

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Meijen, Carla and Jones, Marc V. and McCarthy, Paul J. and Sheffield, David and Allen, Mark S. (2012) Cognitive and affective components of challenge and threat states. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 31 (8). pp. 847-855. ISSN 1466-447X.

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2012.753157>

Link to record in KAR

<http://kar.kent.ac.uk/40373/>

Document Version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

1 Running head: CHALLENGE AND THREAT STATES

2

3

4

5 Cognitive and affective components of challenge and threat states

6 Carla Meijen¹, Marc Jones², Paul J. McCarthy³, David Sheffield⁴, and Mark S. Allen⁵

7 ¹School of Sport and Exercise Sciences, University of Kent

8 ²Centre for Sport, Health and Exercise Research, Staffordshire University

9 ³Department of Psychology, Glasgow Caledonian University

10 ⁴Centre for Psychological Research, University of Derby

11 ⁵Department of Applied Sciences, London South Bank University

12

13

14

15 Keywords: emotions, self-efficacy, achievement goals, control

16

17

18 Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Carla Meijen, School of Sport

19 and Exercise Sciences, University of Kent, Medway Building, Chatham, Kent ME4 4AG,

20 United Kingdom; phone: +44-1634-888816; e-mail: C.Meijen@kent.ac.uk.

Link to publisher version DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2012.753157>

Abstract

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

We explored the cognitive and affective components of the Theory of Challenge and Threat States in Athletes (TCTSA) using a cross-sectional design. One hundred and seventy-seven collegiate athletes indicated how they typically approached an important competition on measures of self-efficacy, perceived control, achievement goals, emotional states and interpretation of emotional states. Participants also indicated to what extent they typically perceived the important competition as a challenge and /or a threat. The results suggest that a perception of challenge was not predicted by any of the cognitive components. A perception of threat was positively predicted by avoidance goals and negatively predicted by self-efficacy and approach goals. Both challenge and threat had a positive relationship with anxiety. Practical implications of this study are that an avoidance orientation appeared to be related to potentially negative constructs such as anxiety, threat and dejection. The findings may suggest that practitioners and researchers should focus on reducing an avoidance orientation, however the results should be treated with caution in applied settings, as this study did not examine how the combination of constructs exactly influences sport performance. The results provided partial support for the TCTSA with stronger support for proposed relationships with threat rather than challenge states.

1 Introduction

2 Sports competition is an example of a motivated performance situation in which an
3 individual must exert effort to attain a goal, or goals, that are self-relevant (Seery, 2011). One
4 approach to explaining how individuals respond in such situations is by considering whether
5 the situation is perceived as a challenge or a threat. The notion that athletes might perceive
6 competition as a challenge or a threat has been considered in organised sport (Anshel &
7 Wells, 2000; Campbell & Jones, 2002; Cerin, 2003; Skinner & Brewer, 2004). The Theory of
8 Challenge and Threat States in Athletes (TCTSA; Jones, Meijen, McCarthy, & Sheffield,
9 2009) explains why sport competitions are often perceived as a challenge or a threat, what
10 physiological and emotional responses ensue, and in turn, how sport performance might be
11 affected. The TCTSA provides the theoretical framework for this study.

12 The TCTSA was developed on principles outlined in the biopsychosocial model of
13 challenge and threat (Blascovich & Mendes, 2000; Blascovich & Tomaka, 1996), along with
14 the model of adaptive approaches to competition (Skinner & Brewer, 2004) and the control
15 model of debilitating and facilitative competitive state anxiety (Jones, 1995). A challenge
16 state is experienced when an individual perceives they have sufficient resources to meet
17 situational demands and a threat state is experienced when an individual perceives they have
18 insufficient resources to meet situational demands (Blascovich & Mendes, 2000; Blascovich
19 & Tomaka, 1996). Challenge states are proposed to be associated with adaptive
20 cardiovascular responses (i.e., decreased vascular resistance and increased cardiac output),
21 positive emotions, increased energy levels and dedication, whereas threat states are
22 associated with maladaptive cardiovascular responses (i.e., increased vascular resistance and
23 no changes or a slight increase in cardiac output), negative emotions, reduced effort and
24 energy levels (Blascovich, Seery, Mugridge, Norris, & Weisbuch, 2004; Skinner & Brewer,
25 2004). The transactional theory of stress (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) also outlines that

1 challenge appraisals have a positive connotation and threat appraisals a negative connotation.
2 Lazarus and colleagues consider challenge and threat appraisals to be part of the appraisal
3 process (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). The biopsychosocial model and the TCTSA, however,
4 conceptualise challenge and threat as states that are the result of the appraisal process (Jones,
5 et al., 2009; Seery, 2011). Thus, to clarify, the demands of the situation might not differ for
6 challenge and threat states in the TCTSA, instead it is the evaluation of the available
7 resources in relation to the demand that leads to a challenge or a threat state. The TCTSA
8 adds to existing literature by specifying these resources.

9 The cognitive resources in the TCTSA are self-efficacy, perceived control, and
10 achievement goals. Self-efficacy refers to an individual's judgement of capability to perform
11 a task successfully (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy is a key aspect of the cognitive aspect as
12 the belief to perform a task contributes to the perception of being able to cope with the
13 demands of the situation (Lazarus, 1999). High levels of self-efficacy can increase the
14 available coping options that can help individuals perceive a motivated performance situation
15 as a challenge (Williams, Cumming, & Balanos, 2010). In addition, for self-efficacy to
16 develop individuals must perceive that they are in control (Bandura, 1997) and, as such,
17 control also forms a central component of the resource appraisals outlined in the TCTSA.
18 Individuals can perceive a situation as within (controllable) or outside personal control
19 (uncontrollable). This influences their perception of the situation as a challenge or a threat.
20 When someone believes that an important situation is controllable, he/she is motivated to use
21 'personal efficacy' most, which in turn increases the chances for success. If a situation is
22 approached as uncontrollable, the likelihood of failure increases, as the individual is more
23 likely to use personal efficacy to a lower extent (Bandura & Wood, 1989). The TCTSA
24 proposes that high levels of perceived control are related to a challenge state and low levels
25 of perceived control are related to a threat state (Jones et al., 2009).

