

# THE GERMAN MAXIMIZING TENDENCY SCALE - TRANSLATION, VALIDATION AND RELATIONSHIP WITH BEHAVIORAL MEASURES FROM GERMAN CONSUMERS

**Timo KIENZLER**, Ph.D.

Hochschule Pforzheim, Fakultät für Wirtschaft und Recht

E-mail: timo.kienzler@hs-pforzheim.de

## **Abstract**

*In this paper, German translations of the Maximizing Tendency Scale (MTS-7, Dalal et al., 2015) and the Alternative Search Scale of the Maximization Inventory (MI-AS, Turner et al., 2012) were tested for their internal consistency and validity. With a student sample of 99 and a population sample of 348, the scales' psychometric properties measuring maximizing following the two-component maximizing model are shown. Further, a hypothetical information search task and a meaningful choice task (with real-world consequences for the participants) were utilized to investigate the relationship between maximizing and consumer behavior. The translated scales show good psychometric properties, while the behavioral measures showed no linear relationship with maximizing tendencies. Future research should further investigate behavioral differences between maximizing and satisficing consumers.*

**Keywords:** tendency, behavior, consumers

**JEL Classification:** D19

## **1. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

Twenty years ago, Schwartz et al. (2002) first reported that consumers always want to have the best. Unlike satisficers who are content if they find a good enough option, so-called maximizers will not settle but always seek the best possible option.

The construct's definition has changed in the past two decades, and many scales for measuring maximizing tendencies have been developed (Cheek & Goebel, 2020). In earlier conceptualizations, regret with the made choices was seen as closely connected to maximizing behavior (Schwartz et al., 2002) or by some researchers even defined as part of the maximizing construct (Richardson et al., 2014). It was believed that maximizers became miserable because of their urge to have the best. However, regret and dissatisfaction are no longer seen as part of the construct. According to Ma and Roese (2014), maximizers are only susceptible to negative consequences if it becomes clear that they did not choose the best available option.

Instead, maximizing is nowadays defined by the goal of having the best and alternative search and comparison strategy to achieve this goal (Cheek & Schwartz, 2016). This conceptualization is called the two-component model of maximizing. Cheek and Schwartz (2016) recommend measuring the goal factor with the 7-Item Maximizing Tendency Scale (MTS-7, Dalal et al., 2015) and the second component, searching strategically for the best option, with the Alternative Search Scale of the Maximization Inventory (MI-AS, Turner et al., 2012).

Although this two-component model of maximizing helps to clarify the vast jungle of different conceptualizations, there are still many questions to be answered about the phenomenon.

### **1.1. THE PRESENT RESEARCH**

As maximizing is an individual difference that plays a special role in the consumer decision domain (Kokkoris, 2019), the question arises as to whether maximizing behavior differs between cultures. Although there are empirical works for a variety of countries like the United States (Schwartz et al., 2002), Italy (Misuraca & Fasolo, 2018), Japan (Oishi et al., 2014), and Germany (Greifeneder & Betsch, 2006), most of the research was done based on definitions other than the two-component model.

This article will contribute to the cultural context of maximizing theory. The below presented German versions of the 7-Item Maximizing Tendency Scale (MTS-7-G) and the Alternative Search Scale of the Maximization Inventory

(MI-AS-G) are two psychometric instruments developed for measuring maximizing following the two-component model in German-speaking populations.

The main research objectives were the following:

1. Testing the internal consistency of the two scales
2. Examining the validity of the two scales by comparing their psychometric properties to established scales measuring similar or contrasting constructs
3. Investigate the relationship between maximizing measured through the translated scales and consumer behavior?

The MTS-7-G and the MI-AS-G were thus tested for their internal consistency and validity in two studies. In Study 1, a student sample was used to test the validity of the scales through correlational analysis with constructs that, according to past studies, stand in convergent and discriminant relation to maximizing. The participants also completed two tasks providing information about the decision-making behavior of maximizers and satisficers in consumer choice situations. In Study 2, a larger population sample was utilized to verify the results of Study 1. Participants completed the same measures and tasks as Study 1, with only slight adaptations.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### 2.1. TRANSLATION

The author translated the items of the MTS-7 and the MI-AS from English into German. At the same time, the two scales were translated by a professional translation expert. When comparing the two independent translations, no major discrepancies were apparent. In two cases, the original wording of the items did not translate well. Thus the formulation was slightly changed (the two items are in italics in Table 1: Original and translated items).

