

# The quiet eye effect: A test of the visual and postural-kinematic hypotheses

Gallicchio, Germano; Ring, Christopher

# Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spy0000162

Published: 01/02/2020

Peer reviewed version

Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA): Gallicchio, G., & Ring, C. (2020). The quiet eye effect: A test of the visual and postural-kinematic hypotheses. Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology, 9(1), 143-159. https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000162

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

• Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.

- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
   You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1	The Quiet Eye Effect: A Test	of the Perceptual and Kinematic Hypotheses				
2						
3						
4	Germano Gallicchio and Christ	opher Ring				
5	School of Sport, Exercise & Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Birmingham, UK					
6						
7						
8	Running head: Quiet eye: Perce	eptual and kinematic hypotheses				
9						
10						
11	Corresponding Author:	Germano Gallicchio				
12		School of Sport, Exercise & Rehabilitation Sciences				
13		University of Birmingham				
14		Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK				
15		Email: germano.gallicchio@gmail.com				
16						
17						
18	Author note: This work was sup	pported by Economic and Social Research Council Grant				
19	ES/J50001X/1					
20						

1

#### Abstract

2

3 The quiet eye effect describes the performance advantage associated with a long ocular fixation on a 4 critical target of an action, prior to and during movement execution. Researchers have advocated a 5 multi-measure approach to shed light on the mechanism(s) behind the association between ocular 6 activity and motor performance. In this study we used psychophysiological methods to test whether 7 the quiet eye period is associated with enhanced visual processing (visual hypothesis) or longer 8 movement durations (postural-kinematic hypothesis). Thirty-two recreational golfers putted 20 balls 9 to a 2-m distant target on a flat surface. We examined quiet eye duration and time-varying eye 10 quietness using electrooculography, occipital alpha power using electroencephalography, and swing 11 duration using kinematic sensors. Occipital alpha power, an inverse neural marker of visual 12 processing, increased prior to and during swing execution, suggesting decreased visual processing 13 compared to baseline. Correlations revealed that, despite the overall decrease, visual processing 14 decreased less with a longer quiet eye and greater eye quietness. Importantly, swing duration was 15 strongly and positively correlated with both indices of ocular activity: longer quiet eye and greater eye 16 quietness were associated with longer swing duration. Our findings support the postural-kinematic 17 hypothesis, confirming that the duration of the quiet eye is associated with a slow movement execution and question the role of visual processing in the final moments of closed-loop aiming tasks. 18 19 We anticipate major advancements in the mechanistic understanding of the quiet eye effect as 20 researchers adopt psychophysiological methods to examine eye movements in combination with 21 measures of other biological systems.

22

23 Key words: Alpha power, Electrooculography, Golf putting, Kinematics, Visual processing

1 The way we move our eyes has been linked with the precision of movements requiring fine motor 2 control, such as those used in target sports. Research using eye-tracking technology has revealed that, 3 compared to novices, experts make fewer ocular fixations of longer duration on action-related 4 locations prior to and during the execution of a motor skill (Mann, Williams, Ward, & Janelle 2007). 5 The duration of the final ocular fixation on a critical target of the action, labelled the quiet eye 6 (Vickers, 1996), has attracted much interest from researchers due to its ability to distinguish skilled 7 from less skilled performers as well as successful from unsuccessful performance of experts (for 8 reviews of studies see Lebeau et al., 2016; Mann, Williams, Ward, & Janelle, 2007; Rienhoff, Tirp, 9 Strauß, Baker, & Schorer, 2016; Vickers, 2007; Wilson, Causer, & Vickers, 2015). In the case of golf 10 putting, the quiet eye period has been defined as the duration of the final ocular fixation on the ball, with onset prior to the initiation of the swing movement and offset when the gaze deviates from the 11 12 ball, potentially even after putter-ball impact (Vickers, 2007). Longer quiet eye durations have been 13 reported for experienced versus novice golfers (Walters-Symons, Wilson, & Vine, 2017) and for 14 holed versus missed putts in experienced golfers (Wilson & Pearcy, 2009). 15 Despite the large body of evidence endorsing the existence of the quiet eye effect, researchers 16 still debate how it might influence performance. In order to advance our understanding and inform the 17 design of training programs aimed at improving performance, researchers have recommended

18 mechanistic and cross-disciplinary investigations to test the validity of the competing hypotheses

19 (Causer, 2016; Williams, 2016; Wilson, Wood, & Vine, 2016). A comprehensive review of the

20 putative mechanisms goes beyond the scope of the present work, and for a detailed account we refer

21 the reader to a recent review by Gonzalez et al. (2017a). In the present study, we evaluated two

22 mechanistic hypotheses: the visual hypothesis and the postural-kinematic hypothesis.

23 Visual hypothesis

Vision-action coupling constitutes a key element in the debate on quiet eye mechanisms.
Researchers have described the quiet eye as a perceptual-cognitive phenomenon reflecting the
selective processing of movement-related visual information through *overt attention* (see Posner,
1980). For example, in their study of the quiet eye in billiards, Williams et al. (2002, p. 197)
concluded that 'To execute the shot, players must successfully integrate visual information from the

1 cue, cue ball, target ball, and pocket.' The thesis that visual processing plays a major role in the quiet 2 eye was emphasized by Vickers (2012), who referred to the dorsal cortical stream -a visual attention 3 network (Corbetta & Shulman, 2002; Goodale & Milner, 1992) – to explain the putative mechanism 4 underlying the quiet eye effect. In short, enhanced processing of visual information has been the 5 dominant mechanism in this context, even for closed-loop aiming tasks with stationary targets, such 6 as golf putting. Indeed, in their study of the quiet eye in golf putting, Vine et al. (2015, p. 5) 7 concluded that 'visual information is being actively extracted and processed' during the quiet eye 8 period. In the current study we refer to this visual attention mechanism as the visual hypothesis.

9 Cognitive processes, including attention and perception, can be studied in an objective and 10 unobtrusive manner by recording individuals' electroencephalogram (EEG) as they perform goaloriented actions. More specifically, the selective allocation of attentional resources to processing of 11 12 visual information can be assessed using the magnitude of cortical oscillations (i.e., power) within the 13 alpha frequency band (8-12 Hz) in the occipital regions of the brain. Importantly, studies have 14 established that increased occipital alpha power reflects decreased visual processing (Romei, Gross, & 15 Thut, 2010; Romei, Rihs, Brodbeck, & Thut, 2008; Vanni, Revonsuo, & Hari, 1997). EEG methods 16 have been successfully implemented in sport research (for review see Cooke, 2013; Hatfield, Haufler, 17 Hung, & Spalding, 2004). For example, EEG research has revealed that superior motor performance is associated with neural efficiency by alpha gating, which describes the allocation of attentional 18 19 resources towards movement-related and away from movement-unrelated information processing (e.g., Gallicchio, Finkenzeller, Sattlecker, Lindinger, & Hoedlmoser, 2016; Gallicchio, Cooke, & 20 21 Ring, 2017).

Given the extensive use of EEG in sport research it is surprising that, with one exception, the association between quiet eye and visual processing, assessed using EEG, has been largely neglected. The exception is the study by Janelle et al. (2000) that reported a positive correlation between quiet eye duration and EEG occipital alpha power in experienced marksmen. Contrary to the visual hypothesis, this finding suggests diminished visual processing during the quiet eye period in a shooting task. Given that this critical piece of evidence appears to have been overlooked within the quiet eye literature and, moreover, that this finding has never been replicated, the association between 1 occipital alpha power and quiet eye duration warrants further investigation.

