Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Social Psychology and Humanity Studies
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2027.39168

Losing to Win: How Elite Athletes Reframe Failure as a Competitive Edge

Zishuo She

Basis International School Park Lane Harbour, Huizhou, China
zishuo.she70845-biph@basischina.com

Abstract. Performance failure is an inescapable reality in competitive sports. An athlete's post- setback trajectory is dictated not by the defeat itself, but by the psychological mindsets and recovery strategies wielded by the individual. This paper discusses the cognitive, emotional, and physiological mechanisms that distinguish elite, psychologically resilient athletes from relatively mentally weak athletes. Building upon foundational frameworks—including Dweck's implicit theories of ability, Weiner's causal attribution theory, and Atkinson's achievement motivation model—this paper contrasts adaptive mindsets (growth orientation, adaptive causal attribution, and self-compassion) with maladaptive orientations(fixed entity mindset, maladaptive attribution, and ego-defensive avoidance). This paper will discuss the psychological theories behind several mindsets. It will also examine the efficacy of suggested interventions like deliberate debriefing, attribution training, and Mindfulness-Acceptance- Commitment (MAC). With data and numbers cultivated from experiments, this paper demonstrates how structured cognitive reframing mitigates threat appraisals. The results of the experiment show how it reduces fear of failure ($\beta = -0.548$) and self-criticism ($\beta = -0.531$), restores self-efficacy ($\beta = +0.408$), and insulates athletes against performance choking. Read together, the paper accentuates the importance and necessity of self-reflective recovery strategies in bolstering conducive athletic performance and mental well-being.

Keywords: performance failure, growth mindset, attribution training, self-compassion, athletic resilience

1. Introduction

Have you wondered why some athletes look so calm and consistent when they lose a game or miss a point while others don't? It all come to the ground on how people think inside of their brain, which is their mindsets. In sports, even the top athletes, the legends, would never confidently say that they could win all the points and matches they have played. What they have done that makes them seem invincible is that they have strong mindsets and recovery strategies that help them get back from failures and build up confidence. The failures here do not have to be detrimental losses in an important game or a major turnover that puts the athlete into bad situations. It could also be taunts and boos from the fans, or criticisms from teammates and coaches. These moments are common and have happened to every athlete. They are not only applicable to the professionals but also amateurs

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2027.39168

and teenagers who play for fun. Looking from a macro lens, sometimes people might think that different reactions to those small setbacks won't make a huge difference on a player's performance and career. However, they do have significant impacts on the player by causing anxieties, having ruminative thoughts about themselves, breaking confidence, and, in severe cases, leading to dropouts. How athletes respond to failures depends on multiple factors like their growing-up background, education level, and culture. While these do determine one's mentality, the internal psychological mechanism plays a bigger role. Understanding the psychological concepts and pathways behind them provides coaches, sports psychologists, and youth sports organizations with actionable strategies to nurture sustainable performance and mental well-being.

Hypothesis: Athletes who select and utilize the psychological mindset and strategy that fits them best will yield the most effective and ideal results after experiencing failures and setbacks, compared to athletes who choose fixed and inflexible mindsets.

2. Elite and struggling athletes: mindsets and strategies

Resilience to challenges is the central task and core for every athlete who wants to go from mediocre to top-tier. When setbacks come, the first mindset that elite athletes construct inside is Growth Orientation. Comparatively, struggling athletes develop a maladaptive orientation mindset, which is opposite to the one elite athletes have. The following sections elaborate on the three leading mindsets: growth orientation versus fixed entity thinking, adaptive causal attribution versus maladaptive attribution, and self-compassion and ego- defensive avoidance. Strategies that correspond to these mindsets will also be explored and explained.

2.1. Growth orientation and deliberate debriefing

Growth orientation means that athletes see failures as opportunities to improve. It has two main components. The first is informational feedback, illustrated when athletes interpret failure as data about a skill that is still under construction, rather than a verdict on their ability. Elite athletes take the information from their losses as a reference, reviewing it repeatedly to see how they could refine themselves. A fitting analogy is to see elite athletes as AI models: when users tell a model that the information it provided is wrong or that they need more, the model does not simply stop working; instead, it uses that feedback to generate better output. The second component, malleable ability, comes directly from Carol Dweck's incremental theory of ability. In Dweck's incremental theory, people believe that abilities are not fixed and can be changed through effort and hard work [1]. Under this thinking, setbacks are framed as solvable problems. Elite athletes with this mindset believe that, through training and sufficient rest, they will eventually improve.

