Affect-guided interval training: Prioritizing pleasure and restoring autonomy by allowing exercisers to choose their intensity

Zachary Zenko^{1*}, Eric E. Hall², and Walter R. Bixby³

¹Department of Kinesiology, California State University Bakersfield

²Elon University

³United States Naval Academy

This is a preprint and has not been peer-reviewed.

Suggested citation: Zenko, Z., Hall, E. E., & Bixby, W. R. (2023). Affect-guided interval training: Prioritizing pleasure and restoring autonomy by allowing exercisers to choose their intensity. *SportRxiv*. DOI: 10.51224/SRXIV.319

Acknowledgements:

This study was funded by an internal grant at California State University, Bakersfield. We are grateful to Conner Nommensen for his service as an independent rater.

Abstract

This registered report tested the effects of a novel exercise protocol, namely affect-guided interval training, on motivationally relevant variables of remembered pleasure, forecasted pleasure, enjoyment, and autonomy. Affect-guided interval training (AIT) consisted of 60second intervals that alternated between the highest pleasant intensity and lowest pleasant intensity for 20 minutes; this was intended to minimize the potential displeasure of traditional high-intensity interval training. The novel protocol was compared to self-selected exercise intensity (30 minutes) and high-intensity interval training (60-second intervals for 20 minutes). All sessions were, on average, vigorous in intensity (80-89% peak heart rate). Data indicate that the AIT session was experienced as most pleasant, had the most pleasant slope of affect, was remembered as most pleasant, resulted in the most positive affective forecasts, and was most enjoyable. Both the affect-guided interval session and self-selected exercise session resulted in greater autonomy than high-intensity interval training. Remembered pleasure, enjoyment, and forecasted pleasure were predicted by experienced pleasure, the pleasure experienced at the end of exercise, the and the slope of pleasure. Overall, this study suggests that affect-guided interval training is a feasible and pleasant alternative that can be included as a viable option for exercise programming.

Keywords: affect, high-intensity interval training, autonomy, self-selected exercise

Despite the plethora of benefits associated with an active lifestyle, exercise professionals are faced with the conundrum of physical inactivity. Though estimates vary (Zenko et al., 2019), nationally representative data using accelerometers indicates that a majority of the population is achieving low levels of cardiorespiratory activity (Troiano et al., 2008) and resistance exercise (Bennie et al., 2020). Further, population-levels of cardiorespiratory fitness appear to be declining (Tomkinson et al., 2019). Affective responses during exercise – or the pleasure and displeasure experienced while exercising – have been shown to predict future exercise behavior (Rhodes & Kates, 2015). Thus, supporting hedonic theory (Ekkekakis & Dafermos, 2012), exercisers seem to repeat what makes them feel pleasant, and avoid exercise that makes them feel unpleasant.

Recently, several researchers have joined the search for exercise protocols and experiences that are more pleasant and that will result in greater adherence (e.g., Hutchinson et al., 2020; Jones et al., 2018; Lacharité-Lemieux et al., 2015; Zenko et al., 2016). Several have focused on characteristics of the *pattern* of exercise. For example, several studies have investigated the effects of continuously reducing intensity on experienced pleasure during exercise, remembered pleasure (i.e., recollections of the pleasure or displeasure experienced during the exercise session), enjoyment, and forecasted pleasure (i.e., predictions about the pleasure or displeasure that will be experienced during future exercise sessions). Zenko et al. (2016) investigated the effects of ramping-down intensity during continuous exercise and found that the slope of pleasure (i.e., the rate and direction of change in affective valence) during exercise explained 35-46% of the variance in remembered and forecasted pleasure. Decreasing intensity resulted in more postexercise pleasure, more enjoyment, more remembered pleasure, and more forecasted pleasure. Hutchinson et al. (2020) largely replicated these effects in a

resistance-exercise format. Decreasing load from 75% of one-repetition maximum (1RM) to 65% 1RM and then 55% 1RM resulted in more postexercise pleasure, more enjoyment, and more remembered pleasure than a workload matched for volume but featuring increasing intensity (i.e., 55% 1RM, 65% 1RM, 75% 1RM). Hutchinson et al. (2023) recently replicated and extended these findings over multiple sessions of resistance exercise. Further, the pleasure experienced at the end of exercise explained more variance in postexercise pleasure, enjoyment, and remembered pleasure than the pleasure experienced at the beginning of exercise (Hutchinson et al., 2020; also see Hargreaves & Stych, 2013). These findings may not generalize as well to athletes and sport contexts where accomplishment may be an important mediator of affective evaluations of the overall session (Stuntz et al., 2020).

High-intensity interval training (HIIT) and similar formats (e.g., sprint-interval training; SIT) in which periods of high-intensity exercise are interspersed with periods of low-intensity exercise (or passive rest) have gained more attention (e.g., Box et al., 2020; Eddols et al., 2017; Gibala et al., 2012; Quednow et al., 2015). The search for "time-efficient" exercise protocols is motivated, in part, because lack of time is frequently reported as a barrier to regular exercise (Gillen et al., 2016). Although the ample leisure-time reported by Americans in the American Time Use Survey (United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015) casts doubt on "lack of time" actually being a primary barrier to physical activity, the physiological benefits of this mode of exercise seem well-established (Batacan et al., 2017). However, debate continues about whether HIIT or SIT should be recommended for the promotion of public health (Biddle & Batterham, 2015). Several researchers have investigated the effects of high-intensity intervals on affective responses. This literature is characterized by mixed protocols and mixed results (Alicea et al., 2020; Box et al., 2020; Decker & Ekkekakis, 2017; Fleming et al., 2020; Follador et al., 2018;

Martinez et al., 2015; Roloff et al., 2020; Saanijoki et al., 2015; for review see Stork et al., 2017).

An Interval Protocol Guided by Pleasure

Here, we propose a novel protocol designed to keep certain strengths of HIIT protocols, while reducing the likelihood of experiencing displeasure elicited by high-intensity exercise (Ekkekakis et al., 2011). As with continuous exercise, changes in affective valence (i.e., ratings of pleasure-displeasure) during interval exercise are predicted by changes in oxygen uptake (Roloff et al., 2020). Therefore, although debate continues (see discussion above) the high metabolic demand of HIIT may be considered a weakness from the perspective of maximizing pleasure and exercise adherence as a result of experiencing lower pleasure (or greater displeasure). Here, we prioritize pleasure over physiological benefits under the assumptions that (a) physiological benefits will not be obtained unless people adhere to exercise, and (b) more pleasant exercise will result in more adherence (Ekkekakis & Dafermos, 2012; Rhodes & Kates, 2015).

On the other hand, while higher intensity may be expected to reduce pleasure (or increase displeasure), it is possible that the changing intensity may be experienced as more interesting and engaging than a constant, unchanging intensity. Continuously decreasing intensity represents one strategy for introducing high-intensity exercise while creating an overall pleasant exercise experience, at least among people with low cardiorespiratory fitness (Zenko et al., 2016) and sedentary or insufficiently active populations (Hutchinson et al., 2020, 2023). Intervals could represent another strategy, especially when compared to 40 minutes of continuous exercise in a laboratory setting (e.g., Jung et al., 2014). Laboratory environments are often sterile and boring,

and, when studying affective responses, participants are frequently unable to listen to music, or unable to focus attention on other pleasant stimuli (e.g., green exercise; Lahart et al., 2019). It is therefore easy to imagine that monotony of continuous exercise in a laboratory environment can result in less positive experiences.

Further, in nonlaboratory environments, people often choose their own exercise intensity, indicating that self-selected exercise intensity may be more ecologically valid than prescribed intensity. Allowing participants to choose their own intensity may also result in increased autonomy (Ekkekakis, 2009; Vazou-Ekkekakis & Ekkekakis, 2009), and reduced likelihood of experiencing displeasure while still providing physiological benefits (Ekkekakis, 2009). In a randomized controlled trial, Williams and colleagues (2015) either prescribed moderate-intensity exercise or allowed participants to choose their own intensity. The participants who self-selected their own intensity engaged in approximately 26 more minutes of walking per week over 6 months than the participants who were prescribed moderate-intensity exercise.

Therefore, giving participants control over their intensity may enhance autonomy, physiological benefits, and pleasure. This may reduce the physiological benefits compared to prescribed high-intensity exercise (i.e., if participants choose lower intensities), but may be more ecologically valid and more conducive to adherence (Williams et al., 2015). To our knowledge, however, using self-paced exercise or exercise regulated by pleasure (i.e., affect-guided exercise), where participants are tasked with self-selecting intensities that "feel good" (Parfitt et al., 2012) has not been investigated in an interval-training context.

The Present Study

The purpose of this study was to test a novel exercise protocol that combines interval training with affect-guided exercise. This Affect-guided Interval Training (AIT) protocol was designed to maintain the interest of frequently changing intensities, reduce monotony, and contribute to autonomy by allowing participants to regulate their own intensities. Further, the AIT is designed to reduce the likelihood of experiencing displeasure during exercise by providing periods of respite and limiting intensity to the range that is experienced as pleasant. We hypothesized that, compared to high-intensity interval training (HIIT) and self-selected continuous exercise (SELF), AIT would result in a more positive in-task pleasure on average (H1), a more positive in-task slope of pleasure (H2), more remembered pleasure (H3) and forecasted pleasure (H4), greater enjoyment (H5), and greater perceived autonomy (H6).

Methods

After obtaining ethical approval, students from a comprehensive Hispanic-serving university in the United States were recruited for this study. Students were eligible if they were deemed to be ready to become more physically active according to the Physical Activity Readiness Questionnaire for Everyone (PAR-Q+; Warburton et al., 2011). All participants completed a prescreening form and, if eligible, provided contact information so that a researcher could schedule laboratory visits.

Power calculations for a repeated-measures design (3 within-subjects conditions), while anticipating a medium effect size (f = .25), 5% type 1 error rate, 10% type 2 error rate, correlated dependent variables (r = .7), and a violation of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .7$) indicated that at least 29 participants were needed (Faul et al., 2007). To protect against anticipated dropout of 20%, the recruitment goal was 35 people. Participants earned \$10.00 for each laboratory visit.

