UiT The Arctic University of Norway

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Health Sciences

An Investigation of Courage, Emotion and Well-Being in Relation to Adventurous Activities

Therese M. Alvestad and Sarah M. Johansen

Master's thesis in clinical psychology (PSY-2901), December 2020.

An Investigation of Courage, Emotion and Well-Being in Relation to Adventurous Activities

Abbreviated title: Adventurous Activities, Emotions and Well-Being

Authors:

Therese M. Alvestad

Sarah M. Johansen

Supervisor:

Tove Irene Dahl

PSY- 2901

Master´s thesis in Cand. Psychol.

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Health Sciences

UiT The Arctic University of Norway

Fall 2020

Preface

This article is written as a main thesis for the last year of clinical psychology at UiT, The Arctic University of Norway. In the process we have consulted professor Tove I. Dahl weekly or up to two times a week, who provided constant feedback and guidance in the progress of the thesis. The authors have contributed equally to this thesis, and each has reviewed the contribution of the other jointly and continuously.

We would like to express our gratitude to Tove for guiding us through the entire process. Thank you for believing in our project in times when we doubted it ourselves! We would also like to thank our study participants for sharing their experiences with us, the administration of Hønefoss Videregående Skole college for distributing our questionnaire to their employees, and our friends and family who have supported us in the process. We would especially like to thank our friend Gitta Visser for thoroughly reviewing and pointing out English grammar mistakes, and our pre-test participants for detailed and helpful comments on our first version of the questionnaire. Last but not least, we would like to thank each other for good teamwork.

Abstract

Spending time in nature is good for our health and well-being (Nizbeth et al., 2011; Park et al., 2009; White et al., 2019) and often involves engaging in some kind of activity. Could there be different benefits depending on the nature of the activity, and whether or not it involves courage?

Adventurous outdoor activities often involve risk (Barton, 2006, p. 3) and higher purpose and therefore also courage to act. This study investigates possible differences in terms of emotions and courage-related measures between acting on or bypassing the call to courage. It also considers how well-being is affected by recalling and reflecting upon a courage-related experience.

Through a mixed-methods questionnaire we captured qualitative and quantitative reports on an adventurous outdoor experience in which participants either acted or bypassed on a call to courage. Particpants were afterwards given the 7-point one-item Kemp Quality of Life Scale (Cheung & Lucas, 2014), which was also given to a control group.

Our findings suggests recalling and reflecting upon adventurous activities has a positive effect on well-being. Both experimental groups rated well-being higher than control group, but the effect was only statistically significant for those who bypassed. Emotions, perceived risk, competence and desire to succeed can be used as reliable predictors for whether the participants acted or bypassed the activity. Those who acted reported stronger positive emotions, higher risk, stronger desire to complete and higher competence in relation to the activity than those who bypassed.

Key words: Adventurous Activity, Risk, Courage, Well-Being, Emotion, Nature

Introduction

Nature and Well-Being

Spending time in nature is good for us, and is associated with positive outcomes in regard to quality of life and general well-being. According to the Cambridge Dictionary, well-being is defined as "the state of feeling healthy and happy" (Cambridge University Press, 2020). The term includes stress managing abilities, satisfaction with life, mental health and a sense of purpose – well-being is what the word implies; feeling well in general (Davis, 2019). As such, an increase in well-being is highly desirable both on individual and societal level. Even better, merely spending some time outdoors seems to contribute to it.

Research by White et al. (2019) found that spending at least 120 minutes a week in nature is sufficient to see a significant positive effect on health and well-being. The effect peaked at 200-300 weekly minutes and was documented for all involved population groups, undifferentiated by gender, social economic status, age, degree of physical activity per week, or social grade occupation (White et al., 2019). Another study found time spent in nature to correlate positively with well-being factors such as positive emotions and satisfaction with life (Nizbeth et al., 2011).

It is not only mental health and well-being that is affected positively by spending time in nature. For instance, forest bathing (spending time in a forest taking in all the impressions) has been shown to lower levels of cortisol (a hormone associated with stress), heart rate and blood pressure, increase parasympathetic nerve activity and decrease sympathetic nerve activity, compared to being in a city environment (Park et al., 2009). This implies that spending time in nature helps promote relaxation and stress reduction, which in turn can contribute to enhanced physical health and well-being.

Spending time outdoors often involve engaging in some kind of activity. There is a wide range of activities one can do while spending time in nature, spanning from mere

recreation to real adventure. Activities that are qualitatively different from each other may have different effects on the outcome in regard to health and well-being. In this study we aim to shed some light on the more adventurous outdoor activities. What is there to gain from facing and managing nature-related risks in the frame of an adventurous activity?

Adventurous Outdoor Activities

The expression outdoor adventurous activity includes a wide range of leisure activities that take place outdoors and involve some degree of uncertainty or risk. These activities can be anything from hiking, swimming and camping to snowboarding, rock-climbing and base-jumping. According to Barton (2006, p. 7), a truly adventurous activity includes the following elements: some uncertainty of outcome, wild/dramatic/unusual settings in nature, an active engagement in the activity, some degree of difficulty (but not impossibility), direct consequences of completion or incompletion (e.g we might get wet if we don't succeed), and a personal responsibility for the outcome (we did this ourselves!). He also adds that a real adventure speaks to the soul, hereby pointing to adventurous experiences being life enhancing in itself (Barton, 2006, p. 7) .

Risk and uncertainty seem to be inevitable when seeking a true adventure experience. Risk assessment in adventurous outdoor activities is not a clear-cut process and there is a lot to take into account. Barton (2006, p. 15) explains risk as a function of how often an accident is expected to happen and how serious the consequences would be if it occurred. This means an activity bears low objective risk when an accident rarely occurs, and/or the consequences of the accident would be minor and high objective risk when accidents are more probable to occur and/or the consequences of the accident would be severe.

Adventurous outdoor activities can loosely be sorted into the categories of soft and hard adventure. Whether an adventurous activity is soft or hard is defined by the degree of

objective or perceived risk involved, where hard adventures involve greater risk than soft adventures (Webster, 2016). Hard adventure activities as in high- risk activity, are explained by Barton (206, p. 17-18) as generally more complex, tend to put participants more at the mercy of nature, more often involve significant exposure to actual hazards and are more likely to entail actual risk, compared to soft adventure. Soft adventure activities, as in low- risk activities, involve less uncertainty, are more controllable and may have fewer actual risks (Barton, 2006, p. 18). However, the subjective experience of risk, and subsequently also fear, can be low or high in either category of adventure. This depends on a number of individual participant factors (Boyes, 2013).

Level of skill has implications for how risky people perceive an activity, and obviously also the degree of objective risk (Boyes 2013; Barton, 2006, p. 15). There is evidence that very experienced participants in high-risk leisure activities experience less fear than beginners do in the same situation (Buckley, 2012). Snowboarding down a steep hill feels less risky if you are an experienced snowboarder than if you are a novice. It is important to note that beginners do make more mistakes and the risk is therefore not only subjectively but also objectively higher for inexperienced participants in skill-demanding high-risk activities (Barton, 2006, p. 16).

Our physical capabilities and frames of mind (e.g our expectations) might also color how risky an activity feels on any particular day. Medical conditions like asthma, epilepsy or heart conditions can affect how risky an activity is to an individual (Barton, 2006, p. 36). The frame of our daily lives might also affect our perception of risk. As an example, a surgeon who needs to maintain a high level of fine motor skills might view the risk of a broken finger during an outdoor activity as intolerable, while others might not find this a deal-breaker. Altogether this means risk assessment is a rather complex procedure, and an adventurous

activity defined by some people as merely recreational might be perceived as a challenging adventure for others (Barton, 2006, p. 16).

Even with the challenges and risks involved, people keep pursuing adventure activities. Adventurous outdoor activities are, in fact, increasing in popularity and adventure tourism has in the recent years been a fast expanding market (Pomfret & Doran , 2015, p. 139; Cater, 2006). From 2009-2015 participation rates in these kinds of activities went up 25% (Gilbertson & Ewert, 2015). Cater (2006) argues that it's not the risk itself but the fear and thrill that is so alluring. This is interesting, as fear is an unpleasant feeling we normally would seek to avoid.

Risk and Emotion

It is reasonable to think that people choose to engage in any leisure activity in order to draw something positive from it, and that this also goes for fear-inducing adventurous activities. The dictionary definition of fear is "an unpleasant emotion that you have when you are frightened or worried by something dangerous, painful or bad that is happening or might happen" (Cambridge University Press, 2020). It does not immediately sound like something you'd want to pursue on a day off, yet a lot of people still do exactly that.

Gilbertson & Ewert (2015) claim there are four main factors motivating people to participate in high-risk, fear-inducing activities: sensation-seeking, socialising, a feeling of escape and improvement of one's self-image. In this study we put our focus mainly on sensation-seeking, through examining emotional components and courage related to adventurous activities. In regard to sensation-seeking, people participating in high-risk activities often describe experiencing a *rush* (Buckley, 2012). The rush is most pronounced after successfully handling an especially challenging situation.

Now, it seems that there has to be risk involved to experience rush, but that it is the rush that motivates people - not the risk itself (Buckley, 2012). The term rush is difficult to describe, and many have said it is only comprehensible to those who have experienced it themselves.

Buckley (2012) argues that rush is the result of thrill and flow experienced simultaneously. Flow can be shortly described as a focused state of mind where one's skill level is met with an optimal challenge (Rickly-Boyd, 2012). Thrill, according to the Cambridge dictionary, translates to "a feeling of extreme excitement usually caused by something pleasant" (Cambridge University Press, 2020). In light of this, and Buckley's (2012) findings we expect there to be a high level of positive emotions experienced after acting with courage and succeeding during an adventurous activity.

Healthy thrill-seeking behaviours, as in adventurous activities, are found to motivate purpose and personal growth and has shown to positively correlate with both social and personal well-being (Sarshar et al., 2019). Sounds desirable enough, but how does it connect to risk, and subsequently fear?

