

THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Self-reported tolerance of the intensity of exercise influences affective responses to and intentions to engage with highintensity interval exercise

Citation for published version:

Bradley, C, Niven, A & Phillips, S 2019, 'Self-reported tolerance of the intensity of exercise influences affective responses to and intentions to engage with high-intensity interval exercise', *Journal of Sports Sciences*, vol. 37, no. 13, pp. 1472-1480. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2019.1570590

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

10.1080/02640414.2019.1570590

Link:

Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer

Document Version: Peer reviewed version

Published In: Journal of Sports Sciences

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Journal of Sport Sciences on 29/01/19, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02640414.2019.1570590.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Édinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



1	Self-Reported Tolerance of the Intensity of Exercise Influences Affective Responses to
2	and Intentions to Engage with High-Intensity Interval Exercise
3	
4	Running title: tolerance of exercise intensity, affect, & high-intensity interval exercise
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

26 Abstract

This study investigated the effect of self-reported tolerance of the intensity of exercise on affective responses to, self-efficacy for and intention to repeat low-volume high-intensity interval exercise (HIIE). Thirty-six healthy participants (mean age 21 ± 2 years) were split into high tolerance (HT; n = 19), low tolerance (LT; n = 9), and very low tolerance (VLT; n = 8) of exercise intensity groups. Participants completed 10 x 6 s cycle sprints with 60 s recovery. Affective valence and perceived activation were measured before exercise, after sprints 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 20 min post-HIIE. Intention and self-efficacy were assessed 20 min post-HIIE. Affective valence was significantly lower in VLT vs. LT (P = 0.034, d = 1.01-1.14) and HT (P= 0.018, d = 1.34-1.70). Circumplex profiles showed a negative affective state in VLT only. The VLT group had lower intentions to repeat HIIE once and three times per week than HT (P < 0.001, d = 1.87 and 1.81, respectively) and LT (P = 0.107, d = 0.85; P = 0.295, d = 0.53, respectively). Self-efficacy was not influenced by tolerance. Self-reported tolerance of exercise intensity influences affective responses to and intentions to engage with HIIE. **KEYWORDS:** interval training; intermittent training; adherence; psychological responses.

51 INTRODUCTION

52

Low volume high-intensity interval exercise (HIIE) encompasses a range of protocols that 53 54 involve brief repeated bouts of relatively intense or all-out exercise separated by rest or low-55 intensity exercise, with total intense exercise time ≤ 10 min per session and total session 56 time ≤ 30 min (Gillen & Gibala, 2014). Growing evidence supports the physical health 57 benefits of low volume HIIE in clinical (Little et al., 2011) and inactive (Allison et al., 2017; 58 Trexler, Wingfield, & Blue, 2016) Smith-Ryan, groups. These benefits are 59 often comparable to or greater than moderate-intensity continuous exercise (Jelleyman et al., 60 2015; Weston, Wisloff, & Coombes, 2014), but with the benefit of greatly reduced total 61 training time. Several researchers have argued that the time-efficiency of HIIE may reduce 62 barriers, such as lack of time, which contribute to population inactivity and poor public health 63 (Biddle & Batterham, 2015).

64

65 The public health potential of HIIE has been subject to debate with opponents arguing that 66 its high-intensity nature will likely mean that participants will find it unpleasant and therefore have poor adherence (Biddle & Batterham, 2015; Hardcastle, Ray, Beale, & Hagger, 67 from Dual Mode 68 2014). This argument draws Theory (DMT) (Ekkekakis, 69 2003), which demonstrates that intensity is a key mediator of affective responses to 70 exercise. Dual mode theory postulates that affective responses to exercise are based on the 71 interplay between cognitive parameters (e.g., self-efficacy), and interoceptive (e.g. muscular 72 and respiratory) cues. The role that these factors play on affect during exercise is dependent 73 on exercise intensity, with increased reliance on anaerobic metabolism (often operationalised 74 as ventilatory threshold; VT) identified as a critical tipping point (Ekkekakis, Hall, & 75 Petruzzello, 2008; Ekkekakis, Hall, & Petruzzello, 2005b). According to DMT, cognitive parameters influence affect at intensities < VT, and affective responses are consistently positive (Ekkekakis et al., 2008). As exercise intensity approaches VT, there is variation in affective responses with some individuals reporting increases and others decreases (Ekkekakis et al., 2008). As exercise exceeds VT interoceptive cues gain salience and most individuals report reduced affect (Ekkekakis, Parfitt, & Petruzzello, 2011).

