

1 Running Head: VALIDITY OF THE TOPS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 Confirmatory factor analysis of the Test of Performance Strategies (TOPS)

9 among adolescent athletes

10

11 Andrew M. Lane

12 University of Wolverhampton, United Kingdom,

13

14 Chris Harwood

15 Loughborough University, United Kingdom,

16

17 Peter C. Terry

18 University of Southern Queensland, Australia,

19

20 Costas I. Karageorghis

21 Brunel University West London, United Kingdom

22

23

24 Reference as: Lane, A. M., Harwood, C., Terry, P.C., & Karageorghis, C.I. (2004). Confirmatory factor

25 analysis of the Test of Performance Strategies (TOPS) among adolescent athletes. *Journal of Sports*

26 *Sciences*, 22, 803-812.

27

Abstract1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

The present study examined the factorial validity of the Test of Performance Strategies (TOPS; Thomas et al., 1999) among adolescent athletes using confirmatory factor analysis. The TOPS was designed to assess eight psychological strategies used in competition (i.e., activation, automaticity, emotional control, goal-setting, imagery, negative thinking, relaxation, and self-talk,) and eight used in practice (the same strategies except negative thinking is replaced by attentional control). National-level athletes ($N = 584$) completed the 64-item TOPS during training camps. Fit indices provided partial support for the overall measurement model for the competition items (RCFI = .92, TLI = .88, RMSEA = .05) but minimal support for the training items (RCFI = .86, TLI = .81, RMSEA = .06). For the competition items, the automaticity, goal-setting, relaxation, and self-talk scales showed good fit, whereas the activation, emotional control, imagery, and negative thinking scales did not. For the practice items, the attentional control, emotional control, goal-setting, imagery, and self-talk scales showed good fit, whereas the activation, automaticity, and relaxation scales did not. Overall, it appears that the factorial validity of the TOPS for use with adolescents is questionable at present and further development is required.

Keywords: measurement, structural equations, model testing, psychological skills

1 **Introduction**

2 The quest to nurture talent has contributed to greater involvement by applied sport
3 psychologists with adolescent athletes (Côté, 1999; Csikzentmihalyi et al., 1993; Bloom,
4 1985). Encouraging athletes to use psychological skills during their formative years may
5 promote better coping skills once they mature. For the practitioner and researcher alike, it
6 might be more important to investigate the development and application of psychological
7 skills among aspiring young athletes than among their mature counterparts. Benefits of
8 integrating psychological skills training into youth sport programmes have been proposed
9 by researchers in the areas of stress (e.g., Hanton and Jones 1999), achievement motivation
10 (e.g., Harwood and Swain, 2002) and the psychological characteristics of peak
11 performance (e.g., Gould et al., 2002), all of whom advocated developing psychological
12 skills at a young age.

13 Recently, within national governing bodies of sport in the United Kingdom,
14 increased emphasis has been placed on identifying and nurturing talented athletes via the
15 World Class Potential plans, funded by the National Lottery®. Hence, methods of gaining
16 insight into existing psychological skills among young athletes have an important role to
17 play in helping to determine individual requirements for psychological skills training and
18 practitioner support offered to athletes through such schemes.

19 Assessment of psychological skills is often recognised as an integral part of the
20 work of an applied sport psychologist (see Chartrand et al., 1992; White, 1993; Hardy et
21 al., 1996; Smith et al., 1995; Taylor, 1995; Thomas et al., 1999). One method of measuring
22 the mental skills of athletes is by using psychological questionnaires or inventories, but the
23 utility of such instruments depends fundamentally upon their psychometric properties. If
24 validity and reliability have not been clearly demonstrated, it is hazardous to accept and
25 apply data derived from such measures (Schutz, 1994; Schutz and Gessaroli, 1993).

26 Several researchers (see Jackson et al., 2000; Fletcher and Hanton, 2001; Gould et

1 al., 2002) have recommended the use of the Test of Performance Strategies (TOPS;
2 Thomas et al., 1999) as the psychometric instrument of choice for assessing psychological
3 skills usage. The TOPS is a 64-item measure, designed to assess the “psychological
4 processes thought to underlie successful athletic performance as delineated by
5 contemporary theory” (Thomas et al., 1999, p. 699). Thomas and his colleagues presented
6 a dual rationale for developing the TOPS. First, they pointed out that the validity of
7 previous measures of psychological skills usage had not been established beyond doubt
8 (see Murphy and Tammen, 1988). For example, the factor structure of the Psychological
9 Skills Inventory for Sport (PSIS; Mahoney et al., 1987) was not fully supported by a
10 subsequent validation study (Chartrand et al., 1992).

11 Second, they emphasised the importance of distinguishing strategies used in
12 competition from those used during practice; a context in which many athletes spend the
13 vast majority of their time. Thomas and associates hypothesised that eight dimensions of
14 psychological skills – activation, attentional control, automaticity, emotional control, goal-
15 setting, imagery, relaxation, and self-talk – would be common to both competition and
16 practice contexts. Exploratory factor analyses supported this structure for the practice
17 items but identified a slightly different solution for the competition items, with negative
18 thinking replacing attentional control as a competition-specific factor.

