr, 2013). Its activity is accompanied by feelings of anxiety, with increased vigilance towards the source of potential threat. Different components of the BIS functioning have been identified (Corr, 2008): Motor interruption (i.e., the inhibition of ongoing behaviors); risk assessment (i.e., cautious approach aimed at gathering information on potential threats); rumination of past unpleasant events and worry about possible future dangers; obsessive thoughts (i.e., emotional and cognitive engagement with unavoidable dangers); and disengagement (i.e., behavioral withdrawal from situations where the threat cannot be avoided and has to be approached).

The BAS is activated by conditioned and unconditioned attractor stimuli, such as cues for reward, non-punishment and escape from punishment (Corr & McNaughton, 2012), and it elicits approach behavior. As discussed by Corr and McNaughton (2008), the main function

1
2
3 of the BAS is to move the organism along a spatio-temporal gradient towards a final
4 biological reinforcer. In the conceptualization proposed by Corr (2008), four distinct but
5 related BAS processes can be distinguished: *Reward Interest* refers to the initial motivation to
6 seek out potentially rewarding stimuli; *Goal-Drive Persistence* is concerned with actively
7 pursuing desired goals, especially when reward is not immediately available. This dimension
8 is conceptually similar, although not identical, to Carver and White's (1994) Drive scale;
9 *Reward Reactivity* relates to excitement at doing things well and winning. It closely
10 resembles Carver and White's (1994) Reward Responsiveness scale; *Impulsivity* refers to
11 acting fast without thinking in the final stage of reward capture, similarly to Carver and
12 White's (1994) Fun-Seeking scale. The theoretical and empirical bases for this
13 multidimensional structure are detailed elsewhere (Corr, 2008, 2016).

14
15 Although several questionnaires have been proposed to assess individual differences
16 in reactions to attractor and repulsor stimuli (e.g., Carver & White, 1994; Jackson, 2009;
17 Reuter, Cooper, Smillie, Markett, & Montag, 2015; Torrubia, Avila, Molto, & Caseras,
18 2001), a comprehensive measure of FFFS, BIS and BAS, as conceptualized in revised RST,
19 has only recently been made available (for a review of existing RST-based questionnaires,
20 see Corr, 2016, and Krupić, Križanić, Ručević, Gračanin, & Corr, 2016). This measure, the
21 Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory of Personality Questionnaire (RST-PQ, Corr & Cooper,
22 2016), comprises 65 items, divided over FFFS, BIS and BAS.

23
24 The FFFS and the BIS are unidimensional scales modelled on several facet domains,
25 which capture different aspects of the underlying dimensions. The facet domains of FFFS (10
26 items) include *flight*, *active avoidance*, and *freeze*. The facet domains of BIS (23 items)
27 include *motor planning interruption*, *cautious risk-assessment*, *obsessive thoughts*, and
28 *behavioral disengagement*. The BAS include four related but separate scales: *Reward Interest*

1
2
3 (7 items), *Goal-Drive Persistence* (7 items reflecting the facets of *goal planning* and *drive-*
4 *persistence*), *Reward Reactivity* (10 items), and *Impulsivity* (8 items).
5
6

7
8 Corr and Cooper (2016) report five validation studies in their development of the
9
10 RST-PQ. A confirmatory factor analysis (Study 3, $n = 831$) supported the expected six-factor
11
12 structure, although the goodness of fit indices revealed mixed findings (i.e., the RMSEA
13
14 indicated acceptable fit, whereas the CFI did not reach the recommended cut-off). As
15
16 expected, BIS and FFFS showed a moderate positive correlation and the four BAS scales
17
18 were positively related to each other, except for Goal-Drive Persistence and Impulsivity,
19
20 which showed a near zero correlation. All scales showed high levels of internal consistency
21
22 (Study 3, $n = 831$), with Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients ranging from .74
23
24 (Impulsivity) to .93 (FFFS). These factors had meaningful patterns of relations with Carver
25
26 and White (1994) BIS/BAS scales and other personality scales conceptually related to RST
27
28 constructs, including the Big-5 personality traits, trait anxiety and fear (Study 4, $n = 362$).
29
30
31

32
33 After the original validation study in the U.K., a growing number of studies from
34
35 different research fields have adopted the RST-PQ (e.g., Bacon, Corr, & Satchell, 2018;
36
37 Beaton, Mutinelli, & Corr, 2017; De Pascalis & Scacchia, 2019; Jiang & Tiliopoulos, 2014).
38
39 Moreover, the RST-PQ has been translated into German (Pugnaghi, Cooper, Ettinger, &
40
41 Corr, 2018), Polish (Wytykowska, Fajkowska, Domaradzka, & Jankowski, 2017), and
42
43 Swedish (Eriksson, Jansson, & Sundin, 2019).
44
45
46

47 In sum, although research using the RST-PQ is still in its infancy, this instrument
48
49 displays promising psychometric properties and replicates across countries and in different
50
51 languages. However, due to its length, it is relatively time consuming and often it is not
52
53 convenient to include in studies that use multiple measurement instruments or adopt complex
54
55 experimental paradigms. This fact only serves to hamper its use in such contexts. Moreover,
56
57 it is less than optimal for use in large-scale surveys, where space is expensive and highly
58
59
60

1
2
3 limited. In addition, with such a large number of items, difficulties may be encountered in the
4 assessment of model fit. Factor analytic procedures on 65 manifest variables requires a very
5 large sample size to be performed. Most importantly, adequate fit might be unrealistic for
6 lengthy scales (e.g., Floyd & Widaman, 1995; Yang, Nay, & Hoyle, 2010) and, even with an
7 adequate sample size, goodness of fit statistics could be biased when the model being
8 estimated is large (Moshagen, 2012).
9

16 17 **The current research**

18
19 The present research aims to develop and validate a short, 22-item, Italian version of
20 the RST-PQ scale (i.e., the RST-PQ-S). We believe that such a shortened version would
21 represent a useful alternative when practical constraints make the use of the full version either
22 not feasible or recommended. In developing the RST-PQ-S, we followed standard
23 recommendations for short-scale construction and validation (e.g., Rammstedt & Beierlein,
24 2014; Smith, McCarthy, & Anderson, 2000; Ziegler, Kemper, & Kruey, 2014; for a
25 thorough discussion of merits and limitations of shortened scales, see Kruey Emons, &
26 Sijtsma, 2013, and Sandy, Gosling, & Koelkebeck, 2014).
27
28

29 The items of the short-form were selected in a first sample, based on both theoretical
30 and empirical criteria. The psychometric properties of the RST-PQ-S were investigated in
31 terms of factor structure and internal consistency, in accordance with classical test theory.
32 Construct validity was assessed through correlations of scale scores with established
33 personality variables conceptually linked to RST constructs. The factor structure and the
34 internal consistency were further examined in a second, independent sample, along with
35 correlations with Carver and White's (1994) BIS/BAS scales. In a third, longitudinal study,
36 reliability in terms of temporal stability was evaluated through test-retest correlations. This
37 study also assessed the overlap between the short and the extended version, and compared
38 their ability to predict a criterion variable (i.e., test anxiety). Moreover, it provided an
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 estimate of the reliable proportion of variance in the RST-PQ-S items that can be attributable
4
5 to state and trait components.
6
7

8 **Study 1**

9
10 The main aim of this study was to develop a short-form of the RST-PQ (i.e., the RST-
11 PQ-S), drawing a subset of 22 items from the original, full version: Five items were selected
12
13 to tap the FFFS and BIS scales; three items were selected for each of the four BAS
14
15 dimension: Reward Interest, Goal-Drive Persistence, Reward Reactivity, and Impulsivity.
16
17 This procedure provides a short-form with an adequate number of items per factor, which
18
19 maintain approximately the same length of other instruments devised to assess similar
20
21 constructs (e.g., Aluja & Blanch, 2011; Carver & White, 1994; Jackson, 2009).
22
23
24
25

26 After the items had been selected, we aimed to provide initial evidence about the
27
28 psychometrics properties of the short-form, in terms of factor structure, internal consistency,
29
30 and construct validity. Factor structure was examined by means of Confirmatory Factor
31
32 Analyses (CFA). Internal consistency was evaluated using McDonald's (1999) omega, a
33
34 model-based reliability coefficient (i.e., the proportion of the total variance accounted for by
35
36 the latent factor). We reported preliminary information on Cronbach's alpha, because this
37
38 was the criteria used in the original validation study of the RST-PQ (Corr & Cooper, 2016).
39
40 However, although alpha is the most widely used measure of internal consistency, omega
41
42 represents a more appropriate approach (Chen, Hayes, Carver, Laurenceau, & Zhang, 2012).
43
44
45
46

47 Construct validity was assessed by examining correlations with personality measures
48
49 included by Corr and Cooper (2016) in the original validation study (i.e., the Big-5 factors,
50
51 trait anxiety, and fear towards aversive stimuli). We expected to replicate the pattern found in
52
53 that study. Specifically, the four BAS scales were expected to be positively related to
54
55 extraversion. Goal-Drive Persistence and Impulsivity should be related to high and low
56
57 Conscientiousness, respectively. Furthermore, both FFFS and BIS should be positively
58
59
60

1
2
3 related to neuroticism. However, BIS should be predominantly related to anxiety, whereas
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

related to neuroticism. However, BIS should be predominantly related to anxiety, whereas
FFFS should be related mostly to fear.

Materials and Methods

Participants and procedures

A total of 341 individuals (60% female, $M_{\text{age}} = 28.14$, $SD = 8.86$) participated in the study. Of these, 150 (46% females, $M_{\text{age}} = 34.51$, $SD = 9.99$) were Italian adults recruited from the general population by two psychology students as part of their master thesis requirement. Each student was briefed on the general aims of the research and instructed how to administer an online questionnaire, which included, in the following order, the RST-PQ and measures of the Big-5 personality factors, trait anxiety, and fear towards aversive stimuli, along with other measures that are not relevant to this study. Participation was voluntary, with no compensation. The other 191 participants were psychology students (72% females, $M_{\text{age}} = 23.14$, $SD = 2.28$), who completed the RST-PQ in class, through an online survey platform, as part of a course assignment at the University of Rome. Students were free to participate in the research and received course credit. All respondents were informed about the aim of the study and signed a consent form.

