THE IMPACT OF RELATIONSHIP SELF-EFFICACY AND COGNITIVE APPRAISALS ON AFFECTIVE RESPONSES TO SOCIAL INTERACTIONS

Zhaoli Song and Angeline Lim*
National University of Singapore

Maw-Der Foo and Marilyn Ang Uy
University of Colorado at Boulder

Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Angeline Lim, Department of Management and Organization, National University of Singapore, 1 Business Link 1, Singapore 117592. Telephone: +65-9783-1121. Fax: +65-6382-4966. Electronic mail address: angeline.lim@nus.edu.sg.

April 10, 20
The Impact of Relationship Self-Efficacy and Cognitive Appraisals on Affective Responses to Social Interactions

Abstract

Social interactions play a part in an individual’s everyday life. Besides being a channel through which information and other resources flow, social interactions also evoke certain affective responses within individuals. This study contributes to social interactions research by examining the role of cognitive appraisals and relationship self-efficacy in relation to affective responses to social interactions. To examine this, we tracked the social interactions and the affective responses of 161 undergraduate students via cell phones over a period of 14 days. Results indicated that relationship self-efficacy moderates the relationship between social interactions and positive moods and cognitive appraisals (pleasant, unpleasant, controllable, and important) mediate the relationship between social interactions and mood.
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Social interactions are an integral part of most individuals’ daily lives. Defined as “any situation involving two or more people in which the behavior of each person is in response to the behavior of the other person” (Reis & Wheeler, 1991), social interactions have been found to affect both individual and organizational performance through the facilitation of information and resource exchange (e.g. Ibarra, 1993; Tichy, 1981). In addition, social interactions provide the social support needed for each individual’s physical and mental well-being (e.g. Myers & Diener, 1995; Pavot, Diener, & Fujita, 1990; Tschan, Semmer, & Inversin, 2004). Social interactions have also been found to evoke certain affective responses within individuals (e.g. Watson, 1988; Watson, Clark, McIntyre, & Hamaker, 1992).

In the last decade, scholars of organizational behavior have seen a renewed interest in the study of affect. This resurgence of affect studies in organizational behavior, greatly enhanced by the emerging of Affective Events Theory (AET, Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996), follows hot on the heels of a similar trend in social psychology. According to the AET, affect is at the core of the relationship between work events and attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. The theory suggests that affective reactions (moods, emotions) to work events mediate this relationship and that dispositional factors may act as a moderator between work events and affective reactions. However, even though in their paper, Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) have clarified the important role of cognitive appraisal in the process of emotional reactions towards external events, empirical tests of
AET tend to ignore the cognitive component of affective reactions. This has resulted in an unrealistic unbalance in the study of affect since cognitive appraisals (sometimes also referred to as evaluations or interpretations) of events or situations has been argued by appraisal theorists to affect the emotion elicited (citation). Given the importance of engagement in social interactions to an individual’s well-being and work outcomes and its documented relationship with affect, we assert that the cognitive aspect of affective reactions to social interactions is understudied. This study proposes to address this gap in the literature by examining the role of cognitive appraisals in affective reactions to social interactions. We postulate that cognitive appraisals play a mediating role in this relationship, and that the individual appraisal dimensions relate directly to positive affect and negative affect.

Affective reactions to social interactions cannot be understood purely based on state-like occurrences of mood and cognitive appraisals. Trait-like variables have a part to play too. Bandura (1986: 393) argues that “people’s beliefs about their operative capabilities function as one set of proximal determinants of how they behave, thought patterns, and the emotional reactions they experience in taxing situations”. These beliefs, which he refers to as self-efficacy beliefs, refer to a sense of mastery in one’s ability to achieve a desired outcome. In relation to social interactions, the belief that one is able to handle a relationship in general may have consequences for how they feel after engaging in social interactions. For instance, if individuals believe that they are capable of handling relationships with others in general, they may feel more positive after engaging in social interactions than individuals who feel incapable of doing so. We thus propose to examine
the role of relationship self-efficacy in affective reactions to social interactions, to complement the state-like measures of cognitive appraisals on affect.

In sum, this study contributes to the social interactions literature by examining the role cognitive appraisals and relationship self-efficacy play in affective reactions to social interactions. Specifically, we posit that cognitive appraisals play a mediating role and relationship self-efficacy plays a moderating role. The next section of this study reviews the literature on cognitive appraisals and relationship self-efficacy in developing the hypotheses for the study. Methods and results are then described and presented. Finally, a discussion of the limitations and implications ensue.