81

82 Empirical research supports tenets of DMT. Continuous exercise > VT typically leads to more 83 unpleasant affective responses than continuous exercise at and < VT (Ekkekakis et al., 2005b; 84 Kilpatrick, Kraemer, Bartholomew, Acevedo, & Jarreau, 2007). However, DMT is based on 85 continuous exercise, and may not be directly applicable to the intermittent nature of HIIE that 86 allows periods of recovery between high-intensity bouts (Jung, Little, & Batterham, 2016). 87 Based on DMT, it may be expected that during intervals >VT, interoceptive cues would 88 dominate and participants would experience negative affect. However studies that have 89 examined affective response to HIIE compared with moderate-intensity continuous exercise, 90 have reported mixed findings (Stork, Banfield, Gibala, & Ginis, 2017). Some studies reported 91 affect was more negative during HIIE compared to moderate-intensity continuous exercise 92 (Decker & Ekkekakis, 2017; Greene, Greenlee, & Petruzzello, 2018; Jung, Bourne, & Little, 93 2014; Niven, Thow, Holroyd, Turner, & Phillips, 2018), and others reported no difference 94 between conditions (Astorino & Thum, 2016; Little, Jung, Wright, Wright, & Manders, 95 2014). The lack of consistency in findings may partly be due to the influence of individual 96 differences in affective responses to a given exercise challenge. Several studies 97 report wide variation in the affective response of participants, particularly to high-intensity 98 continuous exercise and HIIE (Decker & Ekkekakis, 2017; Greene et al., 2018).

99

100 Drawing from personality theories that highlight variation in individuals' arousability and 101 sensory modulation, Ekkekakis, Hall, and Petruzzello (2005a) introduced the concepts of 102 exercise preference and tolerance to examine variations in affective responses to interoceptive 103 stimuli during exercise. In a series of studies, the researchers demonstrated the validity and 104 reliability of the Preference for and Tolerance of the Intensity of Exercise Questionnaire 105 (PRETIE-Q) to assess these constructs (Ekkekakis, et al., 2005a). The researchers reported 106 that the preference and tolerance scales significantly predicted affective responses at VT, but 107 only the tolerance scale predicted affective responses > VT. That is, a higher tolerance was 108 associated with more positive affective responses > VT. More recently, Tempest and Parfitt 109 (2016) and Tempest and Parfitt (2017) demonstrated a biological basis for the influence of 110 tolerance of the intensity of exercise on affective responses to continuous exercise at VT.

111

112 The finding that individual differences in tolerance of the intensity of exercise may influence 113 affective responses has implications for understanding the relationship between HIIE and 114 affect. Although this relationship has been alluded to in the growing literature (Frazao et al., 115 2016), to date no study has investigated the influence of tolerance of the intensity of exercise 116 on affective responses to HIIE. Additionally, no HIIE research has considered the influence of tolerance of the intensity of exercise on self-efficacy and intention, which are cognitive 117 118 antecedents of physical activity and may provide insight into the likelihood of future 119 engagement in HIIE (Rhodes & Kates, 2015).

120

121 The aim of this study was to examine the influence of self-reported tolerance of the intensity 122 of exercise on affective responses to low volume HIIE, and also consider how tolerance may 123 influence self-efficacy for and intention to engage in future HIIE. We hypothesised that self-124 reported tolerance of the intensity of exercise would significantly influence A) the affective responses to low volume HIIE, and B) self-efficacy for and intentions to repeat low-volumeHIIE.

127

128 METHODS

129

130 Participant screening

131

132 The research was approved by the University of Edinburgh, Moray House School of Education 133 Ethics Committee. To identify high and low tolerance participants, we screened a sample 134 (n=114) of healthy (confirmed via Physical Activity Readiness Questionnaire) participants 135 aged 18-35 and unfamiliar with HIIE (confirmed via self-report of unfamiliarity with 136 undertaking HIIE as defined by Gillen & Gibala (2014)). Participants were recruited through 137 University social media platforms to complete the PRETIE-Q (Ekkekakis et al., 2005a). This 138 16-item questionnaire focuses on an individual's interpretation of interoceptive stimuli during 139 exercise in order to separately quantify their preference for and tolerance of the intensity of 140 exercise (Ekkekakis et al., 2005a). Each item comprises a five-point response scale (1 = I)141 totally disagree to 5 = I strongly agree). The eight items relating to tolerance of the intensity 142 of exercise were used in the current study, as the tolerance scale of the PRETIE-Q has been 143 shown to predict affective responses > VT (Ekkekakis et al., 2005a). Participants received a 144 tolerance score ranging from 8 (lowest tolerance) to 40 (highest tolerance). The PRETIE-Q 145 has a test-retest reliability coefficient of 0.85 (Ekkekakis et al., 2005a), and in the current study 146 had an internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of 0.72. Participants' responses to the PRETIE-147 Q were ranked and the highest 25 and lowest 25 scoring participants were invited to participate 148 in the HIIE protocol. Splitting the sample in this way allowed the production of two distinct 149 groups: high tolerance (HT, n = 25) and low tolerance (LT, n = 25) (Tempest & Parfitt, 2016)

