TITLE
Context affects Quiet Eye duration and motor performance independent of cognitive effort

AUTHOR
Runswick, Oliver R.; Jewiss, M.; Sharpe, B.; et al.

JOURNAL
Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology

DATE DEPOSITED
9 November 2020

This version available at
https://research.stmarys.ac.uk/id/eprint/4423/

Context affects Quiet Eye duration and motor performance independent of cognitive effort

Oliver R. Runswick (oliver.runswick@kcl.ac.uk)[1 2]

Matthew Jewiss[1 3]

Ben T. Sharpe[1]

Jamie S. North[4]

[1] Institute of Sport, University of Chichester, Chichester, UK

[2] Department of Psychology, Institute of Psychiatry Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK

[3] School of Life and Medical Sciences, University of Hertfordshire, Hertfordshire, UK

[4]Expert Performance and Skill Acquisition Research Group, Faculty of Sport, Health, and Applied Science, St Mary's University, Twickenham, London, UK

Accepted for publication in *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology* on 06/11/2020

Corresponding author:

Oliver Runswick

Department of Psychology

Guy's Campus

King's College London

Email: oliver.runswick@kcl.ac.uk

Abstract

Extensive literature has shown the effect of 'Quiet Eye' (QE) on motor performance. However, little attention has been paid to the context in which tasks are executed (independent of anxiety) and the mechanisms that underpin the phenomenon. Here, we aimed to investigate the effects of context (independent of anxiety) on QE and performance while examining if the mechanisms underpinning QE are rooted in cognitive effort. In this study, 21 novice participants completed golf putts while pupil dilation, QE duration, and putting accuracy were measured. Results showed putting to win was more accurate compared to the control (no context) condition and QE duration was longer when putting to win or tie a hole compared to control. There was no effect of context on pupil dilation. Results suggest that, while the task was challenging, performance scenarios can enhance representativeness of practice without adding additional load to cognitive resources, even for novice performers.

Key Words: perceptual-cognitive skill; expertise; gaze behaviour, motor control

Introduction

Over the past two decades, researchers have conducted numerous empirical investigations in to the visual control of movement in aiming tasks (Causer et al., 2017; Causer et al., 2011; Miles et al., 2015; Vickers et al., 2017; Vine & Wilson, 2011). A consistent finding is that the final visual fixation (lasting over 100 ms; within one-degree of visual angle) prior to execution of an action is exhibited for longer by higher skilled participants. Longer final fixations are associated with more successful performance outcomes (Lebeau et al., 2016), commonly referred to in the literature as the 'Quiet Eye' (QE; Vickers, 1992; Vickers, 1996; Vickers & Williams, 2007). Research findings highlighting the performance benefits of QE have been consistently shown in sport (Lebeau et al., 2016), surgery (Causer et al., 2014; Harvey et al., 2014), and coordination disorders (Miles et al., 2015). Researchers have also developed interventions to increase QE duration and reported subsequent performance improvements (Causer, Holmes, & Williams, 2011; Panchuk et al., 2014; Vine et al., 2011; Vine & Wilson, 2011). However, little attention has been paid to how the context in which tasks are executed (independent from anxiety) affects QE, and debate remains on the mechanisms that underpin the QE phenomenon. Here, we aimed to investigate the effects of context on QE and performance while examining if the mechanisms underpinning QE are rooted in cognitive effort.

Researchers working in the field of perceptual-motor control have investigated how task constraints affect gaze behaviour, anxiety, and cognitive effort, to glean a broader understanding of the factors affecting performance. To this end, researchers have examined how QE is affected by factors such as physiological arousal (Vickers & Williams, 2007), the presence of opponents (Vickers et al., 2019), and in particular the manipulation of anxiety (Causer et al., 2014; Causer et al., 2011; Moore et al., 2012; Vine et al., 2013; Wood & Wilson, 2011). To manipulate anxiety, previous work has often used competition scenarios.

For example, Causer et al. (2011) instructed skilled shotgun shooters to 'shoot as if they were in a competition' in an attempt to heighten anxiety and found an increase in self-reported anxiety as well as later QE onset and shorter QE duration alongside reduced shooting accuracy in this condition. From here on, we refer to such manipulations of situational variables as manipulations of 'context' where context is defined as referring to 'the situation within which something exists or happens, and that can help explain it' (Cambridge English Dictionary, 2020).