Literature Review and Hypotheses Development

**Relationship self-efficacy**

Relationship self-efficacy refers to a person’s perceived abilities to engage in relationship maintenance activities which are seen as critical for the formation and maintenance of relationships (Morúa & Lopez, 2005). Research on relationship self-efficacy has used this term with specific reference to romantic relationships. Scales developed under this label are also targeted at measuring an individual’s confidence in maintaining relationships with romantic partners. Since the emergence of this construct, emergent theory and research findings have suggested that relationship self-efficacy is related to relationship satisfaction (Bradbury, 1989; Lopez & Lent, 1989; Madden & Janoff-Bulman, 1981) and positive behaviors during marital interactions (Weiss, 1984). Intuitively, a person who has high relationship self-efficacy will feel comfortable engaging in social interactions, as they perceive that they have the skills necessary to maintain relationships. Thus, in the event that they do engage in social interactions, they
will tend to experience more positive moods. Accordingly, we expect that an individual
with high relationship self-efficacy who engages in social interactions is more likely to
have more positive moods. Hence, we posit that

\[ \text{H1: Individuals with high relationship self-efficacy are more likely to have} \]
\[ \text{more positive moods when they engage in social interactions than} \]
\[ \text{individuals with low relationship self-efficacy.} \]

\textit{Cognitive Appraisals}

The idea that cognitive appraisals of a situation or event affect emotions dates
back to the time of Aristotle and Descartes. These ancient philosophers, in philosophizing
about emotions, have already put forth the notion that it is people’s interpretations of the
events that affect their emotional reaction to it (Ellsworth & Scherer, 2003; Gardiner,
Clark-Metcalf, & Beebe-Center, 1980). In the current era, Magda Arnold (1960) was the
first to use of the term \textit{appraisal} to refer to direct, immediate and intuitive evaluations to
account for qualitative distinction among emotions. However, it was only in the 1980s
that scholars in the social psychological field began to recognize the importance of
cognitive appraisals in emotions.

The most prominent early appraisal theorist, Richard Lazarus (1966),
distinguished between three specific forms of appraisal – primary appraisal, secondary
appraisal, and reappraisal. Primary appraisal refers to the evaluation of the situation in
relation to the individual’s well-being, and includes appraisals of positiveness, stressful,
or irrelevance to well-being. Secondary appraisal takes into account the evaluation of the
resources the individual has to handle the situation. Reappraisal occurs when the primary
and secondary appraisals are modified. Subsequently, Smith and Lazarus (1993)
presented a more detailed version of these forms of appraisals and suggested that there are six types of appraisals – two primary and four secondary. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) highlighted that the terms primary and secondary used to distinguish the appraisals do not in any way refer to the sequence of occurrence of these appraisals or differentiate the importance of these appraisals. Appraisal theorists too have not conformed to Lazarus’ (1966) conceptualization of the two forms of appraisals, and have gone ahead to propose differing sets of appraisals that are appropriate to distinguish different types of emotions (see Ellsworth and Scherer (2003) for a comparative overview of the major appraisal dimensions postulated by different theorists). Despite the different sets of appraisals proposed, some appraisal dimensions (e.g. pleasantness, agency, importance) are similar and simply appear in varying forms in these conceptualizations. In this study, we adapt a set of appraisal dimensions that are relevant to social interactions from van Eck, Nicolson, & Berkhof (1998): pleasantness, unpleasantness, controllability and importance.

The valence of the appraisal has long been of concern to researchers, perhaps because pleasure and pain are basic to affective experiences. Appraisal theorists have mostly conceptualized valence as either pleasant (Scherer, 1994; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985), unpleasant (van Eck, Nicolson & Berkhof, 1998) or valence (Frijda, 1986), suggesting that positive and negative appraisals fall on a single continuum. In our study, we conceptualize appraisals of pleasantness and unpleasantness to fall on two continua because there may be instances when social interactions are both pleasant and unpleasant. When one interprets a social interaction to be pleasant, the individual will naturally feel positive. Similarly, when one interprets a social interaction to be unpleasant, the individual will feel negative. As such, we posit that
**H2a:** The more pleasant the appraisal of the social interaction, the more positive the individual’s mood.

