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Abstract

At the onset of the study, participants provided measures of their social support, familiarity with the environment, and emotionality. Participants then entered data daily for 2 weeks about their daily mood and the events that occurred each day. A series of multilevel random coefficient modeling analyses found that daily negative events co-varied with measures of negative affect and daily positive events co-varied with measures of positive affect, self-esteem, and depression. Participants who reported higher measures of trait-level anxiety were found to have significantly lower mean levels of daily self-esteem. Both anxiety and fearfulness were found to be negatively related to BDI measures, and negatively related to positive deactive affect. Anxiety was also found to be positively related to negative active affect and negative deactive affect. Fearfulness was negatively related to positive active affect. Sentimentality was found to be positively related to daily self-esteem, BDI scores, and positive active affect. Conversely, sentimentality was found to be negatively related to both negative active and negative deactive affect. Increased social support from both family and friends leads to higher average ratings of daily self-esteem. Support from friends was negatively related to depression and daily negative deactive affect. Family support was linked to higher average ratings of positive active affect. Familiarity with the environment was found to be predictive of measures of daily well-being. Academic adjustment was positively related to daily self-esteem and depression outcomes. Social adjustment was negatively related to depression. Personal-Emotional adjustment was positively related to self-esteem and positive active and deactive affect. Conversely, Personal-Emotional adjustment was negatively related to depression and negative active and deactive affect.
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The stress process, viewed within the context of daily experience, has been the subject of research within the past two decades. There is a general consensus among stress researchers that daily well-being is positively related to the number of positive events that occur each day and negatively related to the number of negative ones (Affleck, Tennen, Urrows, & Higgins, 1994; Caspi, Bolger, & Eckenrode, 1987; DeLongis, Folkman, & Lazarus, 1988; Nezlek & Allen, 2006). Further examination shows that the relationship between daily events and daily well-being is more nuanced, however. The literature has found that daily experience is influenced by a wide array of variables.

The present study was designed to complement extant research by examining the role of personality and situational variables on the relationship between daily events and well-being. At the onset of the study, participants provided ratings of three trait-level variables: social support, depression, and emotionality (akin to neuroticism). These variables were selected based on the findings of past research. Each day, participants provided measures of well-being and described positive and negative events. The three trait-level variables were then analyzed together with measures of daily well-being and descriptions of daily events.

The primary hypotheses of the study were threefold. First, it was hypothesized emotionality should lead to greater reactivity, with regard to both positive and negative events. Similarly, emotionality should be positively related to daily depression and negative affect and negatively related to daily self-esteem and positive affect. The second hypothesis pertained to the role of social support. Individuals with more social support
should react less strongly to negative events than individuals with less social support. It was also hypothesized that social support would be related to higher mean levels of self-esteem and daily positive affect and to lower mean levels of depression and negative affect. The final hypothesis was that increased familiarity with the environment would lessen the ill effects of negative events. Familiarity with the environment should be positively associated with daily self-esteem and positive affect. Conversely, it should be negatively associated with depression and negative affect.

Individual differences in mood, stress reactivity, self-esteem, and general well-being are influenced by individual differences in stable personality traits. This process is a topic that has received a lot of attention from stress researchers. Attention has shifted to studies of daily events; diary studies that chronicle the impact of stress can elucidate the personality processes in daily experience (Affleck et al., 1994; Bolger & Schilling, 1991). Because they preserve the temporal order of events, diary studies are appropriate to test the inference that daily fluctuation in mood is caused, in part, by daily stressors and hassles, and that this relationship is influenced by personality (Caspi et al., 1987).

Neuroticism is a factor of personality that has been shown to be highly predictive of exposure and reactivity to stressful events. In a 14-day study of college students, high-neuroticism individuals reported more interpersonal stressors and higher ratings of distress in response to negative events than their low-neuroticism counterparts (Gunthert, Cohen, & Armeli, 1999). Because this study relies on self-report mechanisms, however, there are important methodological concerns to address. Research shows that high levels of neuroticism increases the recall of negatively toned information (Gomez, Gomez, & Cooper, 2002; Martin, Ward, & Clark, 1983; Larsen, 1992). A study on social phobia
found that individuals who scored highly on measures of anxiety and neuroticism were more likely to interpret neutral events as threatening and “to catastrophize in response to unambiguous, mildly negative social events” (Stopa & Clark, 1998). Thus, high-N individuals will disproportionately experience, remember, and report negative events compared to positive ones. This retrospection bias in stressor reporting poses interpretive problems (Bolger & Schilling, 1991).

Diary studies are best able to minimize retrospection bias by measuring stress process outcomes closest to when they occur. A study on stress and reactivity in married couples examined independently provided daily accounts of psychological distress and negative events. Because these stressors were experienced by both the husband and the wife, the researchers could test whether the diary study adequately controlled for the reporting bias of high-N individuals. The discrepancy between husbands and wives in stressor reporting did not vary as a function of neuroticism (Bolger & Schilling, 1991). Thus, daily report designs may help researchers avoid biases in reporting and some forms of spuriousness (West & Hepworth, 1991).

Bolger and Schilling (1991) suggested that increased emotional reactivity is the most important mechanism in the relationship between negative events and daily distress. As predicted by the state-trait theory of anxiety, neuroticism’s effect on anxiety is most evident under stress (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1964). Moreover, research on daily stress and the trajectory of mood has shown that high-neuroticism individuals were more distressed by current-day problems (Marco & Suls, 1993). Thus, neuroticism’s effect on anxiety would be most evident on the same day that the problem was occurring.
Personality’s effects on well-being are not contingent upon the occurrence of positive or negative events; rather, research has found that personality can have a direct effect on well-being. Controlling for exposure, Bolger & Schilling (1991) found that reactivity to environmental stressors accounts for 14% of the overall mean difference in distress between high-neuroticism individuals and low-neuroticism individuals. Controlling for reactivity, they found that exposure accounts for 29%. Thus, roughly 57% of the overall mean difference in distress exists independent of exposure or reactivity factors, suggesting an endogenous influence of personality or the influence of a different variable. To get an accurate picture of the process, research must examine both exposure and reactivity mechanisms, as well as consider endogenous effects of neuroticism and other personality variables.

The relationship between daily events and stress, in addition to being influenced by exposure and reactivity variables, is moderated by measures of social support. Stress researchers have suggested that social support networks can serve as a buffer against negative affect (Cohen & Syme, 1985; Sarason, Sarason, & Pierce, 1990). Affleck, Tennen, Urrows, and Higgins (1994) found that individuals with less social support exhibited greater emotional distress following an emotionally undesirable event.

There are two important, but related aspects of social support: perceived support and potential support. The former is a more abstract concept, a measurement of an individual’s perception about his or her available support network. In Nezlek and Allen’s study (2006), perceived social support was measured using a scale that asked participants to indicate the extent to which friends and family members would show each of 45 supportive behaviors. This measure focused on the participants’ attitude of their social
support network rather than asking for specific contacts on whom they could rely. In the study done by Caspi, Bolger, and Eckenrode (1987), however, participants were asked to provide specific lists of people they believed they could “count on” in the event of a crisis. The researchers sought to obtain a count of specifically named individuals in an effort to understand, in the event of a problem, the true extent of social support available for each participant. This decision assumes that if participants are made to write down contacts they will give a more accurate picture of their available social support. Particularly in times of high stress, people tend to exercise a self-serving bias (Campbell & Sedikides, 1999). Thus, perceived social support immediately following a crisis is likely to be greater than the real amount of support available.

