Using short vignettes to disentangle perceived capability from motivation: A test using walking and resistance training behaviors

Ryan E. Rhodes, David M. Williams, & Chetan D. Mistry

2016

The final publication is available at:

https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2015.1074710

Citation for this paper:

Rhodes, R. E., Williams, D. M., & Mistry, C. D. (2016). Using short vignettes to disentangle perceived capability from motivation: A test using walking and resistance training behaviors. *Psychology, Health & Medicine, 21*(5), 639-651. https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2015.1074710.

April, 2015

Running Head: DISENTANGLING PERCEIVED CAPABILITY AND MOTIVATION

Using short vignettes to disentangle perceived capability from motivation: A test using walking and resistance training behaviors

Abstract

Self-efficacy is arguably the strongest correlate of physical activity, yet some researchers suggest this is because the construct confounds ability with motivation. Williams and Rhodes (2014) have proposed a more circumscribed construct, called perceived capability (PC), meant to measure ability but not motivation and propose that the construct will not be related to unskilled physical activities but may be linked to skilled behaviors. The purpose of this paper was to examine whether a PC construct can be stripped of motivation using a vignette approach in both walking and resistance training behaviors. Participants were a random sample of 248 university students who were then randomly assigned to either answer resistance training or walking behavior questions. Both groups completed a PC measure and reasons for their answer before and after reading a vignette that clarified the phrasing of capability to a literal use of the term. PC was significantly ($p < .01$) higher post- compared to pre-vignette and the differences were greater ($p < .01$) for walking than resistance training. PC had significantly ($p < .01$) smaller correlations with intention and self-reported behavior post-disambiguation, which resulted in a null relationship with walking but a small correlation with resistance training behavior. When PC was combined with intention to predict behavior, however, there was no significant ($p > .05$) difference in the amount of variance explained pre to post-vignette. Thought listing showed that participants did not report capability barriers to walking and over half of the sample construed capability as motivation/other priorities pre-vignette. The findings support use of a vignette approach for researchers who wish to disentangle the assessment of PC from motivation while creating no overall loss in explained variance of physical activity.

Key Words: Physical Activity; Motivation; Intention; Opportunity; Ability

Regular physical activity (PA) is linked to reduced chances of acquiring over 25 chronic conditions (Warburton, Katzmarzyk, Rhodes, & Shephard, 2007), yet few North Americans engage in enough physical activity to reap these health benefits (Colley et al., 2011; Troiano et al., 2008). The use of theory to understand PA is important in order to provide an organizing framework to identify critical constructs for future promotion initiatives (Rhodes & Nigg, 2011). At the forefront of this research is Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy (SE) construct. Bandura (1998) defines SE as one's perceived capability to perform a target behavior and construes it as the key antecedent of outcome expectations, motivation, and incentives (Bandura, 1998). The construct was created for Bandura's (1998) social cognitive theory, but it has since been included and similarly operationalized in almost all popular health behavior theories (for a detailed discussion see Williams & Rhodes, 2014).

Despite the widespread application of SE and its clear predictive capability, some researchers have raised concerns that the measurement of the construct extends beyond perceived capability and into general motivation (Cahill, Gallo, Lisman, & Weinstein, 2006; Kirsch, 1982; Rhodes & Blanchard, 2007; Williams, 2010; Williams & Rhodes, 2014). The concern raised by these researchers is that people interpret capability in terms of what they are motivated to do. For example, when one is asked whether they can walk 30 min, five times per week, their interpretation is not one of whether they could physically do it but whether they willing to. When SE measures both capability and motivation, it may have problematic consequences for attempts to understand PA. Because a blend of PA motivation and capability is of broader scope than capability alone, it would show a larger correlation with intention and PA than a measure of mere capability. Prior research has supported this theorizing; measures of SE and perceived behavioral control that have attempted to control for motivation by asking participants whether

they can do PA "if they wanted to" show lower correlations with intention and PA than measures that do not include this phrase that attempts to control for motivation in the response (Rhodes & Blanchard, 2007; Rhodes & Courneya, 2004). An additional method of examining whether motivation and ability are both considered while answering "can do" questions is to ask participants why they provided their response to the question. Using this approach, Rhodes and Blanchard (2007) showed that over half of participants responded with reasons such as motivation, or enjoyment. Thus, many participants appear to respond to SE statements based on a mix of capability and motivational reasons.