To answer this, we look to a qualitative analysis of fear and thrill in high-risk activities by Buckley (2016). According to his findings thrill does correlate positively with fear, but only within a certain threshold window (Buckley, 2016). Thrill can be experienced in the absence of fear below the lower threshold and with fear, in between a lower and upper threshold. Within this window of fear it seems that more fear means more thrill. Above the upper threshold however, thrill vanishes and only fear remains (Buckley, 2016).

It's interesting that a negative emotion like fear can correlate positively with a positive sensation of thrill, and this relation is something we aim to explore. How strong positive or negative emotions people experience in different times during their adventure may influence

whether they choose to act and complete their adventure or not. It might also affect how they recall the experience later, and how the recalling of that memory affects them.

Previous research suggests that episodic memories are attached to the emotional components experienced at the time, and these emotions are in turn affected by the degree of goal-fulfilment experienced when the memory was encoded (Phillipe & Bernard-Desrosiers, 2016; Philippe et al., 2011). Furthermore, the triggering of these memories can affect well-being in the present accordingly (Phillipe & Bernard-Desrosiers, 2016; Philippe et al., 2011).

Courage

In order to complete a truly adventurous activity it seems one has to face, manage and overcome some degree of risk-related fear. Studies have shown that acting despite fear is integral to people's implicit conception of the term courage (Rate et al., 2007). As fear is so closely connected to risk and thrill, we would like to consider what role courage plays in adventurous activities.

Ernest Hemingway defined courage as simply as grace under pressure (Rate et al., 2013). A more complex definition is "the disposition to voluntarily act, perhaps fearfully, in a dangerous circumstance, where the relevant risks are reasonably appraised, in an effort to obtain or preserve some perceived good for oneself or others recognizing that the desired perceived good may not be realized" (Rate et al., 2007). So simple, yet so complicated.

In the positive psychology movement, courage is seen as a character strength connected to bravery, persistence, integrity and vitality (Rate et al. 2007). In American culture, courage is often attributed to all kinds of acts that are admirable, but not necessarily consciously self-sacrificing on behalf of a greater good (Rate et al., 2007). This can possibly be applied to other western cultures as well.

Rate et al., (2007) conducted four different studies trying to come up with a clear-cut definition of courage. According to their conclusion we might best describe a courageous act as one executed after mindful deliberation, involving objective risk to the actor, motivated by a noble good or a worthy end, and carried out despite the presence of fear (Rate et al. 2007).

There will always be some disagreement as to whether or not an action is courageous, as there is no clear-cut threshold of the components of courage – for example, we don't know what is a sufficient noble good or worthy end for the application of courage to be justified (Rate et al., 2007). We argue that actions taken in risk-filled adventure activities in fact can be called courageous. The noble goal component in this setting can be fulfilled through improvements in mental health, purpose, personal growth and improved social and personal well-being (Sarshar et al., 2019; White et al., 2019;). Through adventurous outdoor activities people are offered opportunities to experience self-fulfillment and/or self-realization. In order to get there they need to act despite fear, with courage.

Courage may be relevant in decision-making as well. Decisions made in the face of risk can have immediate or long-term consequences for oneself or others. They can even mark the difference between life and death. Gal & Rucker (2020) examined decision-making and risk aversion in relation to important life decisions. According to their findings, people tend to choose riskier options when they desire to be courageous (Gal & Rucker, 2020). In light of this one could assume participants in hard adventurous activities to choose riskier actions if they desire to be courageous. Now, what might inspire people to be courageous?

Courage can as mentioned be seen as a desirable character trait (Rate et al., 2007) with several benefits. This is also supported in research. Courage, wisdom and transendence are all related to personal strength (Leontopoulou & Triliva, 2012). Personal strength correlates highly positively with well-being, environmental mastery, purpose in life and self-acceptance (Leontopoulou & Triliva, 2012). Courage is also found to attribute to flourishing, wich in turn

can contribute to purpose and enhanced life satisfaction (Santisi et al., 2020). Acting with courage can therefore be a way to achieve self-realization, enhanced well-being and contentment with life.

Study Design

The main research questions that are investigated in this study are: How do we remember outdoor experiences where we felt a call to courage? Are there differences between those times we acted on that and those times we bypassed the call in (1) the kinds and quality of the activities where people feel that call to courage (soft or hard adventure), (2) how they emotionally recall and experience their memory of the event, and (3) how they rate their feeling of courage (goal, risk and competence) in their memory of the event? Can one predict their choice to act or do something else by how they describe the experience? How do the variables relate to their feelings of well-being in the moment of recalling their outdoor adventurous activity, and are there any noteworthy gender differences in these experiences?

In a quasi-experimental design we invited people to recall a situation related to an outdoor adventure activity in which they felt there was risk involved, felt a call to courage and either acted ("acted" group), or did something else ("bypassed" group). We wanted to capture some key qualities of their experiences: 1) their noble goal and how important this was for them, 2) their self-evaluated competence related to the activity, 3) their preceding risk evaluation and 4) their positive and negative emotions just before, right after and when thinking back on the experience. Afterwards, we measured their general well-being using the one-item Kemp Quality of Life Scale. We also asked some participants to briefly describe a recent, neutral outdoor experience (control group), without asking them further about their experience, and measured their well-being with the same one-item scale afterwards.

We had the following hypotheses prior to analysing our data: 1) that there would be a difference in well-being ratings between the groups, where the experimental groups would rate their well-being higher than the control group. We expected the acted group to rate their well-being higher than the bypassed- and control groups. 2) We expected the acted group to report stronger positive emotion and more positive feelings related to the activity than the bypassed group, and the bypassed group to report more negative emotions than positive. 3) That the acted group would report lower risk activities compared to the bypassed group. 4) That competence would be lower in the bypassed group. 5) That the acted group would report a stronger desire to handle the situation than the bypassed group.

Methods

Participants

A total of 622 responses to our survey were registered. A large proportion of these were incomplete. Among the incomplete responses, most had stopped answering as soon as they were asked to describe an incident. There were more incomplete answers in the bypassed group than the acted- and control groups. Two responses were removed as the respondents stated they had no experience in mind and therefore had answered randomly.

After excluding incomplete and randomly-answered responses we were left with a sample of 237 participants who had either completed all or most of the survey, including the key questions for our analyses. In the final sample there were 142 (59%) female and 96 (40%) male participants. In addition, 1 person (0,4%) defined themselves as “other” gender. This person was excluded from analyses of binary gender differences, but not from other analyses.

The participants were distributed into three different groups: the acted group ($N = 67$, 57% female), the bypassed group ($N = 43$, 58% female), and the control group ($N = 125$, 61% female).

The age of participants was fairly evenly spread over the range of 18 to over 70 years. The age distribution among participants were: 18-29 years (N = 38, 16%) 30-39 years (N = 57, 24 %), 40-49 years (N = 56, 23%), 50-59 years (N = 67, 28%), 60-69 years (N = 19, 8%), over 70 years (N = 2, 1%).

Materials

A questionnaire with a total of 29 questions was created to capture the key variables for this study. The questions varied by group, as we will indicate in the procedure section. The survey was made using Qualtrics and all responses were thus collected online. Participants were kept anonymous. The language used in the questionnaire was Norwegian.

The survey was a mixed-methods questionnaire with both qualitative and quantitative items designed to determine if there are differences between the groups in their assessment of the event, how motivated they were to act (and why), and how the experience had affected them later, if at all.

To be able to analyse and control for age and gender differences we asked all participants to state their gender and age-group at the beginning of the survey. The participants were then routed to one of three conditions when they agreed to participate: to describe an outdoor adventure situation where they felt a call to courage and either acted on it (acted group), to describe an outdoor adventure situation where they were called to courage and did not act on it (bypassed group), and to a control condition where they were asked to briefly describe a neutral, recent outdoor experience.

Participants were first asked how much time had passed since the incident, and then to describe the event using their own words. Following this, they rated the risks involved across three different dimensions (physical, emotional and relational) and their perceived competence and abilities related to the activity on a scale of 1-6 (see Table 1 for all items and

answer alternatives). Participants were then asked to rate the impact of positive and negative emotions related to the situation both at activity start, immediately after and in the present when thinking back using the same 1-6 scale of response options. Participants were also asked to rate the importance of the event for them and others around them both at the time, and in the present in terms of if and how the experience had made a difference in their lives.

To capture the qualitative aspects of their adventure experience we asked them to describe the story behind it in their own words. We specifically asked for 1) what they set out to do and why, 2) what happened and how they felt and 3) how the experience had made a difference for them, if at all. They were also asked to list the feelings they felt thinking back on the experience. Suggestions were provided on a list of positive and negative feelings, as well as a textbox if they felt a feeling that was not on the list. We will analyse the qualitative material to look for trends and common themes brought up, and we hope it will provide a deeper insight to our research questions than the quantitative measures can on their own.

To look at how the participants evaluated their choice of action, we asked them to rate the probability of them acting in the same way if they were given the same opportunity again. Then we invited them to describe why they would or would not have done the same, and what it would take to change that.

Overall, the key variables measured by the questionnaire were: “perceived competence before activity”, “general competence”, “subjective risk”, “noble goal”, “emotional experience” (at activity start, immediately after, when thinking back today), “post hoc appraisal”, “post hoc evaluation” and “general well-being”. The variables and items asked to measure them can be seen in Table 1. The items have been roughly translated into English in this table. The whole Norwegian questionnaire, with the information and questions presented to each group, can be found in Appendix.

To answer the question of how the memory of an adventure affects concurrent well-being we included the 7-point one-item Kemp Quality of Life Scale at the end of the survey for all groups. The question asks each participant to take in all aspects of their life and rate their satisfaction with life (SWL) on a scale from 1-7. We chose the one-item scale because validity research on this SWL scale has been shown to have high construct validity when compared to multi-item SWL scales (Cheung & Lucas, 2014).

