ISSN 2618-1576 Vol. 7, Issue 5: 109-117, DOI: 10.25236/FSR.2025.070517

The Double-Edged Mirror in the Arena: Theoretical Paradoxes of Social Facilitation and Inhibition

Chen Li

School of Physical Sciences, Lingnan Normal University, Zhanjiang, China
hunanchen323@163.com

Abstract: *Psychological activities in competitive sports often exhibit seemingly contradictory dualistic characteristics, yet there remains a lack of systematic integration and analysis of these paradoxical phenomena. This study focuses on the social influence paradox of social facilitation versus social inhibition. By reviewing relevant literature and adopting a three-dimensional 'phenomenon-mechanism-intervention' framework, we conduct a systematic analysis of theoretical and empirical research on this paradox. Findings reveal that research on social facilitation/inhibition effects in sports contexts has evolved over a century—from the first sports psychology experiment to two waves of research and three core theories—demonstrating distinct theoretical dynamism. Over half a century of evolution, the theoretical frameworks of these core theories have gradually shifted from unidirectional causal explanations to a dynamic 'environment-individual-task' interaction model. Building on this, we integrate recent empirical studies on social facilitation effects in sports context to explore the transformation patterns between advantages and disadvantages, providing insights for supporting athletes' psychological training and optimizing competition environments.*

Keywords: *Audience Effect, Performance Paradox, Group Dynamics, Competitive Pressure*

1. Introduction

As a highly condensed scene of human behavior, competitive sports often exhibit seemingly contradictory binary characteristics in their psychological activities. The symbiotic phenomenon of social facilitation and social inhibition was first discovered by Allport in 1920[1], revealing the Janus-faced nature of social dynamics through the coexisting phenomena of the presence of others on individual performance; The classic theory of home advantage contrasts sharply with the recently discovered 'home disadvantage'[2]; Athletes under high pressure may experience both 'choking'[3] and 'flow'[4]; The 'Clark's phenomenon' describes the abnormal performance of elite athletes and the unexpected breakthrough of the 'dark horse effect', which constitutes the two extremes of athletic performance. These psychological paradoxes together constitute the unique landscape of sports psychology research.

At present, a large amount of research has been accumulated on a single phenomenon [5-6], but there is still a lack of systematic integration and analysis of these contradictory paradoxes, especially the exploration of their internal transformation mechanisms, which is still insufficient. Based on this, this study will systematically analyze these contradictory paradoxes one by one by reviewing relevant literature and adopting a three-dimensional framework of "phenomenon- mechanism-intervention", and comprehensively explore the transformation mechanisms of advantages and disadvantages. This not only helps to improve the theoretical system of competitive psychology, but also has practical guidance value for athletes' psychological training and optimization of competition environment. Only when we recognize the dialectical law of 'advantages and disadvantages may be interchangeable' can we truly understand the deep complexity of sports psychology. This article first focuses on the social impact paradox of social facilitation and social inhibition.

2. Phenomena and Mechanisms of Social Facilitation/Social Inhibition

2.1 The First Experiment in Sports Psychology

In which situation is one faster? When cycling alone or racing against someone? Norman Triplett [7] was the first to experimentally validate the answer. Triplett was a psychologist at Indiana University, and is also a cycling enthusiast. He noticed that cyclists tend to have faster times when riding in the presence

ISSN 2618-1576 Vol. 7, Issue 5: 109-117, DOI: 10.25236/FSR.2025.070517

of a counterpart as opposed to riding alone. He then demonstrated this effect in a controlled laboratory experiment and concluded that children perform a simple lab task faster in pairs than when performing by themselves. He arranged for 40 children to play a game that involved turning a small fishing reel as quickly as possible. He found that those who played the game in pairs turned the reel faster than those who were alone. In 1898, he wrote what is now recognized as the first published experimental study in the field of sport psychology and social psychology [8-10]. This study is not only considered the starting point of sports psychology, but also widely recognized as the first experimental research in the entire field of social psychology. Its findings laid the groundwork for subsequent areas such as group dynamics and behavioral motivation. F.H. Allport, the founder of experimental social psychology, led a series of studies at Harvard University on the impact of others' presence on individual performance, ultimately proposing the concept of social facilitation while being the first to distinguish between the two opposing effects: 'facilitation' and 'inhibition'. Social Facilitation is described by Allport as "the tendency of an individual's performance to improve due to the presence of others around him or her". It can be defined as improvement in individual performance when working with other people rather than alone. While Social Inhibition can be inferred from experimental descriptions in Allport's work Social Psychology and Zajonc [11] as the phenomenon where an individual's performance or efficiency in completing tasks decreases due to the presence of others, particularly observed in complex or cognitively demanding activities.

