

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

A conditional process model of the effect of mindfulness on 800m personal best times through
pain catastrophizing

Martin I. Jones¹ and John K. Parker²

¹Sport and Health Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK

²School of Sport and Exercise, University of Gloucestershire, Gloucester, UK

Address for correspondence

Martin I. Jones
Sport and Health Sciences, College of Life and Environmental Sciences
University of Exeter, St Luke's Campus
Heavitree Road, Exeter, EX1 2LU
England, UK
Tel: +44 (0) 1392 724747
Fax: +44 (0) 1392 724726
m.i.jones@exeter.ac.uk

Word Count

5100

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the British Miler's Club under the Frank Horwill Research
Scholarship Scheme

1 **Abstract**

2 The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between mindfulness and 800m PB
3 times through pain catastrophizing and to see whether the magnitude and direction of the
4 relationship depended on gender. One hundred and nine participants reported their gender,
5 completed measures of mindfulness (MAAS) and pain catastrophizing (PCS) and reported
6 personal best 800m times that were standardized based on current world records. Results
7 revealed moderate sized relationships between the predictor variables and standardized 800m
8 PB. The size of these relationships reduced after we controlled for gender. The follow-up,
9 conditional process analysis, revealed significant direct and indirect effects that confirmed
10 that pain catastrophizing partially mediated the relationship between mindfulness and 800m
11 PB and gender moderated the indirect paths. The indirect path between mindfulness and pain
12 catastrophizing was consistent with existing literature. However, the path between pain
13 catastrophizing and standardized 800m PB was positive for females and negative for males.
14 The different direction of the relationship could suggest that pain catastrophizing could be
15 performance enhancing for females.

16 **Keywords**

17 Mindfulness, Pain Catastrophizing, Middle distance running

18

19

1 mindfulness correlates with flow states and mental skills adoption (e.g., Kee & Wang, 2008).
2 Other researchers proposed neural correlates of mindfulness and their associations with
3 performance (Marks, 2008). Despite the growing popularity of mindfulness, no researchers
4 have examined mindfulness and performance within the context of high-intensity sport. Nor
5 have researchers considered how a relationship between mindfulness and performance exists
6 (mediators) and when a relationship exists (moderators). It was, therefore, the purpose of this
7 study to extend previous research by examining the relationship between mindfulness and
8 800m PB times.

9 How mindfulness affects performance is a difficult question that has stimulated a
10 mercurial debate in the sport and exercise psychology literature and there may be several
11 different answers to this question based on various sports and skill requirements. We propose
12 that in the context of middle distance running mindfulness connects with performance
13 because of the relationship between mindfulness and pain.

14 The opening quote by Olympic gold medalist Herb Elliot suggests that pain is an
15 unpleasant experience, and it may be best to ignore pain in the context of sport. In sporting
16 contexts, particularly track and field athletics, the pain associated with continued energy
17 expending effort is a potential limiter upon athletic performance (Kress & Statler, 2007).
18 Because of this fact, pain is an integral feature of involvement in sport (Sullivan, Tripp,
19 Rodgers, & Stanish, 2000a). Paradoxically, coaches have likened the importance of athletes'
20 self-inflicting exertion-induced pain during training to investment, where increased deposits
21 help to develop desirable performance outcomes (e.g., speed; Sands, 1995). Subsequently,
22 the desire to experience pain and the ability to manage pain could influence performance (e.g.,
23 running speed). Consequently, pain management could be an expedient accompaniment to
24 psychological skills training programs for athletes in high-intensity sports (Birrer & Morgan,
25 2010). Because of the importance of an athlete's capacity to manage and endure pain,

1 researchers have examined cognitive strategies to control exertion pain symptoms (Masters &
2 Ogles, 1998; Salmon, Hanneman, & Harwood, 2010).

3 The undesirable judgment of pain can negatively influence emotional reactivity
4 (Salmon, Hanneman, & Harwood, 2010). Baron, Moullan, Deruelle, and Noakes (2011)
5 suggested that less favorable emotional responses can lead to maladaptive behaviors. For
6 example, when in pain people might slow the pace to reduce perceived exertion. Reducing
7 pace would likely be detrimental to performance. Rather than ignoring symptoms, adopting a
8 receptive attention to painful stimuli that is nondiscriminatory or nonjudgmental (i.e.,
9 mindful) could ease painful experiences (Kabat-Zinn, 1982). Therefore, mindful attention
10 may influence performances that comprise painful efforts (e.g., middle distance running).

11 Several studies show a robust relationship between mindfulness and pain. For example,
12 McCracken, Gauntlett-Gilbert, and Vowles (2007) found that clinical pain patients that had
13 high scores on a dispositional measure of mindfulness (with no mindfulness training) reported
14 less pain and less pain-related distress than patients with low mindfulness. Similarly, Schütze
15 et al. (2010) examined mindfulness and pain perceptions in a sample of chronic pain
16 outpatients. These researchers found that a dispositional measure of mindfulness significantly
17 negatively predicted pain catastrophizing, pain-related fear, pain hypervigilance, and
18 functional disability. Moreover, mindfulness uniquely predicted pain catastrophizing when
19 the researchers statistically controlled other variables.

