

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

**Re-examining the association between pre-season challenge and threat states and performance across the season**

**Date of re-submission: 12<sup>th</sup> April 2024.**

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

**Abstract**

Challenge and threat (C/T) states have been shown to predict sport performance under pressure. **Nevertheless**, only one study (Blascovich et al., 2004) has examined whether pre-season C/T states are associated with season-long performance, yielding promising findings. Despite promising findings, this work is not without limitations which warrant addressing. We aimed to address these limitations and contribute to the scarce literature which tests the effect of anticipatory C/T states on longer term performance. Thirty-eight amateur cricketers prepared and delivered two counterbalanced speeches; a control speech and a speech about an important cricket batting situation approximately 16 weeks prior to the start of their competitive season. Regression analysis showed that cardiovascular reactivity in anticipation of delivering a speech about an important cricket batting scenario the next season did not predict season-long batting performance. The findings **have potential to** challenge the role C/T states play in predicting **longer-term** performance **in the sport domain**.

**Key Words:** Stress response; performance under pressure, long-term effects

60 **Introduction**

61 The psychophysiological challenge and threat (C/T) response to stressors has become  
62 a well-established predictor of sport performance under pressure (Cooke & Ring, 2019).  
63 Several studies have explored this association and most support the benefits of a challenge  
64 state in yielding positive performance outcomes when faced with stressors (c.f. Behnke &  
65 Kaczmarek, 2018; Hase et al., 2019), although more recent studies have drawn mixed  
66 conclusions (e.g., Jewiss et al., 2023). Within the C/T literature, the majority of studies view  
67 C/T states as situational responses to task specific stressors (e.g., Turner et al., 2013). To  
68 date, only one study (Blascovich et al., 2004) has examined anticipatory C/T responses on  
69 season-long sport performance. Although Blascovich et al. reported promising findings, there  
70 are limitations to this work which warrant addressing. Consequently, the aim of this study is  
71 to re-examine the effects of pre-season anticipatory C/T states on season-long sport  
72 performance.

73 **Theoretical perspectives on C/T states** such as the Biopsychosocial Model (BPSM;  
74 Blascovich & Mendes, 2000) draws from the cognitive components of Lazarus and  
75 Folkman's (1984) transactional model of stress, and Dienstbier's (1989) model of  
76 physiological toughness and weakness. It specifies that in the presence of goal pursuit and  
77 task engagement, C/T states emerge through a cognitive appraisal process. Here, when  
78 individual coping resources (e.g., knowledge of abilities and skill) outweigh task demands  
79 (e.g., perceived required effort) a challenge state will emerge, whereas a threat state results  
80 when demands outweigh resources (Blascovich & Mendes, 2000). **In this article we adopt the**  
81 **BPSM's conceptualisation of C/T states which views them opposite endpoints on a single**  
82 **bipolar continuum. However, we acknowledge this conceptual approach deviates from that**  
83 **outlined by Lazarus and Folkman in their transactional model of stress and more recent,**  
84 **currently untested, theoretical approaches such as the Theory of Challenge and Threat States**

85 in Athletes-Revised (TCTSA-R; Meijen et al., 2020) and the Evaluative Space Approach to  
86 C/T (ESACT; Uphill et al., 2019) which conceptualises C/T states as occurring during  
87 opportunities for growth/harm and treats C/T as independent, bivalent and co-activated states.

88 A downstream effect of the cognitive appraisal process is that demand and resource  
89 evaluations trigger a predictable pattern of cardiovascular changes. In challenge, increased  
90 sympathetic-adreno-medullary (SAM) activity releases catecholamines triggering epinephrine  
91 release from the adrenal medulla causing vasodilation in skeletal beds (Brownley et al., 2000;  
92 Seery, 2011). A product of these neuroendocrine changes are increases in cardiac output  
93 (CO) and reductions in total peripheral resistance (TPR). Conversely, in threat, increased  
94 hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) activity counteracts vasodilatory effects of epinephrine  
95 through the release of cortisol, triggering attenuations or stabilization in CO and increases in  
96 TPR (Brownley et al., 2000; Seery, 2011).

97 Most of the research which has tested the association between C/T states and sport  
98 performance conceptualises C/T states as situation specific anticipatory responses to a  
99 meaningful performance task, where task performance immediately follows the recording of  
100 anticipatory C/T responses. This literature largely supports the idea that a challenge state  
101 yields superior performance outcomes than a threat state. In their meta-analysis of the C/T  
102 state-sport performance literature, Behnke and Kaczmarek (2018) reported small-moderate  
103 performance effects for raw and derivative cardiovascular markers of C/T states. More  
104 specifically, Turner et al. (2013) reported that cardiovascular markers of C/T states recorded  
105 in anticipation of a cricket batting task were significantly associated with batting performance  
106 performed immediately afterwards, with challenge outperforming threat. In addition,  
107 Brimmell et al. (2018) reported that a challenge state recorded in anticipation of a penalty  
108 shooting task was associated with superior immediate task performance when compared to  
109 threat. Similarly, Dixon et al. (2020) found that challenge reactivity prior to a soccer game