## 2 Postural-kinematic hypothesis

An alternative *postural-kinematic hypothesis* contends that the link between quiet eye and performance is accounted for by a kinematic mechanism: postural stability (involving trunk, limbs, head, and eyes) before and during movement is expected to lead to better performance and longer quiet eye. In the case of golf putting, a slower and more stable swing may be linked with (a) cleaner putter-ball impact to optimize impact velocity and angle and thereby ensure greater putting accuracy, and (b) greater likelihood of keeping the head and eyes still, resulting in delayed quiet eye offset and longer quiet eye. Each of these two elements is considered next.

First, the association between swing biomechanics/kinematics (i.e., a slow and stable
movement) and superior putting performance is substantiated by research indicating that, compared to
less skilled counterparts, expert golfers sway less (i.e., exhibit less centre of pressure variability) (e.g.,
Hurrion, 2009; McLaughlin, Best, & Carlson, 2008; Richardson, Hughes, & Mitchell, 2012), generate
less lateral putter head acceleration (i.e., they are less likely to swing out of line) (e.g., Cooke et al.,
2014; Sim & Kim, 2010), and putt more slowly (e.g., Delay et al., 1997; Gallicchio, Cooke, & Ring,
2018).

17 Second, the association between putting biomechanics/kinematics and longer quiet eye can be 18 examined separately for stability and duration. The argument that greater movement stability is 19 associated with longer quiet eye is supported by the finding that novice golfers trained to increase 20 their quiet eye duration in a putting task also generated decreased lateral and vertical putter head 21 acceleration, compared to a control group (Moore, Vine, Cooke, Ring, & Wilson, 2012). The 22 argument that longer movement duration (i.e., slower swing) is associated with longer quiet eye is 23 supported by evidence showing that experts swung for longer than novices and that movement 24 duration was positively correlated with post-movement initiation quiet eye duration (Gallicchio et al., 25 2018). In other words, novices, who swung the putter quicker than experts, had less reason to keep 26 their head still and dwell on the impact location, and more reason to start to track the moving ball sooner (see online supplementary material, Gallicchio et al., 2018). The net result was that novices 27 28 exhibited an earlier quiet eye offset compared to experts. The current study aims to extend and

1 replicate the study by Gallicchio and colleagues by testing the movement duration element of the

2 postural-kinematic hypothesis, using both within- and between-participant analyses.

## **3** The Present Study

4 In the present study we had two aims<sup>1</sup>. Our first aim was to assess whether ocular activity was 5 associated with EEG occipital alpha power and thereby test a core tenet of the visual hypothesis. Our 6 second aim was to assess whether ocular activity was associated with movement duration in order to 7 test a core tenet of the postural-kinematic hypothesis. We used EEG to examine brain activity 8 implicated with visual processing (e.g., Janelle et al., 2000), and movement sensors to examine the 9 duration of the movement (e.g., Gallicchio et al., 2018). We used electrooculography (EOG) to score 10 the quiet eye period in different phases of the movement (e.g., Gallicchio et al., 2018; Gonzalez et al., 11 2017b; Mann, Coombes, Mousseau, & Janelle, 2011). We supplemented quiet eye information with 12 the novel 'eye quietness' index (Gallicchio et al., 2018), which, unlike quiet eye duration, measures 13 the extent to which the eyes are quiet (rather than dichotomizing eye movements into a state of 'quiet' 14 or 'non quiet') with high temporal resolution.

15

#### 16 **Participants**

17 We tested 32 right-handed male relatively-inexperienced recreational golfers (age: M = 20.09, 18 SD = 2.04 years) with no formal golf handicap and occasional golf experience: they reported to have 19 played 12.06 times (SD = 12.96) in the 12 months preceding testing. Participants were asked to refrain 20 from alcohol, caffeine, and nicotine 3 hours prior to testing. All provided signed consent to take part 21 in the study and were compensated with £10 and research credits. This study was approved by the 22 local ethics committee.

Method

23 Putting task

Participants putted golf balls (diameter 4.7 cm) to a 2-m distant target with a 91-cm bladestyle putter on a 5 × 1.5 m flat surface (Turftiles; Stimpmeter value: 2.27 m). The target was a 6 mm
diameter adhesive paper marker placed on the putting surface. Participants were instructed to execute

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The current report describes new analyses of a larger golf putting dataset (Gallicchio & Ring, 2018).

the putt at their own pace (i.e., no time pressure) with the goal to "*get the final position of the ball as close as possible to the target*". Prior to each putt participants were required to stand in a relaxed
position and maintain their gaze on a fixation cross placed at eye level on the facing wall (c. 1.5 m
away) for 4-5 s, until a 200-ms acoustic tone (cue stimulus) prompted them to prepare for the putt.
This acoustic tone was generated by a piezo buzzer controlled by an Arduino Micro board (Arduino,
Italy) interfaced with a computer running MATLAB (MathWorks, USA).

## 7 **Procedure**

8 Upon arrival in the laboratory, participants were briefed and instrumented for physiological 9 recording. Then, participants performed 10 putts to a series of targets varying in distance and extent to 10 familiarize them with the putting surface. Finally, participants putted 20 balls to a straight 2-m distant 11 target. The average time between consecutive putts was 22.82 s (*SD* = 2.45). After each putt the 12 researcher took a photo of the putting area using a ceiling-mounted camera and repositioned the ball 13 for the next putt.

## 14 Physiological signals

15 Electrophysiological signals were recorded using an ActiveTwo system (BioSemi, 16 Netherlands). The EOG was recorded using four electrodes applied on the participant's skin near the 17 eyes: two were placed at the outer canthi of each eye and the other two at the bottom of each eye. The EEG was recorded through 32 electrodes applied on scalp sites Fp1, Fp2, AF3, AF4, F7, F3, Fz, F4, 18 F8, FC5, FC1, FC2, FC6, T7, C3, Cz, C4, T8, CP5, CP1, CP2, CP6, P7, P3, Pz, P4, P8, PO3, PO4, 19 O1, Oz, O2 (10-20 system, Jasper, 1958). Additional electrodes were applied to the mastoids and to 20 21 the chest (proximal lead-II ECG montage) for offline denoising purposes (described below). The 22 signal was amplified and digitized at 2048 Hz with 24-bit resolution and no filter was set during 23 recording. All channels were recorded in monopolar. Common mode sense and driven right leg 24 electrodes were used to enhance the common mode rejection ratio of the signal. 25 Digital triggers (transistor-transistor logic inputs) were sent via parallel communication to the

recording system in order to detect (a) the onset of the acoustic tone (prompting the participant to prepare for the putt), (b) the initiation of the backswing, and (c) the impact of the putter head with the ball. Participants were instructed to align the putter head with an infrared digital switch (E18-D80NK)

1 when ready to putt: this sensor sent a digital trigger as the putter head moved away from the ball at the 2 initiation of the backswing. In addition, a piezo sensor (MiniSense 100) attached to the back of the 3 putter head was used to record putter-ball impact vibrations. This sensor was interfaced with the 4 recording system to synchronize information about the impact with the electrophysiological signals. 5 After recording, we performed the following pre-processing steps. Signals were down-6 sampled to 512 Hz. For the analysis of the quiet eye, the electrodes positioned at the canthi of each 7 eye were re-referenced to each other to create a bipolar horizontal EOG channel. Then we applied a 8 30 Hz low-pass filter (Finite Impulse Response, filter order =  $2^{8}$ ) according to EOG guidelines 9 (Marmor et al., 2011). No high-pass filter was applied in order to preserve flat sections of the signal, 10 typical of ocular fixations (Acuña et al., 2014). Epochs were segmented from -9 to +3 s (0 s = backswing initiation) and the voltages were linearly detrended (i.e., the best straight-line fit was 11 12 subtracted to each epoch signal). Finally, a 125-ms median filter was applied to attenuate ocular 13 overshoots while preserving sharp vertical edges typical of ocular saccades (Bulling et al., 2011; 14 Juhola, 1991). Figure 1 shows the horizontal EOG channel from selected trials for illustration. All 15 single-trial waveforms can be accessed from the online supplemental material (Supplement S1). 16 For the analyses of EEG activity and eye quietness we applied a 0.1-40 Hz band-pass filter 17 (Finite Impulse Response, filter order =  $2^{15}$ ). Two types of epochs were segmented from -3.5 to +1.5 s relative to (a) the acoustic tone (cue stimulus) and (b) the initiation of the backswing. Voltages 18 19 were mean-centered within each epoch. Epochs were visually inspected and were discarded from all 20 subsequent analyses if they showed movement or electrical artefacts. The mean number of 21 backswing-centered epochs that were retained was 19.84 (SD = 0.37, minimum = 19). The mean 22 number of tone-centered epochs that were retained was 19.75 (SD = 0.51, minimum = 18). 23 Independent Component Analysis (Makeig et al., 1996) was performed to attenuate any electrical 24 artefacts due to ocular, cardiac, and muscular activity in the EEG signal using the EOG and ECG 25 channels. Finally, the EEG channels were average-referenced.