150	and provided the study with the power to detect a moderate effect ($\eta^2 = 0.5$) with $\alpha = 0.05$ and
151	$\beta = 0.20$ (Tempest & Parfitt, 2016). Participants were blinded to their grouping, and those who
152	were not invited for the second phase were fully debriefed.
153	
154	Participants
155	
156	Of the 50 participants invited to complete the HIIE protocol, six from the HT and eight from
157	the LT group did not complete the study, leaving $n = 19$ and $n = 17$ for HT and LT, respectively
158	(Figure 1; descriptive statistics in Table 1).
159	
160	**INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE**
161	
162	**INSERT TABLE 1 HERE**
163	
164	Predicted maximal oxygen uptake
165	
166	Participants completed the Perceived Functional Ability (PFA) questionnaire, which quantifies
167	participants' perceived ability to sustain an exercise intensity considered 'not too easy and not
168	too hard' (George, Stone, & Burkett, 1997). An incremental submaximal cycle ergometer
169	(Ergomedic 874E, Monark, Sweden) test was then performed (Nielson, George, Vehrs, Hager,
170	& Webb, 2010). Participants began the test against a 1 kg resistance for 3 min. Each 3 min
171	stage increased in resistance by 0.5 kg. Stages were completed until participants achieved an
172	end-stage heart rate (HR) \geq 70% but < 85% of age-predicted maximum. Cadence was
173	maintained at 70 rev.min ⁻¹ . Heart rate, PFA, end-exercise power output, age, gender and body
174	mass (BM) were used in the following $\dot{V}O_{2max}$ prediction equation:

176 $\dot{V}O_{2max} = 54.513 + 9.752$ (gender, 1 = male, 0 = female) - 0.297(BM, kg) + 0.739(PFA) + 0.077 177 (power output, W) - 0.071(HR)

178

This equation reported a standard error of the estimate of 3.36 ml.kg⁻¹.min⁻¹ in a similar sample to that of the current study (Nielson et al., 2010). This prediction equation was used as it employed multiple key influencers of $\dot{V}O_{2max}$ (gender, BMI, habitual physical activity) as well as a self-reported measure of an individual's PFA, which meaningfully contributed to the accuracy of the equation (George et al., 1997).

184

We chose a submaximal $\dot{V}O_{2max}$ prediction test because 1) participants with low tolerance of the intensity of exercise may have terminated a maximal test prior to attaining $\dot{V}O_{2max}$ (Ekkekakis, Lind, Hall, & Petruzzello, 2007; Hall, Petruzzello, Ekkekakis, Miller, & Bixby, 2014), which would have reduced test validity and presented an ethical concern regarding the use of such a test in this sample, and 2) the $\dot{V}O_{2max}$ data was used as a comparative measure of fitness and not as a measure on which methodological decisions were made, precluding requirement for the potentially greater precision of a maximal test.

192

193 Low-volume high-intensity interval exercise

194

Participants visited the climate-controlled laboratory (~21°C, 50% relative humidity) having abstained from alcohol and strenuous exercise for ≥ 24 h. The investigator gave a detailed explanation of the HIIE protocol, which included the requirement to complete each sprint maximally, and standardised explanations of the psychometric scales according to the original publications.

201 Anthropometric measures were recorded (BM: model 708; Seca, Hamburg, Germany; standing height: model 245; Seca, Hamburg, Germany). The cycle ergometer (Ergomedic 874E, 202 203 Monark, Sweden) was then adjusted to fit the participant, followed by a 5 min warm-up at a 204 self-selected cadence with 1 kg resistance. Participants then completed 3 x 6 sec familiarisation 205 sprints against their individualised target resistance, interspersed with 60 sec recovery. 206 Following a 10 min seated recovery, the HIIE protocol began. Participants completed 10 x 6 207 sec all-out efforts against 7.5% BM (males) or 6.5% BM (females) (Froese & Houston, 1987), 208 interspersed with 60 sec recovery. The first 50 sec of recovery was passive. From 50-59 sec, participants cycled unloaded at 60 rev.min⁻¹. At 59 sec, participants cycled maximally for 1 209 210 sec unloaded, after which the resistance was added to the flywheel and the 6 sec sprint began. 211 This low volume HIIE protocol has been shown to substantially improve $\dot{V}O_{2max}$ and metabolic 212 health in untrained populations (Adamson, Lorimer, Cobley, & Babrai, 2014). The researcher 213 was present throughout to add and remove weight to the flywheel, however no encouragement 214 was provided.

215

216 Measures

217

Heart rate was recorded throughout at 5 sec intervals (Polar Team 2, Finland). The Borg CR10 scale assessed ratings of perceived exertion (RPE) (Borg & Kaijser, 2006; Oliveira, Slama,
Deslandes, Furtado, & Santos, 2013). Affective valence (pleasure/displeasure) was assessed
using the Feeling Scale (FS), ranging from -5 (very bad) to +5 (very good) (Hardy & Rejeski,
1989). Perceived activation was measured using the Felt Arousal Scale (FAS) (Svebak &
Murgatroyd, 1985), ranging from 1 (low arousal) to 6 (high arousal). Scales were administered
at rest immediately prior to HIIE (except RPE), immediately after sprints 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10, and

20 min post-HIIE (except RPE). Scales were taken immediately following sprints due to the
problem of collecting this information during an all-out cycling effort.

227

Data from the FS and FAS were represented in the circumplex model, describing a combined affective state (Russell, 1980) with associated qualitative descriptors (calmness; energy; tension; tiredness) (Oliveira et al., 2013). Ekkekakis et al. (2008) suggested that the circumplex model is particularly appropriate for assessing affect before, during, and after exercise.