Measures

Participants completed an Italian version of the full, 65-item, version of the RST-PQ. For each item, they were asked how accurately it describes them on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from *not at all* to *highly*. The order in which the items were presented was randomized across participants. The complete list of items is reported in the Online Supplementary material (Table S1). The instrument was adapted in Italian following recommended guidelines for translating and adapting questionnaires (e.g., Beaton, Bombardier, Guillemin, & Ferraz, 2000). The forward translation (i.e., from English to Italian) was performed by the first author and a professional translator, who worked independently from each other. The two versions were then compared and merged into a

1
2
3 single forward translation. A back-translation into the original language was performed by an
4
5 Italian native speaker who was fluent in English. The original and back-translated versions
6
7 were compared and checked by the second author. The final version was administered to a
8
9 small sample of 5 students to check for comprehensiveness and clarity.
10
11

12 The subsample of 150 adults additionally completed several personality measures,
13
14 including the Big Five personality traits, trait anxiety, and fear towards aversive stimuli. The
15
16 Big-5 factors were assessed with the Mini-IPIP (Donnellan, Oswald, Baird, & Lucas, 2006).
17
18 We used the Italian translation of the items, available at
19
20 <https://ipip.ori.org/newItemTranslations.htm>. The scale includes 20 items, 4 for each of the
21
22 five personality dimensions (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism,
23
24 and Openness to Experience). For each item, respondents were asked to indicate how much it
25
26 accurately described them using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to
27
28 *strongly agree*. In the current study, the alpha reliability coefficients of the five factors ranged
29
30 from .61 (neuroticism) to .70 (extraversion).
31
32
33
34

35 The generalized propensity to be anxious was assessed with the Italian adaptation
36
37 (Pedrabissi & Santinello 1989) of the Trait Anxiety Scale, taken from the State-Trait Anxiety
38
39 Inventory (STAI) Form-Y2 (Spielberger, Gorsuch, Lushene, Vagg, & Jacobs, 1983). The
40
41 scale includes 20 item asking participants to assess how “in general” they felt, using a 4-point
42
43 Likert scale, ranging from *almost never* to *almost always*. In the present study, Cronbach’s
44
45 alpha for the composite score was .86.
46
47
48

49 Fear towards several potentially aversive stimuli (e.g., *cemeteries, closed spaces,*
50
51 *speaking in front of a group*) was assessed by using the Fear Survey Schedule (FSS; Wolpe &
52
53 Lange, 1977). The version used in this study (Arrindell, 1980) includes 52 items tapping five
54
55 domains: Agoraphobia (13 items), fear of animal (4 items), fear of sexual or aggressive
56
57 situations (8 items), social fear (13 items), and fear of tissue damage (12 items). The items
58
59
60

1
2
3 have been adapted to Italian by using the same procedure as for the RST-PQ. For each
4
5 statement, respondents were asked to indicate the intensity of their fear, using a 4-point Likert
6
7 scale, ranging from *no fear* to *very much fear*. Five composite scores were derived by
8
9 summing item responses within each domain. In the present study, alpha coefficients ranged
10
11 from .75 (fear of sexual or aggressive situations) to .85 (tissue damage fear).
12
13

14 15 **Results and discussion**

16 17 **Preliminary results**

18
19 Three hundred and fourteen participants (92% of the sample) provided complete data
20
21 for the RST-PQ. For the remaining 8% ($n = 27$), mean number of missing items per
22
23 participant was 6.74. Mahalanobis distance (with a $p < .001$ criteria) was used to inspect data
24
25 for the presence of multivariate outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). We identified and
26
27 deleted six outliers, for a remaining sample size of 335. Univariate skewness ranged from -
28
29 .63 to .72, with a mean of .33 ($SD = .21$); univariate kurtosis ranged from -1.44 to .59, with a
30
31 mean of .55 ($SD = .35$). Mardia's test for multivariate kurtosis was statistically significant (z
32
33 = 9.27, $p < .001$), which indicated a moderate deviation from multivariate normality.
34
35
36

37 38 **Item selection**

39
40 The item selection procedure was performed in a two-step approach, which entails a
41
42 combination of empirical and theoretical considerations (e.g., Smith et al., 2000). In the first
43
44 step, we performed a set of CFAs on each of the six dimensions separately, using Mplus
45
46 version 7.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 2010). Parameters were estimated by means of full-
47
48 information maximum likelihood, with robust standard errors and rescaled test statistics
49
50 (missing = FIML and estimator = MLR). This procedure allowed us to deal with missing data
51
52 and non-normal distributions (the same procedure was used for subsequent analyses
53
54 described below). We inspected factor loadings and modification indices to identify items
55
56 with inadequate properties. We dropped items with weak ($< .40$) loadings on the target factor
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 or highest correlated uniqueness. This ensured acceptable levels of internal consistency,
4
5 while avoiding items with redundant content or wording. At the same time, we maintained an
6
7 adequate number of items for each facet domain, thus preserving the content validity of the
8
9 scale (Haynes, Richard, & Kubany, 1995; Smith et al., 2000). This led to the removal of 27
10
11 items: 3 from the FFFS scale (30% of the total), 12 from BIS (52%), 2 from Reward Interest
12
13 (29%), 2 from Goal Drive-Persistence (29%), 5 from Reward Reactivity (50%), and 3 from
14
15 Impulsivity (37%).
16
17

18
19 In the second step, we performed an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) on the whole
20
21 set of remaining 38 items. The six-factor solution had the following fit indices: $\chi^2(522) =$
22
23 681.33, $p < .001$, CFI = .951, TLI = .930, RMSEA = .030, 90% CI [.023, .036], SRMR =
24
25 .031.¹ The resulting pattern of rotated factor loadings is reported in the Online Supplementary
26
27 material (Table S2). Results of EFA were used to select the 22 items with the best
28
29 psychometric properties, with the constrain that the target domains of the original RST-PQ
30
31 were adequately represented in the short form (Haynes et al., 1995; Smith et al., 2000). This
32
33 was accomplished by: (a) selecting the best marker variables (i.e., items with highest ratio
34
35 between primary and secondary loadings) for each thematic facet; and (b) maintaining
36
37 approximately the same proportion of items for each facet as in the original RST-PQ (Corr &
38
39 Cooper, 2016). This approach might decrease the internal consistency of the short form but it
40
41 affords sufficient construct coverage (Krueger et al., 2013).
42
43
44
45
46

47 In the final version of the short form (RST-PQ-S), the FFFS scale included five items
48
49 measuring the facets of *flight* (2 items), *active avoidance* (1 item), and *freeze* (2 items). The
50
51 BIS scale includes five items measuring the facets of *motor planning interruption* (1 item),
52
53 *cautious risk-assessment* (1 item), *obsessive thoughts* (2 items), and *behavioral*
54
55
56
57

58
59 ¹ We interpreted CFI and TLI values $> .90$ (Bentler, 1990), RMSEA values $< .08$ (Browne & Cudeck,
60 1993), and SRMR values $< .06$ (Hu & Bentler, 1998) as indicating an adequate fit.

1
2
3 *disengagement* (1 item). The four BAS scales (Reward Interest, Goal-Drive Persistence,
4 Reward Reactivity, and Impulsivity) are composed by three items each. The Goal-Drive
5 Persistence scale includes items reflecting the two facet domains of *goal planning* (2 items)
6 and *drive-persistence* (1 item) (Corr & Cooper, 2016).
7
8
9
10
11

12 **Descriptive statistics**

13
14 Table 1 reports descriptive statistics, Cronbach's alphas, and average inter-item
15 correlations for the six scales of the RST-PQ-S. Alpha reliability coefficients ranged from .60
16 (FFFS) to .80 (BIS), showing acceptable to good levels of internal consistency. Overall,
17 alphas were lower with respect to those reported for the full-length scale in the original
18 validation study (Table 3, Study 3, Corr & Cooper, 2016). This is not unexpected, given the
19 reduced number of items in the RST-PQ-S. Average inter-item correlations were within the
20 recommended range of .15 – .50 (Briggs & Cheek, 1986; Clark & Watson, 1995), with
21 exception of the Reward Interest scale, which fall slightly above (.52). Taken together, these
22 estimates suggest that the items of the short form are relatively homogeneous, while avoiding
23 unnecessary redundancy (Robins, Fraley, & Krueger, 2007).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Internal validity and reliability**

38
39 A six-factor CFA model on the 22 items of the RST-PQ-S, allowing the correlations
40 among the factors, had adequate fit: $\chi^2(194) = 313.090, p < .001, CFI = .921, TLI = .906,$
41 $RMSEA = .04, 90\% CI [.034, .051], SRMR = .057.$ Standardized factor loadings are shown in
42 the upper panel of Table 2. They were all significant ($p < .001$) and greater than the .40
43 criterion suggested by Brown (2006). Intercorrelations among the six latent factors are
44 reported in the lower panel of Table 2. As expected, BIS and FFS were moderately correlated
45 and they showed non-significant or small, negative relations with the BAS scales.
46
47 Correlations among the BAS scales were all positive and statistically significant, with the
48 exception of the one between Impulsivity and Goal-Drive Persistence. This result is
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 consistent with U.K. (Corr & Cooper, 2016) and German (Pugnaghi et al., 2018) data using
4
5 the full RST-PQ.
6

7
8 Based on CFA model parameters, we estimated omega reliability coefficients for the
9
10 six RST-PQ-S factors. One of the main advantage of using omega rather than alpha for
11
12 assessing the reliability of a shortened scale is that omega is not affected by scale length
13
14 (Rammstedt & Beierlein, 2014; for a thorough discussion about properties of omega, as well
15
16 as criticisms against alpha, interested readers are referred to Raykov, 1997, Revelle &
17
18 Zinbarg, 2009, and Sijtsma, 2009). Conceptually, omega is similar to alpha: both provide an
19
20 empirical estimate of the ratio of the true score variance to the observed score variance. The
21
22 two coefficients have the same metrics and can, therefore, be interpreted by using the same
23
24 standards. Results are reported in Table 2 (lower panel). Coefficients were in the range of .62
25
26 (FFFS) – .81 (BIS), thus suggesting adequate levels of internal consistency.
27
28
29

30 **Construct validity**

31
32
33 Table 3 reports Pearson correlations of the RST-PQ-S with personality measures, age
34
35 and gender. As expected, FFFS, BIS and BAS were correlated in meaningful ways with the
36
37 Big-5 factors. Both the FFFS and BIS were positively related to Neuroticism, although the
38
39 correlation was larger for BIS. Reward Interest was significantly and positively related to
40
41 Extraversion; Goal-Drive Persistence was positively related to Conscientiousness;
42
43 Impulsivity was positively related to Extraversion, and negatively related to
44
45 Conscientiousness.
46
47

48
49 As regard the other personality measures, the BIS showed a large positive correlation
50
51 with trait anxiety. FFFS, by contrast, was more correlated than BIS to fear in all examined
52
53 domains, with the exception of social fear, which showed a stronger positive correlation with
54
55 BIS. This was expected, as social ‘fear’ in RST terms is a conflict stimuli and thus should be
56
57 related to the BIS and anxiety. Our results parallel what was found in the original validation
58
59
60