The manipulation of context independent to anxiety has been of particular interest following recent reviews which have identified the need for researchers to further investigate its influence (see Cañal-Bruland & Mann, 2015; Loffing & Cañal-Bruland, 2017; Williams & Jackson, 2019). Such research has reported that the presence of contextual information can improve anticipation accuracy in cricket (Runswick et al., 2019; Runswick et al., 2018a) and tennis (Murphy et al., 2016). McRobert et al. (2011) reported that providing contextual information that did not focus on manipulating anxiety resulted in not only enhanced accuracy in a perceptual-cognitive anticipation task, but also led to a reduction in length of mean fixation duration, which was proposed as being due to a reduction in the time required to process information. This suggests that the provision of contextual information which does not seek to manipulate anxiety may also affect the functional coupling between QE and action execution and may do so differently than reported in previous QE research that has focused on anxiety based manipulations of the situation (Rodrigues et al., 2002).

Recent studies that have specifically investigated whether anxiety and context operate through separate mechanisms have provided evidence that is consistent with this proposal. Runswick et al. (2018b) conducted an experiment using an in-situ cricket batting task where context and anxiety were manipulated separately. Anxiety was manipulated using a combination of financial rewards, false feedback, and peer comparison, whereas context was added using neutral game situations involving the placement of fielders and the score of the game that did not affect anxiety. Results showed that when performing in conditions where only anxiety was manipulated there was a reduction in batting performance and processing efficiency, inferred from an increase in visual fixations on irrelevant stimuli. In contrast, when contextual information was provided in the absence of the anxiety manipulations, bat-ball contact was negatively affected but through changes in the execution of motor responses without changes in processing efficiency. A similar study by Broadbent et al. (2018) required expert soccer players to complete an anticipation task in high or low anxiety conditions with and without 'contextual priors' that detailed the opponent's action tendencies. In conditions where anxiety was manipulated (through performance evaluation), anticipation performance was negatively affected and was underpinned by a decrease in processing efficiency measured through self-reported mental effort. However, context enhanced anticipation performance without affecting processing efficiency. Taken together, these findings reported by Runswick et al. (2018b) and Broadbent et al. (2018) suggest that the provision of context and the manipulation of anxiety both affect aspects of perceptual-motor control, including gaze behaviour, cognitive load, and performance execution, but do so through separate mechanisms. There is then a need to consider how the provision of contextual information independent to any manipulation of anxiety affects QE and associated performance.

Despite consistent research findings concerning QE and motor performance, there remains some debate over the mechanisms that underpin the phenomenon. In their review, Gonzalez et al. (2017) highlighted a number of mechanisms that have been proposed to underpin the QE effect. Mechanisms included allocation of attention (Klostermann et al., 2014), motor programming (Mann et al., 2011) and response selection and online control (Causer et al., 2017). For example, Vine et al. (2015) used a temporal occlusion paradigm during a golf putting task to show that the latter portion of the QE period was critical when executing the putt, suggesting therefore that QE is not just a motor programming period but also has a role to play in online control. However, evidence has recently emerged which suggests that QE mechanisms may be linked to information processing and increased cognitive effort (Campbell et al., 2019; Klostermann et al., 2014). This suggests that the performance enhancing effects of longer QE periods are due to QE being a proxy for increases in allocation of cognitive resources devoted to the task at hand.

Pupil dilation has been used as a measure of cognitive effort, with larger task-invoked pupil dilation reported as being related to increased cognitive effort during harder cognitive tasks (Beatty & Kahneman, 1966; Campbell et al., 2019; Moran et al., 2016; Robinson & Unsworth, 2019). While Vine et al. (2015) have shown the importance of information available late in the QE period in a golf-putting task, Campbell et al. (2019) found that participants' peak pupil dilation occurred at the onset of QE, consistent with the suggestion that this was the most cognitively demanding time in the task and that QE may be related to cognitive effort. Pupil dilation could, therefore, provide a useful window into the mechanistic underpinnings of QE. However, Campbell et al's (2019) study represents one of the first to investigate the relationship between QE and pupil dilation and so there is a need to examine this further. Further, there has been no investigation into how experimental manipulations of context which alter the degree of cognitive challenge may affect this relationship. By understanding if context affects QE duration, cognitive effort, and perceptual-motor performance, it is possible to better understand the findings of previous work that has used context to manipulate anxiety. Such investigations can then inform the design of training environments that are as representative as possible (Pinder et al., 2011) without overloading the cognitive resources of the learner (Runswick, et al., 2018a; Van Merriënboer & Sweller, 2005).