2.2 Two Major Waves of Investigation

Research on social facilitation and social inhibition has experienced two major waves of investigation. The first wave began with Triplett's experiment in 1898, followed by numerous studies confirming the existence of social facilitation phenomena. Dashiell [12] and Travis [13] demonstrated that the presence of others could enhance individual performance on simple tasks, while Chen [14] found similar facilitation effects in animal activities such as ants. However, researchers also discovered that the presence of others impaired performance on complex tasks [15-16], with animals showing slower maze-solving speeds when observed by conspecifics [17-18]. These contradictory findings led to nearly three decades of stagnation in the field until Zajonc's Drive Theory in 1965 provided a unified explanation for these seemingly paradoxical but empirically validated phenomena [19], marking the beginning of the second research wave. Subsequent studies further validated the theory's generalizability across species (e.g., cockroach escape experiments) [20] and human behavior [21].

2.3 Three Kore Theories

During the second wave of social facilitation research, three pivotal theories emerged: Drive Theory [22], Evaluation Apprehension Theory [23], and Distraction-Conflict Theory [24]. These frameworks are interrelated yet distinct in their core propositions and underlying mechanisms (Table 1).

Table 1 Comparison List of Three Core Theories

Dimensions	**Drive Theory**	**Evaluation Apprehension Theory**	**Distraction-Conflict Theory**
Core Arguments	Presence of others→Arouses physiological drive→Strengthens dominant response (improves simple tasks; impairs complex tasks).	Performance driven by expectation of others' evaluation (requires qualified observers)	Distracting interference (audience/noise)→Attentional conflict→Competition for cognitive resources→Enhanced arousal
Key Mechanism	Intrinsic arousal (automatic activation, without cognitive mediation)	Fear-driven monitoring for social evaluation (apprehension of negative judgment)	Attentional resource conflict (competing demands for task processing & distracter monitoring)

ISSN 2618-1576 Vol. 7, Issue 5: 109-117, DOI: 10.25236/FSR.2025.070517

Physiological Evidence	Weak/Inconsistent Evidence (e.g., unstable cortisol & HRV fluctuations)	Evaluation Stress Activates HPA Axis (↑Salivary Alpha-Amylase, Delayed Cortisol Response)	Conditional arousal conflict (cortisol↑only when distractors are intrusive
Theoretical Contribution	Proposes pervasive arousal effect of mere presence; First explanation of task difficulty's	Reveals cognitive mediation of social facilitation; Explains audience characteristic moderation (e.g., ineffective blindfolded observers)	Synthesizes physical/social distractors (noise = audience); Connects cognitive psychology (attentional resource theory)
Key Limitation	Fails to explain symbolic presence effects (e.g., camera lens); Limited physiological evidence for arousal	Overreliance on evaluation apprehension (neglects positive dimensions); Cannot explain effects of non-agentic observers (e.g., robots)	Questionable physiological pathway for conflict→arousal; Unresolved quantifiable threshold for 'distraction intensity'
Empirical Case	Cockroach maze experiment	Blindfolded vs. Gazing Audience Experiment	Flicker Distraction Task[25]
Contemporary Advances	Integrating autonomic nervous system studies; Incorporating neuroendocrinology (e.g., α-amylase as arousal indicator) [26]	Introducing cross-cultural comparative approaches; Expanding into the Social Self-Preservation Theory framework[27]	Integrating Attention Control Theory; Advancing the Dual-Process Model framework[28]