Measures

Descriptive characteristics. In addition to typical demographic variables (age, sex, gender identity), self-reported exercise behavior and preferences for and tolerances of exercise intensity were also measured. Self-reported exercise behavior was measured using the short form of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ; Craig et al., 2003). This questionnaire measures leisure-time behavior accumulated in bouts of at least 10 minutes. In other words, the IPAQ assesses deliberate exercise behavior rather than total physical activity behavior. See Craig et al. (2003) for evidence of criterion validity.

Preferences for and tolerances of exercise intensity (henceforth "intensity preference" and "intensity tolerance", respectively) was measured using the PRETIE-Q (Ekkekakis et al., 2005). This is a 16-item, two-factor measure that asks participants to rate their agreement on items indicating preference for or tolerance of higher-intensity exercise (e.g., "The faster and harder the workout, the more pleasant I feel"). See Ekkekakis et al. (2005), Ekkekakis et al., (2006), and Ekkekakis et al., (2008) for evidence of validity. In this sample, internal consistency was acceptable (Cronbach's $\alpha = .72$ for the preference subscale, and .82 for the tolerance subscale).

In-task measures. Several variables were measured repeatedly during exercise, including affective valence, arousal, and rating of fatigue. Participants responded to in-task measures verbally and by pointing to poster-sized scales that were made available during measurement but removed from view between measurements. In-task ratings of affective valence (i.e., pleasure-displeasure) were measured using the Feeling Scale (FS; Hardy & Rejeski, 1989) and in-task

ratings of arousal were measured with the Felt Arousal Scale (FAS; Svebak & Murgatroyd, 1985), which are respectively conceptualized to map onto the valence and arousal dimensions of the circumplex model of affect (Russell, 1980). The FS is a single-item, 11-point scale ranging from +5 (*very good*) to -5 (*very bad*) with verbal anchors at 0 and odd numbers. The FAS is a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (*low arousal*) to 6 (*high arousal*). Together, these measures are theorized to provide excellent domain coverage for the domain of affect as well as strong temporal resolution (Backhouse et al., 2007; Russell, 1980). Perceived fatigue was assessed using the Rating-of-Fatigue Scale (ROF; Micklewright et al., 2017). The ROF scale was used to illustrate changes in fatigue during exercise and mainly for exploratory and descriptive purposes because we did not have any specific hypothesis related to ROF. The ROF ranges from 0 (*not fatigued at all*) to 11 (*total fatigue & exhaustion – nothing left*) and contains five verbal descriptors and diagrams representing progressively increasing fatigue. Instructions for each scale were read to participants prior to each exercise session.

Post-task measures. In addition to the FS, FAS, and ROF, several measures were used only after exercise.

Remembered Pleasure.

Kahneman and Riis (2005) made the distinction between the current "experiencing self" and the past "remembering self". The remembering self may be susceptible to biases and individual differences (e.g., in attitudes toward exercise) and appears to be disproportionately influenced by several characteristics of the previous experience, such as the peak and final moment of exercise (Alaybek et al., 2022; Ariely & Carmon, 2000; Hargreaves & Stych, 2013) or the slope of pleasure experienced during exercise (Zenko et al., 2016; Hutchinson et al., 2020; Hutchinson et al., 2023). In contrast to post-task measures of the experiencing self (FS, FAS, and ROF), which require participants to report on how they feel at the moment of measurement, measures of the remembering self require participants to retrospectively reflect on how they felt during a previous experience. It is possible that the *memory of an experience* may influence forecasts or predictions of future experience more than the *actual experience*. Memories of an experience are thought to influence anticipated or forecasted affective experiences at the point of decision making (see Slawinska & Davis, 2020). To our knowledge, one study has demonstrated that remembered pleasure is more strongly associated with future exercise behavior than experienced affective responses in laboratory settings (Kwan et al., 2017).

Therefore, remembered pleasure was assessed using the Empirical Valence Scale (EVS, Lishner et al., 2008). Participants responded to the question "How did you feel during the exercise session you just completed?" using a bipolar rating scale ranging from *most unpleasant imaginable* to *most pleasant imaginable*, with empirically spaced verbal anchors throughout the rating scale. Participants were asked to place an "x" anywhere on a horizontal 140 mm line. Two raters measured and scored each response with excellent agreement (intraclass correlation coefficient of 1.0, 95% CI: 1.0, 1.0). The average of the two ratings was used as the final value for remembered pleasure, which was then transformed so that the minimum possible rating (*most unpleasant imaginable*) corresponded to -100, and the maximum possible rating (*most pleasant imaginable*) corresponded to 100; *neutral* corresponded to a rating of 0.

Enjoyment.

Enjoyment was measured using the Physical Activity Enjoyment Scale (PACES; Kenzierski & DeCarlo, 1991), which consists of 18 bipolar items on a 7-point scale (e.g., *I enjoy* *it* versus *I hate it*). Mean enjoyment was calculated for participants with at least 16 of 18 items completed. Internal consistency in this sample was excellent (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$ following the HIIT session, .92 following the AIT session, .95 following the SELF session).

Forecasted Pleasure.

Forecasted pleasure was measured by asking participants to predict how they would feel if they were to repeat the exercise session again. Participants responded to the question "If you were to repeat today's exercise session, how do you think you would feel?" by responding to a scale ranging from -3 (*extremely negative*) to +3 (*extremely positive*) with a neutral point at 0 (*neither positive nor negative*). Response options were presented vertically. The use of different measures for in-task ratings of affective valence, remembered pleasure, enjoyment, and forecasted pleasure is intended to reduce common method variance (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

Perceived Autonomy.

Perceived autonomy was assessed using the measure describe by Reeve et al., (2003). A nine-item measure of perceived locus of causality, volition, and perceived choice was adapted to focus on exercise intensity (e.g., "I felt like I was doing what I wanted to be doing"; "During the exercise, I felt free"; and "I felt that I had control to decide which intensity to choose"). Responses will range from 1 (*not at all true*) to 7 (*very much true*). One item ("I felt I was only doing what the researcher wanted me to do") reduced internal consistency in all measurements and was eliminated from the analyses. The remaining eight items had strong internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .81$ for the HIIT session, .82 for the AIT session, and .80 for the SELF session).

Procedures

Participants completed four laboratory visits. Whenever possible, each visit was scheduled seven days apart and at the same time of day to control for possible diurnal variation. All exercise sessions began with a 3-minute warm up at 50 Watts (di Fronso et al., 2020). The order of the three experimental sessions was randomly assigned in a counterbalanced fashion. Participants could observe their workload (Watts) on the display of the cycle ergometer. Perceptual measures were removed from the field of view except during moments of measure administration. Likewise, participant-experimenter interaction was kept to a minimum during exercise, with no verbal encouragement or discussion initiated by the researcher. When participants asked questions or initiated a discussion, the researcher explained that they can have a discussion after the experiment is over. Prior to the first laboratory visit, participants completed the screening form to determine eligibility. Participants provided informed consent prior to data collection.

Orientation visit. Eligible participants attended an orientation visit and provided informed consent. The purpose of the orientation visit was to determine peak power output, peak heart rate, height, weight, and body fat percentage using bioelectrical impedance analysis. Participants were also familiarized with measures used in subsequent sessions, namely the FS, FAS, ROF, EVS, and the measure of Forecasted Pleasure. Measurements performed during this session were used for familiarization purposes only, not as dependent variables of the present study. During this session, participants completed an exercise test to volitional exhaustion using an electronically braked cycle ergometer (Lode, Groningen, Netherlands) and while wearing a chest-strap Heart Rate monitor (Polar, Polar USA). Due to user or equipment error, two participants were unable to have their heartrate measured during this session, meaning that peak

heart rate could not be measured for all participants ($89.22 \pm 6.51\%$ age-predicted maximum heart rate). Peak power output was measured for all participants (165 ± 40 Watts). A cycle ergometer was used for all sessions to prevent confounding effects from changing exercise mode (i.e., switching from walking to running during the interval sessions). A ramped protocol consisting of an increasing intensity of 20 Watts/minute was used during this visit. After volitional exhaustion, participants completed a cool-down for 5 minutes at 20 Watts. The subsequent conditions (described next) were scheduled in a random and counterbalanced order. Participants were permitted to drink water during all sessions.

Affect-guided interval training. Affect-guided interval training (AIT) was used for one of the experimental conditions. In this session, participants were instructed to select the highest intensity that still gives them pleasure (i.e., positive affective valence) for 60 seconds, and then the lowest intensity that still gives them pleasure for 60 seconds. Participants were instructed to alternate between the highest pleasant intensity and the lowest pleasant intensity. This pattern was repeated for 20 minutes, such that participants will alternated between 10 higher-intensity "work" intervals and 10 lower-intensity "respite" intervals. During the session, Workload (Watts) and Heart Rate were recorded at the end of each work and respite interval. The FS, FAS, and ROF were administered at 15%, 20%, 35%, 40%, 55%, 60%, 75%, 80%, 95%, and nearly 100% completion, to ensure that measurements were recorded during-exercise and not conflated with post-exercise measurements. The FS, FAS, and ROF were administered 2 minutes before exercise to establish a baseline measure of affective valence, arousal, and fatigue respectively. This measurement schedule ensured that in-task affective valence, in-task arousal, and fatigue were measured during five work intervals and five respite intervals. Post-task affective valence was measured five minutes following exercise, while remembered pleasure, enjoyment,

forecasted pleasure, and perceived autonomy were administered 10 minutes following exercise. All 32 participants who began the AIT session were able to complete it.

High-intensity interval training. High-intensity interval training (HIIT) was used for another experimental condition. Participants completed alternating work and recovery intervals consisting of cycling at 90% of the Watts corresponding to their peak power output and 20% of the Watts corresponding to their peak power output, respectively. These workloads were partly based on previous studies (Gillen et al., 2012; Little et al., 2011), although these prior researchers used 90% maximal Heart Rate for work intervals. Other than the change in intensity regulation, the mode, duration of exercise, number of work and recovery intervals, and measurement protocols were identical to the AIT session. Of the 31 participants who began the HIIT session, 27 were able to complete it (four participants requested to stop early).

