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Abstract

We explore the relationship between indecisiveness and impulsivity using a variety of individual difference measures for each construct. We observe a positive, rather than negative, correlation between traditional measures of indecisiveness and impulsivity. Further analysis demonstrates that standard measures of indecisiveness are positively correlated specifically with dysfunctional impulsivity, and negatively correlated with functional impulsivity. Moreover, indecisiveness is positively and strongly associated specifically with impulsive urgency and lack of perseverance, but not with impulsive sensation-seeking or a lack of premeditation. Finally, we find that particular forms of indecisiveness, including maximizing due to ‘high standards’ and various ‘perfectionistic’ behaviors, do correlate negatively with standard measures of impulsivity. These findings provide insight into the multi-dimensional nature of both indecisiveness and impulsivity, and the complex relationship between these two constructs.
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1. Introduction

The capacity to make decisions quickly, confidently, and competently is important for personal and professional well-being. While decisive and indecisive behaviors are frequently identified in lay discourse, empirical research investigating indecisiveness and its relationship with other traits is relatively sparse. In particular, impulsivity seems an obvious candidate for investigation. Although both indecisiveness and impulsivity may be characterized generally as an inability to engage successfully in thoughtful decision-making, impulsivity is typically understood to be a lack of deliberation before initiating action (Dickman, 1990), whereas indecisiveness is seen as excessive deliberation and ambivalence that prevents the initiation of action (Higgins, et al., 2003). This suggests that indecisiveness and impulsivity might represent opposite poles of a unidimensional construct, with decisiveness located between these maladaptive extremes. Alternatively, it is possible that impulsivity and indecisiveness are positively associated, with both reflecting related difficulties assessing trade-offs and consequences of one’s choices. Third, it is possible that the two constructs are independent constellations of maladaptive behaviors. The purpose of this paper is to determine the relationship between various forms of impulsivity and indecisiveness in order to glean insights into the dynamics of these potentially related constructs.

1.1 Existing Measures of Indecisiveness

A small number of individual difference scales have been developed to measure indecisiveness. An early measure (Cooper, Fuqua & Hartman, 1984) was designed to investigate career indecision and the extent to which it can be distinguished from more general trait indecisiveness. One compelling critique of this scale, however, noted that most of its items appear to measure self-esteem and feelings of helplessness more directly than indecisiveness...
Indecisiveness & Impulsivity

(Frost & Shows, 1993). The Indecisiveness Scale (IS; Frost & Shows, 1993) was developed to address these limitations. It was used initially to test the relationship observed by clinicians between indecisiveness and hoarding behavior in obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) and subsequently to measure “compulsive indecisiveness” in non-clinical populations. The 15-item inventory quantifies participants' agreement or disagreement with various self-assessment statements of indecisiveness.

Subsequent investigations refined the IS. Germeijs and De Boeck (2002) noted that the IS contains items that focus both on general tendencies (e.g. “I find it easy to make decisions”) and on specific decision situations (e.g. "When ordering from a menu, I usually find it difficult to decide what to get"). To distinguish between general indecisiveness and specific indecision, they created a 22-item scale that incorporates several general items from the IS as well as novel items designed to capture domain-general indecisive tendencies, and a parallel scale that changed the wording of the items to focus participants on a specific decision they were facing. In their study, principal components analysis demonstrated that general indecisiveness was a distinct factor from specific career-focused indecision. In a similar vein, Rassin and colleagues (2007) found that the IS retained high reliability with the removal of the four domain-specific decision questions from the original scale.

Inventories that are framed as measuring decisiveness are less common than those framed as measuring indecisiveness. Decisiveness as a general trait appears as a subscale of the Need for Closure Scale (NFCS, Webster & Kruglanski, 1994), and decisiveness in the context of career choice is included as a subscale of the Career Decision Profile (Jones, 1989). Theoretical discussions of indecisiveness suggest that indecisiveness and decisiveness are opposing traits (Van Matre & Cooper, 1984), rather than independent ones, and factor analyses on existing
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Indecisiveness scales have identified factors containing both reverse-scored and regular items (e.g. Rassin et al., 2007; Spunt et al., 2009). Taken together, these findings suggest that purported decisiveness and indecisiveness scales are likely measuring the same trait.