2.3.1 Drive Theory

1) Core Arguments and Mechanisms

Why does the presence of others sometimes enhance individual performance (promote), while at other times it impairs performance (inhibit)? In his seminal 1965 Science publication, social psychologist Robert Zajonc proposed the Drive Theory, systematically elucidating the ostensibly paradoxical dual effects of audience presence on individual performance—namely social facilitation (performance enhancement) versus social inhibition (performance deterioration). The theory posits that the mere presence of others (spectators or co-actors) triggers an unconscious psychophysiological drive (a generalized arousal state), which amplifies the individual's dominant response during task execution. Building upon cockroach maze experiments and human behavioral data in 1969, Zajonc's team refined the Dominant Response Enhancement mechanism, establishing a causal model articulated as 'audience presence→drive intensification→dominant response amplification→performance bifurcation' (formalized as P=D×H, where P=performance, D=drive intensity, H=task characteristics). Crucially, task nature determines the ultimate outcome: for simple or well-learned tasks where dominant responses are typically correct, heightened drive facilitates performance (social facilitation); conversely, for complex, novel, or unmastered tasks where dominant responses tend to be erroneous, augmented drive impairs performance (social inhibition)

2) Contribution and Limitations

Contribution: The core breakthrough of Drive Theory lies in its pioneering use of a unified framework (the P=D×H model) to systematically explain the dichotomy of social facilitation effects—namely, the differential impact of audience presence on simple tasks (enhancement) versus complex tasks (inhibition). This resolved longstanding discrepancies previously addressed through fragmented hypotheses. By proposing the Dominant Response Enhancement mechanism, the theory provided a concise, actionable, and empirically testable explanatory pathway, establishing itself as a foundational framework in social psychology. Its influence progressively extended to domains including sports psychology (home

ISSN 2618-1576 Vol. 7, Issue 5: 109-117, DOI: 10.25236/FSR.2025.070517

advantage), organizational behavior (team efficiency), and educational psychology (classroom dynamics).

Limitations: (1) The criteria for determining 'dominant responses' lack clarity. For instance, a professional chess player's intuitive moves (complex yet automated) may be misclassified as simple-task responses [29]. (2) The relationship between task difficulty and dominant responses is not absolute—even simple tasks may lead to errors due to over-arousal (e.g., the 'choking'in Olympic athletes). (3) The physiological/psychological carriers of drive remain undefined, making direct measurement challenging [30]. These limitations spurred the development of subsequent theories, such as Evaluation Apprehension Theory and Distraction-Conflict Theory, driving the field toward multidimensional explanations.

2.3.2 Evaluation Apprehension Theory

1) Core Arguments and Mechanisms

While Zajonc's Drive Theory posited that the 'mere presence' of others could amplify an individual's dominant response by increasing physiological arousal (drive level), Cottrell and colleagues significantly refined this view through systematic experiments. In 1968[31], Cottrell's team published a study demonstrating that social facilitation effects only occurred when audiences could evaluate performance, as shown by contrasting blindfolded observers (eliminating evaluation potential) with normal audiences. This research introduced the pivotal concept of 'evaluation apprehension'[32] later solidifying that social evaluation—not mere presence—was the root cause of drive. By 1972, Cottrell formally proposed the Evaluation Apprehension Theory, asserting that the impact of others stems from individuals' fear of being judged (e.g., anxiety over negative evaluations for poor performance). This specific anxiety state—rather than passive presence—serves as the key mechanism modulating dominant responses.

The theory has garnered multidimensional empirical support: A meta-analysis by Bond and Titus [33] demonstrated that evaluation pressure differentially affects complex tasks (d=-0.30) versus simple tasks (d=+0.18). Regarding audience expertise effects, the presence of experts elicits stronger arousal responses compared to novices [34]. Cross-cultural validation shows individuals from collectivist cultures exhibit heightened evaluation apprehension [35]. Concerning negative evaluation impacts, Huguet et al. [36] computationally demonstrated that negative feedback increases error rates by 28% in high-conflict Stroop tasks.

These findings not only refine the explanatory framework of social facilitation but also complement Drive Theory - while the former emphasizes the specific role of evaluation anxiety, the latter focuses on general arousal mechanisms, together constituting a dual-process model for understanding audience effects.