Nezlek and Allen (2006) found that the relationship between negative events and daily well-being on the day of the stressful event was weaker for participants who reported thinking that friends and family members would more often show each of 45 supportive behaviors. Caspi, Bolger, and Eckenrode (1987), with their specific list measure of social support, found no moderating effect of social support on daily stress, suggesting that the amount of potential supporters during an undesirable event does not buffer against the effects of stress. There is an interaction, however, between the previous day’s stressful event and the number of potential supporters. This lag reflects the amount of time it would take to mobilize and properly access a support network. While the perceived amount of support (Nezlek & Allen, 2006) provides the buffering effect the day of the event, the actual number of individuals available to be contacted (Caspi et al., 1987) affects the buffering effect the day after. That is, the former measure reflects the
buffering effect of thinking that you have friends to support you, and the latter reflects the buffering effect of knowing that you do. These processes are related, but independent.

Research has shown that the source of social support matters. Students who perceived more social support from their family experienced exactly the opposite effect; negative events had a stronger negative effect on well-being for individuals who perceived having more family support (Nezlek & Allen, 2006). This caveat seems inconsistent with previous research, but Nezlek and Allen argue that it fits within a dual nature of social support. On the one hand, seeking a social support network is an adaptive behavior that aids in social integration. Alternatively, students who reported high levels of social support may not know how to cope on their own; in this context, social support can be detrimental. What determines whether social support is healthy or unhealthy is the context within which it is received. That is, not all social support is supportive. For example, since college is a time for many to grow and become more independent, excess reliance on family members for guidance may be indicative of weakness or of a deficit in social development. As demonstrated by the buffering effect of perceived peer social support, college students who believe they have friends to turn to in times of crisis are better able to fend off the effects of negative events. On the other hand, college students’ relationships with family members may represent a failure to become emotionally independent (Nezlek & Allen, 2006). Akin to those scoring high in depression, this lack of independence could imply a less grounded mood more easily affected by circumstance. Trice (2002), who conducted a study done on first semester college students’ email to parents, suggests that a high frequency of advice-seeking in email communication is indicative of a lack of independence. Caplan, Henderson, Henderson, and Fleming (2002)
found that this independence, a stable self-concept, was predictive of higher levels of adjustment.

In the context of daily event studies, emotional lability represents the degree to which mood fluctuates in response to positive and negative events. High emotional lability is closely related to both neuroticism and depression, and has shown to have a strong moderating effect on the relationship between unfavorable events and distress. A study on affective response intensity in college students found that increased reactivity was strongly linked to measures of depression (Larsen, Diener, & Emmons, 1986). This effect was observed both when participants were exposed to their own daily stressors and when they were provided with descriptions of hypothetical events. The similarity in participants’ reactions between hypothetical events and real ones suggests that reactivity is governed by personality characteristics rather than by lifestyle differences (Larsen et al., 1986).

Though reactivity to positive events has been less frequently studied, it plays an important role in the examination of personality and social processes. Research has found that depression is among the measures that has the greatest effect on reactivity to positive events (Butler, Hokanson, & Flynn, 1994; Nezlek & Plesko 2003). Depressogenic factors have a more reliable effect on reactivity to positive events than neuroticism or generalized negative affect do. While all three measures relate to distress, the fact that depression has a much stronger link implies that there is something unique to it that is causing the effect. Some have proposed that the factor unique to depression that is responsible for the relationship is a weaker and more vulnerable self-concept (Butler et
al., 1994; Nezlek & Allen, 2006). A more labile self-concept could allow environmental feedback to play a greater role in determining daily mood.

Recent affect-focused research augments this conclusion. Nezlek (2005) distinguishes between four types of affect: positive active, positive deactive, negative active, and negative deactive. Positive active affect encapsulates feelings of enthusiasm, happiness, alertness, etc., while positive deactive represents calm, peaceful, satisfied feelings. Conversely, negative active affect encapsulates nervousness, embarrassment, stress, etc., and negative deactive affect represents sluggish, sad, bored, or depressed feelings. Daily affect is closely tied with self-evaluation, or the way a person views him or herself. Nezlek (2005) found that the inverse relationship between positive active affect and negative events ceases to be significant when controlling for self-evaluation. Controlling for self-evaluation also mitigates the direct relationship between positive deactive affect and positive events. As previously mentioned, depression is among the measures that has the greatest effect on reactivity to positive events (Butler et al., 1994; Nezlek & Plesko 2003). The factor unique to depression that is responsible for this relationship is a weaker and more vulnerable self-concept. Self-concept is the construct generated by self-evaluation, so it makes sense that controlling for self-concept would minimize some relationships between events and affect.

Puzzlingly, controlling for self-evaluation also mitigates the relationship between positive active affect and negative events. Prior research has emphasized neuroticism’s unique relationship to negative events and depression’s unique relationship to self-evaluation (Butler et al., 1994; Eysenck & Eysenck 1964; Nezlek & Allen, 2006; Nezlek & Plesko 2003). The fact that controlling for self-evaluation affects reactivity to negative
events could mean that self-evaluation is not a factor unique to depression. It also suggests that neuroticism, as defined by the B5/FFM, is not the primary factor moderating reactivity to negative events.

Research in psychology on the dimensions of personality in the past twenty years has been dominated by the Big Five, or the Five Factor Model of Personality (B5/FFM). There has been relatively broad consensus among researchers on the nature of the basic dimensions of personality (Lee & Ashton, 2006). The five domain-level scales present in the B5/FFM are Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability (vs. Neuroticism), and Openness to Experience. These domains were compiled using a lexical factor analysis; this type of analysis assumes that major axes of personality are represented in language by many adjectives. Using this approach, researchers examine a language and categorize words to extract the underlying concept many of them represent. The B5/FFM lexical factor analysis was first completed in English and has since been translated into many languages. More recent lexical factor analyses of non-English languages, however, repeatedly show that there are six, rather than five, factors of personality (Ashton, Lee, Perugini, Gnisci, & Sergi, 2004). Subsequent re-examination of an archival data set containing self-ratings of 310 respondents on a set of 1,710 English personality adjectives replicated these results (Ashton, Lee, & Goldberg, 2004). Additionally, research has drawn into question the validity of the neuroticism factor as it is currently constructed. Given its ubiquity in personality testing, the B5/FFM should be under constant scrutiny.

To accommodate the new six factor framework, Ashton and Lee (2001) devised a six-dimensional model called the HEXACO. This model is similar to the B5/FFM but
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The sixth factor that emerged in recent non-English factor analysis is called Honesty-Humility, defined by terms such as sincere, modest, and fair versus sly, greedy, and deceitful. This scale has been shown to correlate weakly with the B5/FFM, meaning that its measures are likely outside the scope of the Big Five (Lee & Ashton, 2004; Lee, Ogunfowora & Ashton, 2005; Lee, Gizzarone, & Ashton, 2003).

Research has recently highlighted a set of personality traits that largely fall outside of the realm of the B5/FFM model. Paunonen and Jackson (1996) identified a list of 10 traits, including Conventionality, Seductiveness, Manipulativeness, Thriftiness, Humorousness, Integrity, Femininity, Religiosity, Risk Taking, and Egotism – all of which have low correlations with the lexical Big Five factors (Saucier & Goldberg, 1998). These traits, compiled into the Supernumerary Personality Inventory (SPI) have been found to have acceptable levels of internal reliability (Paunonen, Haddock, Forsterling, & Keinonen, 2003). The lexical approach to the development of personality inventories posits that aspects of personality will have representation in language proportional to their importance in psychometrics. The aforementioned 10 traits were shown to be lexically relevant (Saucier & Goldberg, 1998).