Self-selected continuous exercise. The third and final type of experimental condition consisted of self-selected continuous exercise (SELF). In this session, participants chose whichever intensity they wanted for 30 minutes. The participants were also informed that they can change the intensity at any time, and as frequently or infrequently as they desire. The mode of exercise was identical to the AIT and HIIT sessions. The measurement protocol was also identical, such that in-task measures were administered at 15%, 20%, 35%, 40%, 55%, 60%, 75%, 80%, 95%, and nearly 100% completion, the FS, FAS, and ROF were administered 2 minutes before exercise, and post-task measures were administered identically to the other conditions. This also helped control for participant-experimenter interaction. The duration of this session was longer than the AIT and HIIT sessions because it was anticipated that intensity would be lower, and a longer duration would a more consistent overall workload. These

assumptions were tested. All 32 participants who began the SELF session were able to complete it.

Data Analysis

Data were assessed for outliers on relevant variables using Tukey's fences (i.e., 25th percentile – (IQR * 1.5); 75th percentile + (IQR * 1.5)). Then, the weight of outliers was reduced by winsorizing the data such that the outliers matched the nearest non-extreme observed values. Data were also examined to check the assumption of normality and nonparametric alternatives were used to analyze data, if necessary.

Affective valence was rescaled to control for pre-exercise levels of affective valence for each session. Since a few participants were unable to complete the HIIT session, mean affective valence for each session was computed if a minimum of five measurements were completed. Similarly, mean heart rate for each session was calculated for each participant if a minimum of 10 heart rate measurements were completed. Heart rate is reported as a percentage of the observed peak heart rate from the orientation session. Watts are reported as a percentage of the observed peak power output from the orientation session. In few instances, due to equipment or user error, heart rate measurements are unavailable and thus some participants are not included in some analyses using heart rate. In other instances, missing data is due to a missing measurement (e.g., participants not completing to a questionnaire). Data and analyses are available at https://osf.io/gec4u/?view_only=02915aa2bf9c42d1a169a175e55d0a37.

The primary hypotheses were assessed using within-subjects ANOVAs, using the three exercise sessions (AIT, HIIT, and SELF) as the within-subjects variable. A false discovery rate of 5% was used to address the multiplicity problem while preserving statistical power

(Benjamini & Hochberg, 1995; Benjamini & Yekutieli, 2005; Keselman et al., 2002). This was completed using the STATS PADJUST syntax available for SPSS versions 18 or later.

Further, correlations between average in-task pleasure, the slope of pleasure, remembered pleasure, forecasted pleasure, and enjoyment are reported to examine theoretically likely affective predictors of remembered pleasure, forecasted pleasure, and enjoyment. Theoretically, remembered pleasure is likely predicted by experienced pleasure, the pattern of change in pleasure (i.e., the slope of pleasure) and the pleasure experienced at the final moment of the exercise experience (Alaybek et al., 2022). We also examined the correlation between pre-exercise pleasure and remembered pleasure of each exercise session (Hargreaves and Stych, 2013). In addition, for exploratory purposes and following Alaybek et al. (2022), we calculated the correlations between remembered pleasure, forecasted pleasure, and enjoyment and the peak and the peak-end average.

Two slopes of pleasure were calculated in this study. Primarily, an overall slope of pleasure that included that pre-exercise and during-exercise time points (i.e., baseline, 15%, 20%, 35%, 40%, 55%, 60%, 75%, 80%, 95%, 100% exercise completion) and secondarily, a during-exercise slope of pleasure that disregarded pre-exercise affective valence. Both types of slopes were in the same direction in each condition. In terms of magnitude, there was no difference in the types of slopes in the HIIT and SELF conditions, but the overall slope was significantly more positive than the during-exercise slope in the AIT condition (d = .54, p = .005).

Enjoyment is theorized to be predicted by those variables and remembered pleasure. Forecasted pleasure is theorized to be predicted by those variables and remembered pleasure.

This tested the model illustrated by Jones and Zenko (2021), in which affective responses to exercise, biases in memory, and cognitive filters influence remembered utility (i.e., remembered pleasure), which in turn influences predicted utility (i.e., forecasted pleasure). Repeated measures correlations were calculated using the rmcorr and rmcorr-shiny apps (Bakdash & Marusch, 2017; Marusich & Bakdash, 2021), a package and application that allows a researcher to determine common within-individual associations for repeated measures. This is a statistically powerful tool that does not violate the assumption of independence of observations (Bakdash & Marusch, 2017). Confidence intervals were bootstrapped at the 95% confidence level with 500 resamples (seed 33).

For exploratory purposes, the relations between dispositional and individual factors (e.g., preferences and tolerances for high-intensity exercise, body mass index, and body composition) and mean remembered pleasure are examined (i.e., average remembered pleasure for all three conditions). Graphs are presented to highlight comparisons between in-task ratings of pleasure, heart rate, and power output between conditions. Arousal and fatigue were not central to any hypothesis, but responses are displayed below for descriptive purposes.

Results

Participants

Overall, 34 participants completed at least 1 laboratory visit. These included 24 women and 10 men (sex: 24 females, 10 males), aged 22 ± 3 years (range: 18 to 32 years). Based on body mass index, 16 participants (12 women) had normal weight, 10 participants (7 women) were overweight, and eight participants (5 women) had obesity. Regarding body composition, participants had a body fat percentage of $25.12 \pm 7.40\%$. Using the self-report measure,

participants indicated that they obtained very high levels of physical activity $(316 \pm 271 \text{ minutes})$ of walking per week, 271 ± 280 minutes of vigorous activity per week, and 106 ± 119 minutes of moderate activity per week). Two participants completed only one laboratory visit to assess peak power output (one dropped out for unrelated health reasons, and one dropped out due to scheduling issues). In addition, one participant did not complete the HIIT session due to scheduling issues.

Descriptive Analysis: Intensity, Workload, Arousal, and Fatigue

Exploratory analyses for descriptive purposes revealed differences in intensity between conditions, measured by percentage of peak heart rate. A 3x20 repeated-measures ANOVA with three conditions (HIIT, AIT, SELF) and 20 time points (5%, 10%, 15%, 20%, 25%, 30%, 35%, 40%, 45%, 50%, 55%, 60%, 65%, 70%, 75%, 80%, 85%, 90%, and 100% completion) using percentage of peak heart rate as an outcome revealed a main effect of condition, F (2, 46) = 22.60, p < .001, $\eta p^2 = .496$, a main effect of time, F (3.303, 75.968) = 78.24, p < .001, $\eta p^2 = .773$, and a condition by time interaction, F (38, 874) = 8.38, p < .001, $\eta p^2 = .266$. Analysis of marginal means indicated that all sessions were, on average, vigorous (HIIT: 88.68% peak heart rate, 95% CI: 83.97, 93.40; AIT: 79.63% peak heart rate, 95% CI: 74.91, 84.34; SELF: 80.09% peak heart rate, 95% CI: 75.37, 84.80). See Figure 1. Heart rate was higher in the HIIT condition than the AIT condition (d = .91, p < .001) and the SELF condition (d = .87, p < .001). The AIT and SELF conditions were not different (d = -.05, p > .999).



Figure 1. Mean heart rate over time for each condition, as a percentage of peak heart rate. HIIT: High-intensity interval training. AIT: Affect-guided interval training. SELF: Self-selected continuous exercise. 95% confidence intervals are shown.

Similarly, differences between conditions emerged when examining percentage of peak power output. Exploratory analyses for descriptive purposes revealed differences in intensity between conditions, measured by percentage of peak power output. A 3x20 repeated-measures ANOVA with three conditions (HIIT, AIT, SELF) and 20 time points (5%, 10%, 15%, 20%, 25%, 30%, 35%, 40%, 45%, 50%, 55%, 60%, 65%, 70%, 75%, 80%, 85%, 90%, and 100% completion) using percentage of peak power output as an outcome revealed a main effect of condition, F (2, 58) = 16.48, p < .001, ηp^2 = .363, a main effect of time, F (3.360, 97.436) = 285.621, p < .001, ηp^2 = .908, and a condition by time interaction, F (38, 1102) = 110.006, p < .001, ηp^2 = .791. Examination of Figure 2 indicates that chosen intensity of the SELF condition was much more stable than chosen intensity of the AIT session. The AIT session, in turn, varied as expected but was within a more limited range than the imposed HIIT workloads.



Figure 2. Mean power output over time for each condition, as a percentage of peak power output. HIIT: High-intensity interval training. AIT: Affect-guided interval training. SELF: Self-selected continuous exercise. 95% confidence intervals are shown.

All conditions demonstrated an increase in fatigue (Figure 3) and arousal (Figure 4). There were no differences between conditions for fatigue (p = .143, $\eta p^2 = .072$) or arousal (p = .146, $\eta p^2 = .071$).



Figure 3. Mean fatigue over time for each condition. HIIT: High-intensity interval training. AIT: Affect-guided interval training. SELF: Self-selected continuous exercise. 95% confidence intervals are shown.



Figure 4. Mean arousal over time for each condition. HIIT: High-intensity interval training. AIT: Affect-guided interval training. SELF: Self-selected continuous exercise. 95% confidence intervals are shown.

Hypothesis 1: Experienced Pleasure

Hypothesis 1 predicted that AIT would result in more positive in-task (experienced) pleasure than HIIT and SELF. A repeated-measures ANOVA with three conditions (HIIT, AIT, SELF) and mean in-task affective valence as the outcome confirmed this hypothesis and indicated a main effect of condition, F (2, 58) = 13.24, p < .001, $\eta^2 = .313$. Controlling for pre-exercise levels of affective valence, mean affective valence for the AIT session was 1.08 ± 1.63 units, -0.44 ± 1.91 units for the HIIT session, and 0.03 ± 1.46 units for the SELF session.

Post-hoc analyses using paired t-tests and a false discovery rate of 5% indicated that the AIT condition resulted in more pleasure than HIIT condition (d = .87, p < .001) and the SELF condition (d = .58, p = .003). There was no difference between the SELF and HIIT conditions (d = .28, p = .137).

