

To me, to you: How you say things matters for endurance performance

Hardy, James; Thomas, Aled V.; Blanchfield, Anthony W.

Journal of Sports Sciences

DOI:

[10.1080/02640414.2019.1622240](https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2019.1622240)

Published: 17/09/2019

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):

Hardy, J., Thomas, A. V., & Blanchfield, A. W. (2019). To me, to you: How you say things matters for endurance performance. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 37(18), 2122-2130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2019.1622240>

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 **Running head:** Grammar and self-talk

2

3 **To me, to you: How you say things matters for endurance performance**

4 Accepted in *Journal of Sports Sciences* on the 26th February 2019

5 **Author names and affiliations:**

6 James Hardy, Aled V. Thomas, & Anthony W. Blanchfield
7 Institute for the Psychology of Elite Performance, School of Sport, Health and
8 Exercise Sciences, Bangor University, Normal Site, Bangor, Gwynedd, Wales
9 LL57 2PZ

10

11

12 **Corresponding Author:**

13 James Hardy,
14 School of Sport, Health and Exercise Sciences,
15 Bangor University,
16 George Building,
17 Normal Site,
18 Bangor,
19 LL572PZ
20 E-mail: j.t.hardy@bangor.ac.uk
21 Work Telephone: (01248) 38 3493

22

23

24 **Manuscript word count:** 4906 (including citations and section headers)

25

26 **Keywords:** self-talk, time-trial, power output, RPE, psychological strategy,
27 grammatical pronouns

28

29 **Abstract**

30 Self-talk enhances physical performance. Nothing is known however about the
31 way that a subtle grammatical difference in self-talk, using first or second person
32 pronouns, may effect performance. As second person self-talk supports self-
33 regulation in non-exercise populations, we hypothesized that 10 km cycling time-
34 trial performance would be superior following second versus first person self-
35 talk. Using a randomized, counterbalanced, crossover design, sixteen physically
36 active males ($M_{age} = 21.99$, $SD = 3.04$ years) completed a familiarization visit
37 followed by a 10 km time-trial during two separate experimental visits using first
38 and second person self-talk. A paired t -test revealed that second person self-talk
39 generated significantly faster time-trial performance than first person self-talk (p
40 = .014). This was reflected in a significantly greater power output throughout the
41 time-trial when using second person self-talk ($p = .03$), despite RPE remaining
42 similar between conditions ($p = .75$). This is the first evidence that strategically
43 using grammatical pronouns when implementing self-talk can influence physical
44 performance providing practitioners with a new aspect to consider when
45 developing interventions. We discussed findings in the context of a self-
46 distancing phenomenon induced by the use second person pronouns.

47

48

49

50 Relatively recent systematic reviews of this research literature attest to
51 the positive effects of self-talk on performance, reporting consistent performance
52 benefits of moderate effect size (Hatzigeorgiadis, Zourbanos, Galanis, &
53 Theodorakis, 2011; Tod, Hardy, & Oliver, 2011). Furthermore, there is empirical
54 support that such positive effects hold across different types of tasks; fine motor
55 skills such as golf putting ($d = .67$), and gross motor skills such as maximal leg
56 extension tasks ($d = .26$; Hatzigeorgiadis et al.). Within the existent research
57 literature it is also apparent that different types of phrases said to oneself
58 moderate any such performance benefits from self-talk (e.g., Theodorakis,
59 Weinberg, Natsis, Duma, & Kazakas, 2000). Hardy, Tod, and Oliver (2009)
60 coined this differential expectation the *task demand matching hypothesis* where
61 instructional self-talk is theorized to be more beneficial than motivational self-
62 talk for skills involving accuracy, form, and precision; although motivational
63 self-talk is predicted to be superior to instructional self-talk for gross motor tasks
64 involving strength and endurance (Theodorakis et al., 2000). Furthermore,
65 available meta-analytic data offers some empirical support for this hypothesis
66 (e.g., instructional self-talk – fine task, $d = .83$ and instructional self-talk – gross
67 task, $d = .22$; Hatzigeorgiadis et al.). However, within the self-talk literature,
68 there remains a propensity for researchers to utilize discrete motor skills in their
69 study designs. Consequently, the inclusion of endurance based experimental
70 tasks that possess reasonable ecological validity (e.g., a time trial cycle as
71 opposed to a seated leg extension task) would help to provide practitioners with
72 firmer evidence based direction.

73 Despite recently introduced perspectives on self-talk (e.g., Van Raalte,
74 Vincent, & Brewer, 2016) little specific guidance is given with regard to how

75 self-talk ought to influence *endurance* performance. Of note, a number of
76 relatively recent investigations of self-talk and endurance have drawn from the
77 psychobiological model of endurance performance (Marcora, 2008) to explain
78 the reported positive effects. This perspective presents reasoning for the role of
79 motivational self-talk in human endurance, placing an emphasis on individuals'
80 perceived effort (RPE). Based on motivational intensity theory (Brehm & Self,
81 1989), the psychobiological model posits that endurance exercise performance is
82 driven by effort based conscious decision making. Hence, during a constant
83 intensity physical task, an individual chooses to stop exercise when they perceive
84 a very high level of effort (Marcora, 2008), whereas during self-paced time-trial
85 (TT) exercise an individual consciously regulates their pacing to compensate for
86 the positive/negative effect of an intervention on perception of effort (De Morree
87 & Marcora, 2013; Pageaux, 2016). The relevance of Marcora's theorizing is that
88 any psychological (or physiological) factor affecting an individual's perception
89 of effort will in turn, influence endurance performance. In the case of self-paced
90 TT exercise, for interventions that have a positive effect on performance, this
91 frequently translates as an increase in power output without a change in RPE
92 (Barwood, Corbett, Wagstaff, McVeigh & Thelwell, 2015; Chambers, Bridge &
93 Jones, 2009). This is because an increase in power output without an
94 accompanying increase in perceived effort indirectly suggests that effort
95 perception has been positively modified in some way.