**H2b:** The more unpleasant the appraisal of the social interaction, the more negative the individual’s mood.

Adapting from van Eck et al.’s (1998) measure of cognitive appraisals, the interpretation that a social interaction is within one’s control and is of importance may also impact affective response to social interactions. Importance of the particular social interaction that they engage in may not affect the valence of the mood state, but the intensity of the mood. Given that a social interaction is of particular importance, and is appraised as being an unpleasant one, the individual will feel greater negative affect than if the interaction is an unimportant one. This does not only apply to unpleasant interactions, but other types of interactions too. Thus, so long as the interaction is evaluated as being an important one, the intensity of mood (whichever direction it fluctuates) will be greater. Hence, we hypothesize that

**H2c:** The more important the appraisal of the social interaction, the greater the intensity of moods.

The above three appraisal dimensions fit into what Lazarus (1966) conceptualized to be primary appraisals – appraisals related to the individual’s well-being (positiveness, stressfulness, relevance). The fourth appraisal dimension of controllability falls into Lazarus’ (1966) conceptualization of secondary appraisals – evaluation of resources that the individual has to handle the situation. If individuals feel that they are in control of the situation, they will tend to feel more confident. In turn, they will tend to feel more positive affect. Thus,
H2d: The more controllable the appraisal of the social interaction, the more positive the individual’s mood.

There has been much discussion as to whether cognitive appraisals should be thought of as antecedents of emotions or components of emotions. James (1884) suggested that appraisals preceded emotions, but Zajonc (1980) suggested that emotions may precede appraisals. Other appraisal theorists hold the view that appraisals are components of emotions and that a specific emotion is made up of a set of cognitive appraisals. For example, fear is the feeling of high attention, negative valence, high uncertainty about what is happening or one’s ability to cope with it. There has been no resolution to that debate as yet, thus in this study, we adopt the earliest view of cognitive appraisals as being interpretations of events that lead up to emotions. This implies that when a social interaction occurs, evaluations of the social interaction will affect the mood of the individual. That is, social interactions’ impact on mood is dependent on the cognitive appraisals of the social interaction. Since in the Hypothesis 1 we propose an interaction effect of relationship self-efficacy and social interaction influencing moods, we expect appraisals will mediate this moderating effect. Therefore, we postulate that

H3: Appraisals mediate the moderating relationship between moods, social interaction and relationship self-efficacy.

See Figure 1 for our full conceptual model.

Method

Sample

Participants for this study consisted of undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory Management course. They participated in this study as part of their course
requirement. Participants were selected based on the tutorial classes that they enrolled in. This is to facilitate the administration of the study, since we needed only a portion of the total number of students enrolled in this course. A total of 169 students were enrolled in this study. One student dropped out from the study leaving a total of 168 students who participated in the study. Seven participants were dropped from the study because he did not complete at least 50% of the cellphone surveys, leaving a total of 167 students in the final sample. The average age of the participants was 21.41 years (SD=1.70), 41.61% are males and 58.39% are females. Approximately 83.85% of the participants are ethnically Chinese, while the rest were Malays (2.48%) and Indians (4.97%). Other ethnicities comprising Sinhalese (2), Vietnamese (4), Boyanese (1), Filipino (2), Kashmiri (1), Sikhs (2) and Pakistani (1) make up the remaining 8.70% of the sample.

Procedure

Participants first completed a web-based baseline survey, which obtained information on their demographics, trait affectivity, personality and interpersonal relations. They then had to complete affect momentary surveys via cell phones three times a day for two consecutive weeks. This survey measured their momentary moods, obtained information on the social interactions or activities they were engaged in at that point in time, and their appraisals of these social interactions or activities. To prepare them for the daily cellphone surveys, participants were instructed to activate the GPRS service with their mobile service providers and download the survey from the server into their cell phones. Participants whose phones did not support GPRS or used an operating platform that did not support the survey format that was to be downloaded were loaned cell phones that had the surveys installed. A total of 52 participants had phones which did
not support GPRS or the survey format. Once the survey has been downloaded, participants were instructed to complete the survey once and send it back to the “system” to (1) familiarize them with the survey, and (2) to ensure that any technical issue was ironed out.

Before the actual daily momentary surveys began, a one-day trial run was done with the participants. The trial run simulated the actual daily momentary surveys, whereby 3 SMS reminders were sent in one day to remind participants to complete the survey. The reminders were sent to the participants at semi-random times between 10am and 10pm. These two time points were selected because an earlier study conducted with students from the same cohort indicated that between 8am to 10am students were mostly asleep, even on a week day. The first reminder was sent between 10am and 3pm, the second reminder sent between 3pm and 10am, and a third reminder was sent between 10am and 10pm. The trial run enabled us to iron out any existing problems (technical or otherwise) that were not addressed earlier during the technical support phase. Most of the problems that arose during this phase are because students had deleted the survey application from their cell phone, thinking that it would be sent to them each time they were supposed to do the survey. The actual survey began the day after and lasted for 14 days. Out of 6762 (161 persons × 42 times) reminders sent out, a total of 5915 responses were received, representing an 87.47% response rate.