Lee, Ogunfowora, and Ashton’s (2005) examination of the HEXACO-PI and the SPI scale revealed many of the items of the latter to be highly correlated with those of the former. Interestingly, only four of the ten items on the SPI scale were highly correlated with the Honesty-Humility facet. Of the remaining six, two were correlated with Emotionality and one was correlated with Openness to Experience. The fact that Honesty-Humility alone did not account for the extra personality items reinforces the idea that the HEXACO-PI is not merely The Big Five with Honesty-Humility added on.
Though Emotionality and Openness to Experience from the HEXACO correspond to factors in the B5/FFM, key differences clearly exist between the two. The HEXACO, therefore, appears to accommodate several key personality variables that escape the categorization of the more traditional and widely used Five Factor Model.

Most importantly, however, many clinical researchers have criticized the neuroticism facet of the Big Five as being too broadly constructed. One of the biggest changes, and the most significant for the present study, is the overhaul of the neuroticism factor. Many clinical psychologists object to neuroticism as a messy combination of terms. Though the B5/FFM does feature facet level measurements, they are not emphasized and often go unused. The lack of prominent facet level measurements produces an undesirable homogenizing effect that glosses over useful within-factor differences. The HEXACO, on the other hand, restructures neuroticism into an emotionality scale, which contains separate (but related) facet measures for fearfulness, anxiety, dependence, and sentimentality. This restructuring helps provide a more useful metric for different types of emotionality. Individuals who score highly in emotionality tend to experience more distress from danger, feel more anxious in response to stress, have a strong desire for close emotional relationships, and act more concerned and empathetic toward others. The present study explores the relationship between emotionality and reactivity to positive and negative events.

Environment plays a major part in the development and expression of personality. Environments themselves differ, both in the experiences they bestow and in the frequency and quality of events that occur within them. As discussed earlier, situational factors play a major role in the relationship between personality and daily well-being.
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Bolger & Schilling, 1991). Thus, a change in environment or even a change in the role an individual plays within it can have a significant effect on daily environmental content.

Recent research has demonstrated a link between familiarity with an environment and emotional reactivity (Nezlek, 2007). Over the course of a year, undergraduate students provided daily measures of their psychological well-being and accounts of the positive and negative events that occurred. It was found that the link between negative events and well-being was stronger during the fall than in the spring; as time passed, the link between negative events and well-being decreased. It was found that the number and quality of events remained constant throughout the year; the only significant difference across semesters was participants’ reduced reactivity. This finding emphasizes that familiarity with an environment aids in the coping process rather than in avoiding negative events altogether.

These findings may relate to previous research on social support. As shown by Caspi, Bolger, and Eckenrode (1986) and Nezlek and Allen (2006), social support can act as a buffer against negative events. Research has found that social interactions and social support networks stabilize over time (Nezlek, 1993). Though a link between social support and familiarity with environment has not yet been established, it is reasonable to suppose the two are related.

Familiarity with environment’s effect on reactivity may also be related to changes in coping skills. Spending time somewhere may allow an individual to develop skills particular to the environment that allow them to cope more effectively (Nezlek, 2007). Additionally, spending time in an environment may make challenges more predictable, and there is general consensus that more predictable challenges are less stressful (Evans,
Wener, & Phillips, 2002; Fairbank, Hansen, Fitterling, 1991; Nezlek, 2007). Stewart (1982) suggested that as people become more familiar with an environment, they develop a cross-situational stability that reduces reactivity to events, particularly to negative ones.

The fact that both familiarity with an environment and social support moderate the relationship between negative events and well-being, yet do not for positive events and well-being suggests that the relationships represent the operation of different processes (David, Green, Martin, & Suls, 1997; Nezlek, 2007). Though previous research has demonstrated a connection between depression and reactivity to positive events, the mechanisms that explain the relation of positive events to well-being are less understood. Some researchers claim, and have evidence for, positive and negative events being governed by the same process (Butler et al., 1994; Larsen et al., 1986; Nezlek & Gable, 2001). Thus in general, and particularly with regard to adaptation to new environments, further research on positive events is needed.

Everyday experience methods study social and personality processes by examining ongoing experience, examining social behavior embedded in its natural context. Unlike previous research that has focused on major life events, the majority of daily experience models focus on the seemingly mundane experiences that compose our lives. These events are significant because of the defining role they can play over a long period of time, in contrast to major life events that can have sudden and intense consequences. There are several methodological advantages to employing daily experience models in research. Since diary studies employ a frequent data entry regime, participants are less likely to provide information distorted by errors in recall and summary (Affleck et al., 1994; Marco & Suls, 1993; Reis & Gable, 2000). Additionally,
descriptions of current events and feelings minimize the effects of retrospection bias.

Diary studies are also well suited to provide context, something that many studies in social psychology often fail to sufficiently consider (Reis & Gable, 2000). Everyday experience methods help researchers understand this context and the social processes that occur within it; they permit the examination of events and experiences in their natural, spontaneous setting (Bolger, Davis, & Rafaeli, 2003).

A study specifically examining the merits of major life event research and daily hassles and uplifts found the latter to be significantly more predictive of psychological symptoms (Kanner et al., 1980). The researchers found that the Hassles and Uplifts scale, administered over a period of 10 months, was more predictive of both current and subsequent psychological symptoms. Moreover, hassles and uplifts were found to share most of the variance observed in the major life events scale, and even when the effects of major life events were removed, the hassles and symptoms remained significantly related.

Consistent with previous research, hassles and uplifts were moderately related to measures of daily affect. An emphasis on daily events may thus be more adequate than one on major life events in the examination of mood and psychological symptoms.

The examination of mood in many ways goes hand-in-hand with a diary method; mood is an inherently contextual phenomenon that fluctuates both over the short and long term. Recently, stress has generated a lot of interest in diary research because of the influences it has on other areas of our lives. For example, many studies have found that stress is positively related to heart disease (Bunker et al., 2003; House, 1974). Conversely, low levels of stress have been linked to faster post-op recovery (Dyson et al., 2003; Ebrecht et al., 2004; Liu, Skelly & Weinman, 1994). More commonly, stress can affect
what we say, how we act, and how we feel about many things. Indeed, diary methods specialize in chronicling changes over time and allow researchers to consider how personality and current and prior situations interact. Additionally, since they are temporally sequenced, daily designs allow for some causal inferences to be made. The present study employs a diary method to examine the moderating influence of personality and daily mood on the relationship between positive and negative events and well-being.

Whether to use a within- or between-subjects design is an important methodological consideration. In the context of an experiment on personality and reactivity to stress, a between-subject design would take a single measure of each for each participant and would examine the relationship for the general population. A within-subject design, on the other hand, would repeatedly measure personality and reactivity within each participant. Additionally, within-subject designs are more able to test cause-and-effect relationships with nonexperimental data. Because they preserve the temporal order of events, it is easier to determine causality (Caspi et al., 1987). Many diary study methods employ within-subject designs.

Data, if organized hierarchically, that is, with some measurements contained within others, can be subjected to a special form of analysis: multilevel analysis. Multilevel analyses gather and analyze data at two or more levels simultaneously. For example, consider the present study. The characteristics of each participant are factors that are shared by every daily entry; they exist at the highest level. Contained within this highest level are measures that might vary between days, like daily self-esteem or ratings of positive and negative events.
An advantage of multilevel modeling is that it can be used for any data that is organized hierarchically. For example, consider a study examining the profitability of businesses in different countries around the world. The characteristics of each national economy are factors that are shared by every business in that country; they exist at the highest level. Contained within this highest level are measures that might vary between businesses, like management effectiveness or mean hourly work week.

