

## Do challenge and threat evaluations predict netball performance and selection at trials in youth netball players?

Item Type	Journal article
Authors	Turner, Martin;Massie, Rachel;Slater, Matthew;Braithwaite, Elizabeth
Citation	Turner, M.J., Massie, R. , Slater, M.J. and Braithwaite, E. (2021) Do challenge and threat evaluations predict netball performance and selection at trials in youth netball players?, Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology., 10 (1), pp. 71–87 <a href="https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000248">https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000248</a>
DOI	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000248">10.1037/spy0000248</a>
Publisher	APA
Journal	Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology
Download date	2026-06-17 03:57:48
License	<a href="https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/">https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/</a>
Link to Item	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2436/623311">http://hdl.handle.net/2436/623311</a>

1 Do challenge and threat evaluations predict netball performance and selection at trials in  
2 youth netball players?

3 Turner, M, J<sup>a\*</sup>, Massie, R<sup>b</sup>, Slater, M, J<sup>c</sup>, Braithwaite, E<sup>a</sup>

4

5 <sup>a</sup>Department of Psychology, Faculty of Health, Psychology, and Social Care, Manchester  
6 Metropolitan University, Manchester, UK

7 <sup>b</sup>Institute for Community Research and Development, University of Wolverhampton,  
8 Wolverhampton, UK

9 <sup>c</sup>Department of Sport and Exercise, School of Life Sciences and Education, Staffordshire  
10 University, Stoke-on-Trent, UK

11

12 \*Corresponding author: [m.turner@mmu.ac.uk](mailto:m.turner@mmu.ac.uk)

13

14

15 Link to pre-registration

16 [https://osf.io/4f87m/?view\\_only=c785746842094542b10e8236b5904657](https://osf.io/4f87m/?view_only=c785746842094542b10e8236b5904657)

17

18 **Accepted on 23rd June 2020 in Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology**

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## 1 Abstract

2 In the current paper, we investigated the extent to which challenge and threat evaluations  
3 predicted the trials performance of youth netball players. This paper compared two  
4 theoretical frameworks, the Theory of Challenge and Threat States in Athletes (TCTSA) and  
5 the BioPsychoSocial Model (BPSM) of Challenge and Threat, in their prediction of trials  
6 performance. A field-based cross-sectional design was adopted, including self-report  
7 psychometric, and observational performance, data. Data were collected prior to the  
8 participants' trials performance. Youth female netball athletes ( $n = 92$ ,  $M_{age} = 13.26$  years,  
9  $SD = 1.55$ ) completed psychometrics concerning challenge and threat evaluations and  
10 emotions, in relation to upcoming trials performance. Performance was rated by 10  
11 independent club coaches. Binary logistic and linear regression analyses revealed that BPSM-  
12 derived resource evaluations (general self-confidence, general perception of positive  
13 challenge, positive disposition) were related to trials performance, whilst TCTSA-derived  
14 resource evaluations (self-efficacy, perceived control, goal orientation) were not. Also, a  
15 greater perceived ability to cope with demands was positively related to trial outcome.  
16 The strongest and most consistent predictor of performance was number of previous trials.  
17 The greater number of previously attended trials, the better the participants performed in  
18 trials. The findings reveal the importance of BPSM-derived resource evaluations and the  
19 perceived ability to cope with demands in the prediction of performance outcomes, over and  
20 above the TCTSA-derived resource evaluations. The findings also have important  
21 implications for sports teams, athletes, and coaches, who should strive to maximise  
22 perceptions of resources and coping abilities in the face of pressure situations, such as trials.  
23 Keywords: pressure; adolescents; resources; demands; emotions

24

25

1 Do challenge and threat evaluations predict netball performance and selection at trials in  
2 youth netball players?

3 As part of many athletes' career progression they will frequently be required to attend trials, in  
4 which their performance is evaluated for the purposes of selection to, or deselection from, a  
5 sports team. Performing well at trials, also known as 'try-outs', is important for athletes  
6 because, based on their performance, they are either selected for the team, or they are not. This  
7 binary notion of being selected or not, together with the demands inherent in motivated  
8 performance situations (i.e., goal-relevant, task engaging situations that require instrumental  
9 cognitive and behavioral responses responses; Blascovich & Mendes, 2000), such as  
10 uncertainty, self and other expectations, requirement for effort, judgement or evaluation,  
11 criticism and social rejection, creates a potentially highly stressful situation for athletes (e.g.,  
12 Baumeister, 1997). Research indicates that athletes who respond to or view these motivated  
13 performance situations with a challenge, rather than a threat state, achieve superior  
14 performance outcomes (Hase et al., 2018). In this study, we examine the contribution of  
15 challenge and threat evaluations to success at trials in a sample of youth netball players.

16 Trials have the potential to be a significant stressor for athletes, and a dominant  
17 paradigm in stress and coping literature that has been studied extensively is challenge and threat  
18 (see Behnke & Kaczmarek, 2018, for a meta-analysis). In line with Lazarus' cognitive  
19 appraisal theory (Lazarus, 1966; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), the extent to which a motivated  
20 performance situation, such as trials, is perceived as stressful for athletes depends on their  
21 evaluation of the trials. In the cognitive appraisal theory, the concepts challenge (anticipated  
22 gain), threat (future damage), harm/ loss (damage to goals, values, or beliefs that has already  
23 occurred) were introduced (Lazarus, 1966). Challenge and threat are anticipatory states  
24 (Lazarus, 1999), that have been adopted by Blascovich and Mendes (2000) in the  
25 BioPsychoSocial model (BPSM) of challenge and threat (see Seery, 2011, for a detailed

1 discussion). The BPSM carries forward Lazarus' notion of demands vs. resources, rather than  
2 primary (goal relevance, and goal congruence) and secondary (problem focused coping,  
3 emotion focused coping) evaluations.

4 As well as building on the work of Lazarus, the BPSM of challenge and threat  
5 (Blascovich & Mendes, 2000), is also informed by the work of Obrist (1981) and Dienstbier  
6 (1989) in explaining two distinct ways that humans psychophysiologicaly respond to stressors;  
7 challenge and threat. Importantly, the BPSM proposes that challenge evaluations reflects a  
8 psychophysiologicaly adaptive response to a stressor, whilst threat reflects a  
9 psychophysiologicaly maladaptive response to a stressor. Importantly, in the BPSM, a  
10 challenge state is experienced when an individual facing a motivated performance situation  
11 evaluates sufficient resources to meet the evaluated demands of the situation. A threat state  
12 occurs when the individual evaluates insufficient resources to meet the appraised demands of  
13 the situation (Blascovich & Mendes, 2000). In addition, challenge and threat represent two  
14 anchors of a single bipolar continuum (Blascovich, 2008). In the BPSM presented by  
15 Blascovich and Mendes (2000), demand evaluations comprise perceptions of danger (esteem  
16 and physical), uncertainty, and required effort in a situation, and resource evaluations involve  
17 the assessment of knowledge and skills relevant to the situation. Blascovich (2008) suggests a  
18 number of bipolar factors that may have dynamic implications for resources and demands. For  
19 example, psychological and physical safety/danger, novelty/familiarity, skills, knowledge, and  
20 abilities, and required effort are all thought to be important for demands and resource  
21 evaluations (Seery, 2011). However, there is no comprehensive list of factors.

22 Furthermore, the BPSM does not provide specific details about the resource evaluations  
23 and indeed Blascovich & Mendes (2000) state that "we cannot specify an exact calculus for  
24 resource appraisals" (p. 63). However, resource evaluations are likely to include the assessment  
25 of knowledge and skills relevant to the situational performance (Blascovich & Mendes, 2000).

1 The BPSM-derived resource evaluations can be inferred by exploring the way in which they  
2 have been assessed in past research. To this end, in past measurement of resource evaluations  
3 (e.g., Mendes et al., 2001; Mendes et al., 2007), perceived resources have included questions  
4 pertaining to perceived abilities to perform well, the expectation of performing well, the  
5 importance of performing well, the perception that the situation is a positive challenge, and the  
6 perception that one is predisposed to performing well. Similarly, Lazarus (1999) is very broad  
7 in his conceptualization of the resources, suggesting that “intelligence, money, social skills,  
8 education, supportive family and friends, physical attractiveness, health and energy,  
9 sanguinity, and so on” (p. 71) are all personal resources.