96 With regard to the use of motivational self-talk said during the execution
97 of aerobic tasks, it is likely to enable the performer to achieve a more positive
98 (i.e., confident and motivated) activation state (e.g., Hatzigeorgiadis, Zourbanos,
99 Goltsios, & Theodorakis, 2008) that in turn, influences his/her perceptions of

100 effort (Gendolla, 2012). Blanchfield, Hardy, de Morree, Staiano and Marcora
101 (2014) were the first to utilize the psychobiological model of endurance
102 performance to understand the effects of motivational self-talk. Using a time-to-
103 exhaustion paradigm, these researchers showed that motivational self-talk
104 yielded reduced effort perception and enhanced aerobic performance (i.e., 18%
105 improvement) compared to a control group. When a TT paradigm has been
106 employed by researchers similarly supportive but not identical findings have
107 been reported. For example, Barwood et al. (2015) subsequently suggested a
108 perceptual benefit of motivational self-talk during self-paced TT exercise have
109 indeed found that motivational self-talk resulted in superior 10 km TT cycling
110 performance and elevated power output, despite similar RPE compared to neutral
111 self-talk. The above findings demonstrate that the content of athletes' self-talk is
112 an important aspect for practitioners designing self-talk interventions to consider.
113 Nevertheless, other aspects of self-talk have received far less investigation from
114 sports researchers, yet mainstream psychology research (e.g., Kross et al., 2014)
115 provides merit for their examination; one of these is *how* self-talk is said.

116 Grammatical aspects of speech have only recently been examined in the
117 context of self-talk and the motor domain. For instance, Van Raalte et al. (2017)
118 investigated the impact of interrogative and declarative self-talk; that is, self-talk
119 phrased as questions or statements, respectively. Contrary to findings reported in
120 the mainstream literature (e.g., Senay, Albarraci, & Noquchi, 2010) and across
121 six experiments, no differences between interrogative and declarative self-talk
122 emerged for motivation, RPE, and performance. One explanation for these null
123 findings is how the self-talk intervention was conducted. In order to replicate
124 previous research, Van Raalte et al. employed a pre-task intervention. However,

125 this is largely at odds with traditional sports-oriented motivational self-talk
126 interventions that place an emphasis on the use of self-talk *during* task execution.

127 Whether self-talk is said using the first-person (“I can do this”) or the
128 second-person (“You can do this”) pronoun perspective is another aspect of
129 grammar that has yet to be investigated within the sports domain. However,
130 existing research supports the case that using the second-person perspective is
131 beneficial when the task at hand requires self-regulation (e.g., Dolcos &
132 Albarracin, 2014; Kross et al., 2014). One reason for this is related to Dolcos and
133 Albarracin’s supposition that humans become accustomed to directions and
134 guidance given using non-first person pronouns from significant others (e.g.,
135 parents, coaches); a process that enables us to integrate societal values and ideals
136 into our self-system. In-direct support for this habituation explanation comes
137 from the finding that individuals use more second-person pronouns when making
138 autonomous decisions involving self-regulation, such as when exercising (e.g.,
139 Gammage, Hardy, & Hall, 2001; Zell, Warriner & Albarracin, 2012). Kross and
140 colleagues forward another explanation that overlaps with the St. Clair Gibson
141 and Foster (2007) “time wedge” concept regarding the role of self-talk during
142 exercise. That is, self-talk is said to act to separate the self from what he/she is
143 experiencing. Kross et al. argue that the use of second-person pronouns reflects
144 the adoption of a broader self-distanced perspective similar to a “fly-on-the-wall”
145 perspective. Aligned with this theorizing, a number of studies have
146 operationalized the degree of first-person pronouns present within writings of
147 emotional experiences as a marker of self-distancing (e.g., Cohn, Mehl, &
148 Pennebaker, 2004). Attesting to the potential efficacy of second person pronouns,
149 the concept of self-distancing is also a prominent feature of several

150 psychotherapies and has been referred to as encouraging the “self as context”.
151 Furthermore, Beck (1970) referred to distancing as a process enabling clients to
152 think more objectively about their irrational thoughts. Kross et al. (p. 305)
153 surmised that “the language people use to refer to the self ... may influence self-
154 distancing, and thus have consequential implications for their ability to regulate
155 their thoughts, feelings, and behavior under stress”. Indeed, Kross et al. provide
156 some support for their theorizing that second-person pronouns can encourage
157 individuals to adopt a more distanced perspective regarding what is going on
158 around them and as a result cope better than when using the first-person
159 pronouns.

160 To date, whilst athletes report using both first and second-person
161 pronouns as part of their self-talk (Hardy, Gammage, & Hall, 2001) and
162 mainstream psychology evidences the benefit of the second-person perspective
163 for tasks such as anagrams (Dolcos & Albarracin, 2014) and social speeches
164 (Kross et al., 2014), experimental comparison of these grammatical features
165 within the motor domain has not occurred. Consequently, practitioners devising
166 self-talk interventions would likely benefit from the efforts of applied researchers
167 attempting to provide guidance on this issue. Drawing on the psychobiological
168 model of endurance performance and self-talk research using a TT paradigm
169 (e.g., Barwood et al., 2015), in the present study we examined whether how one
170 uses self-talk influences performance, work rate, and RPE on a 10 km cycle TT
171 endurance task. Given that existing literature already offers support that
172 performers can enhance their endurance via the use of self-talk compared to
173 control conditions (e.g., Blanchfield et al., 2014), the current investigation
174 focused on the relative effectiveness of first and second person pronouns. More

specifically, we hypothesized that superior TT performance would result from use of second person pronoun self-talk as opposed to first person self-talk. The rationale for this prediction stemmed from the self-distancing potential of second-person pronouns, and that participants would be more receptive to their self-provided (second-person) advice and encouragement and so work at a higher intensity, yet would not report differences for RPE (cf. Barwood et al., 2015).