**Table 1. Original and translated items**

Scale	Items
MTS-7	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I do not like having to settle for good enough.</li> <li>2. <i>I am a maximizer.</i></li> <li>3. No matter what I do, I have the highest standards for myself.</li> <li>4. I will wait for the best option, no matter how long it takes.</li> <li>5. I never settle for second best.</li> <li>6. I never settle.</li> <li>7. No matter what it takes, I always try to choose the best thing.</li> </ol>
MTS-7 German Version	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ich mag es nicht, mich mit „gut genug“ zufrieden geben zu müssen.</li> <li>2. <i>Ich will generell das Maximale rausholen.</i></li> <li>3. Ganz gleich was ich tue, ich stelle die höchsten Ansprüche.</li> <li>4. Ich warte stets auf die beste Alternative, egal wie lange es dauert.</li> <li>5. Ich lasse mich nie auf die zweitbeste Wahl ein.</li> <li>6. Ich gebe mich nie zufrieden.</li> <li>7. Ich versuche immer das Beste auszuwählen, koste es was es wolle.</li> </ol>
MI-AS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I cannot come to a decision unless I have carefully considered all of my options.</li> <li>2. I take time to read the whole menu when dining out.</li> <li>3. I will usually continue shopping for an item until it reaches all of my criteria.</li> <li>4. I usually continue to search for an item until it reaches my expectations.</li> <li>5. When shopping, I plan on spending time looking for something.</li> <li>6. When shopping, if I cannot find exactly what I am looking for, I will continue to search for it.</li> <li>7. I find myself going to many different stores before finding what I want.</li> <li>8. When shopping for something, I do not mind spending several hours looking for it.</li> <li>9. I take the time to consider all alternatives before deciding.</li> <li>10. When I see something I want, I always try to find the best deal before purchasing it.</li> <li>11. If a store does not have exactly what I am shopping for, I will go somewhere else.</li> <li>12. <i>I will not decide until I am comfortable with the process.</i></li> </ol>
MI-AS German Version	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ich kann keine Entscheidung treffen, solange ich nicht sorgfältig alle meine Optionen durchdacht habe.</li> <li>2. Wenn ich essen gehe, nehme ich mir Zeit die gesamte Speisekarte zu lesen.</li> <li>3. Wenn ich eine Sache kaufen möchte, suche ich meistens solange danach, bis ich das finde, was alle meine Kriterien erfüllt.</li> <li>4. Für gewöhnlich suche ich solange nach einer Sache, bis sie meine Erwartungen erfüllt.</li> <li>5. Beim Einkaufen plane ich eine Menge Zeit ein, um nach Dingen zu suchen.</li> <li>6. Wenn ich einkaufen gehe und nicht genau das finde, was ich suche, dann suche ich weiter danach.</li> <li>7. Es kommt vor, dass ich viele verschiedene Geschäfte aufsuche, bevor ich das finde, was ich suche.</li> <li>8. Wenn ich etwas kaufen möchte, macht es mir nichts aus, mehrere Stunden danach zu suchen.</li> <li>9. Ich nehme mir die Zeit alle Optionen zu durchdenken, bevor ich eine Entscheidung treffe.</li> <li>10. Wenn ich etwas sehe, das ich haben möchte, versuche ich immer das beste Angebot zu finden, bevor ich es kaufe.</li> <li>11. Wenn ein Geschäft nicht genau das hat was ich kaufen möchte, gehe ich woanders hin.</li> <li>12. <i>Ich treffe keine Entscheidung, mit der ich mich nicht wohl fühle.</i></li> </ol>

**Source:** authors

## 2.2. VALIDATION

Their convergent and discriminant validity was tested to estimate the quality of the translated scales. Convergent validity was assessed using the theoretically positively correlated perfectionism and rational decision style (Cheek & Goebel, 2020). For the discriminant validity, the constructs of intuitive decision style and agreeableness (Dalal et al., 2015) were chosen, which should be negatively and not at all correlated to the two target scales, respectively. Additionally, behavioral measures were gathered using an information search and a choice task.