26 Measures

Quiet eye. Quiet eye durations (ms) were calculated for two periods and were obtained by
further processing the horizontal EOG signal: QE<sub>pre</sub> defined as quiet eye onset to backswing initiation,

1 and  $QE_{post}$  defined as backswing initiation to quiet eye offset. Onset and offset of the quiet eye were 2 identified through a threshold algorithm. Specifically, voltages at successive time points were 3 compared with the voltage at the instant of the initiation of backswing (i.e., time = 0 s). Quiet eye 4 onset and offset were respectively defined as the farthest time points preceding and following 5 backswing initiation that did not exceed a certain threshold (Gallicchio et al., 2018). We evaluated the 6 quiet eye durations for 30 threshold options (ranging from 5 to  $150 \,\mu$ V in 5  $\mu$ V steps). We conducted 7 exploratory analyses using all of these threshold settings (Figure 2), however, for our main analyses, 8 we chose a threshold of 60  $\mu$ V, corresponding with eye movements of 3° of visual angle (Shackel, 9 1967). This choice was informed by visual inspection revealing that, compared to other thresholds 10 (including 20  $\mu$ V corresponding with 1° of visual angle), the 60  $\mu$ V threshold detected most 11 accurately the duration of the final fixation, commencing with the foot of the final square wave prior 12 to backswing initiation (**Figure 1**). Moreover,  $60 \,\mu V$  is the same threshold deemed optimal in a 13 previous study (Gallicchio et al., 2018). The interested reader can inspect the single-trial quiet eve 14 durations identified by the different threshold options in the online supplemental material

15 (Supplement S1).

16 Eve quietness. Eye quietness (%) was computed as the standard deviation of the horizontal 17 EOG channel (HEOG-SD) in eight non-overlapping 0.5 s intervals ranging from -3 to +1 s (0 s = backswing initiation) (Gallicchio et al., 2018). Each HEOG-SD value reflected how much the eyes 18 19 moved or were active in the horizontal plane: larger values indicated more and larger eye movements 20 (hence less eye quietness); conversely, smaller values indicated fewer and smaller eye movements 21 (hence greater eye quietness). Finally, HEOG-SD was baseline-corrected to reflect the percentage 22 change relative to average HEOG-SD in the 2 s prior to the onset of the acoustic tone. This 23 transformation was performed to minimize variability between participants and, moreover, this 24 procedure is implemented as standard in the analysis of EEG signals (Pfurtscheller & Lopes da Silva, 1999). 25

Occipital alpha power. Time-frequency decomposition was performed through short-time
Fast Fourier Transform (FFT), conducted on eight non-overlapping 0.5 s windows ranging from -3 to
+1 s (0 s = backswing initiation), to match the windows used for the analysis of eye quietness. Prior to

1 FFT, each window was mean-averaged, multiplied by a Hanning function to taper both ends, and then 2 zero-padded to reach a length of 4 s, yielding a frequency resolution of 0.25 Hz. The amplitude of the 3 signal resulting from the FFT was doubled for all positive frequencies and alpha power was computed 4 as the squared amplitude in the 8-12 Hz frequency range. Then, alpha power was baseline-corrected to 5 reflect the percentage change (Pfurtscheller & Lopes da Silva, 1999) relative to the average baseline 6 activity in the 2 s prior to the onset of the acoustic tone (cue stimulus). Finally, occipital alpha power 7 was obtained by averaging values for the O1, Oz, and O2 channels to create an occipital region of 8 interest, consistent with previous research (e.g., Gallicchio et al., 2017).

9 Movement duration. The duration of the swing (ms) was measured as the time between
10 backswing initiation and putter-ball impact. These two events were detected through a bespoke
11 MATLAB script that combined data from the infrared switch and the piezo sensor.

Putting performance. Radial error (cm) was computed as the distance between the target and
the terminal position of the ball after each putt. Scoring was performed through a bespoke MATLAB
script that used the photos of the target area taken after each putt (Gallicchio & Ring, 2018).

## 15 Statistical Analyses

We used two statistical strategies to examine the associations between ocular activity (i.e.,
quiet eye and eye quietness) and (a) brain activity (i.e., occipital alpha power), (b) movement
duration, and (c) putting performance (i.e., radial error). Correlations were computed using the
Spearman's rank test. Spearman's rho (ρ) was used as the effect size, with values of .10, .30, and .50
reflecting small, medium, and large effects, respectively (see reference values for Pearson productmoment correlation in Cohen, 1992).

Our first strategy sought to capture the effects for each participant at the individual trial level. We refer to this as trial-level analysis. This strategy involved two steps. First, we correlated the two variables across all trials separately for each participant. Second, we performed a one-sample *t* test on the Fisher-Z transformed correlation coefficients across all participants (cf. Klostermann et al., 2014). For this analysis we report the group mean of the back-transformed Spearman's rho correlation coefficient ( $\rho_M$ ) along with the *t* value and the associated *p* value. Our second strategy sought to compare participants using the average scores over all of their trials; this is the typical correlation analysis. We refer to this as participant-level analysis. For this analysis we report the Spearman's rho
 coefficient (ρ) and the associated *p* value. The purpose of each analysis and our selection of the pairs
 of measures is described next.

Quiet eye and eye quietness. We correlated quiet eye and eye quietness to cross-validate
these two indices of ocular activity. More specifically, we correlated QE<sub>pre</sub> with pre backswing
initiation HEOG-SD (i.e., in the six time intervals from -3 to 0 s) and QE<sub>post</sub> with post backswing
initiation HEOG-SD (i.e., in the two time intervals from 0 to +1 s).

8 Correlates of occipital alpha power. We correlated ocular activity (i.e., quiet eye and eye 9 quietness) with brain activity (i.e., occipital alpha power) to test the visual hypothesis. For the 10 analyses involving the quiet eye, we correlated QE<sub>pre</sub> with pre-backswing initiation occipital alpha power (i.e., in the six time intervals from -3 to 0 s), and QE<sub>post</sub> with post-backswing initiation occipital 11 12 alpha power (i.e., in the two time intervals from 0 to 1 s). For the analyses involving eye quietness, we 13 correlated HEOG-SD and occipital alpha power in each of the eight time intervals from -3 to +1 s. In addition, we evaluated the specificity of any effect to the alpha band by conducting further analyses 14 on activity in other EEG frequencies. We examined non-alpha frequencies to evaluate the extent to 15 16 which any effect for the alpha band was unequivocally attributable to visual processing rather than 17 indicating a non-cortical phenomenon, such as elevated somatic activity.

