

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Anstiss, Paul and Meijen, Carla and Madigan, Daniel J. and Marcora, Samuele Maria (2018) Development and Initial Validation of the Endurance Sport Self-efficacy Scale (ESSES). *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 38 . pp. 176-183. ISSN 1469-0292.

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.06.015>

Link to record in KAR

<http://kar.kent.ac.uk/67610/>

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 Accepted version – before final proof

2 Psychology of Sport and Exercise. DOI: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.06.015

3

4

5 Development and Initial Validation of the Endurance Sport Self-efficacy Scale (ESSES)

6

7 Paul A. Anstiss¹, Carla Meijen², Daniel J. Madigan³, Samuele M. Marcora¹

8 1. School of Sport and Exercise Sciences, University of Kent, United Kingdom

9 2. School of Sport, Health, and Applied Science, St Mary's University, United Kingdom

10 3. School of Sport, York St John University, United Kingdom

11 Corresponding Author: Paul A. Anstiss, School of Sport and Exercise Sciences, University of

12 Kent, Medway Campus, Chatham, Kent, UK, ME4 4AG. Email; pa298@kent.ac.uk.

13 Conflicts of Interest: No conflicts of interest to declare.

14 Abstract

15 Self-efficacy is likely to be an important psychological construct for endurance sport
16 performance. Research into the role of self-efficacy, however, is limited as there is currently
17 no validated measure of endurance sport self-efficacy. Consequently, the purpose of the
18 present research was to develop and validate the Endurance Sport Self-Efficacy Scale
19 (ESSES). In Study 1, an initial item pool was developed following a review of the literature.
20 These items were then examined for content validity by an expert panel. In Study 2, the
21 resultant 18 items were subjected to exploratory factor analyses. These analyses provided
22 support for a unidimensional scale comprised of 11 items. Study 2 also provided evidence for
23 the ESSES's convergent validity. In Study 3, using confirmatory factor analyses, further
24 support was found for the 11-item unidimensional structure. Study 3 also provided evidence
25 for the ESSES's convergent and concurrent validity. The present findings provide initial
26 evidence that the ESSES is a valid and reliable measure of self-efficacy beliefs in endurance
27 sports.

28 Keywords: endurance, performance, belief, questionnaire, efficacy

29

Introduction

30 Endurance sports are characterised by the performance of continuous, dynamic, and
31 whole-body exercise tasks (Burnley & Jones, 2007). These tasks are commonly seen in
32 activities such as running, cycling, and swimming, or in a combination of these (e.g.,
33 triathlon). The duration of these events can range from minutes to days. During these periods,
34 endurance athletes must maintain high levels of effort and perseverance in order to counteract
35 both physical and cognitive fatigue (Marcora, Bosio, & de Morree, 2009; Marcora, Staiano,
36 & Manning, 2009). Alongside persevering with fatigue, endurance athletes must also engage
37 in effective self-regulation strategies relating to pacing (Renfree, Martin, Micklewright, & St
38 Clair Gibson, 2014), attention (Brick, MacIntyre, & Campbell, 2014), and coping (Kress &
39 Statler, 2007; Zepp, 2016). A recent review identified several psychological determinants of
40 endurance performance (McCormick, Meijen, & Marcora, 2015). One key psychological
41 factor highlighted by McCormick et al.'s review, and which has been consistently linked with
42 self-regulation, attention, and coping, is self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997).

43 Self-Efficacy

44 Self-efficacy refers to the “belief in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the
45 courses of action required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p.3) and represents
46 the behaviours and skills an individual believes they can successfully perform. Importantly,
47 self-efficacy beliefs are not just in reference to the skills or abilities an individual possesses
48 but rather what they believe they can do with them (Bandura, 1997). For example, an athlete
49 may possess a high level of physical fitness, but if they do not believe they are capable of
50 utilising this fitness in a competitive environment it will count for little towards their self-
51 efficacy.

52 Self-efficacy beliefs are formed through a series of cognitive processes involving the
53 selection, interpretation, and integration of several sources of information (Bandura, 1997).

54 These sources include past performance experiences, vicarious influences, social and verbal
55 persuasions, and perceptions of physiological and emotional states (see Samson & Solmon,
56 2011 for a review). In addition to an understanding of the task demands and the perceived
57 ease and difficulty of the task, these sources will help provide an individual with an
58 understanding of their own capability (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). Once these beliefs are formed
59 they can have a powerful effect on an individual's cognitions and behaviour. For example,
60 individuals high in self-efficacy typically set more challenging goals (Locke & Latham,
61 2002), put more effort into tasks (Hutchinson, Sherman, Martinovic, & Tenenbaum, 2008),
62 and are more willing to persevere when faced with difficulties (Feltz, Short, & Sullivan,
63 2008).

64 **Self-Efficacy and Endurance Performance**

65 Self-efficacy has been associated with better performance in several endurance sports.
66 Burke and Jin (1996) reported that self-efficacy was a stronger positive predictor of Ironman
67 triathlon performance than performance history, maximal oxygen consumption, and sport
68 confidence. Similarly, Okwumabua (1985) reported that pre-event self-efficacy explained
69 40% of the variance in marathon performance. Other studies have also established that self-
70 efficacy is associated with better performance in track running (LaGuardia & Labbé, 1993),
71 cross country running (Martin & Gill, 1995) and swimming (Miller, 1993).

72 There exist several possible psychological and physiological mechanisms through
73 which self-efficacy may enable better endurance performance. On a psychological level, both
74 perception of pain (Astokorki & Mauger, 2014; Mauger, 2014) and perception of effort (
75 Marcora, Bosio, & de Morree, 2008) have been suggested to be key determinants of
76 endurance performance. Attesting to the possible role of self-efficacy in influencing these
77 perceptions, self-efficacy has been associated with improvements in pain tolerance (Johnson,
78 Stewart, Humphries, & Chamove, 2014) and also with reductions in perceptions of effort

79 (McAuley & Blissmer, 2000). On a physiological level, running economy and maximal
80 oxygen consumption (VO₂max) are two key physiological determinants of endurance
81 performance (Joyner & Coyle, 2009). Again, self-efficacy has been associated with
82 improvements in running economy (Stoate, Wulf, & Lewthwaite, 2012) and maximal oxygen
83 consumption (Montes, Wulf, & Navalta, 2017).

