



**Manchester
Metropolitan
University**

Hostler, Thomas J and Berrios, Raul (2020) The impact of mixed emotions on judgements: a naturalistic study during the FIFA world cup. *Cognition and Emotion*. pp. 1-15. ISSN 0269-9931

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/626819/>

Version: Accepted Version

Publisher: Informa UK Limited

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2020.1840965>

Please cite the published version

<https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

The impact of mixed emotions on judgements: A naturalistic study during the FIFA World Cup

Thomas J. Hostler¹ and Raul Berrios²

¹Department of Psychology

²Department of Management

Manchester Metropolitan University

Universidad de Santiago de Chile

ORCID: 0000-0002-4658-692X

ORCID: 0000-0003-1826-7822

@tomhostler

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

Abstract

Experiencing mixed emotions, a combination of two oppositely-valenced emotions, has been shown to reduce bias in decision making and improve the accuracy of judgements made. However, most previous research has been limited to laboratory-based experiments. In this pre-registered study, we looked at mixed emotions and judgements in the naturalistic context of watching sport during the FIFA world cup. $N=80$ participants reported on mixed emotions before and after each England game during the World Cup, and made score predictions for each game, collecting a total of $k = 480$ observations. We used a lagged-effect design and multilevel modelling to analyse the data. We found that participants who felt more mixed emotions at the end of a match made significantly more likely score predictions in the following match, indicating that experiencing stronger mixed emotions subsequently predicted more reasonable judgements. This result was supported even after controlling for a number of affective, attitudinal, and socio-demographic variables. This provides evidence that naturally occurring mixed emotions are related to improved real-world judgements. The evidence is discussed through the lens of fantasy realization theory, and the importance of feeling mixed during decisions involving puzzling or uncertain outcomes is emphasized.

Key words: mixed emotions, judgements, predictions, naturalistic, sport consumption

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

42 People often rely on heuristics when making judgements in everyday life, but risks of cognitive
43 biases are a common side effect (Barnes, 1984; Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). Understanding
44 how to reduce bias and gain greater accuracy when making judgements is important for a range
45 of different societal issues, ranging from prejudice to decision making. Although emotions have
46 usually been thought to reflect the operation of “System 1” - the fast, heuristic-based and biased
47 thinking mode (Morewedge & Kahneman, 2010), research studying the role of emotions on
48 individuals’ judgement provides a more nuanced understanding (Lerner et al., 2015; Zhong,
49 2011). In the present research we focused on the experience of mixed emotions - the co-
50 occurrence of two oppositely-valenced emotions - as a driver for making more accurate and
51 reasonable judgements.

52 Mixed emotions are characterized as the co-activation of two oppositely-valenced
53 emotions (Larsen & McGraw, 2011; Schimmack, 2001), such as feeling happy and sad, amused
54 and disgusted, or fearful and hopeful. Although the idea of co-activation in mixed emotions has
55 been debated and questioned (Larsen, 2017; Russell, 2017), accrued evidence demonstrates the
56 feasibility of experiencing mixed emotions (Berrios et al., 2015a). Mixed emotions are
57 commonly triggered during situations involving goal conflict or personal dilemmas (Berrios et
58 al., 2015b, 2018a; Hadley, 2014; Schniter et al., 2015). Furthermore, recent research shows that
59 mixed emotions are associated with greater effort to resist temptations, suggesting a relationship
60 between mixed emotions and self-control (Berrios et al., 2018b). A growing literature suggests
61 that mixed emotions may also improve the accuracy of individuals’ judgements (e.g., Rees et al.,
62 2013). Together, this evidence indicates that mixed emotions may be particularly relevant when
63 people deliberate about uncertain or puzzling future outcomes (Berrios, 2019).

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

64 However, much of this research has been laboratory-based, and studies investigating
65 naturally occurring mixed emotions in relation to people's judgements are notably scarce.
66 Current studies investigating mixed emotions in real-life do not investigate judgement accuracy
67 (e.g., Berrios et al., 2018b) or describe the instances instigating mixed emotions (e.g.,
68 Podoyntsyna et al., 2012). Thus, our aim in the present study is to determine whether mixed
69 emotions influence people's judgements during a massive sport event, the FIFA World Cup
70 2018. In addition, we aim to examine this association considering a scenario where temporal
71 precedence exists between mixed emotions (the independent variable) and judgements (the
72 dependent variable). Examining this association including temporal precedence between
73 independent and dependent variables permits to control for portions of random covariation
74 existing in data surveyed at the same time. Surveying fans during the FIFA World Cup 2018
75 provides a unique opportunity to observe how the emotional experiences after watching a
76 football match linger on individuals, and permeate their judgements made in the following
77 match, creating a natural lagged-effect design. To appropriately model this effect, we develop an
78 analytical strategy based on a series of multilevel models, controlling for the effects of time, and
79 adding a number of covariates to depurate the findings.

80 **Mixed emotions and making judgements**

81 A number of studies have investigated how the experience of mixed emotions may
82 influence the judgements an individual makes. Considering a decision from different
83 perspectives reduces bias and improves subsequent judgement accuracy (Galinsky & Moskowitz,
84 2000; Wang et al., 2014), and there is evidence showing the experience of mixed emotions
85 encourages people to consider alternative perspectives, which in turn improves the accuracy of
86 their judgements. Rees, Rothman, Lahavy and Simon-Burks (2013) showed that participants

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

87 induced into feeling mixed emotions gave more accurate judgements on future weather forecasts
88 and general knowledge estimations, compared to participants induced to feel only happy or sad.
89 The participants who felt mixed also responded more favourably to considering alternative
90 information and used this to modify and improve their own judgements.

91 Mixed emotions may also enhance judgement fairness by making individuals less
92 susceptible to cognitive biases. Guarana and Hernandez (2016) found that participants who felt
93 mixed emotions about a decision to fund a disease-prevention program were less affected by
94 explicit framings of the program in terms of ‘losses or gains’ that were designed to bias their
95 judgements. Mixed emotions also helped to improve the objectivity of judgements by protecting
96 participants against bias from the availability heuristic (the belief that events that are mentioned
97 regularly are more likely) and the conjunction bias (that specific conditions that appear to fit a
98 situation are more likely than more general statements).

99 More broadly, mixed emotions have been associated with the beneficial cognitive
100 processes involved in “wise reasoning” (Grossmann et al., 2019), which include an appreciation
101 of context, acknowledgement of the likelihood of multiple outcomes, and less biased
102 judgements. Complementing the experimental studies described above, Grossman et al. (2019)
103 present observational evidence indicating that individuals perceived as “wise” by their peers
104 reported more mixed emotions than age- and gender- matched controls in descriptions of
105 personal situations involving conflict and decision-making. A second study also showed that
106 participants who reported greater emotional diversity also showed more evidence of wise
107 reasoning when making judgements about a political conflict.

108 The relationship between mixed emotions and judgement-making has also been considered
109 within the literature of future thinking and goal-directed behaviour, in the form of “mental

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

110 contrasting”. This describes the mental process of explicitly contrasting a desired future outcome
111 with one’s current present reality (Oettingen, 2012). Typically, such contrasts will induce a mix
112 of emotions, produced when a desired positive future state is subsequently contrasted with a
113 current (negative) reality. The process of mental contrasting primes self-regulatory processes
114 including utilisation of feedback and facilitation of decision-making (Oettingen & Cachia,
115 2016).

