


Accepted Manuscript

Activity pattern profiles: relationship with affect, daily functioning, impairment and variables related to life goals

Rosa Esteve, Alicia E. López-Martínez, Madelon L. Peters, Elena R. Serrano-Ibáñez, Gema T. Ruíz-Párraga, Henar González-Gómez, Carmen Ramírez-Maestre



PII: S1526-5900(16)30372-8

DOI: [10.1016/j.jpain.2016.12.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2016.12.013)

Reference: YJPAI 3352

To appear in: *Journal of Pain*

Received Date: 9 September 2016

Revised Date: 20 November 2016

Accepted Date: 18 December 2016

Please cite this article as: Esteve R, López-Martínez AE, Peters ML, Serrano-Ibáñez ER, Ruíz-Párraga GT, González-Gómez H, Ramírez-Maestre C, Activity pattern profiles: relationship with affect, daily functioning, impairment and variables related to life goals, *Journal of Pain* (2017), doi: 10.1016/j.jpain.2016.12.013.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

**Activity pattern profiles: relationship with affect, daily functioning, impairment
and variables related to life goals**

Rosa Esteve^a, Alicia E. López-Martínez^a, Madelon L. Peters^b,
Elena R. Serrano-Ibáñez^a, Gema T. Ruíz-Párraga^a, Henar González-Gómez^c &
Carmen Ramírez-Maestre^a

^a *Universidad de Málaga, Andalucía Tech, Facultad de Psicología, Málaga, Spain.*

^b *Maastricht University, Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, Clinical
Psychological Science, Behavioural Medicine, The Netherlands.*

^c *Unidad de Rehabilitación de la Unidad de Gestión Clínica Carihuela, Torremolinos,
Málaga, Spain*

Short running title: Activity patterns profiles

Disclosures: Supported by grants from the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (PSI2013-42512- P), and the Regional Government of Andalusia (HUM-566). The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Address for reprint requests to Rosa Esteve, Departamento de Personalidad, Evaluación y Tratamiento Psicológico, Facultad de Psicología, Universidad de Málaga, 29071-Málaga, Spain. E-mail: zarazaga@uma.es

Co-author's e-mails: Carmen Ramírez-Maestre: cramirez@uma.es; Madelon L. Peters: madelon.peters@maastrichtuniversity.nl; Elena R. Serrano-Ibáñez: elenarserrano@uma.es, Gema T. Ruíz-Párraga: gtruizparraga@uma.es; Henar González-Gómez: henar.gonzalez.sspa@juntadeandalucia.es; Alicia E. López-Martínez: aelm@uma.es.

Abstract: The aim of this cross-sectional study was to identify subgroups of patients based on their activity patterns and to investigate their relationship with life goals, optimism, affect, and functioning. The sample comprised 276 patients with chronic musculoskeletal pain. Hierarchical cluster analysis was performed on the activity pattern variables and the resulting clusters were compared using 1-way ANOVA. The 4-cluster was the optimal solution. The four clusters comprised: a) Avoiders: patients with high levels of avoidance and low levels of persistence, who use pacing to reduce pain; b) Doers: patients with high levels of persistence and low levels of pacing and avoidance; c) Extreme Cyclers: patients with high levels of avoidance and persistence and low levels of pacing; and d) Medium Cyclers: patients with moderately high levels of avoidance and persistence and high levels of pacing. Comparison of the clusters showed that Doers had the most adaptive profile, whereas Avoiders, followed by Extreme Cyclers, had unhealthy profiles. Doers showed a high level of optimism and a good balance between goal value, expectancy, and conflict.

Perspective: It is useful to distinguish profiles based on various activity patterns. In contrast to profiles characterised by avoidance, profiles characterized by high persistence and low avoidance were associated with adaptive results. Patients with this profile also showed a high level of optimism and a good balance between goal value, expectancy, and conflict.

Key words: *activity patterns, life goals, avoidance, persistence, pacing, chronic pain.*

Introduction

Chronic pain interferes with daily activities and goals and changes the way in which patients engage in such activities. The activity patterns of patients play a crucial role in their wellbeing. Traditionally, three activity patterns have been distinguished: avoidance, persistence, and pacing. Avoidance has been defined as the reduction in physical or other daily activities with the aim of minimizing pain increases⁴⁴ (e.g. “Because of my pain most days I spend more time resting than doing activities.”). The persistence pattern involves continuing with activities despite pain²⁶ (e.g. “When I am in pain I just keep on doing what I was doing.”). Pacing is characterized by dividing daily activities into smaller tasks²¹ (e.g. “I usually take several breaks.”). A meta-analysis² of the relationship between different approaches to activity and functioning in chronic pain patients found that activity avoidance was linked to worse physical and psychological functioning and increased pain. The results concerning the association between persistence and functioning depended on the measure used: instruments that assessed overactivity were associated with poorer outcomes, whereas instruments that assessed persisting with activity despite pain were associated with positive outcomes. Finally, pacing was associated with better psychological functioning and higher levels of pain and disability.

Recently, Kindermans et al³² identified more specific patterns: pain avoidance (avoidance behaviour in the presence or anticipation of changes in pain); activity avoidance (avoidance refers to the patients’ condition of being in pain rather than the fluctuating pain experience); task-contingent persistence (behavioural persistence in finishing tasks or activities despite pain); excessive persistence (doing too much, not respecting one’s physical limits, and experiencing the rebound effects of heightened activity levels); pain-contingent persistence (the level of experienced pain as the

determinant of the behaviour performed with activity fluctuating over time as a result); and pacing (dividing daily activities into smaller tasks).

Nielson et al^{38,39} proposed that pacing measures should be developed that address a specific pacing behaviour with a single goal. They identified the following pacing behaviours: breaking tasks into smaller, manageable tasks; taking frequent short rests; and slowing down. They proposed the following as the main aims of pacing: increasing activity levels; energy conservation for valued activities; and pain reduction. The recently developed Activity Patterns Scale¹⁷ incorporates the specific activity patterns found by Kindermans et al³² and the aforementioned suggestion by Nielson et al^{38,39} et al. on the assessment of pacing.

Activity patterns are interrelated and patients do not exclusively report one activity pattern. Cluster analysis has been used to identify four homogeneous patient subgroups (Avoiders, Medium Cyclers, Extreme Cyclers, and Doers) based on their scores on different activity pattern subscales.³⁶ Avoiders were characterized by moderately high avoidance and pacing and low confronting. Both Cyclers subgroups were characterized by high Confronting; Extreme Cyclers also showed high levels of Pacing and Avoidance and for the Medium Cyclers, the levels of pacing and avoidance were more moderate. The Doers showed high levels of activity despite pain and low levels of pacing and avoidance.