## RUNNING HEAD: C/T STATES AND PERFORMANCE ACROSS THE SEASON

110 was significantly associated with coach and player ratings of match performance. Similar  
111 findings are reported in other sports, such as golf (Moore et al., 2013), netball (Turner et al.,  
112 2012) when performance directly follows C/T state recording. It is noteworthy however that  
113 some research has not found such positive associations between C/T states and sport  
114 performance (e.g., Behnke et al., 2020; Jewiss et al., 2023). **For instance, Jewiss et al. (2023)**  
115 **found that anticipatory C/T states were not predictive of performance under pressure in a**  
116 **pressurised golf-putting task once past performance had been controlled for in a within-**  
117 **subject design.** In addition, research which explores the purported underlying mechanisms  
118 which drive divergent performance outcomes in C/T states remain largely equivocal (e.g.,  
119 Arthur et al., 2019; Wood et al., 2018)

120         Despite a research focus on exploring how anticipatory C/T states determine sport  
121 performance, it appears that little work has tested the effect of anticipatory C/T states on  
122 season-long performance. The value of such work has practical implications which are of  
123 interest to sport psychologists, sports coaches and wider networks within a sport science  
124 team; it might be possible to predict and identify individuals likely to progress through  
125 academy and youth systems, and it may be possible to identify individuals who are likely to  
126 thrive, be challenged, manage anxiety, and thus perform optimally in critical moments  
127 throughout the course of a season (Blascovich et al., 2004). Furthermore, it may be possible  
128 to identify individuals who may require additional psychological support to facilitate the  
129 emergence of challenge states in critical performance situations.

130         One promising study to examine whether C/T states can predict performance over the  
131 course of a season was conducted by Blascovich and colleagues (2004). **In their study,**  
132 Blascovich et al. asked 27 baseball and softball athletes to prepare and deliver two counter-  
133 balanced speeches, prior to the start of the baseball/softball seasons, whilst recording  
134 cardiovascular markers of C/T states. After, and alongside team membership and baseline

135 variable level, a speech about the qualities of a good friend was entered in Step 1 of  
136 regression analysis to control for C/T response caused by speech giving in general, in Step 2  
137 of the predictive model cardiovascular reactivity recorded during a sport specific speech was  
138 entered and was found to be significantly associated with season-long baseball/softball  
139 performance above variance explained in Step 1. Specifically, participants who responded  
140 with cardiovascular reactivity indicative of challenge performed better throughout the  
141 duration of the season indexed via runs created by batter throughout the duration of the  
142 season, than those who exhibited cardiovascular reactivity reflective of threat.

143         The appropriateness of using a speech task was rationalised by Blascovich et al.  
144 (2004) on the premise that there is a direct relationship between athlete's C/T responses while  
145 imagining and giving a speech about playing their sport and the result of their performance  
146 during the subsequent season. This is speculated to be the case as demand and resource  
147 evaluations, which result in anticipation of athletic performance, will likely be evoked during  
148 a less metabolically demanding task (e.g. anticipating and delivering a speech). Thus, a  
149 speech about performance will elicit identical demand and resource evaluations, and  
150 subsequent C/T states, as actual performance itself. However, recent work which has also  
151 used a speech task to assess task specific anticipatory C/T has questioned its efficacy  
152 predicated on the assumption that cardiovascular reactivity to the task may not be solely  
153 caused by having to talk about it (Meijen et al., 2014). For instance, it may also be  
154 determined by imagery ability and imagery controllability (Beevor et al., 2023). The  
155 implications drawn from Blascovich and colleagues' work, albeit from one study, indicate  
156 that it might be possible to identify individuals likely to thrive in high pressure, goal-oriented  
157 moments to maximise individual and team success in motivated performance situations.

158         Despite significant contributions to the literature, Blascovich et al.'s research is not  
159 without limitations which are worthy of addressing prior to anticipatory C/T states being

160 adopted by sports teams and utilised within the sport domain. For instance, although the  
161 conclusions drawn suggest that cardiovascular markers of C/T states were associated with  
162 season-long performance only one of the two raw cardiovascular markers of C/T states were  
163 associated with season-long performance. Specifically, despite the way TPR and CO are  
164 inversely related (Seery et al., 2010), TPR reactivity was associated with season-long  
165 performance, but CO reactivity was not ( $p > 0.05$ ). More substantively, past performance was  
166 not controlled for, despite Blascovich et al. noting that future performance under pressure  
167 may often be predicted from past performance. Controlling for past performance is important  
168 in isolating the contribution made by C/T states on future performance beyond what can be  
169 attributed to past performance capabilities (Jewiss et al., 2023). Indeed, recent research (e.g.,  
170 Jewiss et al., 2023; Turner et al., 2021) has demonstrated that performance under pressure is  
171 largely predicted by past performance reflected. A further limitation of Blascovich et al.'s  
172 research was that psychological task engagement, which is a pre-requisite to the emergence  
173 of C/T states, was recorded at the group rather than individual level, meaning participants  
174 who did not display task engagement may have been erroneously included in data analysis  
175 (Hase et al., 2020).