84 Self-efficacy appears to be an important factor for endurance performance. The
85 assessment of this importance, however, is contingent on being able to adequately measure
86 relevant self-efficacy beliefs. Here several limitations are evident in the existing literature.
87 First, previous studies have not followed recommendations for self-efficacy scale
88 development (Bandura, 1997, 2006). For example, Stoate, Wulf, and Lethwaite (2012)
89 measured self-efficacy using a scale which conceptualised self-efficacy in the form of “will”
90 rather than “can”. This is problematic because “will” generally refers to an individual’s
91 intention as opposed to an individual’s perceived capability (Bandura, 2006).

92 Second, for those studies which have employed multi-item scales, self-efficacy was
93 typically assessed in terms of ascending or descending performance times (Burke & Jin,
94 1996; LaGuardia & Labbé, 1993) or distances (Bueno et al., 2008). Such scales are known as
95 hierarchical self-efficacy scales (Feltz et al., 2008). Whereas this approach is common in
96 sport and exercise settings, Feltz and colleagues (2008) cautioned against an overreliance on
97 such scales as they result in an oversimplification of complex performances. Hierarchical
98 scales are popular as they typically report high levels of scale score reliability (Feltz et al.,
99 2008) and they do not require a deep understanding of the demands in that domain and,
100 therefore, they can easily be adapted to various study designs and scenarios.

101 Whereas such scales have helped provide evidence for the link between self-efficacy
102 and performance, they often possess limited practical benefit for practitioners, coaches, and
103 athletes. For instance, two athletes could both perceive themselves as not capable of

104 achieving a certain time for a race/to cover a certain distance in a given time. For one athlete,
105 this may be due to the belief that they are unable to pace themselves appropriately, whereas
106 for the other athlete this may be due to the belief they are not capable of tolerating exercise-
107 induced pain. A hierarchical scale would not allow us to differentiate between these two
108 reasons and instead would merely suggest that both athletes perceive themselves incapable of
109 achieving that time or covering that distance. This approach thus limits the possibility of
110 accurate interventions (Bandura, 1997; Feltz et al., 2008). The measurement of these
111 behaviours and skills would be best served through the use of a non-hierarchical scale.

112 Non-hierarchical scales look to assess an individual's self-efficacy across the full range
113 of subskills that underpin performance in that domain (Feltz et al., 2008). Given the
114 similarities in the demands and determinants of performance across endurance sports (Brick,
115 MacIntyre, & Campbell, 2016; McCormick et al., 2016; Renfree et al., 2014), it is likely that
116 there are common subskills which underpin performance across all endurance sports.
117 Therefore, the development of a endurance sport-specific scale would be beneficial because it
118 would provide practical implications for the design and delivery of self-efficacy
119 interventions, as well as allowing further exploration of both the theoretical determinants
120 (e.g., coaching, task difficulty, perceived fatigue) and outcomes (e.g., perception of effort,
121 perseverance, performance) of self-efficacy beliefs.

122 **The Present Research**

123 There is currently no validated non-hierarchical scale of self-efficacy for endurance
124 sports. Given the potential importance of self-efficacy in endurance performance, the
125 development of such a scale would be beneficial for both practical and theoretical reasons.
126 Consequently, the aim of the present research was to develop the Endurance Sport Self-
127 Efficacy Scale (ESSES) that measures self-efficacy specific to the endurance sport domain.

128 We also sought to provide preliminary evidence for the validity and reliability of the ESSES.
129 In so doing, a series of three studies are presented.

130 **Study 1**

131 The purpose of Study 1 was for initial item and scale development. First, in line with
132 Bandura's (2006) recommendations for self-efficacy scale development, factors relating to
133 endurance performance were identified through literature searches and the research teams'
134 own conceptual knowledge, and items relating to these factors were developed. Next, the
135 items and scale were subjected to an expert panel for review in order to ensure high levels of
136 content validity.

137 **Method**

138 **Development of the Initial Item Pool**

139 In the construction of self-efficacy scales, Bandura (2006) urged that scales should be
140 specific to the chosen domain, and researchers should attempt to identify the key factors
141 relating to performance in these domains. Once these key factors have been identified, items
142 relating to these factors should be created allowing the measurement of specific self-efficacy
143 beliefs. This approach can help promote a scale which demonstrates improved sensitivity to
144 individual differences in self-efficacy beliefs and promotes a greater level of validity in that
145 domain (Bandura, 2006).

146 Performance in endurance sport is a complex mixture of physical, technical, and
147 psychological factors (Taylor et al., 1995). Relating to the physical factors, endurance
148 athletes aim to ensure they are physically prepared for their endurance sport (Jones & Carter,
149 2000) and they aim to manage exercise-induced sensations such as exercise pain, injury pain,
150 discomfort and exertion (Christensen, Brewer, & Hutchinson, 2015; Samson, Simpson,
151 Kamphoff, & Langlier, 2017; Schumacher, Becker, & Wiersma, 2016). In regards to the
152 technical aspect, endurance athletes must ensure they pace themselves appropriately to help

153 ensure high levels of performance (Renfree et al., 2014), ensure appropriate technique and
154 form (Novacheck, 1998), and they must also be able to maintain high levels of concentration
155 to aid this and other related decision-making processes (Brick, MacIntyre, & Campell, 2014).
156 Psychologically, endurance athletes must cope with a variety of stressors (Fletcher, Hanton,
157 & Mellalieu, 2006; Martin, 2002; McCormick et al., 2016), and ensure they manage any
158 unwanted thoughts (Holt, Lee, Kim, & Klein, 2014) and emotions (Lane & Wilson, 2011)
159 which may impede their performance.