Crucial to the process of multilevel analysis is a lack of independence among observations. In the example above, all businesses in a given country share the same national characteristics, and thus the data lack independence. In contrast, each business may have different individual characteristics, like mean hourly work week, mentioned above. Understanding differences in profitability can thus be explained both on the individual level and on the group level. In other words, the data could be examined on a within- or between-subjects level. A within-country analysis could examine whether companies whose workers have longer average work weeks have higher profitability. On the other hand, a between-country analysis could examine whether profitability is higher in countries with a longer mean work week. A multi-level analysis could take a within-countries relationship and elevate it to a between-countries examination. For example, one could examine the effect of national economy on the effect of mean hourly work week on profitability. That is, different national economies might influence how much of an effect weekly work time has on profitability. This meta-treatment is a multi-level analysis.
Method

Participants

The participants were 183 students from The College of William and Mary, who received credit in accordance with a class requirement. Since they provided incomplete data, 43 participants were removed from the study. Of the remaining 140 participants, 68 were female and 72 were male.

Procedure

Participants were selected from introductory psychology courses. Participants were given access to a website and asked to enter a series of questions each day for two weeks on personality and experiences of everyday life. At the beginning and end of the study, a 30-minute questionnaire was administered in addition to the daily 15-minute item. These items are contained in the appendix. To ensure that the data correspond to their entire day, participants were instructed to complete the surveys right before going to bed or immediately after waking up the following morning. Since it was possible to input data outside of the allowed bounds, the data from 43 participants were eliminated, leaving 140 participants who provided 2080 days of data (M = 14.85, SD = 0.986).

Trait-Level Measures

Prior to responding to the daily measures, participants provided a variety of trait level measures. These measures included social support, familiarity with the environment, and emotionality. Social support was measured using the Social Support Behaviors Scale (SSB; Vaux, Riedel, & Stewart, 1987). This scale measures perceived social support and asks respondents to examine a list of 45 supportive behaviors and indicate the extent to which they believed their friends and family would exhibit each. Scores for social support were operationalized by averaging the scores across the 45 items for family and friends.
Familiarity with the environment was measured with the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ). Trait level emotionality was measured using Emotionality factor of the HEXACO. The four constituent facets were also important to analysis.

**Daily Measures**

Each day, participants provided measures of self-esteem, depressogenic adjustment, affect, and daily events. Each of these items was measured using a 7-point scale. Daily self-esteem was measured using a modified version of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965). These items (3, 6, 7, and 10) were re-worded in order to serve as daily measures and to refer to how participants felt that day. Depressogenic adjustment, also called the triad measure, was based on Beck’s Cognitive Triad. Three components of depression were measured, including a negative view of self, ‘Overall, how positively did you feel about yourself today’, a negative view of life in general, ‘Thinking of your life in general, how well did things go today?’, and a negative view of the future, ‘How optimistic are you about how your life (in general) will be tomorrow?’ (Nezlek & Allen, 2004). The validity of the modified self-esteem scales and triad measures has been demonstrated in previous studies (Nezlek, 2002; Nezlek & Gable, 2001; Nezlek & Plesko, 2003).

Daily affect was measured using an affective circumplex, crossing positive-negative and active-deactive (Feldman, Barrett & Russell, 1998). Each day, participants were asked to rate four types of affect: positive active affect, how happy, proud, enthusiastic, alert, and excited they were; positive deactive affect, how calm, relaxed, and satisfied they were; negative active affect, how angry, nervous, upset, guilty, afraid, disgusted, and embarrassed they were; and negative deactive affect, how sluggish, sad,
bored, and depressed they were. Participants responded to these items again using a 7-point scale. From these four types of affect, five measures of daily mood were calculated, one for each quadrant of the circumplex and one overall measure. This overall value was computed by subtracting the mean value from the negative affect from the mean value for the positive affect.

Daily events, positive and negative, were measured using the Daily Events Survey (DES; Burtler et al., 1994). The DES was modified to be specifically geared toward collegiate participants, and contained 22 events. For each of these events, participants indicated on a 4-point scale how important the event was: 0 = did not occur, 1 = occurred and not important, 2 = occurred and somewhat important, 4 = occurred and extremely important. Of the 22 events, 10 were negative and 12 were positive. For each participant, a daily average value was calculated for the rated importance of both positive and negative events. Composite scores of event importance were used rather than composite scores of event frequency because they can better account for differences in events importance, whereas frequency counts assumes all events are equally important.

Results

The data were organized into a multilevel structure, with one level of analysis (days) contained within another (people). Similar to the business profitability model discussed earlier, the characteristics of each person are factors at the highest level that are shared by lower level daily data. The hierarchically organized data were organized using the program HLM (Raudenbush, Bryk, Cheong, & Congdon, 2000; Version 5). A series of multilevel analyses were run to analyze the data.
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The two levels of measurement were days and people; each participant provided daily data for a period of two weeks, and measures for days were nested within each participant. The present study was designed to investigate three different sets of individual differences. First, individual differences in daily well-being, daily events, and trait-level measurements were calculated. Second, the individual differences in how daily well-being and daily events interact were calculated. Finally, the individual differences of how trait level measurements affect this interaction were calculated.

The initial within-person coefficients were calculated independent of the effects of higher person-level variables or other daily-level variables. This analysis sought to determine the individual differences in daily and trait level measures. These coefficients were calculated using the equation:

\[ y = \beta_0 + r \]

In this equation, \( y \) is a value of one daily measure for one participant, \( \beta_0 \) is a random coefficient representing the mean of \( y \), and \( r \) represents the error of the measure; the variance of \( r \) represents the within-person variance.

For multilevel modeling, coefficients from one level of analysis are transferred into another. In this case, \( \beta_0 \) is expanded to contain two terms:

\[ \beta_0 = \gamma_{00} + u_0 \]

For this level 2 equation, \( \gamma_{00} \) represents the fixed portion of \( \beta_0 \), and the between-persons mean of the within-person means: the grand mean. The error of \( \beta_0 \) is represented by \( u_0 \), the variance of the means for the between-person measure. The results of these analyses for all of the possible day- and person- level measures are presented in Table 1.

Daily Events and Daily Well-Being
Further analysis was done to determine the nature of the co-variation between daily events and daily well-being. These analyses were done to determine the individual differences in the relevance of positive and negative events on several measures of well-being. This relevance was calculated using the following level 1 equation:

\[ y = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{PosEvent}) + \beta_2(\text{NegEvent}) + r \]

Yet again, \( y \) represents the value of one daily measure for one participant, and \( \beta_0 \) remains a random coefficient that affects the mean score of \( y \). This modified equation contains two random coefficients representing the effect of positive and negative events on a well-being measure \( y \).

Just as before, \( \beta_0, \beta_1, \) and \( \beta_2 \) contain two components, a fixed value and an error term. To determine whether within-person relationships between daily events and daily well-being were significant, the data were analyzed at the person level. The random coefficients were expanded as they were with the within-person coefficients:

Intercept: \[ \beta_0 = \gamma_{00} + u_0 \]
Positive Events: \[ \beta_1 = \gamma_{10} + u_1 \]
Negative Events: \[ \beta_2 = \gamma_{20} + u_2 \]

The intercept in this model contains \( \gamma_{10} \), which again represents the fixed portion of \( \beta_i \), the random coefficient representing the mean of \( y \). For example, using the self-esteem measure, \( \beta_0 \) would constitute a fixed part of the mean. \( \beta_1 \), on the other hand, represents the coefficient that influences the effect of positive events on self-esteem, as \( \beta_2 \) represents the coefficient that influences the effect of negative ones. The relevant part of \( \beta_i \) is the fixed \( \gamma_{10} \) component – the excess variance is represented by \( u_i \), the residual error. Again considering self-esteem as the \( y \) variable, \( \gamma_{10} \) is the coefficient representing the mean effect of positive events variable (PosEvent) on self-esteem. Individual differences in
changes in self-esteem following a positive event are thus represented. The results are summarized in Table 2 for different measures of well-being.