176       This study used Blascovich et al.'s research as a template to add to the limited  
177 existing literature, which makes it difficult to draw firm conclusions, on the impact of C/T  
178 states on season long performance. Specifically, we examine whether anticipatory C/T states  
179 predict cricket batting performance across the course of a season whilst simultaneously  
180 addressing contemporary suggestions in the C/T literature (e.g., controlling for past  
181 performance and ensuring task engagement at an individual level). In addition, this study  
182 adhered to recent calls in the C/T-state literature and ensured psychological task engagement  
183 at an individual level using HR reactivity (Hase et al., 2020) and controlled for past  
184 performance to elucidate the impact of C/T states on performance under pressure above past

185 performance capabilities (Jewiss et al., 2023). Consequently, this study is the first to ensure  
186 psychological task engagement at the individual level and control for past performance to  
187 elucidate on the contribution of C/T states on predicting performance under pressure whilst  
188 assessing the longer-term performance effect yielded by C/T. It was hypothesized that past  
189 performance would be significantly related to subsequent performance over the course of a  
190 season, and C/T states would significantly contribute to predicting performance throughout  
191 the season on top of the contribution made by past performance. Specifically, it was  
192 anticipated that a challenge state indexed by increased CO and reduced TPR would be  
193 associated with better performance over the course of the season reflected by a higher batting  
194 average.

## 195 Method

### 196 Participants

197 An a-priori power analysis with an effect size set at 0.40 (which was derived from  
198 Blascovich et al.'s study because it is the only other known study to look at the effect of  
199 anticipatory C/T states on longer-term performance outcomes), desired statistical power set at  
200 0.80, number of predictor variables set at three, and an  $\alpha$ -level of 0.05, suggested the  
201 minimum required sample size was 32. Thirty-eight amateur male cricketers ( $23 \pm 5$  years),  
202 playing in a cricket league on the south coast of the UK, participated in the current study. All  
203 participants reported being in good health, normotensive with no cardiovascular concerns. No  
204 incentive was offered to participants for taking part. Ethical approval was granted by the  
205 University ethics committee and written individual informed consent was gained prior to data  
206 collection. All participants were asked to refrain from heavy exercise and from consuming  
207 caffeine and alcohol 24 hours prior to testing as this is known to influence resting  
208 cardiovascular measures as per Quintana et al. (2013).



209 **Measures**

210 **Cardiovascular Markers of C/T States**

211 C/T states were indexed via their cardiovascular correlates due to their reported  
212 superiority to self-reported metrics, for instance, **cardiovascular markers are not influenced**  
213 **by some of the biases associated with self-report data** (Seery, 2011). Cardiovascular measures  
214 of heart rate (HR), CO and TPR were recorded using a Finometer PRO (Finapres Medical  
215 Systems, BV, Arnhem, the Netherlands). The Finometer records these cardiovascular markers  
216 using plethysmography underpinned by volume-clamp and physiological criteria (Penaz, 1973;  
217 Wesseling, 1995). An infrared sensor located in an appropriately sized finger cuff placed on  
218 the index fingers of the non-dominant hand records changes in the diameter of the arterial  
219 wall continuously and non-invasively. **In using plethysmography, we acknowledge that the**  
220 **methods used in this paper to record cardiovascular markers diverge from those employed by**  
221 **Blascovich et al. In addition, we acknowledge that a host of stable and transient variables,**  
222 **such as age and gender, smoking behaviour, habitual levels of alcohol consumption, oral**  
223 **contraceptive pill intake, food intake, caffeine intake and engagement in physical activity**  
224 **(Laborde et al., 2017) may determine cardiovascular reactivity when faced with intermittent**  
225 **stressors and may contribute to the findings in this study.**

226 **Performance (dependent variable)**

227 Season-long batting performance, marked by participant batting average (calculated  
228 by taking the total number of runs scored divided by number of times the participant lost their  
229 wicket) the season directly after assessment, was used as our dependent variable. Season-long  
230 batting performance was sourced from a publicly available website ([www.play-cricket.com](http://www.play-cricket.com))  
231 known for holding cricket performance metrics.

232 **Past Performance (control variable)**

233 Season-long batting performance, the season directly before participating in the  
234 current study, was used as our marker of past performance. Past performance data was  
235 sourced from [www.play-cricket.com](http://www.play-cricket.com).

### 236 **Anticipatory C/T states**

237 Anticipatory C/T responses were recorded during the preparation and delivery of two  
238 counterbalanced speeches. In line with previous work (e.g., Blascovich et al., 2004; Meijen et  
239 al., 2014; Seery et al., 2010), the first speech asked participants to explain the qualities of a  
240 good friend and the second was a sport-specific speech about the upcoming cricket season.  
241 Participants were afforded two-minutes to prepare and two minutes to deliver each  
242 counterbalanced speech, during which cardiovascular data was continually recorded, with a  
243 three-minute rest period between each speech. The duration used to prepare and deliver their  
244 speech aligned with the duration employed by Seery et al. (2010), but was shorter than  
245 Blascovich et al. (2004, 2-min prep and 5-min rest) and Meijen et al. (2014, 3-min prep and  
246 10 min rest). Per previous work (Blascovich et al., 2004; Meijen et al., 2014) cardiovascular  
247 data recorded in the friend speech was used as a control variable to isolate C/T responses  
248 which were due to competitive performance and not speech giving in general.

### 249 **Speech One**

250 Participants were instructed to mentally prepare (two minutes) and deliver (two  
251 minutes) a speech outlining the qualities which they considered to be characteristics of a good  
252 friend. Participants were prompted with pre-determined topics (such as encouraging  
253 participants to describe the behaviour of a good friend and outline the top three characteristics  
254 their best friend possessed) to encourage the participants to continue speaking if they stopped  
255 talking for five-seconds during speech delivery.