20 Catastrophizing is an extreme style of unipolar thinking where people believe that the
21 most adverse outcome is likely to occur (Beck, 1976; Ellis, 1962). Beck described
22 catastrophic cognitions as a faulty alarm system where people perceive relatively benign
23 stimuli as noxious, threatening, or dangerous. Sullivan et al. (2001) defined pain
24 catastrophizing as an “exaggerated negative mental set brought to bear during an actual or
25 anticipated pain experience” (p 53). Pain catastrophizing refers to a particular response to

1 pain (Sullivan, Martel, Tripp, Savard, & Crombez, 2006). Individuals who excessively
2 catastrophize focus their attention on pain sensations, exaggerate the threat values of pain, and
3 perceive themselves unable to cope with pain. Pain catastrophizing is a multifaceted
4 construct comprising rumination, magnification, and helplessness (Sullivan, Bishop, &
5 Pivik's, 1995). Rumination is repetitive thinking about the negative sensations associated
6 with noxious stimuli. Magnification is the elevation of the threat value of pain. Helplessness
7 is a belief that nothing can be done to extricate oneself from the pain experience). These
8 components contribute to appraising painful stimuli by myopically focusing on pain. The
9 combination of catastrophizing components also contributes to people displaying a tendency
10 to increase the intensity and threat value of these sensations. They then draw the conclusion
11 that he or she does not have adequate coping resources to deal with pain. It is important to
12 recognize that pain catastrophizing refers to negative emotional and cognitive schema during
13 actual or anticipated painful stimulation. Because of this detail researchers typically measure
14 pain catastrophizing as a trait-like or dispositional variable (Quartana, Campbell, & Edwards,
15 2009). Moreover, pain catastrophizing is relatively stable over time (Sullivan et al. (1995).
16 Consequently, a moderate proportion of the pain catastrophizing research examines people
17 who are not currently experiencing pain. Researchers adopt this strategy because of the
18 widely held belief that pain catastrophizing (as a trait-like measures) will predict how these
19 people generally respond when in pain regardless of the context of the pain (e.g., training
20 exertion vs. injury).

21 Researchers have suggested that mindfulness could attenuate catastrophizing cognitions
22 and affect a person's response to pain (e.g., reports of pain intensity: Kingston, Chadwick,
23 Meron, & Skinner, 2007). In addition to the value of mindfulness and acceptance in clinical
24 populations, researchers in sport psychology suggest that mindfulness may indirectly
25 influence sport performance (e.g., Gardner & Moore, 2004; Kee & Wang, 2008). Hence, the

1 ability to accept pain in a nonjudgmental fashion, rather than adding negative judgment to the
2 experience, may be a useful skill for an athlete to acquire.

3 Pain catastrophizing is evident in athletic populations (Deroche, Woodman, Stephan,
4 Brewer, & Le Scanff, 2011; Sullivan et al., 2000a; Sullivan et al., 2002). The athletes from
5 these studies were not injured, ill, or referred to any chronic pain clinics catastrophize over
6 pain (real or anticipated). Given the relationship between pain catastrophizing and a negative
7 orientation toward pain (i.e., threat) athletes could benefit from developing strategies that help
8 manage catastrophic cognitions. We contend that athletes who do catastrophize could be
9 missing out potentially useful training regimens and may, therefore, be slower. To date,
10 researchers have not shown a relationship between catastrophizing and indicators of
11 performance and it is unclear whether boundary conditions exist (e.g., moderating variables).
12 It is clear that mindfulness and pain are related (in chronic pain populations). However, it is
13 unclear whether the same relationship is evident in athletic populations who are more likely to
14 experience acute rather than chronic pain. Therefore, the examination of pain catastrophizing,
15 mindfulness, and performance in sport is warranted.

16 To date, few researchers have examined whether gender moderates the relationships
17 between mindfulness and performance (and the indirect paths through pain catastrophizing).
18 Despite preliminary evidence that meaningful relationships exist it is unclear whether the size
19 or direction of the relationship depends on gender. Previous researchers have suggested that
20 there are no meaningful differences in dispositional mindfulness scores between genders
21 (MacKillop & Anderson, 2007). However, in educational contexts Anglin, Pirson, and
22 Langer (2008) reported that mindfulness training did moderate gender differences in
23 academic performance. Furthermore, a review of gender differences in the effectiveness of
24 mindfulness-based treatment for substance abuse showed that females gravitated more
25 towards mindfulness-based treatments and benefited more from mindfulness interventions

1 than males (Katz & Toner, 2013). There is also an emergent body of work that highlights
2 gender as a determinant of pain experiences (Lautenbacher & Rollman, 1993; Unruh, 1996).
3 For example, females typically differ in their behavioral responses to pain. Sullivan, Tripp,
4 and Santor (2000) reported that females engaged in a greater volume of pain behavior when
5 compared with males during a cold-water immersion task (immersing the forearm). Pain
6 behavior included grimacing, rocking and flexing the nonimmersed arm, vocalizations, and
7 shaking or rubbing the immersed limb. Given that gender differences do exist, we contend
8 that it is likely that the magnitude of the relationships between mindfulness and performance,
9 mindfulness and pain, and pain and performance will differ between males and females.

10 To this end, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between
11 mindfulness and 800m PB times through pain catastrophizing and to see whether the
12 magnitude and direction of the relationship depended on gender. We chose 800m PB time as
13 our outcome variable because training for the 800m event is painful. Specifically, when
14 people train and compete at high intensities (e.g., an exercise intensity that approaches or
15 exceeds $\dot{V}O_{2max}$: Wood, 1999). We hypothesized that mindfulness would be negatively
16 related to 800m PB time because people high in mindfulness would be low in pain
17 catastrophizing. Furthermore, people low in pain catastrophizing would attend to athletic
18 pain (e.g., lactate build-up) in such a way that will enable them to run more quickly than their
19 lower mindful counterparts.