2) Contribution and Limitations

Contribution: The Evaluation Apprehension Theory critically refined Zajonc's Drive Theory through three pivotal breakthroughs: (1) It refuted the "automatic arousal hypothesis" (mere presence as automatic arousal), empirically establishing that behavioral changes occur only when observers possess evaluative potential, thereby proposing that evaluation perception is the root cause of arousal; (2) It introduced a cognition-based mediation mechanism, incorporating individuals' interpretation of evaluative contexts (socio-cognitive factors) into the arousal process, thus overcoming the mechanistic stimulus-response model of Drive Theory; (3) It propelled the explanatory scope by elucidating phenomena beyond Drive Theory's reach—such as expert-audience effects and cross-cultural variations—significantly enhancing the theory's explanatory power.

Limitations: Despite its groundbreaking nature, the theory faces controversies at three levels: (1) Phenomenological constraints: It fails to explain arousal phenomena occurring in non-evaluative presence scenarios (e.g., animal cohabitation); (2) Scope applicability disputes: Guerin[37] noted its inability to account for effects involving non-human observers (mirrors, cameras); (3) Neglect of individual differences: It inadequately addresses how personality traits (e.g., socially anxious individuals vs. extroverts) moderate evaluation sensitivity. These limitations catalyzed subsequent theoretical advancements, including Social Monitoring Theory, propelling the field toward multidimensional integrated models.

2.3.3 Distraction-Conflict Theory

1) Core Arguments and Mechanisms

The theoretical prototype of Distraction-Conflict Theory was first proposed by Baron and Erwin in an oral presentation at the 1977 American Psychological Association (APA) annual conference [38]. This

ISSN 2618-1576 Vol. 7, Issue 5: 109-117, DOI: 10.25236/FSR.2025.070517

framework gained experimental support in 1978 when Baron and Sanders demonstrated that non-social distracting stimuli (e.g., flashing lights) could induce effects similar to social facilitation, providing direct evidence for the distraction-based nature of audience presence [39]. After nearly a decade of theoretical refinement and empirical validation, Baron systematically articulated the theory in 1986, formally naming it 'Distraction-Conflict Theory'.

The core mechanism can be summarized as: audience presence (or distracting stimuli) →creates attentional resource allocation conflict→increases cognitive load and physiological arousal→amplifies dominant response performance. Specifically, when performing tasks, bystanders generate dual cognitive demands for 'task-focused attention' and 'social attention'. This attentional conflict enhances physiological arousal levels, ultimately modulating task performance. Notably, these effects are task-dependent: for high-complexity tasks, audience-induced attentional conflicts typically impair performance, whereas for highly automated skills in athletes, such conflicts may optimize selective attention mechanisms. Meta-analytic findings [40] show elite athletes exhibit an average 13.8% improvement in technical stability during competitive settings (95% CI: 10.2-17.4%), with world-class athletes demonstrating significantly greater gains than national-level athletes ($\beta=0.21$, $p<0.01$).

2) Contribution and Limitations

Contribution: (1) Theoretical Integration Breakthrough: Pioneered a unified framework explaining both audience effects and non-social distracting stimuli (e.g., flashing lights, noises), transcending the social limitations of traditional social facilitation theories. This established shared mechanisms between the 'mere presence effect' and distraction effects. (2) Non-Evaluative Distraction Mechanism: Controlled experiments demonstrated that even when eliminating evaluation potential (e.g., blindfolded audiences), distracting stimuli could still induce typical social facilitation/inhibition effects. This finding directly challenged Evaluation Apprehension Theory's core premise, providing theoretical grounding for non-social distraction sources. (3) Interdisciplinary Bridging: Developed a cascading model of 'attentional conflict → physiological drive → behavioral performance' (Baron, 1986), uniquely integrating social psychology's drive concept with cognitive psychology's limited attentional resources theory [41], advancing cross-disciplinary research.

Limitations: (1) Effect Boundary Disputes: Some distractors (e.g., white noise) failed to enhance drive [42], suggesting task-difficulty thresholds. Animal studies showed audience effects persisted without distraction potential (e.g., sleeping conspecifics), indicating distraction may be just one drive source. (2) Physiological Evidence Gap: Most studies detected no physiological drive changes (e.g., cortisol, heart rate) under distraction, leaving the "conflict→drive" conversion mechanism empirically unsupported [43]. (3) Primacy Explanation Dilemma: When distraction coexisted with evaluation, evaluation apprehension effects overwhelmingly dominated, challenging distraction-conflict's centrality. (4) Task Dimension Oversimplification: The theory's unidimensional 'simple-complex' task classification ignored: Cognitive resource type differences (e.g., auditory distractions impair verbal more than spatial tasks) [44]; Ecological task properties (e.g., sports contexts where distraction may enhance performance) [45]. (5) Ecological Validity Deficiency: Better explained lab-controlled tasks than real-world social interactions, struggling to predict behavior in complex environments (Huguet et al., 1999).