Marginal means indicated that the AIT was significantly more positive than 0 (preexercise affective valence), at 1.08 units (95% CI: 0.32, 1.84), p = .003). The HIIT condition (-.44 units, 95% CI: -1.33, 0.44, p = .647) and the SELF condition (0.030 units, 95% CI: -0.65, 0.71, p > .999) were not significantly different than baseline affective valence. This analysis included winsorized data for the SELF condition.



Figure 5. Mean affective valence over time for each condition, controlling for pre-exercise levels of affective valence. HIIT: High-intensity interval training. AIT: Affect-guided interval training. SELF: Self-selected continuous exercise. 95% confidence intervals are shown.

This hypothesis was further confirmed by a follow-up repeated-measures ANOVA controlling for pre-exercise levels of affective valence, measured at baseline (Figure 5). This analysis included a 3x10 repeated-measures ANOVA with three conditions (HIIT, AIT, and SELF) and 10 time points (15%, 20%, 35%, 40%, 55%, 60%, 75%, 80%, 95%, 100% exercise completion) revealed a main effect of condition, F (2, 52) = 10.19, p < .001, ηp^2 = .282, and a condition by time interaction, F (5.98, 155.51) = 3.67, p = .002, ηp^2 = .124 (although the effects of time and the condition by time interaction were not relevant to this hypothesis). Bonferroniadjusted post-hoc analysis revealed that the experienced pleasure of the AIT session was more positive than the HIIT condition (d = .77, p < .001) and the SELF condition (d = .55, p = .009). The HIIT condition was not significantly different than the SELF condition (d = .22, p = .647). This analysis included only raw (nonwinsorized) data.

Finally, because pre-exercise valence differed between conditions despite randomization, a further exploratory repeated-measures ANOVA was conducted to examine differences in mean pleasure ratings during exercise, without regard for baseline affect. Results were similar, revealing a main effect of condition, F (2, 58) = 5.633, p = .006, η^2 = .163. Bonferroni-adjusted post-hoc analyses revealed that the AIT was more pleasant than the HIIT condition (d = .48, p = .005), although there was no longer a difference between AIT and SELF (d = .18, p = .702). Again, the HIIT condition was not significantly different than the SELF condition (d = -31, p = .117). The AIT averaged 2.68 ± 1.50 units, while the SELF condition averaged 2.37 ± 1.84 units, and the HIT condition averaged 1.83 ± 1.93 units. This analysis included only raw (nonwinsorized) data.

Hypothesis 2: Slope of Pleasure

Individual slopes of pleasure were calculated for each participant in each session using the least squares method to calculate the line of best fit (Steffens & Guastavino, 2015), using baseline and during-exercise affective valence to capture the overall exercise experience (overall slope of pleasure). Hypothesis 2 predicted that the AIT would result in more positive overall slopes of pleasure than the HIIT and SELF sessions. A repeated-measures ANOVA with three conditions (HIIT, AIT, SELF) and the slope of pleasure as an outcome confirmed this hypothesis and indicated a main effect of condition, F (2, 60) = 12.15, p < .001, η^2 = .288.

Post-hoc analyses using paired t-tests or Wilcoxon-signed rank tests and a false discovery rate of 5% indicated that the AIT condition resulted in a more positive slope than the HIIT condition (d = .99, p < .001) and the SELF condition (d = .63, p = .002). There was no difference between the SELF and HIIT conditions (d = .31, p = .094). A secondary analysis without

considering pre-exercise affective valence, using only the during-exercise time points (15%, 20%, 35%, 40%, 55%, 60%, 75%, 80%, 95%, 100% exercise completion) revealed similar results (AIT vs. HIIT: d = .62, Bonferroni-adjusted p = .002; AIT vs. SELF: d = .55, Bonferroni-adjusted p = .010; SELF vs. HIIT: d = .10, p > .999).

Hypothesis 3: Remembered Pleasure

Hypothesis 3 predicted that AIT would result in greater remembered pleasure than HIIT and SELF. A repeated-measures ANOVA with three conditions (HIIT, AIT, and SELF) confirmed this hypothesis and indicated a main effect of condition, F (2, 60) = 10.78, p < .001, η^2 = .264. The remembered pleasure of the AIT session was 54.31 ± 19.27 units. The remembered pleasure of the SELF condition was 35.27 ± 31.90 units. The remembered pleasure of the HIIT session was 29.56 ± 38.52 units.

Post-hoc analyses using paired t-tests and a false discovery rate of 5% indicated that the remembered pleasure of the AIT was more pleasant than the HIIT condition (d = .73, p < .001) and the SELF condition (d = .70, p < .001). There was no difference between the SELF and HIIT condition (d = .19, p = .311). Overall, approximately 67% of participants remembered the AIT session as more pleasant than the HIIT session (Figure 6).



Figure 6. Remembered pleasure for each condition by participant. HIIT: High-intensity interval training. AIT: Affect-guided interval training. SELF: Self-selected continuous exercise. Standard errors are shown.

Hypothesis 4: Forecasted Pleasure

Hypothesis 4 predicted that the AIT session would result in greater forecasted pleasure than the HIIT and SELF conditions. A repeated-measures ANOVA with three conditions (HIIT, AIT, and SELF) confirmed this hypothesis (Figure 7). The assumption of sphericity was violated (p = .002) and a Greenhouse-Geisser correction was applied. There was a main effect of condition, F (1.479, 44.365) = 5.22 = .016, $\eta^2 = .148$.



Figure 7. Forecasted pleasure for each condition by participant. HIIT: High-intensity interval training. AIT: Affect-guided interval training. SELF: Self-selected continuous exercise. Standard errors are shown.

Post-hoc analyses using paired t-tests or Wilcoxon-signed rank tests and a false discovery rate of 5% indicated that the AIT condition resulted in greater forecasted pleasure than the HIIT condition (d = .84, p = .003). and the SELF condition (d = .78, p = .002). There was no difference between the HIIT and SELF conditions (d = .10, p = .572).

Hypothesis 5: Enjoyment

Hypothesis 5 predicted that the AIT session would be more enjoyable than HIIT and SELF. A repeated-measures ANOVA with three conditions (HIIT, AIT, and SELF) confirmed this hypothesis. The assumption of sphericity was violated (p = .013) and a Greenhouse-Geisser

correction was applied. There was a main effect of condition, F (1.581, 45.857) = 4.55 p = .023, η^2 = .136. Enjoyment of the AIT session was 5.91 ± 0.77 units. Enjoyment of the SELF condition was 5.60 ± 0.91 units. Enjoyment of the HIIT condition was 5.47 ± 0.89 units.

Post-hoc analyses using paired t-tests and a false discovery rate of 5% indicated that the AIT condition resulted in a more enjoyment than the HIIT condition (d = .54, p = .007) and the SELF condition (d = .51, p = .008). There was no difference between the SELF and HIIT conditions (d = .18, p = .329).

Hypothesis 6: Autonomy

Hypothesis 6 predicted that the AIT condition would result in more perceived autonomy than the HIIT and SELF conditions. This was partly confirmed. A repeated-measures ANOVA with three conditions (HIIT, AIT, and SELF) revealed a difference between conditions, F (2, 60) = 28.82, p < .001, η^2 = .490. Autonomy for the SELF condition was 5.78 ± 0.52 units. Autonomy for the AIT condition was 5.43 ± 0.91 units. Autonomy for the HIIT condition was 4.31 ± 1.17 units. Post-hoc analyses using paired t-tests and a false discovery rate of 5% indicated that the AIT condition resulted in a more autonomy than the HIIT condition (d = .89, p < .001). The SELF condition also resulted in more autonomy than the AIT condition (d = .40, p = .032).

Predictors of Remembered Pleasure, Forecasted Pleasure, and Enjoyment

Correlation analyses were conducted to determine the relations between mean experienced pleasure (not controlling for baseline), slopes of pleasure, pleasure experienced at the end of each session (affective valence at 100% completion), remembered pleasure, forecasted pleasure, and enjoyment. This was done to examine theoretically likely predictors of remembered pleasure, forecasted pleasure, and enjoyment.

Remembered pleasure was not correlated with pre-exercise affective valence, $r_{rm}(62) = 0.05, 95\%$ CI [-0.232, 0.299], p = 0.679. Remembered pleasure was correlated with pleasure experienced at the end of exercise, $r_{rm}(61) = 0.67, 95\%$ CI [0.513, 0.783], p < 0.001 and the overall mean experienced pleasure, $r_{rm}(61) = 0.57, 95\%$ CI [0.394, 0.727], p < 0.001 (see Figure 8). Remembered pleasure was also correlated with the overall slope of pleasure, $r_{rm}(62) = 0.60, 95\%$ CI [0.455, 0.727], p < 0.001; and the slope of pleasure determined using only during-exercise affective responses (i.e., not considering pre-exercise affective valence), $r_{rm}(60) = 0.64, 95\%$ CI [0.483, 0.786], p < 0.001. Remembered pleasure was correlated with the peak, $r_{rm}(62) = 0.40, 95\%$ CI [0.123, 0.62], p = 0.001, and the peak-end average, $r_{rm}(62) = 0.62, 95\%$ CI [0.436, 0.76], p < 0.001. Mean remembered pleasure was negatively associated with body mass index (r = -.484, p = .005), but not other variables including preference, tolerance, or body fat percentage.



Figure 8. Rmcorr plot showing the relation between mean affective valence and remembered pleasure using repeated measures. Each line corresponds to a different participant's data.

Enjoyment was correlated with affect experienced at the end of exercise, $r_{rm}(60) = 0.45$, 95% CI [0.255, 0.641], p < 0.001; mean experienced pleasure, $r_{rm}(60) = 0.46$, 95% CI [0.277, 0.631], p < 0.001; the overall slope of pleasure, $r_{rm}(61) = 0.44$, 95% CI [0.23, 0.656], p < 0.001; the slope of pleasure during exercise, $r_{rm}(59) = 0.34$, 95% CI [0.06, 0.574], p = 0.007; and remembered pleasure, $r_{rm}(61) = 0.51$, 95% CI [0.301, 0.703], p < 0.001. Enjoyment was also associated with the peak, $r_{rm}(61) = 0.46$, 95% CI [0.252, 0.678], p < 0.001, and the peak-end average, $r_{rm}(61) = 0.50$, 95% CI [0.309, 0.645], p < 0.001.