In this study, we used a golf-putting task and manipulated the context under which participants putted to investigate how context affects QE duration and motor performance. Specifically, participants putted under conditions where they were instructed that a successful putt would either 'win the hole', would 'tie the hole' (traditionally referred to as a half), or to putt as if they were practising (i.e., absence of context). We recorded QE duration (ms) and putting accuracy (error score) to assess how context affected perceptual-motor control, motor performance and recorded pupil dilation (mm) as an indicator of cognitive effort. Based on the literature showing the effects of QE on performance (Lebeau et al., 2016; Mann et al., 2007) and effects of context on cognitive processes (McRobert et al., 2011b), we predicted that the presence of context would improve putting accuracy and this would be mediated by an increase in QE duration. On the basis of Campbell et al's (2019) proposals, we expected an increase in QE duration would also be accompanied by an increase in pupil dilation as a proxy of cognitive effort. However, Runswick et al. (2018a; 2018b) reported that context had little effect on cognitive effort, which contrasts with the proposals of Campbell et al. (2019). Runswick et al's (2018a; 2018b) findings therefore would inform the hypothesis that the presence of context would affect QE duration and performance but with no change in pupil dilation. Given the relatively novel nature of this part of the study and the limited yet contrasting existing research findings, our aim here was to test these competing hypotheses.

Method

Participants

We conducted an a-priori power analysis using G*power (Faul et al., 2007). The calculation was based on the main effect size from Runswick et al. (2018b) that represents the only previous study to investigate the effects of context on perceptual-cognitive-motor performance in a sports-based task. We used the within-factor effect size that displayed a significant effect of context on motor performance ($\eta p^2 = 0.46$). We set a moderate correlation (r = 0.3) and power at 0.95. The minimum sample size required was n = 10. Given the very large effect size in Runswick et al. (2018b), and to account for potential dropout, we recruited 21 participants. The 21 participants (mean age 21.22 ± 1.89 years) who completed the study were all classed as novice golfers, defined as those with no experience playing golf. Due to the nature of the sample, some participants may have had some limited exposure to putting during lab classes or playing 'crazy golf'. Novices were used for this study due to the benefit in investigating the mechanisms underpinning QE where novices are likely to find the addition of context cognitively demanding due to the need to process the information to assess the most appropriate response (Van Merriënboer & Sweller, 2005). The research was conducted in accordance with the ethical guidelines of the lead institution and written informed consent was obtained from all participants at the outset.

Apparatus and task

The experimental task required participants to complete a golf putt without break from a distance of 243cm (8 ft). Testing was conducted using a hole on an indoor putting green in a laboratory. The golf club used was a 'Series Tour' golf putter, and the ball was a regulation golf ball (diameter = 43.67 mm, mass = 45.93 g). Gaze behaviour, QE duration and pupil diameter were recorded using a SensoMotoric Instruments (SMI) mobile eye tracker recording at 60hz. Pupillometry was recorded at a sampling frequency of 30 Hz from both the left and right eye. Putting accuracy was recorded using a standard digital video camera positioned above the hole.