### Convergent validity

The construct of maximizing is associated with personality traits typical for people who have strong ambitions and set high goals. As was shown by Cheek and Goebel (2020), perfectionism correlates positively with maximizing, as measured by the MTS-7 and the MI-AS. To validate the German versions, the multidimensional perfectionism cognitions inventory (MPCI-G-R, Prestele & Altstötter-Gleich, 2019) was chosen. The MPCI-G-R consists of three subscales, namely Personal Standards Cognitions (PSK), Concern over Mistakes Cognitions (CMK), and Pursuit of Perfection Cognitions (PPK). It is expected that maximizing will correlate well with the PSK and the PPK as these are in line with the two-component model of maximizing defined by Cheek and Schwartz (2016), where the consumer wants the best (PSK) and tries to achieve it by searching and comparing (PPK) for it. However, the negative facet of the CMK, on the other hand, should not correlate highly with the MTS-7-G and the MI-AS-G.

The Rational and Intuitive Decision Styles Scale (RIDSS, Hamilton et al., 2016) consists of an intuitive and a rational decision style component. A high score on the rational subscale should correlate positively with the MTS-7 and the MI-AS (Cheek & Goebel, 2020; Dalal et al., 2015).

### Discriminant validity

In contrast to the rational subscale, the intuitive decision style subscale of the RIDSS represents a construct that should negatively correlate with the MTS-7 and the MI-AS. Additionally, the German version of the agreeableness scale of the Big Five Inventory 2 (BFI-2, Danner et al., 2019) was used to assess dis-

criminant validity further. As Dalal et al. (2015) proposed, agreeableness is an independent personality trait theorized not to be related to maximizing. Therefore, the translated scales should not correlate with the agreeableness items.

## Behavioral measures

Besides the convergent and discriminant validity measures, two tasks were used to gather behavioral measures. The first task was an information search task, and the second task was a choice task.

### Information search task

The task was adapted from Ferrari and Dovidio (2001) and Dalal et al. (2015). In the task, the subjects had to acquire information about different options by uncovering cells containing information about the attributes of the options. The choice set consisted of five hotels described by six attributes. In order to assess if maximizers can find the best option more often than satisficers, a dominant option was implemented. Furthermore, to stronger take after the real-life process of an online search, the attribute information within the task did not stay uncovered. This was to simulate opening and closing product websites to acquire information about different products.

The number and order of uncovered information were used as indicators for information demand and search strategy. Information demand was measured through the number of at least once uncovered attributes (observed attributes) and the number of totally uncovered attributes (click-score; this includes attributes that were clicked on and thus uncovered multiple times).

A strategic search score measured the search strategy. The number of interdimensional transitions (looking at each attribute of an option) and interdimensional transitions (comparing options on an attribute) was counted for this score. The difference between values was calculated and divided by the total number of transitions, resulting in values up to +1 for perfect interdimensional search and -1 for perfect interdimensional search. Since both approaches can be seen as strategic behavior, the absolute values were taken as strategic search scores. A score close to 0 stands for random search behavior and 1 for strategic search behavior (Dalal et al., 2015).

Because a central aspect of maximizing is seeking out and comparing alternatives. It is expected that maximizers will observe more attributes and use more clicks to compare the options more thoroughly. Further, because maximizers want to have the best available option, they will likely apply a systematic comparison process resulting in a higher strategic search score.

### **Choice task**

For the choice task, participants had to look at five well-known restaurant brands and then choose one. After they made their choice, they had the chance to look at an additional set of five restaurants two more times and had the opportunity to switch to one of the new options. This task design was identical to the one used by Dalal et al. (2015). To make the task meaningful, the selection of the restaurant was connected to the chance of winning one of three €30 coupons for the selected restaurant.

The recorded behavioral measures were the total amount of time spent considering the available options (dwell-time), the number of seen options (observed restaurants), and the number of switches between selected restaurants (option switches). Since maximizers are looking for the best available option, it is hypothesized that they will look longer and at more restaurant options than satisficers. Because satisficers are content with a good enough option, it seems more likely that maximizers who want to have the best option will switch to a later presented option.