Unsurprisingly, all measures co-varied with positive and negative events; the $\gamma_{10}$ and $\gamma_{20}$ coefficients were significantly different from 0 in all cases ($p < 0.01$). As expected, daily negative events co-varied with measures of negative affect and daily positive events co-varied with measures of positive affect, self-esteem, and the cognitive triad (a sort of reverse scored measure of depression). This level of analysis can be understood in the context of a linear regression, where the $B_1(\text{PosEvent})$ and $B_2(\text{NegEvent})$ are determined by another set of coefficients. These coefficients inside coefficients represent the individual differences in the effect of one measure on another. For example, the mean positive event coefficient for self-esteem was 0.53; for every unit increase of positive events, self-esteem increases by 0.53.

**Emotionality as a Moderator of Event Slopes**

The present study was primarily designed to investigate whether trait-level measurements moderate within-person relationships, specifically, relationships between well-being and reactivity to daily events. The next series of calculations examined the moderating effect of emotionality (trait-level) on the relationship between daily events and daily-well being (within-person). The first hypothesis of the study was that high levels of emotionality would lead to a mean increase in negative daily affect and a mean decrease in positive daily affect. Further, it was predicted that high levels of emotionality would increase the negative effect of adverse daily events on well-being. The Emotionality scale of the HEXACO contains subscales for fearfulness, anxiety, dependence, and sentimentality. To examine these relationships, a modified form of the
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equations used to calculate the mean within-person co-variation of daily events and well-being were used:

\[ y = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{PosEvent}) + \beta_2(\text{NegEvent}) + r \]

Intercept:
\[ \beta_0 = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{Fearfulness}) + \gamma_{02}(\text{Anxiety}) + \gamma_{03}(\text{Dependence}) + \gamma_{04}(\text{Sentimentality}) + u_0 \]
Positive Events:
\[ \beta_1 = \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11}(\text{Fearfulness}) + \gamma_{12}(\text{Anxiety}) + \gamma_{13}(\text{Dependence}) + \gamma_{14}(\text{Sentimentality}) + u_1 \]
Negative Events:
\[ \beta_2 = \gamma_{20} + \gamma_{21}(\text{Fearfulness}) + \gamma_{22}(\text{Anxiety}) + \gamma_{23}(\text{Dependence}) + \gamma_{24}(\text{Sentimentality}) + u_2 \]

For the intercept equation, each \( \gamma_{01-04} \) coefficient represents the relationship between the four subscales of emotionality and mean daily well-being for each person. For example, when \( y = \text{self-esteem} \), \( \gamma_{02} \) is a coefficient that influences the effect of anxiety on mean levels of daily self-esteem. Increased \( \gamma_{02} \) leads to a stronger negative effect of anxiety on mean daily self-esteem.

The \( \gamma_{11-14} \) coefficients partially determine the coefficients which influence the trait variables in the level 1 equation. For example, \( \gamma_{11} \) is a coefficient that affects fearfulness’ influence on the value of \( \beta_1 \), a level 1 coefficient that moderates the effect of positive events on \( y \), a measure of well-being.

Participants who reported higher measures of trait-level anxiety were found to have significantly lower mean levels of daily self-esteem (\( t = 3.74, p < 0.001 \)). The anxiety coefficient, \( \gamma_{12} \), was also found to be negatively related to BDI measures (\( t = 3.85, p < 0.001 \)), as was the fearfulness coefficient, \( \gamma_{11} \) (\( t = 3.06, p < 0.01 \)). Anxiety was also found to be positively related to negative active affect (\( t = 4.58, p < 0.001 \)) and negative deactive affect (\( t = 4.44, p < 0.001 \)). Both anxiety (\( t = 2.31, p < 0.05 \)) and fearfulness (\( t = 2.35, p < 0.05 \)) were found to be negatively related to positive deactive affect. Fearfulness was negatively related to positive active affect (\( t = 2.53, p < 0.05 \)).
Conversely, high levels of sentimentality were found to be significantly predictive of high levels of daily self-esteem ($t = 3.47, p = 0.001$) and high BDI scores ($t = 3.47, p < 0.01$). Sentimentality was also found to reduce the mean level of daily negative active affect ($t = 2.42, p < 0.05$) and negative deactive affect ($t = 3.17, p < 0.01$). High ratings of sentimentality also co-vary with high positive active affect ($t = 2.58, p < 0.01$). The $\gamma_{24}$ coefficient was also shown to be significant ($t = 1.98, p < 0.05$), meaning that for every unit increase of $\gamma_{24}$, the relationship between negative events and positive deactive affect decreases by 0.21.

**Social Support as a Moderator of Event Slopes**

This study also proposed to measure the influence of social support on the relationship between well-being and daily events. It was hypothesized that high levels of perceived social support would lead to a mean increase in negative daily affect and a mean decrease in positive daily affect. Also, perceived social support might serve as a buffer against negative affect following undesirable daily events. This idea was tested using a similar model to the one used to test the role of emotionality in the previous section.

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{PosEvent}) + \beta_2(\text{NegEvent}) + r$$

**Intercept:** $\beta_0 = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{Family Support}) + \gamma_{02}(\text{Friend Support}) + u_0$

**Positive Events:** $\beta_1 = \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11}(\text{Family Support}) + \gamma_{12}(\text{Friend Support}) + u_1$

**Negative Events:** $\beta_2 = \gamma_{20} + \gamma_{21}(\text{Family Support}) + \gamma_{22}(\text{Friend Support}) + u_2$

It was found that increased support from family ($t = 2.03, p < 0.05$) and friends ($t = 2.16, p < 0.05$) leads to higher average ratings of daily self-esteem. Increased support from friends was related to higher scores on cognitive triad measures ($t = 3.06, p < 0.01$) and lower daily negative deactive affect ($t = 2.14, p < 0.05$). Family support was linked
to higher average ratings of positive active affect ($t = 2.24, p < 0.05$). Measures of social support were not found to provide a buffering effect against the impact of negative events, nor were they found to moderate the relationship between positive events and daily well-being.

**Familiarity with the Environment as a Moderator of Event Slopes**

The third hypothesis for the present study concerned the effect of familiarity with the environment on daily events, daily well-being, and the relationship between the two. Familiarity with the environment was operationalized using the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire, which contained subcategories for academic adjustment, social adjustment, personal-emotional adjustment, and a general attachment to college measure. It was hypothesized that increased adjustment to college would serve as a buffer against the ill-effects of negative events on daily mood.