19 In the development and preliminary validation of the TOPS, Thomas and
20 colleagues recruited participants from a wide range of sports across different performance
21 standards, from recreational to senior international. The heterogeneity of the initial
22 validation sample is a strength of the measure, in terms of its applicability across a wide
23 age range and spectrum of ability. Also, in making a distinction between competition and
24 practice strategies, the authors of the TOPS opened the way for researchers and
25 practitioners to assess individual needs and monitor developments over time in both
26 contexts.

1 However, there are at least two reasons for conducting further psychometric
2 evaluation of the TOPS. First, Thomas and colleagues made a clear recommendation that
3 such research should be undertaken. Specifically, they called for confirmatory factor
4 analysis (CFA) to examine the reliability of the factor structure. Second, certain
5 methodological features of their validation study suggest that a re-evaluation would be
6 prudent before applying the measure to other populations of interest. For example, the
7 ratio of participants to items was below the generally accepted criterion. Thomas and
8 colleagues used a ratio of 4.25 (472: 111), whereas a ratio of 10:1 is usually recommended
9 (e.g., Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). Also, exploratory factor analysis has been criticised
10 for producing mathematically-driven factors that are unique to the sample under
11 investigation rather than reflective of more generalisable constructs (Schutz, 1994;
12 Thompson and Daniel, 1996); a tendency exacerbated when the participant-to-item ratio is
13 low (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). Given that Thomas et al. had proposed an *a priori*
14 theoretical framework, it might have been more appropriate to use confirmatory techniques
15 from the outset, either to test the complete measurement models hypothesised for the
16 competition and practice strategies, or to first test each factor independently, with
17 additional factors being included in subsequent analyses (see Mullan et al., 1997).

18 It is also interesting that, in their exploratory analysis of competition strategies,
19 Thomas and colleagues found that items related to attentional control and emotional
20 control formed a single factor, whereas they had originally conceptualised them as distinct
21 constructs. They pointed out, reasonably enough, that good attentional control is
22 inextricably linked with good emotional control. However, while attentional control and
23 emotional control may closely co-vary they remain conceptually distinct (Lazarus, 1991,
24 1999) and several researchers have warned of the pitfalls of using exploratory factor
25 analysis to generate theory (e.g., Schutz, 1994; Thompson and Daniel, 1996).

26 To date, no research has evaluated the validity of any measure of psychological

1 skills usage, including the TOPS, for use among *adolescent* athletes. Consequently, it is
2 both topical and important that researchers should address this gap in the literature. While
3 the TOPS has shown promising signs of factorial validity, there remains a need to test the
4 measurement model using confirmatory techniques; hence this formed the primary purpose
5 of the present study. A secondary purpose, should the confirmatory analysis provide
6 support for the existing measurement models, was to examine differences in adolescent
7 athletes' usage of psychological skills in practice and competition. Based on the findings of
8 Thomas et al. (1999), it was hypothesised that athletes would report significantly higher
9 usage of psychological skills in competition than in practice.

10 **Method**

11 *Participants*

12 Participants were 584 volunteer athletes (Age range: 15-18 years, male = 264, $M =$
13 16.6 years, $SD = 1.8$; female = 320, $M = 16.9$ years, $SD = 1.9$). Participants were drawn
14 from national-level training camps in the U.K., organised through a joint initiative between
15 Nike, Inc., The Institute of Youth Sport, and the Youth Sport Trust. Athletes competed in a
16 broad range of sports, including badminton, fencing, field hockey, lacrosse, rugby union,
17 soccer, squash, triathlon, track and field, and volleyball.

18 *Measurement instrument*

19 The 64-item Test of Performance Strategies is a self-report instrument designed to
20 measure an athlete's use of psychological skills and strategies during competition and
21 practice (Thomas et al., 1999). Exploratory factor analysis has previously indicated an 8-
22 factor solution for competition items and a slightly different 8-factor solution for practice
23 items. Seven factors are common to both competition and practice contexts, whereas
24 negative thinking is only included in the competition context and attentional control only
25 in the practice context. Each subscale has four items. Items were rated on a 5-point scale
26 anchored by 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*). Scores for each subscale were summed and divided by

1 four; resulting in overall factor scores that could range from 1 - 5.

2 *Procedures*

3 Written parental consent for participation in the research was granted prior to each
4 training camp through the Youth Sport Trust. Participants also gave informed consent and
5 volunteered to participate in the present study with no incentives. Instructions to
6 participants included a reminder to respond to all items and a statement designed to
7 discourage a social desirability bias (c.f., Martens et al., 1990). Participants completed the
8 questionnaire during breaks in their training camps away from the gaze of their peers.

