



HAL
open science

Relationship between perceived physical self-concept and grade in physical education: The mediating role of test anxiety

Nicolas Mascret, Olivier Rey, Sarah Danthony, Christophe Maïano

► To cite this version:

Nicolas Mascret, Olivier Rey, Sarah Danthony, Christophe Maïano. Relationship between perceived physical self-concept and grade in physical education: The mediating role of test anxiety. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 2021, 56, pp.102016. 10.1016/j.psychsport.2021.102016 . hal-03545023

HAL Id: hal-03545023

<https://hal.science/hal-03545023>

Submitted on 27 Jan 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

Abstract

The first aim of this cross-sectional study was to examine the relationships between adolescents' physical self-perceptions (physical condition, sport competence, physical attractiveness, physical strength) and grade in Physical Education (PE). The second aim was to investigate the potential indirect effect of PE test anxiety variables (worry, self-focus, bodily symptoms, somatic tension, perceived control) on the relationships between physical self-perceptions and grade in PE. French adolescent students ($N = 412$; 225 girls) completed scales assessing physical self-perceptions and PE test anxiety. The results highlighted that grade in PE was positively predicted by sport competence, somatic tension, and perceived control, and negatively predicted by bodily symptoms in PE. The results also showed that bodily symptoms have a significant negative indirect effect on the relationships between perceived sport competence and grade in PE, and between physical strength and grade in PE. A significant indirect effect of somatic tension on the relationship between sport competence and grade in PE has also been found.

Keywords: anxiety; self-concept; evaluation; adolescence; school; education.

**Relationship Between Perceived Physical Self-Concept and Grade in Physical
Education: The Mediating Role of Test Anxiety**

Nicolas Mascret^{a*}, Olivier Rey^a, Sarah Danthony^a, & Christophe Maïano^b

^aAix Marseille Univ, CNRS, ISM, Marseille, France

*^bCyberpsychology Laboratory, Department of Psychoeducation and Psychology, Université
du Québec en Outaouais (UQO), Canada*

*Corresponding author

Nicolas Mascret

Institute of Movement Science, 163 avenue de Luminy, Case 910, 13288 Marseille cedex 9,
France

Email: nicolas.mascret@univ-amu.fr

Date of submission: July 12, 2021

The author reports no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgements

The authors want to warmly thanks Alexandre J.S. Morin for invaluable advice during the
revision of the manuscript.

Relationship Between Perceived Physical Self-Concept and Grade in Physical Education: The Mediating Role of Test Anxiety

Introduction

Self-concept is an individual's self-perception constructed through experience with interpretations of one's environment (Marsh, Trautwein, Lüdtke, Koller, & Baumert, 2006). It may be considered a mediating variable that facilitates the achievement of desired outcomes such as physical skills and physical condition and adherence to physical activity (Marsh, 2002). Self-concept is often specified, such as the academic self-concept, which is an individual's self-perceived ability in academic situations (Raufelder & Ringeisen, 2016). Another kind of self-concept is of interest in studies focusing on sport and Physical Education (PE) domains, namely the physical self-concept.

The physical self-concept (i.e., the individual's self-assessment of his/her own physical abilities) is most directly related to the general self-concept (Biddle & Goudas, 1994), particularly among adolescents (Harter, 1990). The physical self-concept may be considered in PE a central psychological construct because of its situation at the interface of the individual's self-concept and the social and/or physical environment in which it operates (Fox, 2000). The physical self-concept has been developed in the physical self-perception profile by Fox and Corbin (1989). In the physical self-concept, two levels of hierarchy can be distinguished. At the first level, there is "Physical Self Worth". Its development, which is itself influenced by physical practice, would contribute to the promotion of overall self-concept (Biddle & Goudas, 1994) and a certain level of self-confidence that would mediate the maintenance of physical activity and/or sport. The second level of the hierarchy, which is

1 more unstable, includes most physical abilities: perceived physical condition (i.e., perception
2 of one's own level of fitness, which conditions one's ability to maintain prolonged effort),
3
4
5 perceived physical strength (i.e., explosiveness, muscular power that determines comfort in
6
7 situations where strength is required), perceived sport competence (i.e., perception of motor
8
9 skills in a physical activity and sport, but also ability to learn new gestures), and perceived
10
11 attractive body (i.e., perception of one's appearance in the eyes of others, and the self-
12
13 perceived attractiveness of one's own body). In PE, students encounter a huge range of
14
15 experiences in different activities during their school years, which could impact on the
16
17 perception of their physical abilities and their body attractiveness, but also their performance
18
19
20
21 in PE.
22
23
24
25

26 **Physical Self-Concept and Performance in Sport and PE**

27

28
29 In general, academic self-concept is consistently related to academic achievement
30
31 (Marsh & Craven, 2006). The pattern is similar for domain-specific studies. For instance,
32
33 math self-concept is positively related to math achievement (e.g., Arens, Marsh, Craven,
34
35 Yeung, Randhawa, & Hasselhorn, 2016). Other studies have also examined the relationship
36
37 between physical self-concept and different kinds of performance in sport and PE. In a study
38
39 conducted with elite athletes, Marsh and Perry (2005) showed that swimmers' physical self-
40
41 concept was a predictor of their swimming performance in two international events. With a
42
43 less specific population than high-level athletes, many studies have highlighted that physical
44
45 self-concept is usually known to be closely associated with the time and effort engaged in
46
47 practice of physical activities and sports (Dapp & Roebbers, 2019; for a review, see Marsh,
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 In the specific context of PE, Peart, Marsh, and Richards (2005) found a positive
2 association between students' physical self-concept, skill development, and motor learning.
3
4 More specifically, another study focused on the reciprocal model of gymnastics self-concept
5 and performance in PE (Marsh, Chanal, & Sarrazin, 2006). This study was conducted among
6
7 a sample of 376 French adolescent students involved in a 10-week gymnastics program in PE
8
9 measured during the first and the last session of the program. Findings showed that
10
11 gymnastics performance and gymnastics self-concept were reciprocally related across time.
12
13 The principal results showed that more positive levels of prior self-concept led to higher
14
15 subsequent levels of gymnastics performance than could be explained by prior levels of
16
17 gymnastics performance. However, higher levels of prior gymnastics performance also led to
18
19 higher levels of subsequent gymnastics self-concept than could be explained by prior levels of
20
21 gymnastics self-concept. These results confirmed the first results found by Chanal, Marsh,
22
23 Sarrazin, and Bois (2005). More recently, Lohbeck, von Keitz, Hohmann, and Daseking
24
25 (2021) highlighted that the physical self-concept of 7-8-year-old schoolchildren was
26
27 significantly and positively related to physical performance assessed during tests conducted in
28
29 PE courses. But in the two studies conducted in gymnastics (Chanal et al., 2005; Marsh et al.,
30
31 2006), performance was not assessed by the PE teachers, but by three independent expert
32
33 judges through videotapes of students performing a standardized gymnastics test. In Lohbeck
34
35 et al.'s study, students' performance was assessed by ten physical tests (e.g., 20-m sprint,
36
37 push-ups, ball throw) which are not directly in relation to what has been specifically studied
38
39 in PE. In these studies, students' performance was not assessed under ecological conditions
40
41 that students usually encounter in PE lessons, such as grades given by PE teachers. But grades
42
43 have not been used hitherto to examine the relationships between physical self-concept and
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 this kind of performance in PE, while educational studies mainly use grades obtained by
2 students to assess performance in academic subjects (Putwain, Connors, & Symes, 2010).
3