10 Drawing heavily on the BPSM, the Theory of Challenge and Threat States in Athletes  
11 (TCTSA; Jones et al., 2009) was proposed, which outlines specific and well-defined resource  
12 evaluations. In the TCTSA, demand evaluations are taken from the BPSM, and the resources  
13 evaluations are drawn from the BPSM (Blascovich & Mendes, 2000), the model of adaptive  
14 approaches to competition (Skinner & Brewer, 2004), and the model of debilitating and  
15 facilitative competitive state anxiety (Jones, 1995). Resource evaluations comprise self-  
16 efficacy, perceptions of control, and goal orientation (Jones et al., 2009). High levels of self-  
17 efficacy, high perceived control, and a focus on approach goals, represent sufficient resources  
18 to cope in a motivated performance situation and are therefore indicative of challenge.  
19 Conversely, low levels of self-efficacy, low perceived control and a focus on avoidance goals,  
20 represent insufficient resources to cope in a motivated performance situation and are indicative  
21 of threat. In addition, the TCTSA predicts that a challenge state will typically be associated  
22 with emotions of a positive valence, and that a threat state will typically be associated with  
23 emotions of a negative valence. Importantly though, emotions experienced during challenge  
24 state will be perceived as helpful to performance, and emotions experienced during a threat  
25 state will be perceived as unhelpful to performance. It is possible to experience negatively

1 valenced emotions but perceive them to be helpful for performance in a challenge state.  
2 However, research has not been able to support these predictions (Meijen et al., 2014). But  
3 some research (e.g., Meijen., et al., 2013) indicates that threat is more related to negatively  
4 valenced emotions (anger and dejection), and that both challenge and threat could be related to  
5 anxiety. In addition, Moore et al. (2012) found that golfers in a challenge state reported lower  
6 anxiety than those in a threat state. Therefore, concerning emotion, research evidence offers  
7 mixed support for the TCTSA.

8         The TCTSA also proposes that challenge and threat states are marked by distinct  
9 physiological patterns of reactivity, a notion carried forward from the BPSM. Both challenge  
10 and threat states are associated with an increase in sympathetic adrenal medullary (SAM)  
11 activation, but a threat state is associated also with an increase in pituitary adrenal cortical  
12 (PAC) activation (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1996; Dienstbier, 1989). Increased PAC activation  
13 inhibits vasodilation that would take place in a challenge state (Blascovich & Mendes, 2000).  
14 Research generally uses cardiovascular reactivity markers to indicate physiological challenge  
15 and threat states. A challenge state is indicated by a decrease in total peripheral resistance  
16 (TPR; sum of the resistance of all peripheral vasculature in the systemic circulation),  
17 indicating vasodilation, and an increase from baseline in cardiac output (CO; litres of blood  
18 pumped from the heart per minute; Blascovich & Mendes, 2000). Cardiovascular challenge  
19 states facilitate cognitive and physical performance (e.g., Turner et al., 2012).

20         A detailed contemporary review of the TCTSA and its main hypotheses (Meijen et al.,  
21 2020) indicates that there is a preponderance of research evidencing the performance effects of  
22 challenge and threat states as measured using cardiovascular indicators, and less research  
23 illustrating that the resource evaluations can predict performance. To be clear, the TCTSA does  
24 not suggest that the resource evaluations should directly predict athletic performance, rather,  
25 that athletes will experience a challenge state if they perceive high self-efficacy, perception of

1 control and there is a focus on approach goals. This is supported by some research (Meijen et  
2 al., 2013; Turner et al., 2014), but the influence on performance of the resource evaluations per  
3 se has not received much research attention.

4 At the core of the TCTSA is the notion that some athletes excel in motivated  
5 performance situations while others fail to perform, and more specifically, an athlete  
6 approaching a competition in a challenge state is more likely to fulfil their potential than an  
7 athlete approaching a competition in a threat state. The importance of TCTSA derived resource  
8 evaluations over and above the BPSM derived resource evaluations is not clear. Some research  
9 literature has shown that the TCTSA derived resource evaluations are important in the  
10 experience of challenge and threat states (Turner et al., 2014), whilst other research suggests  
11 that BPSM derived resources are appropriate to assess challenge and threat states (Mendes et  
12 al., 2007).

13 Using the TCTSA as a framework, it is reasonable to suggest that trials may trigger a  
14 number of demand evaluations, as trials may elicit perceptions of high danger to esteem (due  
15 to evaluation and social rejection), high uncertainty (because success is dependent on coach  
16 perceptions), and high required effort (due to the competitive nature of trying to secure one of  
17 a limited number of places). Similarly, in line with the TCTSA, the extent to which an athlete  
18 is successful at trials or not will partially depend on their resource evaluations. Athletes  
19 approaching trials with high self-efficacy, high perceived control, and a focus on approach  
20 goals, indicative of challenge, are more likely to fulfil their potential (Jones et al., 2009).  
21 However, to date there is little research concerning athletes' psychological approach to trials,  
22 and therefore despite the clear predictions of the TCTSA with regards to competitive  
23 performance, it is not known if these predictions hold within the selection and deselection  
24 context of team sports trials.

1           The extant research demonstrates that self-reported challenge is predictive of superior  
2 athletic performance in some studies (see Hase et al., 2018 for a review), but significant  
3 variation in the measurement of challenge and threat states has made it difficult to draw  
4 meaningful conclusions. For example, some studies use a Demand Resource Evaluation Score  
5 (DRES) comprising two items (e.g., Moore et al., 2012), some use one dichotomous challenge-  
6 threat scale (e.g., Turner et al., 2012), and others use specific scales for each resource  
7 evaluation (e.g., Turner et al., 2013). It is clear, however, that to assess the predictions of the  
8 TCTSA, it is important to assess the resource evaluations separately from demand evaluations.  
9 In a study of elite cricketers, for example, Turner et al. (2013) found that greater performance  
10 approach goals and self-efficacy were positively related to higher scores in a pressured batting  
11 test. However, control and avoidance goals were unrelated to performance outcome. In  
12 contrast, a similar study of adult club netball athletes found that none of the resource  
13 evaluations were related to changes in shooting performance from baseline (Turner et al.,  
14 2012). However, in both studies, performance was determined by the execution of a specific  
15 skill that contributes to one aspect of performance in each sport, but neither study captured the  
16 broad performance outcomes that arise from trials, where multiple skills must be successfully  
17 demonstrated for a successful outcome. One recent study did capture broader performance  
18 outcomes by using coach- and player-rated performance scores in elite soccer (Dixon et al.,  
19 2019). Dixon et al. found that challenge cardiovascular reactivity, self-efficacy, and perceived  
20 control, was positively, and significantly, associated with greater performance. However,  
21 athlete data were collected prior to different competitions, rather than the same single event.

22           A number of research questions remain unanswered regarding the contribution of  
23 challenge and threat states to performance at trials, that the current study aims to address. For  
24 example, are challenge and threat evaluations predictive of selection at trials? Are self-reported  
25 challenge and threat evaluations predictive of coach perceptions of athlete performance? Is the

1 TCTSA an appropriate model for explaining the variance in performance in youth athletes,  
2 where experience and skills that contribute to resource evaluations are less developed? In  
3 essence, the validity of core predictions made in the TCTSA are yet to be tested in youth  
4 athletes, and therefore the current study offers an important and novel test of the TCTSA. This  
5 is important for theory development and refinement, for youth athletes, but also more widely  
6 for athlete populations. Within athletic settings such as trials, try-outs, and athlete testing en  
7 masse, it is not feasible or pragmatic to undertake CV testing of all athletes. Therefore, a greater  
8 understanding of how the self-report measurement of psychological aspects within the TCTSA  
9 can be achieved, and what this can tell us about performance outcomes, is important for the  
10 future real-world application, and validity testing of the TCTSA. We still have little  
11 understanding about the predictive ability of the resources on athlete performance, so greater  
12 insight in this regard will help to test, challenge, and refine theory. Importantly then, the current  
13 study offers a real-world, ecologically valid, test of some of the TCTSA's main assertions  
14 concerning the athletic performance of a seldom studied population of youth athletes.

15 In the current study we examined the extent to which challenge and threat, as indicated  
16 by assessing the demand and resource evaluations from the TCTSA, predicted the trials  
17 performance of youth netball players. In line with some past literature (e.g., Blascovich, 2008)  
18 suggesting that the term 'appraisal' could portray conscious and subconscious mechanisms, we  
19 use the term 'evaluations' as it more accurately reflects the self-report data we collect. Rather  
20 than focus on specific skill execution, as in past research (e.g., Turner et al., 2012), the current  
21 study used coach ratings of athlete performance to capture trials performance more holistically.  
22 First, we hypothesised that participants who were successful at trials would report greater  
23 TCTSA-derived resource evaluations (self-efficacy, perceptions of control, approach goals,  
24 avoidance goals), a greater perceived ability to cope with demands, and lower anxiety than  
25 unsuccessful participants. Second, we hypothesised that self-reported TCTSA-derived resource



1 informed assent for their own participation. Players aged 16 and over provided informed  
2 consent to participate in the study.

