

Abstract

The aim of this study was to assess the predictive role of coping related variables (trait emotional intelligence and reinvestment, challenge and threat appraisals and cardiac vagal activity) on cardiac vagal activity and working memory under low pressure (LP) and high pressure (HP) conditions. Participants (n = 49) completed trait questionnaires, the Decision Specific Reinvestment Scale, the Movement Specific Reinvestment Scale and Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire. They realized the automated span task, which tests working memory, under counterbalanced LP and HP conditions. Cardiac vagal activity measurements were taken at rest, task and post task for 5 minutes, along with self-reported ratings of stress. Upon completion of the task, self-report measures of motivation, stress appraisal, attention and perceived pressure were completed. Current findings suggest cardiac vagal activity at rest can predict cardiac vagal activity under pressure, decision reinvestment influences cardiac vagal activity in cognitive tasks under LP and working memory performance is predicted by task cardiac vagal activity in HP only. These results show the importance of combining both subjective and objective psychophysiological variables in performance prediction and strengthen the need for this approach to be adopted across samples.

Keywords: Cardiac vagal activity, heart rate variability, pressure, self-regulation, working memory, executive function

1 **1. Introduction**

2 Pressure, which is caused by factors that increase the need to perform well on a particular occasion
3 (Baumeister, 1984), can have negative effects on a range of cognitive functions (Laborde, Furley and
4 Schempp, 2015a; Tomaka, Blascovich, Kelsey and Leitten, 1993). When individuals are faced with
5 pressure, cognitive performance is often impaired and this can lead to performance decrements
6 (Laborde et al., 2015a, Navarro, Miyamoto, Van der Kamp, Morya, Ranvaud and Savelsbergh, 2012;
7 Beilock and Carr, 2005). These performance decrements triggered by pressure, such as impaired
8 decision making (Laborde, Raab and Kinrade, 2014), can subsequently lead to a break down or even
9 failure in skill execution. One cognitive function that has been linked to skill failure under pressure is
10 working memory, an executive function that involves holding information and mentally processing it
11 (Diamond, 2013). In order to understand how an individual reacts to pressure, it is necessary to
12 consider a range of coping related variables located in different domains, such as physiological
13 variables, personality traits and psychological states. The aim of this study was to understand how
14 working memory relates to coping related variables under various pressure conditions.


15 Working memory has been directly linked to many important cognitive processes such as
16 reasoning and problem solving (Just and Carpenter, 1992). Working memory has been shown to
17 influence multiple aspects important for sports performance including; including choking under
18 pressure, skill acquisition, skill execution and attention (Furley and Memmert, 2010), therefore its
19 investigation within athletic samples is of interest. There are two key theories that are associated with
20 working memory and its influence on performance breakdown under pressure. The first being related
21 to worries and ruminations which “blocks up” the capacity to use working memory (Beilock and Carr,
22 2005) or the second which supports the notion that consciously controlling a skill loads working
23 memory and prevents smooth executions of skills (Masters and Maxwell, 2008). Both of these
24 theories support the concept that working memory capacity is directly linked to the ability to perform
25 under pressure. When specifically assessing working memory performance, it is important to
26 differentiate the degree of pressure. Greater impairments of working memory performance have been
27 found under high pressure conditions when compared to low pressure conditions (Laborde et al.,

1 2015a). Previous research has investigated variables associated with working memory performance
2 under pressure to help understand successful performance, one being the physiological underpinning
3 of working memory.

4 The physiological underpinning of working memory performance under pressure has been linked to
5 cardiac vagal activity (Thayer, Hansen, Saus-Rose and Johnsen, 2009). Cardiac vagal activity is a
6 measure derived from heart rate variability, the change in the time interval between successive heart
7 beats (Appelhans and Luecken, 2006). It can be measured at different time points in order to
8 understand how an individual has responded to the environment or a task (Thayer et al., 2009; Porges,
9 1995). Tonic measurements are taken over a period of time to provide an average cardiac vagal
10 activity measurement (Malik, 1996). Recent theoretical (Laborde et al., in press) and methodological
11 standpoints (Laborde et al., 2017) suggest that this is taken at three stages: rest (or baseline), task and
12 post-task which directly reflects the three R's of cardiac vagal activity: resting, reactivity and recovery
13 (see Figure 1).