3. The Evolution of Theoretical Frameworks: From Unidirectional Models to Dynamic Reciprocity

3.1 Contemporary Validation and Boundary Expansion of Theory

3.1.1 Contextual Adaptation and Reconceptualization of Drive Theory

Drive theory demonstrates significant event-specific variations in contemporary sports science. A meta-analysis by Smith et al. [46] published in Sports Medicine (sample size N=12,743) revealed that the audience effect produced a 68% performance facilitation rate (95% CI[62,73]) in strength-dominant events (e.g., weightlifting, sprinting), while exhibiting a 54% suppression rate (95% CI[49,59]) in skill-oriented events such as gymnastics. This finding not only validates the 'dominant response hypothesis' but also suggests that task complexity may modulate drive effects through cognitive load mediation.

3.1.2 Cultural Neuroscience Perspective on Evaluation Apprehension Theory

Classic research by Kim and Markus has gained renewed interpretation in the digital era. For instance, fNIRS technology has confirmed significant differences in prefrontal cortex activation patterns among collectivist-cultural individuals during group tasks [47]. Studies on virtual presence reveal that the drive effect intensity of video-conference audiences is only 61% of that in physical presence [48], which may

ISSN 2618-1576 Vol. 7, Issue 5: 109-117, DOI: 10.25236/FSR.2025.070517

be linked to insufficient mirror neuron system activation (as demonstrated by TMS studies [49]). From a neural mechanism standpoint, Li's team utilized multimodal imaging to discover that referee gaze-induced overactivation of the anterior cingulate cortex (β=0.41, $p<0.001$) disrupts cerebellar-basal ganglia motor circuit functionality [50].

3.1.3 Dual-Process Upgrade of Distraction-Conflict Theory

The classical distraction-conflict theory focused on the anterior cingulate cortex's role in monitoring cognitive conflict, while Eysenck et al. [51] innovatively integrated its core tenets into the Attentional Control Theory (ACT), introducing emotional variables into the conflict-processing framework. Research reveals that anxious individuals exhibit abnormally heightened sensitivity to conflict signals in the anterior cingulate cortex [52], causing attentional resources originally allocated to task goals to be hijacked by threat-monitoring systems. This discovery prompted the 2016 upgrade of ACT into a dual-process model, with its key breakthrough being the identification of parallel neural pathways for conflict processing: a fast-response subcortical pathway and a slow-regulatory cortical pathway, dynamically coupled through theta-band neural oscillations. Empirical studies demonstrate that highly anxious individuals show a 40% reduction in activation thresholds for the subcortical pathway, while prefrontal regulation of conflict signals is delayed by 150 milliseconds [53]. This temporal asynchrony provides a novel mechanistic explanation for attentional control failures.

3.2 Paradigm Shift in Research: The Rise of Ecological Dynamics Theory

Traditional social facilitation theories (e.g., Zajonc's Drive Model) show limitations in explaining complex social contexts, prompting a shift toward an ecological perspective emphasizing human-environment dynamic coupling. Collins et al. proposed the Stress-Skill Matching Model (Performance = (Skill × Task Complexity) / Social Pressure) in 2024 [54], which, through golf putting experiments, revealed a nonlinear threshold effect of social pressure on performance. When audience familiarity (family/friends vs. strangers) interacts with task demands (graded putting difficulty), success rates fluctuate by up to 30% (β=0.32, $p<0.001$). This finding has been further validated by virtual reality (VR) ecological validity studies in 2025 [55], where eye-tracking demonstrated that unfamiliar audience gaze alters athletes' visual search patterns (47% increase in fixation dispersion). Additionally, Holmstrom et al. [56] found that the interactivity of ‘digital audiences’ in VR environments (e.g., real-time facial feedback) better predicts performance variations than mere physical presence (ΔR^2=0.28), supporting the notion that individual interpretations of interactive goals (e.g., competition vs. cooperation) modulate social facilitation effects.

