

1 **The contribution of coping related variables and cardiac vagal activity on prone rifle shooting**
2 **performance under pressure**

3

4 **Emma Mosley ^{1,2*}, Sylvain Laborde ^{3,4}, Emma Kavanagh ²**

5 ¹ Southampton Solent University, Southampton, UK

6 ² Bournemouth University, Bournemouth, UK

7 ³ German Sport University, Cologne, Germany

8 ⁴ University of Caen, Caen, France

9

10

11

*Corresponding author:

12

Present Address: Southampton Solent University, East Park Terrace, Southampton, UK, SO14 0YN

13

Email: emma.mosley@solent.ac.uk

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 **Abstract**

2 The aims of this study were to assess the predictive role of coping related variables (CRV) on cardiac
3 vagal activity (derived from heart rate variability), and to investigate the influence of CRV (and
4 cardiac vagal activity) on prone rifle shooting performance under low pressure (LP) and high pressure
5 (HP) conditions. Participants ($n = 38$) competed in a shooting task under LP and HP. Cardiac vagal
6 activity measurements were taken at baseline, task and recovery for 5 minutes, alongside ratings of
7 stress via a visual analogue scale. Upon task conclusion, self-report measures of motivation, stress
8 appraisal, attention, perceived pressure and trait CRV questionnaires (Decision Specific Reinvestment
9 Scale, Movement Specific Reinvestment Scale and Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire) were
10 completed. Results indicated that task cardiac vagal activity was predicted by resting cardiac vagal
11 activity and self-control, in HP and LP. Post task cardiac vagal activity was predicted by resting
12 cardiac vagal activity in both conditions with the addition of a trait and state CRV in HP. Cardiac
13 vagal reactivity, the change from resting to task, was predicted by resting cardiac vagal activity and
14 self-control in LP and HP. Cardiac vagal recovery, the change from task to post task, was predicted by
15 a trait CRV in HP. Shooting performance was predicted by experience and cardiac vagal activity in
16 LP and cardiac vagal activity and a trait in HP. Findings suggest both CRV and cardiac vagal activity
17 influence cardiac vagal activity throughout a pressure task. Additionally, shooting performance
18 directly influences cardiac vagal recovery.

19 **Keywords:** Psychophysiology, cardiac vagal activity, pressure, self-regulation, shooting

20

21

22

23

24

1 **1. Introduction**

2 It is well established that an individuals' performance during aiming tasks such as dart throwing, golf
3 putting and shooting can suffer from a decrease in performance under pressure (Oudejans, Binch, &
4 Bakker, 2013; Nibbeling, Oudejans, & Daanen, 2012; Schucker, Hagemann, & Strauss, 2013;
5 Williams & Cummings, 2012). In particular, shooting is of interest as individuals performing the skill
6 have to shoot with speed and accuracy under pressure for example, athletes, police and army samples
7 (Landman, Oudejans, & Nieuwenhuys, 2015; Thompson, Swain, Branch, Spina, & Grieco, 2015;
8 Brisinda, Venuti, Cataldi, Efremov, Intorno, & Fenici, 2014; Vickers & Lewinski, 2012; Vickers &
9 Williams, 2012; Causer, Bennett, Holmes, Janelle, & Williams, 2010; Ouedjans, 2008; Konttinen,
10 Lyytinen & Viitasolo, 1998). Athletic shooting differs from firearms based shooting regarding the
11 origin of pressure, as firearms professionals have to face life threatening scenarios (Vickers &
12 Lewinski, 2012) whereas in athletic shooting, pressure mainly stems from performance. Shooting can
13 be described as a "sport of the mind" due to its heavy reliance on mental skills (Coleman, 1980). The
14 majority of studies demonstrate that pressure can affect different mechanisms involved in shooting
15 such as gaze (Vickers & Williams, 2012; Vickers & Lewinski, 2012), cardiac activity (Thompson et
16 al., 2015; Brisinda et al., 2014), psychomotor regulation (Konttinen et al., 1998) and gun motion
17 (Causer et al., 2010); which ultimately may result in altered shooting performance. Furthermore, the
18 individual characteristics of the shooter can affect performance under pressure, for example level of
19 expertise (Landman et al., 2015; Vickers & Lewinski, 2012), state anxiety (Causer et al., 2010) and
20 personality traits (Landman et al., 2015). Shooting performance under pressure can also be positively
21 affected by level of experience (Vickers & Lewinski, 2012) or previous training under pressure
22 (Nieuwenhuys & Oudejans, 2011). Pressure can have many effects on individual shooting
23 performance. Recently research has started to examine a range of coping related variables
24 simultaneously in order to further understand performance under pressure (Mosley, Laborde, &
25 Kavanagh, 2017; Laborde et al., 2015). These coping related variables include trait emotional
26 intelligence (Laborde, Brull, Webber, & Anders, 2011), reinvestment (Laborde et al., 2014), challenge
27 and threat appraisal (Laborde, Lautenbach, & Allen, 2015), and cardiac vagal activity (Mosley et al.,

1 2017; Laborde et al., 2015; Laborde, Furley, & Schempp, 2015). Thus, investigating variables that
2 exist within different scientific domains that directly focus on the personal characteristics of the
3 shooter may prove valuable in order to better understand shooting performance under pressure.
4 Subsequently, the purpose of the study was twofold, 1) to examine the effects of coping related
5 variables (trait emotional intelligence, reinvestment, appraisals, and cardiac vagal activity) on cardiac
6 vagal activity under pressure and 2) to examine the effects of cardiac vagal activity and subjective
7 coping related variables (trait emotional intelligence, reinvestment, and appraisals) on athletic
8 shooting performance.

9 Cardiac Activity and Shooting

10 Within shooting research, heart rate is often a focus due to the stationary nature of the sport, if
11 examining stationary target shooting, making it a closed skill when performed indoors. Given there is
12 almost no movement when performing the skill, heart rate is not considered to be influenced by
13 movement but mainly psychological processes due to autonomic nervous control (Levenson, 2014). It
14 has been demonstrated that higher heart rate and blood pressure may impair shooting performance
15 (Fenici, Ruggieri, Brisinda, & Penici, 1999) and slower deceleration of heart rate before shooting was
16 linked to optimal shooting performance (Bertollo et al., 2012). However, studies only assessing heart
17 rate cannot directly inform researchers about psychophysiological reactions to pressure. This is
18 because heart rate alone is influenced by many factors (Levenson, 2014) and does not provide
19 information about autonomic flexibility, which can represent higher order controls such as regulated
20 emotional responding (Applehans & Lueken, 2006). One measure that enables researchers to
21 understand how an athlete reacts to stress (Laborde et al., 2011), regulates emotion (Thayer, Ahs,
22 Fredrikson, Sollers, & Wager, 2012) and performs under pressure (Laborde et al., 2015) is cardiac
23 vagal activity.

24 Cardiac vagal activity represents the contribution of the parasympathetic nervous system to cardiac
25 function (Laborde et al., 2017) and is a measure derived from heart rate variability (HRV); the change
26 in the time interval between successive heart beats (Camm et al., 1996; Akselrod, Gordon, Ubel,
27 Shannon, Barger, & Cohen, 1981). Cardiac vagal activity can index the efficiency of the central-
28 peripheral neural feedback mechanisms, as postulated by the neurovisceral integration model (Thayer,

1 Hansen, Saus-Rose, & Johnsen, 2009). This means that it may serve as a measure of an individual's
2 ability to self-regulate through the organisation of physiological resources and response selection
3 when in a changing environment (Thayer & Lane, 2000). Higher levels of cardiac vagal activity are
4 suggested to be beneficial as the individual has greater behavioural flexibility and adaptability,
5 whereas lower levels are suggested to be detrimental to adaptation in changing environments (Thayer
6 et al., 2009). Cardiac vagal activity can be measured at different time points, which are called tonic
7 measurements, taken over a period of time to provide an average cardiac vagal activity measurement
8 (Laborde et al., 2017). Laborde and colleagues (2017) suggest that this is taken at three stages: rest,
9 task, and post-task which directly reflects the three R's of cardiac vagal activity functioning: resting,
10 reactivity, and recovery.

11 Tonic measures are deemed to be important particularly at rest as it is theorised that higher levels of
12 resting cardiac vagal activity are more beneficial for stress management and emotional regulation
13 (Thayer et al., 2009). Therefore, it is predicted that tonic task and post-task cardiac vagal activity
14 variables will be positively related to resting cardiac vagal activity due to its role in effective self-
15 regulation. It is important to consider that in order to determine the adaptation of the system when
16 demand is placed upon it, tonic measurements alone are not sufficient (Thayer et al., 2012).
17 Therefore, it is important to consider the change between tonic measurements which is known as
18 phasic cardiac vagal activity. Phasic cardiac vagal activity can be split into two variables, reactivity
19 and recovery. Cardiac vagal reactivity is the change from the resting state to the onset of a task (Park,
20 Vasey, Van Bavel, & Thayer, 2014). Cardiac vagal recovery is from the removal or end of the task to
21 the post-task state (Laborde et al., 2017). By assessing phasic cardiac vagal activity, we can
22 understand how the individual is regulating themselves under pressure. Importantly, tonic and phasic
23 levels may influence each other, as higher levels of tonic cardiac vagal activity at rest have been
24 found to positively influence phasic cardiac vagal reactivity (Park et al., 2014). This can be explained
25 because tonic cardiac vagal activity allows for better self-regulation in stressful situations (Thayer et
26 al., 2009).