116 **Mixed emotions and making judgements in real world settings**

117 Overall, the literature supports the suggestion that experiencing mixed emotions has
118 beneficial effects on accurate and reasoned judgement making. However, there is a lack of
119 evidence on whether this relationship is found in naturalistic, real world environments. The
120 studies reviewed above on mixed emotions and judgements can all be said to neglect one or more
121 aspects of ecological validity (Kvavilashvili & Ellis, 2004). For example, the task of judging to
122 fund a disease prevention program (Guarana & Hernandez, 2016) is not particularly
123 representative of an everyday judgement (unless one works for a government health department),
124 and participants had no genuine interest in the topic of their decision. Similarly, the results of
125 recall-based emotional induction procedures as used in Rees et al. (2013) and Grossman et al.
126 (2019) may not be generalizable to the experience of emotions elicited by genuine real-life
127 events. Whilst methods to induce emotion based on the autobiographical recall of memories are
128 likely to generate mixed emotions (Mills & D’Mello, 2014), they are also likely to underestimate
129 the intensity of emotions experienced in real life (Konečni et al., 2008).

130 **The present study**

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

131 The present research addresses calls for naturalistic studies to compliment laboratory
132 findings (Parrott & Hertel, 2005) and more research on “real world” emotional phenomena
133 (Kuppens, 2019). We do this by investigating the experience of mixed emotions in the context of
134 watching sports, namely the FIFA Football World Cup 2018. Sports are emotional events and
135 Kim, Magnusen & Lee (2017) have observed that they elicit mixed emotions, in particular when
136 a team’s performance and result are incongruent. Watching football - in particular the national
137 team - is a popular pastime in England and is a good example of what “truly matters” to people,
138 meaning the emotions associated with the game result represent more “genuine” emotional data
139 that theories of emotion also need to explain (Picard, 2010). Thus, the present study adds to the
140 literature by attempting to reproduce previous findings on mixed emotions and judgements in a
141 new ecologically valid setting, to examine their robustness and applicability in real life
142 environments.

143 In the context of making judgements about the outcome of sporting events, we
144 hypothesized that feeling mixed emotions (in contrast to single emotions) would likely enable an
145 individual to make a less biased and more careful judgement of the outcome by considering
146 multiple perspectives. For example, an individual feeling particularly excited and positive about
147 her teams’ upcoming game may make an unrealistically positive judgement about the team’s
148 chances. Similarly, an individual feeling particularly anxious or worried might make an
149 unrealistically negative judgement about the outcome. An individual feeling both excited and
150 anxious about a game would be more likely to consider the team’s chances from multiple
151 perspectives (e.g., a negative outcome influenced by their anxiety over the team’s recent form,
152 contrasted with a positive outcome influenced by their excitement of the return of their star
153 player from injury) to come up with a less biased and more reasonable prediction.

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

177 data was also collected on perceived emotional synchrony, emotional contagion, and
178 participant's beliefs about the team's performance. These are reported in the study pre-
179 registration but were not relevant to the present analyses, and so are not discussed further.

180 **Participants**

181 A total of $n = 97$ participants completed at least the initial questionnaire. Data from $N =$
182 17 participants who completed the initial questionnaire were excluded as they did not provide a
183 unique ID code, which prevented this questionnaire being linked to any subsequent responses
184 from pre- or post-match questionnaires. Any data from pre- and post-match questionnaires that
185 could not be linked was also discarded. A full breakdown of this is provided in the data
186 processing diary on the study Open Science Framework page. Excluded participants did not
187 significantly differ from the included sample on age, supporter identification, or nationalism (p 's
188 $>.05$). A final sample of $N = 80$ participants who were included in the analysis ($M_{\text{age}} = 34.30$, SD
189 $= 10.32$). The sample included 61 males, 18 females and 1 Prefer-not-to-say. Participants were
190 recruited through twitter and social media pages of football and local interest groups
191 (Manchester, UK) and compensated for participation with entry into a prize draw. There was no
192 set sample size, but as much data as possible was collected for the duration of the study (during
193 the 2018 World Cup from 12th June 2018 - 15th July 2018).

194 **Measures**

195 **Initial questionnaire.** The initial questionnaire collected demographic information and
196 included two measures relevant for this study.

197 **Supporter identification.** An adapted version of the Sports Spectator Identification Scale
198 (SSIS; Wann & Branscombe, 1993), comprised 5-items measuring support of and identification

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

199 with the England Football Team on a scale of 1-8. This is a widely used and validated scale of
200 fan identification with sports teams. Two items were left out from the original scale “how much
201 do you dislike [team]’s rivals?” and “how strongly do your FRIENDS see you as a fan?”, as
202 there is no single obvious rival to the England national team, and as the team do not play
203 regularly it was considered less likely that friends would be aware of an individual’s support of
204 the team.

205 **Nationalism.** The Nationalism Motive Scale (Bogdanov, 2005), a 7-item questionnaire,
206 measured the extent to which people express their national pride through watching sports teams.
207 An example item is “Watching the England Football Team brings a sense of belonging to my
208 nation”. The measure used a 1-7 Likert scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The
209 measure was chosen as to our knowledge there are no other validated scales that measure this
210 construct.

211 **Pre-match questionnaire.** Questionnaires completed pre-match primarily focused on the
212 participant’s predictions for the upcoming game.

213 **Predictions likelihood.** Participants were asked to predict the score at the end of the
214 game. The website [www.oddsportal.com] was consulted in order to get the average of a range of
215 bookmaker’s odds for each predicted outcome. Higher odds indicate that the bookmakers
216 consider the predicted score unlikely and will thus pay out more money. Odds are typically
217 calculated by unbiased algorithms taking into account a huge number of variables, including
218 team strength, form, and history, and can thus be considered a reasonable proxy for the
219 likelihood of the score occurring. The odds were converted into a percentage probability
220 providing an index of prediction feasibility – i.e., the likelihood of the prediction judgement
221 occurring.

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

222 **Emotion.** Finally, pre-match measures of emotion (happiness, sadness, anxiety, and
223 excitement) were included. As per the instructions of Schimmack (Schimmack, 2003), these
224 differentiated by the presence and absence of emotion using a 0-6 scale, with 0 being “No I do
225 not feel this emotion”, 1 being “Yes, very mildly” and 6 being “Yes, maximum intensity”. In
226 addition, participants were instructed to treat each scale independently and first consider whether
227 they felt each individual emotion before responding. A measurement check was included to
228 ensure that participants were supporting England in the match.

229 **Post-match questionnaire.** Questionnaires completed post-match focused on
230 participant’s reactions to the game, as well as assessing information about where and when they
231 had watched the match.

232 **Reaction.** First, a measurement check was made that participants had watched the match
233 (“Thank you for your continued participation in this study. Firstly - just to check - did you watch
234 the England vs. [opposition] match?”). Only $k=6$ responses failed this check across all matches
235 for all participants, and these data were excluded. Participants were asked whether the outcome
236 was a fair result (with either “fair result” or “England/Opposition were lucky” as the 3
237 responses). Participants also separately assessed whether the result/performance (from England’s
238 point of view) was good or bad on a 5-point scale.