1 The TCTSA uses the 2 x 2 model of achievement goals (Elliot & McGregor, 2001) to
2 explain how achievement goals play a role in challenge and threat states. The 2 x 2 model has
3 four types of achievement goals: mastery-approach goals (MAp) that focus on the attainment
4 of task or self-referenced target; mastery-avoidance goals (MAv) that reflect a motivation
5 focusing on avoiding task incompetence; performance-approach goals (PAp) that reflect a
6 motivation to attain normative competence; and performance-avoidance goals (PAv) that
7 reflect the motivation to avoid normative competence. Based on research in academic
8 (McGregor & Elliot, 2002) and athletic settings (Adie, Duda, & Ntoumanis, 2008), the
9 TCTSA contends that approach goals are related to a challenge state and avoidance goals to a
10 threat state.

11 The TCTSA outlines for the affective component that positive emotions are normally,
12 but not exclusively, related to a challenge response, whereas negative emotions are normally,
13 but not exclusively, associated with a threat response. The notion that positive emotions are
14 related to challenge appraisals and negative emotions are related to threat appraisals has been
15 previously proposed in sport (Skinner & Brewer, 2004). However, because some high
16 intensity emotions with a negative valence, like anger or anxiety, can serve motivational
17 functions, they can occur in a challenge state (Mendes, McCoy, Major, & Blascovich, 2008).
18 The interpretation of emotions as facilitative (helpful) or debilitating (unhelpful) to
19 performance also plays a role in challenge and threat states. How an individual interprets
20 emotions directs their behaviour (Lazarus, 1999, 2000) and although emotions are often
21 defined as being positive or negative in terms of valence, this does not mean that a negative
22 emotion only influences performance negatively, or that a positive emotion only influences
23 performance positively (Hanton, Neil, & Mellalieu, 2008; Jones & Uphill, 2004; Mellalieu,
24 Hanton, & Fletcher, 2006). Consistent with Jones' (1995) control model of debilitating and
25 facilitative anxiety, the TCTSA proposed that athletes can experience negative emotions in a

1 challenge state but these are interpreted as helpful to performance provided the athlete feels
2 in control and believes the goal can be achieved (Jones et al., 2009).

3 In summary, the TCTSA specifies the resource appraisals comprising challenge and
4 threat states and proposes how these resource appraisals relate to emotional responses
5 (intensity and interpretation). This relation has not yet been examined (Jones et al., 2009) and
6 testing this part of the TCTSA was the focus of the present study. Specifically, it was
7 hypothesised that a challenge state would be characterised by increased self-efficacy,
8 perceived control, approach goals, positive emotions and a facilitative interpretation of
9 emotions just before an important competition. It was further hypothesised that a threat state
10 would be characterised by decreased levels of self-efficacy, lower perceived control,
11 avoidance goals, more negative emotions and a more debilitating interpretation of emotions
12 just before an important competition.

13 Method

14 Participants and Procedure

15 One hundred and seventy seven collegiate level athletes (121 males, 55 females, 1
16 gender not disclosed) between the ages of 18 and 52 years (mean age 22.50 years, SD = 6.32)
17 took part in the study. Thirty-nine participants were involved in individual sports and 138
18 participants were involved in team sports. These sports included football (n = 73); basketball
19 (n = 16); cricket (n = 14); rugby, netball (both n = 9); martial arts and hockey (both n = 7).
20 Participants competed at levels ranging from international to recreational level with an
21 average of 10.13 (s = 6.04) years competitive experience. The participants played their main
22 sport an average of 6.18 (s = 4.86) hours per week.

23 Participants were recruited from three university sites, using non-probability
24 convenience sampling. That is, participants were asked during undergraduate classes if they
25 were willing to take part in the study and this allowed us to get responses from collegiate

1 athletes who were available and willing to take part (Stevens, 1996). Institutional ethical
2 approval was obtained prior to data collection and all of the participants volunteered to take
3 part in this study and provided written informed consent before completion of questionnaires
4 in a lecture theatre or seminar room. Participants completed the questionnaires in relation to
5 how they typically feel just before an important competition.

6 **Measures**

7 **Self-efficacy.** A sport specific questionnaire developed by Coffee and Rees (2008)
8 was used to measure self-efficacy ($\alpha = .75$). Participants were instructed to indicate with
9 reference to how they typically feel before an important competition, to what extent they felt
10 confident that they could cope with a range of statements. They rated six statements on a
11 five-point scale, 1 represented (not at all) and 5 (completely). An example statement is
12 “mobilise all your resources for this performance”.