A related set of scales have focused on decision behaviors that prolong the decision-making process. The Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire (MDMQ; Mann et al., 1997) includes subscales that measure buck-passing (leaving decisions for others) and procrastination. Similarly, the Maximization Scale (MS; Schwartz et al., 2002) measures the tendency to persist in searching for the ideal option rather than accept the first satisfactory ("satisficing") option, and includes behaviors that could be interpreted as indecisive (e.g. "When I watch TV I channel surf...").

1.2 Relationships Between Indecisiveness and Impulsivity

To our knowledge only two studies have included measures of impulsivity when studying the psychometric properties of indecisiveness; neither study found the relationship between impulsivity and indecisiveness to be significant. Rassin and colleagues (2007) found that their shortened version of the IS had no significant correlation with the impulsivity subscale of the Adolescent Decision Making Questionnaire (ADMQ; Mann et al., 1989). However, we note that this subscale has several limitations: it is made up of only five items from two different subscales (vigilance and complacency), and only measures impulsivity in the domain of decision-making rather than as a more general trait. Similarly, Webster and Kruglanski (1994) found that the decisiveness subscale of NFCS was not significantly correlated with the control subscale of the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire (Tellegen, 1982), which the researchers interpreted as measuring a lack of impulsivity. To date, no study has employed a comprehensive or multidimensional measure of impulsivity to explore the relationship
between impulsivity and indecisiveness. In the current study, we aim to more thoroughly investigate the relationship between indecisiveness, measured both through psychometric inventories and reported decision behaviors, and impulsivity, measured through a variety of multidimensional scales.

2. Study 1

The goal of our first study was to investigate the relationship between measures of indecisiveness and impulsivity. Because the sparse existing literature has not yet documented a significant relationship, we began our investigation using more comprehensive measures of indecisiveness and impulsivity. Our purpose was to determine whether these constructs are negatively correlated (consistent with the notion that the two traits represent opposite and maladaptive extremes of decision-making), positively correlated (consistent with the notion that both are consequences of difficulty engaging with decisions), or not significantly correlated (consistent with results cited above).

2.1. Method

2.1.1. Participants

We recruited 119 undergraduate participants (85 female, mean age = 21.3, SD = 2.97) through a university subject pool to complete an online survey that included the present study and some other unrelated tasks. Participants were compensated $15 in the form of money credited to their university ID cards.

2.1.2. Measures

Indecisiveness Scale. Participants completed the IS (Frost & Shows, 1993), a 15-item scale that reliably measures general indecisiveness. Sample items include, "I often worry about making the wrong choice" and "I find it easy to make decisions" (reverse-scored).
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_Urgent Impulsivity._ Participants completed the 12-item Urgency dimension of the UPPS Impulsive Behaviors Scale (Whiteside et al., 2005). Whiteside and Lynam (2001) used factor analysis to identify four domains that emerge when a variety of existing impulsivity measures are combined: urgency, lack of premeditation, lack of perseverance and sensation seeking. For the purposes of this preliminary study, we used the urgency dimension because it contains the most face-valid measure of the type of impulsivity that motivates our hypothesis; that is, rash decision-making leading to the potential for negative outcomes or regret. For example, the urgency subscale contains such items as “sometimes I do things on impulse that I later regret.”

2.1.3. Procedure

Participants completed an online informed consent document, and those who elected to participate completed measures in an individually randomized order. All questions within each measure were randomized for each participant. Following completion of the survey, all participants received $15 credited to their university ID cards.

2.2. Results

Mean values were computed for indecisiveness and impulsivity for each participant (indecisiveness $M=2.99$, $SD=.51$; impulsivity $M=2.75$, $SD=.68$) following the scoring laid out by the authors of each scale (Frost & Shows, 1993; Whiteside et al., 2005). A parametric (Pearson) correlation revealed that indecisiveness and impulsivity were positively correlated with one another at a high level of statistical significance, $r(117) = .312$, $p = .001$.