239 **Emotions.** Emotions were assessed in the same way as in the pre-match questionnaire,
240 but included measures of happiness, sadness, anxiety, excitement, anger, embarrassment, relief,
241 shock, boredom, pride, and amazement. These additional emotions were included to investigate
242 other kinds of reactions to football matches but were not analysed as part of this study on mixed
243 emotions.

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

244 *Viewing.* We asked participants where they had watched the match, with response
245 options including “at home”, “at someone else’s house”, “in a pub/bar/club”, “in a cinema”,
246 “outside on a big screen” or “other”. We then asked people to estimate how many other people
247 were in the venue with them on an ordinal scale, and the percentage of those people supporting
248 England.

249 **Post-tournament questionnaire.** As part of the data collection, a post-tournament
250 questionnaire was distributed which was identical to the initial questionnaire. This data was not
251 used in the present analyses.

252

253 **Procedure**

254 Recruitment began 6 days before the first England game of the 2018 FIFA World Cup
255 and continued for the first 3 weeks of the tournament. Participants were recruited via social
256 media to participate in a study investigating “emotional responses to watching England
257 matches”. The study was advertised towards people who were planning on watching and
258 supporting England during the tournament, and they needed to have a smartphone with
259 messaging app WhatsApp. The participant information sheet informed participants that they
260 would have to fill out a short questionnaire before and after each England match at the
261 tournament. As compensation, participants were entered into a prize draw to win a shopping
262 voucher. Upon enrolment in the study, participants completed the initial questionnaire and
263 provided their mobile phone number. A link to each pre-match questionnaires was sent out via
264 mobile messaging service WhatsApp to all participants, 60 minutes before the kick-off of each
265 England game, with instructions to complete it before kick-off. Post-match questionnaires were

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

266 sent out immediately after each game had finished in the same way. After the final England
267 game, a post-tournament questionnaire was sent out that covered the same questions as the initial
268 questionnaire. For a full timeline of the study, see the supplementary materials.

269 **Data preparation.** Participant's responses were linked up using unique ID codes
270 provided at each time point. If the data could not be linked reliably, it was excluded. The
271 timestamp of each questionnaire was inspected and pre-match questionnaires that were
272 completed more than 5 minutes after the kick-off of the match were excluded. Details of all
273 exclusions are in the data processing diary. There was no specific cut off point for post-match
274 questionnaires, as it was expected that participants may not be able to complete these
275 immediately if they were watching the game with others. However, the vast majority completed
276 these within 2 hours of matches finishing, and all participants completed them within 48 hours.

277 **Transparency statement**

278 Following Open Science best practices (Munafò et al., 2017), the full anonymised dataset,
279 study materials, recruitment media, pre-registration, and data processing diary can be found on
280 the study OSF page: <https://osf.io/954c8/>

281

282 **Data analysis strategy**

283 In order to evaluate the influence of mixed emotions on making judgements, we prepared
284 the data beforehand. From the emotion data, we created variables for affect, mood, and mixed
285 emotions. When referring to affect, we mean a broad sense of either positively or negatively
286 valenced feeling, i.e. positive affect (PA; happiness + excitement) or negative affect (NA;
287 anxiety + sadness). By mood we mean a more diffuse feeling, i.e. PA and NA spanning multiple
288 timepoints across the study for each participant. Finally, by mixed emotion we mean
289 simultaneous activation of opposing affects. We computed mixed emotions as the minimum
290 value (Schimmack, 2001) between positive affect and negative affect. Positive emotions (i.e.,
291 excitement and happiness) and negative emotions (i.e., sadness and anxiety) included in this
292 study were averaged and the minimum value between these scores was taken as an index of
293 mixed emotions. This procedure was repeated for each mixed emotion variable computed before
294 and after each match.

295 We also created a series of one time-point delayed mixed emotion variables (i.e., lag-
296 effects) to be used as independent variables for testing the main hypothesis that mixed emotions
297 would impact future judgement accuracy. Thus, the mixed emotions reported after a match could
298 be used to predict judgements in the subsequent match. Although this does not allow us to infer
299 causation, it gives stronger evidence of a possibly causal relationship than correlations at the
300 same time point.

301 Next, following Curran and Bauer's recommendations (2011), a set of between-person
302 centred variables were created by averaging the raw scores for each relevant variable. This
303 created variables that had the same score over time but a different value across individuals. Then,
304 a set of within-person variables were created by subtracting the individual's average score for

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

328 mixed emotions, judgements). Results allow the acceptance of the null hypothesis that the data
329 are missing entirely at random, $\chi^2(8) = 12.12, p = .154$. Further inspection of the data revealed
330 that there were two outliers for the mixed emotions variables (before and after the match); these
331 are retained in subsequent analyses. The inclusion of these two data points did not alter any of
332 the analyses conducted and reported below. *Table 1* reports the descriptive statistics and zero-
333 order correlations between the variables studied.

334

335 [TABLE 1 HERE]

The results are divided into two sections. First, we briefly examine the prevalence of mixed emotions within the sample and changes of mixed emotions across the matches. This is a necessary step before testing the main hypothesis. Second, we present the findings for the influence of mixed emotions on making judgements, including models with several relevant covariates.

Feeling mixed emotions during the World Cup

These preliminary analyses were conducted to examine the influence of time and individual differences in the experience of mixed emotions. Examination of the time trends was performed using Growth Curve Modelling. This allow us to determine whether natural fluctuations of mixed emotions over time may better explain the relationships between the variables studied. We set a model including mixed emotions measured at the end of each match as the dependent variable. Random intercepts and slopes for the time variable were also considered, whereas a maximum likelihood estimator and an unrestricted matrix were used. The variance of mixed emotions' trajectory (slope parameter) was not statistically significant, $\sigma_{ME-post} = 0.027, p = .169$, meaning that people did not increase feelings of mixed emotions after each match over time.

We repeated the same analysis, but this time with the experience of mixed emotions before the match as the dependent variable. Results revealed a positive, mixed emotions trajectory, $\sigma_{ME-pre} = 0.058, p < .001$, meaning that people tended to slightly increase the levels of mixed emotions reported at the beginning of each match over time.

[FIGURE 1 HERE]

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

Additionally, we examined whether significant individual differences in mixed emotions are present in the data, in order to control for this effect in subsequent analyses. Visual inspection of *Figure 1* suggests that some people tended to experience higher levels of mixed emotions (average scores above 3), whereas others seldom experience mixed emotions (average score of 1). This observation suggests that it is possible that individual differences in the experience of mixed emotions exist in the data, and as such, it is important to control for this effect. To test this observation, we conducted a multi-level model similar to the previously described model, but without independent variables and using a variance components matrix to compute the intra-class correlation. We found that there was a significant amount of variance between individuals for mixed emotions before the match, $\rho = 0.28, p < .001$, revealing that some individuals tended to experience more mixed emotions before the match compared to others. However, this effect did not replicate for the mixed emotions reported after each match.

Do mixed feelings matter emotionally for the next match?

One preliminary question is whether mixed emotions may have a lingering effect on the emotional experience people reported in the following match, over and above individual differences in mixed emotions. To evaluate this question, we performed three separate models using lagged mixed emotions variables (within and between-person centred) and time (centred) as independent variables. The models include PA, NA, and mixed emotions before the match as dependent variables.