13 **Perceived control.** Perceived control was measured using three items based on
14 Bonetti and Johnston’s (2008) perceived control measure, Ajzen’s (1991) perceived
15 behavioural control protocol and Conner and Sparks’ (1996) locus of control protocol. Locus
16 of control was measured using a single item, “Do you think it is entirely up to you whether
17 you perform to the best of your abilities” rated on a five point scale ranging from 1 (strongly
18 disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Perceived behavioural control was measured using two items:
19 “How much control do you feel you have over whether you perform to the best of your
20 abilities” - ranging from 1 (no control at all) to 5 (complete control), and “How difficult will
21 it be for you to perform to the best of your abilities?” - ranging from 1 (extremely difficult) to
22 5 (not at all difficult). The perceived behavioural control items were in line with the
23 theoretical framework of control (Skinner, 1996) where perceived control relates to the
24 individual’s belief about how much control is available. The internal consistency coefficient
25 of the perceived control measure in this study was $\alpha = .55$. Deleting any of the three items did

1 not improve the internal consistency of the scale. To further explore the scale, a principal
2 components analysis was conducted. All three items were significantly correlated, with
3 correlation coefficients between $r = .22$ to $.40$. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure was $.59$
4 suggesting acceptable reliability (Kaiser, 1974). Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant,
5 $\chi^2(3) = 42.64$, $p < .001$. The communalities of the three items were all above $.30$, indicating
6 that each item shared some common variance with the other two items. A principal
7 components analysis extracted one component. Therefore it was decided to retain the scale
8 for further analysis.

9 **Achievement goals.** Achievement goals were measured using the 12-item
10 Achievement Goal Questionnaire for Sport (AGQ-S; Conroy, Elliot, & Hofer, 2003). The
11 participants indicated the extent to which items were true of them in relation to how they feel
12 just before an important competition, on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all true) to 7 (very
13 true). In line with the TCTSA, the scores for M_Ap and P_Ap were summed for an overall
14 score for approach goals, and M_Av and P_Av were summed up for an overall score for
15 avoidance goals. The internal consistency reliability coefficient was $\alpha = .70$ for approach
16 goals and $\alpha = .84$ for avoidance goals.

17 **Emotions.** Emotions were measured using the 22-item Sport Emotion Questionnaire
18 (SEQ; Jones, Lane, Bray, Uphill, & Catlin, 2005). The SEQ identifies five emotions: anger;
19 anxiety; dejection; happiness; and excitement. The participants were asked to indicate on a
20 scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (extremely), how they feel just before an important
21 competition ($\alpha = .84$ for anxiety, $\alpha = .92$ for dejection, $\alpha = .66$ for excitement, $\alpha = .82$ for
22 anger, and $\alpha = .86$ for happiness). Dejection and anger had low mean scores (see Table 1),
23 and these subscales were not used in further analyses as many participants did not report
24 experiencing these two emotions ($n = 110$ for dejection, $n = 78$ for anger). Interpretation of
25 emotional state was measured using a single item, "how helpful do you feel your emotional

1 state is for your performance?”, rated on a five point scale (0 = not at all helpful to 4 =
2 extremely helpful). This measure was chosen as the prediction for interpretation of emotional
3 state reflected the athletes’ interpretation of their overall emotional state. Only 107 (60.5%)
4 of the participants completed the interpretation of emotional state question, as the result of an
5 administrative error in which the scale was not included in half of the questionnaire booklets.

6 **Challenge and threat appraisals.** To provide a measure of whether competition is
7 typically viewed as a challenge or as a threat participants were asked to imagine that they are
8 about to take part in the most important competition of the season and to indicate on a 5-point
9 scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (extremely) on two items: “how threatened do you feel
10 by this” and “how challenged do you feel by this”. Similar single item measures of challenge
11 and threat have been used in the literature (e.g., Tomaka, Blascovich, Kibler, & Ernst, 1997).

12 **Manipulation check.** To verify if participants were able to imagine if they were just
13 about to take part in an important competition, they were asked to indicate how able they
14 were to complete the task that was asked of them by ticking one out of three options (Jones &
15 Uphill, 2004): option one “I was able to complete the questionnaire as if I was just about to
16 compete in an important competition accurately”; option two “I was able to complete the
17 questionnaire as if I was just about to compete in an important competition with some degree
18 of accuracy”; or option three “I was unable to complete the questionnaire as if I was just
19 about to compete in an important competition with any degree of accuracy”. Participants who
20 ticked option three were removed from data analysis (n = 3). A further two participants failed
21 to indicate how able they were to recall the competition and were also removed from further
22 data analysis. This left 172 participants in the analyses for the cognitive resources and
23 affective responses.

24 **Data analysis**

1 To examine the predictive value of the cognitive resources (self-efficacy, control,
2 approach and avoidance goals) on challenge and threat appraisals, we conducted two linear
3 regression analyses with either challenge appraisal or threat appraisal as the outcome
4 (criterion) variable. Next, to examine the predictive value of the cognitive components on
5 emotions, we conducted three hierarchical regression analyses with the emotions (anxiety,
6 excitement, and happiness) as the outcome variables. For this analysis, self-efficacy, control,
7 avoidance and approach goals were entered in Step 1, and challenge appraisal and threat
8 appraisal were entered in Step 2, whereas the TCTSA proposes that a challenge state is
9 related to approach goals and a threat state to avoidance goals, it does not suggest that
10 avoidance goals are linked to challenge states nor that approach goals are linked to threat
11 states. Jones et al., (2009) noted that research on achievement goals and challenge and threat
12 states was in its early stages, and so we took the opportunity to examine the role of avoidance
13 goals in challenge states and approach goals in threat states. Finally, interpretation of
14 emotional state was measured by a three step hierarchical regression analysis. Emotions
15 (anxiety, excitement, and happiness) were entered in Step 1 to control for the emotional
16 response, self-efficacy, control, avoidance and approach goals were entered in Step 2, and
17 challenge appraisal and threat appraisal were entered in Step 3. The Durbin Watson statistic
18 was close to the recommended value of 2 (Field, 2009) and collinearity diagnostics showed
19 that variance inflation factors (VIF) were below 10.00 (Field, 2009) for all analyses.