Despite these concerns, Bandura (2007) has suggested that the SE construct should not be circumscribed to measure a researcher-defined conception of ability. Thus, Williams and Rhodes (2014) have suggested a replacement construct for researchers who are concerned about the motivation-ability confound called *perceived capability* (PC), defined as: perceptions of physical and mental ability, capacity, or competence to perform a specific circumscribed behavior independent of motivation to perform the behavior. In assessing PC, it is important to instruct a respondent to consider their capability and not their motivation to perform the behavior. The researchers also suggest that PC should have a very weak association with PA under most circumstances where behaviors (e.g., walking) involve little skill but may have some impact on PA when the behavior requires some skill (e.g., resistance training; RT) (Williams & Rhodes, 2014). This theorizing has not been tested in the PA domain at present.

The purpose of this paper was to determine if priming with examples of the colloquial versus the literal use of "I can" based on an approach from Cahill and colleagues (2006), will improve responses to questions about PC to carry out self-reported walking and RT behaviors. We hypothesized that both PAs would be affected by the vignettes. This would be demonstrated by

higher mean scores post-priming (because people "can do" more than they will do), weaker overall correlations with intention (i.e., motivation) and behavior (due to the shrunken measurement domain), as well as reduced elicited beliefs that were motivational in nature as reasons why participants could not participate in the PA. Furthermore, we hypothesized that the primed effect on PC would be larger for walking than RT. This was based on the assumption that respondents will colloquialize the meaning of "I can" in walking to reflect the motivational domain due to the rudimentary skill required to perform the behavior, but RT may have some variability around whether one can literally perform these behaviors. Finally, as the vignette is meant to disentangle motivation from capability, we expected no loss of explained variance in walking and RT behavior pre- to post–vignette when a measure of intention is also entered into a regression equation with PC. This was hypothesized because pre-vignette PC was expected to conflate motivational aspects with capability, so the addition of an independent measure of motivation would account for all variability between the two constructs pre- and post-vignette.

Method

Participants and Procedures

Participants were students enrolled in the winter term at a western Canadian university. A list of all 100- and 200-level classes at the university were collected (k=667). Classes were stratified by year and faculty and nineteen classes, across 10 different Faculties, were randomly selected to be contacted through the university email system. The content of the email asked potential participants to complete a short survey on beliefs and motives for PA. The link for the survey was provided at the end of the email.

After completing informed consent, participants were randomly assigned to respond to questions about walking or RT. Leisure-time walking was defined as at least 150 minutes of

walking per week during free time that was in the moderate intensity (brisk pace) or higher range (Canadian Society for Exercise Physiology, 2011). RT was defined as at least two bouts per week of any work with weights (squats, deadlift, bench press, curls etc.) and other strength exercises (push-ups, pull-ups, sit-ups) done during free time (i.e., not occupation, school or housework).

The order of the questionnaire included 1) assessment of the relevant PA (walking or RT), 2) intentions to perform this behavior, and then 3) the relevant PC questions for the study.

Participants completed a measure of PC and provided reasons for their answers in an open-text thought-listing response box. On the next page, participants were asked to read two vignettes to help clarify what was meant when they were asked to report whether they "can" or "cannot" do PA. The first vignette was:

> Ben is lifting weights with his friend Kevin. Kevin loads several weights onto the barbell. Ben tells Kevin that he "can't" lift that much weight, although he agrees to try. Despite giving it his best effort Ben "cannot" lift the bar.

The second vignette was:

> Jeremy is experiencing loneliness during his first semester at college. He seeks counseling at the student counseling center. The counselor suggests that Jeremy ask a female classmate for coffee. Jeremy says he "can't" ask out his classmate. The counselor points out that, in fact, Jeremy "can" ask his classmate for coffee, but is afraid of being rejected. Jeremy agrees with the counselor: he "can" ask his classmate for coffee, he is just afraid.