Procedure

Participants were required to attend one testing session. Upon arrival at the laboratory, all participants provided written informed consent. Participants then put on the SMI eye-tracker, which was calibrated using the 3–point calibration system with participants looking at golf balls on the ground from a putting stance to represent the viewing angle to be used during testing. Participants were informed that they would be asked to perform 18 golf putts, representing an 18-hole match and were instructed to perform the putt in the way they deemed most appropriate for the scenario they were given. Prior to each putt, the lead investigator provided the participant with contextual information. This consisted of participants being informed that the subsequent putt was to either win the hole, tie the hole, or the putt was simply a practice putt. The order of putts was counterbalanced across participants. As participants were all considered novice golfers, in 'win' and 'tie' scenarios the researcher also outlined the possible outcome of each putt to ensure the participant understood the context but did not direct them on how to behave. For example, "This putt is to win the hole. If you hole the putt you will win, if you miss you will have a second putt to tie (draw) the hole"; "This putt is to tie (draw) the hole. If you hole the putt you will tie (draw), if you miss the putt you will lose the hole"; "The hole is over and you are taking a practice putt".

Dependent Measures

Putting Accuracy

Putting accuracy was recorded as a measure of putting performance. Ten concentric circles surrounded the hole that progressively increased in radius from 10cm to 100cm at 10cm intervals. Error was scored out of 10 (putt finishes in the hole) with the score decreasing by 1 for every ring further from the hole. Any putt that finished outside the 100cm radius ring (the furthest ring from the hole) was scored as zero.

Quiet Eye Duration

Consistent with previous literature (e.g., Causer et al., 2017; Vickers, 2007), QE was defined as the initiation of the final fixation on the ball that occurred prior to the start of the backswing. QE duration was recorded using the eye tracker and defined as the length of the fixation (ms) starting from onset, the first frame when the final fixation on the ball began, to offset, when gaze deviated by more than 1 degree of visual angle from the ball for more than 100 ms (Vickers, 2007).

Pupillometry

Campbell et al. (2019) reported that pupil dilation would peak at the onset of QE. However, in this study pupil dilation peaked after the onset of QE in 74% of all trials. We therefore recorded pupil dilation in three ways. Firstly, the pupil dilation (mm) at the onset of QE (as per Campbell et al., 2019). Secondly, the peak task–evoked pupillary response that occurred during the QE period, and finally the mean pupil dilation across the period of the QE. The dilation of the right eye was used for all analyses (Kahya et al., 2018; Moran et al., 2016; Porter et al., 2007). Full QE and pupillometry data were available for 19 out of 21 participants due to technical issues with the eye tracker for the remaining two participants.

Data Analysis

Separate one-way repeated measures ANOVA were used to establish the effect of context (win vs tie vs practice conditions) on each dependent variable (putting accuracy, Quiet Eye duration, and onset, mean, and peak pupil dilation). Any violations of sphericity were corrected for by adjusting the degrees of freedom using the Greenhouse Geisser correction when epsilon was less than 0.75 and the Huynh-Feldt correction when greater than 0.75 (Girden, 1992). The alpha level (p) for statistical significance was set at 0.05. A Bonferroni adjustment was employed for multiple comparisons in order to lower the significance threshold and avoid Type I errors (McLaughlin & Sainani, 2014). Partial eta squared (ηp^2) was used as a measure of effect size for all ANOVA analyses and Cohen's d for post-hoc comparisons.

Results

Performance

Putting accuracy. There was a main effect of context on putting accuracy ($F(2,40) = 3.696$, $p < 0.034$, $\eta p^2 = 0.156$, Figure 1). Post hoc tests using Bonferroni correction revealed a higher performance score (more accurate putting) in the *Win* (4.92 ± 1.48) compared to *Practice* (3.93 ± 1.51) condition ($p = 0.026$, $d = 0.66$). There was no difference in putting accuracy between the *Tie* (4.23 ± 1.74) and *Practice* ($p = 1.0$, $d = 0.18$) or *Tie* and *Win* ($p = 0.42$, $d = 0.43$) conditions.



Figure 1. Mean performance score per putt with individual participant data points for each condition.

Quiet Eye Duration

There was a main effect of context on QE duration ($F(1.520, 27.361) = 5.250$, $p < 0.02$, $\eta p^2 = 0.226$, Figure 2). Post hoc tests using Bonferroni correction revealed shorter QE duration in the *Practice* (489.23 ± 453.19 ms), compared to *Tie* (752.82 ± 747.76 ms, $p = .05$, $d = 0.43$)

and *Win* (704.80 ± 607.48 ms, p = .005, d = 0.40) conditions. There was no difference in QE duration between *Tie* and *Win* conditions (p = 1.0, d = 0.07).