20

Results

21 Preliminary Analysis

22 Descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients for the cognitive resources and
23 emotional responses are presented in Table 1. The data were screened for outliers and normal
24 distribution. Most of the variables were normally distributed, except for the variable
25 dejection. The non-normal distribution of dejection could be explained by the low variability

1 in the scores for this emotion, most participants ($n = 110$) reported that they did not
2 experience dejection. The data show that challenge appraisals were positively correlated with
3 threat appraisals and anxiety; threat appraisals were positively correlated with challenge
4 appraisals, anxiety, dejection, anger, and avoidance goals and negatively correlated with self-
5 efficacy. Interpretation of emotional state was positively correlated with self-efficacy and
6 negatively correlated with avoidance goals.

7

8 ***INSERT TABLE 1 NEAR HERE***

9

10 **Cognitive Resources**

11 The results for the linear regression revealed that the cognitive variables self-efficacy,
12 control, approach goals and avoidance goals did not significantly predict challenge appraisal
13 ($R^2 = .02$, $p = .54$). In contrast, cognitive variables predicted threat appraisal ($R^2 = .16$, $p <$
14 $.001$); avoidance goals was the only significant predictor of threat appraisal ($\beta = .36$, $p <$
15 $.001$). Self-efficacy ($\beta = -.15$, $p = .06$) and approach goals ($\beta = -.16$, $p = .06$) were nearing
16 significance.

17 Challenge and threat appraisal were positively correlated, therefore the cognitive
18 resource model was re-run with challenge appraisal or threat appraisal entered in Step 1 (see
19 Table 2) to partial out the effects of challenge appraisal on threat appraisal and vice versa.
20 After entering challenge appraisal at Step 1, self-efficacy ($\beta = -.14$, $p = .05$), approach goals
21 ($\beta = -.20$, $p < .001$) and avoidance goals ($\beta = .38$, $p < .001$) predicted threat appraisal in the
22 expected ways ($\Delta R^2 = .17$, $p < .001$). After entering threat appraisal at Step 1, there was an
23 improvement of the fit of the model, with approach goals ($\beta = .20$, $p = .02$) and avoidance
24 goals ($\beta = -.22$, $p = .01$) predicting challenge appraisal in the expected direction. Step 2

1 approached significance ($\Delta R^2 = .05$, $p = .06$); no single predictor added at Step 2 was
2 significant.

3

4 ***INSERT TABLE 2 NEAR HERE***

5

6 **Affective Responses**

7 The results for the hierarchical regression analysis for anxiety showed a significant
8 effect at Step 1 ($R^2 = .25$, $p < .001$), with self-efficacy ($\beta = -.22$, $p = .005$) and avoidance
9 goals ($\beta = .41$, $p < .001$) as significant predictor variables. The addition of challenge and
10 threat appraisals at Step 2 showed a significant improvement in model fit, $\Delta R^2 = .11$, $p <$
11 $.001$, for challenge appraisal ($\beta = .18$, $p = .01$), and for threat appraisal ($\beta = .25$, $p = .002$).

12 Excitement was positively predicted by both self-efficacy ($\beta = .17$, $p = .03$) and
13 approach goals ($\beta = .23$, $p = .01$), and negatively predicted by avoidance goals ($\beta = -.18$, $p =$
14 $.03$). These components accounted for 11.7% of the variance in excitement. The addition of
15 challenge and threat appraisals was not significant. For happiness, cognitive variables
16 accounted for 6.2% explained variance although no significant beta weights were observed
17 for any of the cognitive variables. The addition of challenge appraisal and threat appraisal at
18 Step 2 did not result in a significant improvement in model fit.

19 Avoidance goals predicted both threat appraisal and anxiety, and threat appraisal
20 predicted anxiety, therefore the data pointed to a possible mediating effect. Mediation
21 analysis was performed using protocols outlined by Baron and Kenny (1986) and Kenny,
22 Kashy, and Bolger (1998). This involved three steps; in the first step the outcome variable
23 (anxiety) was regressed on the predictor variable (avoidance) and in the second step the
24 mediator variable (threat appraisal) was regressed on the predictor variable (avoidance). Both
25 of these steps were significant, which is a requirement for mediation to occur. In the third

1 step, the outcome variable (anxiety) was regressed on both the predictor (avoidance) and
2 mediator (threat appraisal) variables. When there is a full mediation effect, the association
3 between avoidance and anxiety would be non-significant (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Although
4 this relation was not attenuated to non-significance, the relation between the predictor and
5 outcome was smaller with the mediator (threat appraisal) included in the model ($B = .22$ vs. B
6 $= .30$). This change in beta-weight was significant (Sobel's $z = 3.60$, $p < .001$) suggesting
7 partial mediation. Threat appraisal partially mediates the relationship between anxiety and
8 avoidance goals.

9 Interpretation of emotional state was measured by a three step hierarchical regression
10 analysis using a subsample of 107 participants. No significant effects were observed at Step 1
11 ($R^2 = .06$, $p = .19$) or Step 2 ($\Delta R^2 = .07$, $p = .21$). However, the addition of challenge and
12 threat appraisal at Step 3 revealed a significant effect ($\Delta R^2 = .09$, $p = .02$), threat appraisal
13 positively predicted the interpretation of emotional state ($\beta = .32$, $p = .01$) as well as self-
14 efficacy ($\beta = .25$, $p = .04$). Participants who reported feeling more threatened by an important
15 competition indicated that their emotional state was more helpful for their performance.