Table 1

All Quantitative Items Sorted by Variable Measured

Variable	Question numbers and formulations	Answer alternatives
Competence before activity	How would you rate your competence to go through with the activity? Here asking for your rating BEFORE starting the activity.	1= to a very small extent, 6= to a very great extend
General competence	Means score for: I had the necessary knowledge to handle the situation. I had the necessary ability to handle the situation	1=not true, 6 = completely true
Perceived risk	How dangerous did you experience the situation to be? Feel free to elaborate on your answer by writing in the textbox	1= not Dangerous at all, 6= extremely Dangerous
	How likely did you think it was that something would go wrong during the activity? Here, we ask what you thought BEFORE activity start.	1= Not true, 6= completely true
	If something had gone wrong, how serious physical damage did you think could have resulted? Here, we ask what you thought BEFORE activity start.	1= No physical injury, 6= serious physical injury or death
	If something had gone wrong, how emotionally uncomfortable did you think it could have gotten for you? Here, we ask what you thought BEFORE activity start.	1= No emotional discomfort, 6= serious emotional discomfort

	If something had gone wrong, how much did you think it could have damaged your relation to others/others relation to you? Here, we ask what you thought BEFORE activity start.	1= to a very small extent, 6= to a very great extend
Noble goal	My wish to manage the situation was strong	1= not true, 6 = completely true
	It was very important to me that I followed through with the activity	
	It was very important to someone else besides me that I followed through with the activity	
Emotional experience		
1. At activity start	Acted: When I decided to act, I felt strong positive emotions	1= Not true, 6= completely true
	Bypassed: When I decided not to act, I felt strong positive emotions	
	Acted: When I decided to act, I felt strong negative emotions	
	Bypassed: When I decided not to act, I felt strong negative emotions	
2. Immediately after	Acted: Right after the activity was done, I felt strong positive emotions	1= Not true, 6= completely true
	Bypassed: Right after the situation I felt strong positive emotions	
	Acted: Right after the activity was done, I felt strong negative emotions	
	Bypassed: Right after the situation I felt strong negative emotions	
3. In the present	When I think back on the situation today, I feel strong positive emotions	1= Not true, 6= completely true
	When I think back on the situation today, I feel strong negative emotions	

Post hoc appraisal	What do you feel when you think back on this situation today?	Several possible answers Pride Joy Sadness Fear Anger Longing Gratitude Interest Engagement Enthusiasm Regret Other (textbox)
Post hoc evaluation 1. Repeat?	How likely is it that you would have solved the situation in the same way, if you had the same opportunity once more?	1= Not likely, 6= completely likely
2. Personal change?	To what degree do you feel that this incident has made a difference to you?	1= to a very small extent, 6= to a very great extend
General well-being	Considering all areas of your life, range your general quality of life on the scale below	1= Life is worrisome, 2, 3, 4= Life is so so, 6, 7= life is great

Note. In the control group we only measured general well-being. In cases where variable items differed by group, this is shown in the table by group name before the item.

Procedure

A pilot version of the survey was pretested once on 5 volunteers without background from the psychological field. Some minor changes were made after pretesting. This included a simplifying of language and merging or splitting some items to make the survey easier and more understandable.

An anonymous link to the survey was distributed through social media to recruit participants. We distributed the link through the following Facebook groups: “På tur med hund i Norge”, “DNT – den norske turistforening”, “Fridykkerforumet”, “Friluftsliv Norge”, “Kajakk Norge”, “RYPEJAKT ER EN LIDENSKAP” and “Oslo Klatring” as well as on our private accounts. The Facebook groups had between 1.000-14.000 members at the time, and

they were all themed for people with an interest in various adventurous outdoor activities ranging from diving and climbing to hiking and hunting. We included a link at the end of the survey for respondents to forward and recruit someone they knew, preferably of the opposite gender. The link was also distributed by e-mail to all employees at Hønefoss Videregående Skole college.

Participants remained completely anonymous. All participants were asked about gender, age and month of birth before being distributed into groups. The study had three groups: acted group, bypassed group and control group. The distribution into different groups was made by asking the participants their month of birth. People born from January-April were placed in control group, people born from May-August were placed in the acted group and people born in September-December were placed in the bypassed group.

Due to the control group quickly outgrowing the other two groups, we removed it from the survey flow once it had reached 125 responses. Participants with birth months that previously would have placed them in the control group were from that point forward placed in the experimental group which was smallest at the time, specifically the bypassed group.

Control group were asked to briefly describe a neutral, recent outdoor experience. Participants in the acted group were asked 29 questions about an incident they'd had during an adventurous outdoor activity, in which they felt a call to courage and acted. Participants in the bypassed group were asked 29 questions about an incident they'd had during an adventurous outdoor activity, in which they felt a call to courage and decided not to act on it. All groups were given the one-item scale measuring satisfaction with life at the end of the survey.

Results

Qualitative Results

In total the participants described 21 different outdoor leisure activities. From highest participant rate (26 responses) to lowest (1 response) the activities described were: hiking (26), paddling (17), climbing (17), mountain skiing (11), walking trips (6), diving (4), free diving (4), bungee jumping (4), rock jumping (4), river wading (3), swimming (3), glacier climbing/wandering (2), outdoor overnighting (2), sledding(1), facade painting (1), zip-lining (1), sailing (1), geocaching (1), parasailing (1), and hunting (1).

As seen in Table 2 a total of 44 participants described what we classified as hard activities (high risk) and 66 described soft activities (low risk). Classification was done based on the type of activity participants described, the risk they reported feeling and the reported possibility for minor or serious physical or emotional injury (Westcott & Bird, 2016). Examples of distinctions are the qualitative difference between paddling in calm waters (soft adventure) and paddling with winds in 17m/s (hard adventure), or skiing in safe terrain (soft adventure) and skiing in uncertain terrain with the possibility for avalanche (hard adventure).

Table 2

Percentage of Hard and Soft Activities Reported by Group

Category and definition	Subcategory, within group prevalence	Example statement (roughly translated)
Soft (percent) As in reported minor risk or of serious physical or emotional injury	**Acted,** 58%	”Walk the mountain for a week carrying everything necessary along”
	Bypassed, 63%	”Wanted to go out on the edge to see the Vøringfoss waterfall”
Hard (percent) As in reported large risk or of serious physical or emotional injury	**Acted,** 42%	“Climbing, long fall if something went wrong”
	Bypassed, 37%	”Mountain skiing, wrong snow and large risk of avalanche”

Note. Percentage in relation to participants in each group.

Gender Differences

To look at gender differences in terms of incident of hard or soft adventure, we looked at their stories and categorized them. Then we ran a chi square test of independence to see if there was an association between gender and the types of adventures they described (soft or hard). The test results showed a statistically significant relation between the variables (X^2 (1, N = 108) = 14.62, p = .000). More men (N = 27) described hard adventure events than women (N = 14) and more women (N = 48) described soft adventure events than men (N = 19).

Analyzing the Results

We divided the qualitative data on the courage experience in three theoretically predetermined main themes: courage motivation, perceived risk and competence assessment. The data were analyzed using standards for interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA) in line with Smith & Osborn´s (2004) guidelines. Each participant description was read thoroughly several times, and themed. After thoroughly inspecting the patterns across themes, they were sorted into hypothetical subgroups of categories (Smith, 2016).

The categories were controlled through a blind second rating. One author first made category definitions and sorted all participants into these. The other author then sorted participants into the same categories in order to test the category definitions and accuracy of the sorting done by the first author. Afterwards, the categorizations were discussed, definitions refined and sorting adjusted, until reaching an adequate level of agreement on a final sorting (minimum level of agreement was 80%). The data of the experiences are reported categorically, and illustrated with direct, translated, quotations from the participants.

Courage Motivation

The courage motivation responses were sorted in line with IPA guidelines into categories by one of the authors, based on the motivation explanations given for making the decision to act or not in the adventure activity. Each participant was sorted into one courage motivation. The sorting was not always clear cut since they often described several motivations. Kerr & Mackenzie (2012) argue that motivations are multifaceted, and are continuously interchangeable and dependent on environmental stimuli, frustration and satiation. Therefore, the categorization was done based on what seemed to drive them to act or bypass.

Eight categories emerged (see Table 3). These were: "with companion", "without companion", "necessity", "effectiveness", "exploring", "safety for oneself or others", "mastery" and "negligence". The second author did a re-sort of the motivations, and the level of agreement was 82%. Where there was disagreement, the authors discussed the category definitions and statements and refined definitions to make category boundaries clearer.

Table 3

Qualities of the Courage Experience and their Prevalence by Group

Category and Definition	Subcategory and group prevalence in (percent (percent to group)	Example statement(s)
Courage Motivation What motivated the participant to act the way they did	**Mastery** (29) Motivated by gaining new experiences, sensation seeking, thrill and rush Acted: 36% Bypassed: 12%	Acted: "A feeling of mastery" Bypassed: "I did not feel a 100% confident that I would master it when it got slippery/wet"
	With companion (24) Motivated by someone who was with them Acted: 24% Bypassed: 16%	Acted: "Other's mental support" Bypassed: "I wanted to shoot grouse, but did not do so when the chance of hitting my friends was to great. I felt it was the right decision"

	Necessity (20) They "had no other choice" Acted: 16% Bypassed: 21%	Acted: "Our only chance to get down before it got dark" Bypassed: "It was too risky in the steep terrain"
	Exploring (10) Chosen out of curiosity Acted: 13% Bypassed: 2%	Acted: "Curiosity made us do this, but it did not seem as dangerous before starting the hike. Later it became difficult when we got stuck and had to find another route down, and darkness came on us" Bypassed: "Thought it was worth the danger it represented. I swam in with my upper body and realized that it was not a good idea, so I discontinued"
	Negligence (4) Chosen without considering the risks involved Acted: 6% Bypassed: 0%	Acted: "Thought It was safe. When we had reached the mountainside I realized that there could be an avalanche. Then I got scared and sought emergency relief as soon as possible"
	Effectiveness (4) When motivated to act efficient to save energy, time or increased risk Acted: 3% Bypassed: 5%	Acted: "Its far to go to the known cross point. After a long day of moose hunting, I quickly wanted to get back to the cabin" Bypassed: "I considered crossing, alternatively further down. Great water flow, thought about the consequences if the snow bridge broke, then I wouldn´t get back to shore"
	Without companion (8) Motivated by the fact that they were alone Acted: 2% Bypassed: 16%	Acted: "Low probability that something goes wrong, mimimize the risk by keeping within my comfort zone" Bypassed: "Decided to avoid the location because of fear, thought made sence since I was alone. Unnecessary to expose oneself to the situation"

	Safety for oneself or others (12) Motivated by safety-seeking for themselves or others Acted: 0% Bypassed: 28%	Bypassed: ”I am the mother of a little girl, decided not to ruin both of our lives, and therefore did not want to jump”
Perceived Risk Depending on the reported probability of serious physical or emotional injury	**Acted** Low 36% Medium 46% High 27% **Bypassed** Low 42% Medium 37% High 21%	Low: ”Experienced it as too dangerous to walk there without being afraid all the time” Medium: ”Moderately dangerous, as long as we discontinued the dive” High: ”Dangerous with possible serious fracture injuries and cooling/ internal bleeding etc when the possibility for rapid evacuation was not present”.
Competence Depending on described competence, if they had a guide, friend or were alone	**Acted** Insufficient 25% Sufficient 74% **Bypassed** Insufficient 63% Sufficient 37%	Insufficient: ”Got intense fear of heights on the top, feet felt like jello, palpitations, tremors throughout the body” Sufficient:”I felt safe with the companion. Kept a safe pace and safety came first”

Note. Categories for activities and courage experience are sorted in order from most participants to least for the acted group. Percentage for each category are based on the group they belonged to.