Within the framework of Fear-Avoidance Models,⁵⁷ an avoidant behavioural style provoked by excessive fear of pain, movement, and re-injury plays a central role in pain chronification. Nevertheless, as the avoidance-endurance model has highlighted²⁶, not all chronic pain patients display this pattern. Some patients even show an opposite behavioural pattern; namely, persistence of activity despite pain. A recent review⁵⁵ highlighted the importance of studying the motivational mechanisms underlying activity

patterns to explain why individuals engage in avoidant or persistence behaviours. From a motivational perspective, activity patterns are conceived not solely as a product of pain, but as a product of the self-regulation of current goals in the context of pain.⁵⁵ Goal conflict results when two goals compete for the same resources, particularly time and energy. Chronic pain interferes with daily activities and goals and consequently patients may need to negotiate competition between their goals for limited physical and cognitive resources. Several experimental studies have shown that the activation of competing goals attenuates pain avoidance behavior^{9,10,56} and non-pain goal pursuit inhibits attention to pain.⁵²

However, cross-sectional studies have suggested that distress results from goal conflict based on the findings that goal conflict correlated with worse affect, less life satisfaction, poor self-rated physical health, higher pain,^{15,16,25,31,47} and more pain-related fear.²⁹

However, the finding that goal conflict has detrimental effects on well-being has not always been replicated, which suggests that contextual or situational factors may play a role.²² Optimism is one such factor,¹ as well as self-efficacy, which has been considered to be a critical appraisal directing the choice to actively pursue a goal.^{4,29,31,33} It has been shown that although optimistic persistence in goal pursuit was linked to higher goal conflict, such conflict did not undermine adjustment, because optimists were more efficient at balancing the benefits and costs of their conflicting goals.⁵³

The aim of this study was to identify the profiles of patients on the basis of their scores on the different activity patterns subscales which compose the Activity Patterns Scale (APS),¹⁷ and to compare the resulting subgroups in relation to affect, daily functioning, impairment, and variables related to life goals. The present study constitutes a relevant contribution because it attempts to replicate previous findings on

activity patterns subgroups,³⁶ while including new and innovative dimensions of the pacing, persistence, and avoidance constructs as measured by the APS. To our knowledge, it is also the first study to investigate the relationship between activity patterns and motivational mechanisms. Based on previous research,³⁶ it was postulated that four subtypes would be identified: Extreme Cyclers, Medium Cyclers, Avoiders, and Doers. It was also postulated the Doers would report better daily functioning and positive affect and less functional impairment and negative affect than Avoiders and Extreme Cyclers. Regarding goal-related variables, it was postulated that Doers would be more optimistic and more efficient at balancing the benefits and costs of their conflicting goals, despite experiencing more conflict between their most valued pain-related goal and their most valued non-pain-related goal.

Methods

Procedure

This study was part of a larger research project,¹⁷ which was approved by the University of Málaga Ethics Committee. Participants were recruited through two local associations of patients with fibromyalgia, an association of patients with rheumatic diseases, one physiotherapy unit, and through doctors working at the Pain Unit of the Hospital Costa del Sol. The data were collected between January 2015 and February 2016. Individuals were considered eligible for inclusion if they met the following criteria: At the moment of participation in the study they were experiencing pain and had been experiencing pain for at least the last 6 months; they were between 18 and 65 years old; they were not being treated for a malignancy, terminal illness, or psychiatric disorder; they were able to understand the Spanish language (spoken and written); and they were able to understand the instructions and questionnaires. Patients were informed of the study aims, confidentiality was assured, and informed consent was obtained. Each

participant had a semi-structured interview with a psychologist to obtain demographic, social, and medical history data; their current goals and subjective goal conflict were elicited using a method developed by Emmons¹⁵ (for details, see section Goals and goal value). Subsequently, they completed self-report questionnaires in the order described below.

Three psychologists took part in data collection. They were trained in the application of the protocol to guarantee the standardization of the assessment process and were blinded to the study design and hypotheses. The patients were always assessed in their usual health centre or in the facilities of the associations. Each session lasted approximately 1 hour.

Participants

Three hundred and eighty-five patients were invited to take part in the study. Of these patients, 82 refused participation, 17 did not meet the inclusion criteria, and 10 were eliminated because of incomplete data.

The final sample comprised 276 chronic pain patients (196 women and 80 men). The average age was 52 years ($SD = 8.83$). At the time of the study, 71.30% were married or cohabiting. Regarding employment, 35.10% were active workers, 26.80% were retired, 22.10% were unemployed, and 15.9% were homemakers.

A total of 34.40% had completed high-school education and 40.70% had completed primary education. Median pain duration was 12.49 years ($SD = 11.05$). The participants had musculoskeletal pain at different locations: The most frequent site of pain was the lower back (49.3%), followed by generalized pain conditions such as fibromyalgia (23.2%), pain in the upper shoulder and upper limbs (15.6%), pain in the lower limbs (11.6%), and pain in other areas (.30%).

Variables and instruments

Goal assessment

Goals and goal value

Current goals were elicited using a method developed by Emmons.¹⁵ Participants were asked to list their current goals (i.e. objectives that they are trying to accomplish at the time), and were given examples of approach and avoidance goals. They were asked to list goals based on what they were trying to do rather than whether they had been successful and “to list as many or as few” as they were currently trying to or attain or avoid.

Thus, every participant produced a single list of goals and then rated each one on a 5-point Likert-type scale for four dimensions of goal value¹⁵: Commitment (“How committed are you to this goal?”); importance (“How important is this goal to you in your life?”); anticipated joy (“How much joy or happiness do you or will you feel when you are successful in this goal?”); and anticipated sorrow (“How much sorrow or unhappiness do you or will you feel if you fail to succeed in this goal?”). The value of each goal was represented by the sum of the scores on commitment, importance, anticipated joy, and anticipated sorrow. In the present study, the internal consistency of the measurement of goal value ranged from $\alpha = .75$ to $\alpha = .80$. As shown below, in order to be able to calculate the variable “balance between goal expectancy, anticipated joy, and conflict”, a question was included to assess expectancy (“How confident are you that you will be able to accomplish this goal?”).⁵³ Because these variables were negatively skewed, analyses (except descriptive statistics) were performed on squared-transformed variables to reduce the influence of more extreme cases.

Two independent judges analysed the answers and determined whether the goals were related or unrelated to pain. Inter-judge reliability was very satisfactory (Kappa = .96). The following variables were considered: total number of goals, number of pain-related goals, number of non-pain-related goals, and goal value.

Subjective conflict between the most valued pain-related goal and the most valued non-pain-related goal

Subjective conflict was assessed using the Striving Instrumentality Matrix.¹⁵ The goals previously listed by the participants were placed in the rows and columns of a matrix. The participants were asked to compare each pair of goals and rate the degree of conflict between them on a 5-point scale where 0 = *not at all*, 1 = *very little*, 2 = *somewhat*, 3 = *definitely*, and 4 = *extremely*. Goal conflicts were defined as the degree to which two goals used the same resources, such as time, money, or energy, or the degree to which the pursuit of one goal interfered with the pursuit of another goal. Examples were given.