16 **Challenge and Threat Patterns**

17 A 2x2 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed to explore how
18 patterns of response on challenge and threat appraisals (high challenge/high threat, high
19 challenge/high threat, low challenge/low threat) relate to the cognitive and affective
20 variables. Only four participants (2%) scored high on threat and low on challenge and this
21 pattern was left out of the MANOVA. A separate one-way ANOVA was conducted for
22 interpretation of emotional state because fewer participants completed this item. The results
23 for the MANOVA showed a main effect for group (challenge/threat pattern), Wilks $\lambda = .770$,
24 $F(14, 274) = 2.74$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .12$. Univariate tests using Bonferroni correction showed
25 that there was a significant difference between the challenge and threat patterns in terms of

1 self-efficacy, $F(2, 143) = 3.58, p = .03, \eta_p^2 = .05$, avoidance goals, $F(2, 143) = 4.34, p = .02,$
2 $\eta_p^2 = .06$, and anxiety, $F(2, 143) = 14.39, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .17$. The high challenge/low threat
3 group scored higher on self-efficacy ($M = 3.79, SD = .55$) than the high challenge/high threat
4 group ($M = 3.48, SD = .68, p = .03$). For avoidance goals, the high challenge/low threat group
5 scored lower ($M = 3.90, SD = 1.29$) than the high challenge/high threat group ($M = 4.64, SD$
6 $= 1.20, p = .01$). For anxiety, the high challenge/high threat group reported higher scores (M
7 $= 2.45, SD = .86$) than the low challenge/low threat group ($M = 1.52, SD = .76, p < .001$) and
8 the high challenge/low threat group ($M = 1.74, SD = .77, p < .001$). There were no significant
9 differences between the challenge and threat patterns and control, $F(2, 143) = 1.90, p = .15,$
10 $\eta_p^2 = .03$, approach goals, $F(2, 143) = 0.19, p = .83, \eta_p^2 = .003$, excitement, $F(2, 143) =$
11 $0.26, p = .77, \eta_p^2 = .004$, happiness, $F(2, 143) = 0.01, p = .99, \eta_p^2 = .00$, and interpretation of
12 emotional state, $F(2, 94) = 3.00, p = .06, \eta_p^2 = .06$.

13 Discussion

14 We examined relations among self-efficacy, perceived control, approach and
15 avoidance goals, emotions, interpretation of emotions and challenge and threat appraisals
16 before competing in an important competition. In this sample of collegiate level athletes the
17 results supported some, but not all, of the predictions made by the TCTSA. Threat appraisal
18 was positively predicted by avoidance goals and negatively predicted by self-efficacy and
19 approach goals. Anxiety was negatively predicted by self-efficacy and positively predicted by
20 avoidance goals, and positively predicted by both challenge and threat appraisals. Excitement
21 was positively predicted by self-efficacy and approach goals, and negatively predicted by
22 avoidance goals. This finding suggests that, for collegiate athletes, the pattern predicted by
23 the TCTSA (control excepted) is only observed when athletes are in a threat state.
24 Collectively, the results provide partial support for theory (TCTSA) and accord with previous

1 research demonstrating the association between cognitive components of challenge and threat
2 states and emotions (Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Sideridis, 2008).

3 The cognitive components of challenge and threat states were associated with
4 emotions. Consistent with similar investigations (Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Sideridis, 2008),
5 results showed that mastery avoidance goals positively predicted anxiety. Thus, the athletes
6 who reported greater anxiety before competitions reported higher avoidance goals compared
7 to those who had lower levels of anxiety before competition. This suggests that anxious
8 individuals are less engaged in competition (Elliot, Cury, Fryer, & Huguet, 2006), for
9 example, an anxious basketball player does not demand the ball as often as his team-mates.
10 This effect was partially mediated by threat appraisal, thus avoidance goals could influence
11 anxiety directly, but also indirectly, through their appraisals of the situation as a threat. In
12 addition, the results showed that there was a positive association between approach goals and
13 interpretation of emotional state and a negative association between avoidance goals and
14 interpretation of emotional state. Thus, those who perceived their emotional state as
15 beneficial to performance reported more approach goals and fewer avoidance goals. This
16 finding is in line with the predictions made by the TCTSA.

17 How athletes perceive an upcoming sport competition and their available resources,
18 such as self-efficacy and achievement goals, plays an important role in determining anxiety
19 responses. The present study shows that perceived available resources also predict other
20 emotional states such as excitement and happiness. For happiness, the combination of self-
21 efficacy, goal orientations, and control contributed more than the constructs separately, which
22 provides support for the combination of cognitive variables as outlined by the TCTSA. Also,
23 the higher a participant scored on threat appraisal, the more helpful they interpreted their
24 emotional state to be. This is important given the strong associations shown between
25 emotional interpretation and sport performance (Swain & Jones, 1996). The finding that

1 threat appraisal was positively related to interpretation of emotional states, however, is
2 inconsistent with our initial hypothesis and previous work. Skinner and Brewer (2004)
3 proposed that a beneficial interpretation of emotional state is related to a challenge; however
4 mild or weak levels of emotions, specifically anxiety (Carver, 1996), were not associated
5 with a strong interpretation of emotional state as beneficial or harmful for performance. It is
6 possible that the low intensity of some of the emotional responses in this study contributed to
7 these findings and therefore we encourage researchers to externally validate these findings in
8 more competitive environments where emotional responses may be greater. Also, participants
9 could have interpreted the scale measuring interpretation of emotional state in terms of
10 helpfulness only and this might have excluded the perception that the emotional state can also
11 be considered as harmful for performance. Furthermore, because we asked participants how
12 they felt in general in sport competition, we may have assessed an individual's disposition to
13 perceive a motivated performance situation as a challenge or a threat rather than assessing
14 actual appraisals in competition, with the latter being more sensitive to the demands of the
15 situation (cf. Roesch & Rowley, 2005). By collecting data in competitive situations, the
16 relationship between demand and resource appraisals can be fully elucidated.