9 *Model Testing*

10 The 8-factor measurement models for practice and competition specified that items
11 were related to their hypothesised factor with the variance of the factor fixed at 1. The first
12 model tested allowed factors to freely intercorrelate and a second model constrained
13 relationships between automaticity and other factors to zero. This second model was
14 prompted by previous findings of inconsistent relationships between automaticity and other
15 factors. For example, Thomas et al. (1999) reported minimal interrelationships whereas
16 Thomas and Over (1994) had previously reported strong positive relationships. Given that
17 such relationships are of theoretical and practical importance, we decided to model both
18 possibilities.

19 Another approach used to evaluate the measurement model was to assess the
20 psychometric properties of each factor independently (see Mullen et al., 1997). This
21 approach has been proposed to be appropriate where overall model fit is not supported
22 (Woodman and Hardy, 2003). Poor model fit can be due to various characteristics, such as
23 when items have low loadings on their hypothesised factors, high loadings across multiple
24 factors, or mis-specified correlations between factors. Given that researchers and
25 practitioners will calculate factor scores by combining items in each subscale, all subscales
26 should demonstrate factorial validity independently.

1 CFA using EQS V5 (Bentler and Wu, 1995, Bentler, 1990, 1995) was used to test
2 the hypothesised models. An assumption underlying SEM is that data are normally
3 distributed. In particular, the maximum likelihood method (ML: Chou and Bentler, 1995)
4 used in the present study assumes multivariate normality. Two precautions were taken to
5 guard against the effects of non-normality. The first was to utilise a large sample, above
6 500 participants, as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2001). The second
7 precaution, in the event of identifying multivariate non-normality, was to use the scaled χ^2
8 Satorra-Bentler method, which has been shown to effectively control for overestimation of
9 χ^2 , under-estimation of incremental fit indexes, and under-identification of errors (see
10 West et al., 1995).

11 The choice of cut-off criteria used to evaluate model adequacy is a contentious
12 issue. Some researchers favour a two-index strategy, with the indices selected on the basis
13 of sample size, model complexity, and the distributional properties of the data (e.g., Hu
14 and Bentler, 1999). We followed the approach of Byrne (1998, 2000), Hoyle and Panter
15 (1995) and Kline (1998), all of whom advocated use of a range of fit indices to judge
16 model adequacy. According to Hoyle and Panter (1995), there is little agreement among
17 researchers about the best index of overall fit used in CFA. Consequently, to achieve a
18 comprehensive evaluation of model fit a range of different indices were used.

19 Model fit was assessed using two incremental fit indices; the robust comparative fit
20 index (RCFI: Bentler, 1995) and the non-normed fit index or Tucker-Lewis index (TLI:
21 Tucker and Lewis, 1973). Incremental fit indices are based on comparisons between the
22 hypothesised model and a null model (in which there are no relationships among the
23 observed variables) and are not influenced by sample size (Marsh et al., 1988; 1996;
24 Bentler, 1990). Kline (1998) proposed that values for the RCFI and TLI of less than .90
25 indicate that the hypothesised model could be substantially improved, and Hu and Bentler
26 (1999) suggested that, in most circumstances, values should approach .95. The third index

1 used was the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA: Steiger, 1990), which
2 indicates the mean discrepancy between the observed covariances and those implied by the
3 model per degree of freedom, and therefore has the advantage of being sensitive to model
4 complexity. A value of .05 or lower indicates a good fit and values up to .08 indicate an
5 acceptable fit (Browne and Cudeck, 1993).

6 The Lagrange multiplier and Wald tests were used to highlight how model fit could
7 be enhanced, as recommended by Biddle et al. (2001). The Lagrange test asks how can
8 model fit be improved by adding parameters while the Wald test asks which parameters, if
9 any, could be deleted or have their variance fixed to zero (see Tabachnick and Fidell,
10 2001).

11 Cronbach alpha coefficients were calculated to assess the internal consistency of
12 the 16 factors. The criterion for acceptability for an internally reliable scale is normally set
13 at .70 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). However, Loewenthal (2001) suggested that an alpha
14 of .60 is acceptable for subscales with four items.

15 **Results**

16 Preliminary analyses showed that multivariate normality was violated for both
17 competition items (Mardia = 48.05) and practice items (Mardia = 49.49); indicating that
18 use of the Satorra-Bentler estimation method was appropriate. Results of the CFA are
19 shown in Table 1. For the competition items, fit indices showed partial support for the
20 hypothesised measurement model. The RMSEA indicated good model fit but the RCFI
21 fell between traditional and contemporary benchmarks; higher than the .90 criterion
22 advocated by Kline (1998) but lower than the .95 criterion proposed by Hu and Bentler
23 (1999). The TLI fell below the minimum value for acceptable fit, indicating that the
24 competition model could be improved significantly. For the practice items, limited support
25 for the model was found. The RMSEA showed support for the adequacy of the
26 measurement model, whereas the incremental fit indices suggested that the practice model

1 could also be improved significantly.

2 Given this evidence that model fit could be improved, modification indices were
3 scrutinised to identify the specific weaknesses of the measurement models. Wald test
4 results showed that model fit could be improved by constraining correlations between
5 automaticity scores and other factor scores to zero. This was evident for both the
6 competition and practice items in this factor.