18 **Correlates of movement duration.** We correlated ocular activity (i.e., quiet eye and eye 19 quietness) with movement duration to test the postural-kinematic hypothesis. Because it was 20 necessary to measure movement duration from the initiation of the backswing, we correlated only the 21 post-backswing initiation indices of ocular activity (i.e.,  $QE_{post}$  and HEOG-SD in the two intervals 22 from 0 to +1 s).

Correlates of performance. We correlated ocular activity (i.e., QE<sub>pre</sub>, QE<sub>post</sub>, and HEOG-SD
 in each of the eight time intervals from -3 to +1 s) with radial error to explore performance effects
 linked with gaze behaviour.

26

### 27 Quiet eye and eye quietness

28

We computed the quiet eye for two intervals: before backswing initiation (QE<sub>pre</sub>) and after

Results

backswing initiation (QE<sub>post</sub>). The threshold algorithm at 60 µV identified the following mean
durations: QE<sub>pre</sub> 928 ms (*SD* = 501, *range* = 227 to 2623) and QE<sub>post</sub> 819 ms (*SD* = 219, *range* = 367
to 1213). The main analyses reported below were conducted using the 60 µV threshold (see Measures
section above for the rationale underlying this choice). Nonetheless, there is a healthy debate among
quiet eye researchers about the appropriate choice of this threshold (i.e., visual angle), and therefore,
we have displayed the influence of threshold choice on quiet eye duration in Figure 2A, which shows
that the higher the threshold the longer the duration.

8 We analysed eye quietness (i.e., HEOG-SD) as a function of time (**Figure 3**). Smaller values 9 reflected less variability, hence greater quietness. Eye quietness was best (i.e., largest effect size) 10 described by a cubic pattern, F(1,31) = 16.84, p < .001,  $\eta_p^2 = .352$ , whereby quietness decreased until 11 -1 s, increased until +0.5 s, and finally decreased after +0.5 s. It is worth mentioning that the greatest 12 quietness was evident between 0 and +0.5 s, that is, during the execution of the swing.

To evaluate the utility of eye quietness as index of ocular activity we examined its correlation with quiet eye durations. The outcomes of trial- and participant-level correlations are reported in **Table 1**. Both types of analyses confirmed that greater eye quietness (i.e., smaller HEOG-SD) was associated with longer quiet eye durations before (i.e., in the time intervals from -1.5 to 0 s) and after (i.e., in the time intervals from 0 to +1 s) backswing initiation, with small to large effect sizes. It is noteworthy that this association held across multiple thresholds (**Figure 2B** and **2C**).

19 Correlates of occipital alpha power

Occipital alpha power averaged 157  $\mu$ V<sup>2</sup> (*SD* = 187, *range* = -59 to 693) in the 1 s prior to backswing initiation and 125  $\mu$ V<sup>2</sup> (*SD* = 158, *range* = -55 to 535) in the 1 s following backswing initiation, indicating an overall increase from the pre-cue baseline. The topography of alpha power for the 32 EEG channels is presented in the online supplemental material (**Supplement S2**).

Quiet eye. Quiet eye durations correlated negatively with occipital alpha power, with small to
large effect sizes (Table 2). More specifically, trial-level analyses revealed that longer QE<sub>pre</sub> was
associated with smaller increases in occipital alpha power from -2 to -1.5 s prior to backswing
initiation. Longer QE<sub>post</sub> was associated with smaller increases in occipital alpha power in the 1 s
following backswing initiation (i.e., approximately during swing execution). Participant-level

correlations revealed that participants who showed smaller increases in occipital alpha power from -3
 to -2.5 s and in the 1 s prior to backswing initiation were those with longer QE<sub>pre</sub>.

Eye quietness. HEOG-SD was positively correlated with occipital alpha power, with small to
large effect sizes (Table 2). More specifically, trial-level correlations revealed that greater eye
quietness (i.e., smaller HEOG-SD) was associated with smaller increases in occipital alpha power in
the 2.5 s prior to backswing initiation. Participant-level correlations confirmed the same pattern for
the 1 s following backswing initiation: participants with greater eye quietness were those with smaller
increases in occipital alpha power.

9 Alpha specificity. The exploration of other (i.e., non-alpha) frequencies revealed that the
 10 association between occipital activity and ocular activity (i.e., quiet eye and eye quietness) was part of
 11 a more general phenomenon that was not specific to alpha band activity (Figure 4).

## 12 Correlates of movement duration

Movement duration averaged 719 ms (*SD* = 174, *range* = 427 to 1057). Correlations
examined the relation between movement duration and ocular activity (i.e., quiet eye and eye
quietness) to test the postural-kinematic hypothesis. Only the indices measured after backswing
initiation were used in these analyses (i.e., QE<sub>post</sub> and HEOG-SD in the two intervals from 0 to 1 s). **Quiet eye.** Quiet eye duration was positively associated with movement duration, with

medium to large effect sizes. The trial-level analysis revealed that movement duration was positively correlated with QE<sub>post</sub>,  $\rho_M(18) = .32$ , t(31) = 4.19, p < .001. Participant-level analysis confirmed this association, revealing that participants who executed the swing more slowly were those with longer QE<sub>post</sub>,  $\rho(30) = .53$ , p = .002.

**Eye quietness.** Eye quietness was inversely associated with movement duration, with small to medium effect sizes, and only for certain time intervals. More specifically, trial-level analyses yielded a negative correlation between movement duration and HEOG-SD in the interval from 0.5 to 1 s,  $\rho_M(18) = -.18, t(31) = -3.40, p = .002$ , but not from 0 to 0.5 s,  $\rho_M(18) = -.01, t(31) = -0.18, p = .86$ . Participant-level analyses confirmed the same general pattern, albeit these were not statistically significant: participants with longer movement durations tended to show greater eye quietness (i.e., smaller HEOG-SD) from +0.5 to +1 s,  $\rho(30) = -.27, p = .15$ , but not from 0 to +0.5 s,  $\rho(30) = .01, p =$  1 .92.

## 2 Correlates of performance

3 Putting performance was assessed as radial error (M = 22.64 cm, SD = 5.47, range = 9.93 -

4 35.05). Trial- and participant-level correlations examined the relation between radial error and ocular

5 activity (i.e., quiet eye and eye quietness). These results are described below.

6	Quiet eye. Trial-level analyses revealed that radial error was not significantly correlated with
7	$QE_{pre}$ , $\rho_M(18) =02$ , $t(31) = -0.40$ , $p = .69$ , and $QE_{post}$ , $\rho_M(18) =03$ , $t(31) = -0.84$ , $p = .41$ .

8 Participant-level analyses also revealed non-significant correlations between radial error and QE<sub>pre</sub>,

9  $\rho(30) = .12, p = .51$ , and between radial error and QE<sub>post</sub>,  $\rho(30) = -.12, p = .53$ . Additional exploratory

10 analyses conducted with less stringent thresholds for scoring the quiet eye duration revealed a

11 negative and statistically significant relation between radial error and QE<sub>post</sub> duration (see Figure 2B),

12 providing some evidence that longer  $QE_{post}$  was associated with superior putting performance.

**Eye quietness.** No relation emerged between radial error and eye quietness (i.e., HEOG-SD) from -3 to + 1 s at the trial level,  $\rho$ Ms(18) = .00 to .06, ts(31) = -0.12 to 1.37, ps = .18 to 97, or at the participant level,  $\rho$ s(30) = -.07 to .09, ps = .62 to .89.

16

## Discussion

17 The goals of this study were to shed light on two putative mechanisms behind the quiet eye 18 phenomenon<sup>2</sup>. Specifically, we tested the link between ocular activity and visual processing (visual 19 hypothesis) and the link between ocular activity and movement kinematics (postural-kinematic 20 hypothesis). Our findings provided support for the postural-kinematic hypothesis and only limited 21 support for the visual hypothesis. The implications of our findings are discussed below.