20 **Methods**

21 **Participants**

22 Following ethical approval from the authors' ethics subcommittee we recruited a
23 sample of competitive athletes. We recruited athletes from online forums and through the
24 British Miler's Club email list (BMC: An elite middle distance running club in the United
25 Kingdom). We asked participants aged 18-40 years, who were not injured and had a PB time

1 for the 800m to consider participation. We chose this age range because we could not gain
2 parental consent for under 18s via the internet and PB times likely changed regularly as under
3 18s matured physically. We did not recruit over the 40s because we felt it was unlikely that
4 participants over the age of 40 were recording new PBs

5 **Procedure**

6 If the participants met our inclusion criteria and wanted to participate in the study, we
7 invited them to click a link written in the email or on the forum post. The link took them to
8 an online information letter, consent form, and battery of questionnaires. We did not record
9 the location or the context of where the participant was when completing the questionnaires.
10 All we can infer is that the participants completed the questionnaires within the range of an
11 internet connection.

12 **Instruments of Data Collection**

13 **Demographic questionnaire.** We used a demographic questionnaire to record gender,
14 date of birth, and 800m PB times. Participants reported PB times in minutes and seconds, and
15 we converted these values into a value in seconds. We then standardized 800m PB time by
16 dividing the participants' PB by current world record time (males = 100.91 seconds, females
17 = 113.28 seconds). Standardized scores ranged from 1.06 to 1.67. These scores represent a
18 percentage difference between each participant and the world record. For example, a
19 participant scoring 1.06 reveals that that his or her 800m PB time is 6% slower than the
20 current world record (i.e., approximately 7 seconds for males). Subsequently, higher scores
21 demonstrate slower times.

22 **PCS.** We used the pain catastrophizing scale (PCS; Sullivan et al., 1995) to measure
23 catastrophic thinking associated with pain. The PCS instructions asked participants to reflect
24 on painful experiences and to indicate the degree that they experienced thoughts or feelings
25 when experiencing pain. The 13-items were scored on a 5-point scale (0 = *not at all* and 4 =

1 *all the time*). The PCS yields a total score and three subscale scores assessing rumination,
2 magnification, and helplessness. For the current study, we chose to use total pain
3 catastrophizing score only because we were interested in the combination of catastrophizing
4 constructs. The PCS has high internal consistency ($\alpha = .87$; Sullivan et al., 1995).

5 **MAAS.** We used the mindful attention awareness scale (MAAS; Brown & Ryan, 2003)
6 to measure individual differences in the frequency of mindful states over time. The MAAS
7 instructions ask participants to rate how frequently they have the experience characterized in
8 each statement. The 15-items were scored on a 6-point scale (1= *almost always* and 6 =
9 *almost never*). The MAAS yields a total score with high scores reflecting high levels of
10 dispositional mindfulness and has high internal consistency ($\alpha = .82$; Brown & Ryan, 2003).

11 **Data Analysis Plan.** We examined the magnitude of the relationships between study
12 variables using zero-order correlations. The purpose of these tests was to examine each
13 relationship separately before considering the model as a whole. Next we conducted first-
14 order partial correlations (controlling for gender) to examine whether the magnitude or
15 direction of the relationship changed. Finally, we used the analytic methods discussed by
16 Hayes (2013) to examine the relationship between mindfulness on 800m PB times through
17 pain catastrophizing. These analytical methods also allowed us to see whether this
18 relationship was moderated by gender (see Figure 1). We avoided multiple testing of the
19 separate paths (and the associated errors) with several separate regressions by replacing
20 multiple testing with one moderated mediation model using PROCESS (Hayes, 2013). We
21 used the Hayes' (2013) PROCESS add-on for SPSS because of the ease by which it allows
22 the researchers to specify a model in the SPSS environment. It is not within the scope of this
23 article to discuss the range of benefits of using PROCESS against older approaches to
24 mediation and moderation (e.g., Baron & Kenny, 1986). We refer the readers who wish to
25 learn more about PROCESS to Hayes (2013).

1 **Results**

2 **Data Screening and Preliminary Analyses**

3 In total 163 participants submitted data. We removed 21 participants from further
4 analysis because they were under the age of 18 years, 18 participants because they were over
5 the age of 40 years, and 15 people who were injured. The total sample comprised 109
6 participants, 73 males ($M_{\text{age}} = 25.48$ years, $SD = 5.31$) and 36 females ($M_{\text{age}} = 24.53$ years, SD
7 $= 5.46$). The calculation of standardized scores for skewness and kurtosis revealed that pain
8 catastrophizing, and mindfulness had a normal distribution; however, standardized 800m PB
9 times were extremely skewed.

10 Rather than transforming standardized 800m PB, we decided to keep the distribution as
11 nonnormal. We did this because ordinary least squares regression is robust with respect to
12 skewness and nonnormality and is insensitive to violations of the fundamental assumptions of
13 normality (Norman, 2010). We screened for univariate outliers on mindfulness, pain
14 catastrophizing and standardized 800m PB time by creating standardized scores and boxplots
15 for each variable identifying outliers as any participant ± 3.29 z scores from the mean. We
16 also screened for multivariate outliers using a $p \leq .001$ criterion for Mahalanobis D^2 . We
17 found three univariate outliers (> 3.29 on the standardized 800m PB time) and no multivariate
18 outliers in the sample. We decided to retain these outliers because even though their 800m
19 PB times were slow compared to the rest of the sample it was likely that they did represent
20 real values. We calculated estimates of internal reliability (Cronbach's α) for mindfulness (α
21 $= .865$) and pain catastrophizing ($\alpha = .914$). We then calculated zero order and first order
22 partial correlations (controlling for gender: see Table 1).