7 The revised model had negligible impact on the fit statistics for the competition
8 items although all fit indices for the practice items were improved (see Table 1). However,
9 despite respecifying the model, fit indices for both competition and practice items fell short
10 of the .95 criterion for acceptability (Hu and Bentler, 1999) and, even when judged against
11 the less stringent traditional criterion, TLI values indicated that significant improvements
12 to the measurement model could be made for both sets of items.

13 Independent analyses of each factor were then conducted. For the competition
14 items, CFA provided strong support for the automaticity, goal-setting, relaxation, and self-
15 talk scales, with all fit indices at the level of acceptability or better (see Table 2). Scope for
16 improvement was indicated for the emotional control, imagery, and negative thinking
17 scales and no support was found for the fit of the activation scale. Among the practice
18 items, strong support was found for the attentional control, emotional control, goal-setting,
19 imagery, and self-talk scales, scope for improvement was indicated for the automaticity
20 and relaxation scales, and again no support was found for the activation scale.

21 Alpha coefficients (Cronbach, 1951) for the competition scales were activation =
22 .69, automaticity = .74, emotional control = .72, goal setting = .80, imagery = .82, negative
23 thinking = .75, relaxation = .80, and self-talk = .77; and for the practice scales were
24 activation = .57, attentional control = .68, automaticity = .62, emotional control = .73, goal
25 setting = .79, imagery = .75, relaxation = .75, and self-talk = .76. Given the 4-item scales
26 of the TOPS, these values suggest adequate internal validity for the competition scales

1 (Loewenthal, 2001) and for all practice scales with the exception of activation.

2 Analysis at the individual item level is reported in Table 3 for the competition items
3 and Table 4 for the practice items. The strength of an item is indicated by high factor
4 loadings and low standard errors. Comrey and Lee (1992) suggested that factor loadings
5 greater than .71 (50% overlapping variance) are excellent, .63 (40% overlapping variance)
6 very good, .55 (30% overlapping variance) good, .45 (20% overlapping variance) fair, and
7 .32 (10% overlapping variance) poor (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001, p. 625). By this rule
8 of thumb, in the present analysis, 54 of the 64 items (84%) could be considered good to
9 excellent and only 3 items (5%) could be considered poor. Of these three items, two ('I
10 have difficulty increasing my energy level during workouts' and 'I have trouble energizing
11 myself if I feel sluggish during practice') were in the practice activation scale and one
12 ('during practice, I don't think about performance much – I just let it happen') in the
13 practice automaticity scale (see Table 4).

14 Overall, support for the TOPS measurement models was mixed for both the
15 competition and practice scales. The scales demonstrated satisfactory psychometric
16 properties on some tests but were shown to be in need of improvement on others. Given
17 this partial support for the hypothesised measurement models, we decided to explore the
18 second purpose of the study. Results of a multivariate analysis of variance are shown in
19 Table 5. A significant multivariate effect of context was found (Wilks' $\lambda_{7,577} = .08$, $p <$
20 $.001$, $\eta^2 = .66$). As hypothesised, the effect was characterised by greater use of the seven
21 common psychological strategies by adolescent athletes in the competition environment
22 compared to the practice environment. Univariate analyses showed these differences to be
23 statistically significant for the strategies of activation ($\eta^2 = .53$), automaticity ($\eta^2 = .13$),
24 emotional control ($\eta^2 = .07$), goal setting ($\eta^2 = .09$), imagery ($\eta^2 = .11$), and relaxation (η^2
25 $= .53$). However, considering the psychometric properties of the activation scales, the
26 observed difference in use of this strategy in the competition and practice situations should

1 be interpreted with great caution. Indeed, caution is advised in the interpretation of
2 between-context differences for *all* TOPS subscales.

3 **Discussion**

4 The purpose of the present study was to investigate the factorial validity of the
5 TOPS for use with adolescent athletes and, subsequently, to advance awareness of
6 psychological skills usage in this population. The TOPS assesses the use of psychological
7 strategies in competition and practice settings. Such measures serve several important
8 functions. First, the TOPS can be used as a research tool into the effectiveness of
9 interventions to improve psychological skills. Second, TOPS scores provide information
10 for coaches and practitioners about the existing psychological skills and future needs of
11 young athletes. Third, information derived from the TOPS can help to educate governing
12 bodies about those psychological skills and qualities that are being properly addressed or
13 perhaps neglected during the early stages of player development.

14 However, the utility of measures for assessing psychological skills depends upon
15 the demonstration of appropriate validity characteristics. Although Thomas et al. (1999)
16 provided some evidence to support the factorial validity of the TOPS among a
17 heterogeneous sample of adults and adolescents, researchers should test the generalisability
18 of measures for different populations of interest (Anatasi and Urbina, 1997; Schutz and
19 Gessaroli, 1993; Schutz, 1994). Researchers should also use the most stringent methods to
20 assess validity (Schutz, 1994). The present study was designed to address both objectives
21 by testing the measurement models for competition and practice presented by Thomas and
22 associates, using confirmatory techniques.