### 3 **Measures**

4         Due to the age range of the sample, and the time limitations of the pre-trials phase at  
5 the club, we strove for short measures that were comprehensible for ages 10 to 17 years. The  
6 short measures for self-efficacy, perceived control, achievement goals, and emotions, have  
7 been used in similar past research with athletes (e.g., Turner et al., 2013). The mental readiness  
8 form (MRF; Krane, 1994) was selected because it is short and the language is simple for young  
9 athletes. Similarly, the DRES was used due to its prominence in challenge and threat research  
10 (Hase et al., 2018), and its ability to assess perceived coping briefly. To assess demands and  
11 resources evaluations, we used Mendes et al.'s. (2007) scale which again has the benefit of  
12 being short (11-items), and indicates demands separately to resources in line with the TCTSA,  
13 which allowed us to test the hypotheses. Finally, two versions of the trial questionnaire were  
14 used: (1) U14's; and (2) - U16's & U19's. Some language in the U14's questionnaire was  
15 adapted so that the questions were age-appropriate.

16         **Demographics.** Participants self-reported their age, number of years played at the club,  
17 and number of previous trials attended.

18         **TCTSA measures.** For self-efficacy, based on Turner et al.'s (2013) self-efficacy  
19 scale, participants who trialled for the U14s team responded to two items: "To what extent do  
20 you feel confident that you can play your best?" and "To what extent do you feel confident  
21 that you will be selected for the elite team?". Participants who trialled for U16s and U19s  
22 responded to 10 items, asking them to indicate how much they were able to, for example,  
23 "make accurate and rapid decisions when needed" and "respond well to mistakes".  
24 Participants indicated the extent to which they agreed with each statement using a visual

1 analogue scale from 0% to 100%. Responses were averaged to create a self-efficacy score.

2 Cronbach's alphas for the U16s and U19s data in the current sample was .91.

3 For perceptions of control we used the adapted Academic Control Scale (Perry,  
4 Hladkyj, Pekrun, & Pelletier, 2001). Participants were asked to rate how much they agreed that  
5 "I think I can control how I play" on a 5-point Likert-scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*)  
6 to 5 (*strongly agree*).

7 To measure achievement goals, we used the Achievement Goals Questionnaire (AGQ;  
8 Conroy et al., 2003) that assessed mastery approach goals ("It is important to me to perform as  
9 well as I possibly can", mastery avoidance goals ("I worry that I may not perform as well as I  
10 possibly can"), performance approach goals ("It is important to me to do well compared to  
11 others"), and performance avoidance goals ("I just want to avoid performing worse than  
12 others"). In-line with previous research (e.g., Turner et al., 2013), the AGQ was reduced to four  
13 items (one item for each subscale). Participants were asked how they felt about the upcoming  
14 trials on a 7-point Likert-scale ranging from 1 (*not at all true*) to 7 (*very true*). The two  
15 approach goal items were averaged to an approach score, and the two avoidance goals to an  
16 avoidance score.

17 The Mental Readiness Form-Likert (Krane, 1994) was used to measure state anxiety on  
18 two bipolar scales corresponding to cognitive anxiety ("My thoughts are...") and somatic  
19 anxiety ("My body feels..."). Participants rated the extent to which they felt worried (1 = *not*  
20 *worried* to 11 = *worried*), and tense (1 = *not tense* to 11 = *tense*).

21 Emotions were assessed using two items from the Sport Emotion Questionnaire (Jones  
22 et al., 2005): anxiety and excitement. Participants indicated the extent to which "right now"  
23 they felt "nervous" and "excited" on a 5-point Likert-scale ranging from 0 (*not at all*) to 4  
24 (*extremely*). Although cognitive anxiety and somatic anxiety were indicated using the MRF,  
25 we felt that asking the athletes about their feelings of nervousness and excitement would

1 provide complimentary information from which we could more accurately understand  
2 participants' preparatory emotions.

3       **BPSM measures.** The participants' perceived ability to cope with demands was  
4 assessed using two items from the cognitive appraisal ratio (Tomaka et al., 1993); "How  
5 demanding do you expect the trials to be?" and "How able are you to cope with the demands  
6 of the trials?". The items were rated using a 6-point Likert scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 6  
7 (*extremely*). A DRES was calculated by subtracting item 1 from item 2, giving a range from -  
8 5 to +5. More positive scores indicate a greater perceived ability to cope with demands, and is  
9 proposed to reflect a challenge evaluation (e.g., Vine et al., 2013).

10       To measure participants' demand and resource evaluations, we used the challenge and  
11 threat scale (Mendes et al., 2007), with regards to the trials, which included questions about  
12 perceived demands and perceived resources on a Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7  
13 (*strongly agree*). Six questions assessed demand evaluations (e.g., "the trials are stressful") and  
14 five questions assessed resource evaluations (e.g., "performing well is important to me"). We  
15 averaged responses to the demand questions and responses to the resource questions to create  
16 a demands score and a resources score. For the current sample, Cronbach's alphas for demand  
17 evaluations was .68 (acceptable) and for resource evaluations was .82 (robust; Taber, 2018).

18       **Netball Performance.** Participant performance was rated by 10 independent coaches  
19 from the club who were all experienced in trial selection. During each game participants were  
20 rated by at least 4 coaches, and each player was assessed by coaches who were familiar with  
21 them, and coaches who were not familiar with them. Therefore, we were able to somewhat  
22 mitigate bias by ensuring the objectivity of coach ratings. Coaches were briefed ahead of trials  
23 by the club's head coach. In the briefing coaches were instructed to rate participant  
24 performance on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = poor, 2 = marginal, 3 = good, 4 = excellent, and 5  
25 = exceptional performance. The decision to use a single rating, rather than multiple ratings for

1 separate skills, such as defence and attack), was based on the practical experience of previous  
2 club trials with a high volume of players and the need to collate information quickly and  
3 succinctly. However, coaches were instructed to consider the execution of basic skills (passing,  
4 catching, footwork), defensive specific skills (tracking opposition, restricting attackers  
5 opponents movement and stage two defence) and attacking specific skills (getting free from a  
6 defender, shooting accuracy and technique, and spatial awareness), over and above the  
7 outcomes of the games. Coaches were also encouraged to base their ratings on the performance  
8 at the trial alone, and not to base their assessments on previous athlete performances. There  
9 were 14 games played over the day, and each participant played in at least two games. We  
10 calculated an average performance score over all games for each participant which captured all  
11 of the coach's ratings who had assessed them. Performance scores ranged from 1.36 to 4.58 ( $M$   
12  $= 2.97$ ,  $SD = .70$ ). We were unable to conduct inter-rater reliability because one of the  
13 assumptions of inter-rater reliability, that all players were rated by all coaches, was not met.

#### 14 **Procedure**

15 This study was reviewed and approved by a University Research Ethics Committee.  
16 Trials and data collection took place over one day. Participants completed a short questionnaire  
17 30 minutes before the trials began. Trial questionnaires are available from [Blinded for review].  
18 Trials consisted of match play, and each player's performance was rated independently by 10  
19 experienced coaches from the club. The athletes and parents were informed that their data  
20 would not be shared with coaches, and that therefore coaches could not use the data to form  
21 decisions about selection.

#### 22 **Planned Statistical Analysis**

23 Prior to conducting inferential statistics, we tested for randomness of missing data using  
24 Little's MCAR test. All  $p$ -values were  $> .05$ , indicating that missing data was random (self-  
25 efficacy (U14s) = 0%; self-efficacy (U19s) = 1.2%; control = 1.1%; MAp = 1.1%; MAv =

1 1.1%; PAp = 2.2%; PA<sub>v</sub> = 2.2%; state anxiety = 2.2%; sport emotions = 4.3%; DRES = 4.3%;  
2 challenge and threat = 3.1%). We therefore imputed missing data using the estimation  
3 maximisation technique (Dixon et al., 2016). We used *z*-scores to identify outliers (greater than  
4 2 SDs) and replaced them using the Winsorising technique (Smith, 2011; self-efficacy (U14s)  
5 = 1; self-efficacy (U19s) = 2; control = 4; MA<sub>p</sub> = 2; MA<sub>v</sub> = 2; PAp = 1; PA<sub>v</sub> = 2; state anxiety  
6 = 8; sport emotions = 6; DRES = 5; challenge and threat = 7), in which the smallest non-  
7 trimmed score replaced the scores trimmed from the lower tail of the distribution, and the  
8 largest non-trimmed score replaced the scores removed from the upper tail (Keselman et al.,  
9 2008). Descriptive statistics were examined on all observed measures. We examined group  
10 differences (selected vs not selected) in netball performance data using a *t*-test. Next, we used  
11 multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) tests to examine group differences (selected  
12 vs not selected) on the self-reported measures. Team (U14, U16 & U19) and number of  
13 previous trials attended were included in the analyses as covariates. Data from the U16 and  
14 U19 teams were combined because the players trialled together, and because of the low  
15 numbers in the U19 group ( $n = 9$ ). All U19 trialists were selected for the elite team. Two  
16 MANCOVA tests were used to examine differences in reported resources (control,  
17 achievement goals, DRES, and self-efficacy) and emotions (anxiety, excitement, and mental  
18 readiness).