17 There are at least three possible reasons why the TCTSA was not fully supported in
18 this sample. First, the control measure posed problems because of its low internal consistency
19 and, although it was included in main analyses, it did not predict responses in either challenge
20 or threat states. Therefore, we cannot be entirely confident that control does not play a role in
21 challenge and threat states. In addition, participants could have drawn on previous
22 experiences when imagining how they typically feel before an important competition,
23 therefore attribution theory might have influenced the findings for control. For successful
24 performance self-efficacy and controllability were not associated, whereas for less successful
25 performance self-efficacy and controllability were positively related (Coffee & Rees, 2008).

1 When recalling a successful performance, controllable or uncontrollable causes of this
2 successful performance showed to have little influence on subsequent self-efficacy beliefs
3 (Coffee & Rees, 2008). This appears to partially explain why the patterns predicted by the
4 TCTSA were only observed in a threat state. Second, the scenarios envisaged by the
5 collegiate athletes may not have sufficient demand characteristics to generate strong
6 psychological responses similar to those normally experienced pre-competition. This is
7 perhaps best evidenced by scores around the mid-range for the emotional responses to the
8 scenario, although we did assess participants' perceptions of their ability to complete the
9 questionnaires accurately and this manipulation check has been used successfully in past
10 research (Jones & Uphill, 2004).

11 Third, athletes typically reported the upcoming competition to be challenging, and not
12 very threatening. Most participants displayed a pattern where they scored high in challenge
13 and low in threat. In a setting where it can be expected that athletes normally describe
14 upcoming competitions as a challenge rather than a threat, the use of the words challenging
15 and threatening in the self-report measures may not accurately reflect how athletes
16 psychologically describe competition. Cerin (2003) has shown that participants can
17 cognitively appraise an upcoming competition as both a challenge and a threat, rather than
18 appraising an upcoming competition as one or the other. This finding suggests that the
19 dichotomous approach proposed by the TCTSA, at least for the self-reported appraisals of
20 challenge and threat, is too simplistic in a sport setting, particularly considering the findings
21 that challenge and threat appraisal were positively related in the present study. Further
22 exploration of challenge and threat patterns showed that the high challenge/high threat pattern
23 scored higher on anxiety than the low challenge/low threat and high challenge/low threat
24 pattern and the high challenge/low threat pattern reported higher self-efficacy and less
25 avoidance goals than the high challenge/high threat pattern. The findings for the challenge

1 and threat patterns illustrate that challenge and threat do not appear to be opposite ends of a
2 continuum, as the different patterns appear to elucidate distinct responses.

3 In addition to the methodological limitations noted earlier, the present study did not
4 explore the cardiovascular activation associated with challenge and threat states. This forms a
5 key part of the biopsychosocial model and latterly the TCTSA. In future researchers should
6 include measures of cardiovascular reactivity and self-report measures to outline the nature of
7 challenge and threat states in an athletic setting. Furthermore, the question of whether
8 challenge and threat appraisals reflect a particular style, or rather fluctuate as demand
9 characteristics and resource appraisals change, could be explored. In addition, as task
10 engagement could be an issue, in future researchers could examine the relation between
11 perceived effort and challenge and threat states. These latter demands were not assessed in
12 the present study and it has been proposed that challenge and threat states may reflect
13 changes in demand rather than simply changes in resource appraisals (Wright & Kirby,
14 2003).

15 Practical implications of the present study are that an avoidance orientation relates to
16 potentially negative constructs such as anxiety, threat appraisal, and dejection. In addition,
17 the findings of the present study provide some insight into the associations between cognitive
18 resources and affective responses of challenge and threat states of how athletes typically
19 respond to an upcoming competition. However, practitioners should be cautious using the
20 findings of the present study for applied practice as it is not clear how the combination of
21 constructs influence sport performance.

22 **References**

23 Adie, J. W., Duda, J. L., & Ntoumanis, N. (2008). Achievement goals, competition

- 1 appraisals, and the psychological and emotional welfare of sport participants. *Journal*
2 *of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 30(3), 302-322. Retrieved from
3 <http://journals.humankinetics.com/jsep>
- 4 Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and*
5 *Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T
- 6 Anshel, M. H., & Wells, B. (2000). Personal and situational variables that describe coping
7 with acute stress in competitive sport. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 140(4), 434-450.
8 doi:10.1080/00224540009600483
- 9 Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: Freeman.
- 10 Bandura, A., & Wood, R. (1989). Effect of perceived controllability and
11 performance standards on self-regulation of complex decision making.
12 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(5), 805-814. doi:10.1037/0022-
13 3514.56.5.805
- 14 Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction
15 in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations.
16 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173-1182. doi:10.1037/0022-
17 3514.51.6.1173
- 18 Blascovich, J., & Mendes, W. B. (2000). Challenge and threat appraisals: The role of
19 affective cues. In J. P. Forgas (Ed.), *Feeling and thinking: The role of affect in social*
20 *cognition* (pp. 59–82). Paris: Cambridge University Press.
- 21 Blascovich, J., Seery, M. D., Mugridge, C. A., Norris, R. K., & Weisbuch, M.
22 (2004). Predicting athletic performance from cardiovascular indexes of challenge and
23 threat. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40(5), 683-688.
24 doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2003.10.007
- 25 Blascovich, J., & Tomaka, J. (1996). The biopsychosocial model of arousal regulation.