## **3. STUDY 1 – STUDENT SAMPLE**

### **3.1. PROCEDURE AND SAMPLE**

Study 1 was conducted as an online questionnaire. Participants were recruited from a German university student panel. One hundred sixty-two questionnaires were completed, of which four were excluded because of missing data. Fifty-nine were removed after applying strict data cleaning steps. Namely, a control question for random answering behavior and the calculation of Mahalanobis distances to control for multivariate outliers. The final sample consisted of a total of 99 cases. The average age of participants was 23 years ( $SD = 2.91$ ) and 70.7% identified as female while 29.3% identified as male.

### 3.2. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

Test on the internal consistency of the translated scales yielded satisfactory results with a Cronbach's Alpha of .76 for the MTS-7-G and .80 for the MI-AS-G in the student sample. Removing the item "*Ich gebe mich nie zufrieden / I never settle*" of the MTS-7 would have resulted in a slightly higher alpha value (.77). The same goes for the item "*Wenn ich essen gehe nehme ich mir Zeit die gesamte Speisekarte zu lesen / I take time to read the whole menu when dining out*" of the MI-AS which would have raised alpha to .82.

As expected, perfectionism measured using the MPCGI-G-R correlated with the two translated scales (for the exact results, see Table 3). The convergent validity is supported by the subscales PSK and PPK, while the discriminant validity is shown through the non-significant correlations with the CMK subscale. As predicted, the rational decision style scale of the RIDSS correlates positively with the MTS-7-G and the MI-AS-G.

Although the intuitive decision style scale correlates negatively with both the MTS-7-G and the MI-AS-G, none of the results reached any significance level. The Agreeableness scale of the Big Five inventory was expected not to correlate with any of the two translations, which is supported by the gathered data.

While the psychometric scales support the theorized connections, analyses showed no significant positive correlation between the strategic search score and the two scales. Furthermore, none of the other measures support the expected relations. Although there are slightly positive correlations between maximizing and the number of observed restaurants, these results do not reach significance.

When dividing the sample into maximizer and satisficer through a median split of the MTS-7 score, no imminent difference arrives from the values of the information search task. Schwartz et al. (2002) wrote that their goal is to have the best, and the extensive search strategy maximizers would achieve better outcomes than satisficers. However, when comparing the percentage of maximizers who identified the dominant option in the information search task, no clear difference to satisficers is apparent.



**Table 2.** Results for identifying the dominant option in the information search task

Tendency	Dominant option found	
	Student sample	Population sample
Maximizer	93.8%	73.1%
Satisficer	88.2%	73.9%

Source: authors

### 3.3. DISCUSSION

Overall, the MTS-7-G and the MI-AS-G have good psychometric properties. Both scales show the expected relationships with the utilized instruments regarding the convergent and discriminant validity.

Unlike hypothesized, there are no significant behavioral differences between maximizers and satisficers. One explanation for this could be the homogeneity of the sample because all participants were students their university education might have influenced their information search behavior. Another explanation for the results of the information search task could be the difficulty. Because 90.9% of all participants chose the dominant option, it might be that the dominant option was too easily identifiable. Thus no extensive comparison process was needed to identify the best option.

A slightly adapted second study was conducted, which used a larger population sample to verify the results of the first study and see if a different picture for the behavioral measures would arrive with a more heterogenetic group.

## 4. STUDY 2 – POPULATION SAMPLE

### 4.1. PROCEDURE AND SAMPLE

The study design was the same as Study 1 but had two minor differences. The first change was that three of the restaurant options, which were well-known among the student population of Study 1 but local brands, were switched to better-known options in the overall German population. The second change was that the difficulty of identifying the dominant option in the information search task was raised by changing the options to be more like, making the dominant option stand out less.

The second sample consisted of participants drawn from the German public. The participants were recruited from a panel provider and participated through an online questionnaire. Of the 402 completed questionnaires, seven were excluded because of missing data. Because of strict data cleaning steps (a control question and calculation of Mahalanobis distances), further 47 cases were removed, leaving a final sample of 348 cases. Participants' average age was 31 years ( $SD = 10.26$ ). Of the 348 participants, 49.1% identified as female, 48.9% as male, and 1.7% as non-binary, while 0.3% did not disclose this information.