160 From these physical, technical, and psychological factors, and based on relevant
161 literature, we developed an initial pool of 20 items. Following Bandura's (2006) guidance, we
162 ensured that these items were related to behaviours and skills that were rooted in the context
163 of performing in endurance sport. Rather than focusing on a specific situation, we instead
164 opted for a general domain focus. Although several self-efficacy researchers have cautioned
165 against attempts to measure "general" self-efficacy which exists across domains (Bandura
166 1997; Maddux & Gosselin, 2003), domain specific self-efficacy scales are a common
167 approach to conceptualisation and measurement of self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 2006; Feltz
168 et al., 2008). In a sport setting the Coaching Self-efficacy Scale (Feltz et al., 1999), the
169 Collective Team Efficacy Scale (Short et al., 2005), and the Refereeing Efficacy Scale
170 (Myers et al., 2012) all utilise a similar domain approach. Furthermore the development of a
171 more general domain scale can in turn inform and facilitate the development of more specific
172 self-efficacy scales (e.g., a running self-efficacy scale, or triathlon self-efficacy scale). For
173 example, the Coaching Self-efficacy Scale (Feltz et al., 1999) has been successfully adapted
174 to be specifically focused on high school coaches (Myers et al., 2008) and youth sport
175 coaches (Myers et al., 2011).

176 Additionally, whereas situation specific self-efficacy scales report greater predictive
177 power for performance (Moritz et al., 2000), they in turn possess less generalisability, and

178 instead can reflect more on the task and transient information (e.g. weather, perceptions of
179 energy), rather than the underlying self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 2006). As the primary aim
180 of the scale was not solely the prediction of performance, but instead to allow the
181 examination of theoretical determinants and outcomes, we felt justified in adopting this
182 general domain focus. In order to promote a high level of content validity, we operationalised
183 self-efficacy in our scale through the use of ‘can’ (Bandura 2006). In regards to the response
184 scale, we opted to use a 0-100 response scale separated with 10 point intervals. Such a scale
185 is commonly used in self-efficacy research (Bandura, 2006; Feltz et al., 2008) and has been
186 suggested to report higher levels of predictive power than those scales which use fewer
187 intervals (Pajares, Hartley, & Valiante, 2001). Considering the general domain focus, the use
188 of the word ‘can’ and the 0-100 response scale, the scale stem which proceeded the items
189 was:

190 “Below you will find a list of actions and skills that are important for endurance
191 performance. When you are taking part in your endurance sport, how confident are you
192 that can do the following things. In each case please rate your degree of confidence
193 from 0 (cannot do at all) to 100 (completely certain can do).”

194 **Expert Review**

195 For the purpose of content validation, two steps were undertaken. First, and in line
196 with best practice for the development of psychological questionnaires (e.g. Hill, Appleton, &
197 Mallinson, 2016), the question stem, the initial list of items, and the response options was
198 submitted to an independent panel of experts via email. The panel consisted of three
199 academics and two endurance sport coaches. The three academics were from different
200 institutions than the research team, and had published research either relating to endurance
201 psychology (n = 2) or self-efficacy scale development (n = 1) in international peer reviewed
202 journals. The two endurance sport coaches had 18 and 22 years of coaching in running and

203 triathlon respectively. This step was conducted to obtain information on each item's
204 perceived clarity and relevance, as well as highlighting any possible missed items (Dunn et
205 al., 1999).

206 Alongside this, following institutional ethical approval, interviews were conducted to
207 gain insight into how endurance athletes understood, processed, and responded to the
208 question stem, generated items, and response options (Dietrich & Ehrlenspiel, 2010). This
209 was deemed a particularly important aspect of the scale development, as endurance athletes
210 would be the end-user of the scale. Six competitive endurance athletes (runners = 2, cyclists =
211 2, triathletes = 2), who had been competing in their endurance sport for an average of 11.85
212 years ($SD = 2.81$) were recruited at this stage. To facilitate this process of understanding,
213 verbal probing was employed. Verbal probes were aimed at comprehension and interpretation
214 (e.g., what does this mean to you?), and at judgment and decision making (e.g., how did you
215 arrive at your answer?).

216 **Results and Discussion**

217 Comments from the expert panel supported the inclusion of 17 of the 20 items
218 submitted. Two items were suggested to be removed due to perceived similarity (e.g., 'Taper
219 appropriately' was deemed too similar to 'Prepare physically' and therefore 'Taper
220 appropriately' was removed), and one item was removed due to a perceived lack of relevance
221 across endurance sports ('Deal with difficult terrain'). Additionally, feedback from the expert
222 panel suggested the splitting of one item "Ensure appropriate nutrition and hydration" into
223 two separate items - "Ensure appropriate nutrition" and "Ensure appropriate hydration".
224 Although some further items were recommended for inclusion into the scale (e.g., Respond to
225 other competitors pacing decisions), we decided against this, as we felt that these were not
226 common across the endurance sport domain. The scale stem and response scale were deemed
227 to be satisfactory.

228 The interviews with the athletes suggested that the scale was clear and measured
 229 appropriate factors relating to endurance performance. When probed about the reason they
 230 gave the answers they provided, the athletes stated that they did so based on their own prior
 231 experiences. As self-efficacy beliefs are hypothesised to primarily be determined through
 232 prior experiences (Bandura, 1997), we took this as an indication of appropriate content
 233 validity. Overall this process resulted in an 18-item scale, named the ‘Endurance Sport Self-
 234 efficacy Scale’ (ESSES), which covered a range of different behaviours and skills relating to
 235 endurance performance.

236 **Study 2**

237 The primary purpose of Study 2 was to explore the factor structure and scale score
 238 reliability of the 18-item version of the ESSES. The secondary purpose was to provide
 239 evidence for the initial convergent validity of the ESSES. This was achieved via an
 240 examination of its relation with other validated self-efficacy scales.

241 **Method**

242 **Participants and Procedures**

243 Following institutional ethical approval, participants completed an online survey,
 244 hosted on the Bristol Online Survey system and were recruited either through social media
 245 (Facebook and Twitter) or emails to endurance sport clubs. Three hundred and forty three
 246 (233 male, 108 female, 2 other) participants completed the survey. The mean age was 38.42
 247 years ($SD = 14.29$) and participants had been taking part and competing in their endurance
 248 sport for an average of 10.97 years ($SD = 12.29$). Of the 343 participants, 137 were runners,
 249 52 were rowers, 50 were triathletes, 49 were cyclists, 49 were swimmers, and 7 were ‘other’.
 250 These ‘others’ consisted of three cross country skiers, two race-walkers, and two participants
 251 who did not specify their endurance sport.