- 22 Quiet eye and eye quietness
- 23

Quiet eye was scored for separate movement phases: QEpre before movement initiation and

 $^{2}$  Our study was not designed to examine the relationship between the mechanisms and performance. Given that quiet eye duration has not been linked with performance in non-expert samples (Lebeau et al., 2016), a more difficult task and a more heterogeneous sample would be required to evaluate these relationships in a golf putting task.

QE<sub>post</sub> after movement initiation. A threshold of 60 μV (3° of visual angle; Shackel, 1967) yielded a
total quiet eye duration of 1747 ms. Quiet eye durations associated with multiple thresholds and
different phases of movement are illustrated in Figure 2A. As expected, larger thresholds yielded
longer quiet eye durations, in line with the findings reported in a previous multiple-threshold EOG
study (Gallicchio et al., 2018). Moreover, these quiet eye durations are consistent with those obtained
using camera-based eye tracking in a similar sample (e.g., Walters-Symons, Wilson, & Vine, 2017).

7 Eye quietness was scored as the standard deviation of the horizontal EOG signal (HEOG-SD) 8 as a function of time relative to the initiation of movement. A polynomial trend analysis revealed a 9 cubic-shaped pattern consisting of three phases: first, increased ocular activity 1 to 2 s prior to 10 movement initiation; second, decreased ocular activity (i.e., increased eye quietness) during movement execution; and third, increased ocular activity. It is possible that the increased ocular 11 12 activity in the first and third phases is attributable to saccades directed towards the target prior to 13 swing initiation and to the ball and target following swing execution, to confirm the target location 14 and monitor the rolling ball towards the target location, respectively. Importantly, the increased eye 15 quietness around movement execution should reflect the quiet eye period. This interpretation is 16 supported by the finding that eye quietness was strongly associated with quiet eye durations around 17 movement initiation. The link between quiet eve and eve quietness was robust because (a) both trialand participant-level analyses yielded medium to large effect sizes (Table 1), (b) the effect emerged 18 19 for multiple quiet eye thresholds (Figure 2), and (c) it replicated previous findings (Gallicchio et al., 20 2018).

## 21 Visual hypothesis

Occipital alpha power was measured as percentage change from a pre-putt baseline, during which participants fixated their gaze on a cross at eye level. The finding that this change score was positive indicates an increase from baseline, which can be interpreted as a withdrawal of cortical resources away from visual processing (Romei et al., 2008, 2010; Vanni et al., 1997). In other words, the participants performed less visual processing in the moments just before, during, and just after putting the ball. This evidence is in line with Janelle et al. (2000). Taken together, these key findings undermine the visual hypothesis.

1 The co-examination of EEG and EOG revealed that occipital alpha power correlated 2 negatively with quiet eye durations (QE<sub>pre</sub> and QE<sub>post</sub>) and positively with eye quietness (HEOG-SD). 3 The size of these effects ranged from small to large (Table 2) and emerged for different quiet eye 4 thresholds (Figure 2). These results could be interpreted as suggesting that, despite the overall 5 decrease in visual processing, it decreased less for longer quiet eye durations and greater eye 6 quietness, providing some limited support for the visual hypothesis. Importantly, however, the fact 7 that these effects were not specific for time, frequency, and cortical region raises doubts about the 8 plausibility of this tentative interpretation. First, some of the significant correlations between occipital 9 alpha and both quiet eye duration and eye quietness (Table 2) emerged for time intervals that 10 preceding the onset of the quiet eye, suggesting that the alpha-gaze association is spurious rather than functional. Second, the correlations between occipital activity and gaze are not specific to the alpha 11 12 frequency band (Figure 4), suggesting the association is driven by broadband general quiescence 13 rather than alpha-related visual processing. Third, these correlations are not confined to the occipital 14 region, whereas the putting-related increase in alpha power relative to baseline is localized to the 15 occipital regions (see the online supplemental material, Supplement S2). Indeed, previous analyses on 16 this dataset, reported in Gallicchio and Ring (2018), revealed that processing resources were gated 17 towards the sensorimotor regions (and away from occipital and temporal regions), presumably reflecting increased attention to and processing of proprioceptive afference, expected to aid postural 18 19 stability. Accordingly, any interpretation of the relationship between EEG occipital alpha power and ocular activity in terms of visual processing should be treated with caution: at the moment we cannot 20 21 rule out a more parsimonious electrophysiological interpretation whereby postural-kinematic 22 quiescence influenced EEG recordings across a broad spectrum of brain waves that includes alpha and 23 across various cortical regions including the occipital one.

24 **Postural-kinematic hypothesis** 

Both measures of ocular activity (quiet eye and eye quietness) were robustly associated with movement duration. First, longer post-movement initiation quiet eye durations (i.e.,  $QE_{post}$ ) were associated with longer swing durations. This association emerged for both trial- and participant-level analyses with large effect sizes and for multiple quiet eye thresholds (**Figure 2**). Second, greater eye quietness was associated with longer swing durations. Interestingly, this association emerged only for the time interval that overlapped the moment of putter-ball impact (i.e., from +0.5 to +1 s after movement initiation) and, therefore, it indicates that a longer duration swing was associated with greater and prolonged eye quietness. These results replicate previous findings (Gallicchio et al., 2018). Taken together, they provide additional support for one key element of the postural-kinematic hypothesis, namely, that ocular quiescence during movement is associated with longer movement durations in closed-loop aiming tasks.

8 In line with the predictions of the postural-kinematic hypothesis, these analyses focused 9 exclusively on the post-movement initiation component of gaze behavior. It is noteworthy that the 10 handful of studies that have examined the separate contribution of pre- and post-movement initiation 11 quiet eye in golf putting have all attributed a greater importance to the latter (Causer et al., 2017; 12 Gallicchio et al., 2018; Klostermann et al., 2014; Vine, Lee, Moore, & Wilson, 2013; Vine, Lee, 13 Walters-Symons, & Wilson, 2015). These findings imply that previous quiet eye effects may be 14 attributable, at least in part, to the kinematics of the movement: a longer post-movement initiation 15 quiet eye is due to a longer (and smoother) movement execution.

## 16 Performance

17 Our study was designed to test the visual and postural-kinematic hypotheses by focusing on the neurophysiological and kinematic correlates of the quiet eye and eye quietness irrespective of 18 19 performance. We found that gaze behavior was not consistently associated with putting performance 20 (Figure 2). It is not possible to compare these mostly null findings with previous findings because 21 there is a conspicuous absence of results – positive, negative, and null – within non-expert samples 22 (Lebeau et al., 2016). Crucially, the inconsistent relation between gaze and performance does not 23 undermine our findings pertinent to the visual and postural-kinematic hypotheses. Separate analyses 24 conducted on the current dataset (see Gallicchio & Ring, 2018) revealed better putting performance in 25 participants who exhibited greater EEG occipital alpha power. This effect was specific to the alpha 26 frequency and the occipital region and thereby suggests that diminished visual processing aids performance. This finding is consistent with Loze, Collins, and Homes (2001) who reported that, 27 28 compared to worst performance, best performance in a pistol-shooting task was accompanied by

1 elevated occipital alpha, indicating reduced visual processing. Swing duration was not associated with 2 putting performance in the current study<sup>3</sup> whereas expert-novice differences have been reported previously (Delay et al., 1997; Gallicchio et al., 2018). It is likely that a range restriction effect 3 4 (Cohen, Cohen, Aiken, & West, 2003) reduced the estimate of the swing-performance relationship in 5 the current study because of a number of factors, including limited variability in performance scores, 6 the homogeneity of putting ability, and short (easy) putting distance. Future studies using more 7 difficult tasks and involving more diverse ability samples are needed to examine the extent to which 8 the effect of gaze behaviour on performance can be attributed to visual processing and swing duration.