2.3. Discussion

We observed a counterintuitive finding: indecisiveness and at least one form of impulsivity are positively related to one another, and do not appear to be opposing tendencies. It is worth noting that items on the urgency subscale of impulsivity emphasize impulsive behaviors that
appear as maladaptive affective responses (e.g., “When I feel bad I will often do things I later regret in order to make myself feel better now”), much like several items on the Indecisiveness Scale (e.g., “I become anxious when making a decision”). This suggests the possibility that both impulsivity and indecisiveness may reflect emotionally reactive decision behaviors. Indeed, recent research suggests that neuroticism exhibits the strongest correlation among the Big Five traits with a measure of indecisiveness (Germeij & Verschueren, 2011). To better understand these findings, we next investigated the relationship between indecisiveness and impulsivity using a greater variety of measures.

3. Study 2

The goal of Study 2 was to replicate the finding of Study 1 that impulsivity and indecisiveness are positively related, and extend these findings by differentiating which aspects of each construct are driving this effect. Because impulsivity is a complex construct and a variety of scales have been developed to measure its various facets, we were interested in determining for which measures of impulsivity the positive relationship with indecisiveness would hold. In addition, we wanted to explore the relationship between impulsivity and alternative measures of indecisiveness, and to determine whether this relationship also appears in participants’ reports of their actual decision behaviors. We speculated that indecisiveness, like impulsivity, may manifest itself in distinct ways, and that various subtypes of indecisiveness may exhibit different relationships with various subtypes of impulsivity. For instance, some varieties of both indecisiveness and impulsivity may be characterized by a desire to avoid negative affect arising from decision difficulty (as we speculate in §2.3). In contrast, we would expect that indecisiveness arising from an excessive need for information
or deliberation would be negatively related to impulsivity that arises from haste or thoughtlessness.

3.1. Method

3.1.1. Participants

We recruited 190 adult participants (126 female, mean age = 34.43, SD = 11.19) from a university subject pool drawn from readers of Craigslist. Participants were asked to complete a survey in exchange for a $10 Amazon.com online gift card.

3.1.2. Measures

Indecisiveness. Participants completed Frost and Shows' (1993) Indecisiveness Scale, described in §2.1.2.

Need For Closure: Participants completed the decisiveness subscale of the Need for Closure Scale (NFCS-D; Webster & Kruglanski, 1994). This scale consists of seven items that measure decisiveness, such as “I usually make important decisions quickly and confidently”. For clarity of exposition when comparing with measures of indecisiveness, we reverse-coded the NFCS-D so that higher scores indicate greater indecisiveness.

Maximizing: Participants completed the 13-item Maximization Scale (MS; Schwartz et al., 2002), described in §1.1. Maximizing is measured by items that describe specific behaviors, such as “Renting videos is really difficult; I'm always struggling to pick the best one.” A possible negative relationship between indecisiveness and impulsivity might be understood in terms of maximizing behavior: indecisive individuals may prolong the decision process in order to feel that they are getting decisions exactly right. The MS has been shown more recently to be decomposable into three subscales (Nenkov et al., 2008), each of which may underlie different aspects of indecisiveness. The high standards dimension consists of three items exemplifying
the desire to select the best option (e.g. “I never settle for second best”). The three items of the alternative search dimension characterize the need to explore other options, regardless of one’s current level of satisfaction (e.g. “When I am in the car listening to the radio, I often check other stations to see if something better is playing, even if I am relatively satisfied with what I am listening to”). Finally, the decision difficulty dimension is made up of three items that describe having trouble selecting one item from a variety of options (e.g. “When shopping I have a hard time finding clothing I really love”). We expected that the positive relationship between standard measures of impulsivity and indecisiveness would replicate for the decision difficulty and possibly the alternative search dimensions—which seem to reflect difficulty engaging with or committing to a decision—but that a negative correlation would hold for the high standards dimension, which seems to reflect a tendency to over-think decisions.