27 Cardiac vagal activity and shooting

1 It is important to consider the role of cardiac vagal activity in differing tasks and situational demands.
2 When tasks involve executive functioning a smaller vagal withdrawal is seen to be effective but if
3 there is more metabolic demand a larger vagal withdrawal is seen to be effective (Thayer et al., 2009).
4 Cardiac vagal activity has rarely been assessed within shooting performance and it is important to
5 understand how cardiac vagal activity may influence shooting performance. Brisinda and colleagues
6 (2015) assessed live cardiac vagal activity reactions of police officers at rest and during simulated
7 medium stress and high stress scenarios. They did not find any significant results when comparing
8 rest and medium stress scenarios. However, they did note an increase in cardiac vagal activity
9 (through high frequency heart rate variability) in high stress scenarios when compared with medium
10 stress scenarios. This was linked to a potential “shut off” of the sympathetic system and increase in
11 vagal activity when faced with short term life threatening danger (Fenici, Brisinda, & Sorbo, 2011),
12 which could potentially be linked to effective self-regulation under stress (Thayer et al., 2009). A
13 similar study by Thompson and colleagues (2015) found that participants who had a smaller reduction
14 in cardiac vagal reactivity (from baseline to task) performed better, one element of better performance
15 was taking less time to complete the shooting task. Most recently a study by Gross, Hall, Bringer,
16 Cook, Killduff, and Shearer (2017) assessed the use of HRV biofeedback training in an elite shooting
17 athlete. Cardiac vagal activity was manipulated during competition through slow paced breathing and
18 was linked to subjective feelings of optimal performance (Gross et al., 2017). Based on the current
19 theory surrounding self-regulation (Thayer et al., 2009) and previous empirical results (Thompson et
20 al., 2015) it is predicted that a smaller reduction of cardiac vagal activity during the shooting task will
21 be beneficial to shooting performance.

22 In sum, there have been limited efforts to examine the role cardiac vagal activity plays in
23 shooting performance. There have been some insightful results, although the validity of some of the
24 findings could be questioned due to the measures of HRV used (Thompson et al., 2015). Moreover,
25 the focus seems to be surrounding firearms based shooting, such as police and army samples, while
26 athletic shooting performance has currently received less attention. This study aimed to address this
27 gap, considering athletic shooting performance in relation with cardiac vagal activity, based on clear
28 psychophysiological theory, namely the neurovisceral integration model (Thayer et al., 2009). In

1 addition to physiological measures such as cardiac vagal activity, it is important to consider the role of
2 other psychological coping related variables that may have an influence on shooting performance,
3 such as personality.

4 Trait Coping Related Variables and Shooting Performance

5 Personality traits are deemed to be stable over time and may directly influence performance under
6 pressure (Mosley & Laborde, 2016). Shooting athletes are said to have differing personality traits
7 according to discipline (Coleman, 1980) and more recently officers under pressure who were called to
8 more violent situations scored higher in sensitivity to threat (Landman et al., 2015). In the interest of
9 psychophysiology, it is already known that other personality traits can affect cardiac reactions under
10 stress such as reinvestment and trait emotional intelligence (Mosley & Laborde, 2015; Laborde et al.,
11 2015; Laborde et al., 2014), therefore those traits will be investigated in the current study.

12 Reinvestment is defined as the “manipulation of conscious, explicit, rule based knowledge, by
13 working memory, to control the mechanics of one's movements during motor output” (Masters &
14 Maxwell 2004, p. 208). Reinvestment has been shown to influence performance under pressure
15 through two facets: movement (Masters & Maxwell, 2008) and decision (Kinrade, Jackson, Ashford,
16 & Bishop, 2010). Studies have shown that higher levels of movement reinvestment have a negative
17 effect on performance under pressure due to their propensity to consciously control previously learnt
18 skills when placed under pressure (Jackson, Ashford, & Norsworthy, 2006; Otten, 2009). In a similar
19 vein, decision reinvestment is defined as overthinking, through consciously controlling thoughts
20 and/or ruminative thoughts, which is caused by high levels of cognitive effort that negatively affects
21 performance (Kinrade et al., 2010). This has been shown in a decision making task (Laborde et al.,
22 2014) and a simulated basketball task (Kinrade, Jackson, & Ashford, 2015). Decision reinvestment
23 has also been linked to cardiac vagal activity and those higher in the trait suffer larger declines in
24 cardiac vagal activity when under pressure (Laborde, Raab, & Kinrade, 2014). Therefore, it is
25 predicted that decision reinvestment will have a negative influence on cardiac vagal activity during
26 the task.

27 Another trait associated with performance under pressure is trait emotional intelligence,
28 which represents a constellation of emotional perceptions (Petrides, Pita, and Koka, 2007). Trait

1 emotional intelligence has shown to have facilitative effects under pressure as it can help to buffer the
2 physiological stress response (Laborde et al., 2011) and facilitate coping (Laborde et al., 2015). In
3 relation to sports performance trait emotional intelligence has shown links to performance satisfaction
4 through coping (Laborde, Dosseville, Guillen, & Chavez, 2014), more facilitative appraisals when
5 under pressure (Laborde et al., 2014), and an increased use of psychological skills to regulate emotion
6 during competition (Lane, Thelwell, Lowther, & Devenport, 2009). In relation to physiology it has
7 been found to predict cortisol secretion within a pressurised tennis serve task (Laborde et al., 2014)
8 and has been shown to be a buffer for stress reactions as indexed by HRV (Laborde et al., 2011) and
9 to positively influence resting levels of cardiac vagal activity (Laborde et al., 2015). Therefore, it is
10 predicted that higher levels of trait emotional intelligence will positively influence resting and task
11 cardiac vagal activity.

12 State coping related variables and shooting performance

13 In addition to trait variables, it is also important to understand the subjective evaluation of
14 psychological components involved with coping related variables. Specifically, we focus here on
15 challenge and threat appraisals, which have been shown to play a role within sporting performance
16 under pressure. Challenge and threat appraisals allow for an understanding of demand and resource
17 evaluations within a pressurised environment (Tomaka, Blascovitch, Kelsey, & Leitten, 1993). It has
18 been shown that challenge appraisals are associated with successful sporting performance such as
19 before a golf competition (Moore, Wilson, Vine, Coussens, & Freeman, 2013). Elite shooters were
20 more likely to have negative appraisals before or after the shooter missed a target and positive
21 appraisals followed after emotion and problem solving coping (Calmeiro, Tennenbaum, & Eccles,
22 2014). Although this study did not use the challenge and threat appraisal ratio, it still acknowledges
23 the appraisal process within elite shooters. It is predicted that challenge appraisal will positively
24 influence shooting performance.

25 The present study

26 In summary, current research shows that different coping related variables (cardiac vagal
27 activity, reinvestment, trait emotional intelligence, and challenge and threat appraisals) may influence
28 cardiac vagal activity and shooting performance under pressure. The combination of variables is still

1 relatively under researched with some studies only combining one or two variables to determine
2 performance under pressure (e.g. Laborde et al., 2015). Given no study has investigated all factors
3 together this study has two aims: 1) to examine the effects of coping related variables (cardiac vagal
4 activity, reinvestment, trait emotional intelligence, and appraisals) on cardiac vagal activity under
5 pressure and 2) to examine the effects of cardiac vagal activity and subjective coping related variables
6 (reinvestment, trait emotional intelligence, and appraisals) on athletic shooting performance. The
7 hypotheses for the current study are as follows: Hypothesis one: Task and post-task cardiac vagal
8 activity variables will be positively correlated with resting cardiac vagal activity and post-task cardiac
9 vagal activity will be positively correlated with task cardiac vagal activity. Hypothesis two: Resting
10 cardiac vagal activity will be positively related to cardiac vagal reactivity and recovery. Hypothesis
11 three: A smaller reduction of cardiac vagal activity from baseline to task will be positively associated
12 to shooting performance. Hypothesis four: Decision reinvestment will have a negative correlation
13 with cardiac vagal activity during the task. Hypothesis five: Higher levels of trait emotional
14 intelligence will be positively correlated with resting and task cardiac vagal activity. Hypothesis six:
15 Challenge appraisal will positively influence shooting performance.

16 **2. Methods**

17 **2.1. Participants**

18 38 competitive prone rifle shooters (30 male and 8 female, $M^{\text{age}}=55$ years old, $SD=14.8$) completed
19 the research task at a national competition. Shooting athletes were competing for a mean of 31.1
20 ($SD=20.5$) years' and participated at a range of levels (international=11, national=12, regional=2,
21 county=13).

22 **2.2. Research design**

23 The study used a within subject design which are highly favoured in heart rate variability research as
24 it allows for optimal experimental control, helps to reduce individual differences in respiratory rate,
25 require fewer participants and help to reduce the impact of external variables such as smoking
26 (Laborde et al., 2017; Quintana & Heathers, 2014). Within subject design can foster learning effects
27 of task and habituation of conditions (Laborde et al., 2017), however, this can be reduced through the
28 use of counterbalancing conditions (Laborde et al., 2017). In the current study participants

1 participated in the same task across two different pressure conditions, low and high, which were
2 counterbalanced.

3 **2.3. Measures**

4 **2.3.1. Personality measures**

5 The Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (TEIQue, Petrides, & Furnham, 2003) measures
6 emotional intelligence as a trait. It assesses four main factors: well-being, self-control, emotionality
7 and sociability and has 153 items. It is scored on a seven-point Likert-scale from 1 = completely
8 disagree to 7 = completely agree (Petrides & Furnham, 2003). A sample items includes “I often find it
9 difficult to recognise what emotions I’m feeling”. It was deemed a reliable scale within the current
10 study (global score $\alpha=.92$, wellbeing $\alpha=.80$, self-control $\alpha=.75$, emotionality $\alpha=.77$, sociability $\alpha=.83$).