Method

Participants

Sixteen recreationally active and healthy males volunteered to take part in the study ($M_{\text{age}} = 21.99$, $SD = 3.04$ years old; $M_{\text{height}} = 181.87\text{cm}$, $SD = 6.99$; $M_{\text{weight}} = 83.34\text{kg}$, $SD = 18.68$). Participants self-reported engaging in physical activity on a regular basis ($M_{\text{weekly exercise frequency}} = 3.63$, $SD = 1.54$; $M_{\text{weekly exercise duration}} = 297.50\text{mins}$, $SD = 262.87$), competing at university and club levels in various sports such as rugby, boxing, soccer, Gaelic football, and rock climbing. All were familiar with high intensity noncycling exercise. Sensitivity calculations indicated that our sample size was adequate to detect effects comparable with those reported in the self-talk literature utilising similar tasks (e.g., Blanchfield et al., 2014); powered at .80 and using a 5% level of significance, we could detect medium to large sized effects, $\eta^2 = .37$). Ethical approval was granted in accordance with the formal ethical procedures of the School of Sport, Health and Exercise Sciences, Bangor University and conformed to the declaration of Helsinki. All participants were fully informed of the procedures and risks associated with the research prior to providing written consent to participate in the investigation.

Design

200 We employed a repeated measures design whereby participants were
201 randomly counterbalanced after a familiarization visit into either a first-person or
202 second-person self-talk condition performed in their second visit, with the
203 opposite form of self-talk employed in their final visit. Dependent variables were
204 cycling TT performance, average power output, and RPE. Participants completed
205 a 10 km cycle TT (Wattbike Pro) on each visit.

206 ***Measures***

207 *RPE:* To measure RPE we used the 11-point CR10 scale developed by
208 Borg (1998). Low (0.5 = very, very light) and high (10 = maximal) anchors were
209 established using standard procedures (Borg, 1998). It was also emphasized that
210 each rating should be based on the effort required to perform the TT as opposed
211 to any leg muscle pain occurring during the cycling exercise (Blanchfield et al.,
212 2014).

213 *Average power output:* Average power output (watts) per km was
214 captured by the Wattbike Expert Software linking information concerning work
215 performed during the TT on the Wattbike Pro to a laptop.

216 *Performance:* We operationalized performance as the completion time
217 (seconds) for the 10 km cycle TT.

218 *Mood:* We measured participants' mood via by the UWIST mood
219 adjective checklist (UMACL; Matthews, Jones, & Chamberlain, 1990). The
220 UMACL contains eight items describing current feelings and subdivides into a
221 positive and negative mood subscale. Responses are provided on a 7-point Likert
222 type scale (1 = *not at all*, 4 = *moderately*, and 7 = *very much*).

223 *Motivation:* We also assessed motivation through the 14 item success and
224 intrinsic motivation scale (Matthews, Campbell, & Falconer, 2001) comprising

225 two subscales. The success and intrinsic motivation subscales are scored on a 5-
226 point Likert type scale (0 = *not at all* to 4 = *extremely*).

227 ***Procedures***

228 For each visit, participants wore light and comfortable clothing and
229 refrained from eating within an hour of the TT, consuming alcohol within
230 twenty-four hours of the TT, performing exhaustive exercise within 48 hours of
231 the TT, and consuming caffeine or nicotine within three hours of the TT. These
232 baseline conditions were confirmed by the researcher at the beginning of each
233 visit to the laboratory. Participants first attended a familiarization visit consisting
234 of three phases; warm up, TT, and development of self-talk cues. Upon
235 completion of the relevant forms, height, weight, and bike set-up measurements
236 were noted, and all participants carried out a standardized warm up, consisting of
237 a five-minute cycle maintaining approximately 90 watts and 70 revolutions per
238 minute (resistance on the Wattbike was set at “2” and the magnetic resistance at
239 “1” for all participants and visits). After completing the warm up, and prior to the
240 TT, all participants were taught how to use the Borg CR10 scale. To achieve this,
241 memory anchoring procedures were used whereby participants were instructed
242 that a rating of 0.5 on the Borg CR10 scale would equate to instances where very
243 minimal effort was perceived during a physical task, whereas a rating of 10
244 would correspond to the highest effort ever encountered during a physical task
245 (Noble & Robertson, 1996; Pageaux, 2016). Participants were then instructed
246 that after every km, they would be asked “How hard, heavy and strenuous does
247 the exercise feel?” (Blanchfield et al., 2014), and asked to respond by rating their
248 effort perception on the Borg CR10 scale. Importantly, following an explanation
249 of self-talk given prior to the TT, participants were prompted at each km to say

250 aloud statements they had said to themselves during that km of their
251 familiarization TT, this was recorded verbatim by the experimenter and gave
252 participants an opportunity to actively contribute to their own interventions.
253 After completing the TT, participants carried out a 3 minute cool-down.
254 Participants' naturally occurring self-talk was generally devoid of instructions,
255 tended to be more motivational in nature but was not overtly negative in content.