1
2
3 study (Corr & Cooper, 2016) and are consistent with the theory underlying the construction
4 of the RST-PQ. Finally, gender and age were only moderately related to the RST-PQ-S
5 scales. Females scored higher on FFFS and, to a lesser extent, on BIS and Reward Reactivity.
6
7 Age was significantly correlated to BIS, with younger individuals having higher scores than
8 older adults. These results are broadly in line with those found in the UK (Corr & Cooper,
9
10 2016) and German (Pugnaghi et al., 2018) samples.
11
12
13
14
15

16 17 **Study 2**

18
19 After selecting the items of the RST-PQ-S and examining their psychometric
20 properties in a first sample, we conducted a second, independent, study. The CFA model
21 tested in Study 1 provided only weak evidence for the psychometric properties of the
22 instrument, due to potential effects of capitalization on chance. Therefore, the results needed
23 to be cross-validated with independent data. We expected to replicate the six-factor structure
24 observed in the first study.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Moreover, we further assessed the internal consistency of scale scores and examined
34 their correlations with Carver and White (1994) BIS/BAS Scale, the most widely used RST
35 measure. We expected to replicate the pattern of correlations found in the original validation
36 study (Corr & Cooper, 2016). Accordingly, the BAS dimensions were expected to be
37 positively related to one other. In accordance with revised RST (Corr, 2008), we expected
38 that BAS Drive, which concerns the persistence in the pursuit of desired goals, would show
39 the highest correlation with Goal-Drive Persistence. We expected that BAS Reward
40 Responsiveness, which reflects a positive response to the occurrence of reward, would show
41 the highest correlation with Reward Reactivity. Finally, we expected that BAS Fun-Seeking,
42 which concerns the desire for new rewards and the willingness to approach them on the spur
43 of the moment, would show the highest correlation with Impulsivity. Furthermore, we
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 expected that Carver and White BIS scale would be positively related with RST-PQ-S BIS
4
5 and, to a lesser extent, with FFFS.
6

7
8 It should be acknowledged, however, that Carver and White's (1994) scales were
9
10 based on Gray's (1987) original theory. Moreover, they were designed to assess BIS and
11
12 BAS, but not FFFS. Since the theory has undergone important theoretical revisions
13
14 (McNaughton & Corr, 2004), researchers have explored the possibility to obtain proxy
15
16 measures of revised RST, by adapting Carver and White's (1994) BIS/BAS scales (e.g., Corr
17
18 & McNaughton, 2008; Johnston, Turner & Iwata, 2003; Poythress et al., 2008). Among
19
20 others, Heym, Ferguson and Lawrence (2008) provided support for a model that distinguishes
21
22 two factors within the original BIS scale, by separating items conceptually related to anxiety
23
24 (BIS) from items that appear to tap fear (FFFS). We examined correlations of RST-PQ-S also
25
26 with this alternative model, referred to as Heym et al. (2008) model.
27
28
29

30 **Materials and Methods**

31 **Participants and procedures**

32
33 The study was part of a larger project on personality assessment that was conducted at
34
35 the University of Rome (Italy). Three hundred and forty psychology students (64% females,
36
37 $M_{\text{age}} = 27.48$, $SD = 12.72$) completed online a self-report questionnaire that included the
38
39 RST-PQ-S, Carver and White BIS/BAS scales and other measures not relevant to this study.
40
41 Each respondent was informed about the aim of the study and signed a consent form.
42
43 Participation was voluntary, with no compensation.
44
45
46
47

48 **Measures**

49
50 Respondents completed the 22 items of the short-form developed in Study 1, and the
51
52 Carver and White (1994) BIS/BAS Scales, a 20-item instrument to assess dispositional BIS
53
54 and BAS sensitivities. We used the Italian adaptation of the instrument (Leone, Pierro, &
55
56 Mannetti, 2002). Seven items were originally designed to measure BIS (e.g., "*I feel worried*
57
58 *when I think I have done poorly on something*"). According to Heym et al. (2008), these
59
60

1
2
3 items can be split into BIS (4 item – e.g., “*I feel worried when I think I have done poorly on*
4 *something*”) and FFFS (3 item – e.g., “*Even if something bad is about to happen, I rarely*
5 *experience fear or nervousness*”).
6
7
8
9

10 Thirteen items were designed to assess BAS, which comprises three subscales: Drive
11 (4 items – e.g., “*I go out of my way to get things I want*”), Fun-Seeking (4 items - “*I crave*
12 *excitement and new experiences*”), and Reward Responsiveness (5 items - “*When good things*
13 *happen to me, it affects me strongly*”). All items are on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from
14 *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Cronbach's reliability coefficients in the present sample
15 were .85 for the original BIS scale, .73 and .74 for the BIS and FFFS scales adapted to reflect
16 the revised theory (Heym et al., 2008), .77 for Drive, .79 for Fun-Seeking, and .85 for
17 Reward Responsiveness.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Results and discussion**

29 **Preliminary results**

30
31
32 The vast majority of participants (98%, $n = 332$) provided complete data for the RST-
33 PQ-S. Based on Mahalanobis distance, two outliers ($p < .001$) were identified and excluded
34 from further analysis. Univariate skewness and kurtosis were in the range -.97 to .82 and -
35 1.34 to .81, respectively. Mardia's test for multivariate kurtosis ($z = 2.01, p < .05$) suggests
36 that the normality assumption was only mildly violated.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Internal validity and reliability**

46
47 The six-factor model yielded close to acceptable fit on all criteria except for the
48 TLI, which was slightly below the recommended threshold of .90: $\chi^2(194) = 357.45, p$
49 $< .001$, CFI = .909, TLI = .892, RMSEA = .050 (.042, .058), SRMR = .057. Standardized
50 loadings ranged from .40 to .85, providing support for the convergent validity of the
51 scales. The full list of factor loadings and intercorrelations among factors are
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 available in the Online Supplementary material (Table S3). Findings substantially
4
5 replicated the pattern found in Study 1. McDonald's omega coefficients were .63 for
6
7 FFFS, .82 for BIS, .79 for Reward Interest, .74 for Goal-Drive Persistence, .64 for Reward
8
9 Reactivity, and .68 for Impulsivity. This indicates acceptable to high levels of internal
10
11 consistency for the RST-PQ-S scale scores in the present sample.
12
13

14 15 **Correlations with Carver and White's BIS/BAS original model**

16
17 Table 4 reports zero-order Pearson's correlations between the RST-PQ-S and Carver
18
19 and White's (1994) BIS/BAS scales. As shown, the two BIS scales correlated highly. The
20
21 FFFS also correlated, although less strongly, with Carver and White BIS. The BAS scales
22
23 were all positively correlated with each other, except for Goal-Drive Persistence and Fun-
24
25 Seeking. Since Carver and White BAS scales (Drive, Reward Responsiveness and Fun-
26
27 Seeking) were substantially correlated (with coefficients in the range of .45–.55), we also
28
29 examined their pattern of partial correlations with the RST-PQ-S BAS. Results are shown in
30
31 the parentheses of Table 4. We found that Goal-Drive Persistence was mostly related to BAS
32
33 Drive, Reward Reactivity was mostly related to BAS Reward Responsiveness, and
34
35 Impulsivity was mostly related to BAS Fun-Seeking. This result aligns with revised RTS and
36
37 provides empirical support to Corr's (2008) theoretical conceptualization of the four RST-PQ
38
39 BAS components.
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 To compare the observed pattern of zero-order correlations with the one reported in
47
48 the original validation study (Corr & Cooper, 2016, Study 4, $n = 362$), we calculated Cohen's
49
50 q for each pair of corresponding correlations. This is an effect size measure of the difference
51
52 between two correlations. Cohen's (1987) recommended benchmarks for q values are: $<.1 =$
53
54 no effect; $.1$ to $.3 =$ small effect; $.3$ to $.5 =$ medium effect; $>.5 =$ large effect. The differences
55
56 we observed were negligible to small: the q 's were in the range $.00 - .24$ ($M = .10$, $SD = .07$).
57
58
59
60

We can, therefore, conclude that the short and full and scale showed a similar pattern of correlations with Carver and White's BIS/BAS scales.

Correlations with Heym et al. model

As reported in Table 4, both the RST-PQ FFFS and BIS scales correlated in similar ways with Heym et al. (2008) BIS and FFFS scales. Correlations between homologous dimensions (e.g., between the two BIS scales) were higher than correlations between heterologous scales (e.g., between the RST-PQ-S BIS and Heym et al. FFFS). Differences, however, were negligible. Thus, Heym et al. (2008) adapted version of Carver and White's BIS/BAS scales seems to capture only partially the distinction between FFFS and BIS, as conceptualized in the revised RST. In this regard, it should be noted that Heym et al. (2008) model provides only a proxy measure for the revised RST. Carver and White's scales, indeed, were theoretically conceived to assess BIS and BAS only. Moreover, several authors have raised concerns about the psychometric properties of the 3-item scale for the assessment of FFFS (e.g., Beck et al., 2009; Dissabandara, Loxton, Dias, Daglish & Stadlin, 2012; Maack & Ebesutani, 2017). Further studies are needed to confirm this result in other samples, using both the short and full version of the RST-PQ.