11 The Movement-Specific Reinvestment Scale (MSRS) was used (Masters & Maxwell, 2008).
12 The MSRS is a nine-item scale and was deemed reliable in the current study ($\alpha=.87$). Items are rated
13 on a five point Likert scale which ranges from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree and a sample item
14 includes “I am always trying to think about my movements when I carry them out”.

15 The Decision-Specific Reinvestment Scale (DSRS) by Kinrade and colleagues (2010)
16 consists of 13 item measure, which was reliable in the current study ($\alpha=.84$). It is rated on a 5 point
17 Likert scale ranging from 0 not characteristic to 4 very characteristic. An example item includes “I’m
18 always trying to figure out how I make decisions”.

19 **2.3.2. Cardiac vagal activity**

20 HRV, from which cardiac vagal activity is derived, was measured using the eMotion Faros 180°
21 (Mega Electronics Ltd, Pioneerinkatu, Finland). Sampling rate was set to 500hz as this is deemed to
22 be a conservative sampling rate (Laborde et al., 2017). Three pre-lubricated disposable electrodes
23 (Ambu VLC-00-S/25, Ambu GmbH, Bad Nauheim, Germany) were placed on the body, one below
24 both left and right clavicles and one on the left side of the chest below the 12th rib.

25 **2.3.3. Perceived Stress Intensity**

1 A visual analogue scale (VAS) was used to reflect stress intensity, on which participants placed a
2 cross on a 100mm line on “how stressed they felt as the present moment” which was anchored from
3 “not at all stressed” to “extremely stressed” (Lesage, Berjot, & Deschamps, 2012).

4 **2.3.4.Cognitive Appraisal**

5 Two items from the cognitive appraisal ratio were used (Tomaka, Blascovitch, Kibler, & Ersnt, 1997).
6 Participants were asked “How demanding did you feel the task was?” and “How able were you to
7 cope with the demands of the task?” and were rated on a 6 point Likert scale rated from 1 (not at all)
8 and 6 (extremely).

9 **2.3.5.Perceived Pressure**

10 The pressure/tension subscales were utilised from the intrinsic motivation inventory (Ryan, 1982).
11 Participants rated four items such as “I felt pressured while doing the task” on a Likert scale ranging
12 from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

13 **2.3.6.Attention VAS**

14 A VAS was also used to measure the direction of attention during the task. Participants were asked to
15 place a cross on the line to determine where their attention was focused during the task. Two VAS
16 scales were used, the first was anchored by the phrases “towards the task” and “away from the task”,
17 the second was anchored by the phrases “towards self” and “away from self”, which was based on a
18 suggestion from previous research (Laborde et al., 2015).

19 **2.3.7.Motivation and effort**

20 Participants completed a single item indicating “How motivated were you to perform to your best in
21 this task?” on a 6 point Likert scale from 0 (not at all) to 5 (very much so).

22 **2.3.8.Shooting performance**

23 In order to create an appropriate task and pressure manipulations for shooting performance expert
24 opinion was sought on the development of the task. The experts were two athletes competing at
25 international level for 16 years combined and a shooting marshal who previously worked at the
26 Olympic Games. Shooting performance was measured through a simulated competition that consisted
27 of two trials of 10 shots each to be fired in a 5 minute time frame. A similar study, examining the
28 effects of pressure of gaze in biathletes, used a comparable 10 shot procedure (Vickers & Williams,

1 2007). The shooting competition was held at a national shooting centre in Bisley (England) during a
2 national rifle event. The shooting range used electronic targets which automatically calculated the
3 score and therefore shooting score is classed as the total score of the 10 shots fired.

4 **2.4. Procedures**

5 **2.4.1. Pre-testing procedures**

6 Ethical approval was granted from the university ethics board. Participants were recruited at a national
7 meeting through posters and announcements to participate in “heart rate” research that would be a
8 separate competition held at the national meeting. Participants signed up to show their interest to
9 participate at the national centre reception at which there was an information sheet participants were
10 prompted to read. The information sheet prompted participants to refrain from heavy exercise 24
11 hours before attending the testing session and to avoid consuming caffeine and food two hours before
12 the session. This is in order to avoid any confounding effects on heart rate activity during the testing
13 (Laborde et al., 2017).

14 **2.4.2. Participant preparation**

15 Upon arrival to the range all participants provided written informed consent. Participants were told to
16 set up their own shooting area, use their own gun, ammunition, and wear their normal shooting attire.
17 Participants then had the three electrodes attached and the Faros 180° device was turned on to begin
18 recording. Once the device was attached the participant was invited to lay on their shooting mat in a
19 comfortable prone position, eyes closed and hands to their sides, to take a resting HRV reading for
20 five minutes. The resting measure was taken in the prone position to ensure the baseline was the same
21 to the position in which the task was carried out (Laborde et al., 2017). After the rest-period the first
22 stress VAS was taken.

23 **2.4.3. Performance**

24 Participants were introduced to the competition structure: two trials of 5 minutes were completed in
25 which individuals had to fire 10 shots, with 2 practice shots before each trial to adjust to conditions,
26 also known as “sighters”. Before commencing the trials, pressure manipulations were introduced as
27 the competition conditions. Pressure manipulations were developed in line with Baumeisters (1984)
28 recommendations and were developed with the international shooters and marshal. To initiate the

1 start, the pressure script was handed to participants to read and the experimenter checked for
2 understanding of the competitive condition. In the low pressure condition participants were told about
3 the competition, monetary rewards for superior performance and interviews for the worst performers.
4 The participants were then instructed to start the task and were not interacted with whilst performing.
5 Once the 5 minutes had passed participants were instructed to put down their guns and make them
6 safe. They then completed a stress VAS and a 5 minute HRV measure was taken whilst prone. After
7 this they filled in a battery of subjective questionnaire (stress VAS, perceived pressure, cognitive
8 appraisal, attention direction and motivation).

9 In the high pressure condition the competitive trial remained the same (5 minutes to fire 10
10 shots), however, additional conditions were added to increase the pressure to perform well. For
11 example, any shots fired below a 7 were scored as zero and the 10th and final shot was worth double
12 points. The adjustments in shot score were not actually taken into account in the final analysis to
13 ensure the task outcome remained the same. In addition to the trial conditions the script included the
14 scores being published on a national shooting website. In addition, the performance was filmed and
15 participants were told the footage would be evaluated by national level coaches. During the task the
16 experimenter made notes and the participants were told they were looking at facial expressions, body
17 language and reactions to the task. After the second trial the participants were instructed to put down
18 their guns and make them safe, fill in a stress VAS and a 5 minute HRV post task measure was taken
19 whilst prone. Following this stage the participants filled in the battery of subjective questionnaires
20 again (as in the low pressure condition). Participants were debriefed which included sending the
21 battery of personality questionnaires (TEIQue, MSRS, DSRS) via email to be completed, they were
22 subsequently thanked for their participation.

23 **2.5. Data preparation**

24 Firstly, the challenge and threat ratio was determined by dividing demands from resources (Tomaka et
25 al., 1997) and all personality questionnaires were coded and scored accordingly. Secondly, heart rate
26 variability data were processed for artefacts. The artefact correction function of Kubios was used,
27 firstly the very low threshold was applied and data was visually inspected for artefacts that had been

1 corrected, if any. Visual inspection of artefacts is deemed important in heart rate variability research
2 to ensure they are correctly identified (Laborde et al., 2017). Secondly the low threshold was applied
3 and data was visually inspected again to ensure artefacts were correctly being identified. If artefacts
4 were highlighted and confirmed via visual inspection the artefact correction was applied at the low
5 threshold level (1%). Next, indicators of cardiac vagal activity were extracted, in this study high
6 frequency heart rate variability was used, which is between 0.15-0.4 Hz. The variable of high
7 frequency absolute power derived from the Fast Fourier Transform was used, which is deemed a
8 reliable measure for cardiac vagal activity (Laborde et al., 2017). Thirdly, data were first checked
9 visually for normality via histograms and boxplots. If any outliers existed, they were winsorized
10 (mean + 2x standard deviations). HRV variables were not normally distributed, therefore a log10
11 transform was applied, in line with procedures used in other research of this nature (Park et al., 2014).
12 After data transformation data were checked again for normality and it was ensured they had a z score
13 of between ± 2.58 (Field, 2009), all variables were considered to be normally distributed.

14 **2.6. Data analysis**

15 To ascertain whether the pressure conditions were successful, a repeated-measures MANOVA was
16 used with condition (low pressure vs. high pressure) set as the within subject factor and the subjective
17 stress variables (Stress VAS after the task, pressure and tension subscales) as dependent variables. A
18 pressure effect would be noted by higher ratings of stress after the task, higher ratings of pressure and
19 lower ratings of relaxation in the high pressure condition when compared to the low pressure
20 condition. To explore the contribution of coping related variables to cardiac vagal activity (resting,
21 task, post task, reactivity and recovery) bivariate correlations were run followed by hierarchical
22 stepwise linear regression analyses. Using a hierarchical regression the following were entered as
23 dependant variables 1) resting, task, post task, reactivity, and recovery cardiac vagal activity, as well
24 as 2) shooting performance under pressure. The first block included age, gender, shooting level, and
25 experience, which allowed the researchers to control covariates. The second block was used to
26 explore the contribution of coping related variables (reinvestment, trait emotional intelligence and,
27 challenge and threat ratio) to cardiac vagal activity and the contribution of the coping related variables
28 and cardiac vagal activity to shooting performance under pressure. When assessing any phasic

1 variables, or when phasic variables were used as a predictor resting cardiac vagal activity was also
2 controlled for in the first block of the hierarchical regression.