Taking into account the aims of this study, goal conflict was operationalized as the conflict between the most valued pain-related goal and the most valued non-pain-related goal. Most patients reported at least one pain-related and one non-pain-related goal. When this was not the case their score on goal conflict was 0.

Balance between goal expectancy, anticipated joy, and conflict

The balance between expected joy on goal attainment, expectancy (the likelihood of attaining the goal), and conflict is a useful index of effective goal strategy management. The balance was calculated by adapting and applying the formula developed by Segerstrom & Solberg Nes⁵³:

$$R = (\lambda e - s)$$

where:

λ = Attainment expectancy of the most valued non-pain-related goal

e = Expected joy on attainment of the most valued non-pain-related goal

s = Subjective conflict between the most valued pain-related goal and the most valued non-pain-related goal.

The higher the value of R , the greater the balance. Differences in scaling were solved by transforming these three variables to have a standard deviation of 1 before calculating R .

Self-report instruments

Dispositional Optimism

Dispositional optimism was assessed using the Spanish version of the Life Orientation Test Revised (LOT-R).^{40,51} The LOT-R consists of six scored items (items 1, 4, and 10 are positively worded and items 3, 7, and 9 are negatively worded) plus four filler items. Respondents indicate the extent to which they agree with each item on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). The total score of the LOT-R was used to reflect the general expectancy of a positive outcome, with higher scores representing higher levels of optimism. The optimism and pessimism subscale scores were calculated by summing the positive and negative items, respectively. In the present study, the LOT-R total score had a Cronbach's alpha of .85. Cronbach's alpha for the optimism and pessimism subscales were .85 and .70, respectively. The Spanish LOT-R has shown adequate criteria validity.¹⁸

Positive and Negative Affect

Positive and negative affect were assessed using the Spanish version of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS),^{48,49,59} which is one of the most reliable, valid, and efficient means to measure these aspects. It comprises two 10-item scales. The instrument has demonstrated appropriate stability over a 2-month time period. The Spanish PANAS also has excellent construct and criterion validity. In this study, the Positive Affect and Negative Affect scales had a Cronbach's alpha of .92 and .89, respectively.

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy was assessed using the Spanish adaptation of the General Self-Efficacy Scale.^{5,50} This instrument assesses people's stable beliefs about their ability to appropriately manage a wide range of life stressors. The instrument has shown and adequate validity. In this study, the instrument showed high internal consistency ($\alpha = .97$).

Impairment and Functioning

Impairment and functioning were assessed using the Impairment and Inventory (IFI),⁴⁵ which consists of 30 items each referring to a specific activity associated with one of the following areas: household (e.g. make the beds), autonomous behaviour (e.g. dress by yourself), leisure (e.g. go to a bar or cafe), and social relationships (e.g. visit friends). Patients are asked if they performed an activity during the previous week (or during the previous month for certain activities). If they did not perform the activity, they are assigned a score of 0; if they did, they are asked how often they performed it, answering on a 4-point scale (1 = between 1 and 2 times, 2 = between 3 and 6 times, 3 = between 6 and 9 times, and 4 = 10 or more times). If they did not perform the activity, they are asked if they practiced this activity before the onset of their chronic pain. The

instrument provides an index of daily functioning, and an index of activity impairment. The 'daily functioning index' is calculated by adding the frequencies at which every activity is performed. The 'activity impairment index' is calculated by adding the total number of activities that the patients have given up since pain began. This approach differentiates between present functioning and impairment and is useful in assessing patients with a long history of pain, concerning whom the degree of deterioration is at least as informative as the current level of functioning.⁴⁵ In this study, the global scales were highly reliable (daily functioning, $\alpha = .88$; impairment, $\alpha = .97$).

Pain Intensity

Patients were asked to rate their mildest, average, and worst pain during the past 2 weeks, as well as their current pain, on a scale ranging from 0 to 10, with a "0" indicating "no pain" and "10" indicating pain as "intense as you could imagine". A composite pain intensity score was calculated for each participant by calculating the average of the mildest, average, worst, and current pain.²⁷

Activity patterns

The Activity Patterns Scale¹⁷ consists of 24 items grouped into 8 three-item subscales: pain avoidance ($\alpha = .78$); activity avoidance ($\alpha = .77$); task-contingent persistence ($\alpha = .87$); excessive persistence ($\alpha = .80$); pain-contingent persistence ($\alpha = .89$); pacing to increase activity levels ($\alpha = .80$); pacing to conserve energy for valued activities ($\alpha = .86$); and pacing to reduce pain ($\alpha = .79$). Participants are asked to indicate to what extent the statement applies to them on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (always). The instrument showed adequate reliability as well as structural, convergent, and criteria validity.¹⁷

Statistical Analysis

Correlation analyses were performed to examine the relationship between the activity patterns subscales and optimism, pessimism, optimism-total, positive affect, negative affect, self-efficacy, daily functioning, functional impairment, pain intensity, total number of goals, number of pain-related goals, number of non-pain-related goals, goal conflict, and goal balance. Correlations were interpreted following the guidelines proposed by Cohen,¹¹ wherein low correlations range from .10 to .29, moderate correlations range from .30 to .49, and high correlations range from .50 to 1.

Hierarchical cluster analysis was performed on the activity pattern variables. The objective of cluster analysis is to profile individuals into specific groups that reveal patterns that show similarities and differences between groups. This analytic approach was chosen because the aim of this study was to identify homogeneous subtypes of patients by considering their scores on the different activity patterns subscales which compose the APS. As suggested by previous research,³⁶ it was assumed that the activity patterns were interrelated and that patients would not exclusively report one activity pattern. The sample size recommended for cluster analysis must be at least 2^m , where m equals the number of clustering variables;¹³ in this study, the eight patterns of activity were the clustering variables ($2^8 = 256$). Thus, the sample size ($N = 276$) was adequate. The hierarchical cluster analysis was conducted using Ward method with squared Euclidean distance. Before cluster analysis, all variables were standardized (Z-score) to obtain similar metrics. The scree plot (elbow criterion) was used to select the optimal number of clusters. After clustering, a post-cluster analysis was performed to determine which variables differentiated the clusters. Post-cluster analysis was performed using a χ^2 test for categorical variables and 1-way ANOVA for continuous variables. Bonferroni

post hoc tests were used to correct for multiple comparisons. All analyses were performed using SPSS 21.

Results

Correlation analyses

Table 1 shows the correlation analyses of the activity pattern subscales and optimism, pessimism, optimism-total, positive affect, negative affect, self-efficacy, daily functioning, functional impairment, pain intensity, total number of goals, number of pain-related goals, number of non-pain-related goals, goal conflict, and goal balance.