19 To address our second hypothesis, we constructed two regression models. The first  
20 was a logistic regression model with selected vs not selected at trials as the outcome. The  
21 following confounders and predictors were included in the model: team, number of previous  
22 trials, demand evaluations (from the challenge and threat scale), TCTSA-derived resource  
23 evaluations (self-efficacy, control, achievement goals), sport emotions (anxiety, excitement,  
24 mental readiness) and DRES. The second model was a linear hierarchical regression model,  
25 which tested predictions of coach-rated performance in line with the theory of challenge and

1 threat states in athletes (TCTSA; Jones et al., 2009). We constructed the model using the  
2 following steps: Step 1 – team and number of previous trials, Step 2 – demand evaluations,  
3 Step 3 - resource evaluations (self-efficacy, control, achievement goals), Step 4 – sport  
4 emotions (anxiety, excitement, mental readiness), Step 5 – DRES. This analysis plan has  
5 been pre-registered on the Open Science Framework  
6 ([https://osf.io/4f87m/?view\\_only=c785746842094542b10e8236b5904657](https://osf.io/4f87m/?view_only=c785746842094542b10e8236b5904657))

### 7 **Exploratory Statistical Analyses**

8         The previous models tested were based on the TCTSA (Jones et al., 2009) conception  
9 of how challenge and threat evaluations predict athletic performance, which rests on the  
10 endorsement of three specific resource evaluations (self-efficacy, control, and approach goals).  
11 However, the BPSM conception of challenge and threat does not include three specific resource  
12 evaluations, but instead proposes that high resource evaluations reflect high perceptions of  
13 ability, positive performance expectations, high task importance, and positive perceptions of  
14 the task (Mendes, 2007). These resources are reflected in the challenge and threat scale we  
15 used, but in our planned analyses we excluded the resources aspect of the challenge and threat  
16 scale in favour of the specific resource evaluations as posited in the TCTSA. In our exploratory  
17 analyses we include the resources aspect of the challenge and threat scale as proposed in the  
18 BPSM (e.g., Mendes et al., 2007), rather than the specific resource evaluations as posited in  
19 the TCTSA (Jones et al., 2009).

20         To address hypotheses three and four, we followed the same protocol as used for the  
21 planned analyses but replaced the three TCTSA resources evaluations with the BPSM  
22 resources. Also, similar to the planned analyses, we constructed two regression models  
23 controlling for team and number of previous trials. In both binary logistic and linear  
24 hierarchical regression analyses we included the BPSM resources in place of the three TCTSA

1 resource evaluations. The replacement of the three TCTSA resource evaluations with the  
2 BPSM resources was the only change to the planned analyses outlined above.

### 3 **Results**

#### 4 **Descriptive statistics**

5 Descriptive statistics, self-report measures and coach-rated performance are displayed  
6 in Table 1, split by age group and by trial outcome (selected vs not selected). An independent  
7 samples *t*-test found that the performance score was higher for those participants who were  
8 selected for the elite teams ( $M = 3.42$ ,  $SD = .45$ ,  $n = 51$ ) than participants who were not ( $M =$   
9  $2.41$ ,  $SD = .45$ ,  $n = 41$ ),  $t_{(90)} = 10.68$ ,  $p < .001$ , Cohen's  $d = 2.24$ .

#### 10 **Planned analyses**

11 **Group (selected vs not selected) differences on psychological measures.** We  
12 conducted two MANCOVA tests to examine group differences (selected vs not) on self-  
13 reported measures of resources (control, achievement goals, DRES, and self-efficacy) and  
14 emotions (anxiety, excitement, and mental readiness). The first MANCOVA found no main  
15 effect of self-reported TCTSA resources on trial outcome,  $F(5,81) = 1.742$ ,  $p = .134$ ,  $\eta^2 = .097$ .  
16 The second MANCOVA also found no main effect of participant's pre-trial emotions on trial  
17 outcome,  $F(4,80) = 1.416$ ,  $p = .236$ ,  $\eta^2 = .066$ .

18 **Predicting performance using psychological variables.** The results of the binary  
19 logistic regression, with trial result (selected vs not) as the outcome are presented in Table 2.  
20 At step 5,  $\chi^2 = 31.486$ ,  $df = 12$ ,  $p = .002$ , number of previous trials was significantly positively  
21 related to trial outcome ( $\beta = .988$ ,  $p = .004$ ) such that a greater number of previous trials  
22 predicted selection into the elite team. In addition, DRES was positively related to trial outcome  
23 ( $\beta = .662$ ,  $p = .049$ ). At step 5, none of the other variables included in the model were significant  
24 predictors of trial outcome (all  $p$ 's  $> .05$ ). Similarly, the results of the linear regression model  
25 (Table 3),  $R^2 = .303$ ,  $F(72) = 2.612$ ,  $p = .006$ , show that the only significant predictor of coach-

1 rated performance was the number of previous trials attended ( $\beta = .369, p = .002$ ). All other  
2 variables included in the model were non-significant ( $p > .05$ ). Post-hoc power analysis using  
3 G\*Power revealed that a power of .81 was achieved.

#### 4 **Exploratory analyses**

5 **Group (selected vs. not) differences on psychological measures.** We conducted one  
6 MANCOVA test to examine group differences (selected vs not) on self-reported measures of  
7 BPSM resources and DRES. The MANCOVA found no main effect of self-reported BPSM  
8 resources on trial outcome,  $F(2,86) = 2.648, p = .077, \eta^2 = .058$ .

9 **Predicting performance using psychological variables.** For the binary logistic  
10 regression analyses (Table 2), at step 5,  $\chi^2 = 25.942, df = 12, p = .002$ , there was a significant  
11 positive relationship between number of previous trials and trial outcome ( $\beta = .847, p = .007$ ),  
12 but none of the other variables included in the model were significant predictors of trial  
13 outcome (all  $p$ 's  $> .05$ ). The results of the linear regression model (Table 3),  $R^2 = .312, F(77)$   
14  $= 3.884, p < .001$ , show previous trials ( $\beta = .348, p = .002$ ) and BPSM resources ( $\beta = .241, p =$   
15  $.034$ ) predicted coach-rated performance. All other variables included in the model were non-  
16 significant ( $p > .05$ ). Post-hoc power analysis using G\*Power revealed a power of .72. A  
17 correlation matrix including all variables can be seen in (Table 4).

#### 18 **Discussion**

19 In the current study we examined the extent to which challenge and threat evaluations,  
20 as indicated by demands and resource evaluations and perceived ability to cope with demands,  
21 predicted trial performance of youth netball players. Based on past research (e.g., Dixon et al.,  
22 2019; Hase et al., 2018), it was hypothesised that participants who were successful at trials  
23 would report greater resource evaluations, greater perceived ability to cope with demands, and  
24 lower anxiety than participants who were unsuccessful at trials, and that TCTSA resource  
25 evaluations (self-efficacy, perceptions of control, approach goals, avoidance goals) would

1 predict success at trials. Results of planned analyses indicated that the TCTSA resource  
2 evaluations, and emotions, did not predict performance outcomes, but greater DRES did predict  
3 trial outcome. In exploratory analyses, resources as measured in line with the BPSM of  
4 challenge and threat did predict performance outcomes, such that greater resources were related  
5 to higher coach-rated performance scores.