23 **Moderated Mediation Model**

24 We initially tested the conditional process model where gender moderated all direct
25 and indirect paths; however, results showed that gender did not moderate the direct path

1 between mindfulness and standardized 800m PB time. Consequently, we removed the non-
2 significant interactions (Hayes, 2013) and reanalyzed the data using a new model where
3 gender moderated the indirect paths only (See Table 2).

4 There was a significant direct effect of mindfulness on standardized 800m PB time, $b =$
5 -0.003 , 95% BCa CI $[-0.005, -0.001]$. There was a significant indirect effect of
6 mindfulness on standardized 800m PB through pain catastrophizing in females, $b = 0.003$,
7 95% BCa CI $[0.001, 0.005]$. However, the indirect effect of mindfulness on standardized
8 800m PB through pain catastrophizing in males was not significant, $b = 0.000$, 95% BCa CI
9 $[-0.001, 0.000]$. Follow-up probing of the interaction between mindfulness and gender on
10 pain catastrophizing showed a stronger negative relationship between mindfulness and pain
11 catastrophizing in females ($b = -0.577$, $t = -4.190$, $p \leq .001$) compared with males ($b =$
12 -0.220 , $t = -2.409$, $p = .018$: see Figure 2).

13 Probing the interaction between pain catastrophizing and gender on standardized 800m
14 PB time showed that greater pain catastrophizing was associated with quicker times in
15 females ($b = -0.003$, $t = -2.126$, $p = .036$) but slower times in males ($b = 0.001$, $t = 2.004$,
16 $p = .048$ see Figure 3). The multiplication of the two indirect paths and the direct path (i.e., a
17 $\times b \times c$) was positive. This result indicated complementary mediation (Zhao, Lynch, & Chen,
18 2010) otherwise known as partial mediation (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

19 The index of moderated mediation, which is a test of equality of the conditional indirect
20 effects across gender, was 0.003, 95% CIs $[0.001, 0.006]$. As this confidence interval does
21 not include zero, we concluded that the indirect effect of mindfulness on 800m PB times
22 through pain catastrophizing is moderated by gender (Hayes, 2014).

23 Discussion

24 The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between mindfulness and
25 800m PB times through pain catastrophizing and to see whether the magnitude and direction

1 of the relationship depended on gender. We hypothesized that mindfulness would be
2 negatively related to 800m PB time. We hypothesized that people who were high in
3 mindfulness would be low in pain catastrophizing. These individuals who were low in pain
4 catastrophizing would attend to athletic pain (e.g., lactic acid) in such a way that will enable
5 them to run more quickly than their low mindfulness and high catastrophizing counterparts.
6 We also hypothesized that the magnitude of these relationships could be different based on
7 the gender of the participants.

8 Our results revealed that in the current sample, a significant association does exist
9 between mindfulness and standardized 800m PBs through pain catastrophizing and the
10 relationship is moderated by gender. Results of zero-order and first-order partial correlations
11 revealed moderate to large sized relationships between the mindfulness and 800m PBs;
12 however these relationships reduced in magnitude after controlling for gender. The reduction
13 in magnitude suggested that some of the relationships were moderated by gender. The
14 subsequent conditional process analysis revealed a significant direct path between
15 mindfulness and 800m. Gender did not moderate this direct path but gender did significantly
16 moderate the indirect path. The direction of the relationship between mindfulness and 800 PB
17 was in the predicted direction. Specifically, mindfulness was negatively related to
18 standardized 800m PB times. Specifically, the participants in the current sample with higher
19 mindfulness scores reported PB times that were closer to the world record than participants
20 with lower mindfulness scores. The path between mindfulness and pain catastrophizing was
21 in the predicted direction. However, the path between pain catastrophizing and standardized
22 800m PB time was not what we expected.

23 **Theoretical Implications**

24 These findings have important theoretical implications for mindfulness and pain
25 catastrophizing in the sports domain. We were able to show a significant correlation between

1 dispositional mindfulness and standardized 800m PB times. This association meant that higher
2 levels of dispositional mindfulness correlated with 800m PB times that are closer to the world
3 record. A significant direct path in the mediation analysis suggesting that dispositional
4 mindfulness is beneficial for middle distance runners. According to Baron and Kenney
5 (1986), full mediation occurs when a significant r_{xy} reduces to a nonsignificant direct effect in
6 a mediation analysis. Current findings revealed a significant r_{xy} and a significant direct path,
7 which may show an omitted mediator. Therefore, future researchers could consider other
8 ways in which mindfulness indirectly influences middle distance performance (e.g., coping,
9 attention, perfectionism).

10 The path between mindfulness and pain catastrophizing is consistent with the existing
11 literature. For example, Schütze et al. (2010) stated that mindfulness uniquely predicted pain
12 catastrophizing in a sample of chronic pain outpatients. Schütze and colleagues believed that
13 a person's ability to focus on what is happening in each moment might inoculate against the
14 onset of pain catastrophizing. Eccleston and Crombez (1999) stated that pain could emerge
15 over other demands for attention; however, the interruptive function of pain depends on pain
16 related characteristics (e.g., threat level of pain). Therefore, it may be that a catastrophizer
17 has his or her attention disturbed to a state of cognitive and behavioral disruption whenever a
18 painful stimulus occurs (Leung, 2012). Consequently, there is the possibility that
19 mindfulness corresponds with pain catastrophizing because higher mindfulness prevents or
20 diminishes this disruption. People high in mindfulness can become aware of the pain and
21 accept the experience as it emerges in a nonjudgmental style rather than a catastrophic form.