Study 3

The aims of this two-wave longitudinal study were threefold. First, we assessed the reliability of the RST-PQ-S in terms of temporal stability, through test-retest correlations. This is a recommended procedure for assessing the reliability of shortened scales (e.g., Rammstedt & Beierlein, 2014). Second, we assessed the degree to which the short and the full forms of the RST-PQ share similar psychometric properties – this is a critical issue in the process of short scales construction (e.g., Heene, Bollmann, & Bühner, 2014; Smith et al., 2000; Ziegler et al., 2014). Specifically, we examined the degree of overlap between the two forms, and compared their criterion validity with regard to a measure of test anxiety, namely

1
2
3 the disposition to experience concern about one's own performance in evaluative settings
4
5 (Schwarzer, Van Der Ploeg & Spielberger, 1987; Zeidner, 1998). Two main manifestations of
6
7 test anxiety have been identified (Sarason, 1961), commonly referred to as emotionality (i.e.,
8
9 heightened physiological activity), and worry (i.e., self-deprecating ruminations). Given the
10
11 target population of the present study (university students), this appears a relevant criterion
12
13 for assessing the concurrent validity of the RST-PQ-S. While there is preliminary evidence to
14
15 suggest that test anxiety is related to sensitivity to punishment (Hagopian, 1994), the present
16
17 study is the first to test this relation within the revised RST. We expected that, among the
18
19 RST-PQ scales, test anxiety would be mostly related to BIS. According to the theory (Corr,
20
21 2008), this defensive system is activated by conflict or uncertainty, such as when there is an
22
23 approach-avoidance situation. This is the case of academic settings, where students must
24
25 approach a situation that presents signals of both reward (obtaining high grades) and
26
27 punishment (emotional distress). Test anxiety should be unrelated or weakly related to the
28
29 other defensive system, the FFFS, which is mediated by fear, not anxiety. Moreover, the
30
31 FFFS is activated when there is no motivation to approach aversive stimuli that can be
32
33 avoided (Gray & McNaughton, 2000). This does not describe what typically happens in
34
35 academic settings. Finally, test anxiety was expected to be unrelated with BAS.
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Third, a Latent State-Trait analysis was applied with the aim of estimating: (a) the
43
44 reliability of the RST-PQ-S at the item-level; and (b) the extent to which the reliable source
45
46 of variance in items responses reflect stable individual differences and systematic effects of
47
48 the situation. In this regard, we expected a substantial degree of trait variance, in line with the
49
50 assumption that RST constructs reflect sources of variation in neuropsychological systems
51
52 that are stable over time (Corr, 2008; Pickering & Corr, 2008).
53
54
55

56 **Materials and Methods**

57 **Participants and procedures**

1
2
3 Three hundred and seventeen university students (72% females, $M_{\text{age}} = 21.28$, $SD =$
4 3.30) completed online the 65 items of the full RST-PQ and a self-report measure of test-
5 anxiety. Respondents were part of a larger project on personality assessment that was
6 conducted at the University of Rome (Italy). The sample included two cohorts, comprising
7 respectively 134 (78% females, $M_{\text{age}} = 21.43$, $SD = 3.97$) and 183 (68% females, $M_{\text{age}} =$
8 21.29, $SD = 2.89$) university students attending the same course in two subsequent semesters.
9 The two cohorts have similar distribution with respect to age, $t(315) = .35$, $p = .73$, and
10 gender, $\chi^2(1) = 3.72$, $p = .05$, standardized residuals in the range -1.2 to 1.1. Overall, 75% of
11 the sample ($n = 238$) completed the 22 items of the short form four weeks later. Students
12 earned course credit in exchange for participation.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Measures

27
28 Respondents completed the full length version of the RST-PQ at Time 1, and the
29 short-form at Time 2. Test anxiety was also assessed at Time 1, through the Test Anxiety
30 Inventory (TAI, Spielberger, 1980). The TAI is a 20-item scale designed to measure
31 individual differences in worry and emotionality, the two main dimensions of test anxiety
32 (Liebert & Morris, 1967). The *Worry* subscale (8 items) refers to a cognitive component that
33 includes intrusive and ruminative thoughts related to the consequences of failure. The
34 *Emotionality* subscale (8 items) concerns affective and physiological reactions, such as
35 tension and heart rate, which are experienced by the individual in the evaluative situation.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 We used an Italian adaptation of the scale, that was prepared by employing a back-
48 translation procedure (such as that described for the RST-PQ in Study 1). For each item,
49 respondents were asked to report how frequently they experience specific symptoms of
50 anxiety before, during, and after examinations, on a 4-point Likert scale (from *almost never*
51 to *almost always*). Examples of items include: “*Thoughts of doing poorly interfere with my*
52 *concentration on tests*” (Worry), and “*During tests I feel very tense*” (Emotionality).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Cronbach's reliability coefficients in the present sample were .89 for Worry, and .92 for
4
5
6 Emotionality.

7 8 **Results and discussion**

9 10 **Preliminary results**

11
12 Participants with complete data on the RST-PQ-S were 99.3% at Time 1, and 99.2%
13
14 at Time 2. Via the Mahalanobis distance, two multivariate outliers ($p < .001$) were identified
15
16 and excluded from subsequent analyses. Univariate skewness ranged from -.70 to .71 at Time
17
18 1, and from -.57 to .58 at Time 2. Univariate kurtosis ranged from -1.17 to .40 at Time 1, and
19
20 from -.98 to .13 at Time 2. Mardia's test for multivariate kurtosis was significant at Time 2 (z
21
22 = 7.30, $p < .001$), but not at Time 1 ($z = 1.44$, $p = .15$).

23 24 25 26 **Internal validity and reliability**

27
28 The six-factor CFA model was estimated at Time 1 because the available
29
30 sample is larger. The model yielded adequate fit: $\chi^2(194) = 297.09$, $p < .001$, CFI = .920,
31
32 TLI = .905, RMSEA = .043 (.033, .052), SRMR = .059. Standardized loadings were in
33
34 the range .39 – .78. Table 5 (left panel) reports omega reliability coefficients and test-retest
35
36 correlations. Omegas ranged from .60 (FFFS) to .79 (BIS). Four-week test-retest reliability
37
38 coefficients ranged from .67 (Reward Reactivity) to .82 (BIS). These findings suggest
39
40 acceptable to good levels of reliability, both in terms of internal consistency and temporal
41
42 stability.

43 44 45 46 47 **Overlap with the extended RST-PQ**

48
49 To assess the degree of overlap between the short (s) and the full (f) scale, we first
50
51 calculated Pearson's correlations between the two forms at the first measurement occasion
52
53 (i.e., r_{f1s1}). Coefficients for the six scales were all $\geq .84$ ($M = .89$; $SD = .04$). This appears to
54
55 suggest a large amount of overlapping variance between the short and full versions. We
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 should consider, however, that correlations might be overestimated, since part of the items
4
5 are included in both forms (Smith et al., 2000).
6

7
8 Following the guidelines provided by Smith et al. (2000), a more conservative
9
10 estimation was obtained by calculating the correlations between the full form measured at
11
12 Time 1 and the short form measured at Time 2 (i.e., r_{fls2}). Results are reported in the right
13
14 panel of Table 5. Since these correlations are affected by measurement error, we compared
15
16 them with test-retest reliability of the short scale (i.e., r_{s1s2}), which provide an upper limit for
17
18 r_{fls2} : the smaller the difference between r_{fls2} and r_{s1s2} , the higher the overlap between the
19
20 short- and the full-length scales.
21
22

23
24 As can observed in Table 5, correlations between the full-length scale at Time 1 and
25
26 the short form at Time 2 were only marginally different from test-retest correlations: Cohen's
27
28 q for the six scales ranged from .03 to .20 ($M = .10$; $SD = .06$). Therefore, we can conclude
29
30 that there is adequate overlapping variance in the present sample between the two forms.
31
32

33 **Criterion validity**

34
35 The criterion validity of the RST-PQ-S was assessed by examining its relationship
36
37 with students' feelings of anxiety. Two multiple regressions were conducted, including the
38
39 six scale scores of the RST-PQ-S at Time 1 as predictors of Worry and Emotionality,
40
41 respectively. Results, are shown in the left panel of Table 6. The BIS showed a significant
42
43 relation to the cognitive component of test anxiety, whose manifestations are similar to those
44
45 related to variations in the BIS functioning (e.g., worry, repetitive thoughts, anxious
46
47 rumination; Pickering & Corr, 2008). The added contribution of FFFS to worry, by contrast,
48
49 was not statistically significant. These results are consistent with the conceptual basis of
50
51 revised RST, which views anxiety and fear as distinct aspects of defensive behaviour
52
53 (DeYoung, 2010; Gray & McNaughton, 2000).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Both the BIS and FFFS were significantly related to the emotional component of test
4 anxiety. This is likely due to the difficulty in disentangling the physiological reactions that
5 accompany anxiety (e.g. increased heart rate, sweating) from those reflecting FFFS-mediated
6 fear (Gray & McNaughton, 2000; Smilie, Pickering, & Jackson, 2006). The BIS, however,
7 made the largest unique contribution to the explanation of emotionality. This confirmed the
8 prediction, providing further support for the revised RST. The BAS scales were unrelated to
9 both components of test anxiety. Taken together, the six scales of the RST-PQ-S accounted
10 for 24% of the variance in Worry, and 29% in Emotionality.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 To compare the criterion validity of the short form with that of the full version, the
23 same analysis was replicated by using the full RST-PQ at Time 1 (Table 6, right panel). The
24 pattern of relationship was similar to the one observed for the short form. Cumulatively, the
25 six scales of the full RST-PQ accounted for a higher proportion of variance (30% in Worry,
26 38% in Emotionality) with respect to the RST-PQ-S scales. However, the expected relation
27 between BIS and test anxiety was substantially the same for the two forms. In sum, although
28 the amount of explained variance was higher for the full RST-PQ, the construct-relevant
29 variance (i.e., the variance shared with constructs the scale is intended to measure) was
30 substantially equivalent for the length and the short form.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **Latent State-Trait Analysis**

43
44 As a next step, we adopted the Latent State-Trait (LST) framework (Steyer, Ferring,
45 & Schmidt, 1992) with the aim of investigating the extent to which scores on the RST-PQ-S
46 items are due to dispositional rather than situational factors. Specifically, we adopted the
47 Indicator-specific Trait (IT) factor model (Eid, 1996). In the IT approach, each item loads on
48 two latent variables: (1) a trait factor, which reflect dispositional (stable) interindividual
49 differences; and (2) a latent state residual factor, which reflects intraindividual differences
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 between occasions of measurement due to the situation. Trait factors were allowed to
4
5 correlate, whereas the latent state residual factors were assumed to be uncorrelated.
6
7

8 This approach has been preferred to other LST models, since it has shown to perform
9
10 well under different conditions, and does not require the identification of a specific reference
11
12 indicator, as in the case of the M – 1 model (see Geiser & Lockhart, 2012). Given the
13
14 available size of the sample, we tested two separate models, one for the two defensive factors
15
16 (FFFS/BIS), and one for the BAS. In order to increase the ratio between estimated parameters
17
18 and number of cases, factor loadings were all fixed to 1.
19
20

21 Model fit was adequate for both FFFS/BIS, $\chi^2(131) = 158.90, p = .05, CFI = .985, TLI$
22
23 $= .979, RMSEA = .026 (.002, .039), SRMR = .036,$ and BAS, $\chi^2(190) = 211.11, p = .14, CFI$
24
25 $= .991, TLI = .987, RMSEA = .019 (.000, .032), SRMR = .035.$ Estimated model parameters
26
27 have been used to decompose the total variability of each item into three components:
28
29 *Consistency (Con)*, which reflects the effect of stable trait factors; *occasion specificity*
30
31 *(OSpe)*, which reflects the effect of the situation; and *random error variance* (Eid & Diener,
32
33 2004). Reliability coefficients at the item-level, which reflects individual differences that are
34
35 due to reliable sources of variance, can be obtained by taking the sum of the *Con* and *OSpe*
36
37 coefficients (Geiser & Lockhart, 2012).
38
39
40
41
42

43 Results showed that the trait component of variance was substantially larger than the
44
45 state component. Within each scale, the proportion of reliable variance due to trait and state
46
47 components averaged, respectively: .68 and .03 for FFFS; .64 and .03 for BIS; .63 and .11 for
48
49 Reward Interest; .71 and .03 for Goal-Drive Persistence; .57 and .07 for Reward Reactivity;
50
51 and .61 and .03 for Impulsivity. Reliability coefficients were in the range .62–.78 for FFFS,
52
53 .63–.71 for BIS, .71–.79 for Reward Interest, .71–.78 for Goal-Drive Persistence, .61–.67 for
54
55 Reward Reactivity, and .58–.69 for Impulsivity. Results of the decomposition of variance at
56
57 the item-level are detailed in the Online Supplementary material (Table S4).
58
59
60

Conclusions

Our research aimed to develop and validate a shortened Italian version of the RST-PQ (Corr & Cooper, 2016), a self-report scale for the assessment of the constructs postulated by revised RST (Corr, 2008). The items of the short form were selected from the original, full version. The short form is more parsimonious with respect to the original RST-PQ, in that it has a limited number of items (from three to five for each dimension), while maintaining similar psychometric properties with respect to the full version.