#### 4.2. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

The internal consistency of the two instruments was once again good and even exceeded the values of the student sample. Cronbach's Alpha was .87 for the MTS-7-G and .86 for the MI-AS-G in the population sample. Removal of the item "*Wenn ich essen gehe nehme ich mir Zeit die gesamte Speisekarte zu lesen / I take time to read the whole menu when dining out*" of the MI-AS-G would have slightly increased the alpha value to .87 in the population sample.

The second sample mostly confirms the results of the first sample. Both scales correlate with the perfectionism measure. The PSK subscale shows a moderate to strong and the PPK subscale a strong positive correlation. However, unlike in sample one, the CMK subscale shows for both translated scales a moderate positive relationship.

The rational subscale of the RIDSS shows similar positive relationships to the MTS-7-G and the MI-AS-G. In contrast, the intuitive subscale confirms the weakly negative but non-significant correlations. The agreeableness scale of the BFI shows no linear relationship to any of the two translated scales again.

There are almost no correlations between the translated scales and the behavioral measures, which reach a significance level. Only the MI-AS-G and the strategic search score show a weak positive linear relationship.

**Table 3.** Results of correlation analyses

Correlate	MTS-7			ASS-12			
	Prediction	Study 1 (n=99)	Study 2 (n=348)	Prediction	Study 1 (n=99)	Study 2 (n=348)	
<b>Personality Traits</b>							
MPCI-G-R	+	.34**	.54**	+	.24*	.36**	
	PSK	+	.40**	.43**	+	.22*	.27**
	CMK	0	.06	.33**	0	.12	.19**
	PPK	+	.34**	.55**	+	.21*	.42**
RIDSS							
	Rational	+	.31**	.35**	+	.50**	.46**
	Intuitive	-	-.17	-.01	-	-.13	-.08
BFI-V	0	-.03	-.04	0	-.07	.06	
<b>Behavioral Measures</b>							
Click-Score	+	-.10	.03	+	-.11	.03	
Strategic Search Score	+	-.15	.07	+	-.05	.11*	
Observed Attributes	+	-.18	.02	+	-.21*	.02	
Dwell-time	+	-.08	.03	+	.02	-.01	
Observed (Restaurants)	+	.09	.01	+	.04	.04	
Option Switches	+	.06	-.02	+	.07	.02	
Note. + = hypothesized positive relationship; - = hypothesized negative relationship; 0 = no relationship hypothesized; *p < .05; **p < .01.							

**Source:** authors

Raising the difficulty of identifying the dominant option in Study 2 was successful since, as can be seen in Table 2, a smaller fraction of participants identified the dominant option. However, there is again no significant difference between maximizers and satisficers.

#### 4.3. DISCUSSION

Removal of the item “*Wenn ich essen gehe nehme ich mir Zeit die gesamte Speisearte zu lesen / I take time to read the whole menu when dining out*” of the MI-AS would slightly increase the alpha value in both samples. One reason for this result could be the ongoing pandemic because of Covid-19. Because of legal restrictions, restaurant visits and dining out rarely happened in the time before data acquisition, which might make the item less relatable. Because the value changes would

only be minuscule, the overall good alpha values and the described circumstance removal of the item seem not justified.

**Table 4.** Cronbach's Alpha for the German versions of MTS-7 and MI-AS

Scale	Items	Alpha value Student sample	Alpha value population sample
MTS-7	7	.761	.869
MI-AS	12	.804	.865

**Source:** authors

## 5. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Convergent and discriminant validity of the German versions of the MTS-7 and MI-AS are given. Both samples show the predicted relationships with the utilized personality measures. As expected, perfectionism and a rational decision style correlate positively with the goal (MTS-7-G) and strategy (MI-AS-G) aspects of maximizing. In contrast, the two discriminant measures, intuitive decision style, and agreeableness show no linear relationships.

Unexpected was the positive relationship between the CMK subscale and the maximizing measure found in the second sample, which was not found in the first sample. Since sample one was a student sample and sample two, a population sample age was tested as a confounder. With a correlation coefficient  $r$  of .31 for the relationship between the CMK and the MTS-7-G and a coefficient  $r$  of .19 for the MI-AS-G, the partial correlations show almost the same values as the standard correlations. Therefore, only small or no confounding through age is present.