252 **Measures**

253 The 18-item ESSES was administered with the same question stem and response
254 format as listed during Study 1. As there are no other validated measure of endurance self-
255 efficacy, we opted to use other measures which we hypothesised would be correlated with
256 endurance self-efficacy in order to assess the convergent validity of the ESSES. The
257 following four instruments were used:

258 **General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES).** The GSES is a 10-item scale that is designed to
259 assess optimistic self-beliefs to cope with a variety of difficult demands in life (e.g. “I can
260 solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort”) (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995).
261 Participants responded to each item on a four-point Likert scale which ranges from 1 (Not
262 true at all) to 4 (Exactly true). The scale reported acceptable scale score reliability ($\alpha = .78$).

263 **Coping Self-Efficacy Scale (CSES).** The CSES is a 26-item scale that is designed to
264 assess a person's perceived ability to cope effectively with life challenges and to employ
265 effective use of coping strategies (Chesney, Neilands, Chambers, Taylor, & Folkman, 2006).
266 It has three subscales: use of problem-focused coping (e.g. “I can make a plan of action and
267 follow it when confronted with a problem”), use of emotion-focused coping (e.g. “I can keep
268 from feeling sad), and received social support (e.g. “I can get friends to help me with the
269 things I need”). Participants responded to each item on a ten-point scale ranging from 1
270 (Cannot do at all) to 10 (Completely certain can do). All the subscales were internally
271 consistent ($\alpha = .77 — .85$).

272 **Barriers to Training Self-Efficacy Scale (BTSES).** The BTSES is an 18-item scale
273 (Bandura, 2006) that is designed to assess a person's perceived ability to maintain training
274 when faced with various stressors (e.g. “After recovering from an injury that prevented me
275 from training”). Participants responded to each item on an eleven-point scale ranging from 0
276 (Cannot do at all) to 100 (Completely certain can do). Good levels of internal consistency
277 were reported ($\alpha = .91$).

278 **Athletic Coping Skills Inventory (ACSI-28)**. The ACSI-28 is a 28-item scale that is
279 designed to measure coping use and effectiveness in athletes (Smith, Schutz, Smoll, &
280 Ptacek, 1995). It comprises seven sport specific subscales: coping with adversity (e.g. “I
281 handle unexpected situations in my sport very well”), peaking under pressure (e.g. “To me,
282 pressure situations are challenges that I welcome), goal setting and mental preparation (e.g. “I
283 set my own performance goals for each training”), concentration (e.g. “It is easy for me to
284 direct my attention and focus on a thing”), freedom from worry (e.g. “I worry quite a bit
285 about what others think of my performance”), confidence and motivation (e.g. “I feel
286 confident that I will perform well”), and coachability (e.g. “I improve my skills by listening
287 carefully to advice and instruction from coaches and peers”). Participants responded to each
288 item on a four-point scale ranging from 0 (Almost never) to 3 (Almost always). All the
289 subscales were internally consistent ($\alpha = .72 — .93$).

290 **Data Analysis**

291 In order to ascertain the factor structure of the ESSES, exploratory factor analysis
292 (EFA) was conducted in line with common recommendations (e.g., Costello & Osborne,
293 2005; Fabrigar et al., 1999; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Factor solutions and retention was
294 explored using principal axis factoring (PAF) with a promax rotation, and was assessed using
295 parallel analysis (using O’Connor, 2000). PAF was chosen as it is not dependent on
296 assumptions of multivariate normality (Costello & Osborne, 2005). A promax rotation was
297 chosen as self-efficacy beliefs are hypothesised to be correlated (Bandura, 1997). Such a
298 rotation is commonly used in self-efficacy scale development (e.g., Chesney et al., 2006;
299 Feltz et al., 1999). Factor solutions were then assessed upon theoretical interpretability,
300 structural and pattern coefficients ($> .40$), interpretability of cross-loadings, and
301 communalities ($> .20$) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

302 Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's α (Kline, 1998). Initial convergent validity
303 was assessed using correlational analysis between the ESSES, GSES, CSES, BTSES, and
304 ACSI-28. Cohen's (1992) guidelines of small ($r = .10$), medium ($r = .30$), and large ($r = .50$)
305 were used when interpreting correlations.

306 **Results and Discussion**

307 **Exploratory Factor Analysis**

308 The initial analyses based on the parallel analysis suggested the possibility of either a
309 one, two, or three factor solution (actual $\lambda_1 = 6.19$, $\lambda_2 = 1.42$, $\lambda_3 = 1.27$ vs. $\lambda_1 = 1.42$, $\lambda_2 =$
310 1.34 , $\lambda_3 = 1.28$ from parallel analysis). All possible factor solutions were investigated
311 considering item-loadings and the theoretical interpretability of the factors. Ultimately, we
312 decided to adopt a one factor (i.e. unidimensional) solution. This decision was based on several
313 reasons. First, in all the possible factor solution combinations, most of the items primarily
314 loaded onto the first factor. Second, the other items tended to display high levels of cross-
315 loading with this first factor. Third, although both the second and third factors were
316 theoretically interpretable, they were only formed from four and three items respectively.

317 In the process of scale refinement, we removed seven items. These items related to
318 skills and behaviours that are carried out prior to performance (e.g. Item-16 "Prepare physically
319 for demanding events"). Once removed, the unidimensional scale related to a variety of
320 behaviours and skills which are carried out during endurance sport performance. This included
321 behaviours and skills relating to psychological factors (e.g. Item-8 "Manage my thoughts
322 during events), physical factors (e.g. Item-1 "Deal with non-injury related pain), and technical
323 factors (e.g. Item-12 "Pace myself appropriately"). The final 11-item one-factor solution is
324 presented in Table 1.

325

326

327 **Reliability and Validity**

328 After establishing the factor structure of the ESSES, the next stage was to assess the
329 reliability and validity of the scale. In terms of scale score reliability, the ESSES displayed
330 acceptable Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = .88$). In terms of convergent validity, correlations between
331 the ESSES, the CSES, GSES, BTSES, and ACSI-28 are presented in Table 2. Examination of
332 the correlations between the ESSES and other scales revealed significant positive relations,
333 and these relations were typically medium and medium-to-large in size. This provides initial
334 evidence for the convergent validity of the ESSES.