# 9 Limitations

10 The present findings need to be considered in light of some potential study limitations. First, our results on quiet eye duration might be biased by the fact that, unlike camera-based eye tracking, 11 12 EOG does not provide spatial information on the gaze location. Despite observing that participants 13 kept their head above the ball during the swing we cannot confirm whether their gaze was on the 14 expected focus point (i.e., the ball) or on locations near this point (e.g., the putter head) during the 15 quiet eye period. The uncertainty of gaze location is aggravated by the fact that the equivalence of 20 16  $\mu$ V on the horizontal EOG signal with 1° of visual angle is more of a guideline than an exact 17 mathematical law (Shackel, 1967). With this in mind, we recommend that researchers co-record EOG with camera-based eye tracking to determine which processing parameters (e.g., EOG threshold) 18 19 provide the most accurate measures of quiet eye.

Second, we could not integrate horizontal and vertical eye movements because the EOG was not spatially calibrated. While we concede that the horizontal signal is more meaningful than the vertical signal in a putting task (which is performed in the frontal plane) we recommend that future studies calibrate the EOG signal (e.g., Gonzalez et al., 2017b) to achieve a better voltage-to-visual angle mapping.

25

Third, our analyses could not determine whether the association between quiet eye and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Movement duration was not significantly associated with radial error as revealed by trial-level analyses,  $\rho M(18) = -.03$ , t(31) = -0.86, p = .40 and participant-level analyses,  $\rho(30) = -.05$ , p = .80.

1 activity in the visual regions of the brain was due to fixation on the critical focus location (i.e., the 2 ball) or just a general ocular quiescence. To answer this question, future research should examine 3 occipital alpha while individuals are instructed to fixate the critical focus location or an irrelevant spot 4 nearby this location (cf. Lee, 2015; Williams, 2016). Connected to this point, future research should 5 consider recording the EEG from a larger set of electrodes to distinguish activity from primary versus 6 secondary visual regions of the brain. This point stems from an alternative interpretation of our 7 findings: the increase in occipital alpha relative to resting baseline does not dismiss the visual 8 hypothesis entirely. It is possible that this increase reflects diminished processing of task-irrelevant 9 visual information, hence a sharpened visual focus on task-relevant visual information (i.e., the ball in 10 golf putting).

Fourth, this study does not provide a comprehensive test of the postural-kinematic hypothesis.
Future studies interested in this mechanism should assess movement smoothness and postural stability
by recording, respectively, multi-axis movement acceleration (e.g., Cooke et al., 2014; Moore et al.,
2012) and body sway (e.g., Hurrion, 2009) in relation to quiet eye duration.

Finally, by focusing on the association between ocular activity and visual processing / movement kinematics, our study tested only one path of the triadic model described by the visual and postural-kinematic hypotheses: we did not examine the role of visual processing or movement kinematics in the relation between quiet eye and performance. With the basic understanding accrued so far, future research is now well-equipped to address causality in the proposed mechanisms by employing experimental manipulations, diverse samples, difficult tasks, and process analyses.

21

### Conclusion

Our study demonstrates the utility of adopting psychophysiological methods in quiet eye research. We anticipate valuable developments in the mechanistic understanding of this phenomenon as quiet eye researchers incorporate this methodology to study eye movements together with the activity of multiple other biological systems. Furthermore, the use of EOG opens new avenues for novel training programmes based on real-time eye quietness biofeedback. Our findings imply that the quiet eye may be indicative of a quiet body (cf. Obrist, Webb, & Sutterer, 1969) and question the role played by visual attention before and during movement execution in golf putting. It is entirely 1 plausible that attention to visual information plays an important role at an earlier stage of movement 2 planning – the so-called "green reading" in golf – where individuals make perceptual judgments on 3 spatial features of the target scene (e.g., distance, slope) to calibrate movement parameters, such as 4 force and direction (Carey, Jackson, Fairweather, Causer, & Williams, 2017). It is likely that 5 individuals internalize these parameters into an action plan and maintain it in working memory before 6 and during movement execution. Obviously, these ideas need to be addressed by future research. 7 Finally, we foresee that a multi-method approach, such as the one that we advocate, will allow research teams to confirm the mechanism(s) underlying the quiet eye phenomenon as we approach the 8 9 end of the third decade since its discovery.

## 1 References

2	Acuña, O. V., Aqueveque, P., & Pino, E. J. (2014, August). Eye-tracking capabilities of low-cost
3	EOG system. In Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC), 2014 36th Annual
4	International Conference of the IEEE (pp. 610-613). IEEE.
5	https://doi.org/10.1109/EMBC.2014.6943665
6	Bulling, A., Ward, J. A., Gellersen, H., & Troster, G. (2011). Eye movement analysis for activity
7	recognition using electrooculography. IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine
8	intelligence, 33(4), 741-753. https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2010.86
9	Carey, L. M., Jackson, R. C., Fairweather, M. M., Causer, J., & Williams, A. M. (2017). Perceptual-
10	cognitive expertise in golf putting. In M. Toms (Eds.), Routledge International Handbook of
11	<i>Golf Science</i> (pp. 173–182).
12	Causer, J. (2016). The future of quiet eye research—Comment on Vickers. Current Issues in Sport
13	Science, 1, 1-4. https://doi.org/10.15203/CISS_2016.103
14	Causer, J., Hayes, S. J., Hooper, J. M., & Bennett, S. J. (2017). Quiet eye facilitates sensorimotor
15	preprograming and online control of precision aiming in golf putting. Cognitive processing,
16	18(1), 47-54. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-016-0783-4
17	Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. Psychological Bulletin, 112, 155-159.
18	http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155
19	Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). Applied multiple regression/correlation
20	analysis for the behavioral sciences (3rd Ed). NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate.
21	Cooke, A. (2013). Readying the head and steadying the heart: A review of cortical and cardiac studies
22	of preparation for action in sport. International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 6,
23	122-138. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2012.724438
24	Cooke, A., Kavussanu, M., Gallicchio, G., Willoughby, A., McIntyre, D., & Ring, C. (2014).
25	Preparation for action: Psychophysiological activity preceding a motor skill as a function of
26	expertise, performance outcome, and psychological pressure. Psychophysiology, 51(4), 374-
27	384. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.12182</u>
28	Corbetta, M., & Shulman, G. L. (2002). Control of goal-directed and stimulus-driven attention in the