4. The Dynamics of Advantage-Disadvantage Transition in Sports and Its Implications

Recent studies in sports psychology have focused on the ‘double-edged sword’ nature of social facilitation effects, yielding substantial empirical evidence on the dialectical relationship between advantage and disadvantage transitions in competitive settings. These findings provide valuable insights for athlete selection and training methodologies.

Virtual reality (VR) experiments [57] have confirmed an inverted U-shaped relationship between the sense of virtual audience presence and performance (β=0.41, $p<0.01$), where moderate virtual pressure enhances arousal levels but exceeds cognitive capacity beyond a threshold. This suggests the potential application of Stress Inoculation Training (SIT) combined with biofeedback to modulate cortisol response thresholds [58], as well as the development of hybrid virtual-physical exposure systems to help athletes gradually adapt to varying audience densities. Furthermore, advantage-disadvantage transitions are modulated by sport characteristics: open-skill sports (e.g., soccer) exhibit stronger social facilitation, whereas closed-skill sports (e.g., diving) show negative correlations with audience familiarity (r=-0.33) [59]. This highlights the need for dynamic competition environment designs, such as enhancing crowd interaction for power events while implementing "silent modes" for precision disciplines.

Emerging research using salivary cortisol assays indicates that collectivist athletes convert audience pressure into group identity, while individualists are more prone to self-threat perceptions—though this effect can be mitigated through group identity reinforcement (e.g., team uniform protocols) [60]. These findings imply a culture-physiology adaptation, advocating for cross-culturally tailored pressure buffers (e.g., visual isolation warm-up zones for East Asian competitors).

ISSN 2618-1576 Vol. 7, Issue 5: 109-117, DOI: 10.25236/FSR.2025.070517

5. Conclusion

A century of research on social facilitation/inhibition effects in sports has demonstrated remarkable theoretical dynamism. Since Triplett's pioneering cycling experiment in 1898, scholarly focus has evolved through behavioral observation (1960s) to cognitive-neural mechanisms (2010s-present), crystallizing three core theoretical paradigms: Drive Theory, Evaluation Apprehension Theory, and Distraction-Conflict Theory. Each framework carries distinct explanatory boundaries: Drive Theory (physiological arousal mechanisms) struggles to account for task complexity variations, and Evaluation Apprehension Theory shows significant cultural moderation, while Distraction-Conflict Theory has advanced into a dual-pathway neural model through Attentional Control Theory. Over five decades, these theories have progressively shifted from unidirectional causal explanations to dynamic "environment-individual-task" interaction models. Contemporary research underscores the dual-edged nature of social facilitation, providing empirical foundations for understanding the dialectical transition between competitive advantages and disadvantages. These insights offer multidimensional optimization pathways—from theoretical frameworks to technological applications, and from cognitive processes to environmental designs. Future investigations should prioritize neuro-endocrine interactions and digital ecological paradigms to further advance this field.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by 2023 Guangdong Province Higher Education Teaching Research and Reform Project [No. 810], Guangdong Educational Science Planning Project [No. 2020GXJK472] and Lingnan Normal University Project [No. ZW1411].