Confirmatory factor analysis in three independent samples supported the expected six-factor structure, comprising FFFS, BIS, and four BAS components (Reward Interest, Goal-Drive Persistence, Reward Reactivity, and Impulsivity). The six factors showed adequate levels of internal consistency throughout the studies, although omega coefficients were less than optimal for the FFFS, reward reactivity, and impulsivity scales, falling in the range of .60 – .70. It should be noted, however, that the overarching goal of the item selection procedure was not to maximize statistical criteria, such as items homogeneity or model fit. The primary interest, by contrast, was to retain the content validity of the original instrument. In this regard, we found a substantial overlap between the short and the full version, as revealed by high correlations between the corresponding scales, as well as by similar pattern and strength of association with several personality measures.

Finally, LST models suggested that the items of the RST-PQ-S mostly captures stable interindividual differences, showing moderate fluctuations across situations. This is the first study to assess state and trait components of RST constructs. These represent fundamental levels of description in the revised theory (Corr & McNaughton, 2008). Examining the behavioral and emotional correlates of FFFS, BIS and BAS at both state and traits levels may represents an important area for future investigations.

1
2
3 Taken together, results from three studies indicate that the RST-PQ-S represents an
4 efficient, valid and reliable measure of RST constructs that can be fruitfully used in several
5 contexts, such as health-related surveys or clinical research, where test length can be an issue.
6
7 Of course, the short form is not intended to replace the original, full version. Due to its higher
8 reliability, the 65-item RST-PQ is more appropriate for using in individual assessment, such
9 as in applied settings, where test scores can have consequences for individuals.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 There are some limitations in our research. First, respondents were recruited using
18 convenience sampling. Second, the criterion validity of the RST-PQ-S was limited to a single
19 construct (i.e., test anxiety). Future studies should examine the criterion validity of the short
20 form with regard to multiple outcome measures, possibly in larger and representative
21 samples. A further potential limitation of the study is that the items of the scale had to be
22 translated into Italian, and we did not have the possibility to test its equivalence with the
23 original, English version. Further studies should test the measurement invariance of the short
24 form across countries and languages. In sum, although much has still to be done to complete
25 the validation process of the RST-PQ-S, we believe that this measure has the potential to be
26 used to good effect in future studies, enhancing the applicability of revised RST theory in
27 empirical research.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Aluja A., & Blanch A. (2011). Neuropsychological behavioral inhibition system (BIS) and behavioral approach system (BAS) assessment: A shortened Sensitivity to Punishment and Sensitivity to Reward Questionnaire version (SPSRQ-20). *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *93*, 628-636. doi:10.1080/00223891.2011.608760
- Arrindell, W. A. (1980). Dimensional structure and psychopathology correlates of the Fear Survey Schedule (FSS-III) in a phobic population: A factorial definition of agoraphobia. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *18*, 229-242. doi:10.1016/0005-7967(80)90080-7
- Bacon, A. M., Corr, P. J., & Satchell, L. P. (2018). A reinforcement sensitivity theory explanation of antisocial behaviour. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *123*, 87-93. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2017.11.008
- Beaton, A. A., Mutinelli, S., & Corr, P. J. (2016). Fractionating negative and positive affectivity in handedness: Insights from the reinforcement sensitivity theory of personality. *Laterality: Asymmetries of Body, Brain and Cognition*, *22*, 419-444. doi:10.1080/1357650X.2016.1213274
- Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2001). Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaption of self-report measures. *Spine*, *25*, 3186-3191. doi:10.1097/00007632-200012150-00014
- Beck, I., Smits, D. J. M., Claes, L., Vandereycken, W., & Bijttebier, P. (2009). Psychometric evaluation of the Behavioral Inhibition/Behavioral Activation System scales and the Sensitivity to Punishment and Sensitivity to Reward Questionnaire in a sample of eating disordered patients. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *47*, 407-412. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2009.04.007

- 1
2
3 Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*,
4
5 107, 238-246. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238
6
7
8 Briggs, S. R., & Cheek, J. M. (1986). The role of factor analysis in the development and
9
10 evaluation of personality scales. *Journal of Personality*, 54, 106-148.
11
12 doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1986.tb00391.x
13
14
15 Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A.
16
17 Bollen, & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (Vol. 154, pp. 136-
18
19 162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Focus Editions.
20
21
22 Brown, T. A. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York: Guilford.
23
24
25 Carver, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and
26
27 affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS scales.
28
29 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 319-333. doi:10.1037/0022-
30
31 3514.67.2.319
32
33
34 Chen, F. F., Hayes, A, Carver, C. S., Laurenceau, J.-P., & Zhang, Z. (2012). Modeling
35
36 general and specific variance in multifaceted constructs: A comparison of the bifactor
37
38 model to other approaches. *Journal of Personality*, 80, 219-251. doi:10.1111/j.1467-
39
40 6494.2011.00739.x
41
42
43 Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale
44
45 development. *Psychological Assessment*, 7, 309-319. doi:10.1037/pas0000626
46
47
48 Cohen, J. (1987). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. New York:
49
50 Academic Press.
51
52
53 Corr, P. J. (2008). Reinforcement sensitivity theory (RST): Introduction. In P. J. Corr (Ed.),
54
55 *The reinforcement sensitivity theory of personality* (pp. 1-43). New York, NY:
56
57 Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511819384.002
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Corr, P. J. (2013). Approach and avoidance behavior: Multiple systems and their interactions.
4
5 *Emotion Review*, 5, 285-291. doi:10.1177/1754073913477507
6
7
8 Corr, P. J. (2016). Reinforcement sensitivity theory of personality questionnaires: Structural
9
10 survey with recommendations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 89, 60-64.
11
12 doi:10.1016/j.paid.2015.09.045
13
14
15 Corr, P. J., & Cooper, A. J. (2016). The Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory of Personality
16
17 Questionnaire (RST-PQ): Development and validation. *Psychological Assessment*, 28,
18
19 1427-1440. doi:10.1037/pas0000273
20
21
22 Corr, P. J., & McNaughton, N. (2008). RST and personality. In P. J. Corr (Ed). *The*
23
24 *reinforcement sensitivity theory of personality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
25
26 Press.
27
28
29 Corr, P. J., & McNaughton, N. (2012). Neuroscience and approach/avoidance personality
30
31 traits: A two stage (valuation-motivation) approach. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral*
32
33 *Reviews*, 36, 2339-2354. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2012.09.013
34
35
36 De Pascalis, V., & Scacchia, P. (2019). The influence of reward sensitivity, heart rate
37
38 dynamics and EEG-delta activity on placebo analgesia. *Behavioural Brain Research*,
39
40 359, 320-332. doi:10.1016/j.bbr.2018.11.014
41
42
43 DeYoung, C. G. (2010). Mapping personality traits onto brain systems: BIS, BAS, FFFS, and
44
45 beyond. *European Journal of Personality*, 24, 404-407. doi:10.1002/per.780
46
47
48 Dissabandara, L. O., Loxton, N. J., Dias, S. R., Daghli, M., & Stadlin, A. (2012). Testing the
49
50 fear and anxiety distinction in the BIS/BAS scales in community and heroin-
51
52 dependent samples. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52, 888-892.
53
54 doi:10.1016/j.paid.2012.01.023
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Donnellan, M., Oswald, F., Baird, B., & Lucas, R. (2006). The Mini-IPIP scales: Tiny-yet effective measures of the Big Five factors of personality. *Psychological Assessment, 18*, 192-203. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.18.2.192
- Eid, M. (1996). Longitudinal confirmatory factor analysis for polytomous item responses: Model definition and model selection on the basis of stochastic measurement theory. *Methods of Psychological Research Online, 1*, 65-85.
- Eid, M., & Diener, E. (2004). Global judgments of subjective wellbeing: Situational variability and long-term stability. *Social Indicators Research, 65*, 245-277. doi:10.1023/B:SOCI.0000
- Eriksson, L. J. K., Jansson, B., & Sundin, Ö. (2019). Psychometric properties of a Swedish version of the reinforcement sensitivity theory of personality questionnaire. *Nordic Psychology, 71*, 134-145. doi:10.1080/19012276.2018.1516563
- Floyd, F., & Widaman, K. F. (1995). Factor analysis in the development and refinement of clinical assessment instruments. *Psychological Assessment, 7*, 286-299. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.7.3.286
- Geiser, C., & Lockhart, G. (2012). A comparison of four approaches to account for method effects in latent state-trait analyses. *Psychological Methods, 17*, 255-283. doi:10.1037/a0026977
- Gray, J. A. (1987). *The psychology of fear and stress*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gray, J. A., & McNaughton, N. (2000). *The neuropsychology of anxiety: An enquiry into the functions of the septo-hippocampal system*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hagopian, L. P., & Ollendick, T. H. (1994). Behavioral inhibition and test anxiety: An empirical investigation of Gray's theory. *Personality and Individual Differences, 16*, 597-604. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(96)00064-5