- 1 Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 28, 1-51. doi:10.1016/S0065-
2 2601(08)60235-X.
- 3 Bonetti, D., & Johnston, M. (2008). Perceived control predicting the recovery of
4 individual-specific walking behaviours following stroke: Testing psychological
5 models and constructs. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 13(3), 463-478.
6 doi:10.1348/135910707X216648
- 7 Campbell, E., & Jones, G. (2002). Cognitive appraisals of sources of stress experienced by
8 elite male wheelchair basketball players. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 19(1),
9 100-108. Retrieved from <http://journals.humankinetics.com/apaq>
- 10 Carver, C. S. (1996). Cognitive interference and the structure of behavior. In I. G.
11 Sarason, G. R. Pierce, & B. R. Sarason (Eds.), *Cognitive interference: Theories,*
12 *methods and findings* (pp. 25-45). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- 13 Cerin, E. (2003). Anxiety versus fundamental emotions as predictors of perceived
14 functionality of pre-competitive emotional states, threat, and challenge in individual
15 sports. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 15(3), 223-238.
16 doi:10.1080/10413200305389
- 17 Coffee, P., & Rees, T. (2008). Main and interactive effects of controllability and
18 generalisability attributions upon self-efficacy. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*,
19 9(6), 775-785. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2007.12.002
- 20 Conner, M., & Sparks, P. (1996). The theory of planned behaviour and health
21 behaviours. In M. Conner & P. Norman (Eds.), *Predicting health behaviour* (pp. 121-
22 162). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- 23 Conroy, D. E., Elliot, A. J., & Hofer, S. M. (2003). A 2x2 achievement goals

- 1 questionnaire for sport: Evidence for factorial invariance, temporal stability, and
2 external validity. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 25(4), 456-476. Retrieved
3 from <http://journals.humankinetics.com/jsep>
- 4 Elliot, A. J., Cury, F., Fryer, J. W., & Huguet, P. (2006). Achievement goals, self-
5 handicapping, and performance attainment: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Sport*
6 & *Exercise Psychology*, 28(3), 344-361. Retrieved from
7 <http://journals.humankinetics.com/jsep>
- 8 Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2 × 2 achievement goal framework.
9 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(3), 501-519. doi:10.1037/0022-
10 3514.80.3.501
- 11 Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London, UK: Sage.
- 12 Hanton, S., Neil, R., & Mellalieu, S. D. (2008). Recent developments in competitive
13 anxiety direction and competition stress. *International Review of Sport and Exercise*,
14 1(1), 45-57. doi:10.1080/17509840701827445
- 15 Jones, G. (1995). More than just a game: Research developments and issues in
16 competitive anxiety in sport. *British Journal of Psychology*, 86(4), 449-478. doi:
17 10.1111/j.2044-8295.1995.tb02565.x
- 18 Jones, M. V., Lane, A. M., Bray, S. R., Uphill, M., & Catlin, J. (2005). Development
19 and validation of the sport emotion questionnaire. *Journal of Sport & Exercise*
20 *Psychology*, 27(4), 407-431. Retrieved from <http://journals.humankinetics.com/jsep>
- 21 Jones, M. V., Meijen, C., McCarthy, P. J., & Sheffield, D. (2009). A theory of
22 challenge and threat states in athletes. *International Review of Sport and Exercise*
23 *Psychology*, 2(2), 161-180. doi:10.1080/17509840902829331
- 24 Jones, M. V., & Uphill, M. (2004). Responses to the Competitive State Anxiety
25 Inventory-2(d) by athletes in anxious and excited scenarios. *Psychology of*

- 1 Sport and Exercise, 5(2), 201-212. doi:10.1016/S1469-0292(02)00054-7
- 2 Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31-36. doi:
3 10.1007/BF02291575
- 4 Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Bolger, N. (1998). Data analysis in social psychology. In D.
5 T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology*, (pp.
6 233-265). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- 7 Lazarus, R. S. (1999). *Stress and emotion: A new synthesis*. New York, NY: Springer
8 Publishing Company.
- 9 Lazarus, R. S. (2000). How emotions influence performance in competitive sports.
10 *The Sport Psychologist*, 14(3), 229-252. Retrieved from
11 <http://journals.humankinetics.com/tsp>
- 12 Lazarus, R.S. & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal and coping*. New York, NY:
13 Springer.
- 14 McGregor, H. A., & Elliot, A. J. (2002). Achievement goals as predictors of
15 achievement-relevant processes prior to task engagement. *Journal of Educational*
16 *Psychology*, 94(2), 381-395. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.94.2.381
- 17 Mellalieu, S. D., Hanton, S., & Fletcher, D. (2006). A competitive anxiety review:
18 Recent directions in sport psychology research. In S. Hanton, & S. D.
19 Mellalieu (Eds.), *Literature reviews in sport psychology* (pp. 1-45).
20 Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.
- 21 Mendes, W. B., McCoy, S., Major, B., & Blascovich, J. (2008). How attributional
22 ambiguity shapes physiological and emotional responses to social rejection and
23 acceptance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(2), 278-291.
24 doi:10.1037/0022-3514.94.2.278