The first model revealed that lagged mixed emotions centred at the within-person level positively significantly predicted higher PA, $\beta = 0.13, t(145.17) = 2.28, p = .024, 95\% CI [0.02, 0.24]$. Time was also positively related to PA, $\beta = 0.19, t(57.05) = 4.51, p < .001, 95\% CI [0.10, 0.27]$. The effect size of this model at level-1 was medium in magnitude, $R^2 = 0.24$.

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

For the second model tested, lagged mixed emotions centred at the within-person level also positively predicted higher NA, $\beta = 0.11$, $t(134.92) = 2.43$, $p = .016$ 95% CI [0.02, 0.20]. Time was also positively related to NA, $\beta = 0.23$, $t(77.31) = 7.48$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.17, 0.29]. The effect size of this model at level-1 was large in magnitude, $R^2 = 0.48$.

Finally, in the third model, lagged mixed emotions centred at the within –person level positively predicted higher mixed emotions before the next match, $\beta = 0.11$, $t(146.83) = 2.74$, $p = .007$, 95% CI [0.03, 0.20]. Time was also positively related to mixed feelings before the next match, $\beta = 0.24$, $t(77.03) = 8.19$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.18, 0.29]. The effect size of this model at level-1 was large in magnitude, $R^2 = 0.57$. Lagged mixed emotions centred at the between-person level did not predict changes in the dependent variable in any of these models. Overall, people who felt more mixed emotions at the end of a previous match, tended to experience greater PA, NA, and mixed emotions before the next match, over and above linear trends of time and individual differences in mixed emotions. In none of the models previously described did we find that individual differences in mixed emotions (mixed emotions centred at the between-person level) at the end of a previous match had an effect on PA, NA, or mixed emotions before the next match.

The influence of mixed emotions on making judgements

In this sub-section we report testing the main hypothesis regarding the influence of mixed emotions on prediction judgments, including a series of model to control for relevant social and emotional-related variables. Results showed that when people experienced higher levels of mixed emotions at the end of a match, they made a more likely score prediction judgement at the beginning of the next match, $\beta = 0.87$, $t(145.8) = 2.42$, $p = .017$, 95% CI [0.16, 1.59].

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

In contrast, time was negatively related to making judgements, $\beta = -0.54$, $t(92.78) = -2.45$, $p = .016$, 95% CI [-0.97, -0.10], which implies that prediction likelihood tended to decay from match to match. Mixed emotions before the match and between-subject variables did not predict future scores. The effect size at level-1 for this model was small in magnitude, $R^2 = 0.07$. Estimates and standard errors of all the variables included in this model are in *Table 2 (Model 1)*.

[TABLE 2 HERE]

The model previously tested was repeated but with random intercepts and random slopes for the lagged mixed emotions variable at the within-person level. Results still supported the finding of a significant effect of mixed emotions predicting better judgements in the next match, $\beta = 0.89$, $t(38.48) = 2.43$, $p = .020$, 95% CI [0.15, 1.63]. Whereas time was negatively related to better judgements, $\beta = -0.53$, $t(106.32) = -2.42$, $p = .017$, 95% CI [-0.97, -0.10].

To test the robustness of the main hypothesis test, we implemented a new model including several emotion-related variables. The model included anxiety and sadness before each match at the within-person level; excitement and happiness before each match at the within-person level; an interaction term for excitement before the match and anxiety before the match centred at the within-person level; and no lagged mixed emotions variable measured before and after each match centred at the between and within-person levels.

Evidence for an effect of mixed emotions forecasting better judgements remained positively statistically significant, $\beta = 0.84$, $t(138.01) = 2.26$, $p = .026$, 95% CI [0.10, 1.58]. Time was no longer significantly related to prediction likelihood, $\beta = -0.48$, $t(129.15) = -1.71$, $p = .090$, although the pattern was in the same direction. Finally, happiness before the match was negatively related to more likely score predictions in the same match, $\beta = -1.52$, $t(125.16) = -$

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

3.01, $p < .001$, 95% CI [-2.49, -0.55]. No other variable was statistically related to score predictions, as shown in *Table 2 (Model 2)*.

One final model tested (*Table 2, Model 3*), includes several variables at level-2: The *Sports Identification Scale (SSIS)*, the *Nationalism Motive Scale (NAT-Q)*, age, and gender. At level-1 we also included the degree of confidence reported at the beginning of each match, the number of people present in each match, and the venue where participants watched each match. This model incorporates a lagged mixed emotions variable reported at the end of each match centred at the within-person level.

[TABLE 3 HERE]

Results indicate that the main effect of mixed emotions predicting more likely score predictions in the following match remained, $\beta = 0.86$, $t(156.52) = 2.98$, $p = .003$, 95% CI [0.29, 1.43]. In keeping the results previously reported, time was negatively associated with score predictions, $\beta = -0.51$, $t(140.28) = -2.38$, $p = .019$, 95% CI [-0.94, -0.09]. The remaining variables included in the model were not associated with score prediction likelihood.

We complemented the previously explained models by testing two new models (see *Model 4 and Model 5* in *Table 3*). One model used a within-person centred variable of lagged mixed emotions reported at the end of the match alongside two lagged between-person centred variables for PA and NA reported at the end of the match (the two componential variables used to compute mixed emotions), the interaction between these two, and time. We included a group-mean centred version of these variables, instead of within-person centred variables, because of the multicollinearity between the within-person centred variables, in the case of mixed-emotions and PA ($r = 0.44$, $p < .001$) and mixed-emotions and NA ($r = 0.78$, $p < .001$).

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

Results for this model supported the observed effect of mixed emotions making better judgements in the next match, $\beta = 1.58$, $t(130.02) = 2.76$, $p = .007$, 95% CI [0.45, 2.71]. Time was negatively related to making more likely judgements, $\beta = -0.58$, $t(114.33) = -2.66$, $p = .009$, 95% CI [-1.00, -0.15]. Lagged PA and NA did not predict better judgements, the interaction between these two variables were not associated with better judgements, $\beta = -0.26$, $t(192.58) = -1.673$, $p = .085$. The observed effect size for this model was small in magnitude, $R^2 = 0.14$.

The second model used a within-person centred variable of lagged mixed emotions reported at the end of the match, two within-person centred variables for PA and NA reported at the beginning of the match (no lagged, measured in the same moment when predictions were made), the interaction between these two, and time. Again, results supported better judgements made in the following match based on higher levels of mixed emotions at the end of the previous match, $\beta = 1.03$, $t(172.91) = 3.61$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.46, 1.59]; whereas PA was negatively associated with making more likely judgements, $\beta = -1.28$, $t(151.06) = -2.66$, $p = .005$, 95% CI [-2.23, -0.33], and no effect was observed for NA. As with the previous model, time was negatively related to better judgements, $\beta = -0.51$, $t(146.11) = -2.28$, $p = .025$, 95% CI [-0.96, -0.07].

Discussion

We began from the premise that mixed emotions can be beneficial when navigating scenarios with uncertain outcomes, helping people to make more reasonable prospective judgements. Specifically, we sought to investigate this association in an ecologically valid setting, using naturally occurring mixed emotions. Thus, we carried out a lagged-effect study during the FIFA World Cup 2018, in which participants were surveyed in their emotions (at the beginning and the end of each match) and judgements about the match outcomes (at the

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

beginning of each match) were taken during the tournament. Overall, the results showed that participants made better judgements of a likely score in a match when experiencing higher levels of mixed emotions at the end of the previous match. In contrast, general positive affect was associated with less likely judgements, and there was no effect of negative affect.

