



Relations between self-efficacy beliefs, self-presentation motives, personal task goals, and performance on endurance-based physical activity tasks



Timothy C. Howle^{*}, James A. Dimmock, Ben Jackson

School of Sport Science, Exercise and Health, The University of Western Australia, Crawley, WA 6009, Australia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 20 February 2015

Received in revised form

24 June 2015

Accepted 28 June 2015

Available online 6 July 2015

Keywords:

Impression motivation

Effort

Persistence

ABSTRACT

We conducted two studies with the aim of examining the relations between self-presentation motives and physical activity task performance. In study 1, prior to performing an endurance-based physical activity task, 133 undergraduate participants ($M_{age} = 20.89$, $SD = 5.21$) reported acquisitive-agentic and protective-agentic self-presentation motives alongside task self-efficacy, self-presentational efficacy, and their personal task goals. Using a different endurance-based physical activity task in study 2, we also assessed undergraduate participants' ($n = 150$; $M_{age} = 20.23$, $SD = 3.34$) dispositional exercise-related self-presentation motivation alongside the variables measured in study 1. Bayesian path analyses revealed indirect relations between agentic self-presentation motives and task performance via participants' personal task goals. Findings also indicated that agentic self-presentation motives may act as intermediaries in indirect pathways linking efficacy beliefs and dispositional exercise-related self-presentation motivation to goal processes and task performance. The results contribute to a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between self-presentation motivation and task performance.

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Self-presentation motivation refers to individuals' motivation to have others view them in a desired way. This motivation is thought to drive acts of impression construction (i.e., the behavior that individuals use to construct and convey a desired image to others; Leary & Kowalski, 1990), including behavior within group-based physical activity settings (Hausenblas, Brewer, & Van Raalte, 2004; Martin Ginis, Lindwall, & Prapavessis, 2007; Prapavessis, Grove, & Eklund, 2004). In line with this notion, Leary (1992) outlined a conceptual link between self-presentation motivation and task performance, contending that individuals will exert (relatively) more effort on a physical activity task when they believe that this effort will create a desired image in the eyes of others. Our overarching aim in the present studies was to test this prediction.

Researchers interested in studying self-presentational phenomena have largely relied on the Self-Presentation in Exercise Questionnaire (SPEQ; Conroy, Motl, & Hall, 2000) to assess the extent of individuals' exercise-related self-presentation motivation. This measure assesses dispositional-level perceptions, inasmuch as

individuals are oriented to consider their general level of self-presentation motivation to be seen as an exerciser, rather than the extent of their self-presentation motivation at a given moment. Although individuals are generally consistent in the way they wish to present themselves (Leary & Batts Allen, 2011) and dispositional measures are useful in predicting individuals' typical day-to-day behavior (c.f., Paunonen & Ashton, 2001), researchers working in the physical activity domain have found that dispositional exercise-related self-presentation motivation typically displays only small-to-moderate positive associations with measures of physical activity, such as exercise frequency (Brunet & Sabiston, 2011; Brunet, Sabiston, & Gaudreau, 2014; Conroy et al., 2000; Lindwall, 2005; Martin Ginis & Mack, 2012). Although the lack of strong relationship between self-presentation motivation and physical activity may appear to be somewhat discouraging for investigators, there are a number of reasons for the continued investigation of self-presentation processes in exercise contexts.

First, there may be merit in considering individuals' self-presentational drive at a given point in time (i.e., a situational approach to the assessment of self-presentation motivation). Social psychologists have argued that considering situational as well as dispositional factors may promote a better understanding of why

^{*} Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: tim.howle@research.uwa.edu.au (T.C. Howle), james.dimmock@uwa.edu.au (J.A. Dimmock), ben.jackson@uwa.edu.au (B. Jackson).

an individual behaves the way they do at a given time (Mischel & Shoda, 1995). For example, Fleeson (2001) noted that although individuals may report relatively consistent behavioral tendencies, there is also meaningful variation in behavior that may be accounted for by situational factors. With respect to self-presentation, researchers have found that context-specific factors, such as the audience's prior knowledge of self-presenters and the cultural norms of self-presenters (Baumeister & Jones, 1978; Kurman, 2001), shape the type of image individuals wish to project. As such, in seeking to explain behavior within a given situation, it may be worth moving beyond a focus squarely on dispositional self-presentation motivation to also explore individuals' self-presentational motivation within that situation.

A second reason that further investigation of self-presentation processes in exercise may be warranted is that rather than only accounting for the direct relationships between self-presentation motivation and physical activity, it may also be useful to examine indirect associations in an effort to provide a more complete understanding of the relationship/s between these constructs. Drawing from the approach/avoidance theoretical paradigm (Elliot, 2008), it is possible that personal task goals are one process through which self-presentation motives are indirectly related to behavior. For example, within the approach/avoidance literature, theorists contend that motives shape goals, and in turn, that goals subsequently shape behavior (Elliot, 2006; Gable & Impett, 2012). Research into interpersonal relationships supports this contention. Elliot, Gable, and Mapes (2006), for instance, found that the social motives for hope of affiliation and fear of rejection positively aligned, respectively, with approach- and avoidance-oriented social goals. Impett et al. (2010) found that individuals high in approach goals were more behaviorally responsive to their partners, whereas the opposite was true for individuals high in avoidance goals. In this manuscript, and in line with previous work (Jones & Hanton, 1996), we focus on individuals' personal level of aspiration for their task performance (i.e., how long an individual aims to perform a physical activity task), which we refer to as their personal task goal. Previous research has found that these types of self-set goals positively predict physical activity performance (Stoeber, Uphill, & Hotham, 2009).