335 In conclusion, Study 2 provided initial evidence for the ESSES as a measure of self-
336 efficacy for endurance sport. The unidimensional scale demonstrated good levels of scale
337 score reliability and convergent validity.

338 **Study 3**

339 Study 3 had **two aims**. First, we aimed to confirm the 11-item unidimensional
340 structure of the ESSES using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Second, we aimed to
341 provide further evidence for the validity of the ESSES. Specifically, we assessed the scale for
342 concurrent and criterion-related validity, by examining the relation between marathons
343 completed and maximal oxygen uptake (VO_{2max}) with the ESSES, using structural equation
344 modelling (SEM).

345 **Method**

346 **Participants and procedures**

347 As in Study 2, following institutional ethical approval, participants completed an online
348 survey which was hosted on the Bristol Online Survey system. Participants were recruited
349 through social media (Facebook & Twitter) and contacting endurance sport clubs in the
350 United Kingdom.

351 Participants for Study 3 consisted of two samples. Sample 1 consisted of 115
352 marathon runners (89 males) with a mean age of 39.84 years (SD = 10.25) who had been
353 competing in distance running for 12.47 years (SD = 11.59). Sample 2 consisted of 105
354 endurance athletes (63 males) with a mean age of 42.38 years (SD = 11.78). Thirty six of the
355 endurance athletes were runners, 17 were cyclists, 45 were triathletes, five were swimmers
356 and three were racewalkers. The athletes had been competing in their endurance sport for an
357 average of 11.32 years (SD = 10.03).

358 **Measures**

359 The 11-item ESSES was administered with the same question stem and response
360 format as listed during Study 1 and Study 2. In addition, in Sample 1, marathon runners were
361 asked to indicate their completed number of marathons. The purpose of this was to help
362 provide criterion validity for the ESSES, as experience is hypothesised to be a key
363 determinant of self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1997).

364 For Sample 2, participants were asked questions to estimate VO₂max. VO₂max was
365 estimated using formulas for men (Malek, Housh, Berger, Coburn, & Beck, 2005a), and
366 women (Malek, Housh, Berger, Coburn, & Beck, 2005b). Reported age (years), weight (kg),
367 height (cm), hours per week of exercise, duration that participants had consistently (no more
368 than one month without exercise) been exercising (in years), and a typical session rating of
369 perceived exertion (6-20 scale) was used to determine the VO₂max. VO₂max is the
370 maximum capacity of the body to consume oxygen during maximal exertion and is
371 considered an important physiological determinant in endurance performance (Joyner &
372 Coyle, 2008). As a further measure of concurrent validity, we hypothesised that the ESSES
373 would correlate with estimated VO₂max

374 **Data Analysis**

375 Model fit was assessed via confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using Mplus 8.0
376 (Muthén & Muthén, 2012) and robust maximum likelihood estimation. We used multiple
377 indexes to assess model fit for the CFA: $\chi^2(df)$ statistic, comparative fit index (CFI), tucker-
378 lewis index (TLI), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). The following
379 criteria were indicative of acceptable model fit: $>.90$ CFI, $>.90$ TLI, and $<.09$ RMSEA
380 (Marsh, Hau, & Wen, 2004). We then used SEM to examine the relation between the number
381 of marathons completed, estimated VO₂max, and scores on the ESSES in each of the relevant
382 samples.

383 Results and Discussion

384 Assessment of Factorial Structure

385 Our initial CFA provided an adequate fit to the data ($\chi^2(df) = 108.47(44)$ $p < .001$,
386 CFI = .92, TLI = .90, RMSEA = .08). These findings provide further support for the 11-item
387 unidimensional structure of the ESSES. Moreover, an examination of the standardised
388 parameter estimates from the CFA indicated that all loadings were significant and meaningful
389 (i.e. $> .04$). The factor loadings and uniquenesses of the CFA are reported in Table 3.

390 Validity

391 The results of the SEM based on Sample 1 revealed that the number of marathons
392 completed significantly predicted scores on the ESSES ($\beta = .28$, $p = .025$). Additionally, the
393 results of the SEM based on Sample 2 revealed that estimated VO₂max significantly
394 predicted scores on the ESSES ($\beta = .32$, $p = .001$). Taken together, these findings provide
395 further evidence for the concurrent and criterion-related validity of the ESSES.

396 General Discussion

397 Self-efficacy is likely to be an important factor in endurance performance (e.g., Burke
398 & Jin, 1996; LaGuardia & Labbé, 1992). To date, however, no non-hierarchical self-efficacy
399 measure has been developed for the endurance sport domain. To address this deficit, we

400 developed and validated the Endurance Sport Self-Efficacy Scale (ESSES). Through three
401 rigorous studies, aligned with best psychometric practice, we derived an 11-item scale that
402 assesses self-efficacy beliefs related to endurance performance.

403 The ESSES captures the breadth of physical, psychological, and technical facets
404 associated with endurance performance. For example, the management of exercise induced
405 sensations is often identified as a key demand of endurance performance in both quantitative
406 and qualitative research (Astokorki & Mauger, 2016; Marcora, 2009; McCormick et al.,
407 2016; Simpson, Post, Young, & Jensen, 2014). Similarly, intrusive thoughts and unwanted
408 emotions are commonly reported by endurance athletes and may interfere with performance
409 (Holt, Lee, Kim, & Klein, 2014; Lane & Wilson, 2014). Self-efficacy to control and manage
410 exercise induced sensations and intrusive thoughts and emotions is likely to be an important
411 factor in understanding and enhancing endurance performance.