232

233 Task self-efficacy was assessed using a two-item measure (Jung et al., 2014). Question one 234 asked: "How confident are you that you can perform one bout of exercise a week for the next 235 four weeks that is just like the one you completed today?" Question two was identical, except 236 the number of exercise bouts increased to three per week (Jung et al., 2014). Responses were 237 scored on a scale of 0% (not at all) to 100% (extremely confident) in 10% increments. This 238 measure has demonstrated good internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha ≥ 0.95) (Jung et al., 239 2014). Intention to engage in the HIIE just completed over the next month was assessed using 240 a two-item measure (Jung et al., 2014), and consistent with other measures of intention 241 (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010). Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with 242 the statement "I intend to engage in the type of exercise I performed today at least once per 243 week during the next month", and the same statement but with a frequency of at least three 244 times per week. Responses were scored on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (very unlikely) to 7 245 (very likely). Task self-efficacy and intentions to repeat were measured 20 min post-exercise, 246 which falls within the window of any affective rebound (Hall, Ekkekakis, & Petruzzello, 2002; 247 Jung et al., 2014; Oliveira et al., 2013).

248

250 Statistical Analyses

251

- 252 *Descriptive statistics*
- 253

Initial observation of the data identified a larger range of PRETIE-Q scores in LT (range = 10) compared to HT (range = 5), as well as a greater variability in affective responses across participants in LT compared to HT. Therefore, the LT group was further subdivided using its median PRETIE-Q score into LT (n = 9; age 22.3 ± 2.2 years, height 1.68 ± 0.05 m, BM 67.3 ± 14.8 kg) and very low tolerance (VLT, n = 8; age 21.4 ± 1.7 years, height 1.72 ± 0.10 m, BM 72.7 ± 7.9 kg) groups.

260

261 Inferential analysis

262

263 The Shapiro-Wilk test assessed normality of distribution for all data sets. Exercise tolerance 264 scores were assessed using the Mann-Whitney U test. Mean VO_{2max}, mean power output and 265 mean peak HR during HIIE was compared using one-way independent groups ANOVA. Post-266 hoc analysis used the Games-Howell test for pairwise comparisons, to account for uneven sample sizes across the tolerance groups (Games & Howell, 1976; Games, Keselman, & Rogan, 267 268 1981). Rating of perceived exertion, affective valence, and perceived activation were analysed 269 using a mixed-method two-way (group x time) ANOVA, with Games-Howell post hoc 270 analysis. Intentions to repeat and self-efficacy were assessed using Kruskall-Wallis tests with 271 Mann Whitney-U post hoc tests for between-group differences. The Bonferroni correction was 272 applied to the alpha level for post hoc tests. For all other tests, an alpha level of P < 0.05 was used. Partial eta² (ηp^2) effect size (ES) quantified the magnitude of main ANOVA effects. For 273 274 select comparisons, Cohen's d ES for between-participants and within-participants designs

(Lakens, 2013) was used and defined as trivial (< 0.20), small (≥ 0.2 - < 0.5), medium (≥ 0.5 -
< 0.8), and large (≥ 0.8) (Cohen, 1992).

277

278 **RESULTS**

279

280 Tolerance of the intensity of exercise, and predicted **VO**_{2max}

281

282 By design, tolerance of the intensity of exercise in VLT (Mdn = 17.0, range 12-19) was

significantly lower than LT (Mdn = 21.0, range 20 to 22; U = 0.0, z = 3.5, P < 0.001) and HT

284 (Mdn = 32.0, range 31 to 36; U = 0.0, z = 4.1, P < 0.001), and was significantly lower in LT

- 285 vs. HT (U = 0.0, z = 4.3, P < 0.001).
- 286

Predicted $\dot{V}O_{2max}$ in the HT, LT, and VLT groups was 54.8 ± 1.8 , 49.9 ± 2.1 , and 47.3 ± 2.0 ml.kg⁻¹.min⁻¹, respectively (F_{2,33} = 10.266, *P* < 0.001). In HT, $\dot{V}O_{2max}$ was significantly greater than LT (*P* = 0.006, *d* = 0.64) and VLT (*P* < 0.001, *d* = 1.05). There was no significant difference between LT and VLT (*P* = 0.478, *d* = 0.42).

291

292 Physiological demand

293

Mean power output during HIIE was 8.7 ± 1.9 , 7.8 ± 1.9 , and $6.3 \pm 2.3 \text{ W} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1}$ for the HT, LT and VLT groups, respectively ($F_{2,31} = 3.913$, P = 0.031). There was a large ES for mean power output between HT and VLT (P = 0.062, d = 1.26), and a medium ES between HT and LT (P= 0.526, d = 0.56) and between LT and VLT (P = 0.385, d = 0.68). Mean peak HR during HIIE was 163 ± 13 , 157 ± 7 , and 157 ± 12 b.min⁻¹ for HT, LT, and VLT, respectively ($F_{2,27} = 1.067$, 299 P = 0.358). There was a medium ES for mean peak HR between HT and both LT and VLT (d300 = 0.50 - 0.52), and a trivial ES for LT and VLT (d = 0.05).

301

302 Rating of Perceived Exertion

303

Figure 2 shows RPE for the three tolerance groups. There was a significant main effect of time on RPE ($F_{2.9,95.0} = 140.118$, P < 0.001, $\eta p^2 = 0.805$), with RPE at each time point significantly different to the previous time point (P < 0.001, d = 0.72 - 2.61). There was no statistically significant effect of tolerance ($F_{2,33} = 0.210$, P = 0.812, $\eta p^2 = 0.013$) or tolerance x time interaction ($F_{5.8,95.0} = 0.833$, P = 0.543, $\eta p^2 = 0.048$).