3 **2.7. Preliminary checks**

4 In order to ensure all participants were motivated to compete in both conditions, a one item measure
5 asked “How motivated were you to perform to your best in this task?” on a 6 point Likert scale from 0
6 (not at all) to 5 (very much so). The participants appeared to be motivated in both the low pressure
7 condition (M=4.15, SD=0.82) and the high pressure condition (M=4.21, SD=0.81). A paired sample t-
8 test confirmed there was no difference between motivation in both conditions $t(37)=.627, p=.534, d =$
9 0.101 . Breathing rate was also checked across conditions as many shooting athletes control their
10 breathing when they shoot (Gross et al., 2017). This was to ensure participants did not change their
11 breathing patterns across conditions which is important for two reasons. Firstly, slow paced breathing
12 can directly affect cardiac vagal activity and secondly, there should be no differences in respiratory
13 frequency between experimental tasks when drawing conclusions from cardiac vagal activity
14 (Laborde et al., 2017). To do this the electrocardiogram derived respiration variable was obtained
15 post-hoc from Kubios. This variable estimates respiratory frequency from the R-wave amplitudes
16 which are known to change under chest movements related to respiration (Tarvainen, Niskanen,
17 Lipponen, Ranta-aho, & Karjalainen, 2014). Therefore, an estimate of average respiratory rate across
18 the task was compared across both low and high pressure conditions. A paired sample t-test confirmed
19 there was no difference between breathing rate in both conditions $t(37)=-1.578, p=.123, d = -0.255$.
20 Lastly in order to account for type one errors, the Benjamini-Hochberg correction (Benjamini &
21 Hochberg, 1995) was applied to the correlations in the current study (Tables 2 and 3). For both high
22 and low pressure correlations, the false discovery rate was set to .15.

23 **3. Results**

24 Firstly, descriptive statistics are reported in table 1 then correlation matrixes of all study variables are
25 presented in table’s 2 and 3.

26 **3.1. Descriptive statistics**

27 Below are the descriptive statistics for the study.

1 Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

	M	SD				
Age	55	14.8				
<i>Trait Variables</i>						
DSRS	1.81	1.43				
MSRS	2.26	1.36				
Trait EI - Well-Being	5.28	1.31				
Trait EI - Self-Control	5.42	.88				
Trait EI - Emotionality	2.47	1.03				
Trait EI - Sociability	5.05	.98				
Trait EI - Global Score	4.50	1.65				
<i>Performance Variables</i>						
	<i>High Pressure</i>			<i>Low Pressure</i>		
	M	SD	M	SD		
Shooting Score	96.26	4.24	97.18	3.36		
Attention Towards Task	18.05	22.63	19.00	23.02		
Attention Towards Self	45.47	32.51	45.00	32.90		
Perceived Demands	3.10	1.35	2.86	1.61		
Perceived Resources	4.78	.90	4.57	1.34		
Demand/Resource Ratio	.69	.37	.71	.54		
Perceived Stress Post Task	34.15	17.82	31.89	20.77		
Perceived Pressure Post Task	3.57	1.82	3.57	1.76		
Perceived Anxiousness Post Task	2.81	1.6	3.1	1.59		
Motivation to Compete	4.21	.81	4.15	.82		
<i>Cardiac Variables</i>						
	<i>High Pressure</i>			<i>Low Pressure</i>		
	M	SD	Range	M	SD	Range
Resting CVA (LT)	2.53	.61	2.18	2.53	.61	2.18
Task CVA (LT)	2.53	.60	2.7	2.51	.62	2.54
Post task CVA (LT)	2.58	.71	2.95	2.42	.68	2.89
Reactivity CVA (LT)	-.006	.66	2.93	-.02	.61	2.23
Recovery CVA (LT)	.05	.71	2.97	-.09	.60	2.81
Resting CVA (Raw)	749.64	907.41	2807.13	749.64	907.41	2807.13
Task CVA (Raw)	645.06	712.74	2622.29	645.76	726.18	2644.60
Post task (Raw)	823.22	1020.99	3968.15	592.57	780.41	2764.17
Reactivity (Raw)	-104.57	913.54	4991.54	-103.87	779.71	4004.28
Recovery (Raw)	178.16	931.54	4612.88	-53.19	648.15	3534.51

Note: DSRS = Decision reinvestment total score; MSRS = Movement reinvestment total score; Trait emotional intelligence = Trait Emotional Intelligence; CVA = Cardiac Vagal Reactivity (High frequency absolute power obtained through the Fast Fourier Transform); LT= Log transformed cardiac vagal activity; Raw = Cardiac variables pre log transform, ms².

2
3

Table 2: Correlation Matrix for Low Pressure Conditions

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. DSRS	-														
2. MSRS	.23	-													
3. Trait EI - Well-Being	-.27	-.07	-												
4. Trait EI - Self-Control	.08	-.02	.19	-											
5. Trait EI - Emotionality	.09	.02	-.10	-.60**	-										
6. Trait EI - Sociability	-.03	-.13	.15	.59**	-.47**	-									
7. Trait EI - Global Score	.15	.15	-.08	-.22	.23	-.05	-								
8. Attention Towards Task	.28	-.17	.08	.35	-.22	.36*	.00	-							
9. Attention Towards Self	-.16	-.04	-.18	.28	-.28	.24	-.37*	.33	-						
10. Demand/Resource Ratio	.07	-.24	-.44**	-.06	.04	.11	-.07	.03	-.00	-					
11. Resting CVA	.16	.05	-.12	.07	-.06	-.15	-.04	-.10	.14	-.10	-				
12. Task CVA	.13	.07	-.04	.46**	-.41**	.27	-.07	.12	-.00	-.11	.50**	-			
13. Post task CVA	.21	.09	.04	.24	-.20	.18	-.11	.09	.14	-.20	.62**	.56**	-		
14. Reactivity CVA	-.02	.02	.07	.39*	-.34	.42**	-.02	.23	-.14	-.11	-.49**	.50**	-.04	-	
15. Recovery CVA	.10	.03	.09	-.20	.19	-.06	-.05	-.02	.17	-.10	.18	-.38*	.54**	-.56**	-
16. Shooting Score	.02	.15	.16	-.03	-.14	-.13	.06	.22	.16	-.37*	.20	.02	.39*	-.17	.42**

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Note: DSRS = Decision reinvestment total score; MSRS = Movement reinvestment total score; Trait emotional intelligence = Trait Emotional Intelligence; CVA = Cardiac Vagal Reactivity (High frequency absolute power)

Table 3: Correlation Matrix for High Pressure Condition

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. DSRS	-														
2. MSRS	.23	-													
3. Trait EI - Well-Being	-.27	-.07	-												
4. Trait EI - Self-Control	.08	-.02	.19	-											
5. Trait EI - Emotionality	.09	.02	-.10	-.60**	-										
6. Trait EI - Sociability	-.03	-.13	.15	.59**	-.47**	-									
7. Trait EI - Global Score	.15	.15	-.08	-.22	.23	-.05	-								
8. Attention Towards Task	.12	-.19	.03	.01	.02	-.06	-.08	-							
9. Attention Towards Self	-.17	-.11	-.26	.22	-.21	.26	-.44**	.34	-						
10. Demand/Resource Ratio	.13	-.20	-.39*	-.14	.06	-.17	.04	.15	-.03	-					
11. Resting CVA	.16	.05	-.12	.07	-.06	-.15	-.04	.20	.19	-.06	-				
12. Task CVA	-.08	.08	-.05	.45**	-.41**	.31	-.20	.06	.11	-.02	.39*	-			
13. Post task CVA	.25	.24	.06	.21	-.08	.23	.20	-.00	-.14	-.17	.53**	.42**	-		
14. Reactivity CVA	-.22	.03	.06	.34	-.31	.43**	-.13	-.13	-.07	.04	-.56**	.53**	-.11	-	
15. Recovery CVA	.32	.16	.10	-.17	.26	-.03	.37*	-.06	-.24	-.16	.20	-.41**	.64**	-.56**	-
16. Shooting Score	.21	.04	.14	.12	-.18	.04	.07	.20	-.02	-.19	.15	-.12	.33	-.28	.43**

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Note: DSRS = Decision reinvestment total score; MSRS = Movement reinvestment total score; Trait emotional intelligence = Trait Emotional Intelligence; CVA = Cardiac Vagal Reactivity (High frequency absolute power)

1 **3.2. Pressure manipulation checks**

2 The MANOVA showed a significant main effect for condition $F(3, 34) = 3.0001$, $p = .032$,
3 $\eta^2 = .26$. However, follow up ANOVA's did not show significant differences in the ratings. This was
4 further investigated in separate paired samples t-tests to firstly compare subjective stress between
5 baseline and task and secondly to compare subjective stress between baseline and recovery. There was
6 a significant difference between subjective stress at baseline and task in both low $t(37) = -6.169$,
7 $p < .001$, $d = -1.001$ and high pressure conditions $t(37) = -8.024$, $p < .001$, $d = -1.302$. In addition, there
8 was a significant difference between subjective stress at baseline and recovery in the high pressure
9 condition only $t(37) = -2.111$, $p = .042$, $d = -0.343$, suggesting participants found the high pressure
10 condition subjectively harder to recover from.