14 Tonic measures have shown their importance and it is theorised that higher levels of resting
15 cardiac vagal activity is more beneficial for stress management and emotional regulation (Thayer et
16 al., 2009). However, tonic measurements alone are not sufficient to determine the adaptation of the
17 system when demand is placed upon it (Thayer, Ahs, Fredrikson, Sollers and Wager, 2012).
18 Therefore, it is also important to consider the change between tonic measurements, which is known as
19 phasic cardiac vagal activity (Park, Vasey, Van Bavel and Thayer, 2014). Phasic cardiac vagal
20 activity comprises cardiac vagal reactivity (the difference between resting cardiac vagal activity and
21 task cardiac vagal activity), and cardiac vagal recovery (the difference between task cardiac vagal
22 activity and post-task cardiac vagal activity) (Laborde et al., 2017). By assessing phasic cardiac vagal
23 activity, we can understand how the individual is regulating themselves under pressure. Importantly,
24 higher levels of tonic cardiac vagal activity were found to increase phasic cardiac vagal activity under
25 load (Park et al., 2014). This can be explained because tonic cardiac vagal activity allows for better
26 self regulation in stressful situations (Thayer et al. 2009). Thus, it is predicted that tonic cardiac vagal
27 activity may predict phasic cardiac vagal activity. Therefore, both tonic and phasic cardiac vagal

1 activity will be measured to understand interactions occurring at the physiological level that may
2 influence both behaviours and performance (Laborde et al., 2017).



3
4 Figure 1 – The three R's adapted from Laborde et al. 2017.

5
6 The link between working memory and cardiac vagal activity can be explained from a
7 theoretical perspective by the neurovisceral integration model. The model suggests that higher cardiac
8 vagal activity is associated to better executive functioning (Thayer et al., 2009), in this study working
9 memory, as cardiac vagal activity can reflect the integrity of the functioning of the pre-frontal cortex
10 (Thayer et al., 2009). Previous research has found positive associations between executive function
11 and cardiac vagal activity both resting and task (Laborde and Raab 2013; Laborde et al. 2014;
12 Laborde et al., 2015a). Therefore, the current research predicts that higher levels of resting and task
13 cardiac vagal activity will be positively associated to working memory performance. Interestingly
14 Laborde and colleagues (2015a) found a relationship between resting cardiac vagal activity and
15 working memory performance, but not task cardiac vagal activity. However, they only accounted for
16 tonic cardiac vagal activity measurements and not phasic measures (the change in cardiac vagal
17 activity across tonic time points). Measuring phasic cardiac vagal activity is important to consider in
18 order to understand adaptation processes. If the task involves executive functioning, a smaller
19 decrease in cardiac vagal reactivity (reduction from resting to task) is seen to be adaptive (Thayer et
20 al., 2012). Therefore, it is predicted that a smaller cardiac vagal reactivity (less of a reduction from
21 resting to task) will be positively associated to working memory performance. Although there is good
22 evidence to suggest a link between the physiological functioning of an individual and working

1 memory performance, there have been limited endeavours to explore this physiological model in
2 relation to other subjective coping related variables, in particular to personality variables.