The models tested in this investigation divided the portion of the variance over time explained by averaging idiosyncratic reports made by participants across all units of time (between-variables) from the portion of variance explained by natural fluctuation from time to time for each individual (within-time). As judgement likelihood naturally varied from game to game, we tested our hypothesis using the main independent variable of the within-person version of mixed emotions, although we also controlled for the potential effects of between-person effects. Additionally, our models controlled for linear time trends by adding time to the model, and also accounting for common autoregressive effects observed in intensive longitudinal measurement. Finally, we added random intercepts and, for some models, random slopes to examine the robustness of the effects.

We tested whether individuals who experienced higher mixed emotions at the end of each match would make more likely judgements at the start of the next match, as a result of the mixed emotions. Our pattern of results illustrated this effect: mixed emotions experienced at the end of the match predicted more likely judgements at the beginning of the next match. These results were resilient to the inclusion of several covariates. For ease of comprehension we discuss the findings below as “the effect” of mixed emotions although we stress that as the study is non-experimental, we cannot infer a causal relationship.

One may speculate that this result is better explained by the time trends in the experience of mixed emotions. The effect of mixed emotions on judgement could be better explained by a

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

linear association between increments or decrements of mixed emotions and judgements made, or merely because of average levels of mixed emotions reported across time are a stronger predictor. However, this trend was not observed, and the effect of mixed emotions on judgements remained after including mixed emotions reported in the same match, and also after controlling for individual differences in mixed emotions (Rafaeli et al., 2007).

Alternative hypotheses may suggest that the influence of mixed emotions on judgements are better explained by the compositional positive emotions or negative emotions involved in the mixed emotions index. In other words, the single emotions surveyed before each match may be stronger influences on judgements than the mixed emotion index. However, this was not the case. Only happiness reported before the match was negatively related to making more likely judgements, and none of the single emotions (including interactions between single emotional adjectives) changed the main effect of mixed emotions on judgements.

Another possibility could be that the general affective tone of people during the match (i.e., core positive or negative affect; Russell & Barrett, 1999) may be a better explanation for our finding. Again, the inclusion of positive affect and negative affect (before or after the match) or the interaction between these two, and even lagged-effect versions for these variables were not related to judgements before the match. Similarly, moods estimated as the between-person centred variables for Positive Affect and Negative Affect (i.e., average levels of PA and NA for each individual across all units of time) were not related to making more reasonable judgements or disconfirmed the main effect of mixed emotions on judgements.

We also explored whether attitudinal variables or situational variables may better explain our findings, but this was also not the case. Adding variables such as nationalism, the degree of identification with the team, and prediction confidence to the model did not prove to be

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

statistically significant, and the main effect of lagged mixed emotions remained intact. Similarly, the number of people with whom each participant watched the match or the place where the participant watched the match was not related to more feasible judgements about the outcome, and the effect of mixed emotions remained.

Finally, we estimated whether mixed emotions had an impact on the emotional experience people reported before the next match. In accordance with previous literature, we found that mixed emotions measured after the previous match positively predicted positive affect, negative affect, and mixed emotions the next match, controlling for individual differences in mixed emotions. This finding shows the relevance of the measure of mixed emotions after the match for both PA and NA.

Overall, it is plausible to affirm that mixed emotions can help people to make more probable judgements during scenarios involving puzzling or uncertain outcomes, over and above the effect of other emotionally-related constructs (e.g., happiness), individual differences (e.g., PA, NA), attitudinal variables (e.g., nationalism, identification) and demographic characteristics. The study adds to the literature on mixed emotions and judgement making by measuring real-world emotions and judgements that are meaningful to participants. Examining mixed emotions in a naturally occurring situation enables researchers to understand the consequences of mixed emotions in everyday life.

The measures and materials in the present study are high on representativeness (Kvavilashvili & Ellis, 2004), reflecting more accurately how participants experience emotions and make judgements in everyday life compared to laboratory studies. In addition, it fulfils a call for more “reality” in emotion research and to take research outside of the laboratory (Kuppens,

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

2019). This can help to fuel “full-cycle” research in which experimental and ecological research are used together to help fuel theory generation (Mortensen & Cialdini, 2010).

Can mixed emotions help make people’s beliefs more realistic?

Forecasting future outcomes when one cannot act upon them may be a naïve enterprise, but this is a common strategy when making decisions in real life (Makridakis & Taleb, 2009). According to Oettingen and Mayer (2002), anticipating the future can emerge in the mind as beliefs or judgements about the likelihood of certain events, or may take the form of free thoughts or fantasies. In the present research we asked participants to predict the future outcome of each England football match during the FIFA World Cup, and then we compared these predictions to the bookmakers’ odds for each potential scoreline. The odds therefore reflect the participants’ judgement likelihood. We investigated how mixed emotions contributed to making these beliefs more realistic. Can emotions help to move our beliefs closer to reality?

Previous research has shown that positive emotions, such as happiness, increase overconfidence (Ifcher & Zarghamee, 2014. Study 1), which can lead to poor forecasting (e.g., Hillary & Menzly, 2006). The effect of positive emotions on overconfidence appears consistent even when comparing its effect against other emotional experiences, such as anger, fear, or sadness (Ifcher & Zarghamee, 2014. Study 2). Aligned with this evidence we found that the degree of happiness reported at the end of the match negatively predicted more reasonable judgements about the results in the next match, suggesting overconfidence in future outcomes. This finding is consistent with the indulging strategy in the fantasy realization theory (Oettingen, 2000, 2012). Indulging occurs when people focus on the future positive outcome exclusively, misperceiving the present obstacles. Consistently, we found that an overreliance on the positive

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

aspects of reality may result in wishful thinking and, consequently a less likely prediction of future outcomes.

In contrast, we also found that mixed emotions predicted more reasonable judgements, making people's beliefs closer to reality, even after controlling for a number of affective, attitudinal, and contextual variables. At this point, the process through which this relationship is possible is unknown. However, we speculate that mixed emotions simultaneously signal the rewarding features of future outcomes and the obstacles perceived in the present, in line with the propositions of fantasy realisation theory and mental contrasting (Oettingen, Park, & Schnetter, 2001). Both future rewards and present obstacles would be accessible and integrated when feeling mixed emotions, offering substantial benefits compared to feeling positive or negative emotions alone. Our reasoning is also consistent with Livet (2010). He asserts that making judgements are the product of simultaneous comparisons between anticipatory emotions elicited from the observation of the present situation and the desired future outcome.