Unlike hypothesized, there were no significant behavioral differences between maximizers and satisficers, which is in line with Dalal et al. (2015). However, it raises questions about the self-assessment and real-life behavior of maximizers. Especially items of the MI-AS like *"I cannot come to a decision unless I have carefully considered all of my options."* and *"I take the time to consider all alternatives before making a decision."* speak for a higher number of observed options and a longer search duration. However, reports of such behavior have been mostly gathered through self-reports (Iyengar & Lepper, 2000; Schwartz

et al., 2002), which might hint toward a divergence between self-perception and the actual behavior of maximizers.

## 6. LIMITATION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Though the present research included students and people from the general public as participants, the results should still be validated with the help of representative samples of German-speaking populations.

Future research should further investigate behavioral correlates of maximizing tendencies. The results of the behavioral measures which support the findings of Dalal et al. (2015) stand in steep contrast to the behavior expected of maximizers. Although different tasks and measures, some of them were utilized even with real-life consequences from the decision outcomes, the consequences might not have been important enough to maximize behavior. Thus, coming designs should incorporate behavioral data gathered from actual decision situations of maximizers and correlate it with psychometric measures for maximizing.

Additionally, as other studies have shown, status (Weaver et al., 2015) and social comparison (Schwartz et al., 2002) are important factors for maximizers. Future research should investigate if perceptual factors could play a role in the self-assessment of maximizers since “maximizers may take the outcomes of decisions as evidence about how smart, shrewd, or discerning they are as choosers” (Schwartz et al., 2002) and therefore could perceive their decision-making process as more effortful than it objectively is.

## REFERENCES

- Cheek, N. N. & Goebel, J. (2020). What does it mean to maximize? Decision difficulty, indecisiveness, and the jingle-jangle fallacies in the measurement of maximizing. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 15(1), pp. 7–24.
- Cheek, N. N. & Schwartz, B. (2016). On the meaning and measurement of maximization. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 11(2), pp. 126–146.
- Dalal, D. K., Diab, D. L., Zhu, X. S. & Hwang, T. (2015). Understanding the Construct of Maximizing Tendency: A Theoretical and Empirical Evaluation. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 28(5), pp. 437–450.
- Danner, D., Rammstedt, B., Bluemke, M., Lechner, C., Berres, S., Knopf, T., Soto, C. J. & John, O. P. (2019). Das Big Five Inventar 2. *Diagnostica*, 65(3), pp. 121–132.

- Ferrari, J. R. & Dovidio, J. F. (2001). Behavioral information search by indecisives. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30(7), pp. 1113–1123.
- Greifeneder, R. & Betsch, C. (2006). Lieber die Taube auf dem Dach! *Zeitschrift Für Sozialpsychologie*, 37(4), pp. 233–243.
- Hamilton, K., Shih, S.-I. & Mohammed, S. (2016). The Development and Validation of the Rational and Intuitive Decision Styles Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 98(5), pp. 523–535.
- Iyengar, S. S. & Lepper, M. R. (2000). When choice is demotivating: Can one desire too much of a good thing? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(6), pp. 995–1006.
- Kokkoris, M. D. (2019). Maximizing without borders: Evidence that maximizing transcends decision domains. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, pp. 2664.
- Ma, J. & Roese, N. J. (2014). The Maximizing Mind-Set. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41(1), pp. 71–92.
- Misuraca, R. & Fasolo, B. (2018). Maximizing versus satisficing in the digital age: Disjoint scales and the case for “construct consensus”. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 121, pp. 152–160.
- Oishi, S., Tsutsui, Y., Eggleston, C. & Galinha, I. C. (2014). Are maximizers unhappier than satisficers? A comparison between Japan and the USA. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 49, pp. 14–20.
- Prestele, E. & Altstötter-Gleich, C. (2019). Testgüte einer deutschen Version des Mehrdimensionalen Perfektionismus Kognitions-Inventars (MPCI-G). *Diagnostica*, 65(1), pp. 14–25.
- Richardson, C. M.E., Ye, H. J., Ege, E., Suh, H. & Rice, K. G. (2014). Refining the measurement of maximization: Gender invariance and relation to psychological well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 70, pp. 229–234.
- Schwartz, B., Ward, A., Monterosso, J., Lyubomirsky, S., White, K. & Lehman, D. R. (2002). Maximizing versus satisficing: Happiness is a matter of choice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(5), pp. 1178–1197.
- Turner, B. M., Rim, H. B., Betz, N. E. & Nygren, T. E. (2012). The Maximization Inventory. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 7(1), 48–60.
- Weaver, K., Daniloski, K., Schwarz, N. & Cottone, K. (2015). The role of social comparison for maximizers and satisficers: Wanting the best or wanting to be the best? *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 25(3), pp. 372–388.