22 The path between pain catastrophizing and standardized 800m PB time was not what
23 we expected. Probing of the interaction between pain catastrophizing and 800m PB
24 suggested that higher pain catastrophizing was associated with faster 800 PB times in females.
25 Existing research suggests that adopting a catastrophic cognitive style may increase the

1 aversive nature of subsequent pain experiences (Keefe et al., 2000) rather than improve
2 performance. In the current study, females who reported higher pain catastrophizing also
3 reported quicker 800m PB times. Previous studies have shown males report lower pain
4 catastrophizing than females (Sullivan et al., 2000b), which could mediate subsequent
5 experienced pain intensity. However, gender differences in pain catastrophizing do not
6 explain the observed antagonistic effects. It appears that pain catastrophizing was
7 performance enhancing for females. Even so, it is not clear whether each facet of pain
8 catastrophizing contributed equally to this effect. It is feasible to hypothesize that magnifying
9 or ruminating on pain may improve performance if athletes perceive pain to be a beneficial
10 investment. By magnifying and ruminating on pain athletes may increase efficacy beliefs
11 because more pain may signify they are training harder and are thus more likely to improve
12 performance. As a result, researchers may wish to examine the components of pain
13 catastrophizing to test this hypothesis.

14 Sullivan, Tripp, and Santor (2000b) reported that females often report higher pain
15 catastrophizing than males. Similarly, Keefe et al. (2000) reported gender differences on pain
16 catastrophizing and pain behavior (i.e., social communication of pain) possibly because of
17 social learning at a young age. Specifically, Keefe and colleagues suggested that females may
18 catastrophize more than males because young women are socialized to express pain and adult
19 caregivers provide more comfort to children showing greater degrees of distress. Unruh
20 (1996) reported the influential role differences in socialization experiences have upon male
21 and female expressions of pain (e.g., pain behavior). For example, social and cultural norms
22 are a prominent factor where males more so than women are encouraged to endure pain and
23 become adept in minimizing its effects. These socialization effects may also provide a
24 potential explanation for the antagonistic effects observed in the current study and, therefore,
25 require further study. Specifically, females may learn to express heightened distress as a form

1 of social communication about pain (Keefe et al., 2000, Sullivan, 2008). This communication
2 could be an attempt to derive empathy-driven responses from the social environment (e.g.,
3 from coaches). The result of heightened distress could be more social support, which may
4 indirectly positively influence performance because of the extra coaching provided. Males
5 may receive less support when expressing pain on the other hand. This issue may be
6 particularly true if coaches adopt a no “pain no gain” attitude or athletes are told to “man up.”
7 To date, the degree to which males and females differ on pain catastrophizing has been
8 studied in clinical samples; however there are limited investigations of pain catastrophizing in
9 athletes. The results of the current study suggest more research into gender differences in
10 sport is warranted.

11 **Practical Implications**

12 These findings have significant implications for scholars and practitioners who work
13 with middle distance runners or who have an interest in mindfulness and pain. Most notably,
14 our results suggest that males and females are different in terms of mindfulness and pain
15 catastrophizing, and coaches need to recognize that pain catastrophizing could be
16 performance enhancing in female middle distance athletes. Deroche, Woodman, Stephan,
17 Brewer, and Le Scanff (2011) examined pain catastrophizing to predict combat athletes’
18 inclinations to play through pain. Results revealed that pain catastrophizing led athletes to
19 reduce their physical involvement in their sports activity and the more an athlete
20 catastrophized his pain, the less he was inclined to play through the pain. In the context of
21 middle distance running the gender of the athlete could be an important variable. Gender may
22 determine whether athletes reduce involvement or use catastrophizing as a form of communal
23 coping (i.e., express pain to engender support).

24 It is important that coaches and athletes recognize that pain can be an indication of
25 tissue damage or similar physiological processes. Therefore, coaches should not encourage

1 athletes to accept pain and push through the extreme discomfort if doing so could cause long
2 term damage. Catastrophizing is analogous to a false alarm based on exaggerated perceptions
3 of potentially benign stimuli. It is possible that athletes are not exaggerating, and the pain
4 stimulus is not harmless and coaches must, therefore, allow athletes to behave accordingly. A
5 careful balance, therefore, needs to be struck to maintain a safe training environment and to
6 promote adaptation to training.

7 Researchers have shown that practitioners can apply mindfulness training in sports
8 domains. However, few people have considered whether dispositional mindfulness is
9 amenable to change. We adopted a relatively stable unidimensional measure of mindfulness;
10 however it is likely that mindfulness is a skill that can be learned and may be domain specific
11 (e.g., mindful training vs. competition). A multidimensional measure of mindfulness may
12 better measure the unique nature of the construct in the context of athletic pain. Researchers
13 may, therefore, consider alternative measurement models in future research (e.g., Five Facet
14 Mindfulness Questionnaire: Baer, Smith, Hopkins, Krietemeyer, & Toney, 2006).

15 **Limitations and Future Research Directions**

16 It is important to note that the cross-sectional nature of the current study renders us
17 unable to infer causality. Therefore, these emergent results warrant replication over time with
18 larger samples, so the accuracy of interval estimates increase. Researchers may also wish to
19 design studies that involved the manipulation of mindfulness attributes and pain
20 catastrophizing to establish whether a causal relationship exists.