As seen in Table 3 there seems to be different motivations that counted in the moment of deciding to act or not to act. In the acted group, mastery, companion and necessity were reported most frequently. The most frequently reported motivations in bypassed group were: safety for oneself or others, necessity, and with companion or without companion.

A large portion of the participants in the acted group described pursuing the situation with the end result in mind. The end result was described as a feeling of mastery, thrill, rush or well-being. An example statement: “The feeling of mastery made us do it. Similar dives are quite common, but there was a stress factor in that we couldn´t swim to the surface if we panicked or had other discomforts. That is, when we dived down, in the cave there was only one way out. There was a small hole only ca 1m wide. The dive was done while a buddy was

at the surface to make sure everything was fine. The feeling of mastery was fantastic". In the bypassed group this was rarely reported as a motivational factor.

Many of the participants in the acted group also seemed driven by having companions along as support, upping the shared level of competence and reducing the overall risk. They often described the companions as more competent than themselves, and that they followed in trust. Example statement: "Brought up thoughts about earlier experiences, used a guide who knew me well and that I trusted, both his climbing experience, and his knowledge about the mountain and the choice of climbing route, and his assessment about if I would master it, and possibly the ability to secure us. Mutual trust in the group that went along, helping each other and thinking positively, enjoying the feeling of mastery along the way".

In the bypassed group there was a tendency to describe motivations in the category safety for oneself or others. Some of the participants reported feeling overwhelmed by fear and sought out safety, without immediate risk of serious emotional or physical injury objectively present.

Some bypassed participants also described the activity less risky in hindsight than they felt it was at the time. Example statement: "Fear made me not to go through with it. But I regretted along the way. I would have mastered it!", a statement and rating of risk: "Met my own fear. Chose to play it safe rather than perform", "2 (out of a 6 scale measure for risk) could have suffered minor injuries".

Many participants in both groups described motivations to act in the category of necessity, stating that they either had no other option than to continue or that it would be too dangerous to continue. Example statement from the bypassed group: "Halfway up there was a storm in the mountainside several hundred meters up. Considered it impossible to climb the exposed lengths that followed the storm. It would have resulted in several falls and in worst

case serious injuries with the danger of severe cooling and major problems with evacuation. Helicopter was not possible".

Perceived Risk

We divided risk into three categories: low, medium and high. These categories emerged from reoccurring risk descriptions by the participants that tended to be rated low, medium or high. We chose to categorize in this manner to grasp the qualitative differences that emerged from the risk-evaluations described.

When categorizing each description we considered the risk assessed by the participants, along with an objective assessment about the severity of the possible consequences. The second author did a re-sort of the risk, and the agreement level between authors was at first 72%. The categories were discussed and refined in cases of disagreement until reaching an agreement level of 80%.

Some cases were easily sorted into either low, medium or high risk. Others were not as clear-cut and were sorted dependent on subjective and objective risk seen jointly. We considered Barton's (2006, p. 14) description of risk degree being a function of probability of an accident occurring and severity of possible accidents.

The participants in each group described a similarly distributed proportion of risk level. Slightly more participants in the acted group described high and medium risk than the bypassed group, which slightly more frequently reported low risk experiences.

Even though the bypassed group reported a larger proportion of low risk, they more often described feeling unsafe and emphasized physical fear reactions more often than the acted group did. When assessing risk, it seemed the acted group more often focused on objective risk, while the bypassed group more often focused on emotional reactions to risk. Example statement from the acted group: "The mountain was very rugged, great distance

between where one could place their feet, in so a risk to slip, and the drop was quite far". Example statement from the bypassed group: "I experienced it as scary and stressful".

Competence

The competence categories were determined based on the degree of competence people described having, in order to handle the situation. Competence was categorized as sufficient or insufficient. When assessing descriptions of competence in line with IPA, several aspects were taken into account; if they had a guide or friend (companion) with them, if they were alone and the assessments done in the situation. The sorting of descriptions into competence categories had an agreement level between authors of 88%.

Companionship was considered since many spoke of competence in relation to this. Many described being more competent themselves when they trusted the competence of their companions. Example statement about what made a participant feel sufficient competence: "Others' mental support". In the Bypassed group some described competence as lower because of less competent companions, yielding insufficient competence in the group. Example statement: "A total assessment of the weather and people on the trip".

When alone, many described feeling sufficient competence, but a lacking due to not having the support of companionship. Example statement of insufficient competence due to lack of companions: "Choose to avoid that location because of fear and thought it was reasonable since I was alone. Unnecessary to expose oneself to the situation".

As seen in Table 3 a much larger proportion of participants in the Acted group described sufficient competence, than the participants in the Bypassed group which reported proportionally more feelings of insufficient competence.

Experienced Feelings

Participants could list one or several feelings that they experienced when thinking back on the situation. We provided a list of feelings to choose from, with the possibility of reporting other feelings that was not among these alternatives. Interestingly, the majority of the participants in the acted group reported experiencing multiple feelings (total of 183 feelings reported), while the majority of the bypassed group reported only one or two (total of 65 feelings reported).

Table 4

Feelings Upon Reflecting on the Adventure Experience by Group

	Acted		Bypassed	
Feelings	n	% Participants which mentioned this feeling	n	% Participants which mentioned this feeling
Joy	38	57%	5	12%
Pride	37	55%	10	23%
Enthusiasm	31	46%	2	5%
Gratitude	25	47%	9	21%
Engagement	16	24%	4	9%
Interest	8	12%	7	16%
Regret	5	7%	5	12%
Fear	5	7%	4	9%
Longing	5	7%	0	0%
Sadness	1	1%	4	9%
Anger	1	1%	1	2%
And other	11	16%	11	26%
Total participants	67participants,		43 participants,	
Total responses	183 responses		62 responses	

The acted group, in order of frequency, most often reported feeling; joy, pride, enthusiasm, gratitude and engagement. The bypassed group, in order of frequency, most often reported feeling; pride, gratitude, interest, joy and regret. A large percentage in both groups checked “other”, adding an explanation about the feelings checked off above, or adding a feeling other than the given options. Example statement from the acted group: “A feeling of,

imagine that we dared, but it was fun. But it will never be done again", and "Embarrassment". Example statements from the bypassed group: "Stupid that I did not dare, but I think it would have been a bad night, so I do not regret going home" and "Satisfaction".

Quantitative Results

We first ran descriptive statistics for all quantitative items in every group (see Table 5).

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for All Variables by Group

	Acted			Bypassed			Control		
Variable	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Time[a]	59	76.86	97.34	40	70.62	121.27			
SWL[b]	67	5.45	1.18	43	5.81	1.11	125	5.24	1.25
Risk									
Dangerousness	60	3.05	1.33	41	3.83	1.30			
Likelihood to go wrong	67	2.43	1.19	42	3.00	1.46			
Physical risk	67	3.94	1.96	42	4.50	1.50			
Emotional risk	67	3.79	1.70	42	4.48	1.27			
Relational risk	67	2.24	1.72	42	3.05	1.92			
Competence									
Self-rated competence	67	4.24	1.30	42	3.71	1.68			
Desire to complete	66	5.58	0.91	43	4.67	1.30			
Knowledge	67	4.67	1.24	43	4.14	1.42			
Ability	67	4.64	1.26	43	4.00	1.54			
Noble goal									
Importance for oneself	67	4.85	1.53	43	2.98	1.53			
Importance for	67	2.34	1.71	43	2.30	1.71			

others						
Emotional experience						
Positive emotions before	67	4.34	1.56	42	2.93	1.53
Negative emotions before	67	1.78	1.08	43	3.02	1.58
Positive emotions right after	67	5.30	1.34	43	3.05	1.46
Negative emotions right after	67	1.46	1.19	43	2.79	1.58
Positive emotions today	67	4.60	1.54	43	2.81	1.53
Negative emotions today	67	1.67	1.30	43	2.42	1.46
Post hoc appraisal						
Experienced emotions today	67	3.25	1.50	43	2.74	1.52
Likelihood to repeat	67	4.54	1.80	43	5.00	1.66
Made a difference for oneself	66	3.14	1.55	43	2.40	1.27

Note. a) Number of months since event; b) General well-being

Emotional Experiences

Within-group emotion comparisons were done with T-tests. A paired samples within-groups T-tests on “positive emotions before” and “negative emotions before” revealed a significant difference between these two variables in the acted group ($t(66) = 9.42$, $p = .000$) where the participants scored higher on positive emotions before ($M = 4.34$, $SD = 1.56$) than they did on negative emotions before ($M = 1.78$, $SD = 1.08$). The same test within the

bypassed group showed no significant difference between these two variables (t(41) = -0.32, *p* = .75).