412 Although endurance performance is underpinned by several different performance-
413 related facets, the ESSES was found to be unidimensional. This may be because of the
414 overlap that exists between the facets associated with endurance performance. For instance,
415 exercise-induced sensations have been demonstrated to be related to pacing decisions, ability
416 to maintain concentration, and the occurrence of unwanted thoughts and emotions (Mauger,
417 2014; McCormick, Meijen, Anstiss, & Jones, 2018; Whitehead et al., 2017). This level of
418 overlap between the facets, means that it is unlikely to identify distinct separate factors, and
419 that instead the ESSES can be best understood as relating to behaviours and skills which
420 occur during performance. It is this level of overlap that also resulted in the removal of seven
421 items generated in Study 1 that related to preparatory aspects of endurance performance. As
422 the goal of the current research was to develop a self-efficacy scale for endurance sport
423 performance, not preparation, we do not consider this to be a major limitation.

424 Our findings illustrate that the ESSES may be a reliable and valid measure. Regarding
425 reliability, we consistently reported high levels of scale score reliability. In addition, several
426 forms of validity were supported. For convergent validity, endurance sport self-efficacy
427 correlated positively with related self-efficacy beliefs (e.g. barriers to training) and use of
428 coping skills during competition. This is line with research that has demonstrated that self-
429 efficacy is associated with the use and maintenance of adaptive coping strategies during
430 competition (Kane et al., 1996). Regarding concurrent validity, in line with previous research
431 (e.g., Okwumabua, 1985), the number of marathons an athlete had completed predicted
432 ESSES scores. This provides further evidence for the association between self-efficacy and
433 prior experiences. This is important because prior success is hypothesised to be the key
434 source of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Feltz et al., 2008). Regarding criterion-related
435 validity, estimated VO_{2max} was a significant predictor of endurance sport self-efficacy.
436 Because of the physiological demands of endurance sports (Joyner & Coyle, 2009), the
437 possession of high levels of physical fitness (e.g., high VO_{2max}), are likely to lead to increased
438 perceived capability. This provides further support for research linking levels of physical
439 fitness and self-efficacy (Caruso & Gill, 1992).

440 **Limitations and Future Research**

441 The present research has two main limitations. First, our measure was derived from
442 cross-sectional data. This meant that we were unable to provide evidence for criterion or
443 predictive validity. It also meant that we could not examine test-retest reliability. To address
444 these issues, researchers should examine the predictive, criterion and test-retest reliability
445 validity of the ESSES in future studies. Second, for all three studies, we used convenience
446 sampling. Whereas this is common practice for research in sport, it may have biased the
447 sample (i.e., resulted in only individuals who already had an interest in the psychological
448 aspects of endurance performance participating in the study). In the same vein, it may be

449 possible that endurance athletes with low levels of self-efficacy, such as novices, lacked a
450 strong athletic identity (Brewer, Van Raalte, & Linder, 1993), **which** may have meant that
451 they would not have considered themselves “endurance athletes”, and therefore they would
452 not have participated in the current research.

453 These limitations aside, the ESSES could make a valuable contribution to future self-
454 efficacy research. In recent years, there has been an increased focus on the self-efficacy-
455 outcome relationship at the within-person level (Gilson, Chow, & Feltz, 2012). The ESSES
456 could be used to examine the relationship between self-efficacy and various outcomes such as
457 performance, coping, and satisfaction. We are particularly interested to see how these
458 variables change across a competitive season. This would help provide valuable insight into
459 the malleability of self-efficacy beliefs and provide evidence for how they may change in
460 response to factors such as training, tapering, and competitive performances (Feltz et al.,
461 2008).

462 Alongside these directions for future research, the ESSES can act as a useful tool for
463 practitioners, coaches, and athletes. Given the strength of the relations between self-efficacy
464 and performance (Moritz et al., 2000), high levels of self-efficacy are likely to be desirable
465 for athletes. The ESSES provides practitioners and coaches with the opportunity to identify
466 low and/or weak self-efficacy beliefs relating to endurance performance. This can help
467 provide the opportunity for more targeted interventions. Such interventions may result in
468 greater performance benefits than common “one-size-fits-all” approaches (cf. McCormick et
469 al., 2018).

470 **Conclusion**

471 The present research provides initial evidence for the validity and reliability of the 11-
472 item Endurance Sport Self-Efficacy Scale (ESSES). The ESSES is the first non-hierarchical
473 self-efficacy scale developed specifically for the endurance sport domain. Consequently, the

474 ESSES provides researchers, practitioners, coaches, and athletes with a means to assess and
475 understand self-efficacy beliefs in endurance sport.

1 References

- 2 Appleton, P. R., Ntoumanis, N., Quested, E., Viladrich, C., & Duda, J. L. (2016). Initial
3 validation of the coach-created Empowering and Disempowering Motivational Climate
4 Questionnaire (EDMCQ-C). *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 22, 53-65.
- 5 Astokorki, A. H. Y., & Mauger, A. R. (2016). Tolerance of exercise-induced pain at a fixed
6 rating of perceived exertion predicts time trial cycling performance. *Scandinavian*
7 *Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.12659>
- 8 Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Macmillan.
- 9 Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. *Self-Efficacy Beliefs of*
10 *Adolescents*, 307–337. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- 11 Brewer, B. W., Van Raalte, J. L., & Linder, D. E. (1993). Athletic identity: Hercules' muscles
12 or Achilles heel? *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 24(2), 237-254.
- 13 Brick, N. E., MacIntyre, T. E., & Campbell, M. J. (2016). Thinking and action: A cognitive
14 perspective on self-regulation during endurance performance. *Frontiers in Physiology*,
15 7(APR), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2016.00159>
- 16 Brick, N., MacIntyre, T., & Campbell, M. (2014). Attentional focus in endurance activity: new
17 paradigms and future directions. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*,
18 7(1), 106–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2014.885554>
- 19 Brown, T. A. (2014). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. Guilford Publications.
- 20 Bueno, J., Weinberg, R. S., Fernández-Castro, J., & Capdevila, L. (2008). Emotional and
21 motivational mechanisms mediating the influence of goal setting on endurance athletes'
22 performance. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 9(6), 786–799.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2007.11.003>
- 24 Burke, S. T., & Jin, P. (1996). Predicting performance from a triathlon event. *Journal of Sport*
25 *Behavior*, 19(4), 272–287.