## APPENDIX

Below listed are the utilized psychometric instruments. Because both samples were German-speaking, only the German versions of the scales were used, and the English Version of the scales is listed to accommodate non-German-speaking readers.

<p><b>Mehrdimensionalen Perfektionismus Kognitions-Inventars (MPCI-G-R)</b>          Prestele, E. &amp; Altstötter-Gleich, C. (2019). Testgüte einer deutschen Version des Mehrdimensionalen Perfektionismus Kognitions-Inventars (MPCI-G). <i>Diagnostica</i>, 65(1), pp. 14–25.</p>
<p><b>Personal Standards Kognitionen (PSK)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Je höher mein Ziel, desto besser.</li> <li>2. Mir hohe Standards zu setzen, ist zu meinem eigenen Wohl.</li> <li>3. Ich strebe danach, sehr hohe Standards zu erreichen.</li> <li>4. Je höher das Ziel, umso herausfordernder.</li> <li>5. Es ist wichtig, dass ich mir hohe Standards setze.</li> </ol> <p><b>Concern over Mistakes Kognitionen (CMK)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Es ist schade, einen Fehler zu machen.</li> <li>7. Wenn ich einen Fehler mache, fühle ich mich elend.</li> <li>8. Ich gebe mir die Schuld, wenn ich einen Fehler mache.</li> <li>9. Wenn ich das nicht gut machen kann, bedeutet das, dass ich unterdurchschnittlich bin.</li> <li>10. Wenn ich versage, würde ich mich wertlos fühlen.</li> </ol> <p><b>Pursuit of Perfection Kognitionen (PPK).</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11. Ich kann nicht zufrieden sein, wenn ich es nicht perfekt mache.</li> <li>12. Ich muss um jeden Preis perfekt sein.</li> <li>13. Wenn Dinge nicht perfekt gemacht sind, kann ich nicht zufrieden sein.</li> <li>14. „Etwas perfekt machen“, macht Sinn.</li> <li>15. Dinge sollten nicht unvollkommen sein.</li> </ol>
<p><b>The Multidimensional Perfectionism Cognitions Inventory-English (MPCI-E)</b>          Stoeber, J., Kobori, O. &amp; Tanno, Y. (2010). The Multidimensional Perfectionism Cognitions Inventory-English (MPCI-E): Reliability, validity, and relationships with positive and negative affect. <i>Journal of Personality Assessment</i>, 92(1), pp. 16–25.</p>
<p><b>Personal Standards</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>16. The higher my goal, the better</li> <li>1. It is to my own benefit to set high standards for myself</li> <li>2. I am going to aim for the highest standards</li> <li>3. The higher the goal is, the more challenging</li> <li>4. It is important to set high standards for myself</li> </ol> <p><b>Concern Over Mistakes</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. It is a shame to make a mistake</li> <li>6. I feel miserable if I make a mistake</li> <li>7. I will blame myself if I make a mistake</li> <li>8. If I cannot do this well, it means I am below average</li> <li>9. I would feel worthless if I fail</li> </ol>