Figure 2. Mean Quiet Eye duration with individual participant data points for each condition.

Pupillometry

There was no main effect of context on pupil dilation at the onset of QE (Practice = 3.77 ± 0.80; Tie = 3.56 ± 0.84; Win = 3.67 ± 0.72; $F(2, 36) = 2.299$, $p = 0.116$, $\eta p^2 = 0.119$). There was also no main effect of context on mean pupil dilation (Practice = 3.81± 0.72; Tie = 3.71 ± 0.71; Win = 3.66 ± 0.66; $F(2, 36) = 2.536$, $p = 0.093$, $\eta p^2 = 0.123$). Finally, there was also no main effect of context on peak pupil dilation during the QE period (Practice = 3.94 ± 0.72; Tie = 3.88 ± 0.67; Win = 3.85 ± 0.62; $F(2, 36) = 0.71$, $p = 0.45$, $\eta p^2 = 0.04$).



Figure 3. Mean and individual participant data points for each condition for (A) Pupil dilation at QE onset (B) Peak pupil dilation during the QE period and (C) Mean pupil dilation during the QE period.

Discussion

Our aim in this experiment was to investigate how manipulation of context independent of anxiety affected visual motor control and motor performance. Participants completed a golf-putting task under manipulations of context or in the absence of context. We recorded Quiet Eye duration as a measure of visual motor control, putting accuracy as a measure of motor performance, and pupil dilation as an indicator of cognitive effort. We predicted that context would positively affect performance, and this would be mediated by changes in QE duration. If Campbell et al's (2019) proposals were accurate then we expected that an increase in QE duration would also be accompanied by an increase in pupil dilation as a proxy of cognitive effort. However, the contrasting findings of Runswick et al. (2018a; 2018b) informed the competing hypothesis that context would affect QE duration and performance with no change in pupil dilation as an indicator of cognitive effort.

In line with our hypotheses, and consistent with findings from previous empirical investigations, there was a significant main effect of context on performance (see Causer et al., 2011; McRobert et al., 2011; Murphy et al., 2016). Participants putted more accurately when putts were in context 'to win' compared to practice putts (no context). These findings are partially consistent with those reported by Runswick et al. (2018b) who found the presence of context affected performance in an interceptive perceptual-cognitive-motor task. However, whilst we observed an *improvement* in putting accuracy, Runswick et al. (2018b) found the presence of context caused a *degradation* in quality of bat-ball contact. When the cricket batters in Runswick's study were exposed to context (in the form of fielder position and score line information) there was an enhanced likelihood of negative outcomes (i.e., they could lose their wicket, or the fielders could intercept their shots). In this study, however, the context of putting to win meant participants had two attempts to avoid losing the hole, meaning a potential increase in possible positive outcomes. Together, these findings suggest that the type of scenario presented and nature of the task may mediate the effects of context on motor performance.

The main effect of context on performance (putting accuracy) was accompanied by a main effect of context on QE duration. However, QE durations reported here are shorter than reported elsewhere previously (e.g., Vine et al., 2011), which may be due to novice participants being used in this experiment whereas much previous research has employed skilled participants. Despite QE duration being comparatively short, both putting conditions where context was provided (i.e., putting 'to win' or 'tie') were characterised by significantly longer QE durations than when putting in the absence of context (i.e., the 'practice' condition), which was also the condition in which putting was least accurate. Although not in an aiming task, McRobert et al. (2011) previously reported changes in gaze behaviour during perceptual-cognitive tasks when provided with contextual information relative to when performing the same tasks without contextual information. In the study reported here, the link between an increase in QE duration and enhanced putting accuracy in the 'putt to win' condition is consistent with much of the literature concerning QE and motor performance, both within golf putting (see Campbell et al., 2019; Causer et al., 2017) and other tasks (see Lebeau et al., 2016). While previous research has shown that QE duration and subsequent motor performance was affected by anxiety manipulated through the addition of context (e.g., Causer et al., 2011), here we have specifically shown the context in which a task is performed- independent of anxiety- affects QE and performance outcomes. This suggests that to develop measures of optimum gaze applicable to real world settings, non-visual information such as contextual factors should be represented in experimental designs and practice environments.