### 256 **Speech Two**

257 Participants were instructed to mentally prepare (two minutes) and deliver (two  
258 minutes) a speech discussing an important and contextually relevant batting scenario they  
259 envisaged facing in the upcoming cricket season. For example, an opening batter may  
260 imagine preparing to face the first ball of the innings, whereas a tailender may imagine  
261 preparing to face their first delivery and planning to get their partner on strike. Participants  
262 were instructed to consider behavioural, cognitive and emotional responses to their envisaged  
263 batting scenario. Participants were prompted with pre-determined topics (such as asking  
264 participants to outline their thoughts/emotions/behaviours as the bowler approached the  
265 batting crease) to encourage the participants to continue speaking if they stopped talking for  
266 five-seconds during speech delivery. The context of the sport-specific speech diverged  
267 slightly from Blascovich et al. (2004) who prescribed a specific batting scenario all  
268 participants should imagine, to reflect the numerous batting positions in cricket each with  
269 unique situational demands to ensure the imagined important batting scenario was  
270 individually and contextually relevant in the context of each participants batting role.

## 271 **Procedures**

### 272 **Laboratory Setup**

273 An email was sent to club captains at adult cricket clubs in a cricket league on the  
274 south coast of the UK asking that the study information and lead researcher's contact details  
275 were circulated. All cricketers who displayed an interest in the study were encouraged to  
276 respond via the details provided. Cardiovascular data collection took place in a sound-proof  
277 Psychology laboratory during the cricket off-season approximately four months before the  
278 start of the upcoming season. Prior to attending their single individual testing session  
279 participants were informed they would be asked to complete two tasks considered as  
280 evaluative social stressors.

281 **Participant Preparation**

282 Participants were prepared for data collection in accordance with previous literature to  
283 use the Finometer PRO (Finapres Medical Systems, BV, Arnhem, The Netherlands). A finger  
284 cuff was attached to the index finger on the non-dominant and a rica-rocci blood pressure  
285 cuff was attached around the bicep of the same arm. To reduce white coat syndrome all  
286 participants were provided with a short description about the sensation of the finger and  
287 blood pressure cuff. Participants were informed that two minutes into baseline data recording  
288 the Finometer would initiate a return-to-flow systolic calibration (which lasts for one-  
289 minute). After the systolic calibration participants were informed that the remaining seven-  
290 minutes of baseline data recording would continue. After the 10-minute baseline data  
291 collection period participants were instructed that experimental phases would begin.

292 **Cardiovascular Data Collection**

293 Cardiovascular markers indicative of C/T states were recorded throughout a 10-  
294 minute baseline period (e.g., Meijen et al., 2014), which was an initial longer rest period than  
295 the timeframes used by Blascovich et al. (2004). Baseline data recording used resting rather  
296 than vanilla baseline principles, and participants were instructed to remain wakeful and to sit  
297 silently with their feet positioned on the floor (Jennings et al., 1992). During the 10-minute  
298 baseline period the experimenter was present to initiate the return-to-flow calibration but left  
299 the testing room once this process had begun to observe from a sound-proofed laboratory  
300 next door. Once baseline data recording was complete the experimenter re-entered the room.

301 Participants were then informed that they would be asked to prepare for and deliver  
302 two counterbalanced speeches: a friend speech and a sport specific speech. In line with  
303 previous C/T literature (e.g., Jewiss et al., 2023), participants received task instructions and  
304 were simultaneously invited to prepare their speech because anticipatory cognitive and

305 emotional changes are likely to occur at the onset of participants receiving new information.  
306 This lasted a total of two-minutes and formed the preparation phase. At the end of the two-  
307 minutes participants were asked to deliver their speech for a further two-minutes. After the  
308 first speech was completed participants were afforded a three-minute recovery prior to  
309 beginning the second speech. A three-minute recovery period was considered appropriate to  
310 allow for cardiovascular measures to return to baseline levels and avoid any residual carry  
311 over effects due to the nature of the static non-metabolically demanding task. See Figure 1.1.  
312 for an overview of the experimental procedure. To facilitate task engagement, participants  
313 were instructed that for each speech they were being video recorded, that a second researcher  
314 was rating how well they performed each speech, and the rating of their performance would  
315 be placed onto a leaderboard to allow for social comparison with other participants. These  
316 types of instructions have been widely used within C/T previous research as a competitive  
317 stressor (e.g., Turner et al., 2013).

### 318 **Analytic Strategy**

319 Data were checked to ensure it met assumptions of linearity, multicollinearity,  
320 homoscedasticity, and had normally distributed residuals prior to completing a regression  
321 analysis. At this stage a total of seven participants were excluded from analysis: the data from  
322 two participants violated statistical assumptions, and five participants had missing  
323 cardiovascular or batting performance data. At this stage, the 31 remaining participants had  
324 no missing cardiovascular data and had batting performance, indexed by a full seasons  
325 batting average, for the season before and after cardiovascular recording. Psychological task  
326 engagement for both speech tasks was then checked at an individual level. To conduct this  
327 necessary check, HR reactivity was calculated by subtracting average HR in the final minute  
328 of baseline from average HR in the two-minute instruction and preparation phase for both  
329 speeches. Here, HR reactivity  $> 0$  indicated psychological task engagement. At this stage, one

330 participant was excluded from data analysis due to displaying psychological task  
331 disengagement in anticipation of both speech tasks. The final sample size was 30 participants  
332 which was marginally underpowered in relation to our a priori power analysis.