23 Results indicated that neither measurement model adequately fitted the data
24 although the competition model showed better fit than the practice model. At the subscale
25 level, many scales showed very good fit, other less so. More specifically, for the
26 competition items, the automaticity, goal-setting, relaxation, and self-talk scales showed

1 good fit, whereas the activation, emotional control, imagery, and negative thinking scales
2 could be improved significantly. For the practice items, the attentional control, emotional
3 control, goal-setting, imagery, and self-talk scales showed good fit, whereas the activation,
4 automaticity, and relaxation scales could be improved.

5 At the individual item level, 84% of items showed good to excellent loadings on
6 their hypothesised factor. Some specific items showed weak loadings, in particular on the
7 practice scales for activation and automaticity. Several possible steps could be taken to
8 address these limitations. For example, weak factor loadings can indicate that participants
9 did not comprehend the meaning of an item in the context of the factor it was intended to
10 represent. In such cases, an item might be reworded to aid clarity. Also, given that the
11 original validation procedures were geared primarily towards adult athletes, it is possible
12 that the language used in some items is inappropriate for adolescents. For example, in the
13 automaticity scale, the item “during competition I perform on *automatic pilot*” requires
14 understanding of the concept of an automatic navigation system to give a meaningful
15 response. Similarly, another automaticity item, “during practice, I don’t think about
16 performing much – I just let it happen”, could be interpreted by some participants as
17 relating to performing with low motivation rather than performing with minimal
18 processing.

19 Another area where changes might improve model fit involves separating the
20 constructs of attentional and emotional control among the competition items. For example,
21 the item, “when I make a mistake in competition, I have trouble getting my concentration
22 back on track”, shows a modest loading (.41) on emotional control, its hypothesized factor.
23 It is difficult to support the notion that this item truly belongs as part of the *emotional*
24 control factor when it is so clearly oriented towards *attentional* control. It is suggested that
25 the decision by Thomas and colleagues to combine these two constructs into a single scale
26 should be reconsidered, at least in the context of adolescent athletes.

1 Collectively, confirmatory techniques showed the factorial structure of the TOPS to
2 be strong in parts but in need of revision elsewhere. In particular, both activation scales
3 appear to require revision. Such revisions should be completed before the TOPS can be
4 applied with confidence among adolescent populations.

5 In terms of psychological skills usage, the results showed that adolescent athletes
6 used the strategies of interest more in competition settings than in the practice
7 environment. This finding is consistent with the results previously reported by Thomas and
8 colleagues. Future research might explore the perceived *effectiveness* of using
9 psychological skills in these different settings rather than simply comparing the relative
10 usage in the two domains.

11 It has been suggested previously (Thomas et al., 1999) that the TOPS may be an
12 appropriate measure for investigating the extent to which psychological skills usage varies
13 over time. Indeed, practitioners may already be using changes in TOPS scores as an index
14 for evaluating the impact of psychological skills training. Such a strategy may be
15 premature until the stability of the TOPS factor structure is established. Unless it can be
16 demonstrated that scores on a questionnaire are stable under conditions where no change is
17 expected, any changes observed may be caused by random error potentially associated
18 with participants not understanding the meaning of items (see Nevill et al., 2001).
19 Therefore, before meaningful comparisons can be made on TOPS data collected over time,
20 it is important for future research to be conducted to investigate the stability of the
21 measure.

22 **Conclusions**

23 In conclusion, findings of the present study have provided evidence of the
24 psychometric properties of the TOPS among adolescent athletes. Results have shown that,
25 in its present form, question marks remain over some aspects of the factorial validity of the
26 measure and hence its appropriateness for use with adolescent athletes remains in doubt.

1 Given the present population of interest, the findings do not provide evidence of the
2 validity of the measure among adult athletes nor among adolescent athletes in other
3 cultural contexts.

4

1 **Author note**

2 Andrew Lane, School of Sport, Performing Arts and Leisure, University of
3 Wolverhampton, School of Sport Performing Arts and Leisure, Walsall Campus, Gorway
4 Road, Walsall, WS1 3BD, U.K. Email: A.M.Lane2@wlv.ac.uk Tel: +44 (0)1902 322862
5 Fax: +44 (0)1902 323230. Peter C. Terry, Department of Psychology, University of
6 Southern Queensland, Australia. Chris Harwood, Sport and Exercise Psychology Research
7 Group, Dept. of Physical Education, Sports Science and Recreation Management,
8 Loughborough University, U.K. Costas Karageorghis, Department of Sport Sciences,
9 Brunel University, U.K.