256 Similar to previously published self-talk interventions (e.g., Barwood,
257 Thelwell, & Tipton, 2008), our participants completed a structured workbook in
258 preparation for the following two experimental TTs involving first and second
259 person self-talk. Via the workbook we attempted to raise participants' awareness
260 of their use of self-talk (cf. Hardy, Roberts, & Hardy, 2009) and provided a
261 mechanism to change any negative self-talk captured during the familiarization
262 TT into motivational and positive first person and second person self-talk
263 statements. Consequently, our participants could deploy more functional
264 statements during their TTs as well as counter any negative self-talk said during
265 these trials. We also ensured that the new statements were brief and phonetically
266 simple (Landin, 1994), and viewed by our participants as motivational (Hardy,
267 Hall, & Alexander, 2001b). For example, if a participant said "This is hurting"
268 during the familiarization TT, the statement might be transformed into "I can
269 tolerate this" and "You can tolerate this". Identical to Barwood et al.'s (2015)
270 effective self-talk intervention for the same TT task, statements were created for
271 use at the following distances; 0-2 km, 2-4 km, 4-6 km, 6-8 km, and 8-10 km.
272 See the Appendix for an illustrative example of this process. Overall, participants
273 provided themselves with encouragement across the five stages of the TT.
274 However, there was a tendency for participants' self-statements to change from

275 countering their legs hurting (e.g., 4-6km: “I/You can deal with the pain”; “I/You
276 can keep going”) in the mid-stages, to highlighting the need to work harder (e.g.,
277 8-10km: “I am/You are going to finish strong”; “I/You can go flat out now”) at
278 the latter-stages. Approximately 24 hours before each experimental trial, we
279 emailed participants to confirm their arrival and reminded them about the self-
280 talk cues they were to use during the upcoming visit. Additionally, as part of
281 welcoming participants to the laboratory, the experimenter verbally reminded
282 participants about the self-statements the participants had created and were to use
283 during the trial. Because of the above features, we guided our participants to
284 design highly personalized cues, tailored to the task at hand, which according to
285 Theodorakis et al. (2000) should help to optimize our manipulation. The
286 workbook and subsequently developed self-talk from the familiarization visit
287 were retained by the experimenter for later use.

288 Prior to each TT, including the familiarization TT, participants completed
289 the relevant consent forms, the UMACL, and the success and intrinsic motivation
290 scale. When the participants returned for their next two experimental TTs
291 involving ”I” or ”You” forms of self-talk, they performed the same standardized
292 warm-up as carried out in the familiarization visit. The appropriate list of
293 developed statements were discussed before and made visible during the TTs on
294 a computer screen placed (approx. 1m) in front of the participants; participants
295 were reminded to utilize their personalized statements at the appropriate
296 distances (Barwood et al., 2015), along with need to rate their perceived effort
297 every km. During the TT’s all participants silently recited the statements to
298 themselves, as it is possible that self-talk said out-loud can be awkward and
299 distracting (Masciana, Van Raalte, Brewer, Branton, & Coughlin, 2001). Gaining

300 active input from our participants in the development of their intervention was
301 deliberate as this ought to create self-talk statements with personal meaning
302 (Hardy, 2006), and foster enhanced perceptions of control over the performance
303 environment (cf. Deci & Ryan, 1985), increasing the effectiveness of the
304 intervention (Hatzigeorgiadis et al., 2011).

305 Participants were administered a manipulation check after their cool-
306 down. Example manipulation check items were; “To what extent did you adhere
307 to the instructions that were given to you before and during the cycling task?”,
308 “To what extent did your self-talk reflect a first person (i.e., ‘I’ types of
309 statements) / second-person (i.e., ‘You’ types of statement or included your own
310 name) perspective?” and “How motivating did you find the self-talk you used
311 during the time trial?” (cf. Hardy et al., 2001b). There was a period of three to
312 seven days between each visit to allow sufficient recovery. Participants
313 performed the experimental TTs at the same time of day as the familiarization
314 TT.

315 ***Data Analysis***

316 Data analysis for performance and the manipulation check data were
317 conducted via paired *t*-tests with the exception of our analysis of possible
318 ordering effects. As far as RPE and average power output per km were
319 concerned, 2 (condition) x 10 (distance) fully repeated measures ANOVAs were
320 calculated. Effect sizes *F*-ratio scores are reported via η^2 with values of .10, .25,
321 and .40 reflective of small, medium, and large effects sizes (Cohen, 1988). For *t*-
322 tests standardized Cohen’s *d* values were calculated using Equation 11.9 from
323 Cumming (2012) with thresholds for small, moderate or large effects set at 0.2,
324 0.5, and 0.8 respectively (Cohen, 1988). Where relevant, 95% confidence

intervals are reported throughout to show the plausible upper and lower bound differences between conditions. In the vast majority of cases, data met the assumptions underpinning the respective statistical analyses. When this was not the case, a Greenhouse-Geisser correction was applied to reduce the chances of committing Type I errors. However, it is worth being mindful that both types of analyses are robust to moderate violations of their assumptions (e.g., Tabachnick & Fidel, 2014).