333 To index C/T states, CO and TPR reactivity data were calculated by subtracting raw  
334 cardiovascular values recorded in the final minute of baseline from average cardiovascular  
335 values recorded during the two-minute instruction and preparation phase. This diverges from  
336 Blascovich et al.'s work (2004) by using the instruction and preparation phase to reflect  
337 anticipatory C/T responses, whereas Blascovich and colleagues used the two-minute speech  
338 delivery phase to reflect anticipatory C/T. The rationale that underpinned this decision was  
339 that using the instruction and preparation phase minimised the opportunity for cognitive re-  
340 appraisal which may have occurred during speech delivery as participants reflect on and  
341 receive feedback about their speech performance (Vine et al., 2016). In addition, using the  
342 instruction and preparation phase minimised the risk of capturing movement artefact in  
343 cardiovascular data, which is common in tasks, like speech giving, where hand gestures are  
344 commonly used.

345 Next, as is common in the C/T state field, CO and TPR reactivity were combined to  
346 create the challenge and threat index (CTI). The CTI was created by standardising CO and  
347 TPR reactivity, multiplying CO reactivity by +1 and TPR reactivity by -1 and summing the  
348 two weighted variables. Subsequent multiple hierarchical regression analyses were conducted  
349 in three steps. Participants batting average achieved the season after C/T states were recorded  
350 was the dependent variable. Participants batting average the season prior to C/T state  
351 recording was entered in Step one. In Step two, friend speech cardiovascular reactivity scores  
352 were entered independently, and sport specific speech reactivity scores were independently  
353 entered in Step three (separate regression analyses for CO, TPR and CTI).

354

## Results

355

### Task Engagement

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

All 30 participants in our sample demonstrated psychological task engagement in anticipation of both speech tasks. In line with previous literature, two paired-samples t-tests were conducted to test for group task engagement by comparing the average HR in the final minute of baseline with the average HR during the two-minute instruction and mental preparation phase. For both the friend speech ( $88 \pm 16$  bpm,  $t(29) = 4.95$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and the sport specific speech ( $88 \pm 13$  bpm,  $t(29) = 7.11$ ,  $p < .001$ ) there were statistically significant increases in HR from baseline ( $79 \pm 10$  bpm) to the preparation phase.

363

### Relationship Between C/T States and Performance

364

365

366

Prior to conducting hierarchical linear regression analysis, correlational analysis revealed that all cardiovascular variables were non-significantly related to season-long performance (see Table 1.1).

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

In Step one, a significant proportion of batting average was accounted for by the previous season's batting average,  $R^2 = 0.25$ ,  $p < .01$ . A higher batting average the season before testing was associated with a higher batting average the season after testing ( $b = .34$ ,  $\beta = .50$ ). The addition of CO reactivity recorded in anticipation of the friend speech in Step two, accounted for a non-significant proportion of additional **accumulated** variance in batting average,  $\Delta R^2 = 0.01$ , Total  $R^2 = 0.26$ ,  $p > .05$ ,  $b = -.42$ ,  $\beta = -.05$ . The addition of CO reactivity recorded in anticipation of the sport-specific speech in Step three also accounted for a non-significant proportion of additional **accumulated** variance,  $\Delta R^2 = 0.01$ , Total  $R^2 = 0.27$ ,  $p > .05$ ,  $b = -1.12$ ,  $\beta = -.11$ . For TPR, friend speech TPR reactivity in Step two accounted for a non-significant proportion of additional **accumulated** variance in batting average,  $\Delta R^2 = 0.06$ , Total  $R^2 = 0.31$ ,  $p > .05$ ,  $b = .02$ ,  $\beta = .33$ . The addition of sport-specific speech TPR reactivity

378 in Step three accounted for a non-significant proportion of additional **accumulated** variance,  
379  $\Delta R^2 = 0.01$ , Total  $R^2 = 0.32$ ,  $p > .05$ ,  $b = -.01$ ,  $\beta = -.14$ . For the CTI, friend speech CTI  
380 entered in Step two accounted for a non-significant proportion of additional **accumulated**  
381 variance in batting average,  $\Delta R^2 = 0.04$ , Total  $R^2 = 0.29$ ,  $p > .05$ ,  $b = -1.07$ ,  $\beta = -.21$ . In Step  
382 three, the addition of sport-specific speech CTI accounted for a non-significant proportion of  
383 additional **accumulated** variance,  $\Delta R^2 = 0.00$ , Total  $R^2 = 0.29$ ,  $p > .05$ ,  $b = .15$ ,  $\beta = .03$ . The  
384 only significant predictor of season long performance was past performance.

### 385 **Discussion**

386 The aim of this study was to adopt Blascovich et al.'s (2004) research as a template  
387 and contribute to the limited literature which has examined the effect of anticipatory C/T  
388 states on performance throughout the course of a season. In addition, this study sought to  
389 strengthen the methodological and analytical procedures adopted in previous work because it  
390 actions recent calls in the C/T field by ensuring psychological task engagement at an  
391 individual level (Hase et al., 2020) and controlling for past performance to elucidate the  
392 unique contribution made by C/T states in determining performance under pressure (Jewiss et  
393 al., 2023). The main finding from this study is that cardiovascular correlates of C/T states are  
394 unrelated to batting performance throughout the duration of a cricket season when controlling  
395 for past performance. In fact, in the predictive model, past performance was the only  
396 significant predictor of subsequent performance under pressure.