To test recent suggestions that QE may be underpinned by cognitive mechanisms based on greater cognitive effort and information processing (Campbell et al., 2019; Klostermann et al., 2014), we collected pupillometry data in three ways during the QE period. The pupil dilations recorded were large compared to those reported in classical work involving participants completing seven digit memory tasks (see Beatty & Kahneman, 1966), suggesting the putting task was cognitively challenging for a novice. However, despite a significant increase in QE duration in the 'putt to win' and 'putt to tie' conditions compared to the control 'practice' condition, there was no effect of the additional context on onset, peak or mean pupil dilation despite concurrent changes in motor performance. This suggests that context manipulations affect perceptual-motor processes independent from changes in cognitive effort. Our findings therefore challenge the predictions of Campbell et al. (2019) who suggest QE may be mediated by changes in cognitive processes. These findings are, however, in line with those of Runswick et al. (2018a; 2018b) and Broadbent et al. (2018)

who reported that changes in context affect perceptual-motor processes independent of cognitive effort and anxiety.

The results have practical, theoretical and empirical implications. First, much of the current understanding around QE behaviour, while predicated on a strong base of scientific evidence derived from research studies that have manipulated numerous constraints on the task (e.g Causer et al., 2014; Causer et al., 2011; Moore et al., 2012; Vine et al., 2013; Wood & Wilson, 2011), has not considered contextual information which is present in performance environments independent of anxiety. It is important that researchers seek to ensure that factors present in performance environments are faithfully represented, as much as is possible, when designing experiments (Broadbent et al., 2015; Pinder et al., 2011; Stone et al., 2014). Second, the finding that context influenced perceptual-motor processes independent of cognitive effort suggests that not only should context be included in experimental design, but that it could be incorporated in learning environments without overloading the cognitive resources of even novice learners (c.f. Cognitive Load Theory; van Merriënboer & Sweller, 2005). We did not find evidence for the proposal that QE duration may be an indicator of enhanced information processing. Future research could also include more specific measures to investigate other proposed QE mechanisms alongside pupillometry that focus on cognitive approaches.

In this study, we employed a context manipulation in a golf-putting task to investigate the effects of context on QE duration, target aiming motor performance and cognitive effort. Findings showed that the provision of context led to an increase in QE duration and more accurate motor performance, yet these effects occurred without changes in pupil dilation; a proxy for cognitive effort. Findings suggest that context could be included in the design of QE experiments and training environments by using simple hypothetical manipulations.

References

Beatty, J., & Kahneman, D. (1966). Pupillary changes in two memory tasks. *Psychonomic Science*. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03328444

Broadbent, D. P., Bishop, D. T., Gredin, N. V., Rye, J. L., & Williams, A. M. (2018). The impact of contextual priors and anxiety on performance effectiveness and processing efficiency in anticipation. *Cognition and Emotion*, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2018.1464434

Broadbent, D. P., Causer, J., Williams, A. M., & Ford, P. R. (2015). Perceptual-cognitive skill training and its transfer to expert performance in the field: Future research directions. *European Journal of Sport Science*, *15*(4). https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2014.957727

Campbell, M. J., Moran, A. P., Bargary, N., Surmon, S., Bressan, L., & Kenny, I. C. (2019). Pupillometry during golf putting: A new window on the cognitive mechanisms underlying quiet eye. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, *8*(1), 53–62. https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000148

Cañal-Bruland, R., & Mann, D. L. (2015). Time to broaden the scope of research on anticipatory behavior: A case for the role of probabilistic information. *Frontiers in Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01518

Causer, J., Hayes, S. J., Hooper, J. M., & Bennett, S. J. (2017). Quiet eye facilitates sensorimotor preprograming and online control of precision aiming in golf putting. *Cognitive Processing*, *18*(1), 47–54. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-016-0783-4

Causer, J., Holmes, P. S., Smith, N. C., & Williams, A. M. (2011). Anxiety, Movement Kinematics, and Visual Attention in Elite-Level Performers. *Emotion*, *11*(3), 595–602.