Decision Behaviors Inventory. Participants completed a novel measure of behavioral indecisiveness, the Decision Behaviors Inventory (DBI; Fox, Barkley-Levenson & Tsai, in preparation). The version of the inventory employed here (see supplementary online material) consists of 18 items describing different decision behaviors, and was generated with the goal of encompassing a variety of consumer choices that adult participants were likely to have experienced. The DBI consists of three subscales of indecisiveness as measured by distinct clusters of behavior that were identified through factor analysis: A dimension of ‘neurotic’ indecisive behavior characterized by difficulty choosing when presented with a variety of options (e.g. “I’m the last of my group to decide what to order in restaurants”; “When I’m hungry I stand in front of the refrigerator for a while trying to figure out what I want”), a ‘perfectionistic’ dimension characterized by excessive information-seeking before choosing (e.g. “When I make a big electronics purchase, I spend days or weeks thoroughly researching
the options before choosing"), and a 'lackadaisical' dimension characterized by a lack of concern with advanced preparation (e.g. "When I receive an invitation for a future event such as a party or wedding, I respond yes or no right away" [reverse-scored]). Each subscale exhibited good reliability in the present sample: Chronbach's $\alpha = .747$ for seven 'neurotic' items, $\alpha = .718$ for five 'perfectionistic' items, and $\alpha = .713$ for six 'lackadaisical' items. In addition, we included four impulsive decision behaviors (e.g. "When I go shopping for clothing I end up bringing home at least one item I never wear") that make up a reliable impulsive behavior subscale (Chronbach's $\alpha = .77$ for four items) that can be related to other measures of impulsivity and indecisiveness in the current study. All items were scored on a five-point scale from "never or almost never" to "always or almost always".

**Barratt Impulsiveness Scale.** Participants completed the revised version of the Barratt Impulsiveness Scale (BIS; Patton et al., 1995). This scale has been validated and revised to differentiate impulsiveness from other related traits, such as anxiety and extraversion (Patton et al., 1995). The BIS consists of 29 items (e.g. "I am restless at the theater or lectures;" "I buy things on impulse").

**UPPS Impulsive Behaviors Scale.** Participants completed all four subscales of the UPPS (Whiteside et al., 2005): urgency (as described in §2.1.2.), (lack of) premeditation, (lack of) perseverance, and sensation-seeking. The 11-item premeditation subscale measures the extent to which participants think before acting, and is scored so that higher scores reflect a lack of premeditation (e.g. "I usually think carefully before doing anything" [reversed]). The ten-item perseverance scale is scored so that higher scores reflect a lack of perseverance or follow-through on tasks (e.g. "Once I start a project, I almost always finish it" [reversed]). Finally,
sensation-seeking is measured by a twelve-item subscale (e.g. “I welcome new and exciting experiences and sensations, even if they are a little frightening and unconventional”).

**Functional and Dysfunctional Impulsivity.** Participants completed the Functional and Dysfunctional Impulsivity Scales (Dickman, 1990). These scales were developed to address the complex relationship observed between impulsivity and cognitive functioning: although impulsivity has been shown to impair performance in complex cognitive tasks, impulsivity can actually confer a benefit in cognitive tasks for which rapid responding is required. This research concluded that functional and dysfunctional impulsivity are two distinct traits, one (functional impulsivity, 11 items) in which participants behave impulsively in situations that call for swift action (e.g. “I am good at taking advantage of unexpected opportunities, where you have to do something immediately or lose your chance”) and a second (dysfunctional impulsivity, 12 items) in which participants behave impulsively in situations that require greater deliberation (e.g. “I often make up my mind without taking the time to consider the situation from all angles”).

**3.1.3. Procedure**

Participants completed an online informed consent document, and those who elected to participate then completed the DBI before completing all remaining measures in an individually randomized order. We used this design to ensure that participants’ recollection of their decision behavior frequencies were not biased by their responses to more evaluative measures. The order of all questions within each measure were randomized. Following completion of the survey, all participants received a $10 Amazon.com online gift card.