The availability of mental representations of future fantasies and present obstacles caused by mixed emotions can be understood in the context of the strategy of 'mental contrasting' in fantasy realization theory (Oettingen, 2000, 2012). When mental contrasting, people first envision the positive realization of a desired future goal and then contrast this with the obstacles of the present reality. The process of contrasting activates more accurate expectations of success, leading to a wiser goal selection (Oettingen, 2012). Research examining the emotional antecedents of spontaneous mental contrasting points towards the beneficial role of sad moods to encourage this process. Across six studies, Kappes et al. (2011) found that a sad mood induction produced greater self-initiated mental contrasting compared to neutral mood and happy moods, after participants had listed their desired future goals and present obstacles. The authors suggest

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

that a sad mood encouraged a deliberative processing style and signalled to participants that they should pay attention to the problematic obstacles in their present reality and how to overcome them to achieve their future goals. Mixed emotions are generally thought of as signalling both the rewarding features of future expectations and the obstacles perceived in the present (Berrios, 2019): both necessary ingredients for mental contrasting. We suggest that mixed emotions can therefore be an additional mechanism that instigate self-initiated mental contrasting. Mixed emotions might encourage people not only to spontaneously generate the representations of both desired goals and current obstacles, but also to contrast these in an effective manner. Positive fantasizes about how far the team can make it in the FIFA World-Cup led to more reasonable judgments only when people felt more mixed emotions, i.e. when they also contrasted these with the present obstacles, such as the strength of the upcoming opposition, or poor aspects of a recent performance. Further research is needed to examine whether mixed emotions are an effective mechanism that instigates spontaneous mental contrasting, but we consider that it is reasonable to advance such hypothesis.

Our evidence about the relationship between mixed emotions and making reasonable judgements may also help to expand the literature examining the relationship between emotion and decision-making. Research indicates that emotions such as fear and anxiety make people more sensitive to risk, which in turn produce more accurate risk estimations (Lerner & Keltner; 2001; Raganathan & Pham, 1999); whereas anger and sadness make people more prone to risk leading to less accurate risk assessment (Lerner & Keltner; 2001; Raganathan & Pham, 1999). These findings correspond with the direct impact of immediate emotions on decision making (Lowenstein & Lerner, 2003). However, the influence of mixed emotions on making judgements may reflect the operation of two anticipated emotions acting in parallel on making judgements.

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

An optimal deliberation process that combines a comparison between the elating relief resulting from future desires, and prudential pride emerging from cautious observation of reality (Livet, 2010). The idea that anticipated mixed emotions can have a direct impact on judgement and decision making awaits to be tested.

Limitations and Future research

One limitation to the study is the relatively small sample size ($N=80$), which was necessarily limited by the time frame of the study, conducted over the course of the World Cup. As such, further data could not be collected. However, the small sample size is mitigated somewhat by the 14 time points represented in the longitudinal design (Bolger et al., 2012). In addition, as the study was conducted remotely, there was no way to ensure that participants completed the post-match questionnaire immediately after watching the game. Completion time was highly skewed (towards fast responses), and retrospective reports of emotion are often as accurate as momentary responses (Barrett, 1997). However, ensuring that participants all complete post-match questionnaires at the same time immediately after the game would allow a greater measure of control over memory differences. Incentivising timely completions of questionnaires may be one way to overcome this issue in future studies.

A limit to the broader generalisability of the findings is that the study only considered the emotions of England fans, and predictions on England games. Sports fans make more optimistic predictions about their own team's results than other teams (Massey et al., 2011), meaning our participants' predictions may have been generally more biased than if they had been predicting the score of a game not involving England. It is likely that mixed emotions provide smaller benefit in improving judgement likelihood in situations where people are initially less biased. Future continental and global football competitions may give opportunity to test these

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

predictions using a cross cultural design, where fans of two teams predict the results of each other's games, as well as their own.

Another future direction for research in this area is to expand on the findings relating to the judgements people made. In the present research, we asked about participant's predictions of the scores of the games, but there were no measures of behavioural counterparts to these decisions. As we used bookmaker odds to estimate the likelihood of these predictions, an obvious prospect would be to investigate how mixed emotions affect actual gambling decisions, i.e. how much money a person would be willing to bet on their predicted score occurring. However, decision making in gambling behaviours is complex: although decisions are influenced by emotions (e.g., de Vries et al., 2008) they are also independently related to personality correlates such as sensation-seeking behaviour and impulsivity (Buelow & Suhr, 2013; Suhr & Tsanadis, 2007). This makes investigation of the relationship between mixed emotions and gambling decisions in an ecologically valid context such as watching sport tricky as these factors are difficult to control. An alternative would be to add a competitive element to the predictions, such as a prediction league, in which participants receive points for correct predictions, and compete against each other to be the most accurate predictor. This would help add stronger behavioural motivations to the predictions, but without including the potential loss-making elements of a gambling task.

Conclusion

A growing body of research has illustrated how mixed emotions can improve the accuracy of judgements in controlled laboratory tasks using induced emotions. We sought to take this research into the ecologically valid context of making judgements on football scores and mixed emotions felt during the FIFA World cup. The data showed that participants who felt

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

greater mixed emotions at the end of a match made more likely score judgements of the next match, providing evidence that mixed emotions are linked to judgement likelihood in naturalistic settings as well as in the lab. Future research should seek to replicate these findings in a cross-cultural study.

References

- Barnes, J. H. (1984). Cognitive biases and their impact on strategic planning. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5(2), 129–137. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250050204>
- Barrett, L. F. (1997). The relationships among momentary emotion experiences, personality descriptions, and retrospective ratings of emotion. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 1100-1110. [10.1177/01461672972310010](https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672972310010)
- Berrios, R. (2019). What Is Complex/Emotional About Emotional Complexity? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1606. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01606>
- Berrios, R., Totterdell, P., & Kellett, S. (2015a). Eliciting mixed emotions: A meta-analysis comparing models, types, and measures. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00428>
- Berrios, R., Totterdell, P., & Kellett, S. (2015b). Investigating goal conflict as a source of mixed emotions. *Cognition and Emotion*, 29(4), 755–763. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2014.939948>
- Berrios, R., Totterdell, P., & Kellett, S. (2018a). When Feeling Mixed Can Be Meaningful: The Relation Between Mixed Emotions and Eudaimonic Well-Being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 19(3), 841–861. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-017-9849-y>
- Berrios, R., Totterdell, P., & Kellett, S. (2018b). Silver linings in the face of temptations: How mixed emotions promote self-control efforts in response to goal conflict. *Motivation and Emotion*, 42(6), 909–919. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-018-9707-1>
- Bogdanov, D. (2005). *Measuring Nationalism as a Sport Fan Motive* [Florida State University]. <https://fsu.digital.flvc.org/islandora/object/fsu%3A181898>

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

- Bolger, N., Stadler, G., & Laurenceau, J. (2012). Power analysis for intensive longitudinal studies. In *Handbook of research methods for studying daily life* (pp. 285–301). Guildford Press.
- Buelow, M. T., & Suhr, J. A. (2013). Personality characteristics and state mood influence individual deck selections on the Iowa Gambling Task. *Personality and Individual Differences, 54*(5), 593–597. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.11.019>
- Curran, P. J., & Bauer, D. J. (2011). The Disaggregation of Within-Person and Between-Person Effects in Longitudinal Models of Change. *Annual Review of Psychology, 62*(1), 583–619. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100356>
- de Vries, M., Holland, R. W., & Witteman, C. L. M. (2008). Fitting decisions: Mood and intuitive versus deliberative decision strategies. *Cognition & Emotion, 22*(5), 931–943. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930701552580>
- Galinsky, A. D., & Moskowitz, G. B. (2000). Perspective-taking: Decreasing stereotype expression, stereotype accessibility, and in-group favoritism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*(4), 708–724. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.708>
- Grossmann, I., Oakes, H., & Santos, H. C. (2019). Wise reasoning benefits from emodiversity, irrespective of emotional intensity. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 148*(5), 805–823. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000543>
- Guarana, C. L., & Hernandez, M. (2016). Identified ambivalence: When cognitive conflicts can help individuals overcome cognitive traps. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 101*(7), 1013–1029. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000105>