4
5 This was the first aim of the present study. In numerous studies, other variables, such as test
6
7 anxiety, have been examined as mediators between self-concept and performance in the
8
9 school context, which was the second aim of the present study.
10
11

12 **Test Anxiety as a Mediator of the Relationship Between Perceived Physical Self-Concept** 13 14 **and Grade in PE** 15

16
17
18 PE may be considered stress-inducing for many reasons, such as the social pressure
19
20 induced by the motor task performed in front of classmates and teachers (Liukkonen,
21
22 Barkoukis, Watt, & Jaakkola, 2010) and the fact that the result is immediately available and
23
24 known to all (Barkoukis, Tsorbatzoudis, Grouios, & Rodafinos, 2005). Anxiety in PE
25
26 concerns everyone: both low- and high-skilled students are confronted with it (Liukkonen et
27
28 al., 2010). Anxiety may also impair their performance, in particular due to the negative role
29
30 played by anxiety on the degree to which individuals are able to control their movements in
31
32 perceptual-motor performance (Nieuwenhuys & Oudejans, 2017). In the real-life PE context,
33
34 assessing the control of the students' movement or their gaze behavior (Nieuwenhuys &
35
36 Oudejans, 2017) is often very complicated and requires particular equipment. Consequently,
37
38 the final outcome has mostly been used in PE as a performance measure, which may be
39
40 represented by a quantitative result (e.g., the running time, the distance of a long jump) or a
41
42 grade given by the PE teacher. The study of anxiety-performance relationships in PE has
43
44 provided mixed results. For example, Barkoukis et al. (2005) showed that anxiety negatively
45
46 predicted the performance of two track and field tasks in PE (triple jump and shot put), but
47
48 anxiety was not always detrimental for students' performance in PE by managing their
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 anxiety as motivation. Consequently, anxiety-performance relationships need to be further
2 investigated in the PE context for a better understanding. But anxiety can take different forms
3
4
5 in this school subject.
6

7 A specific form of anxiety, namely test anxiety, may occur in an educational context
8 during tests or examinations which are considered threatening. In similar fashion to the test
9
10 anxiety experienced in all school subjects (e.g., Putwain et al., 2010), test anxiety in PE is
11
12 defined as a multidimensional attribute with five components (Danthony, Mascret, & Cury,
13
14 2019). Four components were negatively toned: worry (i.e., fear of failure), self-focus (i.e.,
15
16 what might other students say or think about my performance during the PE test?), bodily
17
18 symptoms (e.g., breathing difficulty, headache), and somatic tension (e.g., feeling nervous).
19
20 The cognitive dimension of test anxiety was represented by worry and self-focus, and the
21
22 affective-physiological dimension by bodily symptoms and somatic tension. The fifth
23
24 component of PE test anxiety was perceived control (Cheng, Hardy, & Markland, 2009). It
25
26 represented the capacity to cope and to attain the purpose of the task under pressure (Cheng et
27
28 al., 2009; Mascret, Danthony, & Cury, 2019). In contrast to the cognitive and affective-
29
30 physiological dimensions of PE test anxiety, perceived control indicated a regulatory and
31
32 positively-toned dimension of PE test anxiety (Danthony et al., 2019). Although PE is a
33
34 school subject that confronts students with many different activities, the present study
35
36 investigated PE test anxiety in general, independently of the physical activities taught and of
37
38 the number of evaluations experienced by the students. Indeed, test anxiety in PE is
39
40 considered a psychological trait, which is therefore rather stable and related to the school
41
42 subject itself (Danthony et al., 2019). Investigating test anxiety may be relevant in the PE
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 context to better explain why some students fail when they have to take an examination or
2 assessment in that school subject.
3

4
5 An unequivocal pattern of results was found concerning the negative relations among
6 the different factors of general test anxiety and examination performance, especially the worry
7 dimension, which is the strongest negative predictor of academic performance, often
8 represented by the grades obtained by the students (e.g., Putwain et al., 2010). The question
9 then arose of whether the pattern was similar in the PE context, because recent studies (e.g.,
10 Danthony et al., 2019; Mascret et al., 2019) have shown that PE test anxiety has similar
11 relationships with other constructs than those in the general test anxiety literature, but also
12 specific relationships. Because test anxiety was also studied in relation with self-concept, one
13 of the aims of the study was to examine the indirect effects of the five components of PE test
14 anxiety between physical self-concept and performance in PE.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 In the general test anxiety literature, academic self-concept was studied as an
32 antecedent of test anxiety. The results have highlighted that academic self-concept negatively
33 predicted test anxiety or some components of test anxiety (e.g., Raufelder & Ringeisen,
34 2016). Academic self-concept was often found to be a significant positive predictor of
35 academic performance (e.g., Choi, 2005). In the general test anxiety literature, test anxiety
36 was also studied as a mediator between academic self-concept and academic performance. For
37 example, worry was identified as a mediator between academic self-concept and school
38 grades of gifted students (Zeidner & Schleyer, 1999) and test anxiety mediated the
39 relationships between academic self-concept and academic performance of nursing students
40 (Khalaila, 2015). But Marsh (2006) recommended using more subject-specific measures of
41 self-concept to increase its explanatory power, because a student may have a high academic
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 self-concept in mathematics but a low one in English. Moreover, a perceived anxiety may be
2 induced for students through the presentation of the physical self in circumstances in which
3
4 their physiques are perceived as being evaluated by teachers or peers (Hart, Leary, & Rejeski,
5
6 1989), especially for older students and boys (Hagger, Burn, Mutton, & Brindley, 2008), and
7
8 may finally influence students' performance. These results suggest that physical self-concept
9
10 may be related to anxiety experienced by students during academic evaluations, namely test
11
12 anxiety. But the precise relationships between physical self-concept, test anxiety, and
13
14 performance have not yet been examined in the PE context. Consequently, studying the
15
16 potential indirect effect of PE test anxiety between physical self-concept and performance in
17
18 PE seems worthy of interest to better explain why some students succeed while others fail in
19
20 PE evaluations, leading to good or bad grades in this school subject.

21 **The Present Study**

22
23 This study pursued two objectives. The first objective was to investigate, among
24
25 adolescents, the relationships between perceived physical condition, sport competence,
26
27 physical attractiveness, physical strength, and grade in PE. It was hypothesized that high
28
29 levels of perceived physical condition, sport competence, body attractiveness, and physical
30
31 strength would be related to higher grade in PE.

32
33 The second and main objective was to investigate the possible indirect effect of PE test
34
35 anxiety variables in the relation between physical self-concept variables and grade in PE. To
36
37 examine this objective, the model presented in Figure 1 was used. In this model, the full
38
39 arrows represent a fully mediated (FM) model. More specifically, it was hypothesized that in
40
41 adolescents: (a) higher levels of perceived physical condition (Paths A1-A5), sport
42
43 competence (Paths A6-A10), physical attractiveness (Paths A11-A15), and physical strength
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Paths A16-A20) would be associated with lower levels of worry, self-focus, bodily symptoms, and somatic tension, and higher levels of perceived control; and (b) that lower levels of worry (B1), self-focus (B2), bodily symptoms (B3), and somatic tension (B4), and higher levels of perceived control (B5) would be associated with higher grade in PE.