- 1
2
3 Haynes, S. N., Richard, D. C. S., & Kubany, E. S. (1995). Content validity in psychological
4
5 assessment: A functional approach to concepts and methods. *Psychological*
6
7 *Assessment*, 7, 238-247. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.7.3.238
8
9
- 10 Heene, M., Bollmann, S., & Bühner, M. (2014). Much ado about nothing, or much to do
11
12 about something? Effects of scale shortening on criterion validity and mean
13
14 differences. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 35, 245-249. doi:10.1027/1614-
15
16 0001/a000146
17
18
- 19 Heym, N., Ferguson, E., & Lawrence, C. (2008). An evaluation of the relationship between
20
21 Gray's revised RST and Eysenck's PEN: Distinguishing BIS and FFS in Carver and
22
23 White's BIS/BAS scales. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 45, 709-715.
24
25 doi:10.1016/j.paid.2008.07.013
26
27
- 28 Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1998). Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to
29
30 underparameterized model misspecification. *Psychological Methods*, 3, 424-453.
31
32 doi:10.1037/1082-989X.3.4.424
33
34
- 35 Jackson, C. J. (2009). Jackson-5 scales of revised Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory (r-RST)
36
37 and their application to dysfunctional real world outcomes. *Journal of Research in*
38
39 *Personality*, 43, 556-569. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2009.02.007
40
41
- 42 Jiang, Y., & Tiliopoulos, N. (2014). Individual differences in adult attachment and
43
44 reinforcement sensitivity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 68, 205-210.
45
46 doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.04.022
47
48
- 49 Johnson, S. L., Turner, R. J., & Iwata, N. (2003). BIS/BAS levels and psychiatric disorder:
50
51 An epidemiological study. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*,
52
53 25, 25-36. doi:10.1023/A:1022247919288
54
55
- 56 Krupić, D., Corr, P. J., Ručević, S., Križanić, V., & Gračanin, A. (2016). Five reinforcement
57
58 sensitivity theory (RST) of personality questionnaires: Comparison, validity and
59
60

- 1
2
3 generalization. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 97, 19-24.
4
5 doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.03.012
6
7
8 Kruyen, P. M., Emons, W. H., & Sijtsma, K. (2013). On the shortcomings of shortened tests:
9
10 A literature review. *International Journal of Testing*, 13, 223-248.
11
12 doi:10.1080/15305058.2012.703734
13
14 Leone, L., Pierro, A., & Mannetti, L. (2002). Validità della versione italiana delle scale
15
16 BIS/BAS di Carver e White (1994): Generalizzabilità della struttura e relazioni con
17
18 costrutti affini. *Giornale Italiano di Psicologia*, 2, 413-434. doi:10.1421/1245
19
20
21 Liebert, R. M., & Morris, L. W. (1967). Cognitive and emotional components of test anxiety:
22
23 A distinction and some initial data. *Psychological Reports*, 20, 975-978.
24
25
26 Maack, D. J., & Ebesutani, C. (2018). A re-examination of the BIS/BAS scales: Evidence for
27
28 BIS and BAS as unidimensional scales. *International Journal of Methods in*
29
30 *Psychiatric Research*, 27, e1612. doi:10.1002/mpr.1612
31
32
33 McDonald, R. P. (1999). *Test theory: A unified treatment*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum
34
35 Associates.
36
37
38 McNaughton, N., & Corr, P. J. (2004). A two-dimensional neuropsychology of defense:
39
40 Fear/anxiety and defensive distance. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 28,
41
42 285-305. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2004.03.005
43
44
45 Moshagen, M. (2012). The model size effect in SEM: Inflated goodness-of-fit statistics are
46
47 due to the size of the covariance matrix. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 19, 86-98.
48
49 doi:10.1080/10705511.2012.634724
50
51
52 Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. (2010). *Mplus: Statistical analysis with latent variables*. Los
53
54 Angeles: Authors.
55
56
57 Pedrabissi, L., & Santinello, M. (1989). *STAI State-Trait Anxiety Inventory Forma Y*
58
59 *Manuale*. Organizzazioni Speciali, Firenze.
60

- Pickering, A., & Corr, P. (2008). J.A. Gray's reinforcement sensitivity theory (RST) of personality. In G. Boyle, G. Matthews, & D. Saklofske (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of personality: Theory and assessment personality measurement and testing* (pp. 239-255) London, England: Sage.
- Poythress, N. G., Edens, J. F., Landfield, K., Lilienfeld, S. O., Skeem, J. L., & Douglas, K.S. (2008). A critique of Carver and White's (1994) Behavioral Inhibition Scale (BIS) for investigating Lykken's (1995) theory of primary psychopathy. *Personality and Individual Differences, 45*, 269-275. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2008.04.014
- Pugnaghi, G., Cooper, A., Ettinger, U., & Corr, P. (2018). The psychometric properties of the German language Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory-Personality Questionnaire (RST-PQ). *Journal of Individual Differences, 39*, 182-190. doi:10.1027/1614-0001/a000262.
- Rammstedt, B., & Beierlein, C. (2014). Can't we make it any shorter? The limits of personality assessment and ways to overcome them. *Journal of Individual Differences, 35*, 212-220. doi:10.1027/1614-0001/a000141
- Raykov, T. (1997). Scale reliability, Cronbach's coefficient alpha, and violations of essential tau-equivalence with fixed congeneric components. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 32*, 329-353. doi:10.1207/s15327906mbr3204_2
- Reuter, M., Cooper, A. J., Smillie, L. D., Markett, S., & Montag, C. (2015). A new measure for the revised reinforcement sensitivity theory: Psychometric criteria and genetic validation. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience, 9*, 38. doi:10.3389/fnsys.2015.00038
- Revelle, W., & Zinbarg, R. (2009). Coefficients alpha, beta, omega, and the glb: comments on Sijtsma. *Psychometrika, 74*, 145-154. doi:10.1007/s11336-008-9102-z
- Robins, R. W., Fraley, R. C., & Krueger, R. F. (Eds.). (2007). *Handbook of research methods in personality psychology*. NY: Guilford Press.

- 1
2
3 Sandy, C. J., Gosling, S. D., & Koelkebeck, T. (2014). Psychometric comparison of
4
5 automated versus rational methods of scale abbreviation: An illustration using a brief
6
7 measure of values. *Journal of Individual Differences*, *35*, 221-235. doi:10.1027/1614-
8
9 0001/a000144
10
11
12 Sarason, I. G. (1961). Test anxiety and the intellectual performance of college students.
13
14 *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *52*, 201-206. doi:10.1037/h0049095
15
16
17 Schwarzer, R., Van Der Ploeg, H. M., & Spielberger, C. D. (1987). Test anxiety: An
18
19 overview of theory and research. In Spielberger, C.D. (Eds.), *Advances in test anxiety*
20
21 *research* (pp. 3–9). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
22
23
24 Sijtsma, K. (2009). On the use, the misuse, and the very limited usefulness of Cronbach's
25
26 alpha. *Psychometrika*, *74*, 107-120. doi:10.1007/s11336-008-9101-0
27
28
29 Smith, G. T., McCarthy, D. M., & Anderson, K. G. (2000). On the sins of short-form
30
31 development. *Psychological Assessment*, *12*, 102-111. doi:10.1037//1040-
32
33 3590.12.1.102
34
35
36 Spielberger, C. D. (1980). *Test Anxiety Inventory: Preliminary Professional Manual*. Palo
37
38 Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
39
40
41 Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., Lushene, R. E., Vagg, P. R., & Jacobs, G. A. (1983).
42
43 *Manual for the state-trait anxiety inventory: STAI (Form Y2)*. Palo Alto, CA:
44
45 Consulting Psychologists Press.
46
47
48 Steyer, R., Ferring, D., & Schmidt, M. (1992). States and traits in psychological assessment.
49
50 *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *8*, 79-98.
51
52
53 Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics*. Needham Heights: Allyn &
54
55 Bacon.
56
57
58 Torrubia, R., Avila, C., Molto, J., & Caseras, X. (2001). The Sensitivity to Punishment and
59
60 Sensitivity to Reward Questionnaire (SPSRQ) as a measure of Gray's anxiety and

1
2
3 impulsivity dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31, 837-862.

4
5 doi:10.1016/S01918869(00)00183-5
6

7
8 Wolpe, J., & Lang, P.J. (1977). *Manual for the Fear Survey Schedule*. San Diego, CA:

9
10 EdITS.
11

12
13 Wytykowska, A., Fajkowska, M., Domaradzka, E., & Jankowski, K.S. (2017). Construct

14
15 validity of the Polish version of the reinforcement sensitivity theory-personality

16
17 questionnaire. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 109, 172-180.

18
19 doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.12.054
20

21
22 Yang, C., Nay, S., & Hoyle, R. H. (2010). Three approaches to using lengthy ordinal scales in

23
24 structural equation models: Parceling, latent scoring, and shortening scales. *Applied*

25
26 *Psychological Measurement*, 34, 122-142. doi:10.1177/0146621609338592
27

28
29 Zeidner, M. (1998). *Test anxiety: The state of the art*. New York: Plenum Press.

30
31 Ziegler, M., Kemper, C., & Kruey, P. (2014). Short scales - Five misunderstandings and

32
33 ways to overcome them. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 35, 185-189.

34
35 doi:10.1027/1614-0001/a000148
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

For Peer Review Only

Table 1*Descriptive statistics and scale correlations of the RST-PQ-S (Study 1)*

<i>Scales</i>	1.	2.	3a.	3b.	3c.	3d.
1. FFFS		.23*	-.10	-.01	.13	-.05
2. BIS			-.11	-.17*	.03	.10
3. BAS						
3a. BAS - Reward Interest				.25*	.26*	.32*
3b. BAS - Goal-Drive Persistence					.27*	-.06
3c. BAS - Reward Interest						.21*
3d. BAS - Impulsivity						
<i>M</i>	2.49	2.39	2.61	3.00	3.16	2.25
<i>SD</i>	.61	.66	.60	.59	.55	.65
Skewness	.04	.06	-.03	-.23	-.36	.20
Kurtosis	-.45	-.58	-.10	.10	-.51	-.58
Cronbach's Alpha	.60	.80	.77	.72	.61	.67
Average inter-item correlation	.24	.44	.52	.47	.35	.41

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Note. Correlations among RST-PQ-S scales were tested for significance according to the Bonferroni-Holm procedure, which correct for multiple comparisons. * adjusted $p < .05$.