6 In contrast to past research (Turner et al., 2014) and the postulations of the TCTSA  
7 (Jones et al., 2009), the three resource evaluations self-efficacy, control, and  
8 approach/avoidance goals did not predict performance outcomes (selected vs not selected, and  
9 coach ratings). In addition, emotions did not predict performance outcomes. This could be  
10 because emotion valence is not necessarily important for performance, rather, whether the  
11 emotion is interpreted as facilitative or debilitating may be more important, a proposition that  
12 is in line with the TCTSA (Jones et al., 2009). To be clear, participants' level of self-efficacy,  
13 their perceptions of control, and their levels of approach and avoidance goals, and also how  
14 participants felt (emotions), on approach to the trials performance was not related to trials  
15 selection or coach-rated trials performance. However, self-reported demands and resources as  
16 measured in line with the BPSM of challenge and threat did predict performance outcomes in  
17 some models in the analyses. When predicting selected vs not selected in binary regression  
18 analyses, demands were negatively related to trial outcome prior to the addition of resources  
19 (TCTSA, and BPSM). Also, higher DRES, indicating a greater perceived ability to cope with  
20 demands, was positively related to trial outcome when accounting for all other variables in the  
21 planned model. In the linear regression analyses, BPSM resources positively predicted coach  
22 performance ratings, whilst TCTSA resources did not account for a significant amount of  
23 variance. Together, planned and exploratory analyses reveal the importance the of BPSM-  
24 derived demands and resources, including the assessment of perceived coping as used in the  
25 DRES, in the prediction of performance outcomes, over and above the three resources

1 evaluations, and pre-performance emotions proposed within the TCTSA. Interestingly, whilst  
2 the DRES is considered by researchers to reflect demands vs. resources, item two of the DRES  
3 indicates coping rather than resource dominance. Some contemporary challenge and threat  
4 theory (such as the TCTSA) does not include coping in its Lazarusian form (i.e., emotion  
5 focused and problem focused coping). The current study, alongside other extant research (e.g.,  
6 Brimmell et al., 2019), demonstrates that the DRES has utility in predicting performance and  
7 therefore theorists should more closely consider the role of coping in challenge and threat  
8 states. Indeed, the DRES has been shown to predict performance in a range of contexts in the  
9 laboratory (e.g., Vine et al., 2013), and in more ecologically valid settings similar to the current  
10 study, such as sport (Moore et al., 2013), aviation (e.g., Vine et al., 2015), and medicine (e.g.,  
11 Roberts et al., 2016). In particular relevance to the current study, Moore et al. (2013), found  
12 that DRES taken immediately before a golf competition accounted for a significant  
13 proportion of variance in golf performance, such that a greater DRES was associated with  
14 better performance. Therefore, applied practitioners might consider using the DRES as a short  
15 measure to indicate coping with situational demands.

16         There are a number of potential reasons why TCTSA-derived resource evaluations did  
17 not predict performance in the current study, whilst BPSM-derived resource evaluations did.  
18 In the TCTSA the resource evaluations are separate constructs that are drawn from a variety of  
19 theories whose origins are not tied to the TCTSA. It might be that in proposing the three  
20 resource evaluations, Jones et al. (2009) excluded various other potential constructs that could  
21 determine challenge and threat states (e.g., irrational beliefs; Chadha et al., 2019). Indeed, after  
22 we planned and completed the current study, Meijen et al. (2020) reconceptualised the TCTSA  
23 (TCTSA-R) to include a greater focus on dispositional factors, primary evaluations,  
24 reappraisal, and additional resources such as social support. In the current study, we found that  
25 number of previous trials predicted performance outcomes, which could be considered a

1 dispositional factor, that could influence primary evaluations. This, although based on new  
2 theory, is conjecture because in the current study we did not measure Lazarusian evaluation  
3 components. But broadly, there may be a range of psychosocial factors (e.g., social support,  
4 social identification, irrational beliefs) that contribute to challenge and threat perceptions, not  
5 captured by the current resource evaluations featured in the TCTSA, that are now presented in  
6 the TCTSA-R. The BPSM-derived resource evaluations, whilst not drawn from specific theory,  
7 offer a wider set of psychological factors. Items assess self-confidence in general (e.g., “I have  
8 the expectations to perform well”), a general perception of positive challenge (e.g., “the trials  
9 are a positive challenge”), and also an indication of dispositional factors that could predict  
10 success (e.g., “I am the type of person who does well at trials”). Certainly, more research needs  
11 to be conducted to arrive at a comprehensive set of resource evaluations that can be measured  
12 via self-report scales without placing a heavy time burden on athletes.

13         Aside from the performance effects reported for cognitive and affective variables, the  
14 number of previous trials emerged as the most robust and consistent predictor of performance  
15 outcomes, both in terms of selection vs. non-selection, and coach rated performance. Analyses  
16 revealed that the greater number of trials participants had previously attended, the more likely  
17 they were to be selected for the elite team, and the higher their coach ratings were. In other  
18 words, participants past experience was more important in predicting performance outcomes  
19 than the cognitive and affective variables measured in the current study. There are a number of  
20 possible explanations for this finding. First, number of previous trials is by nature related to  
21 years of experience in the sport, such that greater years of experience in the netball club  
22 presumably relates to greater number of trials, since trials occur annually. Therefore, the notion  
23 that greater experience in trials and in the club would predict performance is logical, because  
24 the athletes will have been aware of the trials format and coach expectations and can, as a  
25 result, engage in more accurate and detailed preparatory behaviours (e.g., mental rehearsal). It

1 is perhaps unsurprising that number of previous trials was revealed to be important for trials  
2 performance considering the fact that past research has indicated competitive experience to  
3 have an influence on competitive anxiety (e.g., Hanton et al., 2008; Hanton et al., 2008).  
4 Hanton et al. (2007) investigated the competitive experience in relation to the interpretations  
5 of anxiety symptoms and found that gaining experience enabled performers to familiarize  
6 themselves with their competition anxiety. Athletes were able to rationalize their thoughts and  
7 feelings, allowing them to cope more competently by altering the direction of their  
8 interpretations. As unsurprising as the current findings might be, the TCTSA does not capture  
9 previous experience explicitly through its challenge and threat antecedents, and therefore we  
10 did not hypothesise this result. Researchers are tasked with developing more comprehensive  
11 theories of competitive (anticipatory) stress that capture the broad range of antecedents and  
12 mediators that are important for the stress-performance relationship. Frameworks such as the  
13 integrative framework of stress, attention, and visuomotor performance (Vine et al., 2016), and  
14 the binary theory of emotional distress (Turner et al., 2018) may be better integrated and  
15 applied.

16       It is also possible that greater number of trials was related to coach ratings due to bias  
17 in how the coaches rated athlete performance. For example, if the athlete is familiar to the  
18 coach due to repeated historic trials attendance, this may bias the coach's opinions of the  
19 athlete's ability and trials performance. In other words, it is possible that past number of trials  
20 could be a decision-making heuristic (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). For example, the "hot  
21 hand" in basketball studied by Gilvoch et al. (1985), reflects the phenomenon in which  
22 basketball shooting performance during a particular period is better than expected on the basis  
23 of the player's overall record. Gilvoch et al. found that basketball fans and professional players  
24 expected players with a successful scoring record to be successful subsequently, whilst actual  
25 performance data revealed no such occurrence. In reference to the current study, coaches had

1 the opportunity to operationalise these expectations by subjectively scoring athletes' trials  
2 performance. Therefore, it is possible that athletes with past trials experience and trials success  
3 may have been scored more highly in the current trials due to inflated performance expectations  
4 from coaches. Future research could study these heuristics by obtaining coach's expectations  
5 prior to trials and controlling for this in the analyses.

6         The findings of the current study in part support the previous research that indicates  
7 that evaluations that reflect high perceived resources and a perceived ability to cope with  
8 demands are related to superior sports performance compared with threat (e.g., Hase et al.,  
9 2018). That is, greater athlete scores in BPSM-relevant resource evaluations were related to  
10 better coach-rated trials performance scores, and higher athlete DRES scores were related to  
11 trial outcome in the planned analyses that included TCTSA resource evaluations. On balance,  
12 a perception of greater resources predicted higher coach-rated trials performance, but did not  
13 predict trial outcome (selection vs. non-selection). The finding that greater resources did not  
14 predict trial outcome could be a symptom of two occurrences. First, with 92 participants the  
15 binary regression analyses may have lacked sufficient power to detect significant effects due  
16 the inclusion of a categorical outcome variable (Hsieh, 1989), compared to the linear regression  
17 analyses which used a continuous variable (Altman & Royston, 2006). Second, a continuous  
18 variable such as that used in the linear regression analyses retains more information, such that  
19 it more fully represents the variability in the data. Categorising the outcome variable into  
20 selected vs. not selected may underestimate the variation in outcome and variability may be  
21 subsumed within each category. Indeed, participants close to but on opposite sides of the cut-  
22 point are characterised as being very different rather than very similar (Altman & Royston,  
23 2006).