A paired samples within-groups T-test between the variables "positive emotions right after" and "negative emotions right after" showed no significant difference within the bypassed group between two variables (*t*(42) = 0.60, *p* = .55). The same test within the acted group revealed a significant difference between the variables (*t*(66) = 13.17, *p* = .000), where the participants scored significantly higher on positive emotions right after (*M* = 5.30, *SD* = 1.35) than on negative emotions right after (*M* = 1.46, *SD* = 1.20).

Between-group emotion comparisons were also done with T-tests. An independent samples between-groups T-test showed a statistically significant difference between the groups on positive emotions before (*t*(107) = -4.630, *p* = .000), where the acted group scored higher (*M* = 4.34, *SD* = 1.56) than the bypassed group (*M* = 2.93, *SD* =1.54). The same test showed a statistically significant difference between the groups on negative emotions before (*t*(108) = 4.91, *p* = .000) where the acted group scored lower (*M* = 1.78, *SD* = 1.08) than the bypassed group (*M* = 3.02, *SD* = 1.58).

An independent samples between groups T-test showed a statistically significant difference between the groups on positive emotions right after (*t*(108) = -8.27, *p* = .000) where the acted group scored significantly higher (*M* = 5.30, *SD* = 1.34) than the Bypassed group (*M* = 3.05, *SD* = 1.46). The same test showed a significant difference between groups on negative emotions right after (*t*(108) = 5.00, *p* = .000) where the acted group scored lower (*M* = 1.46, *SD* = 1.19) than the bypassed group (*M* = 2.79, *SD* = 1.78).

Predicting Experimental Group by Courage and Emotion Ratings: Discriminant Function Analyses

To see how well courage items ("importance to oneself", "desire to complete", "self-rated competence" and "likelihood to go wrong") predicted group belonging between acted and bypassed groups we ran a discriminant function analysis. The result was a correct

prediction of predefined groups for 83% of cases in total, hereby 86% for cases in the acted group and 72% for cases in the bypassed group (see Table 6). This tells us that desire to handle the situation had the largest predictive value of the four variables.

Table 6

Discriminant Function Coefficients for Courage Variables by Group

Variable	Acted group	Bypassed group
Importance to oneself	1.04	0.22
Desire to complete	3.92	3.44
Self-rated competence	1.62	1.45
Likelihood to go wrong	1.33	1.79
Constant	-18.89	-14.46

We ran the same analysis on emotions just before, immediately after and when thinking back on the situation. Results showed that 91% of acted cases and 79% of bypassed cases were predicted the correct predefined group – a total hit rate of 86%.

The classification function coefficients showed that positive and negative emotions right after after the situation had the highest predictive value, then the emotions before, and finally emotions today (see Table 7).

Table 7

Discriminant Function Coefficients for Emotional Variables by Group

Variable	Acted group	Bypassed group
Positive emotions before	0.33	1.10
Negative emotions before	0.88	1.82
Positive emotions right after	5.67	3.84
Negative emotions right after	4.67	3.97
Positive emotions today	1.25	0.90
Negative emotions today	0.96	0.72
Constant	-24.31	-18.57

Because the predictive value of both courage and emotions were so high, we ran another discriminant function analysis where we included all courage variables and added the two emotional variables with highest predictive value (positive and negative emotions right after). The result was a correct prediction of group belonging in 83% of cases in the acted and 86% in the bypassed group, and a total hit rate of 84% (see Table 8).

Table 8
Discriminant Function Coefficients for Emotional and Courage Variables by Group

Variable	Acted group	Bypassed group
Importance to oneself	0.08	0.79
Desire to complete	2.78	2.96
Self-rated competence	1.45	1.42
Likelihood to go wrong	1.66	2.23
Positive emotions right after	5.56	4.37
Negative emotions right after	5.12	5.00

The combination of courage and emotions predicts cases belonging in the bypassed group better than courage or emotions alone. The predictive value on the acted group is still very good when courage and emotions are combined, although these cases were predicted even better by emotions alone. The variable with the highest loading for both groups were the emotions right after. For both groups, though, desire to complete loaded high, and importance to oneself loaded the lowest.

Differences Between Groups in Terms of Emotions and Courage

To examine the differences between groups on courage and emotional variables we ran a MANOVA with group as independent variable and the following dependent variables: importance to oneself, desire to complete, self-rated competence, likelihood to go wrong, positive emotions before, negative emotions before, positive emotions right after, negative emotions right after, positive emotions today and negative emotions today. The analysis

revealed that all variables tested were statistically significantly different from eachother ($p < .05$) except for self-rated competence and likelihood to go wrong which did not differ between groups.

On importance to oneself and desire to complete, the acted group had significantly higher ratings than the bypassed group. The acted group had significantly higher ratings on all measures of positive emotions and significantly lower ratings on all measures of negative emotions compared to the bypassed group, confirming the results of our T-tests. For full descriptives of variable means and standard deviations see Table 5.

Well-Being by Group and Gender

A one-way ANOVA between the experimental group as a whole and the control group revealed a statistically significant difference ($F(1,23) = 4.89$, $p = .028$) in well-being between the experimental group ($M = 5.59$, $SD = 1,17$) and the control group ($M = 5,24$, $SD = 1.25$).

To further investigate group and gender differences in well-being scores we ran a two-way ANOVA with group and gender as independent variables and well-being as the dependent variable. The results showed a significant main effect for gender (F (1,23) = 5.10), $p = .025$) and group ($F(2,23) = 4.20$, $p = .016$), but no interaction between the two ($F(2,23) = 1.14$, $p = .321$). Men ($M= 5.60$, $SD =1.15$) tended to report higher well-being than women ($M= 5.29$, $SD = 1.26$). Post hoc Tukey tests showed that the bypassed group ($M = 5.81$, $SD = 1.12$) scored significantly higher than the control group ($M = 5.24$, $SD = 1.25$), $p < .05$, while the acted group did not score significantly different than the other groups ($M = 5.47$, $SD = 1.18$).

Discussion

The data was wide-ranged and had many complex findings. In the discussion we will do our best to answer our research questions and highlight the most interesting findings as systematically as possible across three main themes: courage, emotional experience and well-being. We will discuss the qualitative and quantitative results simultaneously in order to highlight how they together contribute to our findings.

Summary

The acted group described a higher proportion of high risk activities than the bypassed group. Participants in the acted group more often reported sufficient competence for the activity compared to the bypassed group. The acted group emphasized mastery as their courage motivation, while the bypassed group emphasized safety for oneself or others. Qualitatively, both groups reported more positive than negative feelings. The acted group reported a compound of several positive feelings and barely any negative ones. The bypassed group reported more focused feelings, only 1-2 per participant. There was a higher incident of hard adventurous activity reported in the acted group than the bypassed group.

The acted group consistently reported stronger positive emotions and weaker negative emotions related to the activity than the bypassed group. The bypassed group reported little difference in strength between positive and negative emotions. In line with our hypothesis our results suggests that thinking back to and reflecting on an adventurous activity has a positive effect on general well-being in the moment of recalling the memory. However, this is not dependent on whether the memory recalled revolved around acting towards completing the activity or bypassing and doing something else. The experimental groups both rated their well-being higher than the control group, but the acted group did not significantly differ from the other two groups.

Courage Experience

When people were asked to recall an experience that demanded courage they most often recalled hiking, paddling, climbing, mountain skiing and long distance walking trips. In the qualitative data, competence more often appeared sufficient in the acted group than the bypassed group. The quantitative measures showed the same trend. This is as expected, and tells us that one more often decides to act towards goal-achievement when meeting a challenge one feels well-prepared for than one which perceivably exceeds one's level of competence.

Four quantitative variables were used to measure courage: importance to oneself, desire to complete, self-rated competence and perceived risk. We found an extremely high predictive value for these four variables on whether the participants acted on or bypassed the call to courage. Desire to complete the activity had the highest predictive value, thus seeming to be most important.

The desire to complete the activity and importance to oneself were both rated higher in the acted group than the bypassed group. This tells us that the acted group set out with a strong intention to complete the activity, which should not come as a surprise. Previous research shows that strong intentions are reliably more often realized than weak intentions (Ajzen, 1991).

There was a higher incidence of hard adventure activities in the acted group compared to the bypassed group, and more soft adventure activities in the bypassed group. This was also seen in the quantitative measures, where the risk was rated highest in the acted group. Furthermore, participants in the bypassed group often qualitatively described the perceived risk as high during the situation and low in hindsight. These are interesting findings, as they tell us that those who acted did so in high risk activities while those who bypassed typically did so in low risk activities. Furthermore, for those who bypassed the risk perhaps wasn't that

high after all when thinking back. We had expected high risk to be a more typical reason for bypassing the activity.

We propose that these findings might be explained, at least partly, by differences in planning and risk assessments. An activity in the hard adventure category often needs more planning, risk assessments and safety precautions compared to soft activities where the risk is expected to be low. Previous research on planning and intention shows that the relation between merely good intentions and actual behavior towards goal-achievement is as weak as 30% (Gollwitzer, 1999).

Planning behavior (implementation intentions) to solve an array of possible challenging situations (e.g. unexpected hazards during an adventure activity) allows for an automatic goal-directed behavior to handle the situation and therefore strengthens the positive correlation between intention and goal-achievement (Gollwitzer, 1999). This makes it more likely one will achieve the goal one has in mind, whether it be reaching a summit or rafting down a challenging stream. If the acted group had created more implementation intentions through planning and risk assessments than the bypassed group, this could explain why they acted towards goal-achievement while the other group changed their minds and bypassed.

Emotionally Recalling and Experiencing Their Memory

Our findings suggest that whether or not one decided to act or bypass on a call to courage actually can be predicted by the nature of the emotions experienced during the situation. Predictive analyses of the quantitative emotional measures showed a very high predictive value towards group belonging between acted and bypassed groups. However, their predictive value in total was not as high as the courage variables. The most important predictive emotional variables were the positive and negative emotions that were felt right after the situation. When analysing predictive value for these two combined with the courage

variables, the emotions right after had the highest predictive value. This tells us that emotions felt right after the situation are important and distinct as to whether one acted or bypassed in the situation.