In addition, as illustrated in Figure 1, a partial mediation (PM) model was added to examine the direct relationships between perceived physical condition (A21), sport competence (A22), physical attractiveness (A23), physical strength (A24), and grade in PE. More specifically, this model made it possible to test whether the direct relationships between physical self-concept variables and grade in PE were significant or not when the mediators were considered. Finally, given that the present study included a mixed-sex and -age sample of adolescents, the roles played by these variables were controlled for in the model as illustrated by the dotted lines in Figure 1.

Method

Participants and Procedure

A total of 412 students (187 boys, 225 girls, $M_{age} = 13.90$, $SD = 1.13$) from French *collèges* (ages 12-15, 356 students, 51.12% girls) and *lycées* (ages 15-19, 56 students, 76.79% girls) voluntarily and anonymously participated in the study. Participants were recruited through their PE teachers who volunteered their students to participate, while ensuring that schools' socio-demographic profiles and schools' results on national examinations showed diversity. The present study was completely independent of the course grade. The study was first approved by the Chief Education Officer, the schools' principals, and the students' parents who gave their informed consent. The study met the requirements of the ethical committee of the first author's university and of the *Commission Nationale de l'Informatique*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

et des Libertés (no. 2004-801). French students have three to four hours of PE per week in *collège* and two hours per week in *lycée*. PE examinations occur between three and eight times per year and grades obtained in PE contribute to and diploma. At the beginning of PE lessons, the two first authors of the study supervised the procedure, which lasted about ten minutes. Students completed the questionnaires individually. The students were assured that the study was totally anonymous and would not influence their course grade. No evaluations, tests, or examinations were conducted on the day of completion of questionnaires.

Theoretically, demonstrating a task in front of peers is not considered a task that specifically causes test anxiety, because studying PE test anxiety only focuses on evaluative tasks at the end of the learning process which explicitly lead to a grade (Danthony et al., 2019). When this grade is directly involved in the awarding of a diploma, the term ‘test’ or ‘examination’ is used, whereas if it is not involved, the term ‘evaluation’ is used instead. In the present study, these terms are used interchangeably because in all three cases these evaluative tasks lead to PE test anxiety.

Measures

Physical Self-Concept

Adolescents’ perceived physical condition (e.g., “*I think I could run for a long time without tiring*”), sport competence (e.g., “*I find that I’m good in all sports*”), physical attractiveness (e.g., “*I have a nice body to look at*”), and physical strength (e.g., “*I would be good at exercises that require strength*”) were measured using the French version of the Short Physical Self-Inventory (PSI-S; Maïano et al., 2008; Morin & Maïano, 2011). As recently recommended by Morin et al. (2018), the PSI-S version with only positively worded items

1 was used. Each subscale comprised three items that were rated by the adolescents using a six-
2 point response scale ranging from *not at all* (1) to *entirely* (6).
3

4 ***PE Test Anxiety***

5
6
7 PE test anxiety was assessed with the Revised Test Anxiety and Regulatory dimension
8 of anxiety in PE scale (RTAR-PE; Danthony et al., 2019), validated in French. Participants
9
10 responded on a 1 (*almost never*) to 4 (*almost always*) scale assessing five variables: worry
11
12 (e.g. “*During PE tests, I often think about how difficult it is*”), self-focus (e.g. “*During PE*
13
14 *tests, I think that other students may criticize my performance*”), bodily symptoms (e.g.
15
16 “*During PE tests, my muscles are tighter than during PE lessons*”), somatic tension (e.g.
17
18 “*During PE tests, I feel more tense than during PE lessons*”), and perceived control (e.g.
19
20 “*During PE tests, I believe in my capacity to get a good grade*”).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 ***PE Performance***

29
30
31 In a manner similar to that used in other studies conducted in the general test anxiety
32
33 literature (e.g., Putwain et al., 2010), PE performance was assessed through the grade
34
35 obtained in PE. The PE grade is a combination of the evaluation of three types of skills and
36
37 abilities that have been developed by students in the sports being evaluated: motor (e.g.,
38
39 performance, technique), methodological (e.g., to define a project adapted to its resources),
40
41 and social (e.g., to cooperate with a peer) skills and ability. The PE teacher determines
42
43 him/herself the assessment methods, as there is no national standardized test in France. This
44
45 grade ranged from 0 to 20 and was the mean of the grades in PE in the first three months of
46
47 the school year because the questionnaires were completed at the end of November.
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **Data Analyses**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
As illustrated in Figure 1, the FM and PM models were estimated using structural equation modeling (SEM). Both models comprise 12 manifest indicators forming four latent variables (represented as circles) measuring physical self-concept variables (perceived: physical condition, sport competence, physical attractiveness, physical strength; three items for each latent variable), 19 manifest indicators forming five latent variables measuring test anxiety variables (worry, 4 items; self-focus, 3 items; bodily symptoms, 4 items; somatic tension, 4 items; perceived control, 4 items), and one observed variable (represented as a rectangle) measuring grade in physical education. In these models, the physical self-concept variables were all correlated, and the test anxiety variables were all correlated. Given the ordered categorical nature of the indicators measuring the latent variables, the analyses were performed in three steps using the robust weighted least squares (WLSMV) estimator available in Mplus 8.5 (Muthén & Muthén, 2019). Additionally, in order to take into account the missing responses at the level of the items and the observed variables ($M = 1.04\%$), the models were estimated based on the full available information using the algorithms implemented in Mplus for WLSMV (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2010).

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
In order to control for the nesting of students within schools, we relied on Mplus design-based correction for nesting (TYPE=COMPLEX; Asparouhov, 2005). In the first step, the factor validity and reliability of the nine latent variables were examined using confirmatory factor analyses (CFA). The composite reliability of each latent variable was estimated using McDonald's (1970) omega (ω). Results from this measurement model were used to generate factor scores (mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1) that were used for descriptive statistics and to estimate sex-differences in physical self-concept and test anxiety variables. The factor scores were preferred to observed scale scores, because they preserve the

1 characteristics of the measurement model and incorporate a partial correction for
2 measurement errors (Morin et al., 2017; Skrandal & Laake, 2001). Sex-differences in physical
3 self-concept and test anxiety variables were examined using independent Student *t* test. For
4 each test the Cohen's *d* have been estimated. These analyses were performed using IBM SPSS
5
6
7
8
9
10
11 27 (IBM Corp. Released 2020).