By contrast, struggling athletes tend to develop mindsets that push them toward dropout. They tend to believe that failures reveal a permanent limit on ability—a belief built on entity theory. According to Dweck's implicit theories of ability, athletes with a fixed mindset believe that talent is innate and unalterable. Because performance outcomes represent who they are rather than what they did, a single error or defeat would be a sign of threats to their ability. This wrong interpretation of failures could potentially induce anxiety, helplessness, intrusive self- doubt, and psychological burnout. Empirical research supports this distinction: in a study of athletic resilience and mental health, Ahn et al. [2] found that athletes who fuse their sense of self-worth with competitive outcomes show more volatile motivation loss after failure, elevated psychological distress, and significantly higher rates of anxiety following competitive loss than athletes who do not fuse identity with outcome [2].

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2027.39168

The specific strategy elite athletes use alongside a growth orientation mindset is deliberate debriefing, which consists of three parts. First, formalized review converts a loss into actionable training targets through video and technical breakdown. Second, error analysis objectifies the error rather than personalizing it, which prevents failure from becoming an identity threat. Third, target selection pulls specific, measurable targets out of the setback to guide the next training cycle. Professional football offers a clear example: most teams employ video analysts and coaches in the coaching team. Their job is to review recordings of matches and training sessions to show the head coach and players the nuanced decisions that were made and the consequences those decisions produced. Support staff and athletes then sit down together, break down the technical failure frame by frame, and turn a subtle move into a cold, actionable data point.

2.2. Adaptive Causal Attribution and attribution training

Adaptive Causal Attribution is another mindset elite athletes usually have. The core of adaptive causal attribution is helping athletes reframe the "why" behind their failures. This mindset is drawn on Weiner's attribution theory. Weiner breaks down how people explain failure into three dimensions: locus of control, stability, and controllability [3]. For elite athletes, locus of control sounds like "my strategy was off"—internal, but changeable—whereas for struggling athletes it sounds like "I am just untalented," which is internal but framed as fixed. On the stability dimension, elite athletes think "this was a one-time error" (unstable, not a life sentence), while struggling athletes think "I will always fail" (stable). On controllability, elite athletes think "I can prepare better" (controllable, meaning the athlete has agency), while struggling athletes think "there is nothing I can do" (uncontrollable). This contrast maps the difference between a fixed mindset and an adaptive mindset: elite athletes focus on causes that are internal, unstable, and controllable, because that combination is exactly what preserves self- efficacy after a loss.

The strategy corresponding to adaptive causal attribution is attribution training, which has two steps. The first step is relabeling. In this step, athletes would be systematically instructed and guided through a post-performance cognitive review. By replacing identity-fused statements ("I choked because I am not a clutch performer") with strategy-driven attributions ("I lost control of my footwork during the final rotation"), the intervention changes the athlete's perception of stability [4]. The second step is task-focused self-talk. Under high-stakes conditions, fear of doing the wrong moves and making mistakes often triggers heightened self-consciousness. According to Explicit Monitoring Theory [5], such anxiety causes athletes to overthink their positions and try to control their next move. This often overrides the motor skills that are normally automated in our bodies. This attempt would not make athletes perform better. Rather, it disrupts the fluidity and generates more stress. Task-focused self-talk uses short, action-oriented cues ("explode off the mark," "keep eyes on the target") to occupy the limited capacity of working memory. This strategy helps athletes cut off the irrelevant thoughts that distract them from performing to their potential. Athletes have done a lot of scrimmages and specific training, which means that the situations they encounter in matches are not something new. Their responses, based on their reaction and experience, are better than their response with conscious interference [5].

Huang et al. [6] provide empirical evidence to prove the effectiveness of attribution training in mitigating choking—a paradoxical performance drop under extreme pressure— among elite athletes. The researchers implemented attribution retraining interventions to turn 328 athletes who participated in the experiment from maladaptive attributions to positive attributions. They then measured the training's impact on fear of failure, self- criticism, and self-efficacy. Attribution training showed a significant negative relationship with fear of failure ($\beta = -0.548$) and self-criticism

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2027.39168

(β = -0.531). This result indicates that the intervention predicts reductions in both constructs. Attribution training also shows a significant positive relationship with self- efficacy (β = +0.408), indicating that the intervention predicts higher self-efficacy. Consistent with Huang et al. [6], attribution training yields measurable improvements in emotional regulation and performance under pressure. Struggling athletes who develop maladaptive attributions frequently replay the moment of failure and fall into emotional reactivity, which is detrimental to long-term mental health [6].