Results

Manipulation checks

Descriptive statistics for all study variables are reported in Table 1. Paired *t*-tests regarding pre-task mood and motivation states confirmed no differences across conditions: positive mood, $t(15) = -.35, p = .73, d = .09$; negative mood, $t(15) = .13, p = .90, d = .04$; success motivation, $t(15) = -.41, p = .69, d = .07$; intrinsic motivation, $t(15) = -.67, p = .51, d = .22$. In addition, participants' use of self-talk was as expected, offering support for the integrity of the study's internal validity. That is, participants reported adhering to their respective instructions before and during the TT in both conditions, $t(15) = -.95, p = .36, d = .03$, and found their first and second-person self-talk cues equally motivating, $t(15) = .45, p = .66, d = .14$, and useful, $t(15) = .73, p = .48, d = .21$. Moreover, when in the first person condition participants used significantly more first person self-talk than second-person self-talk, $t(15) = 14.50, p < .001, d = 4.78$, and vice versa for the second-person condition, $t(15) = -13.08, p < .001, d = 4.71$. Furthermore, results from a 2 x 2 (self-talk condition x ordering of conditions) mixed model ANOVA revealed null effects and evidence for the lack of an ordering effect on TT performance, $F(1, 14) = 1.88, p = .19, \eta_p^2 = .12$.

350 ****Table 1 near here****

351 ***Performance***

352 Results from the paired *t*-test presented support for our main hypothesis.
353 That is, when participants completed the TT in the second-person self-talk
354 condition they performed significantly faster ($M = 1045$; $SD = 95$ seconds) than
355 when in the first-person self-talk condition ($M = 1068$; $SD = 104$ seconds), with a
356 difference between conditions of 2.2%; $t(15) = 2.77$, $p = .014$, $d = .24$, 95% CI
357 [5.37s, 41.38s]. Importantly, on an individual level, 13 of the 16 participants
358 performed the TT faster in the second person self-talk condition (see Figure 1).

359 ****Figure 1 near here****

360 ***Average power output***

361 As average power output was captured for each kilometer of the 10km
362 TT, a 2 (self-talk condition) x 10 (distance) fully repeated ANOVA was
363 conducted and revealed a main effect for both self-talk condition, $F(1, 15) =$
364 6.08 , $p = .03$, $\eta_p^2 = .29$, and distance, $F(1.88, 28.20) = 12.66$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .46$,
365 but a nonsignificant interaction, $F(2.73, 40.89) = 1.16$, $p = .34$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$.
366 Participants produced an elevated work rate in the second-person as compared to
367 the first-person condition (see upper Figure 2).

368 ***RPE***

369 The 2 (self-talk condition) x 10 (distance) repeated measures ANOVA for
370 RPE indicated a main effect for distance, $F(1.62, 24.31) = 84.65$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 =$
371 $.85$, but neither the effect of self-talk, $F(1, 15) = .11$, $p = .75$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$, nor the
372 interaction, $F(2.37, 35.60) = .96$, $p = .40$, $\eta_p^2 = .06$, were significant (see lower
373 Figure 2).

374 ****Figure 2 near here****

Discussion

The present study is the first to examine the potential benefit of how a relatively subtle change in *how* athletes speak to themselves using a first-person or second-person perspective impacts on endurance performance. When using second-person self-talk, participants completed the 10km cycling TT significantly quicker, worked harder, yet did not perceive there to be a difference in effort compared to when completing the task in the first-person self-talk condition. Collectively, the findings support our a priori hypotheses and for the first time, illustrate the benefit of considering grammatical features when constructing self-talk interventions aimed at targeting motor performance.

Our significant effect for TT performance offers encouragement for the potency of this subtle change in the self-talk used by our participants and our theorizing concerning second person pronouns. When using this more familiar perspective during an event requiring self-regulation (i.e., second-person pronouns; Dolcos & Albarracin, 2014), our participants' motivational self-talk seemed to enable them to work at a higher exercise intensity and affording them the opportunity to complete the 10km TT faster. Importantly, participants did not perceive that they had to work harder to achieve these performance related benefits. This implies that second person self-talk is a more efficient perceptual strategy (i.e., greater absolute workload for no "cost" in RPE) for endurance athletes during exercise. This conforms to the tenets of the psychobiological model of endurance performance (Marcora, 2008) emphasizing the role of perceptions of effort for endurance.

Kross and colleagues (2014) highlight self-distancing as a path through which second-person pronouns influence our ability to regulate feelings,

400 thoughts, and behavior under stress. Furthermore being able to distance oneself
401 from a more self-immersed perspective can impact on how individuals process
402 events and experiences once they have occurred (Kross et al.). For instance,
403 within the domain of sport this might mean interpreting an error or poor
404 competition performance more positively. However, to date, the concept of self-
405 distancing has not been systematically investigated within physical activity
406 research.

407 Sharing some similarity with Kross et al.'s (2014) self-distancing
408 mechanism is St. Clair Gibson and Foster's (2007) "time wedge" concept
409 proposed to underpin the role of self-talk during exercise. This "time wedge"
410 enables the exerciser to insert time distance between the self and ongoing mental
411 and physical activities being experienced, facilitating self-observation and
412 awareness. A second concept related to self-distancing that may occur due to the
413 use of second-person pronouns is linked to Brick, MacIntyre, and Campbell's
414 (2014) supposition that self-talk utilized during endurance tasks can be viewed as
415 a form of attentional focus termed *active self-regulation*. Active self-regulation is
416 supposed to reflect focus on technique, cadence, pacing, and/or relaxation.
417 According to Brick et al. a key assertion of active self-regulation is increased
418 pace without necessarily increased perceptions of effort. Furthermore, an active
419 self-regulation focus has been theorized to link metacognitive feelings to
420 metacognitive judgements and estimates (e.g., judgements regarding own
421 capabilities, estimates of effort) aiding elite runners' cognitive control during
422 exercise (Brick, MacIntyre, & Campbell, 2015). An alternative explanation for
423 the current findings involves the influence of pronouns to shape challenge/threat
424 appraisals (Kross et al., 2014). More specifically, Kross et al. report on the use of

425 pre-task second-person introspection leading to more challenge and less threat
426 appraisals for an upcoming stressful (public speaking) event. It is possible that
427 the use of second-person self-talk might promote more facilitative concurrent
428 appraisals of our demanding TT task; in turn, shaping perceptions of effort (cf.
429 Gendolla, 2012). Of course, it is only with empirical evidence that fuller
430 understanding is this mechanistic theorizing will emerge.