https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023225

Causer, J., Holmes, P. S., & Williams, A. M. (2011). Quiet eye training in a visuomotor control task. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*. https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e3182035de6

Causer, J., Vickers, J. N., Snelgrove, R., Arsenault, G., & Harvey, A. (2014). Performing under pressure: Quiet eye training improves surgical knot-tying performance. *Surgery (United States)*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surg.2014.05.004

CONTEXT | meaning in the Cambridge English Dictionary. (n.d.). Cambridge English Dictionary. Retrieved July 21, 2020, from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/context

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146

Girden, E. R. (1992). ANOVA: Repeated measures. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gonzalez, C. C., Causer, J., Miall, R. C., Grey, M. J., Humphreys, G., & Williams, A. M. (2017). Identifying the causal mechanisms of the quiet eye. *European Journal of Sport Science*, 17(1), 74–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2015.1075595

Harvey, A., Vickers, J. N., Snelgrove, R., Scott, M. F., & Morrison, S. (2014). Expert surgeon's quiet eye and slowing down: Expertise differences in performance and quiet eye duration during identification and dissection of the recurrent laryngeal nerve. *American Journal of Surgery*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjsurg.2013.07.033

Kahya, M., Wood, T. A., Sosnoff, J. J., & Devos, H. (2018). Increased postural demand is associated with greater cognitive workload in healthy young adults: A pupillometry study. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2018.00288

Klostermann, A., Kredel, R., & Hossner, E.-J. (2014). On the Interaction of Attentional Focus and Gaze: The Quiet Eye Inhibits Focus-Related Performance Decrements. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *36*(4), 392–400. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2013-0273

Lebeau, J.-C., Liu, S., Sáenz-Moncaleano, C., Sanduvete-Chaves, S., Chacón-Moscoso, S., Becker, B. J., & Tenenbaum, G. (2016). Quiet Eye and Performance in Sport: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *38*(5), 441–457. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2015-0123

Loffing, F., & Cañal-Bruland, R. (2017). Anticipation in sport. *Current Opinion in Psychology*,16, 6–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.03.008

Mann, D. T. Y., Coombes, S. A., Mousseau, M. B., & Janelle, C. M. (2011). Quiet eye and the Bereitschaftspotential: Visuomotor mechanisms of expert motor performance. *Cognitive Processing*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-011-0398-8

Mann, D. T. Y., Williams, A. M., Ward, P., & Janelle, C. M. (2007). Perceptual-Cognitive Expertise in Sport: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 29, 457-478. https://dio.org/ 10.1123/jsep.29.4.457

McLaughlin, M. J., & Sainani, K. L. (2014). Bonferroni, holm, and hochberg corrections: Fun names, serious changes to P values. *PM and R*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmrj.2014.04.006

McRobert, A. P., Ward, P., Eccles, D. W., & Williams, A. M. (2011). The effect of manipulating context-specific information on perceptual-cognitive processes during a simulated anticipation task. *British Journal of Psychology*, *102*(3), 519–534. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.2010.02013.x

Miles, C. A. L., Wood, G., Vine, S. J., Vickers, J. N., & Wilson, M. R. (2015). Quiet eye training facilitates visuomotor coordination in children with developmental coordination disorder. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, *40*, 31–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2015.01.005

Moore, L. J., Vine, S. J., Cooke, A., Ring, C., & Wilson, M. R. (2012). Quiet eye training expedites motor learning and aids performance under heightened anxiety: The roles of response programming and external attention. *Psychophysiology*, *49*(7), 1005–1015. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.2012.01379.x

Moran, A., Quinn, A., Campbell, M., Rooney, B., Brady, N., & Burke, C. (2016). Using pupillometry to evaluate attentional effort in quiet eye: A preliminary investigation. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, *5*(4), 365–376. https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000066

Murphy, C. P., Jackson, R. C., Cooke, K., Roca, A., Benguigui, N., & Williams, A. M. (2016). Contextual information and perceptual-cognitive expertise in a dynamic, temporally-constrained task. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, *22*(4), 455–470. https://doi.org/10.1037/xap0000094

Panchuk, D., Farrow, D., & Meyer, T. (2014). How can novel task constraints be used to induce acute changes in gaze behaviour? *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *32*(12), 1196–1201. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2013.876089