Positive emotions right after the situation were rated much higher and the negative emotions lower in the acted group compared to the bypassed group. This aligns nicely with the fact that the rush experienced in relation to thrill-seeking behavior seems to be most pronounced right after a particularly skill-demanding situation (Buckley, 2012).

When asked to list what they felt in the moment of recalling their memory, participants in the acted group reported a wide compound of positive feelings simultaneously: joy, pride, enthusiasm, gratitude and engagement. At the same time they barely reported any negative feelings. The bypassed group on the other hand, tended to report more focused feelings, typically only 1-2 per participant. Most often they reported pride and gratitude, but some also reported interest. There was a higher proportion of participants in the bypassed group who reported negative feelings compared to the acted group, although the incident was still low. The negative feeling reported most often in the bypassed group was regret.

Quantitatively, the acted group consistently rated their positive emotions stronger and negative emotions weaker at all times (just before, right after and when thinking back) than the bypassed group. When rating emotions just before and right after the situation, the acted group consistently rated positive emotions significantly stronger than negative emotions. In the bypassed group this was not the case, they rated their positive and negative emotions similarly, indicating that none of them really dominated their emotional experience. The emotional difference between the groups was at its largest right after the situation.

The quantitative ratings support the result from the qualitative listing of feelings. Together they suggest that although there were more positive than negative feelings listed in both groups, the positive feelings were both more diverse and stronger in the acted group

compared to the bypassed group. The bypassed group reported a different picture– a mix of negative and positive feelings where none of them really stood out. This somewhat contradicts our hypothesis that the bypassed group would have more negative than positive feelings about their experience, although we did as expected find more positive feelings in the acted- than the bypassed group.

According to these findings, the act of bypassing an activity is not exclusively a negative experience, but rather one with positive and negative sides to it. On the other hand, acting with courage and succeeding in completion of an adventure is a potent experience evoking strong positive feelings in the participant. This is also supported in previous research. The motivation for participating in risk-filled adventurous activities is shown to be a highly desirable rush of thrill and flow (Buckley, 2012; Gilbertson & Ewert, 2015), and our results tells us that participants in the Acted group experienced something in that direction.

Well-Being by Group and Gender

In our hypothesis we expected to find a clear cut between the acted- and bypassed groups. We expected the acted group to report higher well-being than the bypassed group. We also expected that the bypassed group in turn would report lower well-being than the acted group, but had no expectations as to whether they'd rate well-being higher or lower than the control group.

In line with our hypothesis, we found that recalling and reflecting upon memories of adventurous outdoor activities affects concurrent well-being ratings in a positive manner. However, we did not find exactly what we expected. Altogether, the experimental groups differed significantly from control group in terms of a higher rated well-being. When splitting the experimental group into acted and bypassed, we found that the acted group did not differ

significantly from the other two groups. The bypassed group on the other hand, rated their well-being significantly higher than the control group.

This unexpected finding might have several explanations, and we want to consider the following: 1) that participants' in the bypassed group might have underestimated how much the goal achievement would mean to them, 2) that they might have felt a need to compensate and therefore rated their well-being higher, or 3) that both groups' perspectives on adventurous activity involves acting courageously in some way. We will give a brief argumentation for these explanations in the following paragraphs.

We have previously mentioned that bypassed group participants' desire to complete the activity, and how important this was for them, were rated lower than in the acted group. If we consider the sour grapes effect, this could be an expression of a hindsight bias in which the bypassed group underestimate how happy they would have felt if they had reached their goal instead of bypassing on the opportunity. Recent research by Sjåstad (2020) proposes that failure to reach one's goal makes the goal seem less attractive, although the positive emotions felt when actually reaching the goal is not affected by the underestimation. If this is the case, the missed opportunity doesn't feel like a loss to them, but rather a neutral experience in nature. This way it might affect their well-being in a positive manner, as merely spending time in nature is associated with enhanced well-being (Nizbeth et al., 2011; Park et al., 2009; White et al., 2019).

The high rated well-being in the bypassed group could also result from compensatory emotion-regulation mechanisms. After being asked several questions about a situation in which they failed to complete what they set out to do, participants' might feel negative emotions and subsequently a need to compensate for this. Previous research by Brunstein & Gollwitzer (1996) has shown that failing on a task related to a self-defining goal leads to enhanced performance on subsequent tasks, if these tasks are also related to that same goal.

Furthermore, Dodgson & Wood (1998) found that failure feedback leads to enhanced accessibility of personal strengths in individuals with high self-esteem. In light of this, reflecting upon a failure situation could bring up compensatory strategies which makes participants evaluate themselves and their lives in a more positive manner. However, there is also research supporting theories of mood congruency, in which negative mood leads to negative thoughts and vice versa (Krohne et al., 2010).

We would also like to consider the opportunity that bypassing an activity isn't necessarily a failure, but a courageous act in its own way. Courage involves the presence of fear and risk, and acting despite this towards a noble good or worthy end (Rate et al., 2007). Those who act with courage to complete their adventure clearly risk something going wrong when they do so. We'd like to consider the risks of bypassing, too. Participants choosing to bypass might face the risk of failure, losing face and damaging social relations. Their noble good in the courageous act of bypassing could arguably be the safety of oneself or others. A courage-appraisal to the act of bypassing might make this something that evokes a positive self-evaluation. This might explain why the bypassed group rated their well-being as high as they did after reflecting upon their experience.

In terms of gender differences we found that men rated their well-being slightly higher than women, but the distribution of male and female participants was fairly equal between groups and this should not have affected the difference between groups. We will not speculate on what lies behind this small effect. Gender effects in well-being are complex and dependent on multiple factors, and research on the matter seems to be inconsistent.

Limitations

Our study had some limitations that are important to account for. We did not access the participants' experience in the moment of it, and for many participants the experience they

reflected upon was years back in time. This may have increased any tendencies of response bias, and we cannot rule out that participants would have painted a different picture closer to the occurrence of the activity.

The sample sizes of the groups could have been larger and more even in size between groups. Many participants, especially from the bypassed group, dropped out when asked to describe a situation in which they bypassed on a courage opportunity, resulting in this group ending up with fewer participants than the other two groups. Having too few participants could result in biased findings that are not generalizable.

There were fewer male than female participants in all groups. We would have preferred a more even distribution of genders. However, since the male-female ratio was similar between groups, we assume that the between-group results were not affected by this.

In our study we chose to use a well documented single-item satisfaction with life scale to assess general well-being (Cheung & Lucas, 2014). It is possible that we would have found differences in aspects of well-being if we had included multiple well-being measures across several dimensions.

Proposals for Future Research

Our study has provided new insights into several aspects of adventurous outdoor activities involving courage. Many questions have arisen through analyzing and interpreting our findings. We collected data broadly on many different aspects of courage experiences, and as a result did not have opportunity to fully deep-dive into either one of them. This is something we would like to see in future research.

Perhaps our most intriguing finding was the high rating of well-being in participants who bypassed. This would be interesting to further investigate through including several well-being measures, and perhaps more participants to strengthen the results. This would provide

valuable insight into how different aspects of well-being are affected by recalling memories of outdoor adventurous activities involving courage.

Conclusion

We conclude that recalling memories of adventurous outdoor activities affects well-being in a positive manner, although this does not seem related to whether one recalls acting with courage or bypassing a courage opportunity.

Measures of courage and emotional experience are strong predictors of whether one decides to act or bypass in a risky situation. The desire to complete and the emotions felt right after the situation seems to be the most important. Those who act on a courage opportunity typically feels competent for the situation, and has a strong intention to complete what they set out to do. For those who bypass, the opposite is true.

Emotionally, acting with courage and succeeding in an adventurous activity evokes a strong positive experience with multiple positive feelings present at once, most pronounced right after the situation. Choosing to bypass evokes mixed emotions, fewer and more focused feelings, and is neither a positive nor negative experience.

Collectively, our results support the old saying “there is no shame in turning back”, and indicate that the benefits of participating in an adventurous activity does not necessarily depend on acting or bypassing on calls of courage.

References

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process, 50*, 179-211.

Barton, B. (2007). *Safety, Risk and Adventure in Outdoor activities.* London: Sage Publications.

Boyes, M. (2013). Outdoor adventure and successful ageing. *Ageing and Society, 33*(4), 644-665. 10.1017/S0144686X12000165

Brunstein, J. C., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (1996). Effects on failure on subsequent performance: the importance of self-defining goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(2), 395-407. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.2.395

Buckley, R. (2012). Rush as a key motivation in skilled adventure tourism: resolving the risk recreation paradox. *Tourism Management, 33*(4), 961-970. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.10.002

Buckley, R. C. (2016). Qualitative analysis of emotion: fear and thrill. *Frontiers in Psychology, 7*, 1187. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01187

Cambridge University Press. (2020, 18. october). *Cambridge Dictionary*. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/thrill

Cater, C. I. (2006). Playing with risk? Participant perceptions of risk and management implications in adventure tourism. *Tourism Management, 27*(2), 317-325. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2004.10.005

Cheung, F., & Lucas, R. E. (2014). Assessing the validity of single-item life satisfaction measures: results from three large samples. *Quality of Life Research, 23*(10), 2809-2818. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-014-0726-4

Davis, T. (2019, 2. January). *What is well-being? definition, types and well-being skills*. Retrieved from Psychology Today: https://www.psychologytoday.com/intl/blog/click-here-happiness/201901/what-is-well-being-definition-types-and-well-being-skills

Dodgson, P. G., & Wood, J. V. (1998). Self-esteem and the cognitive accessibility of strengths and weaknesses after failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(1), 178-197. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.75.1.178

Gal, D., & Rucker, D. D. (2020). Act boldly: important life decisions, courage and the motivated pursuit of risk. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000329

Gilbertson, K., & Ewert, A. (2015). Stability of motivations and risk attractiveness: the adventure recreation experience. *Risk Management, 17*(4), 276-297. https://doi.org/10.1057/rm.2015.16