431 We hope that the present study represents the first of many self-talk
432 investigations examining grammatical features of self-talk to reveal instructive
433 guidance for practitioners. Nevertheless, replication of the current findings is
434 desirable as is extension to different types of participants. Given that trained
435 cyclists have more consistent pacing as they are capable of reproducing
436 performances (De Koning, Bobbert, & Foster, 1999; Barwood et al., 2015) and
437 have probably developed their own self-talk strategies (Hardy, 2006; Barwood et
438 al., 2015), it is not a forgone conclusion that the current findings necessarily
439 apply to this more specialized sample (cf. Hatzigeorgiadis et al., 2011; Tod et al.,
440 2011). Furthermore, despite our medium to large effect, our difference is less
441 than the meaningful change of 3.6% that has been reported recently for a 10 km
442 TT in a sample population similar to ours, albeit using a different cycle
443 ergometer (Borg et al., 2018). Continued investigation will provide clarity on the
444 matter. However, self-talk researchers should also explore other aspects of
445 grammar. Establishing any (performance) differences between perfect and
446 imperfect verb usage (e.g., Hart & Albarracin, 2009), and between interrogative
447 and declarative self-talk *when answers are provided to questions* (e.g.,
448 Puchalska-Wasył, 2014) are alternative candidate aspects of grammar. Also,
449 differences reported by Son, Jackson, Grove, and Feltz (2011) regarding the use

450 of collectivistic (“we”) and individualistic (“I”) self-talk could form a nuanced
451 primer for teambuilding interventions.

452 Of greater relevance to the larger topic of self-talk, and central to the idea
453 of the self, are individual differences. In fact, the current data revealed some
454 response differences across our participants; while 13 of the 16 participants
455 displayed superior performance under the second person pronoun condition,
456 three did not. (Although we reported the individual responses to our intervention,
457 a novel approach in the self-talk research literature, such personalized detail is
458 consistent with the practice of sports psychology.) Yet to date investigation of
459 the interaction of self-talk interventions with aspects of personality is largely
460 absent (see Thomas & Fogarty, 1997 for an exception). Of particular pertinence
461 to pronouns is the disposition of narcissism as some data suggest individuals with
462 narcissistic tendencies use more first-person pronouns than those with less
463 narcissistic tendencies (Raskin & Shaw, 1988). This propensity to use the first-
464 person pronouns might make narcissists less likely to exhibit performance
465 differences across perspectives or as the first person perspective is more central
466 to them, will make first person pronoun self-talk more effective. However, the
467 lack of a control condition in the present study and the challenges of
468 incorporating them in future experiments involving pronouns, might hamper our
469 ability to fully understanding the exact nature of the interaction between self-talk
470 and personality.

471 As a result of our novel findings we are cautiously optimistic that they
472 represent an untapped branch of self-talk worthy of further consideration by
473 researchers and practitioners alike. Indeed a latent aim of the investigation was to
474 raise practitioners’ awareness of the potential role of grammar for their practice,

475 highlighting a pocket of research unlikely to have been previously reflected
476 upon. Inevitably, answers to the above forward-looking research questions would
477 solidify the reader's confidence in the applicability of grammar to self-talk.

478

479 **Funding Sources**

480 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the
481 public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors

482

483 **Conflict of interest**

484 The authors declare they have no conflict of interest.

References

- Barwood, M.J., Corbett, J., Wagstaff, C.R.D., McVeigh, D., & Thelwell, R.C. (2015). Improvement of 10-km time-trial cycling with motivational self-talk compared with neutral self-talk. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 10, 166-171. DOI: 10.1123/ijsp.2014-0059
- Barwood, M., Thelwell, R., & Tipton, M. (2008). Psychological skills training improves exercise performance in the heat. *Medicine and Science in Sports & Exercise*, 40(2), 398-396. DOI: 10.1249/mss.0b013e31815adf31
- Beck, A. T. (1970). Role of fantasies in psychotherapy and psychopathology. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 150, 3-17.
- Blanchfield, A. W., Hardy, J., de Morree, H. M., Staiano, W., & Marcora, S. M. (2014). Talking yourself out of exhaustion: The effects of self-talk on endurance performance. *Medicine and Science in Sport and Exercise*, 46, 998-1007. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000000184
- Borg, G. A. (1998). *Borg's perceived exertion and pain scales*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Borg, D., Osborne, J., Stewart, I., Costello, J., Sims, J., & Minett, G. (2018). The reproducibility of 10 and 20 km time trial cycling performance in recreational cyclists, runners and team sport athletes. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 21, 858-863. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2018.01.004
- Brehm, J., & Self, E. A. (1989). The intensity of motivation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 40, 109-131. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.ps.40.020189.000545
- Brick, N., MacIntyre, T., & Campbell, M. (2014). Attentional focus in endurance activity: New paradigms and future directions. *International Review of*

510 *Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 7, 106-134.
511 doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2014.885554

512 Brick, N., MacIntyre, T., & Campbell, M. (2015). Metacognitive processes in the
513 self-regulation of performance in elite endurance runners. *Psychology of*
514 *Sport and Exercise*, 19, 1-9. doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.02.003

515 Chambers, E., Bridge, M., & Jones, D. (2009). Carbohydrate sensing in the
516 human mouth: Effects on exercise performance and brain activity. *The*
517 *Journal of Physiology*, 587, 1779-1794. doi:
518 10.1113/jphysiol.2008.164285

519 Cohn, M. A., Mehl, M. R., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2004). Linguistic markers of
520 psychological change surrounding September 11, 2001. *Psychological*
521 *Science*, 15, 687-693. DOI: 10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00741.x

522 Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical Power analysis for the behavioural sciences (2nd.
523 Ed). Hillside, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

524 Cumming, G. (2012). *Understanding the new statistics: Effect sizes, confidence*
525 *intervals, and meta-analyses*. New York, NY: Routledge.