21 Limitations of the study included the distinctiveness of the sample and the nature of
22 online data collection. We chose to recruit a sample of competitive middle distance runners
23 because of the likelihood they experienced regular, painful high-intensity interval training. It
24 soon became apparent that individuals who did not compete or train frequented the online
25 forums that we used for data collection. Consequently, we could not include many potential

1 participants because they were not from our population of interest. The participant deletions
2 considerably reduced our sample size and negatively influenced the precision of the interval
3 estimates. A larger sample could have increased the accuracy of the parameter estimates
4 compared with a smaller sample. Hence, the range of values falling between upper and lower
5 confidence limits could have been reduced (as accuracy is increased the intervals get smaller).
6 Some participants may have falsified personal best times. We did not collect data that we
7 could use to identify participating athletes and could not check personal best times, so the
8 veracity of our outcome variable remains undetermined due to issues of anonymity. Because
9 of the model of online data collection, it is also unclear whether participants completed the
10 measures alone or with the help and observation of others (e.g., coaches and peers).
11 Researchers should include measures of social desirability responding, given the demand
12 characteristics of this research. Finally, given the distinctiveness of the sample we cannot
13 draw inferences about relationships between mindfulness and pain catastrophizing in other
14 running disciplines or sports that integrate painful training sessions (e.g., cycling).

15 The MAAS and PCS demonstrated good internal reliability; however, it is important to
16 note that neither measure was perfect; therefore, the relationships that we reported were
17 limited by measurement error. Researchers may wish to try to reduce error or investigate
18 relationships using statistical methods that account for measure error at the item and subscale
19 level. Pain is multifaceted, and participants may have been thinking about experiences related
20 to different types of pain (e.g., injury) when completing the battery of questionnaires.
21 Consequently researchers should consider the context of pain, and level of meaning attached
22 to pain, as we assumed that pain was a negative experience. It is possible, however, that pain
23 athlete's perceived pain positively (i.e., training harder).

24 Researchers may wish to design experiments and conduct prospective longitudinal
25 studies to see whether mindfulness and pain catastrophizing translate into behavior over time,

1 specifically, faster times. The utilization of experimental designs that allow for the
2 manipulation of mindfulness skills between groups of athletes across an athletic season is a
3 viable way forward. Researchers may also wish to use prospective research designs where
4 they measure mindfulness, pain catastrophizing, and running times at different times in the
5 season to see whether temporality can be established.

6 **Conclusion**

7 The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between mindfulness and
8 800m PB times through pain catastrophizing and to see whether the magnitude and direction
9 of the relationship depended on gender. Our study offers several significant contributions to
10 the study of mindfulness and pain catastrophizing. We were able to show a statistically
11 significant association between dispositional mindfulness and performance (standardized
12 800m PB). Our findings also show that mindfulness contributes to pain catastrophizing,
13 which in turn is related to 800m PB times in females. The finding that higher pain
14 catastrophizing contributes to quicker 800m PB times in females was not consistent with our
15 original hypothesis or the existing literature and thus warrants further research. We hope that
16 these findings stimulate researchers to replicate the current study and extend research in
17 mindfulness and pain catastrophizing in high-intensity sports such as middle distance running.
18

References

- 1
2 Anglin, L. P., Pirson, M., & Langer, E. (2008). Mindful learning: A moderator of gender
3 differences in mathematics performance. *Journal of Adult Development, 15*, 132-139.
4 doi: 10.1007/s10804-008-9043-x
- 5 Baer, R. A., Smith, G. T., Hopkins, J., Krietemeyer, J., & Toney, L. (2006). Using self-report
6 assessment methods to explore facets of mindfulness. *Assessment, 13*, 27-45.
- 7 Baron, R. B., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator distinction in social
8 psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of*
9 *Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 1173-1182.
- 10 Baron, B., Moullan, F., Deruelle, F., & Noakes, T. D. (2011). The role of emotions on pacing
11 strategies and performance in middle and long duration sport events. *British Journal of*
12 *Sports Medicine, 45*, 511-517. doi 10.1136/bjism.2009.059964
- 13 Beck, A. T. (1976). *Cognitive therapy and the emotional disorders*. New York, NY:
14 International Universities Press.
- 15 Birrer, D., & Morgan, G. (2010). Psychological skills training as a way to enhance an athlete's
16 performance in high-intensity sports. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in*
17 *Sports, 20*, 78-87. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0838.2010.01188.x
- 18 Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role
19 in psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 822-848.
20 doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.822
- 21 De Petrillo L. A., Kaufman, K., A., & Glass C. R. (2009). Mindfulness for long-distance
22 runners: An open trial using mindful sport performance enhancement (MSPE). *Journal*
23 *of Clinical Sports Psychology, 4*, 357-376.
- 24 Deroche, T., Woodman, T., Stephan, Y., Brewer, B. W., & Le Scanff, C. (2011). Athletes'
25 inclination to play through pain: A coping perspective. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping, 24*,
26 579-587. doi: 10.1080/10615806.2011.552717

- 1 Eccleston, C., & Crombez, G. (1999). Pain demands attention: A cognitive-affective model of
2 the interruptive function of pain. *Psychological Bulletin*, *125*, 356-366. doi:
3 10.1037/0033-2909.125.3.356
- 4 Ellis, A. (1962). *Reason and emotion in psychotherapy*. New York, NY: Stuart.
- 5 Gardner, F. L., & Moore, Z. E. (2004). A mindfulness-acceptance-commitment-based
6 approach to athletic performance enhancement: Theoretical considerations. *Behavior*
7 *Therapy*, *35*, 707-723. doi. 10.1016/S0005-7894(04)80016-9
- 8 Gardner, F. L., & Moore, Z. E. (2006). *Clinical sport psychology*. Champagne, IL: Human
9 Kinetics.
- 10 Hayes, S. C. (2004). Acceptance and commitment therapy, relational frame theory, and the
11 third wave of behavioral and cognitive therapies. *Behavior Therapy*, *35*, 639-665.
- 12 Hayes, A. F. (2013) *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis:*
13 *A regression-based approach*. New York, NY: The Guildford Press
- 14 Hayes, A. F. (2014). *An index and test of linear moderated mediation*. Manuscript submitted
15 for publication.
- 16 Kabat-Zinn, J. (1982). An outpatient program in behavioral medicine for chronic pain patients
17 based on the practice of mindfulness meditation: Theoretical considerations and
18 preliminary results. *General Hospital Psychiatry*, *4*, 33-47.
- 19 Kabat-Zinn, J. (1994). *Wherever you go, there you are: Mindfulness meditation in everyday*
20 *life*. New York, NY: Hyperion.
- 21 Kabat-Zinn, J., Lipworth, L., & Burney, R. (1985). The clinical use of mindfulness meditation
22 for the self-regulation of chronic pain. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *8*, 163-190. doi:
23 10.1007/BF00845519