After reading the vignettes, participants were instructed to consider the words "can" and "cannot" as they are used by Ben in Story 1 and by the counselor in Story 2. Participants were

told that it may or may not change their responses from what they said before. Subsequently, participants repeated measures of PC and again, provided reasons for their answers in an open-text response box.

Measures

Perceived Capability. Before and after reading the vignettes, participants completed a measure of PC with the following stem: "Over the next 2 weeks, I can walk 150 minutes per week/strength train two bouts (at least 20 min per bout) per week." They responded on a 5-point scale of cannot do at all to 100% definitely can do. The measure was adapted from recommendations by Williams and Rhodes (2014) and followed a scaling metric similar to McAuley (1993).

The thought listing measure included the statement "considering your answer on the last question, please list the main reasons why you generally can or cannot walk/resistance train over the next two weeks" Three short open lines followed this statement, so that participants could express their views. This follows similar guidelines to general thought listing methodology (e.g., Petty & Cacioppo, 1986).

Intention. Based on the items created by Courneya (1994), participants in the RT group responded to the question, "I intend to engage in regular leisure-time RT __ times per week over the next 2 weeks" and the walking group responded to the question, "I intend to engage in regular leisure-time walking for ___ minutes per week over the next 2 weeks."

Behaviour. Participants reported the frequency and duration of participation in mild, moderate and vigorous intensity walking or RT using a modified version of the Godin Leisure Time Exercise Questionnaire (Godin, Jobin, & Bouillon, 1986; Godin & Shephard, 1985). The adapted measure has shown good predictive validity in past walking (Brown & Rhodes, 2006;

Rhodes, Courneya, Blanchard, & Plotnikoff, 2007) and RT research (Rhodes, Blanchard, & Matheson, 2007).

Analysis plan

Following sample descriptives, the main hypotheses were evaluated with paired t-tests applied to test differences between mean scores of pre-vignette and post-vignette PC as well as an independent t-test of this change in PC between walking and RT conditions. The effect of pre- and post-vignette PC on intention and self-reported behavior was subsequently examined using Hotelling's t-tests and Steiger's Z tests for dependent correlations. The same procedure was also applied to the multivariate R when both intention and PC were used to predict behavior pre- and post-vignette.

Thematic coding was used to categorize reasons for PC at pre- and post-vignette. These data were coded as total counts per theme (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). Specifically, a judge was trained to code the thoughts, identify the valence of each thought (barrier or facilitator) and theme. A theme was created if at least 5% of the sample made reference to it as a reason for their reports of PC. After primary coding, a second coder independently categorized reasons as well as identified the valence of each reason. The inter-rater reliability for the categories (α=0.79) and valence (α=1.00) were acceptable.

Results

Participants were 248 students (M_{age}=21±4.5, 44% female) with 2.2±1.1 years of university education, and 61% were meeting the Canadian PA guidelines (M=239±499 mins/week). Participants were randomly assigned to respond to the walking (n=99) or RT (n=149) questionnaires. Between groups, there were no differences in age $t(206) = 1.25$, $p > .05$, gender $\chi^2(1)=1.19$, $p > .05$, year of study $\chi^2(4)=4.31$, $p > .05$, or PA $t(226)=-0.51$, $p > .05$.

The main test of PC by vignette demonstrated that means were significantly ($p < .05$) higher post-vignette in comparison to pre-vignette (see Table 1). Furthermore, the walking group showed a significantly ($p < .05$) larger increase on PC post-vignette when compared to the resistance-training group.

Hotelling's t-tests (see Table 2) for dependent sample correlations showed that both walking and RT PC correlations with intention decreased post-vignette. PC was correlated with intention for both walking ($r = .44$ $p < 01$) and RT ($r = .48$; $p < 01$) in the medium effect-size range, but walking reduced to a non-significant ($r = .11$; $p > .05$) value post-vignette, while RT reduced to a small effect size ($r = .18$; $p < .05$). Differences in this change in correlation between the two PAs was not significantly different ($p > .05$).

Pre-vignette PC for RT was correlated with behavior in the large effect size range ($r = .51$; $p < 01$), and this relationship was reduced to a small effect size post-vignette ($r = .22$; $p < 05$), which represented a significant change [$t(136)=3.87$, $q=0.66$]. By contrast, pre- and post-vignette walking PC was not associated with behavior.