1	brain. <i>Nature reviews neuroscience</i> , 3(3), 201. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn755</u>
2	Cousineau, D. (2005). Confidence intervals in within-subject designs: A simpler solution to Loftus
3	and Masson's method. Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology, 1, 42-45.
4	https://doi.org/10.20982/tqmp.01.1.p042
5	Delay, D., Nougier, V., Orliaguet, J., & Coello, Y. (1997). Movement control in golf putting. Human
6	Movement Science, 16, 597-619. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-9457(97)00008-0</u>
7	Gallicchio, G., Cooke, A., & Ring, C. (2017). Practice makes efficient: Cortical alpha oscillations are
8	associated with improved golf putting performance. Sport, Exercise & Performance
9	Psychology, 6(1), 89–102. https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000077
10	Gallicchio, G., Cooke, A., & Ring, C. (2018). Assessing ocular activity during performance of motor
11	skills using electrooculography. Psychophysiology, 55(7), 1-12.
12	https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.13070
13	Gallicchio, G., & Ring, C. (2018). Don't look, don't think, just do it! Towards an understanding of
14	alpha gating in a discrete aiming task. Psychophysiology, e13298.
15	https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.13298
16	Gallicchio, G., Finkenzeller, T., Sattlecker, G., Lindinger, S., & Hoedlmoser, K. (2016). Shooting
17	under cardiovascular load: Electroencephalographic activity in preparation for biathlon
18	shooting. International Journal of Psychophysiology, 109, 92-99.
19	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2016.09.004
20	Gonzalez, C. C., Causer, J., Miall, R. C., Grey, M. J., Humphreys, G., & Williams, A. M. (2017a).
21	Identifying the causal mechanisms of the quiet eye. European Journal of Sport Science,
22	17(1), 74-84. https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2015.1075595
23	Gonzalez, C. C., Causer, J., Grey, M. J., Humphreys, G. W., Miall, R. C., & Williams, A. M. (2017b).
24	Exploring the quiet eye in archery using field-and laboratory-based tasks. Experimental brain
25	research, 235(9), 2843-2855. https://dx.doi.org/10.1007%2Fs00221-017-4988-2
26	Goodale, M. A., & Milner, A. D. (1992). Separate visual pathways for perception and action. Trends
27	in neurosciences, 15(1), 20-25. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-2236(92)90344-8</u>
28	Hatfield, B. D., Haufler, A. J., Hung, T. M., & Spalding, T. W. (2004). Electroencephalographic

1	studies of skilled psychomotor performance. Journal of Clinical Neurophysiology, 21, 144-					
2	156. http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00004691-200405000-00003					
3	Hayes, A. F. (2018) Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis. A					
4	regression-based approach (2nd Ed.). NY: Guilford Press.					
5	Hurrion, P. (2009). A biomechanical investigation into weight distribution and kinematic parameters					
6	during the putting stroke. International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 4, 89-102.					
7	https://doi.org/10.1260/174795409789577489					
8	Janelle, C. M., Hillman, C. H., Apparies, R. J., Murray, N. P., Meili, L., Fallon, E. A., & Hatfield, B.					
9	D. (2000). Expertise differences in cortical activation and gaze behavior during rifle shooting.					
10	Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 22(2), 167-182.					
11	https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.22.2.167					
12	Jasper, H. H. (1958). The ten-twenty electrode system of the International Federation.					
13	Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology, 17, 37–46.					
14	Juhola, M. (1991). Median filtering is appropriate to signals of saccadic eye movements. Computers					
15	in biology and medicine, 21(1-2), 43-49. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-4825(91)90034-7</u>					
16	Klostermann, A., Kredel, R., & Hossner, E. J. (2014). On the interaction of attentional focus and gaze:					
17	the quiet eye inhibits focus-related performance decrements. Journal of Sport and Exercise					
18	Psychology, 36(4), 392-400. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2013-0273					
19	Lebeau, J. C., Liu, S., Sáenz-Moncaleano, C., Sanduvete-Chaves, S., Chacón-Moscoso, S., Becker, B.					
20	J., & Tenenbaum, G. (2016). Quiet eye and performance in sport: A meta-analysis. Journal of					
21	Sport and Exercise Psychology, 38(5), 441–457. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2015-0123					
22	Lee, D. H. (2015). The role of the quiet eye in golf putting (Doctoral dissertation thesis). Retrieved					
23	from Open Research Exeter ( <u>http://hdl.handle.net/10871/17707</u> )					
24	Loze, G. M., Collins, D., & Holmes, P. S. (2001). Pre-shot EEG alpha-power reactivity during expert					
25	air-pistol shooting: a comparison of best and worst shots. Journal of sports sciences, 19(9),					
26	727-733. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410152475856					
27	Mann, D. T., Coombes, S. A., Mousseau, M. B., & Janelle, C. M. (2011). Quiet eye and the					
28	Bereitschaftspotential: Visuomotor mechanisms of expert motor performance. Cognitive					

1	Processing, 12(3), 223-234. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-011-0398-8
2	Mann, D. T., Williams, A. M., Ward, P., & Janelle, C. M. (2007). Perceptual-cognitive expertise in
3	sport: A meta-analysis. Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 29(4), 457-478.
4	https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.29.4.457
5	Makeig, S., Bell, A. J., Jung, T. P., & Sejnowski, T. J. (1996). Independent component analysis of
6	electroencephalographic data. In D. Touretzky, M. Mozer, & M. Hasselmo (Eds.), Advances
7	in neural information processing systems (Vol. 8, pp. 145–151). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
8	Marmor, M. F., Brigell, M. G., McCulloch, D. L., Westall, C. A., Bach, M., & International Society
9	for Clinical Electrophysiology of Vision. (2011). ISCEV standard for clinical
10	electrooculography (2010 update). Documenta Ophthalmologica, 122(1), 1-7.
11	https://doi.org/10.1007/s10633-011-9259-0
12	McLaughlin, P., Best, R., & Carlson, J. (2008). Movement of the centre of pressure (COP) in the
13	putting stroke. In D. Crews & R. Lutz (Eds.) Science and golf V: Proceedings of the World
14	Scientific Congress of Golf (pp. 239-244). Meza, AZ: Energy in Motion.
15	Moore, L. J., Vine, S. J., Cooke, A., Ring, C., & Wilson, M. R. (2012). Quiet eye training expedites
16	motor learning and aids performance under heightened anxiety: The roles of response
17	programming and external attention. Psychophysiology, 49(7), 1005-1015.
18	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.2012.01379.x
19	Obrist, P. A., Webb, R. A., & Sutterer, J. R. (1969). Heart rate and somatic changes during aversive
20	conditioning and a simple reaction time task. Psychophysiology, 5(6), 696-723.
21	http://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1111/j.1469-8986.1969.tb02872.x
22	Pfurtscheller, G., & Da Silva, F. L. (1999). Event-related EEG/MEG synchronization and
23	desynchronization: basic principles. Clinical neurophysiology, 110(11), 1842-1857.
24	https://doi.org/10.1016/S1388-2457(99)00141-8
25	Posner, M. I. (1980). Orienting of attention. Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 32(1), 3-
26	25, https://doi.org/10.1080/00335558008248231
27	Richardson, A. K., Hughes, G., & Mitchell, A. C. S. (2012). Center of pressure excursion during the
28	golf putting stroke in low, mid and high handicap golfers. International Journal of Golf

1

Science, 1(2), 127-139. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijgs.1.2.127

- Rienhoff, R., Tirp, J., Strauß, B., Baker, J., & Schorer, J. (2016). The 'quiet eye' and motor
  performance: A systematic review based on Newell's constraints-led model. *Sports Medicine*,
  46(4), 589–603. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-015-0442-4
- 5 Romei, V., Gross, J., & Thut, G. (2010). On the role of prestimulus alpha rhythms over occipito-
- 6 parietal areas in visual input regulation: correlation or causation? *Journal of Neuroscience*,
- 7 *30*(25), 8692-8697. <u>https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0160-10.2010</u>
- 8 Romei, V., Rihs, T., Brodbeck, V., & Thut, G. (2008). Resting electroencephalogram alpha-power
- 9 over posterior sites indexes baseline visual cortex excitability. *Neuroreport*, *19*(2), 203-208.
- 10 <u>https://doi.org/10.1097/WNR.0b013e3282f454c4</u>
- 11 Shackel, B. (1967). Eye movement recording by electro-oculography. In P. H. Venables, & I. Martin
- 12 (Eds.), *A manual of psychophysiological methods*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: North-Holland.
- Sim, M., & Kim, J. U. (2010). Differences between experts and novices in kinematics and accuracy of
   golf putting. *Human Movement Science*, 29, 932–946.
- 15 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2010.07.014
- Vanni, S., Revonsuo, A., & Hari, R. (1997). Modulation of the parieto-occipital alpha rhythm during
- 17 object detection. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *17*(18), 7141-7147.
- 18 <u>https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.17-18-07141.1997</u>
- 19 Vickers, J. N. (1996). Visual control when aiming at a far target. *Journal of Experimental*
- 20 *Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 22(2), 342–354.
- 21 <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.22.2.342</u>
- 22 Vickers, J. N. (2007). Perception, cognition, and decision training: The quiet eye in action.
- 23 Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- 24 Vickers, J. N. (2012). Neuroscience of the quiet eye in golf putting. *International Journal of Golf*
- 25 *Science*, *1*(1), 2-9. <u>https://doi.org/10.1123/ijgs.1.1.2</u>
- Vine, S. J., Lee, D., Moore, L. J., & Wilson, M. R. (2013). Quiet eye and choking: Online control
- 27 breaks down at the point of performance failure. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*,
- 28 45(10), 1988–1994. <u>https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e31829406c7</u>