2.3. Self-compassion and Mindfulness-Acceptance-Commitment

The third adaptive mindset is self-compassion. To many people, it is often misunderstood as "softness" or a lack of accountability. In elite sport psychology, however, self-compassion functions as a critical neurobiological buffer against performance anxiety, psychological burnout, and acute threat states. It contains three components: self-kindness, avoiding punitive self- punishment; common humanity, recognizing failure as a shared human experience rather than a personal flaw; and mindfulness, sitting with painful emotions without spiraling into rumination [7]. Self-kindness targets the body's biological response at the moment of failure. When an athlete makes an error under high pressure, the amygdala—the brain's threat center—triggers a rise in cortisol and adrenaline. On the other hand, in a self-critical mindset, internal monologues don't help relieve the stress but add more threat to athletes. Self-kindness keeps the sympathetic nervous system locked in a fight-or-flight state, replaces punitive self-judgment with supportive self-talk, and keeps the athlete's brain and body functioning under extreme pressure. Common humanity tells the athlete that errors are common and not that harrowing. Making mistakes is universally applicable to every human being. Common humanity makes the athlete feel warm and at ease. Mindfulness provides the emotional stability needed to interrupt repetitive rumination loops. Rather than forcing positive thoughts or suppressing disappointment, it allows an athlete to observe negative emotions [8]. Consistent with this, Toktaş and Köse found that self-compassion and a growth mindset both independently predicted more adaptive coping with performance failure among professional athletes. This finding corroborates that these two mechanisms operate as complementary factors [9].

The strategy elite athletes use with self-compassion is MAC training, short for Mindfulness-Acceptance-Commitment. MAC training seeks to interrupt ruminative "death spirals" after failure. In high- pressure competition, traditional training focuses on controlling and eliminating negative thoughts and emotions [10]. What differs MAC training from traditional ones is that it teaches athletes to cultivate nonjudgmental awareness and psychological acceptance of internal experiences. After a frustrating failure, self-criticism and post-match thoughts would quickly erode their confidence. Traditional practices trying to actively confront these feelings often have effects opposite to their expectations. MAC training addresses this by telling athletes that uncomfortable emotions are normal and temporary. Athletes should accept these "struggles" instead of changing them. Compassionate self-reflection writing and guided self-kindness routines, for example, give athletes a safe space to reflect and rebuild confidence. Instead of turning away from the setback, this practice allows athletes to work with the discomfort of a loss.

3. Maladaptive avoidance: the motive to avoid failure

Athletes who struggle under pressure often instinctively protect their self-image once they fail. They usually choose to avoid the fact of their failure because they believe that performance is a proxy of personal worth and threatens their core value as a person. This mindset pushes them to develop a strategy of conservative monitoring, which often leads to self-focused execution and choking

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2027.39168

vulnerability. After a poorly performed game, an athlete may become afraid of making further mistakes and thus narrow their choices to basic and low-risk options. While this makes them less likely to make errors during matches, it decreases athletes' high level of athletic performance.

John Atkinson's achievement motivation theory effectively describes his pattern. The theory claims that an athlete's motivation under high-pressure environments comes from tension between two competing drives: the motive to achieve success (Ms) and the motive to avoid failure (Maf). The motive to achieve success represents an approach-oriented capacity to experience pride and satisfaction upon mastering a task, driving athletes toward optimal challenges and calculated competitive risks. The motive to avoid failure, by contrast, represents a defensive, avoidance-oriented tendency driven by the anticipation of shame, humiliation, and loss of face following a setback [11]. Whenever Maf becomes stronger than Ms, athletes steer clear of competitive risks. They prioritize the safety of conservative monitoring instead of embracing challenging opportunities that could help them improve.

4. Discussion

Taken together, the three adaptive mindsets examined in this paper—growth orientation, adaptive causal attribution, and self-compassion—are not independent psychological terms but seeing altogher a transformation of decoupling self-worth from performance outcome. Framed through Atkinson's model, each mechanism functions as a lever that tips the balance from the motive to avoid failure (Maf) back toward the motive to achieve success (Ms). Deliberate debriefing and Dweck's incremental theory recast failure as information about a skill rather than a verdict on identity; attribution training relocates the cause of failure to something internal, unstable, and controllable rather than internal and fixed; and self-compassion interrupts the physiological threat cascade—the amygdala-driven surge of cortisol and adrenaline—that keeps a self-critical athlete locked in a defensive, risk-averse state.

The quantitative evidence strengthens this synthesis. Huang et al.'s [6] beta coefficients are worth noting: attribution training's negative association with fear of failure ($\beta = -0.548$) was nearly as strong as its association with self-criticism ($\beta = -0.531$), while its positive association with self-efficacy was somewhat smaller ($\beta = +0.408$). This pattern suggests that attribution retraining works primarily by dismantling the threat appraisal itself—reducing fear and self-judgment—rather than by directly manufacturing confidence; self-efficacy appears to recover as a downstream consequence of reduced threat, not as the primary target of the intervention. This distinction matters practically: a coach who tries to talk an athlete into confidence without first addressing how the athlete is attributing failure is likely to see a weaker effect than one who begins with relabeling and task-focused self-talk. Ahn et al.'s [2] findings on identity fusion complement this picture by showing that the vulnerability itself is measurable well before an intervention is introduced, which supports the case for early screening rather than purely reactive support after a crisis point.