11 **3.3. The predictive ability of coping-related variables to cardiac vagal activity in low** 12 **pressure**

13 Correlations between all variables are reported in Table 2. As study variables were intercorrelated a
14 series of hierarchical stepwise regressions were performed, the first block was to control for age and
15 gender and the second block was to identify salient predictors (Table 4). Across all step one
16 regressions age and gender had no effect on cardiac vagal activity. Each regression specifies the
17 predictor variables that were entered at each point. For resting cardiac vagal activity all trait variables
18 were entered at step two and no predictors were found. For task cardiac vagal activity all trait, state
19 and resting cardiac vagal activity were entered at step two. The first factor extracted was the level of
20 cardiac vagal activity at rest (adjusted $R^2 = .23$, $p = .001$). The second factor extracted was trait
21 emotional intelligence self-control (adjusted $R^2 = .17$, $p < .001$). The two factors together predicted
22 40% of the variance in cardiac vagal activity at task. For post task all trait, state and resting and task
23 cardiac vagal activity variables were entered at step two. The first factor extracted was cardiac vagal
24 activity at rest (adjusted $R^2 = .36$, $p < .001$). The second factor extracted was cardiac vagal activity at
25 task (adjusted $R^2 = .08$, $p < .001$). Taken together the two factors combined explained 44% of the total
26 residual variance. For cardiac vagal reactivity, trait and state variables and resting cardiac vagal
27 activity were entered at step two. Other cardiac vagal activity variables were excluded at this stage as

1 reactivity is derived from the tonic cardiac vagal activity variables. The first predictor extracted was
 2 resting cardiac vagal activity (adjusted $R^2 = .21$, $p < .001$), the second predictor extracted was Trait
 3 emotional intelligence self-control (adjusted $R^2 = .18$, $p = .002$). Both predictors together accounted
 4 for 39% of the variance in cardiac vagal reactivity. For cardiac vagal recovery trait and state variables
 5 were entered at step two and other cardiac vagal activity variables were excluded at this stage as
 6 recovery is derived from the tonic cardiac vagal activity variables. There were no predictors for
 7 recovery.

8 Table 4 - Multiple (stepwise) Regressions for Cardiac vagal activity in Low Pressure

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	<i>t</i>
	B	Std Error	β	
Task CVA				
1 Resting CVA	.50	.14	.50	3.47*
2 Resting CVA	.47	.12	.46	3.67*
Trait EI Self-control	.30	.08	.43	3.37*
Post task CVA				
1 Resting CVA	.68	.14	.62	4.73**
2 Resting CVA	.49	.15	.44	3.15*
Task CVA	.37	.15	.34	2.42*
Reactivity CVA				
1 Resting CVA	-.49	.14	-.49	-3.37*
2 Resting CVA	-.52	.12	-.49	-3.37**
Trait EI Self-control	.30	.08	.43	3.36*
Shooting Score				
1 Level of experience	-.94	.42	-.34	-2.23*
2 Level of experience	-.90	.39	-.33	-2.30*
Post Task CVA	1.88	.71	.38	2.63*

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$
 Note: CVA = Cardiac Vagal Activity, Trait emotional intelligence = Trait Emotional Intelligence
 If regressions had no predictors they were excluded from the table.

9
 10 **3.4. The predictive ability of coping-related variables to cardiac vagal activity in high**
 11 **pressure**

12 Correlations between all variables are reported in Table 3 As study variables were intercorrelated a
 13 series of hierarchical stepwise regressions were performed: the first block was to control for age and
 14 gender and the second block was to identify salient predictors (Table 5). Across all regressions age
 15 and gender had no covariate effect on cardiac vagal activity. Each regression specifies the predictor
 16 variables that were entered at each point. For resting cardiac vagal activity all trait variables were
 17 entered and no predictors were found. For task cardiac vagal activity all trait, state and resting cardiac
 18 vagal activity variables were entered at this stage. The first factor extracted was trait emotional

1 intelligence self-control (adjusted $R^2 = .18$, $p = .004$). The second factor extracted was the level of
 2 cardiac vagal activity at rest (adjusted $R^2 = .12$, $p = .001$). For post task cardiac vagal activity trait,
 3 state and resting and task cardiac vagal activity variables were entered. The first factor extracted was
 4 resting cardiac vagal activity (adjusted $R^2 = .27$, $p < .001$). The second factor extracted was trait
 5 emotional intelligence sociability (adjusted $R^2 = .08$, $p < .001$). The third and final factor extracted
 6 was attention towards the self (adjusted $R^2 = .13$, $p < .001$). Taken together the three factors combined
 7 explained 48% of the total residual variance in post task cardiac vagal activity. For cardiac vagal
 8 reactivity trait, state variables and resting cardiac vagal activity were entered at this stage, other
 9 cardiac vagal activity variables were excluded at this stage, as reactivity is derived from the tonic
 10 cardiac vagal activity variables. For cardiac vagal reactivity the first factor extracted was resting
 11 cardiac vagal activity (adjusted $R^2 = .29$, $p < .001$), the second factor extracted was trait emotional
 12 intelligence self-control (adjusted $R^2 = .14$, $p < .001$). Taken together these variables accounted for
 13 43% of the variance in cardiac vagal reactivity. For cardiac vagal recovery trait, state variables and
 14 resting cardiac vagal activity were entered at this stage, other cardiac vagal activity variables were
 15 excluded at this stage, as reactivity is derived from the tonic cardiac vagal activity variables. The first
 16 and only factor to be extracted from the model was decision reinvestment (adjusted $R^2 = .08$, $p =$
 17 $.045$).

18 Table 5 - Multiple (stepwise) Regressions for Cardiac vagal activity in High Pressure

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	<i>t</i>
	B	Std Error	β	
Task CVA				
1 Trait EI Self-control	.31	.10	.45	3.10*
2 Trait EI Self-control	.29	.09	.43	3.13*
Resting CVA	.35	.13	.36	2.63*
Post task CVA				
1 Resting CVA	.62	.16	.53	3.83**
2 Resting CVA	.68	.15	.58	4.41**
Trait EI Sociability	.23	.09	.32	2.41*
3 Resting CVA	.79	.14	.68	5.53**
Trait EI Sociability	.31	.09	.43	3.49*
Attention towards self	-.00	.00	-.39	-3.09*
Reactivity CVA				
1 Resting CVA	-.61	.15	-.56	-4.08**
2 Resting CVA	-.64	.13	-.59	-4.79**

Trait EI Self-control	.29	.09	.38	3.14*
Recovery CVA				
1 DSRS	.16	.07	.32	-2.08*
Shooting Score				
1 Recovery CVA	2.59	.89	.43	2.89*
2 Recovery CVA	3.10	.88	.52	3.50*
Trait EI Emotionality	-1.31	.61	-.32	-2.15*

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$
Note: CVA = Cardiac Vagal activity, DSRS = Decision reinvestment score, Trait EI = Trait Emotional Intelligence
If regressions had no predictors they were excluded from the table.

3.5. The predictive ability of coping-related variables and cardiac vagal activity on shooting performance in both low and high conditions

For performance, hierarchical stepwise regressions were performed, the first block was to control for age, shooting experience and shooting level and the second block was to identify salient predictors of shooting performance. Across all step one regressions age, experience and shooting level had no effect on shooting performance in the task. For performance prediction all trait, state and cardiac vagal activity variables were entered at this stage, regressions can be found in tables 4 and 5. The first regression performed was for shooting score in the low pressure. The first factor extracted was level of experience (adjusted $R^2 = .09$, $p = .032$), the second factor was post task cardiac vagal activity (adjusted $R^2 = .13$, $p = .013$). Both predictors together accounted for 22% of the variance in low pressure shooting score. The second regression performed was for shooting score in the high pressure condition. The first factor extracted was cardiac vagal recovery (adjusted $R^2 = .16$, $p = .006$), the second factor extracted was trait emotional intelligence emotionality (adjusted $R^2 = .08$, $p = .003$). Both together accounted for 24% of the variance in shooting score in the high pressure condition.

4. Discussion

The aim of this study was twofold: 1) to examine the effects of coping related variables (cardiac vagal activity, reinvestment, trait emotional intelligence, and appraisals) on cardiac vagal activity under pressure and 2) to examine the effects of cardiac vagal activity and subjective coping related variables (reinvestment, trait emotional intelligence, and appraisals) on athletic shooting performance. Findings will be discussed firstly in line with the predictors of cardiac vagal activity followed by the predictors of shooting performance.

4.1. Resting Cardiac Vagal Activity

1 Hypothesis five, predicting that trait emotional intelligence would be positively associated with
2 resting cardiac vagal activity, was not supported. In both low pressure and high pressure conditions
3 trait emotional intelligence global score and factors did not emerge as predictors for resting cardiac
4 vagal activity. This prediction was based on previous research where trait emotional intelligence
5 predicted resting cardiac vagal activity, in particular the subscale of wellbeing (Laborde et al., 2015).
6 In contrast, other research exploring similar aims found no association with trait emotional
7 intelligence and resting cardiac vagal activity (Mosley et al., 2017; Laborde et al., 2011).