For Peer Review Only

Table 2*Standardized factor loadings of the RST-PQ-S (CFA in Study 1)*

<i>Items</i>	F1:	F2:	F3:	F4:	F5:	F6:
	FFFS	BIS	BAS-RI	BAS-GDP	BAS-RR	BAS-Imp
19. I would run quickly if fire alarms in a shopping mall started ringing	.42					
39. I would instantly freeze if I opened the door to find a stranger in the house	.58					
46. I would leave the park if I saw a group of dogs running around barking at people	.42					
48. I would freeze if I was on a turbulent aircraft	.59					
58. I would not hold a snake or spider	.44					
6. I sometime feel "blue" for no good reason		.65				
43. I often worry about letting down other people		.50				
49. My behavior is easily interrupted		.68				
50. It's difficult to get some things out of my mind		.87				
57. I often wake up with many thoughts running through my mind		.66				

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

14. I regularly try new activities just to see if I enjoy them	.74					
18. I get carried away by new projects	.70					
32. I am always finding new and interesting things to do	.74					
12. I am motivated to be successful in my personal life		.76				
41. I am very persistent in achieving my goals		.74				
65. I will actively put plans in place to accomplish goals in my life		.55				
16. Good news makes me feel over joyed				.58		
25. I get a special thrill when I am praised for something I've done well				.55		
36. I always celebrate when I accomplish something important				.66		
27. I sometimes cannot stop myself talking when I know I should keep my mouth closed						.53
28. I often do risky things without thinking of the consequences						.66
38. I find myself doing things on the spur of the moment						.73

<i>Factor correlations and omega reliability coefficients</i>	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
1. FFFS	.62					
2. BIS	.33*	.81				

3. BAS – RI	-.18	-.13	.77			
4. BAS – GDP	-.07	-.28*	.35*	.73		
5. BAS – RR	.16	.01	.38*	.39*	.63	
6. BAS – Imp	-.12	.13	.47*	-.09	.35*	.68

FFFS = Fight-Flight-Freeze System; BIS = Behavioural Inhibition System; RI = Reward Interest; GDP = Goal-Drive Persistence; RR = Reward

Reactivity; Imp = Impulsivity. Significant correlations among latent factors ($p < .05$, Bonferroni–Holm-adjusted) are marked with asterisks.

Reliability coefficients (McDonald’s omega) are reported on the main diagonal of the correlation matrix.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Table 3

Correlations between the RST-PQ-S and personality measures (Study 1)

	<i>RST-PQ-S factors</i>					
	FFFS	BIS	BAS- Reward Interest	BAS-Goal- Drive- Persistence	BAS- Reward Reactivity	BAS- Impulsivity
Five-factor model						
Extraversion	-.04	-.13	.27*	.19	.24	.27*
Agreeableness	.07	.05	.17	-.01	.16	.09
Conscientiousness	.07	-.23	-.09	.32*	.14	-.32*
Neuroticism	.33*	.67*	-.10	-.10	.11	.12
Openness	-.09	.08	.20	.06	.07	.21
STAI						
Trait Anxiety	.18	.75*	-.03	-.24	-.12	.20

Fear Survey

Schedule

Tissue fear	.53*	.25	-.08	-.09	.06	-.02
Social fear	.33*	.59*	.02	-.16	-.09	.09
Agoraphobia	.43*	.35*	-.14	-.13	-.05	-.02
Sex fear	.36*	.13	-.14	-.10	-.13	-.11
Animal fear	.54*	.39*	.06	-.08	.17	.12
Age	-.07	-.31*	.05	.04	-.13	-.05
Gender	-.34*	-.20*	.03	-.08	-.17*	.06

Note. * $p < .05$, Bonferroni–Holm adjusted.

Table 4

Correlations between the RST-PQ-S and BIS/BAS scales (Study 2)

	<i>RST-PQ-S factors</i>					
	FFFS	BIS	BAS-Reward Interest	BAS-Goal- Drive Persistence	BAS-Reward Reactivity	BAS- Impulsivity
<i>BIS/BAS scales</i>						
BIS – original Carver and White’s (1998) scale	.48*	.68*	-.07	.02	.18*	-.05
BIS – revised Heym et al. (2008) scale	.44*	.65*	-.04	.03	.18*	-.04
FFFS – revised Heym et al. (2008) scale	.48*	.64*	-.10	.00	.16	-.04
BAS: Drive	.05	-.07	.38* (.11)	.55* (.47*)	.33* (.05)	.35* (.11)
BAS: Reward Responsiveness	.17*	.11	.31* (.06)	.44* (.27*)	.54* (.46**)	.23* (-.04)
BAS: Fun-Seeking	-.11	.04	.49* (.34**)	.15 (-.27*)	.25* (-.02)	.50* (.39*)

Note. * $p < .05$, Bonferroni–Holm-adjusted. Coefficients outside the parenthesis represent bivariate (zero-order) correlations.

Coefficients in parentheses are partial correlations controlling for Carver and White’s (1994) BAS subscales.

Table 5*Reliability of the RST-PQ-S and overlap with the full-length scale (Study 3)*

	Reliability of the RST-PQ-S		Correlation with the RST-PQ
	φ	r_{s1s2}	r_{f1s2}
FFFS	.60	.79	.76
BIS	.79	.82	.78
BAS-Reward Interest	.77	.70	.65
BAS- Goal Drive-Persistence	.70	.81	.78
BAS-Reward Reactivity	.65	.67	.65
BAS-Impulsivity	.65	.75	.65

Note. φ = omega reliability coefficient; r = Pearson correlation coefficient; $s1$ = short scale at T1; $s2$ = short scale at T2; $f1$ = full scale at T1.

Table 6

Standardized regression weights and proportion of variance accounted in the Test Anxiety Inventory for the full- and the short-length RST-PQ (Study 3)

	RST-PQ-S		RST-PQ full	
	Worry	Emotionality	Worry	Emotionality
FFFS	.10	.26*	.13	.31*
BIS	.45*	.38*	.46*	.38*
BAS-Reward Interest	.03	-.09	.02	-.08
BAS- Goal Drive-Persistence	-.07	.04	-.08	.08
BAS-Reward Reactivity	.08	.09	.07	.04
BAS-Impulsivity	.02	-.08	.05	-.09
R ²	.24	.29	.30	.38

Note. * $p < .05$.

Table S1. The full length RST-PQ.

-
1. I feel sad when I suffer even minor setbacks
 2. I am often preoccupied with unpleasant thoughts
 3. Sometimes even little things in life can give me great pleasure
 4. I am especially sensitive to reward
 5. I put in a big effort to accomplish important goals in my life
 6. I sometime feel “blue” for no good reason
 7. When feeling “down”, I tend to stay away from people
 8. I often experience a surge of pleasure running through my body
 9. I would be frozen to the spot by the sight of a snake or spider
 10. I have often spent a lot of time on my own to “get away from it all”
 11. I am a very active person
 12. I am motivated to be successful in my personal life
 13. I am always “on the go”
 14. I regularly try new activities just to see if I enjoy them
 15. I get carried away by new project
 16. Good news makes me feel over joyed
 17. The thought of mistakes in my work worries me
 18. When nervous, I sometimes find my thoughts are interrupted
 19. I would run quickly if fire alarms in a shopping mall started ringing
 20. I often overcome hurdles to achieve my ambitions
 21. I often feel depressed
 22. I think I should “stop and think” more instead of jumping into things too quickly
 23. I often feel that I am on an emotional high
 24. I love winning competitions

- 1
- 2
- 3 25. I get a special thrill when I am praised for something I've done well
- 4
- 5 26. I take a great deal of interest in hobbies
- 6
- 7 27. I sometimes cannot stop myself talking when I know I should keep my mouth closed
- 8
- 9
- 10 28. I often do risky things without thinking of the consequences
- 11
- 12 29. My mind is sometimes dominated by thoughts of the bad things I've done.
- 13
- 14 30. I get very excited when I get what I want
- 15
- 16 31. I feel driven to succeed in my chosen career
- 17
- 18 32. I am always finding new and interesting things to do
- 19
- 20 33. I'm always weighing-up the risk of bad things happening in my life
- 21
- 22 34. People are often telling me not to worry
- 23
- 24 35. I am very open to new experiences in life
- 25
- 26 36. I always celebrate when I accomplish something important
- 27
- 28 37. I find myself reacting strongly to pleasurable things in life
- 29
- 30 38. I find myself doing things on the spur of the moment
- 31
- 32 39. I would instantly freeze if I opened the door to find a stranger in the house
- 33
- 34 40. I'm always buying things on impulse
- 35
- 36 41. I am very persistent in achieving my goals
- 37
- 38 42. When trying to make a decision, I find myself constantly chewing it over
- 39
- 40 43. I often worry about letting down other people
- 41
- 42 44. I would go on a holiday at the last minute
- 43
- 44 45. I would run fast if I knew someone was following me late at night
- 45
- 46 46. I would leave the park if I saw a group of dogs running around barking at people
- 47
- 48 47. I worry a lot
- 49
- 50 48. I would freeze if I was on a turbulent aircraft
- 51
- 52 49. My behavior is easily interrupted
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

- 1
2
3 50. It's difficult to get some things out of my mind
4
5 51. I think the best nights out are unplanned
6
7 52. There are some things that I simply cannot go near
8
9 53. If I see something I want, I act straight away
10
11 54. I think it is necessary to make plans to get what you want in life
12
13 55. When nervous, I find it hard to say the right words
14
15 56. I find myself thinking about the same thing over and over again
16
17 57. I often wake up with many thoughts running through my mind
18
19 58. I would not hold a snake or spider
20
21 59. Looking down from a great height makes me freeze
22
23 60. I often find myself "going into my shell"
24
25 61. My mind is dominated by recurring thoughts
26
27 62. I am the sort of person who easily freezes-up when scared
28
29 63. I take a long time to make decisions
30
31 64. I often find myself lost for word
32
33 65. I will actively put plans in place to accomplish goals in my life
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Note. Items are numbered according to their relative position in the original questionnaire

41 (retrieved at <http://www.philipcorr.net/uploads/downloads/153.pdf>). FFFS items: 19, 45, 46

42 (*flight*), 52, 58 (*active avoidance*), 9, 39, 48, 59, 62 (*freezing*); BIS items: 18, 49, 55, 63, 64

43 (*motor planning interruption*), 17, 34, 43, 47 (*cautious risk assessment*), 2, 29, 33, 42, 50, 56,

44 57, 61 (*obsessive thought*), 1, 6, 7, 10, 21, 60 (*behavioral disengagement*); Reward Interest

45 items: 11, 13, 14, 15, 26, 32, 35; Goal-Drive Persistence items: 5, 12, 20, 31, 41 (*drive-*

46 *persistence*), 54, 65 (*goal planning*); Reward reactivity items: 3, 4, 8, 16, 23, 24, 25, 30, 36, 37;

47 Impulsivity items: 22, 27, 28, 38, 40, 44, 51, 53. The *Fight* and *Panic* items were not considered

1
2
3 in the present study: they do not fit with the FFFS factor and should be considered as separate
4
5 scales (see Corr & Cooper, 2016).
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

Table S2. Exploratory Factor Analysis on the 38 items of the RST-PQ selected in the second step of Study 1.