- 309
- 310
- ***Figure 2 near here***
- 311

312 Affective valence

313

Figure 3A shows affective valence for the three tolerance groups. There was a significant main effect of tolerance on affective valence ($F_{2,33} = 9.771$, P < 0.001, $\eta p^2 = 0.372$). Affective valence was significantly lower in VLT vs. LT (P = 0.034, d = 1.01 - 1.14) and HT (P = 0.018, d = 1.34 - 1.70) at all time points during and post-exercise. There were no significant differences between LT and HT (P = 0.862, d = 0.07 - 0.19). There was also a significant main effect of time on affective valence ($F_{2.4,77.9} = 4.581$, P = 0.009, $\eta p^2 = 0.122$). There was no significant tolerance x time interaction ($F_{4.7,6.4} = 1.329$, P = 0.262, $\eta p^2 = 0.075$)..

- 521
- 322 ***Figure 3 near here***
- 323

324 Perceived Activation

325

There was no significant effect of tolerance on perceived activation ($F_{2,33} = 1.573$, P = 0.223, $\eta p^2 = 0.372$; Figure 3B). However, there was a significant effect of time ($F_{3.7,121.9} = 26.11$, P < 0.001, $\eta p^2 = 0.442$), with perceived activation increasing significantly between baseline and sprint 2 (P < 0.001, d = 1.20) and decreasing significantly from sprint 10 to 20 min postexercise (P = 0.014, d = 0.83). There was no tolerance x time interaction ($F_{7.4,121.9} = 26.11$, P = 0.723, $\eta p^2 = 0.038$).

333 Circumplex

334

All groups began with a sense of calmness pre-HIIE (Figure 4). The VLT group progressed to a state of negative affect and low arousal by sprints 8 and 10, associated with tiredness. The LT group generated a similar pattern to the HT group, progressing to a state of energy from sprints 4-10. The VLT and LT groups returned to calmness post-HIIE, whereas the HT group remained in a state of energy.

340

341 ***Figure 4 near here***

342

343 Intention to repeat and exercise task self-efficacy

344

Significant between-groups main effects were found for intention to repeat HIIE once ($\chi 2 =$ 14.3, *P* = 0.001) and three times per week ($\chi 2 =$ 14.8, *P* = 0.001). The VLT group had significantly lower intentions to repeat HIIE at both exercise frequencies than the HT group, and lower intentions to repeat at both frequencies than the LT group, with moderate to large ES (Table 2). Exercise task self-efficacy (Table 2) was not significantly influenced by tolerance of the intensity of exercise once per week ($\chi 2 = 2.3$, P = 0.321) or three times per week ($\chi 2 = 2.8$, P = 0.247).

Table 2 near here

- 352
- 353
- 354

355 **DISCUSSION**

356

357 Research investigating affective responses to HIIE has produced inconsistent findings (Stork 358 et al., 2017). This inconsistency may partly be explained by individual differences in affective 359 responses to HIIE. The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of the individual 360 difference measure self-reported tolerance of the intensity of exercise on affective responses 361 during and after low-volume HIIE. The VLT group reported significantly lower affective 362 valence during and after low-volume HIIE, and more negative circumplex responses, compared 363 to LT and HT. The VLT group also showed lower intentions to repeat low-volume HIIE than 364 the LT and HT groups, and the LT group showed lower intentions to repeat than the HT group. 365 However, there was no effect of tolerance of the intensity of exercise on task self-efficacy.

366

The finding that VLT participants showed significantly more negative affect than HT and LT participants during and after low-volume HIIE suggests that self-reported tolerance of the intensity of exercise moderates affective responses to HIIE. An increase in exercise intensity, particularly to beyond VT, exacerbates the influence of interoceptive cues on an individual's perception of exercise demand, which may lead to a decline in affect (Ekkekakis et al., 2011). A logical extension of this tenet is that individuals who are more tolerant to the 'accumulation' of these interoceptive cues will be more able to defend against declines in affect. Evidence supporting this suggestion can be found in steady-state and incremental exercise protocols
(Ekkekakis et al., 2007; Hall et al., 2014), with recent research suggesting this tolerance has a
biological basis (Tempest & Parfitt, 2016). However, this is the first study to provide support
for a potentially discriminatory role of VLT of the intensity of exercise on affective responses
during HIIE. Our data also supports assertions previously articulated in the growing HIIE
literature that tolerance of the intensity of exercise may explain variance in affective responses
(Frazao et al., 2016).

381

The LT group did not differ in affective responses compared with HT, which is contrary to continuous exercise studies (Ekkekakis et al., 2007; Tempest & Parfitt, 2016). Affective responses to HIIE are known to be influenced by the number and duration of work bouts and the work/rest ratio (Frazao et al., 2016; Martinez, Kilpatrick, Salomon, Jung, & Little, 2015). Therefore, the lack of difference in affect between HT and LT may be as a consequence of the 'more palatable' (Martinez et al., 2015) nature of the low volume HIIE protocol employed in this study, which LT participants were able to tolerate.