12
13 In the second step, the FM models without and with sex and age as control variables
14 were estimated and compared based on their goodness-of-fit. In order to facilitate comparison,
15 sex and age were included in both models. However, in the model without control variables,
16 the regression paths between sex/age and the test anxiety variables and the grade in physical
17 education variable were constrained to be 0. Additionally, in both of these models, the control
18 (sex and age) variables were correlated with the physical self-concept variables. Based on
19 these analyses, only the best FM model (without or with control variables) was retained for
20 the third step. In the third step, the goodness-of-fit of the best FM model (without or with
21 control variables) was compared with that of the corresponding PM model.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 As recommended (e.g., Hu & Bentler, 1999), the goodness-of-fit of the various models
38 (CFA and SEM) was examined using the chi-square test of exact fit (χ^2), the comparative fit
39 index (CFI $\geq .90$ or $> .95$), the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI $\geq .90$ or $> .95$), the root mean square
40 error of approximation (RMSEA $\leq .08$ or $< .06$), and the 90% confidence interval of the
41 RMSEA. Moreover, comparisons of goodness-of-fit between the models were made using χ^2
42 difference tests estimated using the Mplus DIFFTEST function for WLSMV estimation
43 (MD $\Delta\chi^2$; Muthén & Muthén, 2017). The χ^2 difference test was complemented (Chen, 2007)
44 by an examination of changes in goodness-of-fit indices (Δ CFI and Δ TLI $\geq .01$ and Δ RMSEA
45 $\geq .015$). Finally, the significance of the indirect effects was examined using bias-corrected
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 bootstrap (BCB) 95% confidence intervals (95% CI), based on 1,000 bootstrap samples (Lau
2 & Cheung, 2012). An indirect effect is statistically significant when the BCB 95% CI
3
4
5 excludes zero.
6

7 8 **Results**

9 10 **Factor Validity and Reliability of the Latent Variables**

11
12 The CFA model comprising the nine latent variables resulted in a satisfactory fit to the
13 data ($\chi^2 = 528.31$, $df = 398$, $p < .001$; CFI = .985, TLI = .982, RMSEA = .028; RMSEA 90%
14
15 CI = .021-.034). As illustrated in Table S1 (see online supplementary file), all loadings were
16
17 significant and substantial. Additionally, the latent correlations were all significant and
18
19 showed: (a) negative relationships between physical self-concept and test anxiety (except for
20
21 perceived control) variables; (b) positive relationships between physical self-concept
22
23 variables; and (c) negative relationships between test anxiety variables (except for perceived
24
25 control). Finally, as illustrated in Table S1, the composite reliability coefficients (ω) of test
26
27 anxiety and physical self-concept scales were good to excellent ($\omega_{range} = .789-.947$).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Sex Differences**

36
37 Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics and standardized correlations between the
38
39 nine latent variables and the three observed variables. Findings showed that physical self-
40
41 concept variables were correlated with test anxiety, grade in physical education, and sex.
42
43 Similarly, test anxiety was correlated with grade in physical education and sex (except for
44
45 bodily symptoms and somatic tension). Finally, age was not correlated with physical self-
46
47 concept, test anxiety (except for worry), and sex variables.
48
49
50
51
52

53 Table 2 presents the mean and standard deviation of physical self-concept and test
54
55 anxiety variables as function of participants' sex and results from independent Student *t* tests.
56
57 Results not only showed that boys tended to present significantly higher levels of physical
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 self-concept than girls, but also that they tended to present lower scores on test anxiety
2 (except for perceived control) than girls. As illustrated in Table 2, the sizes of these effects
3 were small to large.
4
5
6

7 **Comparison of the Fully and Partially Mediated Models**

8
9
10 Findings from the FM solution not controlled for sex and age resulted in a satisfactory
11 fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 614.41$, $df = 480$, $p < .001$; CFI = .983; TLI = .980; RMSEA = .026;
12 RMSEA 90% CI = .019-.032). The inclusion of sex and age as control variables to this model
13 also resulted in a satisfactory level of fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 602.97$, $df = 468$, $p < .001$; CFI =
14 .983; TLI = .980; RMSEA = .026, RMSEA 90% CI = .020-.032). Comparison of both models
15 provided a significant χ^2 difference ($MD\Delta\chi^2 = 22.49$, $df = 12$, $p = .03$), but fit indices were
16 similar ($\Delta CFI/ \Delta TLI/ \Delta RMSEA = .000$). Examination of the unstandardized parameter
17 estimates revealed that regression paths from sex were significant for perceived control, self-
18 focus and worry. More precisely, results showed that boys tended to have significantly higher
19 levels of perceived control ($b = .305$, $SE = .128$, $p = .017$) and lower levels of self-focus ($b = -$
20 .304, $SE = .138$, $p = .027$) and worry ($b = -.364$, $SE = .152$, $p = .017$) than girls. Additional
21 findings also showed that regression paths from age were significant for perceived control,
22 self-focus, worry, and grade in PE. They showed that older adolescents tended to have
23 significantly higher levels of perceived control ($b = .060$, $SE = .028$, $p = .037$) and lower levels
24 of self-focus ($b = -.103$, $SE = .042$, $p = .015$), worry ($b = -.118$, $SE = .027$, $p < .001$) and grade
25 in PE ($b = -.357$, $SE = .146$, $p = .014$) than younger adolescents. Consequently, based on these
26 findings, the FM model controlled for sex and age was retained as the final model.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 The PM model controlling for the effects of sex and age was then examined. This
55 model, adding the direct paths from the physical self-concept variables to the grade in PE,
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

resulted in a satisfactory fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 597.21$, $df = 464$, $p < .001$; CFI = .983; TLI = .980; RMSEA = .026; RMSEA 90% CI = .020-.032). Comparison of the FM and PM models controlling for the effects of sex and age provided a significant χ^2 difference ($MD\Delta\chi^2 = 14.03$, $df = 4$, $p = .007$), but fit indices were similar ($\Delta CFI/ \Delta TLI/ \Delta RMSEA = .000$). Inspection of the parameter estimates of the direct paths from the PM model revealed that only the direct path between sport competence and grade in PE was significant ($b = .879$, $SE = .264$, $p = .001$). Consequently, based on these findings, the PM model controlling for the effects of sex and age was preferred and retained.

Unstandardized coefficients from the regression paths between physical self-concept (Predictors) and test anxiety (Mediators) and grade in PE (Outcome) are presented in Table 3. The other parameters from this model (i.e., correlations between physical self-concept latent variables and controls; correlations between test anxiety latent variables; regression coefficients from paths between control and test anxiety and grade in PE) are presented in Tables S1 to S3 in the online supplementary file. This model accounted for 33.9% of the variance in adolescents' worry, 26% of the variance in adolescents' self-focus, 14.2% of the variance in adolescents' bodily symptoms, 23.6% of the variance in adolescents' somatic tension, 61.4% of the variance in adolescents' perceived control, and 40.4% of the variance in adolescents' grade in PE. More specifically, findings showed that: (a) perceived sport competence significantly and negatively predicted bodily symptoms, somatic tension, and worry; (b) perceived sport competence significantly and positively predicted the grade in PE and perceived control; (c) perceived physical attractiveness significantly and negatively predicted worry and self-focus; (d) perceived physical strength significantly and positively predicted bodily symptoms and somatic tension; (e) bodily symptoms significantly and

1 negatively predicted grade in PE, whereas somatic tension and perceived control significantly
2 and positively predicted grade in PE; (f) the adolescents' sex significantly and negatively
3 predicted self-focus, worry, and grade in PE, and positively predicted perceived control; and
4
5 (g) the adolescents' age significantly and negatively predicted worry and self-focus.
6
7