PLEASE INSERT TABLE 1 AROUND HERE

Cluster analysis of activity patterns

Hierarchical cluster analysis using the Ward method with squared Euclidean distance was applied to the 8 activity pattern variables. Figure 1 shows the scree plot of the distance coefficients from the hierarchical cluster analysis. The elbow criterion is defined as the step where a significant jump in distance coefficients occurs subtracted from the number of cases (i.e. 276, step 272.). Use of this criterion shows that the 4-cluster solution is the optimal number of clusters for the variables. The distribution of patients within the 4-cluster solution was as follows: 21.01% ($N=58$, cluster 1), 28.26% ($N = 78$; cluster 2), 28.62% ($N = 79$; cluster 3), and 22.10% ($N = 61$, cluster 4). Although the clusters found were similar to those of McCracken and Samuel³⁶, they were not identical, because the APS differentiated more activity patterns than the instrument used by these authors. We used their labels and differences with respect to their results will be highlighted: Cluster 1, Extreme Cyclers; cluster 2, Medium Cyclers; cluster 3, Avoiders; and cluster 4, Doers. Avoiders were characterized by high levels of

pain avoidance, activity avoidance, and pacing to reduce pain with low levels of the three types of persistence, pacing to do more things and pacing to save energy for valued activities. Doers were characterized by high levels of task-contingent persistence, and moderately high levels of excessive persistence and pain-related persistence with low levels of the three types of pacing. Extreme and Medium Cyclers were both characterized by high levels of pain-related persistence, but Extreme Cyclers had high levels of avoidance, moderately high levels of task-contingent persistence and excessive persistence, and low levels of the three types of pacing. Medium Cyclers had high levels of the three types of pacing and moderately high levels of pain avoidance, activity avoidance, task-contingent persistence, and excessive persistence. Figure 2 shows the APS subscales scores for the four patterns of activity obtained.

PLEASE INSERT FIGURE 1 AND 2 AROUND HERE

We performed ANOVASs to analyse the differences between the scores of the four clusters obtained on the APS. Overall significant effects were found for all the subscales (Table 2).

PLEASE INSERT TABLE 2 AROUND HERE

Activity pattern cluster comparisons

A series of χ^2 tests and ANOVAs were used to compare the clusters on categorical and continuous variables related to the patients' demographic and clinical characteristics. There were gender differences between clusters $\chi^2(3, N = 276) = 9.76, p < .05$. The proportion of men (30%) was higher than the proportion of women (17.3%) in the Extreme Cyclers; the proportion of women (32.7%) was higher than the proportion of men (17.5%) in the Medium Cyclers cluster; the proportion of men (32.5%) was slightly higher than the proportion of women (27%) in the Avoiders cluster. There were no significant differences between clusters on the primary location,

$\chi^2(9, N = 273) = 15.68, p < .07$; however, it is striking that 40.6% of the patients with relatively generalized pain syndromes were located in the Avoiders cluster. The clusters did not differ in age, civil status, or education, but did differ on pain duration (in years), $F(3, 264) = 3.25, p < .022$, because the Medium Cyclers had experienced pain for a significantly longer time ($M = 14.74$) than the Doers ($M = 9.31$).

We performed ANOVAs to analyse the differences between clusters on optimism, pessimism, positive and negative affect, self-efficacy, daily functioning, functional impairment, and pain intensity. The clusters were also compared on several goal-related variables (total number of goals, number of pain-related goals, number of non-pain-related goals, goal conflict, and goal balance). As shown in Table 3, Doers showed significantly higher optimism and positive affect and lower pessimism and pain intensity than Avoiders. Doers also showed significantly higher daily functioning and significantly lower functional impairment than the other 3 clusters. In relation to the goal-related variables, Doers showed a higher goal balance than Medium Cyclers.

Medium Cyclers showed higher positive affect and lower negative affect than Avoiders. Medium Cyclers also had higher scores on daily functioning than Avoiders and Extreme Cyclers. Regarding goal conflict, Medium Cyclers had significantly higher scores than Extreme Cyclers.

PLEASE INSERT TABLE 3 AROUND HERE

Discussion

The aim of the present study was to identify patient profiles on the basis of their scores on different activity pattern subscales which compose the APS,¹⁷ and to compare these groups in relation to affect, daily functioning, impairment, and variables related to life goals. Four groups were identified by cluster analysis: Extreme Cyclers, Medium Cyclers, Avoiders, and Doers. Significant differences were found between clusters.

Taking into account that the APS distinguishes more types of activity patterns than the Pain and Activity Relations Questionnaire, the 4 groups were similar, but not identical, to the ones identified by McCracken and Samuels.³⁶

In line with previous research,¹⁷ the correlational analyses showed that activity avoidance was associated with more negative outcomes than pain avoidance. As expected, task-contingent persistence was associated with adaptive results, whereas excessive persistence was associated with negative results. However, in contrast to previous research,¹⁷ the three pacing subscales only showed low correlations with the outcome measures. This result could be explained by the fact that the frequency of use of pacing in this sample was low, especially pacing to increase activity levels and pacing to conserve energy for valued activities.

Avoiders were characterized by high levels of pain avoidance, activity avoidance, and pacing to reduce pain with low levels of the three types of persistence, pacing to do more things, and pacing to save energy for valued activities. These results are in line with previous research, which showed that pacing, when practiced to reduce pain, could be a functionally equivalent to avoidance.^{17,36} Thus, it would appear useful to distinguish between different types of pacing depending on the goal of the behaviour.

In sharp contrast to Avoiders, Doers were characterized by high levels of task-contingent persistence and moderately high levels of excessive persistence and pain-related persistence with low levels of the three types of pacing and the lowest levels of pain and activity avoidance. Comparisons showed that most of the differences between groups were between Doers and Avoiders. As postulated, Doers had significantly higher scores than Avoiders in optimism, positive affect, and daily functioning. In contrast, Avoiders had significantly higher scores than Doers in pessimism, functional

impairment, and pain intensity. Doers had significantly higher scores than the other three groups in daily functioning and significantly lower scores than the other groups in functional impairment. These results show that a behaviour pattern characterized by “doing” despite pain has more adaptive results than a pattern characterized by avoidance even when this pattern has elements of excessive persistence.² These results highlight the association between avoidance and pain intensity in the Avoider profile. As some authors¹² have pointed out, pain functions as a signal of bodily threat that will disrupt ongoing behaviour, and so its association with avoidance should not be underestimated.