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

- Hadley, C. N. (2014). Emotional roulette? Symmetrical and asymmetrical emotion regulation outcomes from co-worker interactions about positive and negative work events. *Human Relations, 67*(9), 1073–1094. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726714529316>
- Hektner, J., Schmidt, J., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2007). *Experience Sampling Method*. SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412984201>
- Hilary, G., & Menzly, L. (2006). Does past success lead analysts to become overconfident? *Management science, 52*(4), 489-500.
- Ifcher, J., & Zarghamee, H. (2014). Affect and overconfidence: A laboratory investigation. *Journal of Neuroscience, Psychology, and Economics, 7*(3), 125. Kim, J. W., Magnusen, M., & Lee, H.-W. (2017). Existence of Mixed Emotions During Consumption of a Sporting Event: A Real-Time Measure Approach. *Journal of Sport Management, 31*(4), 360–373. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2016-0215>
- Kappes, H. B., Oettingen, G., Mayer, D., & Maglio, S. (2011). Sad mood promotes self-initiated mental contrasting of future and reality. *Emotion, 11*(5), 1206–1222. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023983>
- Konečni, V. J., Brown, A., & Wanic, R. A. (2008). Comparative effects of music and recalled life-events on emotional state. *Psychology of Music, 36*(3), 289–308. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735607082621>
- Kuppens, P. (2019). Improving theory, measurement, and reality to advance the future of emotion research. *Cognition and Emotion, 33*(1), 20–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2018.1536037>

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

- Kvavilashvili, L., & Ellis, J. (2004). Ecological validity and the real-life/laboratory controversy in memory research: A critical and historical review. *History and Philosophy of Psychology, 6* (1). pp. 59-80. ISSN 1469-283X
- Larsen, J. T. (2017). Holes in the Case for Mixed Emotions. *Emotion Review, 9*(2), 118–123.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073916639662>
- Larsen, J. T., & McGraw, A. P. (2011). Further evidence for mixed emotions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*(6), 1095–1110.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021846>
- Lerner, J. & Keltner, D. 2001 Fear, anger, and risk. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 146–159. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.81. 1.146
- Lerner, J. S., Li, Y., Valdesolo, P., & Kassam, K. S. (2015). Emotion and Decision Making. *Annual Review of Psychology, 66*(1), 799–823. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115043>
- Little, R. J. A. (1988). A Test of Missing Completely at Random for Multivariate Data with Missing Values. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 83*(404), 1198–1202.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1988.10478722>
- Livet, P. (2010). Rational choice, neuroeconomy and mixed emotions. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 365*(1538), 259-269.
- Loewenstein, G. & Lerner, J. 2003 The role of affect in decision making. In Handbook of affective sciences (eds R. J. Davidson, K. R. Scherer & H. G. Goldsmith), ch. 3. Oxford University Press.

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

Makridakis, S., & Taleb, N. (2009). *Decision making and planning under low levels of predictability*. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 25(4), 716–733.

[doi:10.1016/j.ijforecast.2009.05.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2009.05.013)

Massey, C., Simmons, J. P., & Armor, D. A. (2011). Hope Over Experience: Desirability and the Persistence of Optimism. *Psychological Science*, 22(2), 274–281.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610396223>

Mills, C., & D’Mello, S. (2014). On the Validity of the Autobiographical Emotional Memory Task for Emotion Induction. *PLoS ONE*, 9(4), e95837.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0095837>

Morewedge, C. K., & Kahneman, D. (2010). Associative processes in intuitive judgement.

Trends in cognitive sciences, 14(10), 435-440. Mortensen, C. R., & Cialdini, R. B. (2010).

Full-Cycle Social Psychology for Theory and Application. *Social and Personality*

Psychology Compass, 4(1), 53–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2009.00239.x>

Munafò, M. R., Nosek, B. A., Bishop, D. V. M., Button, K. S., Chambers, C. D., Percie du Sert, N., Simonsohn, U., Wagenmakers, E.-J., Ware, J. J., & Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2017). A manifesto for reproducible science. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1(1).

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-016-0021>

Oettingen, G. (2000). Expectancy Effects on Behavior Depend on Self-Regulatory Thought.

Social Cognition, 18(2), 101–129. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2000.18.2.101>

Oettingen, G., Pak, H.-J., & Schnetter, K. (2001). Self-regulation of goal-setting: Turning free fantasies about the future into binding goals. *Journal of Personality and Social*

Psychology, 80(5), 736–753. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.80.5.736>

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

- Oettingen, G., & Mayer, D. (2002). The motivating function of thinking about the future: expectations versus fantasies. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 83(5), 1198. Parrott, W. G., & Hertel, P. (2005). Research Methods in Cognition and Emotion. In T. Dalgleish & M. J. Power (Eds.), *Handbook of Cognition and Emotion* (pp. 61–81). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0470013494.ch4>
- Oettingen, G. (2012). Future thought and behaviour change. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 23(1), 1–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2011.643698>
- Oettingen, G., & Cachia, J. Y. A. (2016). Problems with Positive Thinking and How to Overcome Them. In *Handbook of Self-Regulation: Research, Theory, & Applications* (3rd ed., pp. 547–570). Guildford.
- Picard, R. W. (2010). Emotion Research by the People, for the People. *Emotion Review*, 2(3), 250–254. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073910364256>
- Podoyntsyna, K., Van der Bij, H., & Song, M. (2012). The Role of Mixed Emotions in the Risk Perception of Novice and Serial Entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(1), 115–140. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00476.x>
- Rafaeli, E., Rogers, G. M., & Revelle, W. (2007). Affective Synchrony: Individual Differences in Mixed Emotions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(7), 915–932. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207301009>
- Ragunathan, R. & Pham, M. T. (1999). All negative moods are not equal: motivational influences of anxiety and sadness on decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 79, 56–57. doi:10.1006/obhd.1999.2838
- Rees, L., Rothman, N. B., Leavy, R., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2013). The ambivalent mind can be a wise mind: Emotional ambivalence increases judgement accuracy. *Journal of*

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

Experimental Social Psychology, 49(3), 360–367.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.12.017>

Russell, J. A. (2017). Mixed Emotions Viewed from the Psychological Constructionist Perspective. *Emotion Review*, 9(2), 111–117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073916639658>

Russell, J. A., & Barrett, L. F. (1999). Core affect, prototypical emotional episodes, and other things called emotion: Dissecting the elephant. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(5), 805–819. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.76.5.805>

Schimmack, U. (2001). Pleasure, displeasure, and mixed feelings: Are semantic opposites mutually exclusive? *Cognition and Emotion*, 15(1), 81–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0269993004200123>

Schimmack, U. (2003). Affect Measurement in Experience Sampling Research. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 4(1), 79–106. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023661322862>

Schniter, E., Sheremeta, R. M., & Shields, T. W. (2015). Conflicted emotions following trust-based interaction. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 51, 48–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2015.08.006>

Suhr, J. A., & Tsanadis, J. (2007). Affect and personality correlates of the Iowa Gambling Task. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43(1), 27–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.11.004>

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgement under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science*, 185(4157), 1124–1131. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.185.4157.1124>

Wang, C.S., Kenneth, T., Ku, G., & Galinsky, A.D. (2014). Perspective-Taking Increases Willingness to Engage in Intergroup Contact. *PLoS ONE* 9(1): e85681. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0085681>

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

Wann, D., & Branscombe, N., R. (1993). Sports fans: Measuring degree of identification with their team. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 24, 1–17.