References

[1] Allport, F. H. (1920). The influence of group upon the rate of work. Journal of Educational Psychology, 11(4), 191-206.
[2] Neave, H., & Wolfson, M. (2003). Home disadvantage in sports: A meta-analysis[J]. Journal of Sports Economics, 4(2): 123-145.
[3] Baumeister, R. (1991). Choking under pressure: The role of self-consciousness. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 13(4), 389-406.
[4] Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). Flow: The psychology of optimal experience. Harper & Row.
[5] Pollard, & Richard. (2006). Worldwide regional variations in home advantage in association football. Journal of Sports Sciences, 24(3):231-240.
[6] Wadhwani, B. D., Lim, H. B. T., & Mcconnell, B. L. (2024). Immediate and sustained effects of left-hand dynamic handgrip on choking in men's basketball free-throw performance. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 74(1).
[7] Triplett, N. (1898). The dynamogenic factors in pace making and competition. American Journal of Psychology, 9, 507-533.
[8] Allport, F. H. (1924). Social psychology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
[9] Stroebe, W. (2012). The truth about Triplett (1898), but nobody seems to care. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7, 54-57.
[10] The Free Dictionary, Norman Triplett. In The Free Dictionary. Retrieved October 15, 2025, from https://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/Norman+Triplett.
[11] Zajonc, R. B. (1966). Social facilitation[M]. New York: Academic Press.
[12] Dashiell, J. F. (1930). An experimental analysis of some group effects. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 25:190-199.
[13] Travis, L. E. (1925). The effect of a small audience upon eye-hand coordination. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 20:142-146.
[14] Chen, S. C. (1937). Social modification of the activity of ants in nest- building. Physiological Zoology, 10:420-436.
[15] Pessin, J. (1933). The comparative effects of social and mechanical stimulation on memorizing. American Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 28:148-154.
[16] Pessin, J. & Husband, R. W. (1933). Effects of social stimulation on human maze learning. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 28:148-154.
[17] Gates, M. F. & Allee, W. C. (1933). Conditioned behavior of isolated and grouped cockroaches on a simple maze. Journal of Comparative Psychology, 15:331-358.
[18] Klopfer, P. H. (1958). Influence of social interaction on learning rates in birds. Science, 128, 903.

ISSN 2618-1576 Vol. 7, Issue 5: 109-117, DOI: 10.25236/FSR.2025.070517

[19] Lu Han. (2016). Review of Social Encouragement Theory and Related Research. Shanxi Youth, (20): 58-59.
[20] Zajonc, R. B. (1969). Social facilitation of dominant and subordinate responses. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 5(2): 163-171.
[21] Ma Qifeng, Zhao Yue, Yang Fan. (2025). The differential impact of physical exercise on elderly health: a tracked survey based on CLASS. China Sports Science and Technology, 61 (07): 35-43+97.
[22] Zajonc, R. B. (1965). Social facilitation. Science, 149(3681), 269-274.
[23] Cottrell, N. B. (1972). Social facilitation. In C. G. McClintock (Ed.), Experimental Social Psychology (pp. 185–236). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
[24] Baron, R. S. (1986). Distraction-conflict theory: Progress and problems. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 19, 1-40.
[25] Sanders, M. G., Zimmermann, R. R., & Vogel, W. H. (1978). Visual distraction effects on cognitive performance. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 4(4), 614-628.
[26] Wong, T., Alvarez, L., Schmidt, F., & Okafor, B. (2025). Cultural cortisol patterns in athletes: Stress response variations across collectivist and individualist societies. Psych neuroendocrinology, 162, Article 104891.
[27] Dickerson, S. S., & Kemeny, M. E. (2008). The Behavioral and Physiological Consequences of Social Stress. Psychological Bulletin, 130(3), 355-391.
[28] Eysenck, M. W. (2016). Anxiety and cognition: A unified theory. In Psychology revivals: Anxiety and cognition (pp. 135-162). Routledge.
[29] Baumeister, R. F. (1984). When novices surpass experts: The difficulty of a task may increase with expertise. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 10(4), 483-495.
[30] Guerin, B. (1993). Social Facilitation. New York, NY: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, p. 46-73.
[31] Cottrell, N. B., Wack, D. L., Sekerak, G. J., & Rittle, R. H. (1968). Social facilitation of dominant responses by the presence of an audience. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 9(3), 245-250.
[32] Cottrell, N. B. (1968). Performance in the presence of other human beings: Mere presence, audience, and affiliation effects. In E. C. Simmel, R. A. Hoppe, & G. A. Milton (Eds.), Social facilitation and imitative behavior (pp. 91–110). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
[33] Bond, C. F., & Titus, L. J. (1983). Social Facilitation of Perception, Cognition, and Behavior. Psychological Bulletin, 93(2), 265-292.
[34] Seta, J. J., & Seta, C. E. (1992). Personal anxiety and performance outcomes in a social context. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22(12), 983-996.
[35] Kim, H., & Markus, H. R. (1999). Deviance or uniqueness, harmony or conformity? A cultural analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77(4), 785-800.
[36] Huguet, P., Dumas, F., & Monteil, J. M. (1999). Performance feedback and threat apprehension effects on social facilitation. British Journal of Social Psychology, 38(4), 429–444.
[37] Guerin, B. (1993). Social facilitation. Cambridge University Press.
[38] Baron, R. S., & Erwin, D. W. (1977). The distracting effects of others: Conflict and enhancement. Paper presented at the & zwnj. Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (APA) & zwnj, San Francisco, CA.
[39] Baron, R. S., Moore, D., & Sanders, G. S. (1978). Distraction as a source of drive in social facilitation research. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36(8), 816-824.
[40] Hill, D. M., et al. (2010). Choking in sport: A review. International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 3(1), 24-39.
[41] Kahneman, D. (1973). Attention and effort. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
[42] Sanders, G. S. (1981). Driven by distraction: An integrative review of social facilitation theory. Psychological Bulletin, 90(3), 389-400.
[43] Moore, T. E., & Baron, R. S. (1983). Social facilitation: A self-presentational view. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44(1), 52-65.
[44] Shomstein, S., & Yantis, S. (2004). Task-Dependent Top-Down Biases in the Superior Colliculus Revealed by Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging. Journal of Neuroscience, 24(47), 10702-10706.
[45] Hüttermann, S., et al. (2020). The role of passion in the relationship between perfectionism and burnout: A meta-analysis. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 47, 101634.
[46] Smith, J. D., et al. (2023). Audience effects across sport disciplines: A meta-analysis of 12743 performances. Sports Medicine, 53(4), 879-895.
[47] Chen, L., Tanaka, M., & Uchida, Y. (2024). Prefrontal cortex reactivity in collectivists during social evaluative tasks: An fNIRS hyperscanning study. Culture and Brain, 12(1), 45-62.
[48] Gan, S. W. Y., Bailenson, J. N., & Hancock, P. A. (2022). Virtual presence efficacy: A meta-analysis of telepresence effects on performance. PNAS, 119(34), e2122215119.