389

390 It is plausible that the greater aerobic fitness of the HT and LT groups vs. the VLT group may 391 have contributed to the better maintenance of affect, as recovery from work bouts during HIIE 392 is enhanced with better aerobic fitness (Tomlin & Wenger, 2001). Less complete recovery in 393 the VLT group compared to the HT group may have led to a progressively greater homeostatic 394 disturbance as HIIE continued, thereby causing a progressively more negative affective state 395 (figure 3A) (Ekkekakis et al., 2011; Gaitanos, Williams, Boobis, & Brooks, 1993; Martinez et 396 al., 2015). However, the difference in aerobic fitness between LT and VLT was small, and 397 there was no significant difference between the groups in RPE suggesting that participants 398 perceived they were working at an equivalent intensity. These findings indicate that aerobic

fitness may have a minor moderating influence on affective responses to HIIE, and should be controlled in order to further isolate the effect of tolerance of the intensity of exercise as a moderator of affective responses to HIIE.

402

403 Several researchers have argued that HIIE does not have public health potential because 404 participants are unlikely to adhere to it (Biddle & Batterham, 2015). In our study intention to, 405 but not self-efficacy for future engagement in HIIE differed across the tolerance groups. It is 406 possible that the more negative affect experienced by the VLT group during HIIE influenced 407 their weaker intention. In a systematic review, Rhodes and Kates (2015) reported a limited 408 relationship between affective responses and intention. It is therefore plausible that there are 409 other explanations for these differences such as past experiences, which may also help explain 410 the difference between HT and LT. The lack of effect of tolerance of the intensity of exercise 411 on self-efficacy for future HIIE could suggest that the different affective responses to HIIE 412 between the groups did not impact on self-efficacy. Rhodes and Kates (2015) reported mixed 413 findings regarding a relationship between affective responses and self-efficacy. Future 414 research would be valuable to examine how individual differences in tolerance of the intensity 415 of exercise, and other variables including exercise preference, moderate the relationship 416 between affective responses to HIIE and intention to engage in and self-efficacy for future HIIE 417 in fully powered studies, whilst controlling for both baseline affect and pre-exercise levels of 418 these variables (Rhodes & Kates, 2015).

419

Although future research should aim to replicate the findings of the current study, our data have
implications for research and practice. Firstly, future studies comparing the influence of HIIE
and continuous exercise on affect should control for self-reported tolerance of the intensity of
exercise as a confounding variable. Practitioners may screen potential HIIE participants for

424 tolerance of the intensity of exercise using the PRETIE-Q to assist in the prescription of 425 appropriate activities. Although there is evidence that some individuals have positive 426 motivating experiences participating in HIIE (Burn & Niven, 2018), it is unsurprising that is 427 not likely to be for everyone and very low tolerance of the intensity of exercise could be a key 428 determinant. A limitation of this study is the sample size. We provided a power calculation 429 for a two-group analysis as this was the original methodological intention of the study. 430 However, the subsequent three-group analysis detected a statistical significance, therefore 431 confirming sufficient power for the statistical test to detect the effect. Furthermore, ES and 432 conservative post hoc tests for uneven sample sizes and variances were used. A second 433 limitation is the use of healthy young (albeit untrained) participants. Future research should 434 replicate the study with wider age and fitness ranges, clinical populations and different HIIE 435 protocols. 436 437 Declaration of interest 438 439 The authors have no conflicts of interest related to this paper. 440 441 REFERENCES 442 Adamson, S. B., Lorimer, R., Cobley, J. N., & Babraj, J. A. (2014). Extremely short-duration 443 444 high-intensity training substantially improves the physical function and self-reported 445 health status of elderly adults. Journal of American Geriatric Society, 62(7), 1380-446 1381.

- 447 Allison, M. K., Baglole, J. H., Martin, B. J., Macinnis, M. J., Gurd, B. J., & Gibala, M. J.
- 448 (2017). Brief Intense Stair Climbing Improves Cardiorespiratory Fitness. *Medicine and*449 *Science in Sports and Exercise*, 49(2), 298-307.
- Astorino, T. A., & Thum, J. S. (2016). Response: Commentary: Why sprint interval training is
 inappropriate for a largely sedentary population. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7.
- 452 Biddle, S. J. H., & Batterham, A. M. (2015). High-intensity interval exercise training for public
- 453 health: a big HIT or shall we HIT it on the head? *International Journal of Behavioral*454 *Nutrition and Physical Activity*, *12*, 95.
- Borg, E., & Kaijser, L. (2006). A comparison between three rating scales for perceived exertion
 and two different work tests. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, *16*(1), 57-69.
- 458 Burn, N., & Niven, A. (2018). Wh
- Burn, N., & Niven, A. (2018). Why do they do (h)it? Using self-determination theory to
 understand why people start and continue to do high-intensity interval training group
 exercise classes. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*. doi:
 https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2017.1421682.
- 462 Cohen, J. (1992). A Power Primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155-159.
- Decker, E. S., & Ekkekakis, P. (2017). More efficient, perhaps, but at what price? Pleasure and
 enjoyment responses to high-intensity interval exercise in low-active women with
 obesity. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 28, 1-10.
- 466 Ekkekakis, P. (2003). Pleasure and displeasure from the body: Perspectives from exercise.
 467 *Cognition & Emotion*, *17*(2), 213-239.
- Ekkekakis, P., Hall, E., & Petruzzello, S. (2005a). Some Like It Vigorous: Measuring
 Individual Differences in the Preference for and Tolerance of Exercise Intensity. *Journal of Sport Exercise Psychology*, 27(3), 350-374.