The data were examined in the same manner as was described previously:

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{PosEvent}) + \beta_2(\text{NegEvent}) + r$$

**Intercept:**

$$\beta_0 = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{Academic Adj.}) + \gamma_{02}(\text{Social Adj.}) + \gamma_{03}(\text{PE Adj.}) + \gamma_{04}(\text{Attachment}) + u_0$$

**Positive Events:**

$$\beta_1 = \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11}(\text{Academic Adj.}) + \gamma_{12}(\text{Social Adj.}) + \gamma_{13}(\text{PE Adj.}) + \gamma_{14}(\text{Attachment}) + u_1$$

**Negative Events:**

$$\beta_2 = \gamma_{20} + \gamma_{21}(\text{Academic Adj.}) + \gamma_{22}(\text{Social Adj.}) + \gamma_{23}(\text{PE Adj.}) + \gamma_{24}(\text{Attachment}) + u_2$$

The analyses showed that the intercept coefficient $\gamma_{01}$ for academic adjustment was positively related to mean daily self-esteem outcomes ($t = 1.78, p < 0.05$) and cognitive triad measures ($t = 2.59, p < 0.05$). The social adjustment intercept coefficient, $\gamma_{02}$ was positively related to mean cognitive triad measures. Personal-Emotional Adjustment was also found to be a significant moderator of the mean relationship between daily events and daily well-being; $\gamma_{03}$ was found to be a significantly large coefficient for every
measure of well-being. As expected, personal-emotional adjustment was positively related to self-esteem \( t = 4.16, p < 0.001 \), the cognitive triad \( t = 2.14, p < 0.05 \), positive active affect \( t = 2.25, p < 0.05 \), and positive deactive affect \( t = 3.89, p < 0.001 \). Conversely, personal-emotional adjustment was negatively related to both measures of negative affect: active \( t = 5.36, p < 0.001 \) and deactive \( t = 4.95, p < 0.001 \).

Discussion

The present study arrives at a number of important conclusions. Consistent with previous research, the number of positive daily events was positively related to daily well-being, just as the number of negative daily events was negatively related to it (Affleck et al., 1994; Caspi et al., 1987; DeLongis et al., 1988; Nezlek & Allen, 2004). With regard to the influence of trait-level measures on event reactivity, the results partially supported the primary hypotheses of the study.

The data supported the first hypothesis. Higher levels of perceived social support were associated with an increase in positive affect and a decrease in negative affect. Increased social support was also shown to be significantly related to higher ratings of daily self-esteem. This relationship existed both for support from family and support from friends. This conclusion makes sense; students who have successfully established support networks are likely to have better self-esteem and lower depression (and vice-versa, perhaps).

The notion that high levels of family support are equally beneficial to measures of daily well-being remains inconclusive. Nezlek and Allen (2006) found friend support to be significantly related to self-esteem, but the influence of family support was notably lacking. It was found instead that negative events had a stronger negative effect on well-
being for individuals who perceived having more family support. The present study, on the other hand, found strong relationships between family support and daily ratings of positive active affect. Research findings thus far are conflicted; the role of family support in daily event studies is clearly nuanced. Nezlek and Allen (2006) discussed the possibility of family support stifling students’ newfound independence; they argued that the role social support must be examined within the context it is received. This appears to be the case—other variables may affect how family support influences reactivity to daily events. Controlling for social class, for example, may help explain the process. Independence may be of more importance to freshmen than to upperclassmen. Additionally, personality may moderate the effect of family support on reactivity to daily events. This relationship was not examined in the present study due to restrictions of time and scope, but merits future investigation.

Past research has found that social support networks not only affect mean levels of well-being, but that they also serve as a buffer against undesirable events. This relationship was the second hypothesis of the study. Social support was not found to directly moderate the relationship between any measures of daily well-being and affect. It is possible, however, that social support served as an indirect buffer by increasing daily positive active affect. Research has found that individuals who experience higher ratings of positive affect tend to experience less negative affect (Gunthert et al., 1999). Indeed, social support networks have traditionally been represented in the literature as being associated with reduced negative affect (Cohen & Syme, 1985; Sarason, Sarason, & Pierce, 1990). Similarly, social support and high mean self-esteem were significantly related, and high self-esteem has been consistently shown to moderate the relationship
between negative events and mood (Affleck et al., 1994; Bolger & Schilling, 1991). Thus, the findings of this study reinforce the notion that social support serves as an indirect buffer.

Another important examination undertaken by the present study was one into the role of environment in the moderation of relationships between daily events and daily well-being. It was hypothesized that higher levels of environmental adjustment would be positively associated with reduced emotional reactivity. The present study measured several facets of adjustment, including academic adjustment, social adjustment, behavioral-emotional adjustment, and an attachment measure. In general, environmental adjustment was found to be significantly predictive of higher daily well-being.

Participants reporting higher levels of academic adjustment reported higher levels of self-esteem and lower levels of depression. This finding makes some intuitive sense. Young people in college, particularly those at a relatively good and selective institution, likely define themselves at least in part by their intellectual abilities. High ratings of academic adjustment were tested with performance-based items like “I have been keeping up to date on my academic work”. Successful academic adjustment thus implies successful academic performance, and with high scores, self-concepts of academically motivated young students are reinforced. Research has shown a consistently reinforced (stable) self-concept to be associated with self-esteem and decreased depression just as high (unstable) emotional lability has been shown to be closely related to increased neuroticism and depression. Indeed, some have suggested that the factor unique to depression that is responsible for emotional lability is a weaker and more vulnerable self-concept (Butler et al., 1994; Nezlek & Allen, 2006). If academic adjustment is related to
improved self-concept, these findings are consistent with those in the present study that show high academic adjustment as predictive of higher self-esteem and BDI scores.

Personal-Emotional adjustment co-varied with every measure of daily well-being. Personal-Emotional adjustment was designed to measure psychological and physical adjustment to college, and included items like “I am experiencing a lot of difficulty coping with the stresses imposed upon me in college” and “I haven't been sleeping very well”. Participants scoring highly on this measure were found to have significantly lower levels of depression and daily active and deactive negative affect. Conversely, this measure was positively related to daily self-esteem and both measures of positive affect.

The introductory level courses from which participants were gathered are composed mostly of freshmen, and almost entirely of underclassmen. Personal-Emotional adjustment thus seems to be the most relevant measure for individuals adjusting to a new environment. The personal-emotional adjustment facet also measures emotional lability, with such items as “I haven't been able to control my emotions very well lately” and “I have been getting angry too easily lately”. Viewing personal-emotional adjustment as a sort of emotional stability is consistent with the previous discussion on emotional lability.

The relationship of environmental adjustment and social support with daily well-being is similar, a notion consistent with past research. Both measures tend to be positively associated with self-esteem and negatively associated with negative affect. This also makes sense; how else would social adjustment be operationalized but as related to successful interactions with peers (“I am meeting as many people, and making as many friends as I would like at college”)? Successful interaction with peers lends itself to high ratings of perceived social support from friends. Nezlek (1993) showed that social
interactions and social support networks stabilize over time. Research has shown that familiarity with an environment promotes a cross-situational stability that reduces reactivity to events, particularly to negative ones (Stewart 1982). Unsurprisingly, it has also been shown that familiarity with an environment increases over time, and this familiarity translates into increased resilience to negative events and higher ratings of daily-well being (Nezlek, 2007).

Anxiety, a subscale of emotionality, proved to be significantly related to all but one measure of daily well-being. Participants scoring higher on measures of anxiety scored lower on self-esteem and positive deactive affect, and conversely, scored higher on measures of depression and negative active and deactive affect. Similarly, fearfulness was negatively related to positive active affect and positively related to depression. These findings are consistent with past research (Bolger & Schilling, 1991; Marco & Suls, 1993).