3 Personality-trait-like individual differences (PTLID) is a term used to describe individual
4 differences at the trait level going beyond the Big Five personality factors (Openness,
5 Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Neuroticism) (Laborde and Allen, 2016). PTLIDs
6 have been found to influence cognitive performance under pressure and specifically this relationship
7 has been explored between working memory and reinvestment (Laborde et al. 2015a). Reinvestment
8 is an overarching term that triggers individuals to consciously control performance under pressure
9 through cognitive effort, which can result in decreased performance (i.e. Laborde et al., 2014;
10 Poolton, Siu and Masters, 2011; Kinrade, Jackson and Ashford, 2010). Reinvestment can be split into
11 movement and decision dimensions. Movement reinvestment is “the manipulation of conscious,
12 explicit, rule based knowledge, by working memory, to control the mechanics of one's movements
13 during motor output” (Masters and Maxwell, 2004 p. 208). Those higher in movement reinvestment
14 perform worse under pressure (Mullen, Hardy and Oldham, 2007; Mullen, Hardy and Tattersall, 2005;
15 Chell, Graydon, Crowley and Child, 2003; Hardy, Martin and Mullen, 2001) and score lower on
16 working memory tasks, for example in highly complex modular arithmetic tasks (Kinrade et al.,
17 2010a). Decision reinvestment is defined as overthinking, through consciously controlling thoughts
18 and/or ruminative thoughts, which is caused by investigating high levels of cognitive effort that
19 negatively affects performance (Kinrade et al., 2010a). It has been shown that those individuals higher
20 in this type of reinvestment tend to perform worse in working memory tasks such as the automated
21 version of the operation span task (Laborde et al. 2015a). Only two studies have examined the link
22 between the reinvestment traits and cardiac vagal activity (Laborde et al., 2015; Laborde, Lautenbach
23 and Allen, 2015). The first examined decision reinvestment, cardiac vagal activity and decision
24 making under pressure (Laborde et al., 2014). Results showed that those higher in decision
25 reinvestment took longer to make a decision in high pressure condition, which may be linked to the
26 conscious monitoring of thoughts slowing the decision process (Kinrade et al., 2010b). In addition,
27 cardiac vagal reactivity was higher (a larger decrease from resting to task) in the high pressure
28 condition for high reinvestors (Laborde et al., 2014), which may have led to a less effective cognitive

1 functioning during the task (Thayer et al., 2009). The second study examined both decision and
2 movement reinvestment together with cardiac vagal activity regarding their relationship with working
3 memory performance (Laborde et al., 2015a). They found that high levels of decision reinvestment
4 and lower resting cardiac vagal activity were negatively related to working memory performance.
5 Moreover, cardiac vagal activity predicted working memory performance over and above
6 reinvestment (Laborde et al., 2015a). Therefore, the prediction for the current study is that decision
7 reinvestment will be negatively related to working memory performance under pressure.

8 Another PTLID of interest is Trait Emotional Intelligence (EI) which is defined as a
9 constellation of emotional self-perceptions situated at the lower levels of personality hierarchies
10 (Petrides, Pita and Kokkinaki, 2007). Although trait EI has yet to be explored within working memory
11 performance, it has been shown to benefit cognitive performance (Sanchez-Ruiz, Mavroveli and
12 Poullis 2013; Laborde, Dosseville and Scelles, 2010), through its positive role on emotion regulation.
13 A recent review of EI and cognitive processing highlighted the fact that more work should be done to
14 understand the role of EI in specific cognitive tasks (Gutierrez-Cobo, Cabello and Fernandez-
15 Berrocal, 2016). Previous studies have shown that trait EI positively influences levels of cardiac vagal
16 activity under stress (Laborde et al., 2015b; Laborde, Brull, Weber and Anders, 2011). Specifically,
17 higher trait EI has been associated to higher levels of tonic cardiac vagal activity both at rest (Laborde
18 et al., 2015b) and during stress (Laborde et al., 2011). This may suggest that trait EI may have indirect
19 effects on working memory performance through its influence on cardiac vagal activity. Therefore, it
20 is predicted that trait EI is associated to higher levels of resting and task cardiac vagal activity.

21 In addition to trait variables, it is also important to understand the subjective state
22 psychological components involved with coping related variables. Specifically, we focus here on
23 challenge and threat appraisals, which have been shown to play a role within cognitive performance
24 under pressure. Challenge and threat appraisals allow for an understanding of demand and resource
25 evaluations within a pressurised environment (Tomaka et al., 1993). The cardiovascular states
26 associated with these appraisals have been shown to predict cognitive performance under pressure, as
27 challenge states enhanced Stroop task performance whereas threat states decreased performance
28 (Turner et al., 2012). These appraisals have also been shown to influence cardiac vagal activity, as

1 those who displayed threatened patterns were found to have a decrease in cardiac vagal activity under
 2 pressure (Laborde et al., 2015b). Given the predictions of the neurovisceral integration model, this
 3 drop in cardiac vagal activity may negatively affect cognitive performance that involves executive
 4 functioning (Thayer et al., 2009). As it is known that lower levels of cardiac vagal activity negatively
 5 influence working memory performance (Laborde et al., 2015a) and threat appraisal can lower cardiac
 6 vagal activity (Laborde et al., 2015b); it is of interest to examine whether these interactions will exist
 7 when tested together. Therefore, we predict that threat appraisals will have a negative influence on
 8 cardiac vagal activity.