471	Ekkekakis, P., Hall, E. E., & Petruzzello, S. J. (2005b). Variation and homogeneity in affective
472	responses to physical activity of varying intensities: An alternative perspective on dose-
473	response based on evolutionary considerations. Journal of Sports Sciences, 23(5), 477-
474	500.

- Ekkekakis, P., Hall, E. E., & Petruzzello, S. J. (2008). The relationship between exercise
 intensity and affective responses demystified: To crack the 40-year-old nut, replace the
 40-year-old nutcracker! *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, *35*(2), 136-149.
- Ekkekakis, P., Lind, E., Hall, E. E., & Petruzzello, S. J. (2007). Can self-reported tolerance of
 exercise intensity play a role in exercise testing? *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, *39*(7), 1193-1199.
- 481 Ekkekakis, P., Parfitt, G., & Petruzzello, S. J. (2011). The Pleasure and Displeasure People
 482 Feel When they Exercise at Different Intensities Decennial Update and Progress
 483 towards a Tripartite Rationale for Exercise Intensity Prescription. *Sports Medicine*,
 484 41(8), 641-671.
- 485 Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (2010). *Predicting and Changing Behavior: The Reasoned Action*486 *Approach*: Psychology Press.
- 487 Frazao, D. T., de Farias, L. F., Dantas, T. C. B., Krinski, K., Elsangedy, H. M., Prestes, J.,
 488Costa, E.C. (2016). Feeling of Pleasure to High-Intensity Interval Exercise Is
- 489 Dependent of the Number of Work Bouts and Physical Activity Status. *Plos One*, *11*(4).
- 490 Froese, E. A., & Houston, M. E. (1987). Performance during the Wingate Anaerobic Test and
- 491 Muscle Morphology in Males and Females. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*,
 492 8(1), 35-39.
- 493 Gaitanos, G. C., Williams, C., Boobis, L. H., & Brooks, S. (1993). Human Muscle Metabolism
 494 during Intermittent Maximal Exercise. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, 75(2), 712-719.

- Games, P. A., & Howell, J. F. (1976). Pairwise multiple comparison procedures with unequal
 n's and/pr variances: a monte-carlo study. *Journal of Education and Behavioural Statistics*, 1(2), 113-125.
- Games, P. A., Keselman, H. J., & Rogan, J. C. (1981). Simultaneous Pairwise Multiple
 Comparison Procedures for Means When Sample Sizes Are Unequal. *Psychological Bulletin*, 90(3), 594-598.
- George, J. D., Stone, W. J., & Burkett, L. N. (1997). Non-exercise VO2max estimation for
 physically active college students. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 29(3),
 415-423.
- Gillen, J. B., & Gibala, M. J. (2014). Is high-intensity interval training a time-efficient exercise
 strategy to improve health and fitness? *Applied Physiology Nutrition and Metabolism- Physiologie Appliquee Nutrition Et Metabolisme, 39*(3), 409-412.
- Greene, D. R., Greenlee, T. A., & Petruzzello, S. J. (2018). That feeling I get: Examination of
 the exercise intensity-affect-enjoyment relationship. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*,
 35, 39-46.
- Hall, E. E., Ekkekakis, P., & Petruzzello, S. J. (2002). The affective beneficence of vigorous
 exercise revisited. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, *7*, 47-66.
- Hall, E. E., Petruzzello, S. J., Ekkekakis, P., Miller, P. C., & Bixby, W. R. (2014). Role of SelfReported Individual Differences in Preference for and Tolerance of Exercise Intensity
- 514 in Fitness Testing Performance. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 28(9),
- 515 2443-2451.
- Hardcastle, S. J., Ray, H., Beale, L., & Hagger, M. S. (2014). Why sprint interval training is
 inappropriate for a largely sedentary population. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5.
- Hardy, C. J., & Rejeski, W. J. (1989). Not what, but how one feels: the measurement of affect
 during exercise. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *11*(3), 304-317.