- 1 Katz, D., & Toner, B. (2013). A systematic review of gender difference in the effectiveness of
2 mindfulness-based treatments for substance use disorders. *Mindfulness*, *4*, 318-331. doi:
3 10.1007/s12671-012-0132-3
- 4 Kingston, J., Chadwick, P., Meron, D., & Skinner, T. C. (2007). A pilot randomized control
5 trial investigating the effect of mindfulness practice on pain tolerance, psychological
6 well-being, and physiological activity. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, *62*, 297-
7 300. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychores.2006.10.007
- 8 Kee, Y. H., & John Wang, C. K. (2008). Relationships between mindfulness, flow
9 dispositions, and mental skills adoption: A cluster analytic approach. *Psychology of*
10 *Sport and Exercise*, *9*, 393-411. doi. 10.1016/j.psychsport.2007.07.001
- 11 Keefe, F. J., Lefebvre, J. C., Egert, J. R., Affleck, G., Sullivan, M. J., & Caldwell, D. S.
12 (2000). The relationship of gender to pain, pain behavior, and disability in osteoarthritis
13 patients: the role of catastrophizing. *Pain*, *87*, 325-334.
- 14 Kress, J. L., & Statler, T. (2007). A naturalistic investigation of former Olympic cyclists'
15 cognitive strategies for coping with exertion pain during performance. *Journal of Sport*
16 *Behavior*, *30*, 428-452.
- 17 Lane, D. (2014, February 23). Herb Elliot motivated by pursuit of perfection not cash or glory.
18 *Sydney Morning Herald*. Retrieved from [http://www.smh.com.au/sport/athletics/herb-](http://www.smh.com.au/sport/athletics/herb-elliott-motivated-by-pursuit-of-perfection-not-cash-or-glory-20140222-338r8.html)
19 [elliott-motivated-by-pursuit-of-perfection-not-cash-or-glory-20140222-338r8.html](http://www.smh.com.au/sport/athletics/herb-elliott-motivated-by-pursuit-of-perfection-not-cash-or-glory-20140222-338r8.html)
- 20 Lautenbacher, S., & Rollman, G. B. (1993). Sex differences in responsiveness to painful and
21 non-painful stimuli are dependent upon the stimulation method. *Pain*, *53*, 255-264.
22 doi:10.1016/0304-3959(93)90221-A
- 23 Leung, L. (2012). Pain catastrophizing: An updated review. *Indian Journal of Psychological*
24 *Medicine*, *34*, 204-217. doi: 10.4103/0253-7176.106012


- 1 MacKillop, J., & Anderson, E. J. (2007). Further psychometric validation of the mindful
2 attention awareness scale (MAAS). *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral*
3 *Assessment*, 29, 289-293. doi: 10.1007/s10862-007-9045-1
- 4 Marks, D. R. (2008). The Buddha's extra scoop: Neural correlates of mindfulness and clinical
5 sport psychology. *Journal of Clinical Sport Psychology*, 2, 216-241.
- 6 Masters, K. S., & Ogles, B. M. (1998). Associative and dissociative cognitive strategies in
7 exercise and running: 20 years later, what do we know? *The Sport Psychologist*, 12,
8 253-270.
- 9 McCracken, L. M., Gauntlett-Gilbert, J., & Vowles, K. E. (2007). The role of mindfulness in
10 a contextual cognitive-behavioral analysis of chronic pain-related suffering and
11 disability. *Pain*, 131, 63-69. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2006.12.013
- 12 Norman, G. (2010). Likert scales, levels of measurement and the "laws" of statistics.
13 *Advances in Health Science Education*, 15, 625-632. doi: 10.1007/s10459-010-9222-y
- 14 Quartana, P. J., Campbell, C. M., & Edwards, R., R. (2009). Pain catastrophizing: A critical
15 review. *Expert Review of Neurotherapeutics*, 9, 745 – 758. doi: 10.1586/ERN.09.34.
- 16 Salmon, P., Hanneman, S., & Harwood, B. (2010). Associative/dissociative cognitive
17 strategies in sustained physical activity: Literature review and proposal for a
18 mindfulness-based conceptual model. *The Sport Psychologist*, 24, 127-156.
- 19 Sands, R. (1995). *Instant acceleration: Living in the fast lane*. Lanham, MD: University Press
20 of America.
- 21 Schütze, R., Rees, C., Preece, M., & Schütze, M. (2010). Low mindfulness predicts pain
22 catastrophizing in a fear-avoidance model of chronic pain. *Pain*, 148, 120-127.
23 doi:10.1016/j.pain.2009.10.030
- 24 Sullivan, M. J. (2008). Toward a biopsychomotor conceptualization of pain: implications for
25 research and intervention. *The Clinical Journal of Pain*, 24, 281-290.