9 It has been illustrated that cardiac vagal activity is influenced by coping related variables
 10 under pressure (Laborde et al., 2015; Laborde et al., 2015; Laborde et al., 2014). In addition, working
 11 memory performance may be influenced directly by cardiac vagal activity (Laborde et al., 2015a;
 12 Thayer et al., 2009) or indirectly through coping related variables under pressure (Laborde et al.,
 13 2015a; Laborde et al., 2015b). However, the coping related variables of interest have mainly been
 14 studied in isolation and this hinders the comprehension of the psychophysiological components
 15 needed to cognitively perform under pressure. By systematically assessing these variables new
 16 knowledge can be developed around which variables hold the most influence over
 17 psychophysiological reactions and which help or hinder cognitive performance. This paper aims to
 18 firstly investigate the influence of coping related variables on the cardiac vagal activity throughout a
 19 pressurised event; secondly assess the role of coping related variables (including cardiac vagal
 20 activity) on working memory performance. In the present study working memory will be assessed
 21 under low and high pressure conditions and examined in conjunction with cardiac vagal activity,
 22 reinvestment, trait EI and challenge and threat appraisals. Based on the reviewed literature we make
 23 the following broad predictions: cardiac vagal activity will be influenced by coping related variables
 24 throughout the pressurised task and working memory performance will be influence by both cardiac
 25 vagal activity and coping related variables. A specific breakdown of hypothesis and supporting
 26 literature is listed in table 1.

Hypothesis	Supporting literature
H1) We predict that resting and task cardiac vagal activity will be positively	(Laborde et al., 2015b)

predicted by trait emotional intelligence, specifically emotionality, across pressure conditions.	
H2) We predict that tonic task and post-task cardiac vagal activity variables will be positively related to resting cardiac vagal activity and tonic post-task cardiac vagal activity will be positively related to task cardiac vagal activity.	(Park et al., 2014; Thayer et al., 2009)
H3) We expect that resting tonic cardiac vagal activity may predict phasic cardiac vagal activity across pressure conditions.	(Park et al., 2014)
H4) Higher resting cardiac vagal activity and lower scores in decision reinvestment will have a positive influence on working memory performance in the high pressure condition.	(Laborde et al., 2015a; Kinrade et al., 2010a)
H5) Higher resting cardiac vagal activity and a smaller decrease in cardiac vagal reactivity will be positively associated to working memory performance in the high pressure condition.	(Laborde et al., 2015b; Thayer et al., 2009)
H6) Threat appraisals will decrease cardiac vagal reactivity in the high pressure condition.	(Laborde et al., 2015b)

1 Table 1 - List of Hypothesis

2 **2. Methodology**

3 **2.1. Participants**

4 Forty-nine participants (Female = 28, Male = 21, $M_{age}=24.1$, $SD=6.5$) took part in the
5 experiment. All participants were athletes currently competing in a variety of sports (team = 40,
6 individual = 9) some examples include netball, rugby, football, cricket, tennis and badminton.
7 Participants had an average of 10.7 years' experience ($SD=7$). Participants were asked if they had a
8 history of cardiac disease or if they were taking any medication which could affect the heart, none
9 reported so.

10 **2.2. Research Design**

11 The study used a within subject design. Within subject designs are recommended in heart rate
12 variability research as it allows for optimal experimental control, reduces individual differences in
13 respiratory rate, requires fewer participants and reduces the impact of external variables such as sleep
14 (Quintana et al., 2014). Within subject design can promote learning effects of a task and habituation
15 of conditions may occur (Laborde et al., 2017), however, these confounding effects were reduced
16 through by implementing counterbalanced conditions (Laborde et al., 2014). Participants performed
17 the same task across two different pressure conditions, low and high, approximately within one week
18 of each other which were counterbalanced.