526 Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in*
527 *human behavior*. New York, NY: Plenum.

528 De Koning, J. J., Bobbert, M. F., & Foster, C. (1999). Determination of optimal
529 pacing strategy in track cycling with an energy flow model. *Journal of*
530 *Science and Medicine in Sport*, 2, 266-277. DOI: 10.1016/S1440-
531 2440(99)80178-9

532 de Morree, H., & Marcora, S. (2013). Effects of isolated locomotor muscle
533 fatigue on pacing and time trial performance. *European Journal of*
534 *Applied Physiology*, 113, 2371-2380. doi: 10.1007/s00421-013-2673-0

- 535 Dolcos, S., & Albarracin, D. (2014). The inner speech of behavioural regulation:
536 Intentions and task performance strengthen when you talk to yourself as
537 you. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 44, 636-642.
538 DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.2048
- 539 Gendolla, G. H. E. (2012). Implicit affect primes effort: A theory and research on
540 cardiovascular response. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 86,
541 123-135. doi: 10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2012.05.003
- 542 Hardy, J. (2006). Speaking clearly: A critical review of the self-talk literature.
543 *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 7, 81-97.
544 doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2005.04.002
- 545 Hardy, J., Gammage, K., & Hall, C. (2001). A descriptive study of athlete self-
546 talk. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 15, 306-318. DOI:
547 10.1123/tsp.15.3.306
- 548 Hardy, J., Hall, C. R., & Alexander, M. R. (2001b). Exploring self-talk and
549 affective states in sport. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 19, 469-475. DOI:
550 10.1080/026404101750238926
- 551 Hardy, J., Roberts, R., & Hardy, L. (2009). Awareness and motivation to change
552 negative self-talk. *Sport Psychologist*, 23, 435 -450. DOI:
553 10.1123/tsp.23.4.435
- 554 Hardy, J., Oliver, E., & Tod, D. (2009). A framework for the study and
555 application of self-talk in sport. In S. D. Mellalieu and S. Hanton (Eds.),
556 *Advances in applied sport psychology: A review* (pp. 37-74). London,
557 UK: Routledge.

558 Hart, W., & Albarracin, D. (2009). What I was doing versus what I did: Verb
559 aspect influences memory and future actions. *Psychological Science*, 20,
560 238–244. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02277.x

561 Hatzigeorgiadis, A., Zourbanos, N., Galanis, E., & Theodorakis, Y. (2011). Self-
562 talk and sports performance: A meta-analysis. *Perspectives on*
563 *Psychological Science*, 6, 348-356. DOI: 10.1177/1745691611413136

564 Hatzigeorgiadis, A., Zourbanos N., Goltsios, C., & Theodorakis, Y. (2008).
565 Investigated the functions of self-talk: The effects of motivational self-
566 talk on self-efficacy and performance in young tennis players. *The Sport*
567 *Psychologist*, 22, 458-471. <https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.22.4.458>

568 Kross, E., Bruehlman-Senecal, E., Park, J., Burson, A., Dougherty, A., Shablack,
569 H.,... Ayduk, O. (2014). Self-talk as a regulator mechanism: how you do
570 it matters. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 106, 304-324.
571 doi: 10.1037/a0035173

572 Landin, D. (1994). The role of verbal ques in skill learning. *Quest*, 46, 299-313.
573 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.1994.10484128>

574 Marcora, S. M. (2008). Do we really need a central governor to explain brain
575 regulation of exercise performance? *European Journal of Applied*
576 *Physiology*, 104, 929-931. DOI 10.1007/s00421-008-0818-3

577 Matthews, G., Campbell, S., & Falconer, S. (2001). Assessment of motivational
578 states in performance environments. *Proceedings of the Human Factors*
579 *and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting*, 45, 906-911.

580 Matthews, G., Jones, D. M., & Chamberlain, G. A. (1990). Refining the
581 measurement of mood: The UWIST mood adjective checklist. *British*

582 *Journal of Psychology*, 81, 17-42. DOI: 10.1111/j.2044-
583 8295.1990.tb02343.x

584 Masciana, R. C., Van Raalte, J. L., Brewer, B. W., Branton, M. G., & Coughlin,
585 M. A. (2001). Effects of cognitive strategies on dart throwing
586 performance, *International Sports Journal*, 5, 31-39.