397 Our findings partially contradict the only known study to test the effect of C/T states  
398 on performance over the course of the season (Blascovich et al., 2004) **and potentially**  
399 **challenge the role C/T states play in determining season-long performance, although our**  
400 **findings should be consumed in the context of methodological limitations (e.g., the use of**  
401 **speech tasks to elicit C/T states).** Here, Blascovich and colleagues found that TPR and CTI



402 were significantly associated with season-long baseball performance, whereas CO reactivity  
403 was a non-significant contributor to season-long performance. Several methodological  
404 decisions may explain divergent findings reported in Blascovich et al. (2004) and this study.  
405 First, Blascovich et al. control for team membership and responses to speech giving in  
406 general, whereas this study adds past performance as an additional controlling variable. It is  
407 possible that season-long performance variance explained by C/T states in Blascovich et al. is  
408 captured within the variance explained by past performance in this study. Second, Blascovich  
409 and colleagues encouraged all participants to imagine a prescribed and fixed baseball batting  
410 scenario, whereas this study afforded participants autonomy to imagine a batting scenario  
411 familiar to them. It is possible that choice led to lower invested effort in the preparation for  
412 the tasks (Phillips et al., 2013). **Third, the use of social comparison through task instructions**  
413 **which specified that speeches would be scored and placed on a leaderboard deviated from**  
414 **Blascovich et al. and may partially explain divergent findings because some participants**  
415 **appraisals may have been naturally facilitated by the potential of social comparison whereas**  
416 **other participants appraisals may have been inhibited. For instance, Mendes et al. (2001)**  
417 **found that cardiovascular responses indicative of C/T states varied during downward and**  
418 **upward social comparisons.** In addition, Blascovich et al. delivered task instructions via  
419 audiotape, whereas the experimenter in this study delivered instructions verbally and research  
420 has shown that verbal instructions may contribute to different cardiovascular effects than  
421 audiotaped instructions due to social interaction, demand characteristics as well as differing  
422 pace and tone (Frings et al., 2014).

423         Although Blascovich and colleagues speculate that individuals who experience  
424 challenge when imagining and speaking about a goal-relevant situation are likely to  
425 experience challenge when faced with the same goal-relevant situation in game, which is  
426 likely consistent throughout the course of a season, alternative theory questions the extent to

427 which C/T appraisals remain consistent (Jones et al., 2009; Vine et al., 2016). For instance, in  
428 the Theory of Challenge and Threat States in Athletes (TCTSA), Jones et al. (2009) propose  
429 that C/T states are dynamic and argue that demand, and resource appraisals change over time  
430 and in the presence of new information (Chadha et al., 2023; Cummings et al., 2017). For  
431 instance, Chadha et al. (2023) evidenced the dynamic nature of C/T cognitions and affective  
432 states in the lead up to competition throughout three different time points. In addition, in their  
433 Integrative Framework of Stress, Attention and Visuomotor Performance, Vine et al. (2016)  
434 propose a feedback loop where knowledge of performance may determine subsequent  
435 demand-resource evaluations in the presence of a similar performance task. Evidence for the  
436 existence of a feedback loop can be seen in Crowe et al. (2020) who found individual  
437 changes in demand and resource evaluations following individualised task performance  
438 feedback. In addition, research has demonstrated that cardiovascular reactivity to similar  
439 competitive scenarios varies from competitive event to competitive event (Dixon et al.,  
440 2020). Taken together, it is likely that individual appraisals of demands and resources in  
441 similar scenarios are likely to differ according to fluctuations caused by new information,  
442 past performance, and feedback over the course of the season. In addition, across the duration  
443 of a competitive season participants may experience major life events which may determine  
444 an individual's habitual demand and resource appraisals which may shape C/T states and  
445 performance under pressure (Moore et al., 2018).

446         The current study has limitations which should be considered when interpreting our  
447 findings and which should be addressed in future before any stronger inferences about the  
448 importance of C/T states for season-long performance can be made. One limitation which  
449 should be noted is that our final sample size is slightly underpowered in reference to the  
450 sample size calculation due to missing cardiovascular and performance data and individual  
451 participants not satisfying pre-requisites needed for the calculation of C/T states. In addition,

452 subsequent research may benefit from asking participants to verbally report the specific  
453 scenario they imagined and prepared for as this could provide explanatory insights into the  
454 situations which shaped their cardiovascular reactivity. Future work may wish to allow for  
455 missing data and participants not satisfying pre-requisites in advance, although dropout rates  
456 are variable (e.g., 13% of original sample in Jewiss et al., 2023 versus 49% in Hase et al.  
457 2019) and difficult to predict. In this study C/T states were only indexed via their  
458 cardiovascular correlates and following recommendations in the C/T literature (Hase et al.,  
459 2019), future work may wish to use self-reported metrics alongside their cardiovascular  
460 markers. Furthermore, although it satisfies theory to infer task engagement from HR  
461 reactivity, stronger conclusions may be drawn by a manipulation check. Last, recording  
462 ventricular contractility (VC) alongside HR would allow for stronger judgments of task  
463 engagement on a cardiovascular level.