**3.2 Results**
Correlations between measures of impulsivity and indecisiveness are reported in Table 1. The overall positive correlation between indecisiveness and impulsivity remained robust for two different indecisiveness measures. The IS again exhibits a strong positive correlation with UPPS-urgency \((r = .521, p < .001)\), and the NFCS-D (reverse-scored to reflect indecisiveness) exhibits the same relationship \((r = .458, p < .001)\). Both indecisiveness measures are also positively correlated with the UPPS lack of perseverance subscale \((IS \ r = .491, p < .001; \ NFCS-D \ r = .485, p < .001)\) and with the BIS \((IS \ r = .528, p < .001; \ NFCS-D \ r = .471, p < .001)\). These findings confirm the strong positive relationship between traditional measures of indecisiveness and particular measures of impulsivity. However, for other dimensions of impulsivity the positive relationship with indecisiveness is weaker (lack of premeditation) or nonexistent (sensation-seeking). Most tellingly, functional and dysfunctional impulsivity displayed opposing relationships with measures of indecisiveness: dysfunctional impulsivity consistently exhibited a positive relationship with indecisiveness \((IS \ r = .412, p < .001; \ NFCS-D \ r = .359, p < .001)\), whereas functional impulsivity exhibited a negative relationship \((IS \ r = -.551, p < .001; \ NFCS-D \ r = -.597, p < .001)\). From these findings, we see that standard measures of indecisiveness are positively correlated with particular dimensions of impulsivity (urgency and lack of perseverance) and that they are also uniquely associated with a dysfunctional rather than functional form of impulsivity.

To begin exploring whether distinct behavioral patterns within indecisiveness exhibit unique relationships with impulsivity, we correlated the MS and its subscales with measures of impulsivity; these correlations are displayed in Table 2. As predicted, the original unidimensional MS (Schwartz et al., 2002) exhibits strong positive correlations with BIS and urgency, and a weak positive correlation with dysfunctional impulsivity, echoing the results
above. However, when we break down the MS into its components (Nenkov et al., 2008), we find that the high standards and decision difficulty subscales exhibit diverging associations with impulsivity. Like other measures of indecisiveness, decision difficulty exhibits a strong positive correlation with BIS \( (r = .380, p < .001) \), urgency \( (r = .410, p < .001) \) and lack of premeditation \( (r = .331, p < .001) \). High standards, in contrast, exhibits the opposite relationship with BIS \( (r = -.179, p < .05) \) and lack of premeditation \( (r = -.471, p < .001) \), and has no significant relationship with urgency. Moreover, we observe a strong dissociation in the correlation of these dimensions with functional and dysfunctional impulsivity: whereas decision difficulty is negatively associated with functional impulsivity \( (r = -.398, p < .001) \) and positively associated with dysfunctional impulsivity \( (r = .246, p < .01) \), this pattern is reversed for high standards \( (r = .208, p < .01 \) with functional impulsivity; \( r = -.249, p < .001 \) with dysfunctional impulsivity).

Correlations between subscales of the DBI and measures of impulsivity are reported in Table 3. The correlations between ‘neurotic’ indecisiveness and measures of impulsivity are similar to those observed with standard measures of indecisiveness: Like the IS and NFCS-D, ‘neurotic’ behaviors exhibit positive correlations with urgency \( (r = .492, p < .001) \), lack of perseverance \( (r = .234, p < .001) \), BIS \( (r = .511, p < .001) \) and dysfunctional impulsivity \( (r = .300, p < .001) \), and a negative correlation with functional impulsivity \( (r = -.201, p < .01) \). In addition, these indecisive behaviors are also highly positively correlated with the impulsive behaviors subscale \( (r = .857, p < .001) \). However, other subtypes of indecisiveness exhibit markedly different relationships with impulsivity. ‘Perfectionistic’ behaviors have no relationship with urgency, and are negatively, rather than positively, correlated with lack of premeditation \( (r = -.403, p < .001) \), lack of perseverance \( (r = -.220, p < .01) \), and dysfunctional
impulsivity ($r = -.232, p < .01$). Meanwhile, ‘lackadaisical’ indecisive behaviors exhibit no significant relationship with urgency or with either functional or dysfunctional impulsivity; instead, this dimension correlates positively with lack of premeditation ($r = .337, p < .001$) and especially with lack of perseverance ($r = .386, p < .001$).