According to these results, the patients’ general expectations about the likelihood of achieving their goals⁸ (i.e. optimism and pessimism), and their positive-negative affect are related to how they regulate their activity (i.e. patterns of avoidance and persistence). The correlational analysis also showed that optimism was positively correlated with task-contingent persistence and negatively correlated with pain avoidance and activity avoidance; the opposite pattern of correlations was observed for pessimism. Optimism was also associated with higher persistence. Doers had the highest goal balance. These results are in line with previous research,⁵³ which showed that optimists are persistent because they expect to overcome adversity;¹ however, this is not simply sterile persistence because they are also more flexible in their goal management.²⁴ That is, when they repeatedly fail to attain certain goals, they substitute these goals with attainable goals^{14,46} because they are sensitive to the contextual parameters^{20,41} that are linked to a positive affect that may broaden their perspectives.¹⁹

In line with previous research,⁵³ the present study postulated that Doers would experience more conflict between their most valued pain-related goal and their most valued non-pain-related goal than the other groups; contrary to our expectations, the Doers did not obtain the highest scores in goal conflict. It must be taken into account

that, in this study, goal conflict was operationalized as the conflict between the most valued pain-related goal and the most valued non-pain-related goal instead of a general measure of goal conflict. Perhaps, the measure used in the present study did not capture the tendency of optimists to engage in many life goals. No significant differences were found among the four groups in the total number of goals or in the number of pain-related or non-pain-related goals. It should be emphasized that there was little variability in these variables.

Medium Cyclers had the highest score in the conflict between the most valued pain-related and non-pain-related goals; in addition, their score was significantly higher than the score of the Extreme Cyclers. Medium Cyclers could also be labelled as 'Pacers' because this group had the highest scores on the three pacing subscales. They were also characterized by high levels of pain-related persistence, and moderately high levels of pain avoidance, activity avoidance, task-contingent persistence, and excessive persistence. The proportion of women was higher than the proportion of men in the Medium Cyclers group, which had been experiencing pain for a significantly longer time than the Doers group. Medium Cyclers showed significantly higher levels of positive affect and significantly lower levels of negative affect than Avoiders, and had better daily functioning than Extreme Cyclers and Avoiders. In summary, the Medium Cyclers group appeared to put into action all the different patterns of activity at a high level and, after the Doers, showed better adaptation than Avoiders and Extreme Cyclers. It could be speculated that Medium Cyclers are motivated by the conflict between a pain-related and a non-pain-related goal, and that they use a wide range of patterns of activity which they fine tune depending on the circumstances leading to adaptive results. This profile may develop over time; thus, future longitudinal research could investigate if patients evolve from a Doer profile to a Medium Cyclers profile.

Based on previous experimental studies,^{9,10,56} it would have been reasonable to expect that the presence of conflict between the most valued non-pain-related goal and the most valued pain-related goal could have been associated with an attenuation of avoidance behaviour. Instead, in the present study, goal conflict appeared to be associated with a moderately high use of persistence, avoidance, and pacing in all their forms and with adaptive results. This finding is in contrast with the results of several cross-sectional studies, which showed that distress results from goal conflict.^{15,16,25,29,31,47}

Finally, Extreme Cyclers were characterized by high levels of pain-related persistence and the two forms of avoidance, by moderately high levels of task-contingent persistence and excessive persistence, and by low levels of the three types of pacing. They had a low level of daily functioning and a high level of functional impairment; after Avoiders, this profile experienced the most disabling effects. As mentioned, they also had the lowest score in goal conflict; this score was significantly lower than that of the Medium Cyclers. Extreme Cyclers are characterised by high persistence and avoidance at the same time, and so it could be speculated that their behaviour is mainly controlled by the fluctuations in pain intensity along with the limited motivational influence of non-pain-related goals. This hypothesis could be tested in future research by the use of daily diaries.

One of the suggestions of the avoidance-endurance model is that positive mood may be a risk factor for excessive persistence behaviour and subsequent disability as a result of overuse.²⁶ This hypothesis was not supported by the results of the present study because although Doers had the highest score on positive affect, they had the lowest levels of functional impairment. It should be borne in mind that this profile is

characterized by high levels of the three forms of persistence, and not simply by excessive persistence.

Self-efficacy has been considered to be a critical appraisal that directs the choice to actively pursue a goal.³⁰ In contrast, Carver & Scheirer⁷ emphasized the importance of the expectation itself that the goal will be achieved (i.e. optimism). In this study, optimism, (at least in relation to patterns of activity profiles), seemed to play a more important role than self-efficacy because no significant differences were found between groups in self-efficacy.

The present study has a number of limitations. Firstly, the only method used was self-reporting. Shared method variance may have contributed to the results. Future research should not only rely on self-reports, but should also use objective measures of activity patterns.⁵⁵ Nevertheless, the objective measurement of activity patterns remains a controversial issue because the patterns actually performed by people are not only the result of their habitual style, but are also the result of contextual factors in which motivational elements play a central role. It is only with difficulty that objective measures can capture these aspects.³ The results on goal balance should be taken with caution because the use of a compound score to express the balance between goal expectancy, anticipated joy, and conflict⁵³ could be limited by the fact that the measurement errors in each of the original scores are inherited by the new compound score. Secondly, the cross-sectional nature of the study does not allow causality to be inferred. Finally, given that the variability in the number of goals expressed by the patients was low, goal conflict was operationalized as the conflict between the most valued pain-related goal and the most valued non-pain-related goal; future studies should consider the total amount of conflict between all goals.

This study supports the therapeutic approaches proposed within the framework of the Fear-Avoidance Model aimed at the extinction of avoidance behaviours such as graded exposure *in vivo*⁵⁸ and those that emphasize engaging in activities linked to valued non-pain life goals despite pain (e.g. Acceptance and Commitment Therapy³⁵). Based on our results, these interventions could be reinforced by techniques aimed at strengthening the expectations that personal goals can be achieved (e.g. Best Possible Self, which aims to increase optimism^{23,37,42,43}). As several studies have shown, optimism could counteract the fatigue in self-regulation resources which is common in patients who have chronic pain.^{6,54}

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Scree plot of the distance coefficients in the steps of the cluster analysis.

Figure 2. Activity Patterns Scale subscale scores for four derived activity management clusters: Extreme Cyclers, Medium Cyclers, Avoiders, and Doers.

Note. Painavo: Pain Avoidance; Actiavo: Activity Avoidance; Persitask: Task-contingent persistence; Persiexce: Excessive Persistence; Persipain: Pain-contingent persistence; Paceactiv: Pacing for increasing activity level; Pacener: Pacing for conserving energy for valued activities; Pacepain: Pacing for pain reduction.

Acknowledgments

AFIMAR, AFIBROMA, AMARE, Centro de Salud Carihuela, and the Agencia Sanitaria Costa del Sol collaborated in this study.