As discussed previously, the Emotionality scale of the HEXACO was designed to be the replacement for the neuroticism measure contained in the B5/FFM. It was argued that the B5/FFM’s neuroticism scale was flawed because of its homogenizing mix of many undesirable characteristics. Supposedly, one of the greatest advantages of the HEXACO was the separation of neuroticism into discrete, yet related, component facets. With this goal in mind, the results of the present study are puzzling. For every measure of daily well-being, sentimentality had a relationship in a direction opposite of other measures. Sentimentality was positively related where anxiety and fearfulness were negatively; with self-esteem, positive active affect, and positive deactive affect. Similarly, the measures with which anxiety and fearfulness were positively related (depression,
negative active/deactive affect) sentimentality was negatively related. Composed of such items as “when someone I know well is unhappy, I can almost feel that person's pain myself” and “when someone close to me is concerned about something, I feel concerned too”, sentimentality seems to be measuring healthy empathy. The results of the present study found that increased distress from danger and increased anxiety in response to stress should not be operationalized within the same factor as a facet largely representative of empathy. More research is needed to conclusively determine the nature of the Emotionality Scale, but the present data suggest that it falls victim to the same homogenizing effects it was created to fix.

One of the greatest advantages of multi-level modeling is the ability to deconstruct relationships between variables. In the case of the present study, the relationship between daily events and well-being was deconstructed to examine whether social support and familiarity with the environment played a significant role. These two factors were not found to have an effect on the relationship between events and well-being. They were, however, found to significantly influence several measures of daily well-being directly. Though the scope of the present study prevents further examination of this relationship, it is possible to speculate. The results show that social support and familiarity with the environment are most frequently associated with, of all the measures of well-being, self-esteem and depression. Research has found that self-evaluation is the most important factor in both of these measures of well-being (Butler et al., 1994; Nezlek & Allen, 2006). In this case, a healthy self-evaluative style would be one characterized by emotional stability and a strong-self concept; an unhealthy self-evaluative style would be characterized by high emotional lability and a weak self-concept. Much of evaluative
style is thus encompassed by emotionality, one of the person-level variables characterized by the intensity and frequency of emotional experience. Emotionality may thus help explain the effects of familiarity with the environment and social support on the measures of well-being. A unifying theme of the present study is the role of emotionality. Parsimony encourages the consideration of its role in the other person- and day-level measures.

This study had several limitations. Like many other daily event studies, the interpretation of the data relies on assumptions of causality. That is, the present study assumed that daily events cause subsequent changes in measures of daily well-being. Since data collection occurs only once daily, it is impossible to disentangle the effect of events from an aggregated measure of daily well-being. An investigation of lagged relationships (events on day \( n \) and states on day \( n + 1 \)) could help clarify a causal relationship (Nezlek & Allen, 2006).

Additionally, unlike more traditional methods, calculating power for multi-level modeling is a process not well understood. It is possible that the lack of moderating effects on the part of the three trait-level variables could be attributable to insufficient statistical power. Future investigation into the theory of multi-level modeling is needed.

Finally, a careful examination of the results showed some participants to have entered unreliable data. Since the data entry process had to be done daily for a period of two weeks, and the researchers had no way of enforcing accurate data entry, it is likely that some participants supplied erroneous responses. Data that yielded highly unlikely systematic results discarded. There is no feasible way to discard the data of participants who answered survey items at random, however. This erroneous data likely had a
negative impact on statistical power, particularly in the case of the measures relying on multi-level modeling.

Despite these shortcomings, the present study meaningfully investigates daily events and well-being. It reinforced the idea that social support and familiarity with an environment are related to mean measures of well-being, particularly to self-esteem and depression. Emotionality’s relationship to both person- and day-level items was explored; moreover, the possibility of the sentimentality facet being relocated was discussed. The present study also examined the role of new environments in daily event reactivity. Though familiarity with the environment was operationalized as adaptation to college, the concept is applicable to other situations as well.
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Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations of Trait Level Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fearfulness</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.421**</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentimentality</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Support</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend Support</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per.-Em.</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Daily Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Between-Person Variance</th>
<th>Within-Person Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive triad</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive events</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative events</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In this and all the following tables, NA, ND, PA, and PD represent daily Negative Active, Negative Deactive, Positive Active, and Positive Deactive moods respectively.
Table 3

Relationships Between Daily Events and Daily Well-Being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Positive Events</th>
<th>Negative Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive triad</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.59**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For this and all other tables, coefficients marked with ** were significantly different from 0 at $p < .01$ or beyond and coefficients marked with * were significant at $p < .05$ or beyond.
Coefficients describing how emotionality moderated relationships between daily events and daily well-being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Measure</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Positive Events</th>
<th>Negative Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>Fearfulness</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>-0.30**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentimentality</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive triad</td>
<td>Fearfulness</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentimentality</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Fearfulness</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentimentality</td>
<td>-0.26*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Fearfulness</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentimentality</td>
<td>-0.34**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Fearfulness</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentimentality</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Fearfulness</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sentimentality</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Coefficients Describing How Social Support Moderated Relationships Between Daily Events and Daily Well-Being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Measure</th>
<th>Type of Support</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Positive Events</th>
<th>Negative Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive triad</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Coefficients describing how familiarity with the environment moderated relationships between daily events and daily well-being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Measure</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Positive Events</th>
<th>Negative Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal-Emotional</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive triad</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal-Emotional</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal-Emotional</td>
<td>-0.45**</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal-Emotional</td>
<td>-0.36**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal-Emotional</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal-Emotional</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 1: Emotionality Factor of the HEXACO Personality Inventory

Fearfulness Facet

1. I would feel afraid if I had to travel in bad weather conditions.
2. Where physical pain is involved, I'm a very tough person.
3. It doesn't bother me to get some bumps and bruises.
4. I don't mind doing jobs that involve dangerous work.
5. People say that I am a fearless person.
6. I would avoid any sport that involves a high risk of physical injury.
7. When it comes to physical danger, I am very fearful.
8. Even in an emergency I wouldn't feel like panicking.

Anxiety Facet

1. I sometimes can't help worrying about little things.
2. I often find myself lying awake in bed and worrying about something.
3. If I were a parent, I would probably tend to worry a lot about my children.
4. I worry a lot less than most people do.
5. Sometimes I feel nervous without really knowing why.
6. I rarely, if ever, have trouble sleeping due to stress or anxiety.
7. I tend to remain calm even when other people get stressed out.
8. I get very anxious when waiting to hear about an important decision.

Dependence Facet

1. I rely a great deal on other people when I feel depressed.
2. Without the emotional support of other people, I sometimes feel helpless.
3. When I suffer from a painful experience, I need someone to make me feel comfortable.
4. I can tough it out on my own through any kind of personal hardship.
5. When I have a problem, I like to get advice from others.
6. I can handle difficult situations without needing emotional support from anyone else.
7. Whenever I feel worried about something, I want to share my concern with another person.
8. I rarely discuss my problems with other people.
### Sentimentality Facet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel like crying when I see other people crying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>When someone I know well is unhappy, I can almost feel that person's pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I feel strong emotions when someone close to me is going away for a long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I don't understand why some people get so emotional at weddings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>When someone close to me is concerned about something, I feel concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>People sometimes say that I am not sensitive to others' feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I remain unemotional even in situations where most people get very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I sometimes get quite sentimental when thinking about people and places I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>used to know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 2: Student Adjustment to College Questionnaire (SACQ)

Academic Adjustment

3. I have been keeping up to date on my academic work.
5. I know why I'm in college and what I want out of it.
6. I am finding academic work at college difficult.
10. I have not been functioning well during examinations.
13. I am satisfied with the level at which I am performing academically.
17. I'm not working as hard as I should at my course work.
19. My academic goals and purposes are well defined.
21. I'm not really smart enough for the academic work I am expected to be doing now.
23. Getting a college degree is very important to me.
25. I haven't been very efficient in the use of study time lately.
27. I enjoy writing papers for courses.
29. I really haven't had much motivation for studying lately.
32. Lately I have been having doubts regarding the value of a college education.
36. I am satisfied with the number and variety of courses available at college.
39. Recently I have had trouble concentrating when I try to study.
41. I'm not doing well enough academically for the amount of work I put in.
43. I am satisfied with the quality or the caliber of courses available at college.
44. I am attending classes regularly.
50. I am enjoying my academic work at college.
52. I am having a lot of trouble getting started on homework assignments.
54. I am satisfied with my program of courses for this semester/quarter.
58. Most of the things I am interested in are not related to any of my course work at college.
62. I am very satisfied with the professors I have now in my courses.
66. I'm quite satisfied with my academic situation at college.