24         The current study differs from most of the extant research examining the extent to  
25 which challenge and threat evaluations predict athletic performance. This study used coach

1 ratings as a performance outcome and used selection as an outcome criterion, whilst the  
2 majority of past research uses actual skill execution as the performance outcome, such as runs  
3 scored in a cricket batting test (Turner et al., 2013), or the movement kinematics of a golf putt  
4 (Moore et al., 2012). Of course, coach ratings are fallible to subjectivity and do not necessarily  
5 reflect actual performance. Future research could use more sensitive markers of netball  
6 performance such as forced errors or goals scored, depending on the position played. In  
7 addition, coaches could rate aspects of performance such as passing, movement off the ball,  
8 and goal shooting, to provide a more detailed and nuanced set of performance outcome data.  
9 Indeed, unlike past research we focussed on the outcome of a complete trials process rather  
10 than a single skilled performance event (e.g., batting test: Turner et al., 2013). This process  
11 involved participants performing a range of activities, and this could explain the lack of  
12 relationships between the TCTSA resource evaluations and performance. It is possible that  
13 participants evaluated certain aspects of their game as a challenge, and other aspects as a threat.  
14 For example, a player could perceive high self-efficacy in relation to the physical aspects of  
15 trials, whilst perceiving low self-efficacy in relation to the tactical aspects of trials. Therefore,  
16 by measuring how trials as a whole were evaluated, we may have missed important nuances in  
17 how certain aspects of trials were evaluated. Future research could assess how athletes evaluate  
18 components of trials performance, rather than the trial as a whole. Finally, much of the previous  
19 research that has found links between challenge and threat and athletic performance used  
20 physiological, rather than psychological, markers of challenge and threat (see Behnke &  
21 Kaczmarek, 2018, for a meta-analysis). So, future research could measure the CV reactivity of  
22 netball athletes approaching trials, adopting similar methods to past research conducted in  
23 athletic settings (e.g., Turner et al., 2013).

24         The present paper purports in its theoretical rationale and its findings that evaluations  
25 that reflect greater resources than perceived demands, and greater ability to cope with demands,

1 are facilitative for performance, whilst threat evaluations are debilitating for performance. This  
2 reflects a rather simplistic perspective on challenge and threat and extant research indicates  
3 that competent skilled performance is still possible following threat evaluations, so long  
4 negative emotions associated with threat are interpreted as facilitative (e.g., Neil & Woodman,  
5 2019), and self-efficacy is maximised (Turner et al., 2013). Indeed, as posited in the TCTSA,  
6 precompetitive anxiety that could stem from threat evaluations can be perceived as facilitate  
7 for performance (see Jones, 1995), and can enhance performance via motivational and  
8 attentional mechanisms (see Woodman & Hardy, 2001). In addition, Turner et al. (2013) found  
9 that elite cricketers who evinced a threat state but also performed well in a pressured batting  
10 test, reported the extremely high self-efficacy. Therefore, future research should assess the  
11 interpretation of precompetitive emotions (e.g., Turner et al., 2012), particularly anxiety, as  
12 well the intensity of the emotions as reported in the current study.

13         It could be argued that the current study used a moderate sample size to detect the  
14 hypothesised effects, particularly in the binary regression analyses. However, the sample size  
15 represents the maximum number of participants possible for the club we sampled, and post-  
16 hoc power analyses indicates sufficient statistical power for the planned analysis (.81). It is  
17 important to test theory in field settings, with the sampling limitations inherent in live sporting  
18 environments. The findings of the current study have important implications for club trials with  
19 regards to the salience of resource evaluations for performance, and the importance of past  
20 trials on future performance. As scientist-practitioners, it is possible to make recommendations  
21 to netball clubs that can influence the experience and performance of local athletes, a goal that  
22 is informed by the high internal validity of the current study, although its external validity can  
23 be challenged. For example, on the basis of the current study, coaches and practitioners  
24 working with youth athletes should endeavour to help them develop high perceptions of  
25 resources and coping abilities. Indeed, past research indicates that challenge-oriented

1 instructions (Moore et al., 2012; Turner et al., 2014), rational language (Evans et al., 2018),  
2 and a strong connection with the leader (e.g., coach; Slater et al., 2018) can facilitate a  
3 challenge state. In addition, practitioners could apply imagery with youth athletes (e.g.,  
4 Williams et al., 2010), and reappraisal (Sammy et al., 2017) to encourage a challenge state.  
5 Finally, given the findings that past trials experience is an important predictor of future trials  
6 performance, coaches could perhaps provide young athletes with opportunities to experience  
7 trial conditions throughout the season, under supportive conditions, for the purposes of  
8 providing positive experiences from which to draw from in future trials (e.g., Turner & Barker,  
9 2013).

10         Should future researchers wish to address the limitations of the present study, they  
11 should adopt more sensitive performance and skill execution measures, and collect  
12 cardiovascular reactivity data to reduce the bias inherent within self-report evaluations  
13 measurement. Research could also repeat the data collection at multiple time points across  
14 different events, such as competitive games and tournaments, to examine the changing  
15 evaluations of netball athletes across different motivated performance situations (e.g.,  
16 Cumming et al., 2017).

17         In summary, the results of the current study demonstrate that in predicting the trials  
18 performance of the youth netball athletes sampled, the number of previous trials attended, the  
19 perceived BPSM-derived resource evaluations, and perceived ability to cope with demands  
20 (DRES), explained the greatest proportion of variance. Specifically, a greater number of  
21 previous trials, higher self-reported resource evaluations, and greater perceived ability to cope  
22 with demands (higher DRES), were related to better trial performance. TCTSA-derived  
23 resource evaluations and self-report emotional states were not related to performance  
24 outcomes.

25

## References

- 1 Altman, D. G., & Royston, P. (2006). The cost of dichotomising continuous variables. *BMJ*  
2 *(Clinical research ed.)*, 332(7549), 1080.
- 3 Baumeister, R. F. (1997). Esteem threat, self-regulatory breakdown, and emotional distress as  
4 factors in self-defeating behaviour. *Review of General Psychology*, 1, 145–174.
- 5 Behnke, M., & Kaczmarek, L.D. (2018). Successful performance and cardiovascular markers  
6 of challenge and threat: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*,  
7 130, 73-79. doi:10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2018.04.007.
- 8 Blascovich, J. (2008). Challenge and threat. In A.J. Elliot (Ed.), *Handbook of approach and*  
9 *avoidance motivation* (pp. 431-445). New York; Psychology Press.
- 10 Blascovich, J., & Mendes, W. B. (2000). Challenge and threat appraisals: the role of affective  
11 cues. In J. P. Forgas (Ed.) *Feeling and thinking: the role of affect in social cognition*  
12 (pp. 59-82). Paris: Cambridge University Press.
- 13 Blascovich, J., & Tomaka, J. (1996). The biopsychosocial model of arousal regulation.  
14 *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 28, 1-51.
- 15 Brimmell, J., Parker, J., Wilson, M. R., Vine, S. J., & Moore, L. J. (2019). Challenge and  
16 threat states, performance, and attentional control during a pressurized soccer penalty  
17 task. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, 8(1), 63-79.
- 18 Chadha, N., Turner, M. J., & Slater, M. J. (2019). Investigating irrational beliefs, cognitive  
19 appraisals, challenge and threat, and affective states in golfers approaching competitive  
20 situations. *Frontiers in Psychology*. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02295.
- 21 Conroy, D. E., Elliot, A. J., & Hofer, S. M. (2003). A 2 x 2 achievement goals questionnaire  
22 for sport: Evidence for factorial invariance, temporal stability, and external validity.  
23 *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 25(4), 456–476.