8 **4.2. Task Cardiac Vagal Activity**

9 In both the low and high pressure conditions trait emotional intelligence self-control and resting
10 cardiac vagal activity predicted task vagal activity, this supports hypothesis five and hypothesis
11 one. Shooters who had higher resting cardiac vagal activity had higher levels of cardiac vagal activity
12 during the shooting task. High levels of cardiac vagal activity at rest positively influences adaptive
13 emotional responding (Thayer et al., 2009; Ruiz-Padial, Sollers, Vila, and Thayer, 2003) and positive
14 behavioural responses during tasks (Hansen, Johnsen, & Thayer, 2003), which is supported by
15 previous research (Mosley et al., 2017; Park et al., 2014). Based on this, it could be suggested that
16 individuals with higher resting cardiac vagal activity are better able to meet the demands of the task
17 by successfully regulating themselves in stressful situations. This is directly complemented by the
18 other predictor trait emotional intelligence self-control, which will be referred to as self-control from
19 this point forward. Self-control is defined as the ability to regulate emotions, impulses and manage
20 external pressure and stress (Petrides & Furnham, 2003). This may suggest individuals with greater
21 self-control are better able to regulate themselves under stress, subsequently leading to higher cardiac
22 vagal activity during stressful tasks. It has been shown that higher levels of cardiac vagal activity are
23 linked to better emotional regulation (Park et al., 2014) which can be directly linked to the emotion
24 regulation component of self-control (Petrides & Furnham, 2003). In addition, this further supports
25 the notion that cardiac vagal activity is an index for self-regulation (Park et al., 2014; Thayer et al.,
26 2012). An interesting point to note is the amount of influence in the low and high pressure conditions.
27 In the high pressure condition self-control was the first predictor and in the low pressure condition it
28 was the second. This may suggest that in high pressure conditions the trait of self-control may have a

1 stronger influence on task cardiac vagal activity over resting levels of cardiac vagal activity. This
2 could be supported by Landman and colleagues finding (2015) that self-control strength predicted
3 perceived anxiety in the high pressure condition of a police shooting task. Higher anxiety was
4 predicted by lower levels of self-control (Landman et al., 2015), therefore this may be directly
5 associated with poorer self-regulation and reduced levels of cardiac vagal activity (Thayer et al.,
6 2012).

7 **4.3. Post Task Cardiac Vagal Activity**

8 Hypothesis one predicted that resting cardiac vagal activity would positively influence task cardiac
9 vagal activity and this was supported. In the low pressure condition post task cardiac vagal activity
10 was predicted by resting and task cardiac vagal activity. An organism's recovery demonstrates the
11 ability to face a stressful event and then return efficiently to resting level (Stanley, Peake, & Buchheit,
12 2013). These findings suggest higher levels of cardiac vagal activity at baseline fosters more effective
13 recovery due to a greater initial capability to uptake self-regulation resources.

14 In the high pressure condition resting cardiac vagal activity was the first predictor.
15 Additionally, trait emotional intelligence sociability and attention towards the self came out as
16 predictors for post task cardiac vagal activity. Trait emotional intelligence sociability is defined as the
17 ability to influence other decisions and emotions and also the capability to assert oneself (Petrides &
18 Furnham, 2003). It could be suggested that individuals higher in sociability were better able to assert
19 themselves in the high pressure condition where they had negative social influences i.e. the
20 experimenter making notes and element of social evaluation. It has been suggested assertiveness and
21 control over one's environment can be linked to stress resistance (Wallston, Wallston, Smith, &
22 Dobbins, 1987), however this finding should be explored further. The final predictor was attention
23 towards the self. The more the individual focussed away from themselves, perhaps towards irrelevant
24 cue such as competitors or distractions, the lower the levels of post task cardiac vagal activity. The
25 more attention paid towards the self promoted high levels of post task cardiac vagal activity. It may be
26 that individuals who focussed on themselves made resources available to cognitively reflect on the
27 task rather than sending energy to the body (Segerstrom & Nes, 2007), as during this time point the
28 athlete would no longer be exerting physical effort in the task.

1 **4.4. Cardiac Vagal Reactivity and Recovery**

2 Hypothesis one was partially supported in that resting cardiac vagal activity predicted reactivity in the
3 low and high pressure condition. However, the relationship between resting and reactivity was
4 negative, in that the higher the resting levels the greater the drop from rest to task. It is important to
5 note that the type of task that is being completed does not solely rely on executive function (Thayer et
6 al., 2009) and therefore a withdrawal may be seen as adaptive and that this pattern is seen to be
7 adaptive in prone rifle shooters. Interestingly self-control was seen to enhance cardiac vagal activity
8 under pressure. This could imply that a large vagal withdrawal at the start of a competition allows
9 shooters to meet the demands of the task. Following this, those high in self-control are able to enhance
10 cardiac vagal activity after the initial onset of stress – which may subsequently lead to a better
11 recovery. However, this needs further investigation and perhaps a detailed breakdown of the stages of
12 competition, or shot by shot analysis.

13 Cardiac vagal recovery in the high pressure condition was predicted by decision reinvestment.
14 The higher the level of reinvestment, the better the recovery from a stressful event. This finding does
15 not support hypothesis four and contradicts the predictions of the trait, particularly as decision
16 rumination that promotes the individual to think back to decisions they have made (Kinrade et al.,
17 2010), which may be a process in recovery from stress. One explanation could be that as the stressor
18 was removed at the point of recovery which prompted a relief, those higher in decision reinvestment
19 display a higher cardiac vagal recovery level. It has been suggested that relief is linked to a decrease
20 in sympathetic vascular influences and decreased breathing rates (Kreibig, 2010). It is well known
21 that slowing breathing can positively influence cardiac vagal activity levels (Leher et al., 2013) and
22 this breathing pattern is promoted by relief when the threat of danger is removed (Vlemincx, van
23 Diest, Bressesleers, Bogaerts, Fannes, Wan, & van den Bergh, 2009). Consequently, more research
24 into this finding is needed to shed light on the association of cardiac vagal recovery and decision
25 reinvestment.

26 **4.5. Shooting Performance**

27 For shooting performance it was predicted that a smaller reduction of cardiac vagal activity during the
28 task will positively influence shooting performance (hypothesis three), which was partially supported.

1 In the low pressure condition firstly level of experience came out as the first predictor. This finding
2 suggested that the more experience the shooter has the better their performance, which is supported by
3 previous research (Vickers & Lewinski, 2012). The secondary predictor of shooting performance in
4 the low pressure condition was post task cardiac vagal activity. Better shooting performance promoted
5 a higher level of post task cardiac vagal activity in recovery. A similar finding was discovered in the
6 high pressure condition as the first predictor extracted was cardiac vagal recovery. The larger the
7 decrease in cardiac vagal activity from task to post task the poorer the shooting performance was.
8 Therefore, in both low and high pressure conditions the performance outcome from the shooting task
9 directly influenced cardiac vagal activity after the task.

10 Previous research has supported the link between cardiac activity and shooting performance
11 in elite pistol shooters (Bertollo et al., 2012), although Bertollo and colleagues examined individual
12 shot performance rather than total score. They found that higher heart rate and slower deceleration
13 occurred before moderate to poor shots and lower heart rate and earlier deceleration occurred before
14 optimal shots (Bertollo et al., 2012). Although Bertollo and colleagues (2012) did not assess cardiac
15 vagal activity or cardiac reactions during recovery, it demonstrates that poor shooting performance is
16 directly linked to higher heart rate and optimal shooting performance is linked to slow and stable heart
17 rate prior to performance. It could be suggested that optimal shooting performance prompts slower
18 heart rate and thus increased cardiac vagal activity, which subsequently leads to better cardiac vagal
19 recovery post shooting performance. It has also been noted that elevated high heart rates impair
20 shooting performance (Vickers & Williams, 2007; Fenichi et al., 1999), which could lead to a poorer
21 cardiac vagal recovery.

22 There has been very limited research surrounding cardiac vagal recovery and shooting
23 performance, however recovery seems an important aspect in shooting sports. In shooting
24 competitions athletes fire up to 60 shots which requires mental regulation throughout (Bortoli,
25 Bertollo, Hanin, & Robazza, 2012; Prapavessiss, Grove, McNair, & Cable, 1992). Some of this
26 regulation may come after negative experiences such as missed shots (Gross et al., 2017), which could
27 be considered as part of the recovery process as it is an effort to return to resting level (Stanley et al.,
28 2013). In addition, an observation from the time spent at the shooting range by the primary researcher

1 was that many shooters take rest during competition to break up 60 shot matches. It may be that this
2 time could be used more wisely by shooting athletes, particularly for those who have not performed
3 well. Practitioners working within shooting sports should uncover what athletes do during recovery
4 time to make it most beneficial to performance.

5 The secondary predictor of shooting score in the high pressure condition was trait emotional
6 intelligence – emotionality. The findings suggested that those lower in emotionality had a better score
7 in the high pressure condition. Typically, it is expected that higher emotionality would promote better
8 performance due to the nature of the trait in recognising ones' emotions (Petrides, 2009). However, it
9 may be that in shooters the ability to ignore or be unaware of your emotional state during high
10 pressure competitions may be more beneficial. This may also link to other findings linked to trait
11 emotional intelligence in this study as self-control played a role at various points. Therefore, it may be
12 that training shooters in self-control is more vital to performance than emotionality, however this
13 would need to be investigated further.

14 **4.6. Limitations**

15 There are some limitations that need to be considered in light of the current study. Firstly, the pressure
16 manipulations may have not been fully effective in creating a high and low pressure condition. One
17 reason for this may be that although shooters were aware of the extra pressure (i.e. making notes,
18 being filmed), because of the safety of live firing ranges these had to be performed in the peripheries
19 of the athletes. Some athletes also wear caps to block out external stimuli so this could have stopped
20 them from being exposed to the high pressure manipulations, although they were still psychologically
21 aware of them. This is a limitation of collecting data in ecologically valid settings, however in future
22 other shooting or aiming tasks could be assessed to allow for full pressure manipulation to be carried
23 out (i.e. Turner, Jones, Sheffield, Slater, Barker, & Bell, 2013).