After completing the phone surveys, participants completed a web-based survey asking for their experience with the cell phone survey. They were given an incentive of S$20 (equivalent to US$13) each for their participation.

Measures
**Relationship self-efficacy.** Relationship self-efficacy was measured in the baseline survey using a modified version of the Relationship Self-Efficacy Scale (RSE; Morúa & Lopez, 2005). This scale was developed to measure a person’s perceived abilities to engage in relationship maintenance activities with romantic partners. The original questionnaire for the scale development comprised of 35 questions, 9 of which were included in this study on the basis that they are applicable to the relationships of interest in this study. Two more items were added, and a total of 11 questions made up the RSE scale for this study. The items were administered on a 9-point Likert scale, following Morúa & Lopez (2005), and anchored by 1 = I’m not sure at all, 5 = Somewhat sure, and 9 = Completely sure. Questions were asked in the form of “In terms of your relationship with people in general, how confident are you in your ability to do each of the following?” Sample items are “accept others’ affection”, “be stay calm when you are having a serious argument with others”, and “handle relationships with others”. The internal consistency of the scale yielded an alpha of .79.

**Momentary affect.** Affect was assessed using items from the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). We used the PANAS because most of the recent research on personality and job satisfaction looked at Positive Affectivity and Negative Affectivity (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). The 10 items assessing positive affect are: active, alert, attentive, determined, enthusiastic, excited, inspired, interested, proud, and strong. The other 10 items assessed negative affect; they are: afraid, ashamed, distressed, guilty, hostile, irritable, jittery, nervous, scared, upset. Participants were asked to enter a number ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely) to estimate the extent to which the item described their momentary mood. The alpha
reliability of the PA and NA scales are .91 and .88 respectively. Momentary affect was presented first in the cell phone survey.

*Social interaction.* Social interaction was measured in the daily affect survey with the question “Did you engage in any social interactions in the last 15 minutes?” Responses were coded as 0 = No (did not engage in any social interactions in the last 15 minutes) and 1 = Yes (engaged in at least one social interaction in the last 15 minutes). Engagement in social interaction was measured subsequent to the measurement of momentary affect in the cell phone survey. Among 5,915 responded surveys, 2,269 (38.36%) reported engaging in social interactions in the last 15 minutes.

*Cognitive Appraisals.* Appraisals of the social interaction (when individual indicated engaging in social interaction in the last 15 minutes) or other non-interactive activity (when individual indicated not engaging in social interaction in the last 15 minutes) were adapted from van Eck, Nicolson, and Berkhof (1998). We identified four measures of appraisals that are related to this investigation – pleasantness, unpleasantness, importance and controllability. Appraisals were measured in the cell phone surveys, and came after the measurement of social interactions.

**Results**

Table 1 displays the correlation matrix and the reliability coefficients.

Table 2 and Table 3 show the hypothesis testing results. Since the data set has a nested structure (individuals completed repeated surveys), we use a random-effect model to test the data. Regression results supported most of our hypotheses. Consistent with Hypothesis 1, we found that even though on average individuals who engage in social interactions experience more positive moods, those with higher relationship efficacy
experience even more positive moods than those with lower relationship efficacy (see Figure 2).

Hypotheses 2a, 2b and 2d are also supported. Hypothesis 2a posits that the more pleasant the appraisal of the social interaction, the more positive the mood. Regression analyses indicate that pleasantness of appraisal is significantly related to positive affect (\(b=0.05, p<.01\)). Hypothesis 2b similarly posits that the more unpleasant the appraisal, the more negative the mood. Results of the analyses suggest that unpleasantness of appraisal is indeed positively related to negative affect (\(b=0.06; p<.01\)). Hypothesis 2c is not supported. Hypothesis 2d postulates that the more controllable the appraisal, the more positive the mood. Results also support this hypothesis to show that controllability is positively related to positive affect (\(b=0.03; p<.01\)). Post-hoc analyses of the data suggest interestingly that appraisals of importance are positively correlated with positive mood (\(b=0.04, p<.01\)) and negatively correlated with negative mood (\(b=-0.01, p<.01\)). Controllable appraisals are also positively correlated with negative mood (\(b=0.01, p<.01\)).

Finally, we found that cognitive appraisals do indeed mediate the relationship between social interactions and mood, supporting Hypothesis 3. Results indicate a partial mediating effect.