464 *Although moderators to the C/T states-performance association, such as*  
465 *methodological decisions like the type of performance, measurement mode, experimental*  
466 *design (e.g., Behnke & Kaczmarek, 2018 and variables like age and gender (e.g., Hangen et*  
467 *al., 2019) have been documented in the C/T field, future work may wish to consider the*  
468 *moderating impact of psychological strategies and techniques. One such variable worth*  
469 *consideration, in particular in research where encouraging participants to imagine and reflect*  
470 *is a core tenet, is imagery. Research has shown that the use of imagery can influence*  
471 *cardiovascular reactivity (e.g., Cumming & Williams, 2012) and greater capacity to produce*  
472 *images underpinned by task mastery could be associated with adaptive stress appraisals*  
473 *(Beevor et al., 2023). Consequently, recording the clarity, vividness and valence of images*  
474 *and further recording the extent to which this moderates C/T states is worthy of attention. In*  
475 *addition, future work may wish to fully explore the extent to which demographic information*  
476 *such as population characteristics and task demands such as the requirements of the skill*

477 determine C/T appraisals and their subsequent explanatory power. For instance, research has  
478 shown that C/T states are stronger predictors of performance in elite (e.g., Turner et al., 2013)  
479 compared to novice (e.g., Moore et al., 2015) participants and in sports where there is greater  
480 opportunity for harm such as cricket batting (e.g., Jewiss et al., 2023; Turner et al., 2013) in  
481 comparison to physically safe tasks like golf putting (Moore et al., 2015).

482 In conclusion, the aim of this study was to add to the limited literature which tests the  
483 effect of anticipatory C/T states on batting performance across the course of a cricket season.  
484 The study has increased methodological rigour by ensuring task engagement at an individual  
485 level and by controlling for past performance to understand the contribution made by C/T  
486 states on top of past performance capabilities. The findings of this study suggest that C/T  
487 states are not associated with performance throughout the cricket season. Consequently, the  
488 results of this study may challenge the role C/T states play in predicting longer-term  
489 performance when C/T states are elicited through speech giving and more broadly challenge  
490 the utility of speech giving as an appropriate methodology to assess anticipatory C/T  
491 responses. Consequently, before any stronger inferences can be made regarding the  
492 importance of C/T states for longer-term performance outcomes, further research is required.

## 493 References

494 Arthur, T. G., Wilson, M. R., Moore, L. J., Wylie, L. J., & Vine, S. J. (2019).  
495 Examining the effect of challenge and threat states on endurance exercise capabilities.  
496 *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 44*, 51-59.  
497 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2019.04.017>.

498 Beevor, H. J., Ginty, A. T., Veldhuijzen van Zanten, J. J., & Williams, S. E. (2023).  
499 Mastery imagery ability moderates the relationship between heart rate reactivity to acute

500 psychological stress and perceptions of stress and physiological arousal. *Psychophysiology*,  
501 e14486.

502 Behnke, M., & Kaczmarek, L. D. (2018). Successful performance and cardiovascular  
503 markers of challenge and threat: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*,  
504 130, 73-79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2018.04.007>.

505 Blascovich, J., & Mendes, W. B. (2000). Challenge and threat appraisals: The role of  
506 affective cues In Forgas J (Ed.), *Feeling and thinking: The role of affect in social cognition*  
507 (pp. 59–82).

508 Blascovich, J., Seery, M. D., Mugridge, C. A., Norris, R. K., & Weisbuch, M. (2004).  
509 Predicting athletic performance from cardiovascular indexes of challenge and threat. *Journal*  
510 *of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40(5), 683-688.  
511 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2003.10.007>.

512 Brownley, K.A., Hurwitz, B.E., & Schneiderman, N. (2000). Cardio-vascular  
513 psychophysiology. In J.T. Cacioppo, L.G. Tassinary, & G.G. Berntson (Eds.), *Handbook of*  
514 *psychophysiology* (pp. 224–264). Cambridge University Press.

515 Cooke, A., & Ring, C. (2019). Psychophysiology of sport, exercise, and performance:  
516 Past, present, and future [Editorial]. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, 8(1), 1–6.  
517 <https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000156>

518 Crowe, E. M., Moore, L. J., Harris, D. J., Wilson, M. R., & Vine, S. J. (2020). In-task  
519 auditory performance-related feedback promotes cardiovascular markers of a challenge state  
520 during a pressurized task. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, 1-14.  
521 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2020.1766681>.

522 Dienstbier, R.A. (1989). Arousal and physiological toughness: Implications for  
523 mental and physical health. *Psychological Review*, 96(1), Article 84.  
524 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.96.1.84>

525 Frings, D., Rycroft, N., Allen, M. S., & Fenn, R. (2014). Watching for gains and  
526 losses: The effects of motivational challenge and threat on attention allocation during a visual  
527 search task. *Motivation and Emotion*, 38(4), 513-522. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-014-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-014-9399-0)  
528 9399-0.

529 Hangen, E. J., Elliot, A. J., & Jamieson, J. P. (2019). Stress reappraisal during a  
530 mathematics competition: Testing effects on cardiovascular approach-oriented states and  
531 exploring the moderating role of gender. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, 32(1), 95-108.  
532 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2018.1530049>.

533 Hase, A., Gorrie-Stone, T., & Freeman, P. (2019). Tyrosine intake and cardiovascular  
534 responses in a motivated performance situation. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance*  
535 *Psychology*, 8(1), 80. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000144>.

536 Hase, A., O'Brien, J., Moore, L. J., & Freeman, P. (2019). The relationship between  
537 challenge and threat states and performance: A systematic review. *Sport, Exercise, and*  
538 *Performance Psychology*, 8(2), 123. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000132>.

539 Hase, A., van het Rot, M., de Miranda Azevedo, R., & Freeman, P. (2020). Threat-  
540 related motivational disengagement: Integrating blunted cardiovascular reactivity to stress  
541 into the biopsychosocial model of challenge and threat. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, 1-15.  
542 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2020.1755819>.