- 1 Sullivan, M. J. L., Bishop, S. R., & Pivik, J. (1995). The pain catastrophizing scale:
2 Development and validation. *Psychological Assessment*, *7*, 524-532. doi: 10.1037/1040-
3 3590.7.4.524
- 4 Sullivan, M. J. L., Martel, M. O., Tripp, D., Savard, A., & Crombez, G. (2006). The relation
5 between catastrophizing and the communication of pain experience. *Pain*, *122*, 282-288.
6 doi: 10.1016/j.pain.2006.02.001
- 7 Sullivan, M. J. L., Rodgers, W. M., Wilson, P. M., Bell, G. J., Murray, T. C., & Fraser, S. N.
8 (2002). An experimental investigation of the relation between catastrophizing and
9 activity intolerance. *Pain*, *100*, 47-53. doi: 10.1016/S0304-3959(02)00206-3
- 10 Sullivan M. J. L., Thorn B., Haythornthwaite J. A., Keefe F. J., Martin M., Bradley L. A., &
11 Lefebvre, J. C. (2001). Theoretical perspectives on the relation between catastrophizing
12 and pain. *Clinical Journal of Pain*, *17*, 52-64.
- 13 Sullivan, M. J. L., Tripp, D. A., Rodgers, W. M., & Stanish, W. (2000a). Catastrophizing and
14 pain perception in sport participants. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *12*, 151-167.
15 doi: 10.1080/10413200008404220
- 16 Sullivan, M. J. L., Tripp, D. A., & Santor, D. (2000b). Gender differences in pain and pain
17 behavior: the role of catastrophizing. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *24*, 121-134.
18 doi: 10.1023/A:1005459110063
- 19 Unruh, A. M. (1996). Gender variation in clinical pain experience. *Pain*, *32*, 173-167. doi:
20 10.1016/0304-3951(95)00214-6
- 21 Wood, D. M. (1999). Physiological demands of middle distance running. In J. L. Fallowfield
22 and D. M. Wilkinson (Eds.), *Middle and long distance running: A scientific approach*
23 *to race preparation* (pp 14-37). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

1 Zhao, X., Lynch, J. G., & Chen, Q., (2010). Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and
2 truths about mediation analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37, 197 – 206. doi:
3 10.1086/651257

4

1 *Figure 1. Statistical Diagram of Mindfulness (X) on standardized 800m PB (Y) through Pain*
 2 *Catastrophizing (M) moderated by gender (W)*




18 Note. * significant at $p \leq .05$ level (1-tailed), ** significant at the $p \leq .01$ level (1-tailed).

19 Conditional indirect effect of X on Y through $M_i = (a_{1i} + a_{3i}W)(b_{1i} + b_{3i}W)$. Direct effect
 20 of X on Y = c'

21


1 *Figure 2. Visual Representation of the Moderation Effect of Mindfulness (X) on Pain*
2 *Catastrophizing (Y) by Gender (W)*



3

4

1 *Figure 3. Visual Representation of the Moderation Effect of Pain Catastrophizing (M) on*
2 *Standardized 800m PB times (Y) by Gender (W)*



3

4

1 Table 1

2 *Internal Reliability Estimates, Zero-Order Pearson's r , and First-Order Partial Pearson's r between Pain Catastrophizing and Mindfulness, and*
 3 *standardized 800m PB Times*

Zero-order correlations			
Measure	1	2	3
1. 800m PB time			
2. Mindfulness	-.254 [-.403, -.084] ^{***}	($\alpha = .865$)	
3. Pain Cat	.069 [-.089, .229]	-.415 [-.563, -.249] ^{***}	($\alpha = .914$)
First-order partial correlations (controlling for gender)			
Measure	1	2	3
1. 800m PB time			
2. Mindfulness	-.236 [-.402, -.054] ^{**}		
3. Pain Cat	.033 [-.139, .206]	-.369 [-.527, -.193] ^{***}	

4 *Note.* Internal reliability estimates are shown on the diagonals. BCa bootstrap results are based on 10,000 bootstrap samples. BCa 95% CIs
 5 [LLCI, ULCI] for Pearson's r (1-tailed) are shown in brackets. * Correlation is significant at the $p \leq .05$ level (1-tailed), ** Correlation is
 6 significant at the $p \leq .01$ level (1-tailed), *** Correlation is significant at the $p \leq .001$ level (1-tailed).

1

1 Table 2

2 *Model coefficients for the Moderated Mediation Analysis*

Antecedent	Consequent							
	<i>M</i> (Pain Catastrophizing)				<i>Y</i> (standardized 800m PB time)			
	Path	Coeff. [LLCI, ULCI]	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	Path	Coeff. [LLCI, ULCI]	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Constant	i_1	28.557 [16.861, 40.253]	5.899	≤ .001	i_2	1.322 [1.157, 1.487]	0.083	≤ .001
<i>X</i> (Mindfulness)	a_{1i}	-0.220 [-0.402, -0.039]	0.091	.018	c'	-0.003 [-0.005, -0.001]	0.001	.017
<i>M</i> (Pain Catastrophizing)		-	-	-	b_{1i}	0.001 [-0.001, 0.004]	0.001	.311
<i>W</i> (Gender)	a_{2i}	25.086 [5.010, 45.162]	10.125	.015	b_2	0.138 [0.040, 0.237]	0.050	.006
Mindfulness x Gender	a_{3i}	-0.356 [-0.684, -0.029]	0.165	.033		-	-	-
Pain Catastrophizing x Gender		-	-	-	b_{3i}	-0.006 [-0.010, -0.002]	0.002	.002
		$R^2 = .265, F(3,105) = 11.276, p \leq .001$				$R^2 = .130, F(4,104) = 3.830, p = .006$		

3 *Note.* BCa bootstrap results are based on 10,000 bootstrap samples. BCa 95% CIs [LLCI, ULCI].

1

2