10 The authors would like to thank Sam Barney for his helpful comments during the
11 production of this paper.

12

13

1 **References**

- 2 Anastasi, A. and Urbina, S. (1997). *Psychological testing* (7th ed.). New York: Prentice-
3 Hall.
- 4 Bentler, P.M. (1990). Comparative fit indices in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*,
5 **107**, 238-246.
- 6 Bentler, P.M. (1995). *EQS structural equation program manual*. Encino, CA: Multivariate
7 Software.
- 8 Bentler, P.M. and Wu, E.J.C. (1995). *EQS/Windows user's guide*. Encino, CA:
9 Multivariate Software.
- 10 Biddle, S.J.H., Markland, D., Gilbourne, D., Chatzisarantis, N. and Sparkes, A.C. (2001).
11 Research methods in sport and exercise psychology: Quantitative and qualitative issues.
12 *Journal of Sports Sciences*, **19**, 777-809.
- 13 Bloom, B.S.. (1985). *Developing talent in young people*. New York: Ballantine.
- 14 Browne, M.W. and Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In *Testing*
15 *structural equation models* (edited by K.A. Bollen and J.S. Long), pp. 132-162.
16 Newbury, CA: Sage.
- 17 Byrne, B.M. (1998). *Structural equation modelling with LISREL, PRELIS, and SIMPLIS:*
18 *Basic concepts, applications and programming*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 19 Byrne, B.M. (2000). *Structural equation modelling with AMOS: Basic concepts,*
20 *applications and programming*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 21 Chartrand, J.M., Jowdy, D.P. and Danish, S.J. (1992). The Psychological Skills Inventory
22 for Sports: Psychometric characteristics and applied implications. *Journal of Sport and*
23 *Exercise Psychology*, **14**, 405-413.
- 24 Chou, C. and Bentler, P. (1995). Estimates and tests in structural equation modelling. In
25 *Structural equation modelling: Concepts, issues, and applications* (edited by R.H.
26 Hoyle), pp. 158-175. London: Sage.

- 1 Comrey, A.L. and Lee, H.B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Mahwah,
2 NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 3 Côté, J. (1999). The influence of the family in the development of talent in sport. *The Sport*
4 *Psychologist*, **13**, 395-417.
- 5 Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, **16**,
6 297-334.
- 7 Csikzentmihalyi, M., Rathunde, K., Whalen, S. and Wong, M. (1993). *Talented teenagers:*
8 *The roots of success and failure*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 9 Fletcher, D. and Hanton, S. (2001). The relationship between psychological skills usage
10 and competitive anxiety responses. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, **2**, 89-101.
- 11 Gould, D., Dieffenbach, K. and Moffatt, A. (2002). Psychological characteristics and their
12 development in Olympic champions. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, **14**, 172-204.
- 13 Hanton, S. and Jones, J.G. (1999). The acquisition and development of cognitive skills and
14 strategies: I. Making the butterflies fly in formation. *The Sport Psychologist*, **13**, 1-21.
- 15 Hardy, L., Jones, J.G. and Gould, D. (1996). *Understanding psychological preparation for*
16 *sport: Theory and practice of elite performers*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- 17 Harwood, C. and Swain, A. (2001). The development and activation of achievement goals
18 in tennis: I. Understanding the underlying factors. *The Sport Psychologist*, **15**, 319-341.
- 19 Hoyle, R.H. and Panter, A. T. (1995). Writing about structural equation models. In
20 *Structural equation modelling: Concepts, issues, and applications* (edited by R.H.
21 Hoyle), pp. 158-175. London: Sage.
- 22 Hu, L. and Bentler, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure
23 analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*,
24 **6**, 1-55.
- 25 Jackson, S.A., Thomas, P.R., Marsh, H.W. and Smethurst, C.J. (2000). Relationships
26 between flow, self-concept, psychological skills, and performance. *Journal of Applied*

- 1 *Sport Psychology*, **13**, 129-153.
- 2 Kline, P. (1998). *Handbook of psychological testing*. London: Routledge.
- 3 Lazarus, R.S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 4 Lazarus, R.S. (1999). The cognition-emotion debate: A bit of history. In *Handbook of*
5 *cognition and emotion* (edited by T. Dalglish and M. Power), pp. 3-19. New York:
6 Wiley.
- 7 Loewenthal, K.M. (2001). *An introduction to psychological tests and scales* (2nd ed.).
8 London: UCL Press.
- 9 Mahoney, M.J., Gabriel, T.J., and Perkins, T.S. (1987). Psychological skills and
10 exceptional athletic performance. *The Sport Psychologist*, **1**, 181-199.
- 11 Marsh, H.W., Balla, J.R. and Hau, K.T. (1996). An evaluation of incremental fit indices: A
12 clarification of mathematical and empirical properties. In *Advanced structural equation*
13 *modelling* (edited by G.A. Marcoulides and R.E. Schumaker), pp. 315-353. Mahwah,
14 NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 15 Marsh, H.W., Balla, J.R. and McDonald, R.P. (1988). Goodness-of-fit indexes in
16 confirmatory factor analysis: The effect of sample size. *Psychological Bulletin*, **103**,
17 391-410.
- 18 Martens, R., Vealey, R.S. and Burton, D. (1990). *Competitive anxiety in sport*. Champaign,
19 IL: Human Kinetics.
- 20 Mullen, E., Markland, D. and Ingledew, D.K. (1997). A graded conceptualization of self-
21 determination in the regulation of exercise behavior: Development of a measure using
22 confirmatory factor analysis procedures. *Personality and Individual Differences*, **23**,
23 745–752.
- 24 Murphy, S.M. and Tammen, V. (1988). In search of psychological skills. In *Advances in*
25 *sport and exercise psychology measurement* (edited by J.L.Duda), pp. 195- 209.
26 Morgantown. WV: Fitness Information Technology.