- 1 Cumming, S., Turner, M. J., & Jones, M. V. (2017). Longitudinal changes in elite rowers'  
2 challenge and threat appraisals of pressure situations: A season-long observational  
3 study. *The Sport Psychologist*, 31, 217-226.
- 4 Dienstbier, R. A. (1989). Arousal and physiological toughness: Implications for mental and  
5 physical health. *Psychological Review*, 96, 84-100.
- 6 Dixon, M., Turner, M. J., & Gillman, J. (2017). Examining the relationships between  
7 challenge and threat cognitive appraisals and coaching behaviours in football coaches,  
8 *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 35(24), 2446-2452
- 9 Dixon, J., Jones, M., & Turner, M. J. (2019). A challenge mind-set on match day:  
10 Investigating cardiovascular reactivity in professional academy footballers. *European*  
11 *Journal of Sport Science*. doi: 10.1080/17461391.2019.1629179.
- 12 Evans, A. L., Turner, M. J., Pickering, R., & Powditch, R. (2018). The effects of rational and  
13 irrational coach team talks on the cognitive appraisal and achievement goal orientation  
14 of varsity football athletes. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*. 13,  
15 431–438. doi: 10.1177/1747954118771183
- 16 Gilovich, T., Vallone, R., & Tversky, A. (1985). The hot hand in basketball: On the  
17 misperception of random sequences. *Cognitive Psychology*, 17(3), 295-314
- 18 Hanton, S. et al. (2007). Experience in sport and its relationship with competitive anxiety.  
19 *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 5, 28–53.
- 20 Hanton, S., Neil, R., & Mellalieu, S. D. (2008). Recent developments in competitive anxiety  
21 direction and competition stress research. *International Review of Sport and Exercise*  
22 *Psychology*, 1(1), 45-57, doi: 10.1080/17509840701827445
- 23 Hanton, S., Neil, R., Mellalieu, S., & Fletcher, D. (2008). Competitive experience and  
24 performance status: an investigation into multidimensional anxiety and coping.  
25 *European Journal of Sport Science*, 8(3), 143–152.

- 1 Hase, A., O'Brien, J., Moore, L., & Freeman, P. (2018). The relationship between challenge  
2 and threat states and performance: A systematic review. *Sport, Exercise, and*  
3 *Performance Psychology*. DOI: 10.1037/spy0000132
- 4 Hsieh, F. Y. (1989). Sample size tables for logistic regression. *Statistics in medicine*, 8(7),  
5 795-802.
- 6 Jones, G. (1995). More than just a game: Research developments and issues in competitive  
7 anxiety in sport. *British Journal of Psychology*, 86, 449-478.
- 8 Jones, M. V., Lane, A. M., Bray, S. R., Uphill, M., & Catlin, J. (2005). Development and  
9 validation of the Sport Emotions Questionnaire. *Journal of Sport & Exercise*  
10 *Psychology*, 27, 407–431.
- 11 Jones, M., Meijen, C., McCarthy, P. J., & Sheffield, D. (2009). A theory of challenge and  
12 threat states in athletes. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 2, 161–  
13 180. doi:10.1080/17509840902829331
- 14 Keselman, H. J., Algina, J., Lix, L. M., Wilcox, R. R., & Deering, K. N. (2008). A generally  
15 robust approach for testing hypotheses and setting confidence intervals for effect sizes.  
16 *Psychological Methods*, 13, 110–129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.13.2.110>
- 17 Krane, V. (1994). The Mental Readiness Form as a measure of competitive state anxiety. *The*  
18 *Sport Psychologist*, 8(2), 189-202.
- 19 Lazarus, R. S. (1966). *Psychological stress and the coping process*. New York: McGrawHill.
- 20 Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal and coping*. New York: Springer.
- 21 Meijen, C., Jones, M. V., McCarthy, P. J., Sheffield, D., & Allen, M. S. (2013). Cognitive  
22 and affective components of challenge and threat states. *Journal of Sports Sciences*,  
23 31(8). <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2012.753157>

- 1 Meijen, C., Jones, M. V., Sheffield, D., & McCarthy, P. J. (2014). Challenge and threat  
2 states: Cardiovascular, affective, and cognitive responses to a sports-related speech  
3 task. *Motivation and Emotion*, 38(2). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-013-9370-5>
- 4 Meijen, C., Turner, M. J., Jones, M. V., Sheffield, D., & McCarthy, P. (2020). A theory of  
5 challenge and threat states in athletes: A revised conceptualisation. *Frontiers in*  
6 *Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00126>.
- 7 Mendes, W. B., Blascovich, J., Major, B., & Seery, M. (2001). Challenge and threat  
8 responses during downward and upward social comparisons. *European Journal of*  
9 *Social Psychology*, 31(5), 477-497. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.80>
- 10 Mendes, W. B., Blascovich, J., Hunter, S. B., Lickel, B., & Jost, J. T. (2007). Threatened by  
11 the unexpected: physiological responses during social interactions with expectancy-  
12 violating partners. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 92(4), 698-716.
- 13 Mendes, W. B., Gray, H. M., Mendoza-Denton, R., Major, B., & Epel, E. S. (2007). Why  
14 Egalitarianism Might Be Good for Your Health: Physiological Thriving During  
15 Stressful Intergroup Encounters. *Psychological Science*, 18(11), 991–  
16 998. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.02014.x>
- 17 Moore, L. J., Wilson, M. R., Vine, S. J., Coussens, A. H., & Freeman, P. (2013). Champ or  
18 chump?: challenge and threat states during pressurized competition. *Journal of Sport &*  
19 *Exercise Psychology*, 35, 551–562. doi: 10.1123/jsep.35.6.551
- 20 Moore, L. J., Vine, S. J., Wilson, M. R., & Freeman, P. (2012). The effect of challenge and  
21 threat states on performance: An examination of potential mechanisms.  
22 *Psychophysiology*, 49, (10), 1417-1425. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-8986.2012.01449.x
- 23 Neil, R., & Woodman, T. (2019). Performance anxiety, arousal, and coping in sport. In T. S.  
24 Horn & A. L. Smith. (Eds.). *Advances in sport and exercise psychology*. Champaign,  
25 IL: Human Kinetics.

- 1 Obrist, P. A. (1981). *Cardiovascular psychophysiology: A perspective*. New York: Plenum.
- 2 Perry, R. P., Hladkyj, S., Pekrun, R. H., & Pelletier, S. T. (2001). Academic control and  
3 action control in the achievement of college students: A longitudinal field study.  
4 *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(4), 776–789. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.93.4.776
- 5 Roberts, M. J., Gale, T. C. E., McGrath, J. S. *et al.* (2016). Rising to the challenge: acute  
6 stress appraisals and selection centre performance in applicants to postgraduate  
7 specialty training in anaesthesia. *Advances in Health Science Education*, 21, 323–339.  
8 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-015-9629-6>
- 9 Sammy, N., Anstiss, P. A., Moore, L. J., Freeman, P., Wilson, M. R., & Vine, S. J. (2017).  
10 The effects of arousal reappraisal on stress responses, performance and  
11 attention. *Anxiety Stress Coping*, 30, 619–629. doi: 10.1080/10615806.2017.1330952
- 12 Seery, M.D. (2011). Challenge or threat? Cardiovascular indexes of resilience and  
13 vulnerability to potential stress in humans. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioural Reviews*,  
14 35, 1603-1610. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2011.03.003.
- 15 Skinner, N., & Brewer, N. (2004). Adaptive approaches to competition: Challenge appraisals  
16 and positive emotion. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 26, 283-305.
- 17 Slater, M. J., Turner, M. J., Evans, A. L., & Jones, M. V. (2018). Capturing hearts and minds:  
18 the influence of relational identification with the leader on followers' mobilization and  
19 cardiovascular reactivity. *Leadership Quarterly*, 29, 379–388. doi:  
20 10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.08.003
- 21 Smith, M. (2011). *Research methods in accounting* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE Publications  
22 Ltd.
- 23 Taber, K.S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research  
24 instruments in science education. *Research in Science and Education*, 48(6), 1273–  
25 1296

- 1 Tomaka, J., Blascovich, J., Kelsey, R. M., & Leitten, C. L. (1993). Subjective, physiological,  
2 and behavioral effects of threat and challenge appraisal. *Journal of Personality and*  
3 *Social Psychology*, 65(2), 248.
- 4 Turner, M. J., & Barker, J. B. (2013). Resilience: Lessons from the 2012 Olympic Games.  
5 *Reflective Practice*, 14(5), 622-631.
- 6 Turner, M. J., Jones, J., & Wood, A. G. (2018). Applying the REBT cognitive disputation  
7 technique to the binary theory of emotional distress. *Effective Scientist-Practitioner*,  
8 1(1), 46-64.
- 9 Turner, M. J., Jones, M. V., Sheffield, D., Barker, J. B., & Coffee, P. (2014). Manipulating  
10 cardiovascular indices of challenge and threat states using resource appraisals.  
11 *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 94, 9-18.
- 12 Turner, M. J., Jones, M. V., Sheffield, D., Slater, M. J., Barker, J. B., & Bell, J. (2013). Who  
13 thrives under pressure? Predicting the performance of elite academy cricketers using  
14 the cardiovascular indicators of challenge and threat states. *Journal of Sport and*  
15 *Exercise Psychology*, 35(4), 387-397
- 16 Turner, M. J., Jones, M. V., Sheffield, D., & Cross, S. L. (2012). Cardiovascular indices of  
17 challenge and threat states predict performance under stress in cognitive and motor  
18 tasks. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 86, 48-57.  
19 doi:10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2012.08.004.
- 20 Turner, M. J., Jones, M. V., Sheffield, D., Barker, J. B., & Coffee, P. (2014). Manipulating  
21 cardiovascular indices of challenge and threat states using resource appraisals.  
22 *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 94, 9-18
- 23 Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and  
24 Biases. *Science*, 185(4157), 1124-1131. Retrieved from  
25 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1738360>