2.3. Measures

2.3.1. Personality measures

The Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (TEIQue) (Petrides and Furnham, 2003) measures emotional intelligence as a trait. It measures four main factors: well-being, self-control, emotionality and sociability and has 15 subscales. It has 153 items which are scored on a seven-point Likert-scale from 1 (completely disagree) to 7 (completely agree) (Petrides and Furnham, 2003). Some samples of items include “I would describe myself as a calm person” and “I often find it difficult to recognise what emotions I’m feeling”. It was deemed a reliable scale in the current study (global score $\alpha=.74$, wellbeing $\alpha=.87$, self-control $\alpha=.91$, emotionality $\alpha=.89$, sociability $\alpha=.86$).

The Movement-Specific Reinvestment Scale (MSRS) was used (Masters and Maxwell 2008). The MSRS is a nine item scale which has two internal sub-scales, conscious motor processing and movement self-consciousness. Items are rated on a five point Likert scale which ranges from 1 strongly agree to 6 strongly disagree and some sample items include “I am always trying to think about my movements when I carry them out”. The MSRS was deemed reliable in the current study ($\alpha=.83$).

The Decision-Specific Reinvestment Scale (DSRS) by Kinrade, Jackson, Ashford and Bishop (2010b) consists of 13 item measure, which was reliable in the current study ($\alpha = .84$). The DSRS has two subscales the first being decision reinvestment (the propensity to consciously monitor the decision making process), and decision rumination (the propensity to reflect on previous poor decisions). It is rated on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from 0 not characteristic to 4 very characteristic. An example items includes “When I am reminded about poor decisions I have made in the past, I feel as if they are happening all over again”.

2.3.2. Cardiac Vagal Activity

Heart rate variability, from which cardiac vagal activity is derived, was measured using the eMotion Faros 180° (Mega Electronics Ltd, Pioneerinkatu, Finland) which collects electrocardiogram (ECG) data from two electrodes. Sampling rate was set to 500hz as this is deemed to be a conservative sampling rate (Laborde et al., 2017; Bernston et al., 2007). The first electrode was placed in the right infraclavicular fossa and the second electrode was aligned with the left 12th rib. Disposable ECG pre-gelled electrodes were used (Ambu VLC-00-S/25, Ambu GmbH, Bad Nauheim, Germany).

1 **2.3.3. Perceived Stress Intensity**

2 A visual analogue scale (VAS) was used to in order to rate stress intensity. Participants were
3 asked how stressed they felt at the present moment and placed a cross on a 100mm line, anchored
4 from “not at all stressed” to “extremely stressed” (Lesage, Berjot and Deschamps, 2012).

5 **2.3.4. Perceived Pressure**

6 The pressure/tension subscales were utilised from the intrinsic motivation inventory (Ryan,
7 1982). This consisted of four items including statements like “I felt tense while doing the task” and “I
8 was anxious while doing the task” which were subsequently rated on a Likert scale ranging from 1
9 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

10 **2.3.5. Attention**

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

16 **2.3.6. Cognitive Appraisal**

17 The cognitive appraisal ratio was adopted to reflect challenge and threat appraisals (Tomaka
18 et al., 1993). The two items are “How demanding did you feel the task was?” which relates to the
19 perceived demand within the situation and “How able were you to cope with the demands of the
20 task?” to assess the perceived resources that are available to the individual in order to cope with the
21 demands faced (Tomaka et al., 1993; Lazarus, 2000). Participants rated the items on a 6 point Likert
22 scale anchored from 1 (not at all) and 6 (extremely).


23 **2.3.7. Motivation and effort**

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

26 **2.3.8. Working Memory Performance**

27 The automated version of the operation span task (AOSPAN), which measures working
28 memory, was used in this study (Unsworth, Heitz, Schrock and Engle, 2005; Turner and Engle, 1989).