- 1 Nevill, A., Lane, A.M., Kilgour, L., Bowes, N. and Whyte, G. (2001). Stability of
2 psychometric questionnaires. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, **19**, 273-278.
- 3 Schutz, R.W. (1994). Methodological issues and measurement problems in sport
4 psychology. In *International perspectives on sport and exercise psychology* (edited by
5 S.Serpa, J.Alves and V.Pataco), pp. 35-57. Morgantown, VA: Fitness Information
6 Technology.
- 7 Schutz, R.W. and Gessaroli, M.E. (1993). Use, misuse, and disuse of statistics in
8 psychology research. In *Handbook of research on sport psychology* (edited by
9 R.N.Singer, M.Murphey and L.K.Tennant), pp. 901-921. New York: McMillan.
- 10 Smith, R.E., Schutz, R.W., Smoll, F.L. and Ptacek, J.T. (1995) Development and
11 validation of a multidimensional measure of sport-specific psychological skills: The
12 Athletic Coping Skills Inventory-28. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, **17**,
13 379-398.
- 14 Steiger, J.H. (1990). Structural model evaluation and modification: An interval estimation
15 approach. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, **25**, 173-180.
- 16 Tabachnick, B.G. and Fidell, L.S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). New York:
17 Harper and Row.
- 18 Taylor, J. (1995). A conceptual model for integrating athletes' needs and sport demands of
19 competitive mental preparation strategies. *The Sport Psychologist*, **9**, 339-357.
- 20 Thomas, P.R. and Over, R. (1994). Psychological and psychomotor skills associated with
21 golf performance. *The Sport Psychologist*, **8**, 73-86.
- 22 Thomas, P.R., Murphy, S. and Hardy, L. (1999). Test of Performance Strategies:
23 Development and preliminary validation of a comprehensive measure of athletes'
24 psychological skills. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, **17**, 697-711.
- 25 Thompson, B. and Daniel, L.G. (1996). Factor analytic evidence for the construct validity
26 of scores: A historical overview and some guidelines. *Educational and Psychological*

- 1 *Measurement*, **56**, 197-208.
- 2 Tucker, L.R. and Lewis, C. (1973). A reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor
3 analysis. *Psychometrika*, **38**, 1-10.
- 4 West, S.G., Finch, J.F. and Curren, P.J. (1995). Structural equations models with
5 nonnormal variables: Problems and remedies. In *Structural equation modelling:
6 Concepts, issues, and applications* (edited by R.H.Hoyle), pp. 56-73. London: Sage.
- 7 White, S.A. (1993). The relationship between psychological skills, experience, and practice
8 commitment among collegiate male and female skiers. *The Sport Psychologist*, **7**, 49-
9 57.
- 10 Woodman, T. and Hardy, L. (2003). The relative impact of cognitive anxiety and self-
11 confidence upon sport performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, **21**, 443-
12 457.
- 13

1 Table 1

2 *Confirmatory factor analysis of the Test of Performance Strategies*

Fit index	8-factor model for Competition	8-factor model for Practice	Revised model for Competition	Revised model for Practice
χ^2	901	1079	925	801
<i>df</i>	436	436	443	360
TLI	.88	.81	.88	.86
RCFI	.92	.86	.91	.90
RMSEA	.05	.06	.05	.05

3 *Note.* All χ^2 values are significant at $p < .01$.

4

5

1 Table 2

2 *Confirmatory factor analysis of subscales of the Test of Performance Strategies*

Subscales	χ^2	TLI	RCFI	RMSEA
Competition				
Activation	40.47	.68	.88	.19
Automaticity	4.24	.98	.99	.06
Emotional control	29.54	.78	.93	.18
Goal-setting	1.53	1.00	1.00	.00
Imagery	22.23	.90	.98	.16
Negative thinking	29.54	.78	.93	.18
Relaxation	2.02	1.00	1.00	.03
Self-talk	.65	1.00	1.00	.00
Practice				
Activation	58.57	.29	.73	.23
Attentional control	3.55	.97	.99	.06
Automaticity	11.05	.89	.96	.01
Emotional control	3.74	.98	1.00	.06
Goal-setting	3.21	.99	1.00	.04
Imagery	.39	1.00	1.00	.00
Relaxation	23.50	.87	.95	.15
Self-talk	4.11	.98	1.00	.05