24 Sample size was a limitation within the current study. Given the nature of opportunistic and
25 purposive sampling of the study being held at a national shooting competition, it was difficult to
26 ascertain a large sample. Therefore, we used a posteriori analysis to calculate the minimum effect size
27 that can be reliably detected with the current sample size, which was $f^2 = .47$. A further limitation
28 could be the attrition of sample based on the personality scores being taken afterwards. In future

1 research participants should answer personality questionnaires straight away in order to avoid sample
2 size being affected. In line sampling the sample had a range of level of competitors and year's
3 experiences and it has been shown in other research that experience plays a role in shooting
4 performance under pressure (Vickers & Lewinski, 2012). In the current study this was controlled for
5 in the analysis and was not found to affect the results, however future studies may wish to look solely
6 at one shooting level.

7 Another consideration is that shooting sports naturally lend themselves to controlling breathing
8 whilst performing the skill and controlled breathing is noted to have an influence over heart rate
9 variability measurements (Malik, 1996; Berntson et al., 1997). In the current study a post-hoc analysis
10 was used to control for breathing influences on heart rate variability measurement during the task and
11 this method has been highlighted to have limitations (Laborde et al., 2017; Quintana & Heathers,
12 2014). The breathing measure was also an average respiratory rate during the task and would not have
13 accounted for the changes in respiratory frequency across the course of the task. Future studies should
14 look to use more advanced methods of assessing breathing during the task, such as using a strain
15 gauge, which measures inhalation and exhalation via thorax dilation (Quintana & Heathers, 2014).
16 This would allow respiration patterns of inhalation and exhalation to be identified across the course of
17 competition. Ultimately this would increase reliability of the results and to better understanding the
18 influence of breathing on heart rate variability measurement (Laborde et al., 2017). In addition to
19 breathing, body mass index has been shown to affect heart rate variability measurements (Yi, Lee,
20 Shin, Kim, & Ki, 2012). This variable was not assessed in the current study and should be
21 systematically assessed in future research to avoid confounding effects.

22 **5. Conclusion**

23 To conclude, this study has furthered the knowledge surrounding the contribution of coping related
24 variables to cardiac vagal activity across a pressured situation. At the theoretical level, we have
25 strengthened the link between resting cardiac vagal activity and other tonic points (task and post task)
26 throughout stressful tasks. This further affirms the link between resting cardiac vagal activity and self-
27 regulation in situations requiring stress management and emotional regulation (Thayer et al., 2009). In

1 addition we noted a relationship between self-control and task cardiac vagal activity in both low and
2 high pressure conditions. It may be an interesting avenue to explore training self-control, as it has
3 been shown that trait emotional intelligence can be trained (Campo, Laborde, & Mosley, 2016), to see
4 if this can assist those with poor self-regulation under pressure. We also showed that cardiac vagal
5 activity was directly linked to shooting performance. Specifically better post task and recovery levels
6 were associated with better shooting performance. Not only does this strengthen the need to assess
7 the three R's of cardiac vagal activity (Laborde et al., 2017), it shows that cardiac vagal activity has a
8 larger influence on performance than subjective coping related variables. This indicates the
9 importance of using physiological and psychological measures in order to gain a holistic view of
10 performance and should be used in future pressure research.

11 At the applied level findings show the importance of understanding what athletes do during
12 recovery periods after both successful and unsuccessful performances in sports that have changes in
13 momentum. Consultants should consider measuring cardiac vagal activity across a competitive event
14 to map changes over the whole 60 shot period. This will enable practitioners to implement suitable
15 interventions for effective recovery periods in shooting competition. This may also be paired with
16 training self-control as it had a beneficial effect on task cardiac vagal activity. The enhancement of
17 both self-control and task cardiac vagal activity may further support an athlete's ability to self-
18 regulate under pressure.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 References

- 2 Appelhans, B. M. and Luecken, L. J., (2006). Heart rate variability as an index of regulated emotional responding. *Review of*
3 *General Psychology*, 10 (3), 229-240.
- 4 Akselrod, S., Gordon, D., Ubel, A.F., Shannon, D.C., Barger, A.C., & Cohen, R.J., (1981). Power spectrum analysis of heart
5 rate fluctuation: A quantitative probe of beat-to-beat cardiovascular control. *Science*, 213, 220-222.
- 6 Baumeister, R. F. (1984). Choking under pressure: Self-consciousness and paradoxical effects of incentives on skilful
7 performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(3), 610-620. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.46.3.610
- 8 Benjamini, Y., & Y. Hochberg., (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple
9 testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 57, 289-300.
- 10 Bertollo, M., Robazza, C., Falasca, N., Stocchi, M., Babiloni, C., Del Percio, C., Comani, S. (2012). Temporal pattern of
11 pre-shooting psycho-physiological states in elite athletes: A probabilistic approach. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 13(2),
12 91-98.
- 13 Bortoli, L., Bertollo, M., Hanin, Y., & Robazza, C. (2012). Striving for excellence: A multi-action plan intervention model
14 for Shooters. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 13(5), 693–701.
- 15 Brisinda, D., Venuti, A., Cataldi, C., Efremov, K., Intorno, E. and Fenici, R., (2014). Real-time imaging of stress-induced
16 cardiac autonomic adaptation during realistic force-on-force police scenarios. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*,
17 30 (2), 71-86.
- 18 Camm, J.A., Malik, M., Bigger, J.T., Breithardt, G., Cerutti, S., Cohen, R.J., Coumel, P., Fallen, E.L., Kennedy, H.L.,
19 Kleiger, R.E., Lombardi, F., Malliani, A., Moss, A.J., Rottman, J.N., Schmidt, G., Schwartz, P.J., Singer, D.H., (1996). Heart
20 rate variability: Standards of measurement, physiological interpretation and clinical use. *Circulation*, 93, 1043-1065.
- 21 Campo, M., Laborde, S., & Mosley, E. (2016). Emotional Intelligence Training in Team Sports. *Journal of Individual*
22 *Differences*, 37(3), 152-158. doi:10.1027/1614-0001/a000201
- 23 Calmeiro, L., Tenenbaum, G. and Eccles, D. W., (2014). Managing pressure: patterns of appraisals and coping strategies of
24 non-elite and elite athletes during competition. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 32 (19), 1813-1820.
- 25 Causer, J., Bennett, S. J., Holmes, P. S., Janelle, C. M. and Williams, A. M., (2010). Quiet eye duration and gun motion in
26 elite shotgun shooting. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 42 (8), 1599-1608 1510p.
- 27 Fenici, R., Brisinda, D., Sorbo, A.R., (2011) Methods for real-time assessment of operational stress during realistic police
28 tactical training. In: Kitaëff J (ed) Handbook of Police Psychology. Routledge, New York, pp 295–319
- 29 Fenici, R., Ruggieri, M. P., Brisinda, D. and Penici, P., (1999). Cardiovascular adaptation during action pistol shooting. /
30 Adaptation cardiovasculaire lors d ' un tir au pistolet. *Journal of Sports Medicine & Physical Fitness*, 39 (3), 259-266.
- 31 Field, A. (2009). Discovering statistics using SPSS. London: Sage.
- 32 Gross, M. J., Hall, R., Bringer, J. D., Cook, C. J., Killduff, L., & Shearer, D. (2017). Resonant frequency training in elite
33 sport: A case study example. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action*, 1-11. doi:10.1080/21520704.2017.1287797
- 34 Hansen, A. L., Johnsen, B. H. and Thayer, J. F., (2003). Vagal influence on working memory and attention. *International*
35 *Journal of Psychophysiology*, 48 (3), 263-274.
- 36 Jackson, R. C., Ashford, K. J. and Norsworthy, G., (2006). Attentional Focus, Dispositional Reinvestment, and Skilled
37 Motor Performance Under Pressure. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 28 (1), 49-68.
- 38 Kinrade, N. P., Jackson, R. C. and Ashford, K. J., (2015). Reinvestment, task complexity and decision making under
39 pressure in basketball. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 20, 11-19.
- 40 Kinrade, N. P., Jackson, R. C., Ashford, K. J. and Bishop, D. T., (2010). Development and validation of the Decision-
41 Specific Reinvestment Scale. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 28 (10), 1127-1135.
- 42 Kontinen, N., Lyytinen, H. and Viitasalo, J., (1998). Preparatory heart rate patterns in competitive rifle shooting. *Journal of*
43 *Sports Sciences*, 16 (3), 235-242.
- 44 Kreibig, S. D. (2010). Autonomic nervous system activity in emotion: A review. *Biological Psychology*, 84, 394–421.

1 Laborde, S., Brull, A., Weber, J. and Anders, L. S., (2011). Trait emotional intelligence in sports: A protective role against
2 stress through heart rate variability? *Personality and individual differences*, 51 (1), 23-27.

3 Laborde, S., Dosseville, F., Guillén, F. and Chávez, E., (2014). Validity of the trait emotional intelligence questionnaire in
4 sports and its links with performance satisfaction. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 15 (5), 481-490.

5 Laborde, S., Furley, P., & Schempp, C. (2015). The relationship between working memory, reinvestment, and heart rate
6 variability. *Physiology & Behavior*, 139, 430-436. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2014.11.036

7 Laborde, S., Lautenbach, F. and Allen, M. S., (2015). The contribution of coping-related variables and heart rate variability
8 to visual search performance under pressure. *Physiology & Behavior*, 139, 532-540.