References

1. Affleck G, Tennen H, Zautra A, Urrows S, Abeles M, Karoly P: Women's pursuit of personal goals in daily life with fibromyalgia: a value-expectancy analysis. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 69: 587-596, 2001
DOI: [10.1037/0022-006X.69.4.587](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.69.4.587)
2. Andrews NE, Strong J, Meredith PJ: Activity pacing, avoidance, endurance, and associations with patient functioning in chronic pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 93: 2109-2121, 2012
DOI: [10.1016/j.apmr.2012.05.029](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2012.05.029)
3. Andrews NE, Strong J, Meredith PJ: Avoidance or Incapacitation: A Discussion on Definition and Validity of Objective Measures of Avoidance, Persistence and Overactivity. *Clin J Pain* 31: 670-672, 2015 DOI: [10.1097/AJP.0000000000000121](https://doi.org/10.1097/AJP.0000000000000121)
4. Arends RY, Bode C, Taal E, Van de Laar MA: The role of goal management for successful adaptation to arthritis. *Patient Educ Couns* 93: 130-138, 2013 DOI: [10.1016/j.pec.2013.04.022](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2013.04.022)
5. Baessler J, Schwarzer R: Evaluación de la autoeficacia: Adaptación española de la escala de Autoeficacia General. *Ansiedad y Estrés* 2: 1-8, 1996
6. Boselie JJ, Vancleef LM, Smeets T, Peters ML: Increasing optimism abolishes pain-induced impairments in executive task performance. *Pain* 155: 334-340, 2014 DOI: [10.1016/j.pain.2013.10.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2013.10.014)
7. Carver C, Scheier MF: *On the self-regulation of behavior*. Cambridge, England, Cambridge University Press, 1998
8. Carver CS, Scheier MF, Segerstrom SC: Optimism. *Clin Psychol Rev* 30: 879-889, 2010 DOI: [10.1016/j.cpr.2010.01.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2010.01.006)

9. Claes N, Crombez G, Vlaeyen JWS: Pain-avoidance versus reward-seeking: an experimental investigation. *Pain* 156: 1449-1457, 2015 DOI: 10.1097/j.pain.0000000000000116
10. Claes N, Karos K, Meulders A, Crombez G, Vlaeyen JWS: Competing goals attenuate avoidance behavior in the context of pain. *J Pain* 15: 1120-1129, 2014 DOI: 10.1016/j.jpain.2014.08.003
11. Cohen JW: *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*, 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1988
12. Crombez G, Eccleston C, Van Damme S, Vlaeyen JWS, Karoly P. Fear avoidance model of chronic pain. The next generation. *Clin J Pain* 28: 475-83, 2012 DOI: 10.1097/AJP.0b013e318285392
13. Dolnicar S: Using Cluster Analysis for Market Segmentation – Typical Misconceptions, Established Methodological Weaknesses and Some Recommendations for Improvement. *Aust J Market Res* 11: 5-12, 2003
14. Duke J, Leventhal H, Brownlee S, Leventhal EA: Giving up and replacing activities in response to illness. *J Geront* 57: 367-376, 2002 DOI: 10.1093/geronb/57.4.P367
15. Emmons RA: Personal strivings: An approach to personality and subjective well-being. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 51:1058–1068, 1986 DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.51.5.1058
16. Emmons RA, King LA: Conflict among personal strivings: Immediate and long-term implications for psychological and physical well-being. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 54:1040– 1048, 1988 DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1040

17. Esteve R, Ramírez-Maestre C, Peters ML, Serrano-Ibáñez ER, Ruíz-Párraga GT, López-Martínez AE: Development and Initial Validation of the Activity Patterns Scale in Patients with Chronic Pain. *J Pain* 17: 451-461, 2016 DOI: 10.1016/j.jpain.2015.12.009
18. Ferrando PJ, Chico-Librán E, Tous JM: Propiedades psicométricas del test de optimismo Life Orientation Test. *Psicothema* 14: 673-680, 2002
19. Fredrickson BL: The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *Am Psychol* 56: 218–226, 2001
DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218
20. Geers AL, Wellman JA, Lassiter GD: Dispositional optimism and engagement: the moderating influence of goal prioritization. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 96: 913-932, 2009
DOI: 10.1037/a0014830
21. Gill JR, Brown CA: A structured review of the evidence for pacing as a chronic pain intervention. *Eur J Pain* 13: 214-216, 2009 DOI: 10.1016/j.ejpain.2008.03.011
22. Gorges J, Esdar W, Wild E: Linking goal self-concordance and affective reactions to goal conflict. *Motiv Emotion* 38: 475-484, 2014 DOI: 10.1007/s11031-014-9392-7
23. Hanssen MM, Peters ML, Vlaeyen, JWS, Meevissen YM, Vancleef LM: Optimism lowers pain: evidence of the causal status and underlying mechanisms. *Pain* 154: 53-58, 2013 DOI: 10.1016/j.pain.2012.08.006
24. Hanssen MM, Vancleef LMG, Vlaeyen JWS, Hayes AF, Schouten EGW, Peters ML: Optimism, Motivational Coping and Well-being: Evidence Supporting the Importance of Flexible Goal Adjustment. *J Happiness Stud* 16: 1-13, 2014
DOI: 10.1007/S10902-014-9572-x

25. Hardy JK, Crofford LJ, Segerstrom SC: Goal conflict, distress, and pain in women with fibromyalgia: A daily diary study. *J Psychosom Res* 70: 534-540, 2011 DOI: 10.1016/j.jpsychores.2010.10.013
26. Hasenbring MI, Verbunt J. A. (2010). Fear-avoidance and endurance-related responses to pain: new models of behavior and their consequences for clinical practice. *Clin J Pain* 26: 747-753, 2010 DOI: 10.1097/AJP.0b013e3181e104f2
27. Jensen MP, Turner P, Romano JM, Fischer LD: Comparative reliability and validity of chronic pain intensity measures. *Pain* 83: 157-162, 1999 DOI:10.1016/S0304-3959(99)00101-3
28. Karoly P, Lecci L: Motivational correlates of self-reported persistent pain in young adults. *Clin J Pain* 13: 104-109, 1997
29. Karoly P, Okun MA, Ruhlman LS, Pugliese JA: The Impact of Goal Cognition and Pain Severity on Disability and Depression in Adults with Chronic Pain: An Examination of Direct Effects and Mediated Effects via Pain-Induced Fear. *Cognitive Ther Res* 32: 418-433, 2008 DOI: 10.1007/s10608-007-9136-z
30. Karoly P, Ruhlman LS: Goal Cognition and Its Clinical Implications Development and Preliminary Validation of Four Motivational Assessment Instruments. *Assessment* 2: 113-129, 1995
31. Karoly P, Ruhlman LS: Motivation Implications of Pain: Chronicity, Psychological Distress, and Work Goal Construal in a National Sample of Adults. *Health Psychology* 15: 383-390, 1996 DOI: 10.1037/0278-6133.15.5.383
32. Kindermans HP, Roelofs J, Goossens ME, Huijnen IP, Verbunt JA, Vlaeyen JWS: Activity patterns in chronic pain: underlying dimensions and associations with