3

1 Table 3
2 *Factor loadings for competition items by subscale*

Subscale	Item	Factor loading	Error
Goal-setting	I set very specific goals for competition	.752	.659
	I set personal performance goals for a competition	.751	.661
	During competition I set specific result goals for myself	.730	.683
	I evaluate whether I achieve my competition goals	.595	.804
Automaticity	During competition, I don't think about performing much - I just let it happen	.732	.682
	During competition I perform on 'automatic pilot'	.660	.751
	During competition, I play/perform instinctively with little conscious effort	.650	.760
	I perform at competitions without consciously thinking about it	.549	.836
Emotional control	My emotions keep me from performing my best at competitions	.811	.585
	My emotions get out of control under the pressure of competition	.776	.631
	When something upsets me during a competition, my performance suffers	.469	.883
	When I make a mistake in competition, I have trouble getting my concentration back on track	.412	.911
Imagery	I rehearse my performance in my mind at competitions	.845	.535
	I imagine my competitive routine before I do it at a competition	.815	.579
	At competitions, I rehearse the feel of my performance in my imagination	.710	.704
	I visualize my competition going exactly the way I want	.559	.829
Activation	I do what needs to be done to get psyched up for competitions	.740	.672
	I psych myself up at competitions to get ready to perform	.599	.801
	I can increase my energy to just the right level for competitions	.573	.819
	I can raise my energy level at competitions when necessary	.490	.872
Self-talk	I say things to myself to help my competitive	.736	.677

	performance		
	I manage my self-talk effectively during competition	.716	.698
	I have specific cuewords or phrases that I say to myself to help my performance during competition	.541	.841
	I talk positively to myself to get the most out of competitions	.759	.651
Relaxation			
	I am able to relax if I get too nervous at a competition	.815	.580
	When I need to, I can relax myself at competitions to get ready to perform	.745	.667
	When pressure is on at competitions, I know how to relax	.708	.706
	I find it difficult to relax when I am too tense at competitions	.571	.821
Negative thinking			
	My self-talk during competition is negative	.688	.725
	I keep my thoughts positive during competitions	.648	.761
	During competition I have thoughts of failure	.644	.765
	I imagine screwing up during a competition	.634	.773

1

2

3

1 Table 4

2 *Factor loadings for practice items by subscale*

Subscale	Item	Factor loading	Error
Goal setting	I have very specific goals for practice	.861	.508
	I set goals to help me use practice time effectively	.696	.718
	I don't set goals for practices, I just go out and do it	.620	.785
	I set realistic but challenging goals for practice	.644	.765
Automatcity	Competition		
	During practice, my movements and skills just seem to flow naturally from one to another	.678	.735
	During practice sessions I just seem to be in a flow	.624	.782
	At practice, I can allow the whole skill or movement to happen naturally without concentrating on each part of the skill	.583	.813
Emotional control	During practice, I don't think about performing much - I just let it happen	.323	.947
	I have trouble controlling my emotions when things are not going well at practice	.838	.546
	When things are going poorly in practice, I stay in control of myself emotionally	.602	.799
	When I perform poorly in practice I lose my focus	.587	.809
Imagery	I get frustrated and emotionally upset when practice does not go well	.551	.835
	At practice, when I visualize my performance, I imagine what it will feel like.	.729	.684
	I rehearse my performance in my mind before practice	.681	.732
	At practice, when I visualize my performance, I imagine watching myself as if on a video replay	.615	.788
	During practice I visualize successful past performances	.605	.796
Activation	I practise energizing myself during training sessions	.724	.690
	I practise a way to energize myself	.658	.753
	I have difficulty increasing my energy level during workouts	.286	.958

Self-talk	I have trouble energizing myself if I feel sluggish during practice	.264	.965
	I motivate myself to train through positive self-talk	.754	.657
	I talk positively to myself to get the most out of practice	.696	.718
	I say things to myself to help my practice performance	.614	.789
Relaxation	I manage my self-talk effectively during practice	.596	.803
	I practise using relaxation techniques at workouts	.809	.588
	I practise a way to relax	.778	.628
	I use practice time to work on my relaxation technique	.650	.760
Attentional control	I relax myself at practice to get ready	.415	.910
	During practice I focus my attention effectively	.664	.748
	My attention wanders while I am training	.633	.774
	I have trouble maintaining my concentration during long practices	.579	.815
	I am able to control distracting thoughts when I am training	.512	.859

1

2

1 Table 5
2 *Comparison of competition and practice scores on the Test of Performance Strategies*
3 *among 584 adolescent athletes*

	Competition		Practice		<i>F</i>	η^2
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Activation	3.73	.70	2.98	.64	654.11*	.53
Automaticity	3.73	.70	2.81	.80	89.19*	.13
Emotional control	3.42	.75	3.23	.78	46.42*	.07
Goal-setting	3.49	.84	3.27	.82	58.53*	.09
Imagery	3.15	.93	2.93	.89	70.12*	.11
Relaxation	3.21	.81	2.17	.76	663.92*	.53
Self-talk	3.29	.88	3.26	.81	1.94	.00
Attentional control			3.47	.64		
Negative thinking	2.42	.78				

Wilks' $\lambda_{7,577} = .34, p < .001, \eta^2 = .66$

4 * $p < .01$

5