Forecasted pleasure was correlated with affect experienced at the end of exercise, $r_{rm}(61) = 0.51, 95\%$ CI [0.282, 0.695], p < 0.001; overall mean experienced pleasure, $r_{rm}(61) = 0.48, 95\%$ CI [0.237, 0.675], p < 0.001; the overall slope of pleasure, $r_{rm}(62) = 0.43, 95\%$ CI [0.211, 0.592], p < 0.001; the slope of pleasure using during-exercise affective responses, $r_{rm}(60) = 0.45, 95\%$ CI [0.166, 0.665], p < 0.001; and remembered pleasure, $r_{rm}(62) = 0.62, 95\%$ CI [0.362, 0.788], p < 0.001. Forecasted pleasure was also related to the peak, $r_{rm}(62) = 0.46, 95\%$ CI [0.185, 0.709], p < 0.001, and the peak-end average, $r_{rm}(62) = 0.54, 95\%$ CI [0.303, 0.719], p < 0.001. Enjoyment of the exercise session was strongly associated with forecasted pleasure of a repeated session, $r_{rm}(61) = 0.78, 95\%$ CI [0.642, 0.874], p < 0.001.

Discussion

The primary purpose of this registered report was to test a novel exercise protocol, namely Affect-guided interval training (AIT). AIT allows participants to alternate between the highest pleasant and lowest pleasant intensities, which are expected to vary between participants. AIT is expected to put the exercisers in control and allow them to avoid feelings of displeasure, while still providing a meaningful physiological stimulus. This study compared 20 minutes AIT to traditional high-intensity interval training (HIIT), which alternated between 90% and 20% of peak power output for 20 minutes, and 30 minutes of self-selected continuous exercise (SELF), where participants were informed that they could change intensity whenever they pleased but, in contrast to AIT, were not explicitly instructed to alternate between the highest pleasant and lowest pleasant intensities.

In this study, all sessions were, on average, vigorous (i.e., > 76% peak measured heart rate). The AIT session ranged from $71.37 \pm 8.70\%$ to $84.79 \pm 11.60\%$ peak heart rate. The HIIT session ranged from $77.93 \pm 9.15\%$ to $97.50 \pm 5.25\%$ peak heart rate. The SELF session ranged from $70.66 \pm 9.57\%$ to $83.02 \pm 12.09\%$ peak heart rate. This suggests that all exercise sessions tested could provide health-enhancing effects and meaningful physiological changes, consistent with physical activity guidelines. Interestingly, but not surprisingly, the AIT session resulted in changes in intensity (from highest pleasant intensity to lowest pleasant intensity), but the peaks and valleys were not as extreme as the HIIT session, which ranged from 90% of peak power output to 20% of peak power output, with no consideration for psychological responses (See Figure 2). This suggests that the "pleasant range" of exercise intensities might be narrower than the range imposed by high-intensity interval training.

In-task Affective Responses

Our hypotheses regarding in-task affective responses were confirmed. The AIT was experienced as more pleasant than the HIIT session (Hypothesis 1), with a large effect size (d = .87), as well as the SELF session, with a medium effect size (d = .58). When differences in baseline affective valence were not considered, the AIT remained more pleasant than the HIIT condition (d = .48) but was no longer different than the SELF condition, which only partly supported Hypothesis 1. Further, confirming Hypothesis 2, the overall slope of pleasure in the AIT was more positive than the overall slope of pleasure in the HIIT condition, again with large effects (d = .99) and the SELF condition, again with a more medium effect size (d = .63), although these effects were attenuated but remained significant when not considering baseline affective valence (d = .62, .52, respectively).

Intensity and pleasure are known to be linked, with people generally experiencing less pleasure as intensity increases beyond the ventilatory threshold (Ekkekakis et al., 2011). Interestingly, the heart rate during the AIT and SELF conditions were not different from each other, but the AIT still resulted in more experienced pleasure and a more positive affective slope. This could be due to several factors that warrant further investigation. First, the AIT session was 10 minutes shorter, and participants were aware of how long the exercise session would be; this could have had an impact on the overall affective experience via anticipated affective responses (e.g., Davis & Stenling, 2020). Second, although participants were in control of their intensity in both the AIT and SELF sessions, they were only explicitly instructed to vary intensity between the highest pleasant intensity and lowest pleasant intensity in the AIT session. Thus, only the AIT session resulted in deliberate changes in intensity each minute during exercise, always with a focus on pleasant affective responses. There may be something unique about providing varying intensities and periods of respite during exercise that are inherently pleasant. Further, differences in the AIT and longer SELF condition diminished and became nonsignificant in the analysis that did not consider baseline affective valence.

The SELF condition was, on average, vigorous. This was an unexpected result, and it was predicted that exercisers would choose a lower intensity over 30 minutes compared to a 20minute exercise session. Although the SELF condition was 10 minutes longer, and vigorous, it was not experienced as less pleasant than the HIIT session, and it did not have a more negative affective slope than the HIIT session. The SELF condition was also not less enjoyable than HIIT, despite being 50% longer. It is possible that participants in the SELF condition were able to regulate intensity and avoid displeasure, even if not explicitly instructed to choose a pleasant intensity. Although vigorous, there was still a large difference in intensity in the HIIT condition compared to the SELF condition (d = .87). This suggests a limit in the intensity that participants were willing to impose on themselves. This is in line with a review by Ekkekakis (2009), who noted that most individuals choose intensities that are physiologically beneficial and do not result in declines in pleasure. Therefore, it is possible that both self-selected exercise sessions here (AIT and SELF) allowed participants to choose individually appropriate intensities (and vigorous intensity overall), without crossing a threshold that would reduce pleasure and enjoyment.

Although all conditions were vigorous, the 20-minute AIT session was experienced as most pleasant, and the 30-minute SELF condition was not experienced as less pleasant than the much more intense, but shorter HIIT condition. This also highlights the possibility that an exercise session that is 50% longer (i.e., SELF vs. HIIT, 30 minutes vs. 20 minutes) may not be perceived as inferior, less pleasant, or more unpleasant, if the exerciser can regulate their own intensity level. This also suggests the possibility of duration neglect (Fredrickson & Kahneman, 1993); perhaps participants are less sensitive to the duration of exercise than they are to the intensity of exercise. In this study, participants were informed that the SELF condition would be 30 minutes, and they were aware that the other sessions were 20 minutes. Despite this, there were also no differences in forecasted pleasure between HIIT and SELF (discussed below). This idea warrants further investigation.

Remembered Pleasure

Hypothesis 3 predicted that the remembered pleasure of the AIT session would be highest. This was confirmed. The remembered pleasure of the AIT session was greater than the HIIT session, with large effects (d = .73) and the SELF condition, again with large effects (d =.70). Despite being 50% longer, and also vigorous, the SELF condition was not remembered as less pleasant than HIIT (d = .19). In this within-subjects design, about 67% of participants reported higher remembered pleasure following the AIT session compared to the HIIT condition. Whereas approximately 19% of participants remembered the HIIT session to be unpleasant (i.e., more negative than neutral), 9% of participants remembered the SELF session to be unpleasant. In contrast, every participant remembered the AIT session to be pleasant (remembered pleasure ratings ranged from 23 units to 93 units).

Regarding raw values of remembered pleasure, there was a range from 29.56 units (on average) following the HIIT session, to 35.27 units following the SELF session, to 54.31 units following the AIT session. These correspond to approximately mildly pleasant (24 units) to moderately-strongly pleasant (38 to 70) on the Empirical Valence Scale (Lishner et al., 2008). Regarding behavioral implications, Kwan et al. (2017) have demonstrated that remembered pleasure of a laboratory exercise experience is associated with subsequent exercise behavior, whereas Hargreaves and Stych (2013) observed nonsignificant associations between retrospective evaluations and exercise behavior. Theoretically, remembered pleasure and core affective experiences are linked to forecasted pleasure and attraction toward exercise, which is associated with exercise behavior (Ekkekakis et al., 2021; Nieves & Zenko, 2023). Future investigators, ideally with longitudinal designs, should work to determine how many units on the Empirical Valence Scale correspond to meaningful differences or changes in behavior. That is,

are 10 units associated with 10 minutes of physical activity per week, or 30, or more, or fewer? It is also noteworthy to observe that remembered pleasure was, on average, positive for all sessions. It is possible that results may differ and that larger differences between conditions would emerge in a different sample (e.g., older, more sedentary, clinical).

Forecasted Pleasure

Hypothesis 4 predicted that AIT would be forecasted as most pleasant. This was confirmed; the AIT was forecasted to be more pleasant than the HIIT condition (d = .84) and the SELF condition (d = .78), and again there was no difference between the HIIT and SELF condition (d = .10). Like with remembered pleasure, future investigators should work to determine how much difference in forecasted pleasure results in meaningful difference in behavior. For now, at least theoretically, exercise sessions that are predicted to be more pleasant are more likely to be repeated (Ekkekakis & Dafermos, 2012; Hutchinson et al., 2023; Jones & Zenko, 2021; Slawinska & Davis, 2020). In addition, future investigators should work to understand how to enhance more complex anticipated emotions (Feil et al., 2022).

Enjoyment

Hypothesis 5 predicted that AIT would be more enjoyable than HIIT and SELF. This was also confirmed; the AIT was more enjoyable than HIIT (d = .54) and SELF (d = .51). However, as with forecasted pleasure, remembered pleasure, the slope of pleasure, and experienced pleasure, there was no difference between the HIIT session and the longer SELF session (d = .18). We believe it is uncontroversial to suggest that exercise should be enjoyable whenever possible, as activities that are enjoyable are more likely to be repeated. Indeed, Lewis et al. (2016) provided data indicating that enjoyment of physical activity is a more powerful predictor of future behavior than self-efficacy.

Autonomy

Hypothesis 6 predicted that the AIT session would result in higher levels of autonomy than the HIIT and SELF condition. This was only partly confirmed. Although AIT resulted in more autonomy than the HIIT condition (d = .89), there was also a large difference in autonomy of SELF vs. HIIT (d = 1.23). Further, the SELF condition resulted in more autonomy than the AIT condition (d = .40). This suggests that, perhaps, allowing participants to choose the highest pleasant and lowest pleasant intensities enhanced autonomy relative to imposing intensities, but reduced autonomy relative to allowing them to simply choose their own intensity with no instructions on increasing or decreasing intensity. Although somewhat mixed (Teixeira et al., 2012), there seems to be a generally positive association between autonomy and exercise behavior (Nieves & Zenko, 2023).