- 1 Caruso, C. M., & Gill, D. L. (1992). Strengthening physical self-perceptions through
2 exercise. *The Journal of sports medicine and physical fitness*, 32(4), 416-427.
- 3 Chesney, M. A., Neilands, T. B., Chambers, D. B., Taylor, J. M., & Folkman, S. (2006). A
4 validity and reliability study of the coping self-efficacy scale. *British Journal of Health
5 Psychology*, 11, 421–437. <https://doi.org/10.1348/135910705X53155>
- 6 Christensen, D. A., Brewer, B. W., & Hutchinson, J. C. (2015). In-task assessment of
7 psychological changes during an ultramarathon race. *Wilderness & Environmental
8 Medicine*, 26(4), e4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wem.2015.03.013>
- 9 Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four
10 recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment,
11 Research & Evaluation*, 10(7), 1-9.
- 12 Dietrich, H., & Ehrlenspiel, F. (2010). Cognitive Interviewing: A Qualitative Tool for
13 Improving Questionnaires in Sport Science. *Measurement in Physical Education and
14 Exercise Science*, 14(1), 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10913670903455025>
- 15 Dunn, J. G., Bouffard, M., & Rogers, W. T. (1999). Assessing item content-relevance in sport
16 psychology scale-construction research: Issues and recommendations. *Measurement in
17 Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 3(1), 15-36.
- 18 Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use
19 of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4(3),
20 272.
- 21 Feltz, D. L., Short, S. E., & Sullivan, P. J. (2008). Self-efficacy in sport. *Human Kinetics*.
- 22 Feltz, D. L., Chase, M. A., Moritz, S. E., & Sullivan, P. J. (1999). A conceptual model of
23 coaching efficacy: Preliminary investigation and instrument development. *Journal of
24 educational psychology*, 91(4), 765.
- 25 Fletcher, D., Hanton, S., & Mellalieu, S. D. (2006). An organizational stress review:

- 1 Conceptual and theoretical issues in competitive sport. In S. Hanton & S. D. Mellalieu
2 (Eds.), *Literature reviews in sport psychology* (pp. 321–373). New York, NY: Nova
3 Science.
- 4 Gilson, T. A., Chow, G. M., & Feltz, D. L. (2012). Self-efficacy and athletic squat performance:
5 Positive or negative influences at the within-and between-levels of analysis. *Journal of*
6 *Applied Social Psychology*, 42(6), 1467-1485.
- 7 Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants
8 and malleability. *Academy of Management review*, 17(2), 183-211.
- 9 Hill, A. P., Appleton, P. R., & Mallinson, S. H. (2016). Development and initial validation of
10 the Performance Perfectionism Scale for Sport (PPS-S). *Journal of Psychoeducational*
11 *Assessment*, 34(7), 653-669.
- 12 Holt, N. L., Lee, H., Kim, Y., & Klein, K. (2014). Exploring experiences of running an
13 ultramarathon. *The Sport Psychologist*, 28, 22–35. <https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.2013-0008>
- 14 Hutchinson, J. C., Sherman, T., Martinovic, N., & Tenenbaum, G. (2008). The effect of
15 manipulated self-efficacy on perceived and sustained effort. *Journal of Applied Sport*
16 *Psychology*, 20, 457–472. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200802351151>
- 17 Johnson, M. H., Stewart, J., Humphries, S. A., & Chamove, A. S. (2012). Marathon runners'
18 reaction to potassium iontophoretic experimental pain: Pain tolerance, pain threshold,
19 coping and self-efficacy. *European Journal of Pain*, 16(5), 767–774.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1532-2149.2011.00059.x>
- 21 Jones, A. M., & Carter, H. (2000). The effect of endurance training on parameters of aerobic
22 fitness. *Sports Medicine*, 29(6), 373-386.
- 23 Joyner, M. J., & Coyle, E. F. (2008). Endurance exercise performance: the physiology of
24 champions. *The Journal of Physiology*, 586, 35–44.
25 <https://doi.org/10.1113/jphysiol.2007.143834>

- 1 Kline, R. B. (1998). *Structural equation modeling*. New York: Guilford.
- 2 Kress, J. L., & Statler, T. (2007). A naturalistic investigation of former Olympic cyclists'
3 cognitive strategies for coping with exertion pain during performance. *Journal of Sport*
4 *Behavior*, 30, 428–452.
- 5 Laguardia, R., & Labbé, E. E. (1993). Self-efficacy and anxiety and their relationship to
6 training and race performance. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 77, 27–34.
7 <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1993.77.1.27>
- 8 Lane, A. M., & Wilson, M. (2011). Emotions and trait emotional intelligence among ultra-
9 endurance runners. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 14(4), 358–362.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2011.03.001>
- 11 Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and
12 task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *The American Psychologist*, 57, 705–717.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705>
- 14 Maddux, J. E., & Gosselin, J. T. (2003). Self-efficacy. In *Handbook of self and identity* (pp.
15 218–238).
- 16 Malek, M. H., Housh, T. J., Berger, D. E., Coburn, J. W., & Beck, T. W. (2005). A new
17 nonexercise-based VO₂max equation for aerobically trained females. *Medicine and*
18 *Science in Sports and Exercise*, 36(10), 1804–1810.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1249/01.MSS.0000142299.42797.83>
- 20 Malek, M. H., Housh, T. J., Berger, D. E., Coburn, J. W., & Beck, T. W. (2005b). A new non-
21 exercise based VO₂max equation for aerobically trained males. *Journal of Strength and*
22 *Conditioning Research*, 19(3), 559.
- 23 Marcora, S. M., Bosio, A., & de Morree, H. M. (2008). Locomotor muscle fatigue increases
24 cardiorespiratory responses and reduces performance during intense cycling exercise
25 independently from metabolic stress. *American Journal of Physiology - Regulatory*,