Pinder, R. A., Davids, K., Renshaw, I., & Araújo, D. (2011). Representative Learning Design and Functionality of Research and Practice in Sport. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *33*(1), 146–155. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.33.1.146

Porter, G., Troscianko, T., & Gilchrist, I. D. (2007). Effort during visual search and counting: Insights from pupillometry. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*.

https://doi.org/10.1080/17470210600673818

Robison, M.K., Unsworth, N. Pupillometry tracks fluctuations in working memory performance. Atten Percept Psychophys 81, 407–419 (2019). https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-018-1618-4

Rodrigues, S. T., Vickers, J. N., & Williams, A. M. (2002). Head, eye and arm coordination in table tennis. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *20*(3), 187–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/026404102317284754

Runswick, O. R., Roca, A., Mark Williams, A., Bezodis, N. E., Mcrobert, A. P., & North, J. S. (2018a). The impact of contextual information and a secondary task on anticipation performance: An interpretation using cognitive load theory. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *32*(2), 141–149. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3386

Runswick, O. R., Roca, A., Williams, A. M., Bezodis, N. E., & North, J. S. (2018b). The effects of anxiety and situation-specific context on perceptual–motor skill: a multi-level investigation. *Psychological Research*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-017-0856-8

Runswick, O. R., Roca, A., Williams, A. M., McRobert, A. P., & North, J. S. (2019). Why do bad balls get wickets? The role of congruent and incongruent information in anticipation. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *37*(5), 537–543. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2018.1514165

Stone, J. A., Panchuk, D., Davids, K., North, J. S., Fairweather, I., & Maynard, I. W. (2014). An integrated ball projection technology for the study of dynamic interceptive actions. *Behavior Research Methods*, *46*(4), 984–991. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-013-0429-8

Van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Sweller, J. (2005). Cognitive load theory and complex learning:

Recent developments and future directions. *Educational Psychology Review*, 17 (2), 147–177. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-005-3951-0

Vickers, J. N. (1992). Gaze control in putting. *Perception*. https://doi.org/10.1068/p210117

Vickers, J. N. (1996). Visual Control When Aiming at a Far Target. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*. https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.22.2.342

Vickers, J. N. (2007). Perception, cognition, and decision training: The quiet eye in action. Human Kinetics.

Vickers, J. N., Causer, J., & Vanhooren, D. (2019). The Role of Quiet Eye Timing and Location in the Basketball Three-Point Shot: A New Research Paradigm. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*(OCT), 2424. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02424

Vickers, J. N., Vandervies, B., Kohut, C., & Ryley, B. (2017). Quiet eye training improves accuracy in basketball field goal shooting. *Progress in Brain Research*, 234, https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.pbr.2017.06.011

Vickers, J. N., & Williams, A. M. (2007). Performing under pressure: The effects of physiological arousal, cognitive anxiety, and gaze control in biathlon. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, *39*(5), 381–394. https://doi.org/10.3200/JMBR.39.5.381-394

Vine, S. J., Lee, D. H., Walters-Symons, R., & Wilson, M. R. (2015). An occlusion paradigm to assess the importance of the timing of the quiet eye fixation. *European Journal of Sport Science*, *17*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2015.1073363

Vine, S. J., Moore, L. J., & Wilson, M. R. (2011). Quiet Eye Training Facilitates Competitive Putting Performance in Elite Golfers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *2*(JAN), 8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00008

Vine, S. J., & Wilson, M. R. (2011). The influence of quiet eye training and pressure on attention and visuo-motor control. *Acta Psychologica*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2010.12.008

Vine, S. J, Lee, D., Moore, L. J., & Wilson, M. R. (2013). Quiet eye and choking: Online control breaks down at the point of performance failure. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, *45*(10), 1988–1994. https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e31829406c7

Williams, A. M., & Jackson, R. C. (2019). Anticipation in sport: Fifty years on, what have we learned and what research still needs to be undertaken? *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 42, 16–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.11.014

Wood, G., & Wilson, M. R. (2011). Quiet-eye training for soccer penalty kicks. *Cognitive Processing*, *12*(3), 257–266. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-011-0393-0