In this study, allowing participants to choose their own intensity, or allowing them to choose the highest and lowest pleasant intensities, enhanced autonomy relative to imposing intensity. This extends previous research focused on matched intensities (e.g., Vazou-Ekkekakis & Ekkekakis, 2009). Although the chosen intensities in the current study were different than the imposed condition, the percentage of peak heart rate observed for the AIT and SELF conditions were not different. It is important to highlight that the AIT and SELF conditions both included vigorous exercise and lasted for 20 to 30 minutes, while still enhancing autonomy relative to HIIT. This complements previous research that has indicated self-paced HIIT can enhance cardiorespiratory fitness and other outcomes (Connolly et al., 2017; Solyu et al., 2021).

Arguably, these findings suggest that we can simplify exercise prescription by removing the need to be rigid and focused on indicators of intensity (e.g., prescribing based on a percentage of heart rate, or a percentage of maximal oxygen consumption). Allowing participants

to choose their own intensity and emphasizing intensities that are pleasant or "feel good" has been recommended previously (e.g., Ladwig et al., 2017) and shown to result in physiological and psychological benefits (Carter et al., 2022; Parfitt et al., 2012). These results suggest that allowing people to choose their own intensity increases autonomy, and allowing people to choose their own intensity with an emphasis on pleasure enhances experienced pleasure, the slope of pleasure, remembered pleasure, forecasted pleasure, and enjoyment. Further, allowing participants to choose their own intensity and emphasizing pleasure may enhance completion and adherence to the exercise programming. In this study, all 32 participants who began the AIT and SELF conditions were able to complete the 20- or 30-minute sessions. However, about 13% of the participants (4 of 31) who began the HIIT session were unable to complete it.

Predictors of Remembered Pleasure, Forecasted Pleasure, and Enjoyment

Further, this study examined predictors of remembered pleasure, forecasted pleasure, and enjoyment. While these differed between conditions, as discussed above, it is also important to recognize potential individual differences or characteristics of an exercise experience that enhance remembered pleasure, forecasted pleasure, and enjoyment.

Remembered pleasure.

In the current study, remembered pleasure was not associated with pre-exercise affective valence, which is different from the findings of Hargreaves and Stych (2013). In that study, pre-exercise pleasure was correlated with retrospective evaluations in participants who exercised at or above the ventilatory threshold (Hargreaves and Stych, 2013).

Remembered pleasure was predicted by in-task ratings of affective valence. This suggests that about 32% of the variance in remembered pleasure was explained by mean experienced pleasure. These results are consistent with a study by Hutchinson et al. (2020), who found that

pleasure experienced during exercise was associated with remembered pleasure, both shortly after and 24 hours after exercise. In addition, when considering the overall experience, the slope of pleasure during exercise explained 36% of the variance in remembered pleasure. The relations between the slope of pleasure and remembered pleasure were similar when considering only affective responses measured during exercise (not pre-exercise affective valence); this slope explained 41% of the variance in remembered pleasure.

These results conceptually replicate prior research findings by Hutchinson et al. (2020, 2023) and Zenko et al. (2016). In these studies, researchers experimentally manipulated the slope of pleasure during exercise by manipulating exercise intensity or resistance training load and found that improving affective responses during exercise impacted remembered pleasure. In this current study, although the AIT session resulted in more positive slopes compared to HIIT and SELF, reflecting an increasingly positive experience, this was not due to instructions to progressively decrease intensity.

Affective responses at the end of the sessions (i.e., final measured response during exercise) predicted 45% of the variance in remembered pleasure, while the peak explained 16% of the variance and the peak-end average explained 38% of the variance. This is consistent with previous researchers who found that affective responses experienced at the peak (Hargreaves and Stych, 2013) and end (Hargreaves and Stych, 2013; Hutchinson et al., 2020, 2023) of the session were related to remembered pleasure or retrospective evaluations. In the context of high-intensity interval exercise, one study (to our knowledge) examined the effect of creating a longer high-intensity interval session that would be less intense at the end. However, this did not change psychological responses at the end of the exercise, suggesting that the end was not sufficiently altered between the short and long exercise sessions (Alves et al., 2021). Recently, Fessler et al.

(2023) performed an early phase study which included an additional nine minutes of exercise at a lower intensity over multiple sessions. This resulted in more positive affective attitudes toward exercise.

Taken together, the relations between experienced pleasure, the slope of pleasure, the peak of pleasure, and the final moment affect during exercise and remembered pleasure observed in the current study conceptually replicate and extend previous research in exercise psychology (Hargreaves & Stych, 2013; Hutchinson et al., 2020, 2023; Zenko et al., 2016). In the broader literature, Alaybek et al. (2022) conducted a meta-analysis to determine the influence of the peak, end, peak-end, trend, and other characteristics of an experience on retrospective evaluations. Overall, the peaks the end of an experience had a robust effect on the retrospective evaluations, comparable to the overall average, while the effect of the trend was considerably weaker (Alaybek et al., 2022). Future researchers should work to determine other influences of remembered pleasure, beyond the affect experienced during exercise. In addition, future researchers should investigate other ways to enhance remembered pleasure.

Enjoyment and Forecasted Pleasure.

As expected, enjoyment was related to affective responses to exercise and other retrospective and prospective evaluations of exercise. Mean affective responses during exercise explained 20% of the variance in enjoyment, while affective responses at the end of exercise explained 23% of the variance in enjoyment. The slopes of pleasure explained between 12% and 19% of the variance in enjoyment. The peak was comparable and shared 21% of the variance with enjoyment, while the peak-end average shared 25% variance. Enjoyment and remembered pleasure were also strongly associated, sharing 26% variance.

Forecasted pleasure was associated with experienced pleasure. Mean affective valence during exercise explained 23% of the variance in forecasted pleasure. The affect experienced at the end of exercise explained 26% of the variance in forecasted pleasure. Further, the slopes of pleasure explained 18% to 20% of the variance in forecasted pleasure. The peak of pleasure explained 21% of the variance in forecasted pleasure, while the peak-end average shared 29% variance with forecasted pleasure. Finally, remembered pleasure explained 38% of the variance in forecasted pleasure. Overall, these findings are consistent with prior research (Hutchinson et al., 2023; Zenko et al., 2016). Interestingly, forecasted pleasure or anticipated affective states also seem to be predictive of global retrospective evaluations following exercise (Davis & Stenling, 2020).

Importantly, the measures of remembered pleasure and forecasted pleasure were distinct. The measure of remembered pleasure consisted of a horizontal visual analog scale, ranging from *most unpleasant imaginable* to *most pleasant imaginable*, and required participants to draw an "x" to indicate their response. The measure of forecasted pleasure was a vertically oriented seven-point scale ranging from *very unpleasant* to *very pleasant*. This suggests that the correlation was not inflated due to common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). It is also possible that the forecasted pleasure would be more strongly related to remembered pleasure, the slope of pleasure, and enjoyment if the response scale was more granular (Pearse et al., 2011). The measure used in the current study was ad-hoc with face validity and intended to be distinct. However, future researchers may consider larger (e.g., 21-point) scales that would allow for greater response variability (Pearse, 2011).

Dispositional Factors

Although the experimental condition had an effect on experienced pleasure, the slope of pleasure, remembered pleasure, forecasted pleasure, enjoyment, and autonomy, in line with our hypotheses, it is also clear from the above results that a large percentage of variance in remembered pleasure remained unexplained by affective responses and evaluations of the experience. In contrast to recent findings (Hutchinson et al., 2023), preference for high-intensity exercise and tolerance of high-intensity exercise were not correlated with remembered pleasure in this sample. Remembered pleasure was negatively associated with body mass index.

This indicates that the search for dispositional and personality influences on remembered pleasure should continue in further research. For example, exploratory analyses indicated that, although the AIT session was remembered as more pleasant than HIIT overall (d = .73), about 25% of participants remembered the HIIT session as more pleasant. Understanding predictors of these individual differences seems important. Thus, the biases in memory and cognitive filters and appraisals illustrated by Jones and Zenko (2021), which are expected to influence remembered pleasure and be highly individualized, should be systematically investigated and identified.

Strengths and Limitations

This study had several strengths. It was a registered report, with the six primary hypotheses, methods, sample size justification, and data analysis plan all specified and peerreviewed prior to data collection. Data collection took place in a controlled laboratory environment, with consistent timing of measurements across conditions. Valid and reliable measurement approaches were used to assess affective responses during exercise and outcome variables. We also compared three realistic exercise programming options, namely affect-guided

interval training (for 20 minutes), high-intensity interval training (for 20 minutes), and selfselected exercise intensity (for 30 minutes). In the HIIT session, intensity was based on peak power output, assessed during the first laboratory visit. In the AIT and SELF sessions, intensity was ultimately decided by the participant, and this allowed us to observe that participants chose moderate-to-vigorous exercise intensities. The novel exercise paradigm introduced here, the AIT, is therefore able to be applied in further research.

On the other hand, this study did include several weaknesses. The sample consisted of students without known health conditions or medical issues. The sample was also fairly young, at 22 years of age, on average. All but five participants were between 18 and 24 years old. Therefore, the generalizability of these findings to other samples may be limited. In addition, the test of peak power output included stages that increased by 20 Watts per minute. This allowed peak power output to only be sensitive to 20-Watt increments (e.g., 130 Watts, 150 Watts, 170 Watts). It is possible that a smaller increment or ramped protocol would allow a more precise estimate of peak power output, and therefore a more precise prescription of intensity for HIIT. It is also possible that intensity was underestimated; peak measured heart rate averaged $89 \pm 7\%$ age-predicted maximum heart rate (range: 75% to 99%). It is possible that the cycling modality did not allow participants to achieve their true maximum heart rate. A final limitation was that SELF was anticipated to result in lower exercise intensity than HIIT, because it was 50% longer. Although it did result in lower exercise intensity, the overall intensity was still vigorous. Therefore, the differences observed between SELF and AIT may diminish if lower intensities (e.g., moderate) or more comparable durations (e.g., 20 minutes) are used.