9 Laborde, S., Lautenbach, F., Herbert, C., Allen, M. S. and Achtzehn, S., (2014). The role of trait emotional intelligence in
10 emotion regulation and performance under pressure. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 57, 43-47.

11 Laborde, S., Raab, M., & Kinrade, N. P. (2014). Is the ability to keep your mind sharp under pressure reflected in your
12 heart? Evidence for the neurophysiological bases of decision reinvestment. *Biological Psychology*, 100, 34-42.
13 doi:10.1016/j.biopsycho.2014.05.003

14 Landman, A., Oudejans, R. R. D. and Nieuwenhuys, A., (2015). The impact of personality traits and professional experience
15 on police officers' shooting performance under pressure. *Ergonomics*, 1-12.

16 Lane, A. M., Thelwell, R. C., Lowther, J. and Devonport, T. J., (2009). Emotional intelligence and psychological skills use
17 among athletes. *Social behavior and personality*, 37 (2), 195-202.

18 Lesage, F. X., Berjot, S., & Deschamps, F. (2012). Clinical stress assessment using a visual analogue scale. *Occupational
19 Medicine*, 62(8), 600-605. doi:10.1093/occmed/kqs140

20 Levenson, R.W., (2014). The autonomic nervous system and emotion. *Emotion Review*, 6 (2), 100-112.

21 Masters, R. and Maxwell, J., (2008). The theory of reinvestment. *International Review of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 1
22 (2), 160-183.

23 Masters, R. S. W. and Maxwell, J. P., (2004). Implicit motor learning, reinvestment and movement disruption: What you
24 don't know won't hurt you? In: Williams, A. M. and Hodges, N. J., eds. *Skill Acquisition in Sport: Research, Theory and
25 Practice*. London: Routledge, 207-288.

26 Moore, L. J., Wilson, M. R., Vine, S. J., Coussens, A. H. and Freeman, P., (2013). Champ or chump?: Challenge and threat
27 states during pressurized competition. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 35 (6), 551-562.

28 Mosley, E. and Laborde, S., (2015). Performing with all my Heart: Heart Rate Variability and its Relationship with
29 Personality-Trait-Like-Individual-Differences (PTLIDs) in Pressurized Performance Situations. In: Walters, S., ed. *Heart
30 Rate Variability (HRV): Prognostic Significance, Risk Factors and Clinical Applications*. USA: Nova Biomedical.

31 Mosley, E. and Laborde, S., (2016). Performing Under Pressure: The Influence of Personality-Trait-Like Individual
32 Differences. In: Raab, M., Lobinger, B. and Hoffmann, S., Pizzera, A. and Laborde, S., eds. *Performance Psychology: A
33 Scientific Guide across Perception, Action, Cognition and Emotion*. UK: Esliiver.

34 Nibbeling, N., Oudejans, R. R. D. and Daanen, H. A. M., (2012). Effects of anxiety, a cognitive secondary task, and
35 expertise on gaze behavior and performance in a far aiming task. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*, 13, 427-435.

36 Otten, M., (2009). Choking vs. Clutch Performance: A Study of Sport Performance Under Pressure. *Journal of Sport and
37 Exercise Psychology*, 31, 583-601.

38 Oudejans, R. R. D., (2008). Reality-based practice under pressure improves handgun shooting performance of police
39 officers. *Ergonomics*, 51 (3), 261-273.

40 Oudejans, R. R. D., Binsch, O. and Bakker, F. C., (2013). Negative instructions and choking under pressure in aiming at a
41 far target. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 44 (4), 294-309.

42 Park, G., Vasey, M. W., Van Bavel, J. J., & Thayer, J. F. (2014). When tonic cardiac vagal tone predicts changes in phasic
43 vagal tone: The role of fear and perceptual load. *Psychophysiology*, 51(5), 419-426.

44 Petrides, K. V. (2009). Technical manual for the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (TEIQue). In. London: London
45 Psychometric Laboratory.

1 Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2003). Trait emotional intelligence: behavioural validation in two studies of emotion
2 recognition and reactivity to mood induction. *European Journal of Personality*, 17(1), 39-57.

3 Petrides, K. V., Pita, R. and Kokkinaki, F., (2007). The location of trait emotional intelligence in personality factor space.
4 *British Journal of Psychology*, 98 (2), 273-289.

5 Prapavessis, H., Grove, J. R., McNair, P. J., & Cable, N. T. (1992). Self-Regulation Training, State Anxiety, and Sport
6 Performance: A Psychophysiological Case Study. *Sport Psychologist*, 6(3), 213-229.

7 Quintana, D., & Heathers, J. (2014). Considerations in the assessment of heart rate variability in biobehavioral research.
8 *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5(805), 1-10.

9 Ruiz-Padial, E., Sollers Iii, J. J., Vila, J., & Thayer, J. F. (2003). The rhythm of the heart in the blink of an eye: Emotion-
10 modulated startle magnitude covaries with heart rate variability. *Psychophysiology*, 40(2), 306.

11 Ryan, R. M., 1982. Control and information in the intrapersonal sphere: An extension of cognitive evaluation theory.
12 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43 (3), 450-461.

13 Segerstrom, S. C., & Nes, L. S. (2007). Heart Rate Variability Reflects Self-Regulatory Strength, Effort, and Fatigue.
14 *Psychological Science* (0956-7976), 18(3), 275-281. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01888.x

15 Schucker, L., Hagemann, N. and Strauss, B., (2013). Analogy vs. Technical learning in a golf putting task: an analysis of
16 performance outcomes and attentional processes under pressure. *Human Movement*, 14 (2), 175-184.

17 Stanley, J., Peake, J. M., & Buchheit, M. (2013). Cardiac Parasympathetic Reactivation Following Exercise: Implications for
18 Training Prescription. *Sports Medicine*, 43(12), 1259-1277.

19 Thayer, J. F., Ahs, F., Fredrikson, M., Sollers, J. J., 3rd, & Wager, T. D. (2012). A meta-analysis of heart rate variability and
20 neuroimaging studies: implications for heart rate variability as a marker of stress and health. *Neuroscience And*
21 *Biobehavioral Reviews*, 36(2), 747-756. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2011.11.009

22 Thayer, J. F., Hansen, A. L., Saus-Rose, E., & Johnsen, B. H. (2009). Heart Rate Variability, Prefrontal Neural Function, and
23 Cognitive Performance: The Neurovisceral Integration Perspective on Self-regulation, *Adaptation, and Health*. *Annals of*
24 *Behavioral Medicine*, 37(2), 141-153. doi:10.1007/s12160-009-9101-z

25 Thayer, J. F., & Lane, R. D. (2000). A model of neurovisceral integration in emotion regulation and dysregulation. *Journal*
26 *of Affective Disorders*, 61(3), 201-216. doi:10.1016/S0165-0327(00)00338-4

27 Thompson, A. G., Swain, D. P., Branch, J. D., Spina, R. J. and Grieco, C. R., (2015). Autonomic response to tactical pistol
28 performance measured by heart rate variability. *Journal of Strength And Conditioning Research / National Strength &*
29 *Conditioning Association*, 29 (4), 926-933.

30 Tomaka, J., Blascovich, J., Kelsey, R. M. and Leitten, C. L., (1993). Subjective, physiological, and behavioral effects of
31 threat and challenge appraisal. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65 (2), 248-260.

32 Tomaka, J., Blascovich, J., Kibler, J., & Ernst, J. M. (1997). Cognitive and physiological antecedents of threat and challenge
33 appraisal. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(1), 63-72. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.63

34 Tarvainen, M.P., Niskanen, J., Lipponen, J.A., Ranta-aho, P.O. & Karjalainen, P.A., (2014). Kubios HRV – Heart rate
35 variability analysis software. *Computer methods and programs in biomedicine*, 113, 210-220.

36 Turner, M. J., Jones, M. V., Sheffield, D., Slater, M. J., Barker, J. B. and Bell, J. J., (2013). Who Thrives Under Pressure?
37 Predicting the Performance of Elite Academy Cricketers Using the Cardiovascular Indicators of Challenge and Threat States.
38 *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 35 (4), 387-397.

39 Vickers, J. N. and Lewinski, W., (2012). Performing under pressure: Gaze control, decision making and shooting
40 performance of elite and rookie police officers. *Human Movement Science*, 31, 101-117.

41 Vickers, J. N. and Williams, A. M., (2007). Performing Under Pressure: The Effects of Physiological Arousal, Cognitive
42 Anxiety, and Gaze Control in Biathlon. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, 39 (5), 381-394.

43 Vlemincx, E., van Diest, I., de Peuter, S., Bresseleers, J., Bogaerts, K., Fannes, S., van den Bergh, O. (2009). Why do you
44 sigh? Sigh rate during induced stress and relief. *Psychophysiology*, 46(5), 1005-1013.

1 Wallston, K. A., Wallston, B. S., Smith, S., & Dobbins, C. J. (1987). Perceived Control and Health. *Current Psychological*
2 *Research & Reviews*, 6(1), 5-25.

3 Williams, S. and Cumming, J., (2012). Challenge vs. threat: Investigating the effect of using imagery to manipulate stress
4 appraisal of a dart throwing task. *Sport & Exercise Psychology Review*, 8 (1), 4-21.

5 Yi, S.H., Lee, K., Shin, D., Kim, J.S., Ki, H., (2012). Differential association of adiposity measures with heart rate variability
6 measures in Koreans. *Yonsei Medical Journal*, 54 (1), 55-61.

7

8