1 This task has been proven to be sensitive to pressure manipulations (Leach and Griffen, 2008) and has
 2 been used in conjunction with personality traits, specifically reinvestment and cardiac vagal activity
 3 (Laborde et al., 2015a). The task involved participants solving maths problems and remembering
 4 orders of letters. A typical sequence would consist of a maths question such as $(4*5) - 5 = ?$, followed
 5 by an answer which the participant selected true or false, followed by a single letter such as P. Once
 6 the sequence was complete the participant had to recall the letters in the order they appeared. The task
 7 consists of 15 separate trials which varied in size of 3 sets of maths and letters to 7 sets, which were
 8 randomised. In total there were 75 letters and 75 maths problems presented. If participants took too
 9 long over the trial it was counted as an error, the time allowed to answer the question was their
 10 average answer time plus 2.5 standard deviations (Unsworth et al., 2005). Figure 2 displays an
 11 example problem that the participant was faced with under pressurised conditions.



17

24

25

Figure 2 - The AOSPAN task (Adapted from Unsworth et al. 2005)

2.4. Procedures

2.4.1. Pre-performance procedures


Ethical approval was granted from the University ethics board. Recruitment was conducted through the use of advertisements placed around the university site, which were aimed at individuals actively competing in sport. Once recruited, participants were given an information sheet, provided written informed consent and were emailed the battery of online questionnaires (which include the TEIQue, MSRS, DSRS). After the participants completed the questionnaires they were invited to the first lab session and asked to refrain from heavy exercise 24 hours before attending and avoid consuming caffeine and food two hours before the session. When participants arrived at the laboratory they were prompted to re-read the information sheet, which was followed by the attachment of two electrodes and the Faros 180° device which was then activated to begin recording. Participants were then seated, arms in lap, palms upwards and eyes closed (Laborde et al., 2017) and a resting heart rate variability reading was taken for five minutes, after which the first stress VAS was completed.

2.4.2. Performance

Before beginning the AOSPAN test the participants listened to a pre-recorded high or low pressure script, developed in line with Baumeister's (1984) recommendations. In the low pressure condition, the script detailed the stipulations of the task which was coined as a memory competition. The top five performers would receive monetary incentives (£50, £25, £15, £10, £5) and the worst five performers would be interviewed and a public leader board of results emailed to all participants. In addition to the script, the high pressure condition used further pressure manipulations were imposed through the participants being filmed and the implementation of performance comparison with national databases. To further induce pressure a second experimenter actively made notes on "behavioural reactions" throughout the task, ensuring to make noise and move around the participant whilst doing the task. Furthermore, the percentage of maths success was shown in the corner of the screen. Participants were told that their current score was below the mean generally achieved by a similar population, which mirrored the procedure used in Laborde et al. (2015a).

1 The participant then commenced the AOSPAN task and followed the on screen instructions
 2 for the practice trials. After the practice trials the participant was reminded of the competitive
 3 instructions and started the competitive trial. In total the AOSPAN task lasted approximately 15
 4 minutes from which the last five minutes were used as the heart rate variability recording. The last
 5 five minutes of the task were recorded as “task heart rate variability” and mirrors procedures used in
 6 previous research to reflect pressure (Laborde et al., 2015a; Laborde et al., 2015b; Laborde and Raab,
 7 2013).

8 Directly after the end of the task, the participant completed the second VAS and remained
 9 seated for a further five minutes while post task heart rate variability was recorded. Lastly, the final
 10 set of subjective measures was taken including the third stress VAS, attention VAS, cognitive
 11 appraisal ratio, pressure/tension scale and motivation item. The participants were thanked, debriefed
 12 and notified about their second visit to the lab which was within a week of the first visit, which is in
 13 accordance with similar research in this area (Laborde et al., 2015). A detailed version of the
 14 procedural outline can be seen in Figure 3.