These findings carry direct implications for coaches, parents, and sport psychologists. Because deliberate debriefing and attribution training are structured, teachable routines video review sessions, post-competition debriefs, and pre-performance self-talk cues should been put in work. Similarly, because self-compassion is trainable rather than fixed [7, 9], coaching environments that model common humanity and permit mistakes without public shaming may do as much protective work as any individual intervention. At the same time, several limitations temper how far these conclusions should be generalized. Both Ahn et al. [2] and Huang et al. [6] rely on correlational intervention data rather than long-term randomized controlled trials, which limits causal claims about how durable these effects are once formal training ends. Ahn et al.'s [2] sample was also

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2027.39168

drawn from a specific cultural and competitive context. Thus, the strength of the identity-fusion effect may not generalize uniformly. Most of the underlying constructs—fear of failure, self-criticism, self-efficacy—are also measured through self-report, which is vulnerable to social desirability bias, particularly among elite athletes who may be reluctant to disclose psychological vulnerability. Finally, MAC training and self-compassion practices require sustained guidance from a trained practitioner to be delivered with fidelity, which may limit their accessibility for youth or amateur athletes without access to sport psychology resources.

Future research would benefit from longitudinal designs that track athletes across multiple competitive seasons to determine whether the reductions in fear of failure and self- criticism reported by Huang et al. [6] persist after the formal intervention ends, and from randomized controlled trials that directly compare combined intervention packages (for example, attribution training paired with MAC) against either component in isolation. Direct physiological measurement —cortisol sampling or amygdala activation via neuroimaging during simulated high-pressure competition—would also help verify whether the neurobiological mechanism proposed in this paper actually mediates the behavioral outcomes observed, rather than simply co-occurring with them.

5. Conclusion

The difference between elite resilience and vulnerability illustrates that failure is not an absolute measure of ability. It is a manageable cognitive and physiological event. As discussed in this paper, an athlete's trajectory following a loss depends on the specific psychological machinery they deploy. When struggling athletes operate under a fixed entity mindset, when they attribute defeat to internal defects, or allow the motive to avoid failure (Maf), they trigger a cascade of threat appraisals that fuses athletic performance with personal identity. The result is elevated anxiety and more avoidance [5]. Elite athletes, by contrast, protect their long-term performance by systematically reframing adversity. By decoupling self-worth from short-term outcomes, they treat failure as informational feedback that could help them improve [1]. The integration of adaptive causal attributions [3] with self- compassion and MAC protocols provides a dual-engine framework for recovery: cognitive restructuring redirects focus toward controllable variables, while emotional acceptance down-regulates sympathetic threat arousal and preserves autonomic stability. Failure in sports is not avoidable. Thus, athletes should employ the right mindset and strategy that work for themselves. This ultimately help them to live with the adversities.

References

[1] Dweck, C. S. (2013). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Psychology Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315783048

[2] Ahn, H., Yoo, K., Baek, S., & Moon, H.-W. (2025). Resilience to failure and mental health in elite athletes: Psychological and structural perspectives. *Journal of Sport and Applied Science, 91*, 31-45. https://doi.org/10.13106/jas.2025.vol9.no1.31

[3] Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review, 92*(4), 548-573. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.92.4.548

[4] Hallam, L. (2023, August 15). Attribution theory in sports psychology. *HubPages*. https://discover.hubpages.com/education/Attribution-Theory-in-Sport-Psychology

[5] Masters, R. S. W. (1992). Knowledge, knerves and know-how: The role of explicit versus implicit knowledge in the breakdown of a complex motor skill under pressure. *British Journal of Psychology, 83*(3), 343-358. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1992.tb02446.x

[6] Huang, D., Wang, H., Tang, Y., Lei, H., & Koh, D. (2025). Enhancing athlete performance under pressure: The role of attribution training in mitigating choking. *Frontiers in Psychology, 16*, Article 1435374.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2027.39168

https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1435374
[7] Neff, K. (2003). Self-compassion: An alternative conceptualization of a healthy attitude toward oneself. *Self and Identity, 2*(2), 85-101. https://doi.org/10.1080/15298860309032
[8] Ceccarelli, L. A., Giuliano, R. J., Glazebrook, C. M., & Strachan, S. M. (2019). Self-compassion and psycho-physiological recovery from recalled sport failure. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, Article 1564. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01564
[9] Toktaş, E., & Köse, N. (2025). Predicting coping with performance failure by self-compassion and growth mindset in professional athletes. *Health Nexus, 3*(3), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.hn.3.3.2
[10] Gardner, F. L., & Moore, Z. E. (2007). *The psychology of enhancing human performance: The mindfulness-acceptance-commitment approach*. Springer Publishing Company.
[11] Atkinson, J. W. (1957). Motivational determinants of risk-taking behavior. *Psychological Review, 64*(Pt. 1), 359-372. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0043445