8
9
10 In addition, the present findings revealed a significant indirect effect of: (a) bodily
11 symptoms on the relationships between perceived sport competence and grade in PE ($b =$
12 $.480$, BCB 95% CI = $.065$ to 1.249) and between physical strength and grade in PE ($b =$
13 $-.285$, BCB 95% CI = $-.713$ to $-.040$); and (b) of somatic tension on the relationship between sport
14 competence and grade in PE ($b =$ $-.739$, BCB 95% CI = $-.998$ to $-.089$). However, the indirect
15 effects of: (a) perceived control on the relationship between sport competence and grade in PE
16 ($b =$ $.429$, BCB 95% CI = $-.542$ to $.897$) was non-significant; and (b) somatic tension between
17 physical strength and grade in PE ($b =$ $.207$, BCB 95% CI = $-.013$ to $.311$) was non-
18 significant.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Discussion

34
35
36 The purposes of the present study were (a) to examine among adolescents the
37 relationships between perceived physical condition, sport competence, physical attractiveness,
38 physical strength, and grade in PE, and (b) to investigate the possible indirect effect of PE test
39 anxiety variables on the relation between physical self-concept variables and grade in PE. The
40 results highlighted direct relationships between different components of physical self-concept
41 and both PE test anxiety and grade in PE, direct relationships between PE test anxiety and
42 grade in PE, and the indirect effect of some components of PE test anxiety between physical
43 self-concept and grade in PE. The results also highlighted that boys had higher levels of
44 physical self-concept and lower scores of test anxiety (except for perceived control) than girls,
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

which is in line with the physical self-concept (e.g., Klomsten, Skaalvik, & Espnes, 2004; Morin et al., 2018) and PE test anxiety (Danthony et al., 2019; Danthony, Mascret, & Cury, 2020) studies.

First, the results showed that grade in PE was positively predicted by sport competence. This result was not surprising because relationships between sport competence and objective motor performance have previously been found in middle-school students (Morano, Colella, Robazza, Bortoli, & Capranica, 2011). Grade in PE was also positively predicted by somatic tension and perceived control, and negatively predicted by bodily symptoms. Similarly to the general anxiety literature in which bodily symptoms were found to be negative predictors of academic performance (e.g., Putwain et al., 2010), bodily symptoms were also found to be negative predictors of performance in PE represented by grade in this school subject. Experiencing troublesome symptoms (e.g., headache, accelerating heart, sweating) tend to decrease grades in PE because of unpleasant feelings before and during examinations. Surprisingly, somatic tension was positively related to grade in PE in the present study, while it was usually not related to academic performance (e.g., Putwain et al., 2010) or negatively related (e.g., McIlroy, 2000). However, somatic tension was found to be related in some studies with positive beliefs (Matthews, Hillyard, & Campbell, 1999), which could explain the positive predicting role of somatic tension on grade in PE. Finally, grade in PE was positively predicted by perceived control, which is a positive and regulatory dimension of PE test anxiety. This result was in line with recent results showing that perceived control in PE was positively related with adaptive outcomes such as approach-based goals and interest for PE (Danthony et al., 2019).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Secondly, the results highlighted that some components of the physical self-concept (sport competence, physical attractiveness, and physical strength) were predictors of the five PE test anxiety components. Sport competence was a negative predictor of worry, bodily symptoms, and somatic tension, and a positive predictor of perceived control. Perceived competence in PE has been previously found to be a negative predictor of worry and self-focus, and a positive predictor of perceived control (Danthony et al., 2019), because the likelihood of failure is higher when the situation is considered more threatening. But no relationships were found in Danthony et al.'s study between perceived competence in PE, bodily symptoms, and somatic tension. Assessing perceived sport competence (at the general level), and not specifically perceived competence in PE, led to negative predictions on the affective-physiological dimension of PE test anxiety. Physical attractiveness was also found to negatively predict the two cognitive dimensions of PE test anxiety, namely worry and self-focus. A negative perception of one's appearance in the eyes of others (i.e., the negative perceived attractiveness of one's own body) may induce cognitive responses of anxiety. These responses are negatively toned because they are linked with perceived threats related to body attractiveness before and/or during examinations and tests: fear of failure (Putwain et al., 2010) and fear of others' judgment (Cheng et al., 2009). Finally, physical strength was a positive predictor of bodily symptoms and somatic tension. Feeling physically strong may lead students to be more attentive to body sensations and tensions experienced before and/or during examinations (e.g., feeling tension in his/her muscles, feeling nervous).

Thirdly, the results showed that bodily symptoms have a significant negative indirect effect on the relationships between perceived sport competence and grade in PE, and between physical strength and grade in PE. A significant indirect effect of somatic tension on the

1 relationship between sport competence and grade in PE has also been found. Bodily
2 symptoms and somatic tension are self-reported physiological manifestations of test anxiety
3 (e.g., breathing difficulty, headache, feeling nervous, feeling tense) that can be very badly
4 perceived by students and may impair their grade in PE. These physiological indicators of
5 anxiety seem to be of particular relevance in the PE context based on the involvement of the
6 body in different sports (Danthony et al., 2019), which could explain their indirect effects
7 identified in the present study investigating the relationships between physical self-concept
8 and PE grade.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 Table 1 showed that the correlations between the test anxiety variables were high. This
22 result was not surprising because worry and self-focus are two kinds of cognitive anxiety and
23 somatic tension and bodily symptoms are two kinds of affective-physiological anxiety. In a
24 more general way, cognitive anxiety and affective-physiological anxiety are two components
25 of test anxiety, which explains the high correlations between worry, self-focus, somatic
26 tension, and bodily symptoms. Moreover, perceived control is a positive component of test
27 anxiety (Mascret et al., 2019) and is consequently negatively correlated with the four previous
28 variables. All these correlations are in line with those found in the general test anxiety
29 literature (e.g., Putwain et al., 2010; Zeidner & Matthews, 2005) and in the PE test anxiety
30 literature (e.g., Danthony et al., 2019, 2020). Table 1 also showed that the correlations
31 between the physical self-concept variables were positive and high. This is consistent with the
32 initial validation of the hierarchical model of the physical self-perception profile by Fox and
33 Corbin (1989) especially for perceived competence, strength, and physical condition.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Christiansen, Lund-Cramer, Brondeel, Smedegaard, Holt, & Skovgaard, 2018) and in French obese adolescent school students (Rey, Vallier, Nicol, Mercier, & Maïano, 2017).