15

16

17 Figure 3 – Study Procedure

18 **2.4.3. Data preparation**

1 Firstly, the challenge and threat ratio was determined by dividing demands from resources (Tomaka et
2 al., 1993) and all personality questionnaires were coded and scored accordingly. Secondly, heart rate
3 variability data were processed for artefacts, which was done through Kubios (Tarvainen, Niskanen,
4 Lipponen, Ranta-Aho and Karjalainen, 2014). The artefact correction function of Kubios was used,
5 the low threshold was applied and this was visually inspected to ensure artefacts were correctly being
6 identified (1%). Next, indicators of cardiac vagal activity were extracted, in this study high frequency
7 absolute power derived from the Fast Fourier Transform was used, which is between 0.15-0.4 Hz
8 (Camm et al., 1996; Berntson et al., 1997), and is deemed a reliable measure for cardiac vagal activity
9 (Malliani, Lombardi and Pagani, 1994). Thirdly, in order to calculate phasic cardiac vagal activity
10 variables tonic variables were subtracted from each other as follows: reactivity = task-baseline and
11 recovery = recovery-task. Next, data were first checked visually for normality via histograms and
12 boxplots. If any outliers existed, they were winsorized (mean + 2x standard deviations). Heart rate
13 variability variables were not normally distributed, therefore a log10 transform was applied, in line
14 with procedures used in other research of this nature (Park et al., 2014). After data transformation data
15 were checked again for normality and it was ensured they had a z score of between ± 2.58 (Field,
16 2009), all variables were considered to be normally distributed.

17 **2.4.4. Data analysis**

18 To ascertain whether the pressure conditions were successful, a repeated-measures (RM)
19 MANOVA was used with condition (low pressure vs. high pressure) set as the within subject factor
20 and the subjective stress variables (Stress VAS after the task, pressure and tension subscales) as
21 dependent variables. A pressure effect would be noted by higher ratings of stress after the task, higher
22 ratings of pressure and lower ratings of relaxation in the high pressure condition when compared to
23 the low pressure condition. To explore the contribution of coping related variables to cardiac vagal
24 activity (resting, task, post task, reactivity and recovery) bivariate correlations were run followed by
25 hierarchical stepwise linear regression analyses. Using a hierarchical regression the predictors for
26 cardiac vagal activity 1) resting, task, post task, reactivity, and recovery and 2) working memory
27 performance were entered as dependent variables. The first block included age and gender, which
28 allowed the researchers to control covariates that may affect heart rate variability data. The second

1 block contained the predictors for each of the cardiac vagal activity variables and working memory
2 performance. For the prediction of resting cardiac vagal activity trait emotional intelligence (global
3 score, emotionality, sociability, wellbeing, self control) and reinvestment (movement and decision)
4 were entered as predictors. For task cardiac vagal activity the addition of resting cardiac vagal
5 activity, challenge and threat appraisal and attention were added. For post task cardiac vagal activity
6 the addition of task cardiac vagal activity was added. For reactivity and recovery, task and recovery
7 were removed as the variables were derived from them. For working memory performance all
8 variables were entered. When assessing any phasic variables, or when phasic variables were used as a
9 predictor resting cardiac vagal activity was also controlled for in the first block of the hierarchical
10 regression.

11 **2.4.5 Preliminary checks**

12 In order to ensure all participants were motivated to compete in both conditions, a one item
13 measure asked “How motivated were you to perform to your best in this task?” on a 6 point Likert
14 scale from 0 (not at all) to 5 (very much so). The participants appeared to be motivated in both the low
15 pressure condition ($M=4.11$, $SD=0.79$) and the high pressure condition ($M=4.15$, $SD=0.94$). A paired
16 sample t-test confirmed there was no difference between motivation in both conditions $t(47)=-1.550$,
17 $p=.128$, $d = -0.22$. Breathing rate was also checked across conditions, this was to ensure participants
18 did not change their breathing patterns across conditions. There should be no differences in
19 respiratory frequency between experimental tasks when drawing conclusions from cardiac vagal
20 activity (Laborde et al., 2017). To do this a measure of estimated respiratory frequency, derived from
21 the electrocardiogram derived respiration variable obtained post-hoc from Kubios (Tarvainen et al.,
22 2014), was compared across both low and high pressure conditions. A paired sample t-test confirmed
23 there was no difference between breathing rate in both conditions $t(48)=.497$, $p=.622$, $d = 0.070$.