3.3. Discussion

Correlational analysis revealed a number of distinct relationships between different measures of impulsivity and indecisiveness. In particular, we observed that the positive relationship between indecisiveness and impulsivity holds specifically for dysfunctional impulsivity. In contrast, functional impulsivity is negatively and strongly correlated with standard measures of indecisiveness. This finding supports the notion that indecisive and impulsive behaviors both arise as maladaptive responses to the need for deliberation – the same individuals may in some instances respond too quickly when faced with a deliberative decision (resulting in high impulsivity scores) and in other instances hesitate or delay (resulting in high indecisiveness scores). Furthermore, we observed that standard measures of impulsivity are generally positively related to the decision difficulty subscale of the MS, but negatively related to the high standards subscale. This finding suggests that one motivation for decision delay (reluctance to engage with decisions) may share a common cause with the tendency to sometimes make hasty decisions, whereas another motivation for decision delay (deliberating in order to optimize one’s choices) may reflect an opponent process with the tendency to act rashly, manifesting as a more intuitive negative correlation.

These disparate motivations for indecisiveness are highlighted by the distinct behavioral clusters identified using the DBI. Like traditional evaluative measures of indecisiveness, classic forms of indecisive behavior (as captured by the DBI ‘neurotic’ subscale) correlate positively
with standard forms of impulsivity (BIS, urgency, and dysfunctional impulsivity). However, other forms of indecisive behavior (as captured by the DBI ‘perfectionistic’ subscale, which reflects a desire to optimize choice by delaying it) in fact exhibit the more intuitive negative relationship with impulsivity.

4. General Discussion

In this paper we document an initially surprising positive association between indecisiveness and impulsivity. We follow up this observation with a more detailed investigation into the relationship between these constructs using a wide range of measures. Our findings suggest that classical measures of indecisiveness and impulsivity can be viewed as two sides of the same coin. Both indecisiveness and impulsivity are maladaptive behavioral responses to difficulty engaging with a decision. We surmise that these distinct responses arise from a common desire to avoid negative affect that some individuals experience when making choices. When these individuals are given the opportunity to make unrestricted selections, they may behave in an impulsive manner, hastily choosing in order to avoid unpleasant deliberation over opportunity costs (i.e. thinking about what one must give up in order to obtain the target object or experience). However, when presented with a restricted choice between two or more items, the same individuals may struggle to resolve a tradeoff between each option (i.e., getting mired in an approach-approach or avoidance-avoidance conflict). This interpretation is supported by the association between decision difficulty and a variety of negative emotions, such as vulnerability and worry, which has been documented previously (Milgram & Tenne, 2000). Similarly, studies have independently found that both indecisiveness and urgent impulsivity are associated with neuroticism (Germeijs & Verschueren, 2011; Whiteside & Lynam, 2001), which is characterized by feelings of anxiety and distress. We
suggest that future studies might manipulate decision situation parameters such as the number of options presented at once to better understand the mechanisms underlying the positive association between impulsivity and indecisiveness.

Furthermore, we note that this positive relationship between conventional measures of impulsivity and indecisiveness obscures a more nuanced story when one examines the relationship between subscales of these constructs. In particular, we find that ‘perfectionistic’ indecisiveness does, in fact, exhibit a negative relationship with impulsivity, albeit with a type of impulsivity (lack of premeditation) that is not distilled in standard measures of this construct. Both perfectionism and premeditation are related to depth of evaluation, suggesting that whereas a neurotic preference to avoid engaging with decisions may underlie some forms of both indecisiveness and impulsivity, a desire to optimize decision outcomes may lead to excessive contemplation before choosing, which also manifests itself as a striking lack of impulsivity.