<i>Items</i>	F1: FFFS	F2: BIS	F3: RI	F4: GDP	F5: RR	F6: Imp
<i>Flight</i>						
19. I would run quickly if fire alarms in a shopping mall started ringing	0.47	-0.10	-0.03	0.10	0.05	0.12
46. I would leave the park if I saw a group of dogs running around barking at people	0.43	-0.10	0.07	0.01	0.12	-0.07
<i>Freezing</i>						
39. I would instantly freeze if I opened the door to find a stranger in the house	0.52	0.10	-0.09	0.07	0.04	-0.05
48. I would freeze if I was on a turbulent aircraft	0.64	0.11	0.14	-0.03	-0.15	-0.09
59. Looking down from a great height makes me freeze	0.35	0.12	-0.08	-0.01	-0.03	0.02
62. I am the sort of person who easily freezes-up when scared	0.47	0.35	-0.11	-0.04	0.17	0.07
<i>Active Avoidance</i>						
58. I would not hold a snake or spider	0.43	0.02	0.10	-0.04	0.06	-0.11
<i>Obsessive thoughts</i>						
29. My mind is sometimes dominated by thoughts of the bad things I've done	-0.06	0.48	0.04	0.05	-0.22	0.00

1						
2						
3	50. It's difficult to get some things out of my mind	0.03	0.80	0.02	-0.03	0.01
4						-0.01
5	57. I often wake up with many thoughts running through my mind	0.08	0.62	0.09	0.05	-0.06
6						0.20
7						
8	<i>Behavioral disengagement</i>					
9						
10	1. I feel sad when I suffer even minor setback	-0.02	0.67	0.02	-0.14	0.01
11						-0.15
12	6. I sometime feel "blue" for no good reason	-0.15	0.73	-0.01	-0.02	0.00
13						-0.06
14	7. When feeling "down" I tend to stay away from people	-0.10	0.63	-0.06	0.00	0.00
15						0.18
16						
17	<i>Cautious risk assessment</i>					
18						
19	17. The thought of mistakes in my work worries me	0.16	0.38	-0.06	0.11	0.17
20						-0.12
21	43. I often worry about letting down other people	0.10	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.17
22						-0.16
23						
24	<i>Motor planning interruption</i>					
25						
26	18. When nervous. I sometimes find my thoughts are interrupted	0.19	0.49	-0.05	0.06	0.12
27						0.07
28	49. My behavior is easily interrupted	0.15	0.65	0.05	-0.09	-0.09
29						0.07
30	64. I often find myself lost for words	0.33	0.36	-0.08	-0.01	-0.14
31						0.07
32						
33	<i>Reward Interest</i>					
34						
35	14. I regularly try new activities just to see if I enjoy them	-0.05	0.00	0.68	-0.06	0.02
36						0.14
37	18. I get carried away by new projects	0.05	-0.13	0.62	0.14	-0.03
38						0.07
39						
40						
41						
42						
43						
44						
45						
46						

26. I take a great deal of interest in hobbies	-0.11	-0.01	0.38	0.08	0.17	-0.11
32. I am always finding new and interesting things to do	-0.01	0.00	0.74	0.05	0.01	0.06
35. I am very open to new experiences in life	-0.27	0.13	0.48	0.01	0.21	-0.02
<i>Drive-Persistence</i>						
12. I am motivated to be successful in my personal life	-0.05	-0.06	-0.03	0.80	0.00	0.03
20. I often overcome hurdles to achieve my ambitions	0.09	-0.19	0.14	0.58	-0.03	0.01
31. I feel driven to succeed in my chosen career ^a	-0.13	0.14	0.01	0.76	0.08	0.00
41. I am very persistent in achieving my goals	0.02	-0.13	0.12	0.63	-0.02	-0.04
<i>Goal planning</i>						
65. I will actively put plans in place to accomplish goals in my life	0.00	0.09	0.02	0.55	0.02	-0.12
<i>Reward Reactivity</i>						
4. I am especially sensitive to reward	0.05	0.05	-0.07	0.18	0.31	0.01
16. Good news makes me feel over joyed	0.12	-0.09	0.18	0.01	0.50	-0.02
23. I often feel that I am on an emotional high	0.01	0.23	0.11	0.04	0.31	0.15
25. I get a special thrill when I am praised for something I've done well	0.01	0.09	-0.04	0.18	0.51	0.00
36. I always celebrate when I accomplish something important	-0.07	-0.09	0.07	0.02	0.68	0.05

37. I find myself reacting strongly to pleasurable things in life	0.03	0.05	0.13	-0.05	0.47	0.07
<i>Impulsivity</i>						
22. I think I should “stop and think” more instead of jumping into things too quickly	0.03	-0.10	-0.06	-0.08	0.18	0.38
27. I sometimes cannot stop myself talking when I know I should keep my mouth closed	0.05	0.01	-0.01	0.13	0.04	0.54
28. I often do risky things without thinking of the consequences	-0.18	0.03	0.03	0.02	-0.04	0.70
38. I find myself doing things on the spur of the moment	-0.02	0.02	0.13	-0.08	0.20	0.62
40. I’m always buying things on impulse	0.11	0.07	0.06	-0.10	0.07	0.36

Note. The best marker variables (i.e., items with the highest ratio between primary and secondary loadings) were selected for each thematic facet (in boldface). Number of items retained for each facet reproduces the way items are distributed in the original scale. ^a This item was deleted because it is highly similar in content to item 12, which showed better psychometric properties.

Table S3. Standardized factor loadings on the RST-PQ-S (CFA in Study 2).

<i>Items</i>	F1:	F2:	F3:	F4:	F5:	F6:
	FFFS	BIS	BAS-RI	BAS-GDP	BAS-RR	BAS-Imp
19. I would run quickly if fire alarms in a shopping mall started ringing	.43					
39. I would instantly freeze if I opened the door to find a stranger in the house	.59					
46. I would leave the park if I saw a group of dogs running around barking at people	.52					
48. I would freeze if I was on a turbulent aircraft	.55					
58. I would not hold a snake or spider	.44					
6. I sometime feel “blue” for no good reason		.72				
43. I often worry about letting down other people		.60				
49. My behavior is easily interrupted		.70				
50. It’s difficult to get some things out of my mind		.79				
57. I often wake up with many thoughts running through my mind		.65				

14. I regularly try new activities just to see if I enjoy them	.73					
18. I get carried away by new projects	.72					
32. I am always finding new and interesting things to do	.79					
12. I am motivated to be successful in my personal life		.72				
41. I am very persistent in achieving my goals		.76				
65. I will actively put plans in place to accomplish goals in my life		.60				
16. Good news makes me feel over joyed				.65		
25. I get a special thrill when I am praised for something I've done well				.52		
36. I always celebrate when I accomplish something important				.67		
27. I sometimes cannot stop myself talking when I know I should keep my mouth closed						.40
28. I often do risky things without thinking of the consequences						.64
38. I find myself doing things on the spur of the moment						.85

<i>Factor correlations and omega reliability coefficients</i>	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
1. FFFS	.63					

1						
2						
3	2. BIS	.57*	.82			
4						
5	3. BAS – RI	-.15	-.08	.79		
6						
7	4. BAS – GDP	.08	-.10	.50*	.74	
8						
9	5. BAS – RR	.33*	-.01	.51*	.60*	.64
10						
11	6. BAS – Imp	.11	.19	.36*	.10	.30*
12						
13						
14						

FFFS = Fight-Flight-Freeze System; BIS = Behavioural Inhibition System; RI = Reward Interest; GDP = Goal-Drive Persistence; RR =

Reward Reactivity; Imp = Impulsivity. Significant correlations among latent factors ($p < .05$, Bonferroni–Holm-adjusted) are marked with asterisks. Reliability coefficients (McDonald’s omega) are reported on the main diagonal of the correlation matrix.

Table S4. Estimated variance components of the RST-PQ-S items (Study 3).

Scale	<i>Con</i>	<i>OSpe</i>	<i>Rel</i>
FFFS			
Item 19, Time 1	.62	.03	.65
Item 39, Time 1	.66	.03	.69
Item 46, Time 1	.75	.03	.78
Item 48, Time 1	.71	.03	.74
Item 58, Time 1	.60	.02	.62
Item 19, Time 2	.64	.03	.67
Item 39, Time 2	.68	.03	.71
Item 46, Time 2	.70	.02	.72
Item 48, Time 2	.69	.03	.72
Item 58, Time 2	.70	.02	.72
BIS			
Item 6, Time 1	.63	.06	.69
Item 43, Time 1	.65	.07	.71
Item 49, Time 1	.61	.06	.67
Item 50, Time 1	.58	.07	.65
Item 57, Time 1	.58	.05	.63
Item 6, Time 2	.68	.00	.69
Item 43, Time 2	.66	.00	.67
Item 49, Time 2	.65	.00	.65

1				
2				
3	Item 50, Time 2	.66	.00	.66
4				
5				
6	Item 57, Time 2	.68	.00	.69
7				
8				
9	Reward Interest			
10				
11				
12	Item 14, Time 1	.63	.10	.73
13				
14				
15	Item 18, Time 1	.58	.13	.71
16				
17				
18	Item 32, Time 1	.61	.09	.71
19				
20				
21	Item 14, Time 2	.64	.09	.73
22				
23				
24	Item 18, Time 2	.64	.13	.77
25				
26				
27	Item 32, Time 2	.69	.10	.79
28				
29				
30	Goal-Drive Persistence			
31				
32				
33	Item 12, Time 1	.70	.03	.73
34				
35				
36	Item 41, Time 1	.68	.03	.71
37				
38				
39	Item 65, Time 1	.75	.03	.78
40				
41				
42	Item 12, Time 2	.68	.03	.71
43				
44				
45	Item 41, Time 2	.70	.02	.72
46				
47				
48	Item 65, Time 2	.74	.02	.77
49				
50				
51	Reward Reactivity			
52				
53				
54	Item 16, Time 1	.52	.11	.63
55				
56				
57	Item 25, Time 1	.58	.09	.67
58				
59				
60				

1				
2				
3	Item 36, Time 1	.59	.06	.65
4				
5				
6	Item 16, Time 2	.56	.07	.64
7				
8				
9	Item 25, Time 2	.55	.05	.61
10				
11				
12	Item 36, Time 2	.64	.04	.67
13				
14				
15	Impulsivity			
16				
17				
18	Item 27, Time 1	.64	.05	.69
19				
20				
21	Item 28, Time 1	.56	.08	.64
22				
23				
24	Item 38, Time 1	.60	.07	.67
25				
26				
27	Item 27, Time 2	.68	.00	.68
28				
29				
30	Item 28, Time 2	.58	.00	.58
31				
32				
33	Item 38, Time 2	.61	.00	.61
34				
35				

Note. *Con* = consistency, *OSpe* = occasion specificity; *Rel* = reliability.