The magnitude of the multivariate R when intention and PC were used to predict behavior pre- and post-vignette was also examined. For walking, the pre- (intention $\beta = .50$, $p < .01$; perceived capability $\beta = .08$, $p > .05$) and post- (intention $\beta = .51$, $p < .01$; perceived capability $\beta = -.11$, $p > .05$) vignette Rs = .54. For RT, the pre-vignette (intention $\beta = .51$, $p < .01$; perceived capability $\beta = .24$, $p < .01$) R = .67 and this was reduced to (intention $\beta = .61$, $p < .01$; perceived capability $\beta = .13$, $p > .05$) R = .65 post-vignette. The change was not significant ($z = .28$, $p > .05$).

Reasons Why Participants Perceived they "Can" or "Cannot" do the Physical Activities

Thematic analysis of the reasons provided why respondents could or could not engage in walking and RT are provided in Table 3. Nine themes emerged from the thought listing procedure pre-vignette including physical ability, past behavior accomplishment, school work, time, motivation, resources, environment, affective judgments, and outcome expectations. Comparisons of the shift of themes are also present in Table 3. Of note, perceptions of ability as a facilitator (walking +15%; RT +16%) rose considerably post-vignette, while reasons of past behavior (walking -17%; RT -22%) declined. In terms of barriers, school (walking -24%; RT -23%), time (walking -28%; RT -10%), and motivation (walking -16%; RT -6%) all fell considerably from pre-vignette to post-vignette.

Discussion

Our hypothesis that a primed vignette condition that clarifies the definition of "I can" would affect PC measures for walking and RT had strong support and demonstrates the sensitivity of wording in health-related measurement (McClain, Grant, Willis, & Berrigan, 2012). First, mean PC scores under the post-vignette condition showed much higher values than pre-vignette, supporting our theorizing that people "can do" more than they will do. This finding complements prior work by Rhodes and colleagues (Rhodes & Blanchard, 2007; Rhodes & Courneya, 2003, 2004), who showed that SE constructs also had higher means when "if I wanted to" was employed to hold motivation to a positive constant.

The thought listing procedures for the reasons behind these responses showed a clear illustration of what was happening pre- to post-vignette. Among the reasons given for responses pre-vignette, capability/past accomplishment represented 35-40% of the responses. The remaining 60-65% of responses cited other priorities and outcome expectations. The findings corroborate a similar thought listing procedure conducted by Rhodes and Blanchard (2007). Both

studies demonstrate that more than half of the reasons for responding to SE measures are based on outcome expectations and overall motivation, which are supposed to be its consequences and not its antecedents. The reasons given for PC post-vignette, however, show a marked change in ability as a facilitator, as well as very large decreases in barriers such as time, school work, and motivation. This is the first study to map these changes in the reasons for PC as a result of clarifying the definition of "I can".

We also had support for the hypothesis that the colloquial use of "I can" would be larger for walking than RT. Walking showed a significantly larger mean increase in the post-vignette condition compared to RT. In the thought listing procedure, ability to walk was not considered a barrier for any participant and motivation shrunk from 16% to zero post-vignette. By contrast, 17% of respondents gave ability reasons as a barrier for RT and this showed a minor decrease post vignette (- 4%).

Our hypothesis that the vignette would affect PC correlations with intention and PA was also supported. Correlations with intention were significantly larger pre-vignette compared to post-vignette. The finding corroborates prior work (Rhodes & Blanchard, 2007; Rhodes & Courneya, 2003, 2004), but our examination of self-reported walking compared to RT advanced prior literature. Specifically, while the effects of the vignette reduced PC and intention/behavior relationships to null in the walking condition, RT PC had small and significant relationships with intention and behavior. This supports the summary position by Williams and Rhodes (2014) that PC will have a weak relationship with non-skilled behaviors but still relate to behaviors that may require more skill. The results also validate the utility of understanding PC across different behaviors.