The present research provides a first step to understanding the nature of the complex relationship between impulsivity and indecisiveness; in so doing it provides a novel perspective on these established constructs. Naturally, future studies will be needed to more thoroughly identify mechanisms that underlie various forms of indecisiveness and impulsivity.
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Table 1. Correlations between dimensions of indecisiveness and impulsivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>.521**</td>
<td>.214*</td>
<td>.491**</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.528**</td>
<td>-.551**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFCS-D</td>
<td>.458**</td>
<td>.172†</td>
<td>.485**</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>-.597**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. †p<.05, *p<.01, **p<.001
Table 2. Correlations between maximizing subscales and types of impulsivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximizing</td>
<td>.356**</td>
<td>.418**</td>
<td>.218*</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.289**</td>
<td>-.195*</td>
<td>.157†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High Standards</td>
<td>-.179†</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.471**</td>
<td>-.433**</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>.208*</td>
<td>-.249*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decision Difficulty</td>
<td>.380**</td>
<td>.410**</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.331**</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.398**</td>
<td>.246*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alternative Search</td>
<td>.307**</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.296**</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. †p<.05, *p<.01, **p<.001
Table 3. Correlations between behavioral and self-reported indecision and impulsivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>DBI: Imp.</th>
<th>DBI: 'neurotic'</th>
<th>DBI: 'perfectionistic'</th>
<th>DBI: 'lackadaisical'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Urgency</td>
<td>Lack of Premed.</td>
<td>Lack of Persev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sensat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dysfunc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imp.</td>
<td>Imp.</td>
<td>Imp.</td>
<td>Imp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBI: 'neurotic'</td>
<td>.857**</td>
<td>.492**</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.234**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.278**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.511**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.201*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.300**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBI: 'perfectionistic'</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.403**</td>
<td>-.220*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.197*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.232*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBI: 'lackadaisical'</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.337**</td>
<td>.386**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.179†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. †p<.05, *p<.01, **p<.001
Supplementary Online Material: Decision Behaviors Inventory and Impulsive Behavior Subscale

1. When I’m hungry I stand in front of the refrigerator for a while trying to figure out what I want.

2. When I make a big electronics purchase (e.g., laptop, digital camera) I spend days or weeks thoroughly researching the options before choosing.

3. When facing a complex project, I put off getting started until the deadline is looming.

4. I’m the last of my group to decide what to order in restaurants.

5. I try on more than one outfit in the morning before I pick one I like.

6. I know what movie or movies I want to rent before I go to the store or online. (R)

7. When I receive an invitation for a future event such as a party or wedding, I respond yes or no right away. (R)

8. I like to “sleep” on things before making an important decision.

9. When someone gives me a gift card for credit with an online merchant (e.g., iTunes, Amazon), it takes me more than one visit to the web site to choose what to spend it on.

10. When it is up to me to make weekend social plans I figure things out several days in advance. (R)

11. When planning a vacation I buy tickets and book rooms at least a month in advance. (R)

12. Before I purchase a gift I browse multiple stores and/or web sites.

13. If I’m at a restaurant where they serve food family-style (where people share dishes), I let other people in my group choose all of the dishes.

14. Before I finalize my decision to purchase an expensive item, like a car or nice piece of furniture, I go to see it at least a couple of times.

15. When I go on vacation I write out a detailed itinerary in advance and I stick to it. (R)

16. When I go on a business trip or vacation I use virtually all of the items that I packed into my suitcase. (R)

17. When I am unsure which color or style of a product to purchase I find out which is most popular.
18. When I go out for ice cream, frozen yogurt, or gelato, I try tasting samples before choosing.

19. When I go to a mall I buy things “on impulse” and later regret having bought them.

20. When I go shopping for food I end up buying things I hadn’t planned to buy because they look good.

21. When I go shopping for clothing I end up bringing home at least one item I never wear.

22. When I go on vacation I come back with some souvenirs and gifts that I later throw away.

Scoring directions:
‘Neurotic’ Indecisiveness: Items 1, 3, 4, 5, 13, 17, 18
‘Perfectionistic’ Indecisiveness: Items 2, 8, 9, 12, 14
‘Lackadaisical’ Indecisiveness: Items 6, 7, 10, 11, 15, 16
Impulsive Behavior: Items 19, 20, 21, 22