1	Vine, S. J., Lee, D. H., Walters-Symons, R., & Wilson, M. R. (2015). An occlusion paradigm to
2	assess the importance of the timing of the quiet eye fixation. European Journal of Sport
3	Science, 17(1), 85-92. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17461391.2015.1073363
4	Walters-Symons, R. M., Wilson, M. R., & Vine, S. J. (2017). The quiet eye supports error recovery in
5	golf putting. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 31, 21-27.
6	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.03.012
7	Williams, A. M., Singer, R. N., & Frehlich, S. G. (2002). Quiet eye duration, expertise, and task
8	complexity in near and far aiming tasks. Journal of Motor Behavior, 34(2), 197-207.
9	https://doi.org/10.1080/00222890209601941
10	Williams, A. M. (2016). Quiet eye vs. noisy brain: The eye like the brain is always active—Comment
11	on Vickers. Current Issues in Sport Science, 1, 1-3. https://doi.org/10.15203/CISS_2016.116
12	Wilson, M. R., Causer, J., & Vickers, J. N. (2015). Aiming for excellence. In J. Baker, & D. Farrow
13	(Eds.), Routledge handbook of sport expertise. New York, NY: Routledge.
14	Wilson, M. R., & Pearcy, R. C. (2009). Visuomotor control of straight and breaking golf putts.
15	Perceptual and Motor Skills, 109(2), 555-562. https://doi.org/10.2466%2Fpms.109.2.555-562
16	Wilson, M. R., Wood, G. W., & Vine, S. J. (2016). Say it quietly, but we still do not know how quiet
17	eye training works—Comment on Vickers. Current Issues in Sport Science, 1, 1–3.

18 <u>https://doi.org/10.15203/CISS\_2016.117</u>

Table 1. Trial-level analyses (i.e., average Spearman's ρ and *t* values) and participant-level
 analyses (i.e., Spearman's ρ) of the relation between quiet eye durations (QE<sub>pre</sub> and QE<sub>post</sub>) and eye

3 quietness (HEOG-SD) in 8 0.5 time intervals from -3 to +1 s (0 s = backswing initiation).

4

	QEpre			QEpost			
Time	ρ <sub>M</sub> (18)	<i>t</i> (31)	ρ(30)	ρ <sub>M</sub> (18)	<i>t</i> (31)	ρ(30)	
-3 to -2.5 s	08	-1.86†	00				
-2.5 to -2 s	.01	0.16	06				
-2 to -1.5 s	02	-0.29	26				
-1.5 to -1 s	12	-2.48*	25				
-1 to -0.5 s	30	-5.85***	42*				
-0.5 to 0 s	31	-4.34***	42*				
0 to +0.5 s				09	-2.15*	29	
+0.5 to +1 s				03	-0.71	40*	

<sup>5</sup> Note. Only relevant comparisons are reported: QE<sub>pre</sub> with pre-movement initiation HEOG-SD (i.e., 6

6 intervals from -3 to 0 s) and  $QE_{post}$  with post-movement initiation HEOG-SD (i.e., 2 intervals from 0

7 to +1 s).

8  $\dagger < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001$ 

**Table 2.** Correlations between ocular activity ( $QE_{pre}$ ,  $QE_{post}$ , and HEOG-SD) and occipital alpha power in 8 0.5 time intervals from -3 to +1 s (0 s = backswing initiation). Spearman's  $\rho$  is reported for the participant-level correlations. Average  $\rho$  and *t* values are reported for the withinparticipant correlations.

4

QEpre			QE <sub>post</sub>			HEOG-SD			
Time	ρ <sub>M</sub> (18)	<i>t</i> (31)	ρ(30)	ρ <sub>M</sub> (18)	<i>t</i> (31)	ρ(30)	ρ <sub>M</sub> (18)	<i>t</i> (31)	ρ(30)
-3 to -2.5 s	.00	0.02	37*				0.04	0.76	.04
-2.5 to -2 s	.04	0.84	27				0.11	2.61*	.09
-2 to -1.5 s	09	-2.24*	28				0.13	3.04**	.21
-1.5 to -1 s	03	-0.82	29				0.12	2.47*	.07
-1 to -0.5 s	08	-1.58	44*				0.12	2.37*	.32†
-0.5 to 0 s	09	-1.54	51**				0.09	1.67	.47**
0 to +0.5 s				14	-3.38**	10	0.05	1.04	.36*
+0.5 to +1 s				08	-2.21*	28	0.08	1.84	.42*

5 Note. Only relevant comparisons are reported: QE<sub>pre</sub> with pre-movement initiation occipital alpha power (i.e., 6 intervals from -3 to 0 s) and QE<sub>post</sub>

6 with post-movement initiation occipital alpha power (i.e., 2 intervals from 0 to +1 s).

7  $\ddagger < .10, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001$ 

#### **1** Figure captions.

2

26

**Figure 1.** Voltage of the horizontal EOG channel as a function of time (0 s = backswing3 4 initiation) for selected putts. Increases and decreases in signal amplitude indicate saccades to the left and 5 right, respectively, whereas a flat signal indicates absence of eye saccades (i.e., fixations). For each 6 waveform, the grey line represents the original signal (low-pass filtered at 30 Hz); the black line 7 represents the same signal after median filtering; orange and blue portions represent respectively QEpre 8 and  $QE_{post}$  durations identified with the 60  $\mu$ V threshold; the red vertical line indicates putter-ball impact. 9 10 **Figure 2.** Effect of threshold (5-150  $\mu$ V) on quiet eye durations (s) in the 'pre' and 'post' phases 11 (panel A). Trial-level (panel B) and participant-level (panel C) analyses exploring the relation between 12 quiet eye (s) and eye quietness (%), occipital alpha power (%), movement duration (s), and radial error 13 (cm), as a function of thresholds ( $\mu$ V). Only relevant associations were tested (e.g., pre-movement 14 initiation quiet eye duration with occipital alpha in the 1 s preceding movement initiation). The 15 association between quiet eye and movement durations were conducted only for the post-movement 16 initiation component of the quiet eye, in line with the predictions of the postural-kinematic hypothesis. 17 18 Figure 3. Eye quietness (HEOG-SD) as percentage change from the baseline (i.e., cross-trial 19 average activity in the 2 s prior to the onset of the acoustic tone) as a function of time (i.e., 0.5-s non-20 overlapping intervals from -3 to +1 s; 0 s = movement initiation). Smaller values indicate less variability 21 on the horizontal plane hence greater eye quietness. Error bars indicate within-participant SE computed 22 through normalization of the outcome factor (Cousineau, 2005) 23 24 Figure 4. Trial-level (panel A) and participant-level (panel B) analyses exploring the relation 25 between EEG power (%) in the 1 s preceding (-1 to 0 s) and following (0 to +1 s) backswing initiation

and either quiet eye (s) or eye quietness (%), as a function of frequency (Hz).













1 Figure 4

