Abstract

Reliability generalization procedures were used in the present study to examine internal consistency estimates of the Positive Affect Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS: Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988), a two-factor measure for self-reported mood. In addition, study characteristics that may impact score reliability were investigated. The mean reliability estimates for PA and NA scales were acceptable with both scales demonstrating negative skewness. In regard to study characteristics, number of items correlated with PA and NA scale reliability estimates. Finally, ANOVA results indicated that timeframe was significant in the level of score reliability for PA with "year" having the lowest score reliability.

Introduction

Watson, Clark & Tellegen (1988) developed the Positive Affect Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) validating a two factor measure for self-reported mood. Given that the PANAS is a widely used measure in psychological research, evaluating the psychometric properties of its scores could increase the level of confidence in interpreting empirically based conclusions. The purpose of the current study is to present a reliability generalization analysis across studies using the PANAS. While the theoretical and empirical support for the construct is promising, research surrounding score reliability remains to be established.

METHODS

A literature search was conducted in the PsychARTICLES and PsychINFO databases using the terms positive and negative affect schedule and positive and negative affect scale. Duplicated article were eliminating, resulting in a total of 316 articles. An examination of these articles identified 59 articles did not use the scale and 22 articles were written in non-English or were unavailable or unusable. Of the remaining 235 articles, 62 (26.4%) did not report a reliability score and 74 coefficients were reported in 94 studies and test-retest scores were reported in 5 studies. Because of the limited number of test-retest scores, only cronbach alpha estimates were used in the present study. Some articles provided reliability estimates for multiple samples, resulting in 140 coefficient alphas from the 94 articles.

RESULTS

For the positive affect (PA) scale, the mean reliability coefficient for the 133 cases reporting internal consistency reliability was .86 (SD = .06; SE = .005) with a 95% confidence interval ranging from .85 to .87. The median and mode reliability coefficient were .88 and .89 respectively, with scores ranging from .62 to .96. The PA distribution was negatively skewed (-2.05; SE = 210) with a kurtosis of 5.63 (SE = .417). For the negative affect (NA) scale, the mean reliability coefficient for the 119 cases reporting internal consistency reliability was .84 (SD = .05; SE = .005) with a 95% confidence interval ranging from .83 to .85 The median and mode reliability coefficient were .85 and .87 respectively, with scores ranging from .67 to .95. The NA distribution was negatively skewed (-3.98; SE = .222) with a kurtosis of 1.10 (SE = .440). See Figures 1 and 2 for boxplots of PA and NA reliability scores.