Limitations of the present study and directions for future studies may be envisaged. First, physical self-perceptions and PE test anxiety were self-reported, and such measures can be impacted by social desirability. Secondly, due to the cross-sectional nature of the study design, some reverse relationships between the variables of interest could be expected (e.g., grade as a predictor of test anxiety, grade as a predictor of physical self-perceptions). But the rationale of the present study was based on the test anxiety literature, in which test anxiety is mostly studied as an antecedent of grades (e.g., Putwain et al., 2010). However, PE grades may also influence PE test anxiety in a circular relationship. Concerning the potential reverse relationship between PE grade and physical self-perceptions, some findings in PE showed that gymnastics performance and gymnastics self-concept were reciprocally related across time (Marsh, Chanal, & Sarrazin, 2006). However, in the test anxiety models, beliefs (and especially competence beliefs) strongly influence the degree and severity of test anxiety and are mostly used as antecedents of test anxiety (Zeidner & Matthews, 2005). For both of the above reasons, the present study has investigated the relationships between physical self-perceptions, test anxiety, and PE grade in this direction. Thirdly, the questionnaires were completed at the end of November, which explains why the present study considered only the last three months to determine the PE grade. Because PE grade may depend on the nature of the sports practiced by the students, it would have been interesting to average the mean grade over six months or to take into account the annual average grade. Fourthly, the study was conducted in a single country (France), and it would be necessary to carry it out in other countries to potentially generalize the results, because PE curriculum models may be different

1 between countries. Finally, Body Mass Index (BMI) was not collected in the present study,
2 while it can impact both students' physical self-perceptions and motor performance (Morano
3 et al., 2011). Future studies should investigate if the pattern of results would be the same
4
5 between normal- weight, overweight, and obese students.
6
7

8
9
10 These findings may also have research and practical implications. The present study
11 follows in the tradition of the test anxiety literature that relates self-perceptions, test anxiety,
12 and academic performance, while investigating it for the first time in the context of PE using
13 specific validated scales (Short Physical Self-Inventory, Revised Test Anxiety and Regulatory
14 dimension of anxiety in PE scale). This study enables us to better understand the processes
15 that link these three variables and to envisage heuristic research perspectives, in particular to
16 study in a more specific way a potential influence of the type of physical activity (e.g., team
17 sports, artistic activities, risky activities) on the relationships that the present study was able to
18 highlight between physical self-perceptions, test anxiety, and PE grades. Implications for
19 practice are also to be discussed. The findings of the present study may be relevant for
20 students to better understand the psychological factors (physical self-perceptions and test
21 anxiety) that may positively or negatively impact their own PE grades. The findings may be
22 useful for PE teachers to identify students at risk in their PE courses (e.g., students with high
23 bodily symptoms, students with a low sport competence) in order to put in place appropriate
24 interventions such as focusing students on task mastery and on their personal progress
25 (Danthony et al., 2020).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Conclusions**

50
51 Studying simultaneously physical self-perceptions and test anxiety seemed of interest
52 in the PE context to better explain why some students fail when they are faced with an exam.
53
54 The results of the present study showed that grade in PE was directly predicted by some
55 components of physical self-perceptions and test anxiety, and that the relationships between
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 physical self-perceptions and grade in PE were mediated by bodily symptoms and somatic
2 tension. A better understanding of failure in PE is relevant in the short term to increase the
3 chances of passing a PE exam, but also in the longer term because participation, success, and
4 interest in PE increase the likelihood of the adoption of health-related behaviors by students
5 outside school, such as physical activity and sport participation (Ferriz, González- Cutre,
6 Sicilia, & Hagger, 2016).
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Arens A. K., Marsh H. W., Craven R. G., Yeung A. S., Randhawa E., Hasselhorn M. (2016).
Math self-concept in preschool children: structure, achievement relations, and
generalizability across gender. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 36(3), 391-403.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2015.12.024>
- Asparouhov, T. (2005). Sampling weights in latent variable modeling. *Structural Equation
Modeling*, 12(3), 411-434. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328007sem1203_4
- Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B. O. (2010). *Weighted least square estimation with missing data*.
www.statmodel.com/download/GstrucMissingRevision.pdf
- Barkoukis, V., Tsorbatzoudis, H., Grouios, G., & Rodafinos, A. (2005). The development of a
physical education state anxiety scale: A preliminary study. *Perceptual and Motor
Skills*, 100(1), 118-128. <https://doi.org/10.2466/PMS.100.1.118-128>
- Biddle, S., & Goudas, M. (1994). Sport, activité physique et santé chez l'enfant. *Enfance*,
47(2), 135-44. <https://doi.org/10.3406/enfan.1994.2094>
- Chanal, J. P., Marsh, H. W., Sarrazin, P. G., & Bois, J. E. (2005). The big-fish-little-pond
effect on gymnastics self-concept: Generalizability of social comparison effects to a
physical setting. *Journal of Exercise and Sport Psychology*, 27(1), 53-70.
<https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.27.1.53>
- Christiansen, L. B., Lund-Cramer, P., Brondeel, R., Smedegaard, S., Holt, A. D., &
Skovgaard, T. (2018). Improving children's physical self-perception through a school-
based physical activity intervention: The Move for Well-being in School study.
Mental Health and Physical Activity, 14, 31-38.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mhpa.2017.12.005>

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Chen, F. F. (2007). Sensitivity of goodness of fit indexes to lack of measurement. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 14(3), 464-504. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510701301834>
- Cheng, W. N. K., Hardy, L., & Markland, D. (2009). Toward a three-dimensional conceptualization of performance anxiety: Rationale and initial measurement development. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 10(2), 271-278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2008.08.001>
- Choi, N. (2005). Self- efficacy and self- concept as predictors of college students' academic performance. *Psychology in the Schools*, 42(2), 197-205. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20048>
- Danthony, S., Mascret, N., & Cury, F. (2019). Development and validation of a scale assessing test anxiety in physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 38(4), 357-366. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2018-0282>
- Danthony, S., Mascret, N., & Cury, F. (2020). The relationships between the 3×2 achievement goal model and test anxiety in Physical Education. *European Physical Education Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X20971325>
- Dapp, L. C., & Roebbers, C. M. (2019). The mediating role of self-concept between sports-related physical activity and mathematical achievement in fourth graders. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(15), 2658. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16152658>
- Ferriz, R., González- Cutre, D., Sicilia, Á., & Hagger, M. S. (2016). Predicting healthy and unhealthy behaviors through physical education: A self- determination theory- based longitudinal approach. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 26(5), 579-592. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.12470>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Fox, K. R. (2000). Self-esteem, self-perceptions and exercise. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 31(2), 228-240.

Fox, K. R., & Corbin, C. B. (1989). The physical self-perception profile: Development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 11(4), 408-430.
<https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.11.4.408>

Hagger, H., Burn, K., Mutton, T., & Brindley, S. (2008). Practice makes perfect? Learning to learn as a teacher. *Oxford Review of Education*, 34(2), 159-178.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980701614978>

Hart, E. A., Leary, M. R., & Rejeski, W. J. (1989). Tie measurement of social physique anxiety. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 11(1), 94-104.
<https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.11.1.94>

Harter, S. (1990). Identity and self-development. In S. Feldman, & G. Elliot (Eds.): *At the threshold: The developing adolescent* (pp.352-387). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1-55.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>

IBM Corp. Released 2020. *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 27.0*. Armonk, NY:

IBM Corp

Khalaila, R. (2015). The relationship between academic self-concept, intrinsic motivation, test anxiety, and academic achievement among nursing students: Mediating and moderating effects. *Nurse Education Today*, 35(3), 432-438.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2014.11.001>

1 Klomsten, A. T., Skaalvik, E. M., & Espnes, G. A. (2004). Physical self-concept and sports:

2 Do gender differences still exist?. *Sex roles*, 50(1), 119-127.

3 <https://doi.org/10.1023/b:sers.0000011077.10040.9a>

4
5
6
7 Lau, R. S., & Cheung, G. W. (2012). Estimating and comparing specific mediation effects in
8 complex latent variable models. *Organizational Research Methods*, 15(1), 3-16.