Gollwitzer, P. M. (1999). Implementation intentions: strong effects of simple plans. *American Psychologist, 54*(7), 493-503. 10.1037/0003-066X.54.7.493

Kerr, J. H., & Mackenzie, S. H. (2012). Multiple motives for participating in adventure sports. *Psyhology of Sport and Exercise*, *13*(5), 649-657. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2012.04.002

Krohne, H. W., Pieper, M., Knoll, N., & Breimer, N. (2002). The cognitive regulation of emotions: the role of success versus failure experience and coping dispositions. *Cognition and Emotion*, *16*(2), 217-243. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930143000301

Leontopoulou, S., & Triliva, S. (2012). Explorations of subjective wellbeing and character strengths among a Greek university student sample. *International Journal of Wellbeing, 2*(3), 251-270. 10.5502/ijw.v2.i3.6

Nizbeth, E. K., Zelenski, J. M., & Murphy, S. A. (2011). Happiness is in our nature: exploring nature relatedness as a contributor to subjective well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 12*, 303-322. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-010-9197-7

Park, B. J., Tsunetsugu, Y., Kasetani, T., Kagawa, T., & Miyazaki, Y. (2010). The physiological effect of Shinrin-Yoku (taking in the forest atmosphere or forest

bathing): evidence from field experiments in 24 forests across Japan. *Environmental Health and Preventive Medicine, 15*(1), 18-26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12199-009 0086-9

Philippe, F. L., Koestner, R., Beaulieu-Pelletier, G., Lecours, S., & Lekes, N. (2012). The role of episodic memories in current and future well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*(4), 505-519. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211429805

Phillipe, F. L., & Bernard-Desrosiers, L. (2016). The odyssey of episodic memories: identifying the paths and processes through which they contribute to well-being. *Journal of Personality, 85*(4), 518-529. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12257

Pomfret, G., & Doran , A. (2015). Gender and mountaineering tourism. G. Musa, J. Higham & A. Thomposon-Carr (Ed.)*, Mountaineering Tourism*, 128-155. https://books.google.no/books?hl=no&lr=&id=gFnLCQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA13 8&dq=Gender+and+mountaineering+tourism&ots=ScIFDF37XR&sig=qFnVE-GTFRMo2jY5YfZGa4QFPI4&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Gender%20and%20moun taineering%20tourism&f=false

Rate, C. R., Clarke, J. A., Lindsay, D. R., & Sternberg, R. J. (2007). Implicit theories of courage. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 2*(2), 80-98. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760701228755

Rickly-Boyd, J. M. (2012). Lifestyle climbing: toward existential authenticity. *The Journal of Sport Tourism, 17*(2), 85-104. https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2012.729898

Santisi, G., Lodi, E., Magnano, P., Zarbo, R., & Zammitti, A. (2020). Relationship between psychological capital and quality of life: The role of courage. *Sustainability, 12*(13), 5238. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12135238

Sarshar, M., Farley, F., Fiorello, C. A., & DuCette, J. (2019). T behaviour: psychological

implications of thrill-seeking/risk-taking. *Current Psychology*, 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00557-7

Sjåstad, H. (2020, 01. December). *Does faliure make victory seem sweeter?* Scientific American. https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/does-failure-make-victory-seem-sweeter/?fbclid=IwAR0eo1EVZ3ZR9XsojSSTISMi9yWHdtPFhbuOr9cf0VHfmYD-HnIAH75kLYI

Smith, J. A. (2016). Interpretative phenomenological analysis: getting at lived experience. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 12*(3), 303-304. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1262622

Smith, J. A., & Osborn, M. (2004). Interpretative phenomenological analysis. In G. M. breakwell (Ed.), *Doing Social Psychology* (1), 229-254. Oxford,Uk: The British Psychological Society; Blackwell Publishing.

Webster, D. (2016). Chapter 5. Recreation. Westcott, M., & Bird, G (Red.), *Introduction to tourism and hospitality in BC.* Campus Manitoba. https://opentextbc.ca/introtourism/chapter/chapter-5-recreation/

White, M. P., Alcock, I., Grellier, J., Wheeler, B. W., Hartig, T., Warber, S. L., Bone, A., Depledge, M. H., Lora, E. F. (2019). Spending at least 120 minutes a week in nature is associated with good health and wellbeing. *Scientific Reports, 9*(1), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-44097-3

Appendix

Questionnaire as Presented to Each Group

Presented to all groups

Friluftsliv og velvære

Aktiviteter i friluftsliv kan være utfordrende og krevende, samtidig som de kan gi oss en opplevelse av velvære og mestring. Dette ønsker vi å se nærmere på i denne undersøkelsen.

Hva er hensikten med undersøkelsen og hva må jeg gjøre for å delta?

Med din hjelp skal vi nærmere undersøke ulike faktorer ved opplevelser i friluftsliv. Du vil bli bedt om å tenke på en relevant opplevelse du selv har hatt, og deretter bli spurt spørsmål som omhandler denne. Det vil være noen spørsmål av typen "multiple choice" hvor du krysser av på et eller flere alternativ. Det vil også være spørsmål hvor vi ønsker at du skriver litt selv, og det er derfor en fordel om undersøkelsen gjennomføres på PC. Alt i alt vil undersøkelsen ta fra 5 til 15 minutter.

Vi tar vare på deg og dine data

Det blir ikke samlet inn kontaktinformasjon og deltakelsen er således helt anonym. Hvis du er 18 år eller eldre er du kvalifisert til å delta. Deltakelsen er helt frivillig, og det er ingen risiko assosiert med å delta. Svarene dine er konfidensielle. De blir håndtert kun av forskningsteamet og lagret på UiT Norges arktiske universitet etter strenge etiske retningslinjer anbefalt av Norsk datatilsyn. Du kan når som helst velge å avslutte deltakelsen din uten å måtte oppgi noen form for begrunnelse.

Hva om jeg har spørsmål eller kommentarer?

Hvis du har noen spørsmål eller kommentarer kan du skrive det inn i kommentarfeltet på slutten av spørreskjemaet eller sende oss en e-post.

Beste hilsen

Therese M. Alvestad, profesjonsstudent, tal020@uit.no

Sarah M. Johansen, profesjonsstudent, sjo143@uit.no

Tove I. Dahl, professor, tove.dahl@uit.no

Alle fra Institutt for psykologi ved UiT Norges arktiske universitet.

1.) Velg ditt kjønn
[ ] Mann
[ ] Kvinne
[ ] Annet

2.) Hvor gammel er du?
[ ] 18-29 år
[ ] 30-39 år
[ ] 40-49 år
[ ] 50-59 år
[ ] 60-69 år
[ ] Over 70 år

3.) For å komme til spørreundersøkelsen, velg når du ble født
[ ] Januar-April
[ ] Mai-august
[ ] September-Desember
[ ] Jeg ønsker ikke å delta, takk

Presented to the Acted group

1.) Vi er i denne undersøkelsen interessert i å vite litt om dine erfaringer med aktiviteter/opplevelser i friluftsliv. Eksempler på aktiviteter kan være, men er ikke begrenset til: Tur/utflukter, camping/overnatting ute, ridning, jakt/fiske, padling, seiling, svømming, surfing, strikkhopp, klatring, paragliding, aking, slalomski, utflukter i farlig terreng, osv.
Du vil bli bedt om å først tenke på en hendelse og deretter svare på en rekke spørsmål om denne. Til sist vil det også være spørsmål om generell livstilfredshet.

2.) Tenk på en situasjon hvor du hadde ønske om å gjøre noe du selv opplevde som særlig risikabelt/ utfordrende/skummelt, hvor du måtte utvise mot for å gjennomføre, og hvor du faktisk gjennomførte aktiviteten. Hva skjedde? Eks; hvor var du, når, hva skjedde, og hvem var du sammen med?

3.) Hvor lenge er det siden hendelsen?
:_____

4.) Hva var det du ville gjøre, og hva gjorde at du vurderte aktiviteten som risikabel? Beskriv som du ville gjort til en venn
: _____

5.) Hvor farlig opplevde du at situasjonen var? Utdyp gjerne svaret ved å skrive i tekstboksen.
[ ] 1 Ikke farlig i det hele tatt: ____
[ ] 2: ____
[ ] 3: ____
[ ] 4: ____
[ ] 5: ____
[ ] 6 Ekstremt farlig: _____

6.) Hvor sannsynlig tenkte du det var at noe skulle gå galt under aktiviteten? Her er vi ute etter hva du tenkte FØR aktivitetens start.
[ ] 1 Svært lite sannsynlig
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Svært sannsynlig

7.) Dersom noe hadde gått galt, hvor alvorlige fysiske skader tenkte du at kunne forekommet? Her er vi ute etter hva du tenkte FØR aktivitetens start.
[ ] 1 Ingen fysisk skade
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Alvorlig fysisk skade eller død

8.) Dersom noe hadde gått galt, hvor følelsesmessig ubehagelig tenkte du at det kunne ha blitt for deg? Her er vi ute etter hva du tenkte FØR aktivitetens start.
[ ] 1Ingen emosjonelle ubehag
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Alvorlig emosjonelt ubehag

9.) Dersom noe hadde gått galt, hvor mye tenkte du det kunne skadet ditt forhold til andre og/eller andres forhold til deg? Her er vi ute etter hva du tenkte FØR aktivitetens start.
[ ] 1 I svært liten grad
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 I svært stor grad

10.) Hvor kompetent følte du deg for å gjennomføre aktiviteten? Her er vi ute etter hva du følte FØR aktivitetens start.
[ ] 1 I svært liten grad
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 I svært stor grad

11.) Hva fikk deg til å gjennomføre, og hvordan gjorde du det? Skriv gjerne som om du forteller historien til en venn. Skriv gjerne; Hva gjorde, tenkte, følte du? -Eller hva gjorde, tenkte, følte du ikke?

: _____

12.) Nå kommer det en rekke påstander. Vurder disse.