- disability and depressed mood. *J Pain* 12: 1049-1058, 2011 DOI: 10.1016/j.jpain.2011.04.009
33. Knittle KP, De Gucht V, Hurkmans E.J, Vlieland TP, Peeters AJ, Runday HK, Maes S: Effect of Self-Efficacy and Physical Activity Goal Achievement on Arthritis Pain and Quality of Life in Patients with Rheumatoid Arthritis. *Arthrit Care Res* 63: 1613-1619, 2011 DOI: 10.1002/acr.20587
34. Librán EC, Píera P J F: Variables cognitivas y afectivas como predictoras de satisfacción en la vida. *Psicothema* 20: 408-412, 2008
35. McCracken LM, Morley S: The psychological flexibility model: A basis for integration and progress in psychological approaches to chronic pain management. *J Pain* 15: 221-234, 2014 DOI: 10.1016/j.jpain.2013.10.014
36. McCracken LM, Samuel, VM: The role of avoidance, pacing, and other activity patterns in chronic pain. *Pain* 130: 119-125, 2007 DOI: 10.1016/j.pain.2006.11.016
37. Meevissen YM, Peters ML, Alberts HJ: Become more optimistic by imagining a best possible self: Effects of a two week intervention. *J Behav Ther Exp Psy* 42: 371-378, 2011 DOI: 10.1016/j.jbtep.2011.02.012
38. Nielson WR, Jensen MP, Karsdorp PA, Vlaeyen JWS: Activity pacing in chronic pain: concepts, evidence, and future directions. *Clin J Pain* 29: 461-468, 2013 DOI: 10.1097/AJP.0b013e3182608561
39. Nielson WR, Jensen MP, Karsdorp PA, Vlaeyen JWS: A content analysis of activity pacing in chronic pain: what are we measuring and why? *Clin J Pain* 30: 639-645, 2014 DOI: 10.1097/AJP.0000000000000024

40. Otero JM, Luengo A, Romero E, Gómez JA, Castro, C: *Psicología de la personalidad. Manual de prácticas*. Barcelona, Ariel Practicum, 1988.
41. Pavlova MK, Silbereisen RK: Dispositional Optimism Fosters Opportunity-Congruent Coping With Occupational Uncertainty. *J Pers* 81: 76-86, 2013 DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2012.00782.x
42. Peters ML, Flink IK, Boersma K, Linton SJ: Manipulating optimism: Can imagining a best possible self be used to increase positive future expectancies? *J Positive Psychol* 5: 204-211, 2010 DOI: 10.1080/17439761003790963
43. Peters ML, Meevissen YM, Hanssen MM: Specificity of the Best Possible Self intervention for increasing optimism: Comparison with a gratitude intervention. *Terapia Psicológica* 31: 93-100, 2013
44. Phillips HC, Rachman S (eds): *The Psychological Management of Chronic Pain: A Treatment Manual*. New York, Springer, 1996.
45. Ramírez-Maestre C, Esteve, R: A New Version of the Impairment and Functioning Inventory for Patients with Chronic Pain (IFI-R). *PM&R* 7: 455-465, 2015 DOI: 10.1016/j.pmrj.2014.11.013
46. Rasmussen HN, Wrosch C, Scheier MF, Carver CS: Self-regulation processes and health: The importance of optimism and goal adjustment. *J Pers* 74: 1721-1747, 2006 DOI:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2006.00426.x
47. Riediger M, Freund AM: Interference and facilitation among personal goals: Differential associations with subjective well-being and persistent goal pursuit. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull* 30:1511–1523, 2004 DOI: 10.1177/0146167204271184

48. Sandín B, Chorot P, Lostao L, Joiner TE, Santed MA, Valiente, R.M: Escalas PANAS de afecto positivo y negativo: Validación factorial y convergencia transcultural. *Psicothema* 11: 37-51, 1999
49. Sandín B, Valiente RM, Chorot P: Instrumentos para la evaluación del estrés psicosocial. In: Sandín B (ed): *El estrés psicosocial: Conceptos y consecuencias clínicas*. Madrid, Klinik, 2008, pp 275-358
50. Sanjuán-Suárez P, Pérez- García AM, Bermúdez-Moreno J: Escala de autoeficacia general: datos psicométricos de la adaptación para población española. *Psicothema* 12: 509-513, 2000
51. Scheier MF, Carver CS, Bridges MW: Distinguishing optimism from neuroticism (and trait anxiety, self-mastery, and self-esteem): A reevaluation of the Life Orientation Test. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 67: 1063–1078, 1994 DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.67.6.1063
52. Schrooten MG, Van Damme S, Crombez G, Peters ML, Vogt J, Vlaeyen JWS: Nonpain goal pursuit inhibits attentional bias to pain. *Pain* 153: 1180-1186, 2012 DOI: 10.1016/j.pain.2012.01.025
53. Segerstrom SC, Solberg Nes L: When goals conflict but people prosper: The case of dispositional optimism. *J Res Pers* 40: 675-693, 2006 DOI: 10.1016/j.jrp.2005.08.001
54. Solberg Nes L, Carlson CR, Crofford LJ, de Leeuw R, Segerstrom SC: Individual differences and self-regulatory fatigue: Optimism, conscientiousness, and self-consciousness. *Pers Individ Diff* 50: 475-480, 2011 DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2010.11.011

55. Van Damme S, Kindermans H: A self-regulation perspective on avoidance and persistence behavior in chronic pain: new theories, new challenges? *Clin J Pain* 31: 115-122, 2015 DOI: 10.1097/AJP.0000000000000096
56. Van Damme S, Van Ryckeghem DM, Wyffels F, Van Hulle L, Crombez, G: No pain no gain? Pursuing a competing goal inhibits avoidance behavior. *Pain* 153: 800-804, 2012 DOI: 10.1016/j.pain.2011.12.015
57. Vlaeyen JW, Linton SJ: Fear-avoidance and its consequences in chronic musculoskeletal pain: State of the art. *Pain* 85: 317-332, 2000 DOI:10.1016/S0304-3959(99)00242-0
58. Vlaeyen JWS, Morley SJ, Linton SJ, Boersma K, de Jong J. *Pain-Related Fear: Exposure-Based Treatment of Chronic Pain: Exposure-Based Treatment*. 2nd Edition. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2015.
59. Watson D, Clark LA, Tellegen A: Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 54: 1063-1070, 1988 DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063

Table 1. Correlations between the Activity Patterns Scale (APS) subscales and optimism, pessimism, optimism-total, positive affect, negative affect, daily functioning, functional impairment, pain intensity, total number of goals, number of pain-related goals, number of non-pain-related goals, goal conflict, and goal balance.