Conclusions

This study demonstrated that AIT resulted in a moderate-to-vigorous exercise for 20 minutes, with vigorous intensity overall. The AIT session was experienced as more pleasant, remembered as more pleasant, forecasted to be more pleasant if repeated again, and perceived as more enjoyable than HIIT and SELF conditions. Perceived autonomy was higher following both SELF and AIT compared to HIIT. Characteristics of the exercise session, including average level of pleasure, pleasure at the final moment of the exercise experience, and the slope of pleasure meaningfully predicted remembered pleasure. These data suggest that AIT is a feasible alternative to HIIT and SELF and may be useful to enhancing the experience of – and ultimately adherence to – regular exercise behavior. Future research should investigate the effects of using AIT in a longitudinal study to determine long-term effects on exercise behavior.

References

- 1. Alaybek, B., Dalal, R. S., Fyffe, S., Aitken, J. A., Zhou, Y., Qu, X., Roman, A., & Baines, J. I. (2022). All's well that ends (and peaks) well? A meta-analysis of the peakend rule and duration neglect. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *170*, 104149. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2022.104149</u>
- Alicea, S. K., Parrott, A. D., Manos, T. M., & Kwon, Y. S. (2020). Comparison of the affective responses to continuous training and high-intensity interval training protocols: Application of the dual-mode model. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*. doi:10.1519/JSC.000000000003282
- Alves, E. D., Julio, U. F., Panissa, V. L. G., Franchini, E., & Takito, M. Y. (2021). Might high-intensity interval exercise be remembered as more pleasurable? An Attempt to Test the Peak-End Rule in the Exercise Context. *Perceptual and motor skills*, *128*(4), 1586– 1606. <u>https://doi-org.falcon.lib.csub.edu/10.1177/00315125211010047</u>
- 4. Ariely, D., & Carmon, Z. (2000). Gestalt characteristics of experiences: The defining features of summarized events. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, *13*(2), 191–201.
- Backhouse, S. H., Ekkekakis, P., Biddle, S. J. H., Foskett, A., & Williams, C. (2007). Exercise makes people feel better but people are inactive: Paradox or artifact? *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 29*, 498-517.
- 6. Bakdash, J.Z., & Marusich, L.R. (2017). Repeated Measures Correlation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 256. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00456
- 7. Batacan, R. B. Jr., Duncan, M. J., Dalbo, V. J., Tucker, P. S., & Fenning, A. S. (2017). Effects of high-intensity interval training on cardiometabolic health: A systematic review

and meta-analysis of intervention studies. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 51, 494-503.

- 8. Benjamini, Y., & Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, *57*(1), 289-300. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1995.tb02031.x
- Benjamini, Y., & Yekuteli, D. (2005). False discovery rate-adjusted multiple confidence intervals for selected parameters. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 100(469), 71-81. https://doi.org/10.1198/016214504000001907
- Bennie, J. A., Kolbe-Alexander, T., Seghers, J., Biddle, S. J. H., & De Cocker, K. (2020). Trends in muscle-strengthening exercise among nationally representative samples of United States adults between 2011 and 2017. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 17, 512-518.
- Biddle, S. J. H., & Batterham, A. M. (2015). High-intensity interval exercise training for public health: A big HIT or shall we HIT it on the head? *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 12, 95. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-015-0254-9
- 12. Box, A. G., Feito, F., Zenko, Z., & Petruzzello, S. J. (2020). The affective interval: An investigation of the peaks and valleys during high- and moderate-intensity interval exercise in regular exercisers. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 49,* 101686.
- Carter, E. E., Bird, M. D., & Jackman, P. C. (2022). Comparing the effects of affectregulated green and indoor exercise on psychological distress and enjoyment in university undergraduate students: A pilot study. *Journal of Advancing Sport Psychology* in Research, 2(2), 23-34. <u>https://doi.org/10.55743/000016</u>
- Connolly, L. J., Bailey, S. J., Krustrup, P., Fulford, J., Smietanka, C., & Jones, A. M. (2017). Effects of self-paced interval and continuous training on health markers for women. European Journal of Applied Physiology, 117, 2281-2293. <u>https://doiorg.falcon.lib.csub.edu/10.1007/s00421-017-3715-9</u>
- 15. Craig, C. L., Marshall, A. L., Sjöström, M., Bauman, A. E., Booth, M. L., Ainsworth, B. E., Pratt, M., Ekelund, U., Yngve, A., Sallis, J. F., & Oja, P. (2003). International physical activity questionnaire: 12-country reliability and validity. *Medicine and Science in Sport and Exercise*, 35(8), 1381-1395.
- 16. Davis, P. A., & Stenling, A. (2020). Temporal aspects of affective states, physiological responses, and perceived exertion in competitive cycling time trials. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 30(10), 1859–1868. https://doiorg.falcon.lib.csub.edu/10.1111/sms.13766
- 17. Decker, E. S., & Ekkekakis, P. (2017). More efficient, perhaps, but at what price? Pleasure and enjoyment responses to high-intensity interval exercise in low-active women with obesity. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 28,* 1-10.
- di Fronso, S., Aquino, A., Bondár, R. Z., Montesano, C., Robazza, C., & Bertollo, M. (2020). The influence of core affect on cyclo-ergometer endurance performance: Effects on performance outcomes and perceived exertion. *Journal of Sport and Health Science*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jshs.2019.12.004
- Eddolls, W. T. B., McNarry, M. A., Stratton, G., Winn, C. O. N., & Mackinstosh, K. A. (2017). High-intensity interval training interventions in children and adolescents: A systematic review. Sports Medicine, 47, 2363-2374.

- Ekkekakis, P. (2009). Let them roam free? Physiological and psychological evidence for the potential of self-selected exercise intensity in public health. *Sports Medicine*, 39(10), 857-888.
- 21. Ekkekakis, P., & Dafermos, M. (2012). Exercise is a many-splendored thing, but for some it does not feel so splendid: Staging a resurgence of hedonistic ideas in the quest to understand exercise behavior. In E. O. Acevedo (Ed.), Oxford library of psychology. The Oxford handbook of exercise psychology (p. 295–333). New York: Oxford University Press.
- 22. Ekkekakis, P., Hall, E. E., & Petruzzello, S. J. (2005). Some like it vigorous: Measuring individual differences in the preference for and tolerance of exercise intensity. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *27*(3), 350-374.
- Ekkekakis, P., Lind, E., & Joens-Matre, R. R. (2006). Can self-reported preference for exercise intensity predict physiologically defined self-selected exercise intensity? *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 77(1), 81-90.
- 24. Ekkekakis, P., Parfitt, G., & Petruzzello, S.J. (2011). The pleasure and displeasure people feel when they exercise at different intensities: Decennial update and progress towards a tripartite rationale for exercise intensity prescription. *Sports Medicine*, *41* (8), 641-671.
- 25. Ekkekakis, P., Thome, J., Petruzzello, S. J., & Hall, E. E. (2008). The Preference for and Tolerance of the Intensity of Exercise Questionnaire: A psychometric evaluation among college women. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *26*(5), 499-510.
- 26. Ekkekakis, P., Zenko, Z., & Vazou, S. (2021). Do you find exercise pleasant or unpleasant? The Affective Exercise Experiences (AFFEXX) questionnaire. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 101930. <u>https://doiorg.falcon.lib.csub.edu/10.1016/j.psychsport.2021.101930</u>
- 27. Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, *39*, 175-191.
- 28. Fessler, L., Sarrazin, P., Maltagliati, S., Smeding, A., & Cheval, B. (2023). All's well that ends well: An early-phase study testing lower end-session exercise intensity to promote physical activity in patients with Parkinson's disease. *Movement and Sport Sciences*. <u>https://doi.org/10.1051/sm/2023009</u>
- Feil, K., Weyland, S., Fritsch, J., Wäsche, H., & Jekauc, D. (2022). Anticipatory and anticipated emotions in regular and non-regular exercisers—A qualitative study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <u>https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.929380</u>
- 30. Fleming, A. R., Martinez, N., Collins, L. H., Ashley, C. D., Chiodini, M., Waddell, B. J., & Kilpatrick, M. W. (2020). Psychological responses to high-intensity interval training: A comparison of graded walking and ungraded running at equivalent metabolic loads. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 42,* 70-81.
- 31. Follador, L., Alves, R. C., Ferreira, S. D. S., Buzzachera, C. F., Andrade, V., Garcia, E., Osiecki, R., Barbosa, S. C., de Oliveira, L. M., & da Silva, S. G. (2018). Physiological, perceptual, and affective responses to six high-intensity interval training protocols. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 125(2), 329–350.
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Kahneman, D. (1993). Duration neglect in retrospective evaluations of affective episodes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(1), 45-55. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.65.1.45