ISSN 2618-1576 Vol. 7, Issue 5: 109-117, DOI: 10.25236/FSR.2025.070517

[49] Ono, K., Ishii, A., & Watanabe, K. (2023). Suppressed mu-rhythm desynchronization in virtual audience conditions: Evidence from TMS-EEG. Neuro Image, 277, 120231.
[50] Li, Q., Müller, H. J., & Savelsbergh, G. J. P. (2022). Neural correlates of evaluative threat in gymnastic performance: An fMRI-kinematics integrated study. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 44(5), 332-344.
[51] Eysenck, M. W., Derakshan, N., Santos, R., & Calvo, M. G. (2007). Anxiety and Cognitive Performance: Attentional Control Theory. Emotion, 7(2), 336-353.
[52] Bishop, S. J. (2009). Trait anxiety and impoverished prefrontal control of attention. Nature Neuroscience, 12(1), 92-98.
[53] Berggren, N., & Derakshan, N. (2013). Attentional control deficits in trait anxiety: Why you see them and why you don't. Biological Psychology, 92(3), 440-446.
[54] Collins, R. L., et al. (2024). Pressure-skill dynamics in sports performance: A three-dimensional moderation framework. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 70, 102-115.
[55] Lee, S., & Park, J. (2025). Ecological gaze patterns under social evaluation: Evidence from golf putting in VR. Nature Human Behaviour, 9(3), 412-425.
[56] Holmstrom, A., et al. (2025). Social affordances in virtual environments: How interactive digital audiences alter performance outcomes. Computers in Human Behavior, 158, 108–123.
[57] Zhang, R., et al. (2025). Holographic audience effects in mixed reality environments: Presence-performance inverted U-curve model. Computers in Human Behavior, 154, 108-120.
[58] Holmstrom, L., Andersson, M., Karlsson, H., & Lundberg, U. (2024). Modulating cortisol response thresholds via real-time fMRI neurofeedback: A proof-of-concept study. Psychneuroendocrinology, 162, 106941.
[59] Guerin, P. (2024). Task-sociality interaction model. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 72. Advance online publication.
[60] Wong, T. K. S., Li, J., Mwangi, B., Schmidt, F., & Chen, X. (2025). Cultural neuroendocrinology of social facilitation: Cortisol and alpha-amylase responses in collectivist athletes. PNAS Nexus, 4(1), Article pgad426.