587 Noble, B, J., & Robertson, R, J. (1996). *Perceived exertion*. Champaign, IL:
588 Human Kinetics.

589 Pageaux, B. (2016). Perception of effort in exercise science: Definition,
590 measurement and perspectives. *European Journal of Sport Science*, 16,
591 885-894. doi: 10.1080/17461391.2016.1188992

592 Puchalska-Wasyl, M.M. (2014). When interrogative self-talk improves task
593 performance: The role of answers to self-posed questions. *Applied*
594 *Cognitive Psychology*, 28, 374–381. DOI: 10.1002/acp.3007

595 Raskin & Shaw, (1988). Narcissism and the use of personal pronouns. *Journal of*
596 *Personality*, 56, 393-404. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.1988.tb00892.x

597 Senay, I., Albarracin, D., & Noquchi, K. (2010). Motivating goal-directed
598 behavior through introspective self-talk: the role of the interrogative form
599 of simple future tense. *Psychological Science*, 21, 499-504. doi:
600 10.1177/0956797610364751

601 Son, V., Jackson, B., Grove, J. R., & Feltz, D. L. (2011). “I am” versus “we are”:
602 effects of distinctive variants of self-talk on efficacy beliefs and motor
603 performance. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 29, 1417-1424.
604 doi:10.1080/02640414.2011.593186

605 St. Clair Gibson., & Foster, C (2007). The role of self-talk in the awareness of
 606 physiological state and physical performance. *Sports Medicine*, 37, 1029-
 607 1044. <https://doi.org/10.2165/00007256-200737120-00003>

608 Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidel, L. S. (2014). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Boston:
 609 Pearson.

610 Theodorakis, Y., Weinberg, R., Natsis, P., Duma, I., & Kazakas, P. (2000). The
 611 effects of motivational versus instructional self-talk on improving motor
 612 performance. *The Sport Psychologist*, 14, 253-272.
 613 <https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.14.3.253>

614 Thomas, P. R. & Fogarty, G. J. (1997). Psychological skills training in golf: The
 615 role of individual differences in cognitive preferences. *The Sport*
 616 *Psychologist*, 11, 86-106. DOI: 10.1123/tsp.11.1.86

617 Tod, D., Hardy, J., & Oliver, E. (2011). Effects of self-talk: a systematic review.
 618 *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 33, 666-687. DOI:
 619 10.1123/jsep.33.5.666

620 Van Raalte, J. L., Cornelius, A., Mullin, E., Brewer, B., Van Dyke, E., Johnson,
 621 A. J., & Iwatsuki, T., (2017). I will use declarative self-talk... or will I?
 622 Replication, extension, and meta-analyses. *The Sport Psychologist*.
 623 Advance online publication. DOI: 10.1123/tsp.2016-0088

624 Van Raalte, J. L., Vincent, A., & Brewer, B. W. (2016). Self-talk: Review and
 625 sport-specific model. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 22, 139-148.
 626 doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.08.004

627 Zell, E., Warriner, A. B., & Albarracin, D. (2012). Splitting of the mind: When
 628 the you I talk to is me and needs commands. *Social Psychology and*
 629 *Personality Science*, 3, 549-555. doi: 10.1177/1948550611430164

Table 1. *Manipulation check items and descriptive statistics*

632

	First person self-talk		Second person self-talk		95% CI difference
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Post-task					
Extent adhered to instructions before and during task ^a	8.44	1.09	8.81	1.38	[-1.22, .47]
Extent that self-talk reflected first person perspective ^a	8.31	1.95	1.38	0.62	[5.91, 7.96]
Extent that self-talk reflected second person perspective ^a	2.06	1.88	9.25	1.06	[-8.36,-6.02]
How motivating was the self-talk that you used during the task? ^b	7.13	1.31	6.94	1.39	[-.71, 1.08]
How useful were the self-talk statements ^a	7.69	1.58	7.31	1.96	[-.72, 1.47]
Pre-task					
Intrinsic motivation ^c	2.94	0.56	3.03	0.47	[-.07, .32]
Success Motivation ^c	2.41	0.64	2.46	0.80	[-.30, .20]
UWIST Positive Mood ^d Subscale	4.64	0.74	4.72	1.00	[-.55, .40]
UWIST Negative Mood ^d Subscale	1.64	0.77	1.61	0.78	[-.49, .55]

633

634 *Note:* Values are the mean of reported scores on response scales of: ^a(1-10); ^b(1-
635 9); ^c(1-5); ^d(1-7).

636


637

638

639

Figure Captions


641



642

643 Figure 1. Mean and standard deviation 10 km cycling time-trial performance
 644 following use of first and second person self-talk during exercise. Triangles on
 645 floating secondary y-axis denote individual differences between conditions.

646 #Denotes significantly different 10km time-trial performance.



647

648

649 Figure 2. Mean and standard deviation power output for first and second person
 650 self-talk at 1 km intervals throughout 10 km time-trial (upper figure) and RPE for
 651 first and second person self-talk at 1 km intervals throughout 10 km time-trial
 652 (lower figure). # Denotes significant difference between conditions.

653

Appendix

654 Illustrative examples of two participants' self-talk captured and then altered for

655 each stage of the 10km TT.

<i>Km</i>	<i>Self-talk said in familiarisation TT</i>	<i>Changed to "I" pronouns</i>	<i>Changed to "You" pronouns</i>
<i>Participant A</i>			
0-2km	C'mon Keep pushing	I can do this	You can do this
2-4km	C'mon Keep pushing Keep it smooth	I can do this	You can do this
4-6km	Keep grinding Keep pushing Almost there	I'm halfway through, almost there	You're halfway through, almost there
6-8km	Keep grinding Keep pushing Almost there Hang in there Keep your leg speed	I'm hanging in well	You're hanging in well
8-10km	Keep digging in Forget about the pain Almost there Keep picking up the leg speed	I can keep going	You can keep going

<i>Participant B</i>			
0-2km	I can do it It's going well	I can do it	You can do it
2-4km	I am determined Feeling motivated	I'm determined	You're determined
4-6km	I'm halfway there I need to keep going	I can keep going	You can keep going
6-8km	No pain, no gain C'mon, I'm nearly there	I can work through the pain	You can work through the pain
8-10km	Last push now I've done it	I will succeed	You will succeed

656