- 1 Integrative and Comparative Physiology, 294, R874–R883.
2 <https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpregu.00678.2007>
- 3 Marcora, S. M., Staiano, W., & Manning, V. (2009). Mental fatigue impairs physical
4 performance in humans. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, 106(3), 857-864.
- 5 Marsh, H. W., Hau, K. T., & Wen, Z. (2004). In search of golden rules: Comment on
6 hypothesis-testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers in
7 overgeneralizing Hu and Bentler's (1999) findings. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 11(3),
8 320-341.
- 9 Martin, J. J. (2002). Training and performance self-efficacy, affect, and performance in
10 wheelchair road racers. *The Sport Psychologist*, 16(4), 384–395.
- 11 Martin, J. J., & Gill, D. L. (1995). The relationships of competitive orientations and self-
12 efficacy to goal importance, thoughts, and performance in high school distance runners.
13 *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 7, 50–62.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413209508406300>
- 15 Mauger, A. R. (2014). Factors affecting the regulation of pacing: current perspectives. *Open*
16 *Access Journal of Sports Medicine*, 5, 209–214. <https://doi.org/10.2147/OAJSM.S38599>
- 17 McAuley, E., & Blissmer, B. (2000). Self-efficacy determinants and consequences of physical
18 activity. *Exercise and Sport Sciences Reviews*, 28, 85–88.
- 19 McCormick, A., Meijen, C., Anstiss, P. A., & Jones, H. S. (2018). Self-regulation in endurance
20 sports: theory, research, and practice. *International Review of Sport and Exercise*
21 *Psychology*, 1-30.
- 22 McCormick, A., Meijen, C., & Marcora, S. (2015). Psychological Determinants of Whole-
23 Body Endurance Performance. *Sports Medicine*, 45(7), 997–1015.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-015-0319-6>
- 25 McCormick, A., Meijen, C., & Marcora, S. (2016). Psychological demands experienced by

- 1 recreational endurance athletes. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*,
2 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2016.1256341>
- 3 Miller, M. (1993). Efficacy strength and performance in competitive swimmers of different
4 skill levels. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 24, 284–296.
- 5 Montes, J., Wulf, G., & Navalta, J. W. (2017). Maximal aerobic capacity can be increased by
6 enhancing performers' expectancies. *The Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical*
7 *Fitness*. <https://doi.org/10.23736/S0022-4707.17.07254-1>
- 8 Moritz, S. E., Feltz, D. L., Fahrback, K. R., & Mack, D. E. (2000). The Relation of Self-
9 Efficacy Measures to Sport Performance: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Research Quarterly*
10 *for Exercise and Sport*, 71(3), 280–294.
11 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2000.10608908>
- 12 Myers, N. D., Chase, M. A., Pierce, S. W., & Martin, E. (2011). Coaching efficacy and
13 exploratory structural equation modeling: A substantive-methodological synergy.
14 *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 33(6), 779-806.
- 15 Myers, N. D., Feltz, D. L., Guillén, F., & Dithurbide, L. (2012). Development of, and initial
16 validity evidence for, the Referee Self-Efficacy Scale: A multistudy report. *Journal of*
17 *Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 34(6), 737-765.
- 18 Myers, N. D., Feltz, D. L., & Wolfe, E. W. (2008). A confirmatory study of rating scale
19 category effectiveness for the coaching efficacy scale. *Research Quarterly for Exercise*
20 *and Sport*, 79(3), 300-311.
- 21 Nicholls, A. R., Polman, R., & Levy, A. R. (2010). Coping self-efficacy, pre-competitive
22 anxiety, and subjective performance among athletes. *European Journal of Sport Science*,
23 10(2), 97–102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17461390903271592>
- 24 Novacheck, T. F. (1998). The biomechanics of running. *Gait & Posture*, 7(1), 77-95.
- 25 O'Connor, B. P. (2000). SPSS and SAS programs for determining the number of components

- 1 using parallel analysis and Velicer's MAP test. *Behavior Research Methods,*
2 *Instrumentation, and Computers*, 32, 396-402
- 3 Okwumabua, T. M. (1985). Psychological and physical contributions to marathon
4 performance: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 8, 163–171.
- 5 Pajares, F., Hartley, J., & Valiante, G. (2001). Response format in writing self-efficacy
6 assessment: Greater discrimination increases prediction. *Measurement and Evaluation*
7 *in Counseling and Development*, 33(4), 214.
- 8 Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Allyn & Bacon/Pearson
9 Education.
- 10 Taylor, J. (1995). A conceptual model for integrating athletes' needs and sport demands in the
11 development of competitive mental preparation strategies. *The Sport Psychologist*, 9,
12 339–357.
- 13 Renfree, A., Martin, L., Micklewright, D., & St Clair Gibson, A. (2014). Application of
14 decision-making theory to the regulation of muscular work rate during self-paced
15 competitive endurance activity. *Sports Medicine*, 44, 147–158.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-013-0107-0>
- 17 Samson, A., Simpson, D., Kamphoff, C., & Langlier, A. (2017). Think aloud: An examination
18 of distance runners' thought processes. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise*
19 *Psychology*, 15, 176–189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2015.1069877>
- 20 Samson, A., & Solmon, M. (2011). Examining the sources of self-efficacy for physical activity
21 within the sport and exercise domains. *International Review of Sport and Exercise*
22 *Psychology*, 4(1), 70-89. doi: 10.1080/1750984X.2011.564643
- 23 Schumacher, J. M., Becker, A. J., & Wiersma, L. D. (2016). Forging ahead: An examination
24 of the experiences and coping mechanisms of channel swimmers. *The Sport*
25 *Psychologist*. <https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.2015-0137>

- 1 Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In Measures in health
2 psychology: *A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35–37).
3 <https://doi.org/10.1037/t00393-000>
- 4 Short, S. E., Sullivan, P., & Feltz, D. L. (2005). Development and preliminary validation of the
5 collective efficacy questionnaire for sports. *Measurement in Physical Education and*
6 *Exercise Science*, 9(3), 181-202.
- 7 Smith, R. E., Schutz, R. W., Smoll, F. L., & Ptacek, J. T. (1995). Development and Validation
8 of a Multidimensional Measure of Sport-Specific Psychological Skills: The Athletic
9 Coping Skills Inventory-28. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 17(4), 379–398.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.17.4.379>
- 11 Stoate, I., Wulf, G., & Lewthwaite, R. (2012). Enhanced expectancies improve movement
12 efficiency in runners. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 30(8), 815–823.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2012.671533>
- 14 Zepp, C. (2016). Coping with Stress During a Marathon. In *Marathon Running: Physiology,*
15 *Psychology, Nutrition and Training Aspects* (pp. 83-105). Springer International
16 Publishing.