Social Adjustment

1. I feel that I fit in well as part of the college environment.
4. I am meeting as many people, and making as many friends as I would like at college.
8. I am very involved with social activities in college.
9. I am adjusting well to college.
14. I have had informal, personal contacts with college professors.
16. I am pleased now about my decision to attend this college in particular.
18. I have several close social ties at college.
22. Lonesomeness for home is a source of difficulty for me now.
26. I enjoy living in a college dormitory. (Please omit if you do not live in a dormitory; any university housing should be regarded as a dormitory.)
30. I am satisfied with the extracurricular activities available at college.
33. I am getting along very well with my roommate(s) at college. (Please omit if you do not have a roommate.)
37. I feel that I have enough social skills to get along well in the college setting.
42. I am having difficulty feeling at ease with other people at college.
46. I am satisfied with the extent to which I am participating in social activities at college.
Reactions to Daily Events

48. I haven't been mixing too well with the opposite sex lately.
51. I have been feeling lonely a lot at college lately.
56. I feel I am very different from other students at college in ways that I don't like.
57. On balance, I would rather be home than here.
63. I have some good friends or acquaintances at college with whom I can talk about any problems I may have.
65. I am quite satisfied with my social life at college.

Personal-Emotional Adjustment

2. I have been feeling tense or nervous lately.
7. Lately I have been feeling blue and moody a lot.
11. I have felt tired much of the time lately.
12. Being on my own, taking responsibility for myself, has not been easy.
20. I haven't been able to control my emotions very well lately.
24. My appetite has been good lately.
28. I have been having a lot of headaches lately.
31. I’ve given a lot of thought lately to whether I should ask for help from the Psychological/Counseling Services Center or from a psychotherapist outside of college.
35. I've put on (or lost) too much weight recently.
38. I have been getting angry too easily lately.
40. I haven't been sleeping very well.
45. Sometimes my thinking gets muddled up too easily.
49. I worry a lot about my college expenses.
55. I have been feeling in good health lately.
64. I am experiencing a lot of difficulty coping with the stresses imposed upon me in college.

Attachment

15. I am pleased now about my decision to go to college.
16. I am pleased now about my decision to attend this college in particular.
34. I wish I were at another college or university.
47. I expect to stay at this college for a bachelor's degree.
53. I feel I have good control over my life situation at college.
59. Lately I have been giving a lot of thought to transferring to another college.
60. Lately I have been giving a lot of thought to dropping out of college altogether and for good.
61. I find myself giving considerable thought to taking time off from college and finishing later.
67. I feel confident that I will be able to deal in a satisfactory manner with future challenges here at college.
Item 3: Daily Measure of Cognitive Triad

1. Overall, how positively did you think about yourself today?
   1=very negatively
   2=negatively
   3=somewhat negatively
   4=neither negatively nor positively
   5=somewhat positively
   6=positively
   7=very positively

2. Thinking of your life in general, how well did things go today?
   1=very poorly
   2=poorly
   3=somewhat poorly
   4=neither poorly nor well
   5=somewhat well
   6=well
   7=very well

3. How optimistic are you about how your life (in general) will be tomorrow?
   1=very pessimistic
   2=pessimistic
   3=somewhat pessimistic
   4=neither pessimistic nor optimistic
   5=somewhat optimistic
   6=optimistic
   7=very optimistic
Item 4: Modified Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and characteristics.

Please read each statement and consider the extent to which you agree or disagree AT THIS MOMENT. All responses will be kept confidential, so please answer as honestly as possible. Remember, base your responses on the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement AT THIS MOMENT.

[SCALE IS 1 TO 7, 7=STRONGLY DISAGREE]

___ 3. All in all, I am inclined to feel like a failure. REVERSE
___ 6. I take a positive attitude toward myself. REVERSE
___ 7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
___ 10. At times I think I am no good at all.
___ 13. Did something special for a friend/steady date which was appreciated.
___ 14. Flirted with someone or arranged a date.
___ 15. Got caught up (or ahead) in coursework or work duties.
___ 16. Got along poorly with peers (e.g., classmates, co-workers, roommates).
___ 17. Failed to meet a daily fitness goal.
___ 18. Classmate, teacher, co-worker, or friend complimented me on my abilities.
___ 19. Went out to eat with a friend/date
___ 20. Tried to do homework and couldn’t understand it.
___ 21. Did well on a school or work task (e.g. test, assignment, job duty).
___ 22. Had plans fall through to spend time with someone special.
___ 23. Had other type of pleasant event (not listed above) with friends, family, or date.
___ 24. Had other type of unpleasant event (not listed above) with friends, family, or date.
___ 25. Had other type of pleasant event (not listed above) concerning performance at school, work, or another activity.
___ 26. Had other type of unpleasant event (not listed above) concerning school work, or another activity.
Item 5: Daily Event Schedule

A series of events that commonly occur in the lives of students will follow. Please read each carefully. Some of the events may have occurred in your life today, some may not have occurred today. If the event did NOT occur today, enter '0'.

If the event did occur today, rate how important it was to you using the following scale:

1 = Not important  
2 = Somewhat important  
3 = Pretty important  
4 = Extremely important

1. Had especially good interactions with friend(s) or acquaintances.  
2. Completed work on an interesting project or assignment.  
3. Did poorly on schoolwork task (e.g. test, assignment, job duty).  
4. Did something awkward or embarrassing in a social situation.  
5. Was excluded or left out by my group of friends.  
6. Fell behind in coursework or duties.  
7. Went out socializing with friends/date (e.g. party, dance club).  
8. Met a daily fitness goal  
9. Had especially good interactions with my steady date.  
10. Performed well (sports, music, speaking, drama, etc.).  
11. A disagreement with a close friend or steady date was left unresolved.  
12. Classmate, teacher, co-worker, or friend criticized me on my abilities.
Item 6: Mood/Affect PANAS mood

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Indicate to what extent YOU HAVE FEELT THIS WAY TODAY. Keep the following scale in mind as you rate each word:

[SCALE IS 1 TO 7, 1 – not at all, 7 = very much]

1. ___ enthusiastic
2. ___ energetic
3. ___ happy
4. ___ satisfied
5. ___ calm
6. ___ relaxed
7. ___ quiet
8. ___ still
9. ___ sleepy
10. ___ sluggish
11. ___ sad
12. ___ disappointed
13. ___ nervous
14. ___ afraid
15. ___ surprised
16. ___ aroused
17. ___ active
18. ___ alert
19. ___ proud
20. ___ joy
21. ___ amused
22. ___ tired
23. ___ bored
24. ___ ashamed
25. ___ guilty
26. ___ angry
27. ___ disgusted
28. ___ embarrassed
29. ___ interested
30. ___ upset