<p><b>Pursuit of Perfection</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. I cannot feel satisfied unless things are done perfectly</li> <li>11. I must be perfect at any cost</li> <li>12. I can't be satisfied unless I make it perfect</li> <li>13. There is meaning in "doing something perfectly"</li> <li>14. Things shouldn't be imperfect</li> </ol>
<p><b>Rational and Intuitive Decision Styles Scale (RIDSS)</b>                  Hamilton, K., Shih, S.-I. &amp; Mohammed, S. (2016). The Development and Validation of the Rational and Intuitive Decision Styles Scale. <i>Journal of Personality Assessment</i>, 98(5), pp. 523–535.                  Translated into German</p>
<p><b>Rational decision style</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ich bevorzuge es alle nötigen Informationen zu sammeln, bevor ich mich auf eine Entscheidung festlege.</li> <li>2. Ich beurteile Entscheidungsalternativen gewissenhaft, bevor ich eine endgültige Wahl treffe.</li> <li>3. Bei der Entscheidungsfindung nehme ich mir Zeit die Vor- und Nachteile oder Risiken und Nutzen einer Situation zu betrachten</li> <li>4. Die Fakten zu ermitteln ist ein wichtiger Teil meines Entscheidungsfindungsprozesses.</li> <li>5. Ich wäge eine Vielzahl an unterschiedlichen Faktoren ab, wenn ich eine Entscheidung treffe.</li> </ol> <p><b>Intuitive decision style</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Wenn ich Entscheidungen treffe, verlasse ich mich hauptsächlich auf mein Bauchgefühl.</li> <li>7. Im Allgemeinen folge ich bei Entscheidungen meiner ersten Ahnung.</li> <li>8. Ich treffe Entscheidungen auf Basis von Intuition.</li> <li>9. Ich verlasse mich auf meine ersten Eindrücke, wenn ich Entscheidungen treffe.</li> <li>10. Beim Entscheiden, messe ich Gefühlen mehr Bedeutung zu als Analysen.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Rational and Intuitive Decision Styles Scale (RIDSS)</b>                  Hamilton, K., Shih, S.-I. &amp; Mohammed, S. (2016). The Development and Validation of the Rational and Intuitive Decision Styles Scale. <i>Journal of Personality Assessment</i>, 98(5), pp. 523–535.</p>
<p><b>Rational decision style</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I prefer to gather all the necessary information before committing to a decision.</li> <li>2. I thoroughly evaluate decision alternatives before making a final choice.</li> <li>3. In decision-making, I take time to contemplate the pros/cons or risks/benefits of a situation.</li> <li>4. Investigating the facts is an important part of my decision-making process.</li> <li>5. I weigh several different factors when making decisions</li> </ol> <p><b>Intuitive decision style</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. When making decisions, I rely mainly on my gut feelings.</li> <li>7. My initial hunch about decisions is generally what I follow.</li> <li>8. I make decisions based on intuition.</li> <li>9. I rely on my first impressions when making decisions.</li> <li>10. I weigh feelings more than analysis in making decisions.</li> </ol>



**Die deutsche Version des Big Five Inventory 2**

Danner, D., Rammstedt, B., Bluemke, M., Lechner, C., Berres, S., Knopf, T., Soto, C. J. & John, O. P. (2019). Das Big Five Inventar 2. *Diagnostica*, 65(3), pp. 121–132.

1. Ich bin einfühlsam, warmherzig.
2. Ich begegne anderen mit Respekt.
3. Ich neige dazu, andere zu kritisieren.
4. Ich habe mit anderen wenig Mitgefühl.
5. Ich habe oft Streit mit anderen.
6. Ich bin nachsichtig, vergebe anderen leicht.
7. Ich bin hilfsbereit und selbstlos.
8. Ich bin manchmal unhöflich und schroff.
9. Ich bin anderen gegenüber misstrauisch.
10. Andere sind mir eher gleichgültig, egal.
11. Ich bin höflich und zuvorkommend.
12. Ich schenke anderen leicht Vertrauen, glaube an das Gute im Menschen.

**The Big Five Inventory-2**

Soto, C. J. & John, O. P. (2017). The next Big Five Inventory (BFI-2): Developing and assessing a hierarchical model with 15 facets to enhance bandwidth, fidelity, and predictive power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113(1), pp. 117–143.

I am someone who . . .

1. Is compassionate, has a soft heart
2. Is respectful, treats others with respect
3. Tends to find fault with others
4. Feels little sympathy for others
5. Starts arguments with others
6. Has a forgiving nature
7. Is helpful and unselfish with others
8. Is sometimes rude to others
9. Is suspicious of others' intentions
10. Can be cold and uncaring
11. Is polite, courteous to others
12. Assumes the best about people