Importantly, our results also supported the hypothesis for no loss of explained variance in walking and RT behavior pre-to post–vignette when a measure of motivation (i.e., intention) was also entered into a regression equation with PC. It may seem odd to some readers that Williams and Rhodes (2014) advocate for a measure, such as PC, and suggest it should show a weak correlation with behavior. As scientists and promotion specialists are gain-framed to understand more variance in PA, this seems counter-intuitive in terms of face-value utility. However, the purpose of using the PC construct in PA research is to provide a disentangled separation between motivation and capability. The demonstration that an independent measure of motivation can account for all variability between the two constructs pre- and post-vignette provides support that researchers can use the PC construct with measures of motivation to parse their relative contributions and design interventions accordingly.

While the results of this study support the use a vignette approach to measure PC in health behavior surveys, some limitations warrant mention. First, the study used a sample of university undergraduates and adapted measures of self-reported PA. This line of research would benefit by including objective measures of PA, behaviors with larger discrepancies in skill than walking and RT, and diverse samples. Indeed, it's imperative that clinical or compromised populations be assessed independently and these findings not be generalized, because PC may be a far more important construct for these groups compared to young healthy adults (Williams & Rhodes, 2014). Finally, our experimental format where we ask participants to re-answer the same questions post-vignette could bias the results. This is largely alleviated by the differences observed in the walking and RT conditions, but a randomized between-groups trial with a no-vignette condition, as well as vignettes that illustrate what "can" or "cannot" do other than physical tasks will help remove this possibility of error.

References

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84,* 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1998). Health promotion from the perspective of social cognitive theory. *Psychology and Health, 13,* 623-649.

Bandura, A. (2007). Much ado over a faulty conception of perceived self-efficacy grounded in faulty experimentation. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 26,* 641-658.

Brown, S. G., & Rhodes, R. E. (2006). Relationships among dog ownership and leisure time walking amid Western Canadian adults. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 30,* 131-136.

Cahill, S. P., Gallo, L. A., Lisman, S. A., & Weinstein, A. (2006). Willing or able? The meanings of self-efficacy. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 25,*, 196-209.

Canadian Society for Exercise Physiology. (2011). Canadian physical activity guidelines for adults 18-64 years. http://www.csep.ca/english/view.asp?x=804

Colley, R. C., Garriguet, D., Janssen, I., Craig, C. L., Clarke, J., & Tremblay, M. S. (2011). Physical activity of Canadian adults: Accelerometer results from the 2007 to 2009 Canadian health measures survey, Health Reports *Statistics Canada* (pp. 22(21), 21-28).

Courneya, K. S. (1994). Predicting repeated behavior from intention: The issue of scale correspondence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24,* 580-594.

Godin, G., Jobin, J., & Bouillon, J. (1986). Assessment of leisure time exercise behavior by self-report: A concurrent validity study. *Canadian Journal of Public Health, 77,* 359-361.

Godin, G., & Shephard, R. J. (1985). A simple method to assess exercise behavior in the community. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Science, 10,* 141-146.

Kirsch, I. (1982). Efficacy expectations or response predictions: The meaning of efficacy ratings as a function of task characteristics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42*, 132-136. doi: doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.42.1.132

McAuley, E. (1993). Self-efficacy and the maintenance of exercise participation in older adults *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 16*, 103-113.

McClain, J. J., Grant, D., Willis, G., & Berrigan, D. (2012). Effect of temporal domain on self-reported walking behaviors in the California Health Interview Survey. *Journal of physical activity & health, 9*, 344-351.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In L. Berowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Psychology* (Vol. 19, pp. 124-203). New York: Academic Press.

Rhodes, R. E., & Blanchard, C. M. (2007). What do confidence items measure in the physical activity domain? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37*, 753-768.

Rhodes, R. E., Blanchard, C. M., & Matheson, D. H. (2007). Motivational antecedent beliefs of endurance, strength, and flexibility activities. *Psychology, Health and Medicine, 12*, 148-162.

Rhodes, R. E., & Courneya, K. S. (2003). Self-efficacy, controllability, and intention in the theory of planned behavior: Measurement redundancy or causal independence? *Psychology and Health, 18*, 79-91.

Rhodes, R. E., & Courneya, K. S. (2004). Differentiating motivation and control in the theory of planned behavior. *Psychology, Health and Medicine, 9*, 205-215.