543 Jennings, J. R., Kamarck, T., Stewart, C., Eddy, M., & Johnson, P. (1992). Alternate  
544 cardiovascular baseline assessment techniques: Vanilla or resting

545 baseline. *Psychophysiology*, 29(6), 742-750. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469->  
546 8986.1992.tb02052.x.

547 Jewiss, M., Runswick, O. R., & Greenlees, I. (2023). An Examination of the  
548 Challenge/Threat State and Sport-Performance Relationship While Controlling for Past  
549 Performance. *Journal of sport & exercise psychology*, 45(4), 195-207.  
550 <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2022-0197>.

551 Jones, M., Meijen, C., McCarthy, P. J., & Sheffield, D. (2009). A theory of challenge  
552 and threat states in athletes. *International review of sport and exercise psychology*, 2(2), 161-  
553 180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17509840902829331>.

554 Laborde, S., Mosley, E., & Thayer, J. F. (2017). Heart rate variability and cardiac  
555 vagal tone in psychophysiological research—recommendations for experiment planning, data  
556 analysis, and data reporting. *Frontiers in psychology*, 8, 213.  
557 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00213>.

558 Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Coping and adaptation. *The handbook of*  
559 *behavioral medicine*, 282325.

560 Meijen, C., Turner, M., Jones, M. V., Sheffield, D., & McCarthy, P. (2020). A theory  
561 of challenge and threat states in athletes: A revised conceptualization. *Frontiers in*  
562 *psychology*, 11, 126. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00126>.

563 Mendes, W. B., Blascovich, J., Major, B., & Seery, M. (2001). Challenge and threat  
564 responses during downward and upward social comparisons. *European Journal of Social*  
565 *Psychology*, 31(5), 477-497. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.80>.

566 Moore, L. J., Wilson, M. R., Vine, S. J., Coussens, A. H., & Freeman, P. (2013).  
567 Champ or chump?: Challenge and threat states during pressurized competition. *Journal of*  
568 *Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 35(6), 551-562. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.35.6.551>.

569 Moore, L. J., Young, T., Freeman, P., & Sarkar, M. (2018). Adverse life events,  
570 cardiovascular responses, and sports performance under pressure. *Scandinavian Journal of*  
571 *Medicine & Science in Sports*, 28(1), 340-347. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.12928>.

572 Nosek, B. A., Alter, G., Banks, G. C., Borsboom, D., Bowman, S. D., Breckler, S. J.,  
573 & Yarkoni, T. S. (2015). *Promoting an open research culture*. *Science*, 348(6242), 1422-  
574 1425. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aab2374>.

575 Penaz, J. (1973). Photoelectric measurement of blood pressure, volume and flow in  
576 the finger [Conference session]. In *Digest of the 10<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Medical*  
577 *and Biological Engineering*. Dresden, p. 104.

578 Phillips, A. C., Ginty, A. T., & Hughes, B. M. (2013). The other side of the coin:  
579 Blunted cardiovascular and cortisol reactivity are associated with negative health  
580 outcomes. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 90(1), 1-7.  
581 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2013.02.002>.

582 Quintana, D. S., McGregor, I. S., Guastella, A. J., Malhi, G. S., & Kemp, A. H.  
583 (2013). A meta-analysis on the impact of alcohol dependence on short-term resting-state  
584 heart rate variability: Implications for cardiovascular risk. *Alcoholism: Clinical and*  
585 *Experimental Research*, 37, E23-E29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-0277.2012.01913.x>.

586 Seery, M. D., Weisbuch, M., Hetenyi, M. A., & Blascovich, J. (2010). Cardiovascular  
587 measures independently predict performance in a university course. *Psychophysiology*, 47(3),  
588 535-539. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.2009.00945.x>.



589 Turner, M. J., Jones, M. V., Sheffield, D., & Cross, S. L. (2012). Cardiovascular  
590 indices of challenge and threat states predict competitive performance. *International Journal*  
591 *of Psychophysiology*, 86(1), 48-57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2012.08.004>.

592 Turner, M. J., Jones, M. V., Sheffield, D., Slater, M. J., Barker, J. B., & Bell, J. J.  
593 (2013). Who thrives under pressure? Predicting the performance of elite academy cricketers  
594 using the cardiovascular indicators of challenge and threat states. *Journal of Sport and*  
595 *Exercise Psychology*, 35(4), 387-397. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.35.4.387>.

596 Uphill, M. A., Rossato, C. J., Swain, J., & O'Driscoll, J. (2019). Challenge and threat:  
597 A critical review of the literature and an alternative conceptualization. *Frontiers in*  
598 *psychology*, 10, 1255. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01255>.

599 Vine, S. J., Moore, L. J., & Wilson, M. R. (2016). An integrative framework of stress,  
600 attention, and visuomotor performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1671.  
601 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01671>.

602 Wesseling, K. H. (1995). Physiocal, calibrating finger vascular physiology for  
603 Finapres. *Homeostasis*, 36, 67-82.

604 Wood, N., Parker, J., Freeman, P., Black, M., & Moore, L. (2018). The relationship  
605 between challenge and threat states and anaerobic power, core affect, perceived exertion, and  
606 self-focused attention during a competitive sprint cycling task. *Progress in Brain Research*,  
607 240, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.pbr.2018.08.006>.