2 × 2 self-presentation motives

Recent developments in the literature may assist investigators in considering situational self-presentation motivation and accounting for goals in the self-presentation motive/behavior relationship. Specifically, researchers have proposed a 2 × 2 framework of self-presentation motives, have developed an instrument designed to measure these motives, and have detailed how these motives may align with constructs of interest (e.g., task performance, goals, behavior, and efficacy beliefs; Howle, Dimmock, Whipp, & Jackson, 2015; Howle, Jackson, Conroy, & Dimmock, 2015). These 2 × 2 motives are conceptualized as being situational and orthogonal in nature. That is, individuals may endorse more than one motive at a given time, and the type/strength of an individual's motive endorsement may differ from moment-to-moment, rather than being stable across situations.

The 2 × 2 motive framework is derived from the approach/avoidance (Elliot, 2008; Elliot & Church, 1997; Gable & Impett, 2012) and agency/communion (Bakan, 1966; Horowitz et al., 2006) theoretical perspectives. Approach motives are those that orient individuals toward positive stimuli, whereas avoidance motives are those that orient individuals away from negative stimuli (Elliot, 2008). Arkin (1981) conceptualized self-presentation motives based on this distinction. Individuals who adopt an acquisitive (i.e., approach-oriented) self-presentation motive desire to gain social approval, whereas individuals who adopt a protective

(i.e., avoidance-oriented) self-presentation motive desire to avoid social disapproval. In addition to the *valence* of an individual's self-presentation motive, the 2 × 2 framework also accounts for the *focus* of one's self-presentation efforts. An agentic motive orients individuals to a focus on influence, task-oriented achievement, and mastery, whereas a communal motive orients individuals to a focus on interpersonal relationships and connections (Horowitz et al., 2006; O'Brien & DeLongis, 1996).

By integrating acquisitive/protective and agentic/communal perspectives, Howle, Dimmock, et al. (2015), Howle, Jackson, et al. (2015) proposed that individuals may endorse acquisitive-agentic, acquisitive-communal, protective-agentic, or protective-communal self-presentation motives. In the present studies we only considered acquisitive-agentic and protective-agentic (and not communal) motives. This focus on agency was appropriate given that (a) individuals' focus on agency (i.e., a task-focus) in response to agentic stressors (i.e., task performance; O'Brien & DeLongis, 1996), and (b) we examined task performance in a context where communal motives were not salient (i.e., the tasks did not allow for interpersonal interaction). An acquisitive-agentic motive reflects a focus on gaining approval from others in terms of their perceptions of one's physical qualities and task ability (e.g., being seen as athletic or physically competent). A protective-agentic motive reflects a focus on avoiding social disapproval from others in terms of their perceptions of one's physical qualities and task ability (e.g., avoiding being seen as incompetent during a task). Consistent with the approach (i.e., acquisitive) and avoidance (i.e., protective) paradigm (c.f., Elliot, 2008), acquisitive-agentic motives are positively aligned with task involvement, performance, and a focus on success, whereas protective-agentic motives are positively aligned with avoidance, withdrawal, and a focus on potential failures (Arkin, 1981; Howle, Dimmock, et al., 2015; Howle, Jackson, et al., 2015; Schutz, 1998).

As noted earlier, however, it is also important to consider the personal task goals that individuals adopt alongside assessments of their self-presentation motivation and task performance. The inclusion of personal task goals may be particularly useful because accounting for the indirect pathways between self-presentation motivation and physical activity behavior may inform a more nuanced view of the relationship between these constructs. Acquisitive-agentic motives are expected to be positively associated with personal task goals insofar as better performance is indicative of greater task ability and physical competence on tasks in which performance is under one's control (Howle, Jackson, et al., 2015). Researchers (Howle, Dimmock, et al., 2015) have previously examined the relationship between agentic motives and performance goal orientations (i.e., approach- or avoidance-orientation), but did not allow individuals to set personal task goals using an open-ended format. The appropriateness of open-ended assessments of personal task goals is supported by findings that these measures (a) positively correspond with established questionnaires (Harackiewicz, Barron, Carter, Lehto, & Elliot, 1997), (b) are thought to be a more proximal determinant of performance than goal-orientation (Brett & VandeWalle, 1999; Latham & Locke, 2007), and (c) are strongly and positively associated with physical activity performance (Stoeber et al., 2009). In this respect, we sought to extend earlier findings by directly measuring *what* personal task goals are set (i.e., goal time) rather than *what types* of goals are set (i.e., goal orientation).

In addition to considering 2 × 2 motives, personal task goals, and task performance, it may also be important to account for individuals' task self-efficacy and self-presentational efficacy beliefs. Task self-efficacy represents one's confidence in his/her ability to perform the requisite elements of a task (Bandura, 1977). Self-presentational efficacy represents one's confidence in his/her ability to present a desired image (Leary & Atherton, 1986).

متن کامل مقاله

دریافت فوری ←

ISIArticles

مرجع مقالات تخصصی ایران

- ✓ امکان دانلود نسخه تمام متن مقالات انگلیسی
- ✓ امکان دانلود نسخه ترجمه شده مقالات
- ✓ پذیرش سفارش ترجمه تخصصی
- ✓ امکان جستجو در آرشیو جامعی از صدها موضوع و هزاران مقاله
- ✓ امکان دانلود رایگان ۲ صفحه اول هر مقاله
- ✓ امکان پرداخت اینترنتی با کلیه کارت های عضو شتاب
- ✓ دانلود فوری مقاله پس از پرداخت آنلاین
- ✓ پشتیبانی کامل خرید با بهره مندی از سیستم هوشمند رهگیری سفارشات