- 520 Jelleyman, C., Yates, T., O'Donovan, G., Gray, L. J., King, J. A., Khunti, K.,...Davies, M.J.
- (2015). The effects of high-intensity interval training on glucose regulation and insulin
 resistance: a meta-analysis. *Obesity Reviews*, *16*(11), 942-961.
- Jung, M. E., Bourne, J. E., & Little, J. P. (2014). Where Does HIT Fit? An Examination of the
 Affective Response to High-Intensity Intervals in Comparison to Continuous
 Moderate- and Continuous Vigorous-Intensity Exercise in the Exercise Intensity-Affect
 Continuum. *Plos One*, 9(12), 1-18.
- Jung, M. E., Little, J. P., & Batterham, A. M. (2016). Commentary: Why sprint interval training
 is inappropriate for a largely sedentary population. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6.
- Kilpatrick, M., Kraemer, R., Bartholomew, J., Acevedo, E., & Jarreau, D. (2007). Affective
 responses to exercise are dependent on intensity rather than total work. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, *39*(8), 1417-1422.
- Lakens, D. (2013). Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: a
 practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *4*.
- Little, J. P., Gillen, J. B., Percival, M. E., Safdar, A., Tarnopolsky, M. A., Punthakee,
 Z.,...Gibala, M.J. (2011). Low-volume high-intensity interval training reduces
 hyperglycemia and increases muscle mitochondrial capacity in patients with type 2
 diabetes. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, *111*(6), 1554-1560.
- Little, J. P., Jung, M. E., Wright, A. E., Wright, W., & Manders, R. J. F. (2014). Effects of
 high-intensity interval exercise versus continuous moderate-intensity exercise on
 postprandial glycemic control assessed by continuous glucose monitoring in obese
 adults. *Applied Physiology Nutrition and Metabolism, 39*(7), 835-841.
- Martinez, N., Kilpatrick, M. W., Salomon, K., Jung, M. E., & Little, J. P. (2015). Affective and
 Enjoyment Responses to High-Intensity Interval Training in Overweight-to-Obese and
 Insufficiently Active Adults. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *37*(2), 138-149.

545	Nielson, D. E., George, J. D., Vehrs, P. R., Hager, R. L., & Webb, C. V. (2010). Predicting
546	VO2max in College-Aged Participants Using Cycle Ergometry and Perceived
547	Functional Ability. Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science, 14(4),
548	252-264.

- Niven, A., Thow, J., Holroyd, J., Turner, A. P., & Phillips, S. M. (2018). Comparison of
 affective responses during and after low volume high-intensity interval exercise,
 continuous moderate- and continuous high-intensity exercise in active, untrained,
 healthy males. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 1-9, 1993-2001.
- Oliveira, B. R. R., Slama, F. A., Deslandes, A. C., Furtado, E. S., & Santos, T. M. (2013).
 Continuous and High-Intensity Interval Training: Which Promotes Higher Pleasure? *Plos One*, 8(11). doi: ARTN e7996510.1371/journal.pone.0079965.
- Rhodes, R. E., & Kates, A. (2015). Can the Affective Response to Exercise Predict Future
 Motives and Physical Activity Behavior? A Systematic Review of Published Evidence. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 49(5), 715-731. doi: 10.1007/s12160-015-9704-5
- Russell, J. A. (1980). A Circumplex Model of Affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39(6), 1161-1178.
- Smith-Ryan, A. E., Trexler, E. T., Wingfield, H. L., & Blue, M. N. M. (2016). Effects of highintensity interval training on cardiometabolic risk factors in overweight/obese women. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *34*(21), 2038-2046.
- 564 Stork, M. J., Banfield, L. E., Gibala, M. J., & Ginis, K. A. M. (2017). A scoping review of the
- psychological responses to interval exercise: is interval exercise a viable alternative to
 traditional exercise? *Health Psychology Review*, 11(4), 324-344.
- 567 Svebak, S., & Murgatroyd, S. (1985). Metamotivational Dominance a Multimethod
 568 Validation of Reversal Theory Constructs. *Journal of Personality and Social*569 *Psychology*, 48(1), 107-116.

570	Tempest, G., &	& Parfitt	t, G.	(2016).	Self-reported	tolerance	influences	prefi	rontal cortex
571	hemody	namics	and	affective	responses.	Cognitive,	Affective,	and	Behavioura
572	Neuroscience, 16(1), 63-71.								

- 573 Tempest, G. D., & Parfitt, G. (2017). Prefrontal oxygenation and the acoustic startle eyeblink
 574 response during exercise: A test of the dual-mode model. *Psychophysiology*, 54(7),
 575 1070-1080.
- Tomlin, D. L., & Wenger, H. A. (2001). The relationship between aerobic fitness and recovery
 from high intensity intermittent exercise. *Sports Medicine*, *31*(1), 1-11.
- 578 Weston, K. S., Wisloff, U., & Coombes, J. S. (2014). High-intensity interval training in patients
- 579 with lifestyle-induced cardiometabolic disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
- 580 [Review]. British Journal of Sports Medicine, 48(16), U1227-U1252.

583 FIGURE 1. Schematic detailing the flow of participants through the study (number of 584 participants recruited, excluded based on pre-test screening, allocated to high tolerance and low 585 tolerance groups, and who withdrew from the study).

586

587 FIGURE 2. Ratings of perceived exertion at all time points for all groups.

588 * Significant main effect of time. HT = high tolerance; LT = low tolerance; VLT = very low
589 tolerance.

590

- 591 FIGURE 3. Affective valence (A) and perceived activation (B) at all time points for all groups.
- 592 ** Significantly lower in VLT vs. LT and HT at all time points P = 0.034.
- 593 *** Significant difference between time-points, P < 0.001 and P = 0.014, respectively. HT =
- 594 high tolerance; LT = low tolerance; VLT = very low tolerance.
- 595
- 596 FIGURE 4. Affective circumplex model applied to the all groups. HT = high tolerance; LT
- 597 = low tolerance; VLT = very low tolerance.

598

599