- 1 Roesch, S. C., & Rowley, A. A. (2005). Evaluating and developing a multidimensional,
2 dispositional measure of appraisal. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 85(2), 188-
3 196. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa8502_11
- 4 Seery, M. D. (2011). Challenge or threat? Cardiovascular indexes of resilience and
5 vulnerability to potential stress in humans. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*,
6 35(7), 1603-1610. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2011.03.003
- 7 Sideridis, G. D. (2008). The regulation of affect, anxiety, and stressful arousal from
8 adopting mastery-avoidance goal orientations. *Stress and Health*, 24(1), 55-69. doi:
9 10.1002/smi.1160
- 10 Skinner, N., & Brewer, N. (2004). Adaptive approaches to competition: Challenge
11 appraisals and positive emotion. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*,
12 26(2), 283-305. Retrieved from <http://journals.humankinetics.com/jsep>
- 13 Skinner, E. A. (1996). A guide to constructs of control. *Journal of Personality and*
14 *Social Psychology*, 71(3), 549-570. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.71.3.549
- 15 Sobel, M. E. (1982). Asymptotic intervals for indirect effects in structural equation models.
16 In S. Leinhardt (Ed.), *Sociological methodology* (pp. 290-312). San Francisco, CA:
17 Jossey-Bass.
- 18 Stevens, J. (1996). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. Mahwah, NJ:
19 Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 20 Swain, A. B. J., & Jones, G. (1996). Explaining performance variance: The relative
21 contribution of intensity and direction dimensions of competitive state anxiety.
22 *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping: An International Journal*, 9(1), 1-18.
23 doi:10.1080/10615809608249389
- 24 Tomaka, J., Blascovich, J., Kibler, J., & Ernst, J. M. (1997). Cognitive and
25 physiological antecedents of threat and challenge appraisal. *Journal of*

- 1 Personality and Social Psychology, 73(1), 63-72. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.63
- 2 Williams, S. E., Cumming, J., & Balanos, G. M. (2010). The use of imagery to
- 3 manipulate challenge and threat states in athletes. Journal of Sport & Exercise
- 4 Psychology, 32(3), 339-358. Retrieved from <http://journals.humankinetics.com/jsep>
- 5 Wright, R. A., & Kirby, L. D. (2003). Cardiovascular correlates of challenge and
- 6 threat appraisals: A critical examination of the biopsychosocial analysis. Personality
- 7 and Social Psychology Review, 7(3), 216-233. doi:10.1207/S15327957PSPR0703_02

Table 1: Summary of Means, Standard Deviation, and Correlations for Scores on Self-efficacy, Control, Approach Goals, Avoidance Goals, Emotions, Interpretation of Emotions and Challenge and Threat Appraisals

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1 Self efficacy	3.70	0.59	--														
2 Control	3.69	0.62	.31***	--													
3 Approach	5.36	0.89	.21**	.13	--												
4 Avoidance	4.25	1.34	-.09	-.09	.42***	--											
5 MAP	6.22	0.71	.29***	.22**	.57***	-.04	--										
6 MAV	4.74	1.48	-.24**	-.12	.25**	.82***	.04	--									
7 PAP	4.50	1.50	.12	.06	.92***	.52***	.20*	.28***	--								
8 PAV	3.75	1.71	.06	-.04	.44***	.86***	-.10	.41***	.57***	--							
9 Anxiety	1.93	0.87	-.27**	-.11	.13	.47***	-.02	.53***	.16*	.27**	--						
10 Anger	0.48	0.77	-.09	.03	.00	.22	-.19*	.14	.09	.23**	.23**	--					
11 Excitement	2.85	0.67	.26**	.12	.19*	-.14	.27*	-.15	.09	-.08	.03	.04	--				
12 Dejection	0.27	0.61	-.18*	.08	-.02	-.25**	-.18*	.24**	.06	.19*	.32***	.74***	-.04	--			
13 Happiness	2.26	0.98	-.20*	.19*	.03	-.13	.14	-.15	-.03	-.07	-.12	.16*	.55***	.21**	--		
14 Interpretation emotional state	3.05	0.86	.25**	.12	.07	-.20*	.26**	-.11	-.04	-.21*	-.09	-.01	.15	-.09	.18	--	
15 Challenge appraisal	3.05	0.93	-.01	-.06	.10	.02	.15	.09	.05	-.04	.29***	-.11	.05	-.04	-.05	.16	--
16 Threat appraisal	1.72	1.14	-.23**	-.15	-.02	.34***	-.19*	.42***	.06	.17*	.47***	.17*	-.07	.17*	-.07	.12	.33***

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. MAP = mastery-approach goals, MAV = mastery-avoidance goals, PAP = performance-approach goals, PAV = performance-avoidance goals.

Table 2: Regression Analyses for Self-efficacy, Control, Approach Goals and Avoidance Goals Predicting Challenge Appraisal and Threat Appraisal

	Challenge			Threat		
	B	SE b	<i>B</i>	B	SE b	<i>B</i>
Step 1						
Challenge or Threat	0.28	0.06	.33*	0.40	0.09	.33*
Step 2						
Challenge or Threat	0.34	0.07	.41	0.42	0.08	.35*
Self-efficacy	0.06	0.13	.04	-0.27	0.14	-.14
Control	-0.09	0.12	-.06	-0.05	0.13	-.03
Approach	0.21	0.09	.20	-0.26	0.10	-.20*
Avoidance	-0.15	0.06	-.22	0.32	0.06	.38*

Note. Challenge $R^2 = .11$, $p < .001$ for Step 1, $\Delta R^2 = .05$, $p = .06$ for Step 2. Threat $R^2 = .11$, $p < .001$ for Step 1, $\Delta R^2 = .17$, $p < .001$ for Step 2.

* $p < .001$