Rhodes, R. E., Courneya, K. S., Blanchard, C. M., & Plotnikoff, R. C. (2007). Prediction of leisure-time walking: An integration of social cognitive, perceived environmental, and

personality factors. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 4*, 51.

Rhodes, R. E., & Nigg, C. R. (2011). Advancing physical activity theory: A review and future directions. *Exercise and Sports Sciences Reviews, 39*, 113-119.

Troiano, R. P., Berrigan, D., Dodd, K. W., Masse, L. C., Tilert, T., & McDowell, M. (2008). Physical activity in the United States measured by accelerometer. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise, 40*, 181-188.

Warburton, D. E. R., Katzmarzyk, P., Rhodes, R. E., & Shephard, R. J. (2007). Evidence-informed physical activity guidelines for Canadian adults. *Applied Physiology, Nutrition and Metabolism, 32*, S16-S68.

Williams, D. M. (2010). Outcome expectancy and self-efficacy: Theoretical implications of an unresolved contradiction. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 14*, 417-425.

Williams, D. M., & Rhodes, R. E. (2014). The confounded self-efficacy construct: Review, conceptual analysis, and recommendations for future research. *Health Psychology Review*, 1-16.

Table 1. Means, standard deviations and dependent t-tests for pre-vignette and post-vignette perceived capability.

	Perceived Capability					
Behaviour	Pre M(SD)	Post M(SD)	Pre-Post Difference[A]	df	t	*d*
Walking	4.01 (1.27)	4.86 (0.38)	0.85	92	6.60**	1.63
Strength Training	4.19 (1.29)	4.59 (0.94)	0.40	142	4.03**	0.68

Notes: A) The pre-post difference scores were significantly different from one another, $t(234)=2.81$, $p<.05$; *$p<0.05$; ** $p<0.01$.

Table 2. Correlations and differences between pre-vignette self-efficacy and post-vignette perceived capability correlations with intentions and behavior.

	Perceived Capability-Intention						Perceived Capability-Behavior					
Behavior	Pre (r)	Post (r)	z	r	t	q	Pre (r)	Post (r)	z	r	t	q
Walking	0.44**	0.11	2.71*	0.99	2.84*	0.58	0.19	-0.17	2.79*	0.99	2.91*	0.59
Strength Training	0.48**	0.18*	3.72*	0.99	3.93*	0.67	0.51**	0.22*	3.67*	0.99	3.87*	0.66

Notes: ** p<0.01, *p<0.05. t = Hotelling's t for dependent correlations. Walking behavior df=96, Strength training df=136.

Table 3. Thought listing by valence, behavior and pre- and post-vignette.

	Walking				Strength training				
	Pre		Post		Pre		Post		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	Examples
Facilitators									
Ability	14	8	39	23	12	5	54	21	“I am physically capable of this.”
Past/Present behaviour	53	29	21	12	86	33	27	11	“I already do this every week.”
Class, Exams, School	8	4	3	2	9	3	4	2	“It is a part of my routine at school.”
Time, Busy	26	14	34	20	40	15	38	15	“I have the time to do so.”
Motivation	7	4	10	6	25	10	12	5	“I have the motivation.”
Resources	3	2	3	2	6	2	16	6	“I have a gym membership.”
Environment	17	9	13	8	2	1	4	2	“I live close to a gym.”
Affective judgments	24	13	27	16	33	13	18	7	“I enjoy physical activity.”
Outcome expectations	19	10	12	7	41	14	16	6	“Beneficial to my health.”
Barriers									
Ability	2	3	0	0	13	16	10	13	“Shoulder injury.”
Past/Present behaviour	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	“I’ve never done it before.”
Class, Exams, School	20	28	3	4	22	27	3	4	“Studying for final exams.”
Time, Busy	25	35	5	7	16	19	7	9	“Not enough time.”
Motivation	11	16	0	0	8	10	3	4	“I lack the motivation.”
Resources	4	6	1	1	5	6	1	1	“I don't have a gym membership.”
Environment	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	“Weather might not be nice all week.”
Affective judgments	6	9	3	4	14	17	7	9	“It's boring.”
Outcome expectations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	