- 33. Gibala, M. J., Little, J. P., MacDonald, M. J., & Hawley, J. A. (2012). Physiological adaptations to low-volume, high-intensity interval training in health and disease. *Journal of Physiology*, *590*(5), 1077-1084.
- 34. Gibala, M. J., & McGee, S. L. (2008). Metabolic adaptations to short-term high-intensity interval training: A little pain for a lot of gain? *Exercise and Sport Science Reviews*, 36(2), 58-63.
- 35. Gillen, J. B., Little, J. P., Punthakee, Z., Tarnopolsky, M. A., Riddell, M. C., & Gibala, M. J. (2012). Acute high-intensity interval exercise reduces the postprandial glucose response and prevalence of hyperglycaemia in patients with Type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes, Obesity & Metabolism, 14*(6), 575-577.
- 36. Gillen, J. B., Martin, B. J., MacInnis, M. J., Skelly, L. E., Tarnopolsky, M. A., & Gibala, M. J. (2016). Twelve weeks of spring interval training improves indices of cardiometabolic health similar to traditional endurance training despite a five-fold lower exercise volume and time commitment. PLoS ONE, 11(4), e154075. <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0154075</u>
- 37. Hardy, C. J., & Rejeski, W. J. (1989). Not what, but how one feels: The measurement of affect during exercise. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *11*(3). 304-317.
- 38. Hargreaves, E. A., & Stych, K. (2013). Exploring the peak and end rule of past affective episodes within the exercise context. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 14(2), 169–178.
- 39. Hutchinson, J. C., Zenko, Z., Santich, S., & Dalton, P. C. (2020). Increasing the pleasure and enjoyment of exercise: A novel resistance-training protocol. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *42*(2), 143-152.
- 40. Hutchinson, J. C., Jones, L., Ekkekakis, P., Cheval, B., Brand, R., Salvatore, G. M., Adler, S., & Luo, Y. (2023). Affective-responses to increasing- and decreasing-intesnity resistance training protocols. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 45(3), 121-137.
- 41. Jones, L., Hutchinson, J. C., & Mullin, E. M. (2018). In the zone: An exploration of personal characteristics underlying affective responses to heavy exercise. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 40(5), 249-258.
- 42. Jones. L., & Zenko, Z. (2021). Strategies to facilitate more pleasant exercise experiences. In Z. Zenko & L. Jones (Eds.), *Essentials of exercise and sport psychology: An open access textbook* (pp. 242–270). Society for Transparency, Openness, and Replication in Kinesiology. https://doi.org/10.51224/B1011
- 43. Jung, M. E., Bourne, J. E., & Little, J. P. (2014). Where does HIT fit? An examination of the affective response to high-intensity intervals in comparison to continuous moderateand continuous vigorous-intensity exercise in the exercise intensity-affect continuum. *PLoS One*, 9(12), e114541. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0114541
- Kahneman, D., & Riis, J. (2005). Living and thinking about it: Two perspectives on life. In F. A. Huppert, N. Baylis, & B. Keverne (Eds.), *The Science of Well-Being*, (pp. 285-304). Oxford University Press.
- 45. Kendzierski, D., & DeCarlo, K. J. (1991). Physical Activity Enjoyment Scale: Two validation studies. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 13(1), 50–64.
- 46. Keselman, H. J., Cribbie, R., & Holland, B. (2002). Controlling the rate of Type I error over a large set of statistical tests. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 55(1), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.1348/000711002159680

- 47. Kwan, B. M., Stevens, C. J., & Bryan, A. D. (2017). What to expect when you're exercising: An experimental test of the anticipated affect-exercise relationship. *Health Psychology*, 36(4), 309–319. https://doi-org.falcon.lib.csub.edu/10.1037/hea0000453
- Lamoureux, N. R., Fitzgerald, J. S., Norton, K. I., Sabato, T., Tremblay, M. S., & Tomkinson, G. R. (2019). Temporal trends in cardiorespiratory fitness of 2,525,827 adults between 1967 and 2016: A systematic review. *Sports Medicine*, 49, 41-55.
- 49. Lacharité-Lemieux, M., Brunelle, J-P., Dionne, I. J. (2015). Adherence to exercise and affective responses: Comparison between outdoor and indoor training. *Menopause*, 22(7), 731-740.
- 50. Lahart, I., Darcy, P., Gidlow, C., & Calogiui, G. (2019). The effects of green exercise on physical and mental wellbeing: A systematic review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(8), 1352. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16081352</u>
- 51. Ladwig, M. A., Hartman, M. E., & Ekkekakis, P. (2017). Affect-based exercise prescription: An idea whose time has come? ACSM's Health and Fitness Journal, 21(5), 10-15. DOI: 10.1249/FIT.00000000000332
- 52. Lewis, B. A., Williams, D. M., Frayeh, A., & Marcus, B. H. (2016). Self-efficacy versus perceived enjoyment as predictors of physical activity behavior. *Psychology and Health*, 31(4), 456-469. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/08870446.2015.1111372</u>
- Lishner, D. A., Cooter, A. B., & Zald, D. H. (2008). Addressing measurement limitations in affective rating scales: Development of an empirical valence scale. *Cognition and Emotion*, 22, 180–192. doi:10.1080/0269993070131913
- 54. Little, J. P., Gillen, J. B., Percival, M. E., Safdar, A., Tarnopolsky, M. A., Punthakee, Z., Jung, M. E., & Gibala, M. J. (2011). Low-volume high-intensity interval training reduces hyperglycemia and increases muscle mitochondrial capacity in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, 111, 1554-1560.
- 55. Martinez, N., Kilpatrick, M. W., Salomon, K., Jung, M. E., & Little, J. P. (2015). Affective and enjoyment responses to high-intensity interval training in overweight-toobese and insufficiently active adults. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 37, 138-149.
- 56. Marusich, L.R., & Bakdash, J.Z. (2021). rmcorrShiny: A web and standalone application for repeated measures correlation [version 1; peer review: 2 approved]. *F1000Research*, 10, 697. <u>https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.55027.1</u>
- 57. Micklewright, D., St Clair Gibson, A., Gladwell, V., & Al Salman, A. (2017). Development and validity of the Rating-of-Fatigue Scale. *Sports Medicine*, 47(11), 2375–2393. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-017-0711-5</u>
- Nieves, J., & Zenko, Z. (2023). Motivational Correlates of Exercise Behavior Among College Students. *Communications in Kinesiology*, 1(5). https://doi.org/10.51224/cik.2023.47
- 59. Parfitt, G., Alrumh, A., & Rowlands, A. V. (2012). Affect-regualted exercise intensity: Does training at an intensity that feels 'good' improve physical health? *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, *15*(6), 548-553.
- 60. Pearse, N. (2011). Deciding on the scale granularity of response categories of Likert type scales: The case of a 21-point scale. *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 9(2), 159-171.

- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
- 62. Quednow, J., Sedlak, T., Meier, J., Janot, J., & Braun, S. (2015). The effects of high intensity interval-based kettlebells and battle rope training on grip strength and body composition in college-aged adults. *International Journal of Exercise Science*, 8(2), 124-133.
- 63. Reeve, J., Nix, G., & Hamm, D. (2003). Testing models of the experience of selfdetermination in intrinsic motivation and the conundrum of choice. *Journal of Education Psychology*, 95(2), 375-392.
- 64. Rhodes, R. E., & Kates, A. (2015). Can the affective response to exercise predict future motives and physical activity behavior? A systematic review of published evidence. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 49(5), 715-731.
- Roloff, Z. A., Dicks, N. D., Krynski, L. M., Hartman, M. E., Ekkekakis, P., & Pettitt, R. W. (2020). Ratings of affective valence closely track changes in oxygen uptake: Application to high-intensity interval exercise. *Performance Enhancement & Health*, 7(3-4), 100158.
- 66. Russell, J. A. (1980). A circumplex model of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *39*(6), 1161-1178.
- 67. Saanijoki, T., Nummenmaa, L., Eskelinen, J. J., Savolainen, A. M., Vahlberg, T., Kalliokoski, K. K., & Hannukainen, J. C. (2015). Affective responses to repeated sessions of high-intensity interval training. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 47(12), 2604–2611.
- 68. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2013.06.006</u>
- 69. Slawinska, M. M., & Davis, P. A. (2020). Recall of affective responses to exercise: Examining the influence of intensity and time. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living, 2*. <u>https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2020.573525</u>
- 70. Soylu, Y., Arslan, E., Sogut, M., Kilit, B., & Clemente, F. M. (2021). Effects of self-paced high-intensity interval training and moderate-intensity continuous training on the physical performance and psychophysiological responses in recreationally active young adults. Biology of Sport, 38(4), 555-562. https://doi.org/10.5114/biolsport.2021.100359
- 71. Stork, M. J., Banfield, L. E., Gibala, M. J., & Martin Ginis, K. A. (2017). A scoping review of the psychological responses to interval exercise: Is interval exercise a viable alternative to traditional exercise? *Health Psychology Review*, 11, 324–344.
- 72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2021.100607
- 73. Stuntz, C. P., Grosshans, M., Boghosian, R., Brendel, A., & Williamson, M. (2020). Exert more and feel better, not worse?: Examining links among changes in exertion, feelings of accomplishment, and feeling states. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 48, 101657.
- 74. Svebak, S., & Murgatroyd, S. (1985). Metamotivational dominance: A multimethod validation of reversal theory constructs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *48*(1), 107-116.
- 75. Teixeira, P. J., Carraça, E. V., Markland, D., Silva, M. N., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). Exercise, physical activity, and self-determination theory: A systematic review.

International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, *9*, 78. https://doi.org/10.1186/1479-5868-9-78

- 76. Tomkinson, G. R., Lang, J. J., & Tremblay, M. S. (2019). Temporal trends in cardiorespiratory fitness of children and adolescents representing 19 high-income and upper middle-income countries between 1981 and 2014. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 53, 478-486.
- 77. Troiano, R. P., Berrigan, D., Dodd, K. W., Mâsse, L., Tilert, T., & McDowell, M. (2008). Physical activity in the United States measured by accelerometer. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 40, 181-188
- 78. United States. (2015). American time use survey. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
- Vazou-Ekkekakis, S., & Ekkekakis, P. (2009). Affective consequences of imposing the intensity of physical activity: Does the loss of perceived autonomy matter? *Hellenic Journal of Psychology*, 6(2), 125–144.
- Warburton, D. E. R., Jamnik, V. K., Bredin, S. S. D., & Gledhill, N. (2011). The Physical Activity Readiness Questionnaire for Everyone (PAR-Q+) and Electronic Physical Activity Readiness Examination (ePARmed-X+). *Health & Fitness Journal of Canada*, 4(2), 3-23.
- Williams, D. M., Dunsiger, S., Miranda, R. Jr., Gwaltney, C. J., Emerson, J. A., Monti, P. M., & Parisi, A. F. (2015). Recommending self-paced exercise among overweight and obese adults: A randomized controlled trial. Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 49(2), 280-285.
- 82. Zenko, Z., Ekkekakis, P., & Ariely, D. (2016). Can you have your vigorous exercise and enjoy it too? Ramping intensity down increases postexericse, remembered, and forecasted pleasure. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *38*(2), 149-159.
- Zenko, Z., Willis, E. A., & White, D. A. (2019). Proportion of adults meeting the 2018 Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans according to accelerometers. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 7, 135.