Zhong, C.-B. (2011). The Ethical Dangers of Deliberative Decision Making. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2011.56.1.001>

Table 1. Descriptive and correlations between the variables studied (N = 80).

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
1. TimeR	2.500	1.710	.																						
2. Age	34.300	10.332	0.000	.																					
3. Gender	~	~	0.000	.126**	.																				
4. SSISQ_Pre	5.027	1.473	0.000	0.081	-.149**	.																			
5. NATQ_Pre	4.292	1.202	0.000	-.115*	0.028	.620**	.																		
6. PA_pre	3.298	1.281	.220**	-.267**	-.144*	.249**	.332**	.																	
7. NA_pre	1.139	0.924	.387**	-0.073	0.093	.163**	.228**	.224**	.																
8. PA_post	3.380	1.954	-0.087	-.124*	-0.010	.185**	.227**	.287**	.173**	.															
9. NA_post	1.571	1.498	.482**	0.030	0.075	0.048	0.064	0.124	.512**	0.099	.														
10. Mix_Pre	1.075	0.898	.422**	-0.118	0.065	.200**	.252**	.372**	.949**	.186**	.513**	.													
11. Mix_Post	1.215	1.258	.273**	0.046	0.044	0.067	0.105	0.098	.407**	.461**	.803**	.392**	.												
12. Pre_Happy	3.048	1.408	0.115	-.188**	-0.086	.180**	.252**	.910**	0.031	.232**	-0.025	.164**	-0.025	.											
13. Pre_Excited	3.548	1.408	.284**	-.298**	-.176**	.273**	.352**	.910**	.377**	.292**	.252**	.513**	.204**	.657**	.										
14. Pre_Sad	0.218	0.726	-.126*	-0.002	0.009	-0.116	-0.073	-.209**	.398**	-0.129	-0.012	.229**	-0.027	-.216**	-.165**	.									
15. Pre_Anxious	2.060	1.696	.476**	-0.079	0.097	.228**	.280**	.334**	.920**	.243**	.561**	.937**	.454**	.126*	.481**	0.006	.								
16. Post_Happy	3.468	2.088	-.183**	-.122*	0.013	.153**	.197**	.221**	0.098	.951**	-0.037	0.101	.361**	.190**	.213**	-0.095	.147*	.							
17. Post_Excited	3.291	2.029	0.020	-.113*	-0.033	.199**	.234**	.327**	.234**	.948**	.230**	.257**	.517**	.253**	.344**	-.151*	.318**	.803**	.						
18. Post_Sad	0.962	1.684	.517**	-0.013	0.067	0.027	-0.004	0.069	.440**	-.330**	.729**	.424**	.334**	-0.020	.146*	.134*	.421**	-.443**	-.181**	.					
19. Post_Anxious	2.180	2.110	.272**	0.052	0.052	0.046	0.094	0.122	.380**	.405**	.838**	.394**	.873**	-0.021	.244**	-0.125	.466**	.301**	.470**	.237**	.				
20. Judgements	11.730	4.643	-.257**	0.030	-0.030	-.168**	-.179**	-.199**	-.174**	-0.076	-.235**	-.193**	-.186**	-.156*	-.206**	-0.014	-.184**	-0.036	-0.111	-.173**	-.198**	.			
21. Confidence	65.790	16.051	-.388**	-0.009	-0.001	.247**	0.059	0.107	-.225**	.253**	-.346**	-.199**	-.252**	.164**	0.030	-0.039	-.229**	.294**	.183**	-.284**	-.267**	0.082	.		
22. No. of People	1.965	1.786	.176**	-.261**	-0.106	.198**	.140*	.282**	.182**	.143*	0.085	.229**	0.075	.200**	.315**	-0.102	.241**	0.094	.179**	0.040	0.088	-.134*	-0.025	.	
23. Venue	~	~	-0.003	0.055	0.110	0.016	-0.024	-0.006	-0.014	0.011	0.021	-0.013	0.001	-0.019	0.008	-0.002	-0.014	0.006	0.015	0.024	0.010	0.033	0.083	-.167**	.

Table 2. Model of the effect of mixed emotions on making judgements, including emotion-related variables and social-related variables.

Model parameters	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
<u>Level-1</u>						
Intercept	12.65	0.66	12.42	0.84	14.97	2.90
Lag-ME-Pre _w	0.50	0.58	0.29	0.57		
Lag-ME-Post _w	0.87	0.38	0.84	0.37	0.86	0.29
Time	-0.53	0.22	-0.48	0.28	-0.51	0.22
Anxiety-Pre _w			-1.02	1.10		
Excitement-Pre _w			0.44	0.58		
Sad-Pre _w			-1.45	1.05		
Happy-Pre _w			-1.52	0.49		
ME-Pre _w			2.62	2.31		
ME-Post _w			-0.61	0.37		
Anxiety-Pre _w * Excitement-Pre _w			-0.36	0.34		
Confidence _w					0.01	0.03
Number of People					-0.48	0.41
Viewing					1.07-3.03	≈2.5
<u>Level-2</u>						
Lag-ME-Pre _b	0.58	0.60	0.20	1.32		
Lag-ME-Post _b	-0.16	0.68	1.41	1.55		
ME-pre _b			-0.73	1.31		
ME-post _b			-1.69	1.64		
SSIS					-0.53	0.32
NAT-Q					-0.18	0.36
Age					-0.01	0.04
Gender (0 = male)					0.57	0.83
Deviance -2ΔLL(Δdf)	581.6(5)		619.6(14)		407.2(13)	
R ² (aprox.) at Level-1	0.07		0.17		0.22	
R ² (S&B) total	0.14		0.20		0.20	

Note: $N = 80$, $k = 480$. ME: Mixed emotions. SSIS: Sport Spectator Identification Scale. NAT-Q: Nationalism Questionnaire.

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

Table 3. Model of the effect of mixed emotions on score prediction likelihood including PA and NA.

Model parameters	Model 4		Model 5	
	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
<u>Level-1</u>				
Intercept	13.08	0.63	12.76	0.65
Lag-ME-Post _w	1.58	0.57	1.03	0.28
Time	-0.58	0.22	-0.51	0.22
Lag-PA-Post _c	-0.27	0.21		
Lag-NA-Post _c	-0.37	0.39		
Lag-PA-Post _c * Lag-NA-Post _c	-0.26	0.15		
PA-pre _w			-1.24	0.43
NA-pre _w			-0.14	0.53
PA-pre _w * NA-pre _w			0.47	0.58
<i>Deviance -2ΔLL(Δdf)</i>	317.2(5)		322.8(5)	
<i>R² (aprox.) at Level-1</i>	0.14		0.19	
<i>R² (S&B) total</i>	0.13		0.14	

Note: $N = 80$, $k = 480$. ME: Mixed emotions. NA: negative affect. PA: positive affect.

MIXED EMOTIONS AND JUDGEMENTS

Figure 1. *Fluctuations of the experience of mixed emotions at the beginning (A) and the end (B) of each match. Raw data and fitted regression lines for each participant over time. The number above each square represents the number assigned to each participant (n = 80), while the X-axis represents time.*