9
10
11 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428110391673>

12
13
14
15 Liukkonen, J., Barkoukis, V., Watt, A., & Jaakkola, T. (2010). Motivational climate and
16 students' emotional experiences and effort in physical education. *The Journal of*

17
18
19
20
21 *Educational Research*, 103(5), 295-308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220670903383044>

22
23
24 Lohbeck, A., von Keitz, P., Hohmann, A., & Daseking, M. (2021). Children's Physical Self-
25 Concept, Motivation, and Physical Performance: Does Physical Self-Concept or
26 Motivation Play a Mediating Role?. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12.

27
28
29
30
31 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.669936>

32
33
34 Maïano, C., Morin, A. J. S., Ninot, G., Monthuy-Blanc, J., Stephan, Y., Florent, J.-F., &

35
36
37
38
39
40
41 Vallée, P. (2008). A short and very short form of the Physical Self-Inventory for
42 adolescents: Development and factor validity. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*, 9(6),

43
44
45
46
47
48
49 830-847. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2007.10.003>

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1 Marsh, H. W., Chanal, J. P., & Sarrazin, P. G. (2006). Self-belief does make a difference: A

2 reciprocal effects model of the causal ordering of physical self-concept and

3 gymnastics performance. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 24(1), 101-111.

4
5
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410500130920>

8
9
10 Marsh, H.W., & Craven, R.G. (2006). Reciprocal effects of self-concept and performance

11 from a multidimensional perspective. Beyond seductive pleasure and unidimensional

12 perspectives. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 1, 133-163.

13
14
15
16
17 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00010.x>

18
19
20 Marsh, H. W., & Perry, C. (2005). Does a positive self-concept contribute to winning gold

21 medals in elite swimming? The causal ordering of elite athlete self-concept and

22 championship performances. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 27(1), 71-91.

23
24
25
26
27
28 <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.27.1.71>

29
30
31 Marsh, H. W., Trautwein, U., Lüdtke, O., Köller, O., & Baumert, J. (2006). Integration of

32 multidimensional self- concept and core personality constructs: Construct validation

33 and relations to well- being and achievement. *Journal of Personality*, 74(2), 403-456.

34
35
36
37
38
39 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00380.x>

40
41
42 Mascret, N., Danthony, S., & Cury, F. (2019). Anxiety during tests and regulatory dimension

43 of anxiety: A five-factor French version of the Revised Test Anxiety scale. *Current*

44
45
46
47
48
49 *Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00481-w>

50 Matthews, G., Hillyard, E. J., & Campbell, S. E. (1999). Metacognition and maladaptive

51 coping as components of test anxiety. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy: An*

52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65 *International Journal of Theory & Practice*, 6(2), 111-125.

[https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1099-0879\(199905\)6:2%3C111::aid-](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1099-0879(199905)6:2%3C111::aid-)

[cpp192%3E3.0.co;2-4](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1099-0879(199905)6:2%3C111::aid-cpp192%3E3.0.co;2-4)

1
2
3
4
5 McDonald, R. P. (1970). Theoretical foundations of principal factor analysis, canonical factor
6
7 analysis, and alpha factor analysis. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical*
8
9 *Psychology*, 23(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8317.1970.tb00432.x>

10
11
12
13 McIlroy, D. (2000). An evaluation of the factor structure and predictive utility of a test
14
15 anxiety scale with reference to students' past performance and personality indices.
16
17 *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70(1), 17-32.

18
19
20
21 <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709900157949>

22
23
24 Morano, M., Colella, D., Robazza, C., Bortoli, L., & Capranica, L. (2011). Physical self-
25
26 perception and motor performance in normal- weight, overweight and obese children.
27
28 *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 21(3), 465-473.

29
30
31 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0838.2009.01068.x>

32
33
34 Morin, A.J.S., Boudrias, J.-S., Marsh, H.W., McInerney, D.M., Dagenais-Desmarais, V.,
35
36 Madore, I., & Litalien, D. (2017). Complementary variable- and person-centered
37
38 approaches to the dimensionality of psychometric constructs: Application to
39
40 psychological wellbeing at work. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 32(4), 395-419.

41
42
43
44 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-016-9448-7>

45
46
47 Morin, A. J. S., & Mañano, C. (2011). Cross-validation of the short form of the Physical Self-
48
49 Inventory (PSI-S) using exploratory structural equation modeling. *Psychology of Sport*
50
51 *& Exercise*, 12(5), 540-554. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2011.04.003>

52
53
54
55 Morin, A. J., Mañano, C., Scalas, L. F., Aşçı, F. H., Boughattas, W., Abid, S., ... & Probst, M.
56
57 (2018). Cross-cultural validation of the short form of the Physical Self Inventory (PSI-
58
59

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

S). *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, 7(1), 60-79.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000096>

Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. (2019). *Mplus user's guide*. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.

Nieuwenhuys, A., & Oudejans, R. R. (2017). Anxiety and performance: Perceptual-motor behavior in high-pressure contexts. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 16, 28-33.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.03.019>

Peart, N. D., Marsh, H. W., & Richards, G. E. (2005). The physical self-description questionnaire: Furthering research linking physical self-concept, physical activity and physical education. *Educational Psychology Review*, 2(1), 71-77.

Putwain, D. W., Connors, L., & Symes, W. (2010). Do cognitive distortions mediate the test anxiety–examination performance relationship?. *Educational Psychology*, 30(1), 11-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410903328866>

Raufelder, D., & Ringeisen, T. (2016). Self-Perceived competence and test anxiety. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 37(3), 159-167. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001/a000202>

Rey, O., Vallier, J. M., Nicol, C., Mercier, C. S., & Maïano, C. (2018). Repeated effects of vigorous interval training in Basketball, Running-Biking, and Boxing on the physical self-perceptions of obese adolescents. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 30(1), 64-82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2017.1334159>

Skrondal, A., & Laake, P. (2001). Regression among factor scores. *Psychometrika*, 66(4), 563-576. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02296196>

Zeidner, M., & Matthews, G. (2005). Evaluation anxiety. In A. J. Elliot & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp.141-163). London: Guilford Press.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Zeidner, M., & Schleyer, E. J. (1999). The big-fish–little-pond effect for academic self-
concept, test anxiety, and school grades in gifted children. *Contemporary Educational
Psychology*, 24(4) 305-329. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1998.0985>




Figure 1. Illustrations of the Hypothesized Fully and Partially Mediated Models Including Sex and Age as Control Variables.

Note. PE = physical education. In these models, the predictors and the control variables were correlated, and the mediators were correlated. They are not represented in order to simplify the representation of the hypothesized model to the maximum. The full arrows (A1-A20 and B1-B5) reflect a Fully Mediated (FM) model. Partial mediation (PM) will be tested by including the paths depicted through the dashed arrows (A21-A24). Finally, the prediction of controls (sex and age) will be tested by contrasting models including the dotted arrows with models where these paths are constrained to be zero.