**DISCUSSION**

The study examines students’ affective responses to social interactions. Such a study is particularly relevant given the importance of social interactions on individual outcomes (physical and mental well-being; e.g. Tschan et al., 2004) and work outcomes (organizational functioning and performance; e.g. Ibarra, 1993; Tichy, 1981). The study contributes to socialization research by showing the underlying dynamics of the impact of
social interaction on affect. The stable factor of relationship self-efficacy has also been shown to result in differing effects on positive and negative affect experienced during social interaction. More importantly, the study shows that state-like and trait-like variable both affect the relationship between social interactions and momentary affect.

Consistent with our hypotheses, results show support for a moderating relationship between social interactions and momentary affect. Relationship self-efficacy was found to moderate this relationship. We observed that individuals who have higher confidence in their ability to maintain relationships are more likely to experience more positive moods when they engage in social interactions, as compared to individuals who are less confident. This finding is consistent with Bandura’s self-efficacy theory, which suggests that confidence in the ability to perform a particular task in a given task domain greatly improves the performance. In this case, the desired outcome would be more positive moods.

We also found significant relationships between the appraisals that an interaction is pleasant, unpleasant, controllable and important, and positive and negative affect. We notice that individuals who perceived an interaction as being pleasant will more likely experience more positive moods. On the contrary, individuals who perceived an interaction as being unpleasant are more likely to experience more negative moods. Perceptions of controllability were also related to positive moods. Last but not least, interactions that were viewed as being more important were associated with a greater intensity in the momentary mood reported, be it positive or negative. These results are consistent with our hypotheses.
Our results also indicated that cognitive appraisals do not simply have an independent impact on momentary mood. They partially mediate the relationship between social interactions and momentary affect. This suggests that even though individuals’ moods may be affected by cognitive appraisals of the social interaction, the interaction itself has a significantly direct impact on affect. The implication here is that there may be simultaneous cognitive and affective response to events happening around us such as social interactions.

**Future research directions**

This study uses a non-working student sample to test this model. However, the effects of social interaction on momentary affect may play out differently in a working sample, since working adults may be less spontaneous in their social interaction, and the social interactions may be calculated political moves. Further studies can examine the model using different types of samples to ascertain the stability of the model.

This study examines the moderating effect of one dispositional factor – relationship self-efficacy. While relationship self-efficacy has been shown have a significant effect, there may be other dispositional factors that can impact the dynamics of the proposed model. Future studies can identify what these factors are and examine if it is consistent with or deviates from the AET model.

Our study uses the PANAS scale to measure momentary moods. It is important to note that the positive affectivity being measured in this scale relates more to “activation” than “hedonism”. As such, in interpreting the results of this study, we need to be careful not to misinterpret positive affectivity. Future studies can replicate the study using a modified version of PANAS to examine if the effects hold.
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Figure 2. Moderating effect of relationship efficacy on engagement in social interactions and positive mood
Table 1. The Mean, Standard Deviation, and Correlation Matrix of study variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. T1 social self-efficacy</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Average positive mood</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Average negative mood</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Average social interaction(^a)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Average pleasant appraisal</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Average unpleasant appraisal</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Average controllable appraisal</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Average important appraisal</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
\(^a\) 0=no social interaction in the last 15 minutes, 1=social interaction in the last 15 minutes.
p<.05 if the correlation is higher than .15.
p<.01 if the correlation is higher than .20.
Table 2. Regression analyses of moods on relationship self-efficacy and social interaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Positive Mood</th>
<th></th>
<th>Negative Mood</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.93**</td>
<td>1.46**</td>
<td>2.07**</td>
<td>2.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>-0.08*</td>
<td>-0.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interaction&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy × Social interaction</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5784</td>
<td>5784</td>
<td>5784</td>
<td>5784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model fit statistics (Wald $\chi^2$)</td>
<td>104.87**</td>
<td>112.76**</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: <sup>a</sup> 0=no social interaction in the last 15 minutes, 1=social interaction in the last 15 minutes.
* p<.05; ** p<.01.
Table 3. Regression analyses of moods on relationship self-efficacy, social interaction and appraisals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Positive Mood</th>
<th></th>
<th>Negative Mood</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.59**</td>
<td>1.18**</td>
<td>1.49**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>-0.01**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllable</td>
<td>0.03**</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interaction&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy×Social interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 5789 5747 5789

Model fit statistics (Wald $\chi^2$) 355.99** 454.68** 323.53**

Note: <sup>a</sup> 0=no social interaction in the last 15 minutes, 1=social interaction in the last 15 minutes.
* p<.05; ** p<.01.