13.) Ønsket om å håndtere/takle situasjonen var sterkt
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

14.) Jeg hadde nødvendig kunnskap til å håndtere situasjonen
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

15.) Jeg hadde de nødvendige evnene til å håndtere situasjonen
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

16.) Det var svært viktig for **meg selv** at jeg gjennomførte aktiviteten
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

17.) Det var svært viktig for noen **andre** enn meg at jeg gjennomførte aktiviteten
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

18.) Når jeg besluttet å handle, følte jeg sterke positive emosjoner
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

19.) Når jeg besluttet å handle, følte jeg sterke negative emosjoner
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

20.) Like etter aktiviteten var gjennomført, følte jeg sterke positive emosjoner
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

21.) Like etter aktiviteten var gjennomført, følte jeg sterke negative emosjoner
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

22.) Når jeg tenker tilbake til situasjonen i dag, føler jeg sterke positive emosjoner
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

23.) Når jeg tenker tilbake til situasjonen i dag, føler jeg sterke negative emosjoner
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

24.) Denne opplevelsen har endret hvordan du tenker, opplever eller føler om noe den dag i dag
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

25.) Hva føler du når du tenker på denne situasjonen idag?

[ ] Glede
[ ] Stolthet
[ ] Tristhet
[ ] Frykt
[ ] Sinne
[ ] Savn
[ ] Takknemlighet
[ ] Interesse
[ ] Engasjement
[ ] Begeistring
[ ] Anger
[ ] Annet:_____

26.) Hvor sannsynlig er det at du ville løst det på samme måte, dersom du fikk mulighet til det samme på nytt?

[ ] 1 Svært lite sannsynlig
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Svært sannsynlig

27.) Velg spørsmålet som passer til din situasjon og svar på det ved å skrive i tekstboksen under.

[ ] Dersom det er liten sannsynlighet for at du ville valgt å gjøre det samme, hvorfor og hva kunne endret på dette?

: _____

[ ] Dersom det er stor sannsynlighet for at du ville valgt å gjøre det samme igjen, hvorfor og hva kunne endret på dette?

: _____

28.) Hvilken grad føler du at denne hendelsen har gjort en forskjell for deg?

[ ] 1 I svært liten grad
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 I svært stor grad

29.) Hvis aktuelt, hvordan har hendelsen gjort en forskjell for deg? (F.eks.: Har hendelsen påvirket hvem du omgir deg med, hvordan du tenker, føler, opplever noe den dag idag?)

: _____

30.) Tatt alle områder av livet ditt i betraktning, ranger din generelle livskvalitet på skalaen nedenfor

[ ] 1 (livet er bekymringsfullt)
[ ] 2
[ ] 3

[ ] 4 (livet er så som så)
[ ] 5
[ ] 6
[ ] 7 (livet er flott)

31.) Er det noe mer du ønsker å legge til, som vi ikke har spurt om?
: _____

32.) Har du kommentarer til undersøkelsen?
: _____

Presented to the Bypassed group

1.) Vi er i denne undersøkelsen interessert i å vite litt om dine erfaringer med aktiviteter/opplevelser i friluftsliv. Eksempler på aktiviteter kan være, men er ikke begrenset til: Tur/utflukter, camping/overnatting ute, ridning, jakt/fiske, padling, seiling, svømming, surfing, strikkhopp, klatring, paragliding, aking, slalomski, utflukter i farlig terreng, osv.
Du vil bli bedt om å først tenke på en hendelse og deretter svare på en rekke spørsmål om denne. Til sist vil det også være spørsmål om generell livstilfredshet.

2.) Tenk på en situasjon hvor du hadde ønske om å gjøre noe du selv opplevde som særlig risikabelt/ utfordrende/skummelt, hvor du måtte utvise mot for å gjennomføre, og hvor du **IKKE** gjennomførte aktiviteten. Hva skjedde? Eks; hvor var du, når, hva skjedde, og hvem var du sammen med?

3.) Hvor lenge er det siden hendelsen?
:_____

4.) Hva var det du ville gjøre, og hva gjorde at du vurderte aktiviteten som risikabel? Beskriv som du ville gjort til en venn
: _____

5.) Hvor farlig opplevde du at situasjonen var? Utdyp gjerne svaret ved å skrive i tekstboksen.
[ ] 1 Ikke farlig i det hele tatt: ____
[ ] 2: ____
[ ] 3: ____
[ ] 4: ____
[ ] 5: ____
[ ] 6 Ekstremt farlig: _____

6.) Hvor sannsynlig tenkte du det var at noe skulle gå galt under aktiviteten? Her er vi ute etter hva du tenkte FØR aktivitetens start.
[ ] 1 Svært lite sannsynlig
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Svært sannsynlig

7.) Dersom noe hadde gått galt, hvor alvorlige fysiske skader tenkte du at kunne forekommet? Her er vi ute etter hva du tenkte FØR aktivitetens start.
[ ] 1 Ingen fysisk skade
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Alvorlig fysisk skade eller død

8.) Dersom noe hadde gått galt, hvor følelsesmessig ubehagelig tenkte du at det kunne ha blitt for deg? Her er vi ute etter hva du tenkte FØR aktivitetens start.
[ ] 1Ingen emosjonelle ubehag
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Alvorlig emosjonelt ubehag

9.) Dersom noe hadde gått galt, hvor mye tenkte du det kunne skadet ditt forhold til andre og/eller andres forhold til deg? Her er vi ute etter hva du tenkte FØR aktivitetens start.
[ ] 1 I svært liten grad
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 I svært stor grad

10.) Hvor kompetent følte du deg for å gjennomføre aktiviteten? Her er vi ute etter hva du følte FØR aktivitetens start.
[ ] 1 I svært liten grad
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 I svært stor grad

11.) Hva gjorde at du ikke gjennomførte, og hva skjedde da? Skriv gjerne som om du forteller historien til en venn. Skriv gjerne; Hva gjorde, tenkte, følte du? -Eller hva gjorde, tenkte, følte du ikke?
: _____

12.) Nå kommer det en rekke påstander. Vurder disse.

13.) Ønsket om å håndtere/takle situasjonen var sterkt
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5

[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

14.) Jeg hadde nødvendig kunnskap til å håndtere situasjonen
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

15.) Jeg hadde de nødvendige evnene til å håndtere situasjonen
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

16.) Det var svært viktig for **meg selv** at jeg gjennomførte aktiviteten
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

17.) Det var svært viktig for noen **andre** enn meg at jeg gjennomførte aktiviteten
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

18.) Når jeg besluttet å ikke gjennomføre aktiviteten, følte jeg sterke positive emosjoner
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

19.) Når jeg bestemte å ikke gjennomføre aktiviteten, følte jeg sterke negative emosjoner
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5

[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

20.) Like etter aktiviteten var gjennomført, følte jeg sterke positive emosjoner
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

21.) Like etter aktiviteten var gjennomført, følte jeg sterke negative emosjoner
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

22.) Når jeg tenker tilbake til situasjonen i dag, føler jeg sterke positive emosjoner
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

23.) Når jeg tenker tilbake til situasjonen i dag, føler jeg sterke negative emosjoner
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

24.) Denne opplevelsen har endret hvordan du tenker, opplever eller føler om noe den dag i dag
[ ] 1 Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Stemmer fullstendig

25.) Hva føler du når du tenker på denne situasjonen idag?
[ ] Glede
[ ] Stolthet
[ ] Tristhet
[ ] Frykt
[ ] Sinne
[ ] Savn

[ ] Takknemlighet
[ ] Interesse
[ ] Engasjement
[ ] Begeistring
[ ] Anger
[ ] Annet:_____

26.) Hvor sannsynlig er det at du ville løst det på samme måte, dersom du fikk mulighet til det samme på nytt?
[ ] 1 Svært lite sannsynlig
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 Svært sannsynlig

27.) Velg spørsmålet som passer til din situasjon og svar på det ved å skrive i tekstboksen under.
[ ] Dersom det er liten sannsynlighet for at du ville valgt å gjøre det samme, hvorfor og hva kunne endret på dette?
: _____
[ ] Dersom det er stor sannsynlighet for at du ville valgt å gjøre det samme igjen, hvorfor og hva kunne endret på dette?
: _____

28.) Hvilken grad føler du at denne hendelsen har gjort en forskjell for deg?
[ ] 1 I svært liten grad
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4
[ ] 5
[ ] 6 I svært stor grad

29.) Hvis aktuelt, hvordan har hendelsen gjort en forskjell for deg? (F.eks.: Har hendelsen påvirket hvem du omgir deg med, hvordan du tenker, føler, opplever noe den dag idag?)
: _____

30.) Tatt alle områder av livet ditt i betraktning, ranger din generelle livskvalitet på skalaen nedenfor
[ ] 1 (livet er bekymringsfullt)
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4 (livet er så som så)
[ ] 5
[ ] 6
[ ] 7 (livet er flott)

31.) Er det noe mer du ønsker å legge til, som vi ikke har spurt om?
: _____

32.) Har du kommentarer til undersøkelsen?
: _____

Presented to the control group:

1.) Vi er i denne undersøkelsen interessert i å vite litt om dine erfaringer med aktiviteter/opplevelser i friluftsliv.
Du vil bli bedt om å først tenke på en hendelse og deretter svare på en rekke spørsmål om denne. Til sist vil det også være spørsmål om generell livstilfredshet.

2.) Tenk tilbake til en opplevelse du nylig har hatt i friluftsliv. Hva skjedde? Eks.: Hvor var du, når, hvem var du sammen med?

3.) Tatt alle områder av livet ditt i betraktning, ranger din generelle livskvalitet på skalaen nedenfor
[ ] 1 (livet er bekymringsfullt)
[ ] 2
[ ] 3
[ ] 4 (livet er så som så)
[ ] 5
[ ] 6
[ ] 7 (livet er flott)

4.) Har du kommentarer til undersøkelsen?
: _____

Presented to all groups

1.) Vi setter pris på om du vil dele undersøkelsen videre til noen du kjenner ved å sende dem linken under. Send gjerne til en (eller flere) av et annet kjønn, da vi tilstreber lik kjønnsfordeling blant deltakerne.

2.) Takk for deltakelsen, klikk videre for å avslutte undersøkelsen.