Table 1*Descriptive Statistics and Standardized Correlations between latent and observed variables*

Measures	Physical condition	Sport competence	Physical attractiveness	Physical strength	Worry	Self-focus	Bodily symptoms	Somatic tension	Perceived control	Grade in PE	Sex	Age
Physical condition	-											
Sport competence	.720	-										
Physical attractiveness	.483	.601	-									
Physical strength	.504	.708	.484	-								
Worry	-.344	-.519	-.471	-.371	-							
Self-focus	-.277	-.375	-.468	-.241	.735	-						
Bodily symptoms	-.229	-.318	-.234	-.097	.552	.363	-					
Somatic tension	-.285	-.463	-.305	-.246	.706	.613	.751	-				
Perceived control	.538	.775	.464	.595	-.574	-.424	-.250	-.454	-			
Grade in PE	.419	.529	.385	.340	-.453	-.351	-.360	-.315	.492	-		
Sex (girls = 0; boys = 1)	.438	.384	.162	.358	-.275	-.207	-.103	-.147	.373	.160	-	
Age	-.112	-.030	.017	-.017	-.097	-.091	-.037	-.001	.010	-.022	-.086	-
Mean	.017	.000	-.004	.006	.029	.057	.053	.058	-.009	14.62	-	13.90
SD	.899	.943	.901	.905	.882	.833	.821	.850	.934	2.84	-	1.13
Minimum	-1.900	-2.610	-2.176	-2.140	-2.015	-1.581	-1.527	-1.705	-2.538	4	-	12
Maximum	2.024	2.336	2.163	2.329	2.904	2.314	2.724	3.023	2.068	20	-	19
Frequency	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	54.6%	girls

Notes. PE = physical education; Non-significant correlations are in italics. Other correlations are significant at $p < .05$, $< .01$ or $< .001$. Descriptive statistics (mean, SD, minimum and maximum) for measures of physical self-concept and test anxiety are those provided by the factor scores extract from the measurement model.

Table 2

*Mean and Standard Deviation of Physical Self-Concept and Test Anxiety Variables as Function of Participants' Sex and Results from Independent Student *t* tests*

Measures	Girls		Boys		<i>t</i> (410)	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
	M	SD	M	SD			
<i>Physical Self-Concept</i>							
Physical condition	-.324(2.501)	.743(1.263)	.426(3.835)	.903(1.586)	-9.087	<.001	-.915
Sport competence	-.337(3.320)	.823(1.237)	.405(4.296)	.921(1.259)	-8.548	<.001	-.855
Physical attractiveness	-.180(3.293)	.882(1.365)	.208(3.678)	.880(1.306)	-4.455	<.001	-.441
Physical strength	-.291(2.773)	.846(1.311)	.363(3.711)	.845(1.315)	-7.813	<.001	-.773
<i>Test anxiety</i>							
Worry	.242(2.353)	.826(0.798)	-.227(1.984)	.880(0.828)	5.573	<.001	.551
Self-focus	.205(2.121)	.834(1.025)	-.121(1.755)	.799(0.915)	4.030	<.001	.399
Bodily symptoms	.136(1.851)	.784(0.710)	-.046(1.759)	.856(0.711)	2.252	.025	.223
Somatic tension	.210(1.762)	.801(0.737)	-.124(1.578)	.873(0.700)	4.048	<.001	.401
Perceived control	-.323(2.645)	.835(0.779)	.369(3.211)	.909(0.767)	-8.048	<.001	-.796

Notes. M = Mean; SD = standard deviation; *d* = Cohen's *d*. Analyses were performed using the factor scores extract from the measurement model. The mean and standard deviation obtained from the raw data are presented in parenthesis.

Table 3

Unstandardized Coefficients from the Regression Paths Between Physical Self-Concept (Predictors) and Test Anxiety (Mediators) and Grade in Physical Education (Outcome)

Predictors		Mediators	b	SE	b/SE	<i>p</i>
Physical condition (A1)	→	Worry	.149	.099	1.505	.132
Sport competence (A6)	→	Worry	-.523	.137	-3.816	.000
Physical attractiveness (A11)	→	Worry	-.337	.083	-4.067	.000
Physical strength (A16)	→	Worry	.065	.088	.746	.456
Physical condition (A2)	→	Self-focus	.067	.109	.620	.535
Sport competence (A7)	→	Self-focus	-.244	.141	-1.729	.084
Physical attractiveness (A12)	→	Self-focus	-.471	.077	-6.116	.000
Physical strength (A17)	→	Self-focus	.142	.090	1.579	.114
Physical condition (A3)	→	Bodily symptoms	.014	.105	.130	.897
Sport competence (A8)	→	Bodily symptoms	-.494	.142	-3.471	.001
Physical attractiveness (A13)	→	Bodily symptoms	-.101	.069	-1.470	.142
Physical strength (A18)	→	Bodily symptoms	.293	.092	3.173	.002
Physical condition (A4)	→	Somatic tension	.129	.109	1.177	.239
Sport competence (A9)	→	Somatic tension	-.714	.115	-6.219	.000
Physical attractiveness (A14)	→	Somatic tension	-.077	.097	-.795	.426
Physical strength (A19)	→	Somatic tension	.200	.072	2.778	.005
Physical condition (A5)	→	Perceived control	-.108	.091	-1.186	.236
Sport competence (A10)	→	Perceived control	1.175	.104	11.334	.000
Physical attractiveness (A15)	→	Perceived control	.008	.084	.098	.922
Physical strength (A20)	→	Perceived control	.121	.077	1.565	.118
Predictors		Outcome	b	SE	b/SE	<i>p</i>
Physical condition (A21)	→	Grade in PE	.243	.189	1.286	.199
Sport competence (A22)	→	Grade in PE	.879	.264	3.333	.001
Physical attractiveness (A23)	→	Grade in PE	-.065	.258	-.253	.801
Physical strength (A24)	→	Grade in PE	-.083	.163	-.511	.609
Mediators		Outcome	b	SE	b/SE	<i>p</i>
Worry (B1)	→	Grade in PE	-.401	.227	-1.763	.078
Self-focus (B2)	→	Grade in PE	-.405	.224	-1.808	.071
Bodily symptoms (B3)	→	Grade in PE	-.972	.304	-3.194	.001
Somatic tension (B4)	→	Grade in PE	1.035	.331	3.128	.002
Perceived control (B5)	→	Grade in PE	.365	.147	2.474	.013

Notes. SE = standard error. Information in parenthesis represent the label of the paths depicted in Figure 1.

**Supplementary Materials for:
Relationship Between Perceived Physical self-concept and Grade in Physical Education:
The Mediating Role of Test Anxiety**

Table S1. Standardized Loadings, Uniquenesses, and Latent Correlations

Table S2. Unstandardized Coefficients from the Regression Paths Between Sex/Age and Test Anxiety (Mediators) and Grade in Physical Education (Outcome)

Table S3. Unstandardized Correlations Between Predictors and Control Variables from the Partially Mediated Model Including Sex and Age as Control Variables

Table S4. Unstandardized Correlations Between Mediators from the Partially Mediated Model Including Sex and Age as Control Variables

The author reports no conflicts of interest.



[Click here to access/download](#)

Supplementary Material

Supplementary materials PSE (Revision).docx