- 1 Vine, S., Freeman, P., Moore, L., Chandra-Ramana, R., & Wilson, M. (2013). Evaluating  
2 stress as a challenge is associated with superior attentional control and motor skill  
3 performance: Testing the predictions of the biopsychosocial model of challenge and  
4 threat. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 19(3), 185-  
5 194. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034106>
- 6 Vine, S. J., Moore, L. J., & Wilson, M. R. (2016). An integrative framework of stress,  
7 attention, and visuomotor performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7. doi:  
8 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01671.
- 9 Vine, S.J., Uiga, L., Lavric, A., Moore, L. J., Tsaneva-Atanasova, K., & Wilson, M.  
10 R. (2015). Individual reactions to stress predict performance during a critical aviation  
11 incident, *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, 28(4), 467-  
12 477, doi: [10.1080/10615806.2014.986722](https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2014.986722)
- 13 Williams, S. E., Cumming, J., & Balanos, G. M. (2010). The use of imagery to manipulate  
14 challenge and threat appraisal states in athletes. *Journal of Sport & Exercise*  
15 *Psychology*, 32, 339–358. doi: 10.1123/jsep.32.3.339
- 16 Woodman, T., & Hardy, L. (2001). Stress and anxiety. In R. N. Singer, H. A. Hausenblas, &  
17 C. M. Janelle (Eds.), *Handbook of sport psychology* (pp. 290-318). New York: Wiley.
- 18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 Table 1. Mean (SD) descriptive statistics of the sample self-report measures and coach-rated  
 2 performance split by age group and by trial outcome (selected vs not selected)

Variable (scale)	U14		U16/U19	
	Selected (n=22)	Not selected (n=29)	Selected (n=29)	Not selected (n=12)
Age	12.14 (0.64)	12.03 (0.87)	14.90 (0.90)	14.33 (0.65)
New to club	4 (18.2%)	11 (37.9%)	3 (10.3%)	0
Number of previous trials	0.77 (0.69)	0.45 (0.87)	1.86 (1.34)	0.67 (0.65)
Control (1 - 5)	4.41 (0.59)	4.31 (0.66)	4.21 (0.77)	4.50 (0.67)
Approach goals (1 - 7)	5.80 (0.78)	5.74 (0.88)	6.08 (0.73)	6.21 (0.66)
Avoidance goals (1 - 7)	4.02 (1.48)	4.90 (1.69)	4.79 (1.54)	4.88 (1.45)
Excitement (0 - 4)	3.14 (0.64)	2.95 (0.87)	2.60 (0.94)	2.25 (0.97)
Anxiety (0 - 4)	2.14 (1.06)	2.54 (1.17)	2.48 (1.01)	2.67 (0.98)
Self-efficacy (0 - 100%)	67.88 (10.03)	63.46 (10.16)	73.65 (11.17)	81.09 (14.43)
DRES (-5 - +5)	0.60 (1.05)	-0.14 (1.09)	0.11 (0.94)	0.14 (0.84)
Demands (1 - 7)	3.10 (0.50)	3.37 (0.62)	3.35 (0.66)	3.75 (0.46)
Resources (1 - 7)	5.15 (0.53)	4.84 (0.52)	5.07 (0.53)	4.99 (0.51)
Cognitive anxiety (1 - 11)	4.77 (2.43)	5.97 (2.40)	6.28 (2.03)	7.68 (1.61)
Somatic anxiety (1 - 11)	4.09 (2.24)	4.93 (1.65)	5.25 (2.05)	6.89 (1.24)
Coach-rated performance (1 - 5)	3.46 (0.41)	2.34 (0.48)	3.40 (0.51)	2.52 (0.48)

3

4

5

6

7

1 Table 2. Binary logistic regression with trial outcome (selected vs not selected) as the outcome variable, using TCTSA resource appraisals, and  
 2 BPS resource appraisal in two separate models.  
 3

TCTSA Resources					BPS Resources				
Variables	$\beta$	Wald	$p$	Odd Ratio (Exp B)	Variables	$\beta$	Wald	$p$	Odd Ratio (Exp B)
Previous trials	.988	8.116	.004	2.687	Previous trials	.847	7.223	.007	.847
Team trialing for Demands	1.385	3.548	.060	3.996	Team trialing for Demands	1.012	2.814	.093	1.012
Self-efficacy	-.262	.152	.697	.769	BPS resources	-.371	.370	.543	-.371
Control	-.837	2.404	.121	.433	Excitement	.245	.204	.651	.245
Approach	.322	.459	.498	1.380	Anxiety	-.098	.081	.776	-.098
Avoidance	.076	.095	.758	1.078	Cognitive anxiety	.051	.030	.862	.051
Excitement	.063	.029	.866	1.065	Somatic anxiety	-.039	.046	.83	-.039
Anxiety	.039	.015	.902	1.040	DRES	-.205	1.469	.225	-.205
Cognitive anxiety	-.059	.079	.778	.942		.383	1.629	.202	.383
Somatic anxiety	-.199	1.276	.259	.820					
DRES	.662	3.870	.049	1.938					

4  
 5  
 6  
 7  
 8  
 9

1 Table 3. Linear regression model with coach-rated performance as the outcome variable, using TCTSA resource appraisals, and BPS resource  
 2 appraisal in two separate models.  
 3

<i>TCTSA Resources</i>					<i>BPS Resources</i>				
Variables	$\beta$	$t$	$p$	Unstandardized B	Variables	$\beta$	$t$	$p$	Unstandardized B
Previous trials	.369	3.183	.002	.22	Previous trials	.348	3.167	.002	.209
Team trialing for	.073	.53	.598	.099	Team trialing for	.056	.489	.626	.075
Demands	-.013	-.089	.929	-.014	Demands	-.014	-.105	.917	-.015
Self-efficacy	-.004	-.03	.977	0.00	BPS resources	.241	2.164	.034	.306
Control	.001	.006	.995	.001	Excitement	-.118	-1.058	.293	-.086
Approach	.153	1.211	.23	.133	Anxiety	-.066	-.545	.587	-.041
Avoidance	.058	.439	.662	.024	Cognitive anxiety	-.196	-1.276	.206	-.057
Excitement	-.086	-.733	.466	-.064	Somatic anxiety	.061	.465	.643	.02
Anxiety	-.07	-.533	.596	-.043	DRES	.051	.441	.66	.033
Cognitive anxiety	-.19	-1.104	.273	-.055					
Somatic anxiety	-.006	-.043	.966	-.002					
DRES	.128	1.069	.289	.082					

4  
 5  
 6  
 7  
 8  
 9  
 10

1 Table 4. Pearson's correlation coefficients for all variables.

2

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Demands	-											
2. Self-efficacy (U16s, U19s; N = 41)	-.05	-										
3. Self-efficacy (U14s; N = 49)	-.29*	NA	-									
4. Control	.02	.57**	.45**	-								
5. Approach goals	.09	.54**	.15	.33**	-							
6. Avoidance goals	.41**	-.10	.04	.13	.43**	-						
7. Resources	-.18	.52**	.56**	.39**	.48**	.11	-					
8. DRES	-.43**	.22	.43**	.15	.10	-.22*	.39**	-				
9. Cognitive anxiety	.59**	-.14	-.24	-.13	.11	.47**	-.15	-.18	-			
10. Somatic anxiety	.51**	-.03	-.32*	-.02	.06	.36**	-.25*	-.21*	.65**	-		
11. Excitement	-.37**	.26	.24	.13	.01	-.09	.26*	.26*	-.35**	-.33**	-	
12. Anxiety	.42**	-.09	-.20	.03	.06	.23*	-.04	-.05	.59**	.39**	-.14	-
13. Coach-rated performance	-.16	.16	.12	.18	.19	-.07	.30**	.12	-.24*	-.13	-.01	-.21

3

4 \* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

5 \*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

6 NA Cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant.

7