Variables	Pain avoidance	Activity avoidance	Task-contingent persistence	Excessive persistence	Pain-contingent persistence	Pacing to increase activity level	Pacing to conserve energy for valued activities	Pacing to reduce pain
Optimism	-.16**	-.33**	.21**	-.09	-.00	.07	.08	.07
Pessimism	.30**	.43**	-.17**	.18**	.07	.11	.06	-.02
Optimism-total	-.25**	-.42**	.21**	-.15*	-.04	-.02	.02	.05
Positive Affect	-.26**	-.41**	.36**	-.06	.03	.04	.12*	.08
Negative Affect	.14*	.39**	-.16**	.35**	.17**	-.09	-.12*	-.04
Self-efficacy	-.24**	-.35**	.27**	-.12	.00	-.06	.01	.12*
Daily Functioning	-.37**	-.48**	.34**	.20**	.20**	.14*	.09	-.10
Functional Impairment	.38**	.52**	-.27**	.00	.00	.10	.06	.05
Pain Intensity	.20**	.31**	-.12*	.11	.01	.04	-.17**	-.02
Total Number of Goals	-.01	-.01	.04	.14*	.17**	.02	.08	.08

Table 1 (continuation). Correlations between the Activity Patterns Scale (APS) subscales and optimism, pessimism, optimism-total, positive affect, negative affect, daily functioning, functional impairment, pain intensity, total number of goals, number of pain-related goals, number of non-pain-related goals, goal conflict, and goal balance.

Variables	Pain avoidance	Activity avoidance	Task-contingent persistence	Excessive persistence	Pain-contingent persistence	Pacing to increase activity level	Pacing to conserve energy for valued activities	Pacing to reduce pain
Number of Pain-related goals	.09	.12	-.06	.07	.05	.02	.01	.04
Number of non-pain-related goals	-.14*	-.08	.07	.09	.12*	.01	.06	.05
Goal Conflict	-.07	-.09	.03	.13*	.02	.06	.09	.16**
Goal Balance	-.19**	-.22*	.12*	-.05	.02	-.07	-.05	.04

Table 2. Means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for comparisons between activity pattern clusters in the APS sub-scales.


Variables	1 Extreme	2 Medium					Significant inter-cluster		
<i>M (SD)</i>	Cyclers	Cyclers	3 Avoiders	4 Doers	<i>F</i> (3, 272) ¹	<i>P</i>	differences(<i>p</i> < .05)		
Pain avoidance	8.12 (2.51)	7.50 (2.27)	8.28 (2.28)	3.52 (1.37)	68.25	.000	1 > 4	2 > 4	3 > 4
Activity avoidance	8.05 (2.15)	6.56 (2.24)	7.59 (2.58)	4.11 (2.48)	34.03	.000	1 > 2	1 > 4	2 > 4
								3 > 2	3 > 4
Task-contingent persistence	6.90 (2.95)	5.87 (2.50)	3.42 (1.85)	9.16 (1.66)	75.91	.000	1 > 3	2 > 3	4 > 1
								4 > 2	4 > 3
Excessive persistence	5.43 (2.59)	6.10 (2.93)	2.96 (2.36)	6.74 (3.75)	23.68	.000	1 > 3	2 > 3	4 > 3
Pain-contingent persistence	8.72 (2.40)	8.45 (2.59)	4.19 (2.58)	7.20 (4.02)	37.37	.000	1 > 3	1 > 4	2 > 3
								2 > 4	4 > 3
Pacing to increase activity level	3.43 (2.19)	7.53 (1.99)	1.70 (2.02)	1.74 (2.18)	130.43	.000	1 > 3	1 > 4	2 > 1
								2 > 3	2 > 4
Pacing to conserve energy for valued activities	1.99 (1.50)	7.37 (2.22)	1.57 (1.92)	1.26 (1.47)	184.62	.000			
							2 > 1	2 > 3	2 > 4
Pacing to reduce pain	4.19 (2.65)	7.71 (2.57)	7.86 (2.52)	3.13 (2.53)	60.48	.000	2 > 1	2 > 4	3 > 1
									3 > 4


¹ Note: Degrees of freedom

Table 3. Means and standard deviations for comparisons between activity pattern clusters

Variables <i>M (SD)</i>	1 Extreme Cyclers	2 Medium Cyclers	3 Avoiders	4 Doers	<i>F</i> (3,272) ¹	<i>P</i>	Significant inter-cluster differences(<i>p</i> < .05)
Optimism	7.84 (2.71)	8.03 (3.17)	6.99 (3.20)	8.39 (3.17)	2.70	.046	4 > 3
Pessimism	5.24 (2.84)	5.51 (2.91)	5.80 (2.61)	4.40 (2.76)	3.12	.027	3 > 4
Optimism- total	14.60 (4.97)	14.51 (5.14)	13.19 (5.48)	16.02 (5.54)	3.26	.022	4 > 3
Positive Affect	29.62 (9.40)	31.75 (7.80)	28.09 (8.95)	33.77 (7.98)	5.80	.001	2 > 3 4 > 3
Negative Affect	27.66 (9.26)	24.36 (7.37)	27.92 (8.26)	25.10 (8.86)	3.30	.021	3 > 2
Self-efficacy	68.83 (20.66)	70.55 (19.07)	67.16 (21.75)	75.97 (18.42)	2.37	.071	n.s.
Daily Functioning	44.85 (11.27)	51.29 (15.17)	40.33 (13.20)	57.53 (11.77)	2.44	.000	2 > 1 2 > 3 4 > 1 4 > 2 4 > 3
Functional Impairment	5.64 (4.14)	4.21 (3.85)	6.09 (6.49)	1.84 (4.03)	10.15	.000	1 > 4 2 > 4 3 > 4
Pain Intensity	5.98 (1.71)	6.39 (1.65)	6.65 (1.41)	5.78 (1.76)	3.99	.008	3 > 4
Total Number of Goals	2.71 (1.11)	3.018 (1.11)	2.86 (.92)	2.97 (.98)	1.12	.344	n.s.
Number of Pain-related goals	.79 (.69)	.74 (.50)	.78 (.50)	.66 (.57)	.79	.50	n.s.
Number of non-pain-related goals	1.89 (1.24)	2.27 (1.18)	2.08 (.97)	2.31 (1.10)	1.82	.114	n.s.
Goal Conflict	1.15 (1.53)	1.92 (1.79)	1.46 (1.29)	1.38 (1.53)	3.06	.046	2 > 1
Goal Balance	7.50 (5.83)	7.46 (5.07)	8.54 (5.18)	10.06 (4.99)	3.44	.017	4 > 2

¹Note: Degrees of freedom





- Four subgroups of patients can be distinguished according to their activity patterns.
- The subgroups were: Doers, Avoiders, Medium Cyclers, and Extreme Cyclers.
- Doers had higher optimism, positive affect, functioning, and less impairment.
- Doers had the highest goal balance.
- Medium Cyclers had the highest conflict between pain and non-pain-related goals.