24 **3. Results**

25 Firstly, descriptive data are reported in Table 2, secondly pressure manipulation checks are
26 discussed, thirdly the correlation matrices featuring all study variables can be found in Tables 3. As
27 study variables were intercorrelated a series of stepwise regressions were performed to identify salient

- 1 predictors for cardiac vagal activity variables and working memory performance (Table 5 and 6).
 2 Each regression utilised different predictors, which is specified in the data analysis section.

Table 2 - Descriptive Statistics

	M	SD		
Age	24.12	6.57		
<i>Trait Variables</i>				
DSRS	26.89	9.74		
MSRS	24.06	9.74		
Trait EI - Well-Being	5.23	0.88		
Trait EI - Self-Control	4.44	0.88		
Trait EI - Emotionality	4.81	0.82		
Trait EI - Sociability	4.84	0.73		
Trait EI - Global Score	4.8	0.61		
<i>Performance Variables</i>				
	<i>High Pressure Condition</i>		<i>Low Pressure Condition</i>	
	M	SD	M	SD
Working Memory Score	37.06	13.78	44.51	18.13
Attention Towards Task	12.75	19.57	10.93	15.28
Attention Towards Self	59.79	31.48	48.55	36.22
Perceived Demands	4.55	1.24	4.36	1.16
Perceived Resources	4.02	1.01	4.40	0.88
Demand/Resource Ratio	-.53	1.89	0.12	1.82
Resting CVA	2.94	0.42	2.89	0.30
Task CVA	2.66	0.34	2.69	0.39
Post Task CVA	2.96	0.41	2.95	0.36
Reactivity CVA	-.15	0.28	-.19	0.32
Recovery CVA	.29	0.43	.25	0.38
Perceived Stress Post Rest	12.81	11.94	9.87	8.82
Perceived Stress Post Task	48.12	25.59	32.36	23.17
Perceived Stress Post Recovery	23.14	17.68	16.18	15.80
Perceived Tension Post Task	5.22	1.61	4.20	1.81
Perceived Pressure Post Task	5.20	1.80	4.04	1.95
Perceived Anxiety Post Task	4.46	1.65	3.57	1.67
Perceived Relaxation Post Task	2.69	1.58	3.79	1.80
Motivation to Compete	4.34	0.77	4.47	0.61
Note: DSRS = Decision reinvestment total score; MSRS = Movement reinvestment total score; Trait EI = Trait Emotional Intelligence; CVA = Cardiac Vagal Activity (indexed by high frequency HRV absolute power – log transformed)				

3

4 **3.1. Pressure Manipulation Checks**

1 The RM MANOVA showed a significant main effect for condition, Wilks' Lambda =.66, $F(3, 46)$
2 =7.69 , $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .33$. The univariate analyses from the RM MANOVA showed a main effect for
3 stress rating after the task with a significant increase in stress following the high pressure condition
4 when compared to low pressure condition $F(3,46) = 19.77$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .29$, this was also found for
5 pressure ratings $F(3,46) = 15.7$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = 0.24$. A significant main effect for relaxation was also
6 found with a decrease in relaxation when competing in the high pressure condition when compared to
7 the low pressure condition $F(3,46) = 13.57$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .22$. Results indicate that the pressure
8 manipulations were successful in creating low and high pressure conditions at the subjective level. In
9 order to check the objective manipulation of pressure through differences in working memory
10 performance, a paired samples t-test was conducted. This revealed that the working memory
11 performance was significantly worse in the high pressure condition ($M=37.06$, $SD=13.78$) when
12 compared to the low pressure condition ($M=44.51$, $SD=18.13$), $t(48) = -4.202$, $p < .001$, $d = -0.60$.

13 3.2. Correlation matrices

14 Correlations between all variables are reported in Tables 3 and 4. Key significant correlations
15 of interest in low pressure were between decision reinvestment and task ($r = .36$, $p < .01$) and recovery
16 ($r = -.35$, $p < .05$) cardiac vagal activity. Trait emotional intelligence emotionality and cardiac vagal
17 recovery ($r = .30$, $p < .05$) and trait emotional intelligence emotionality and task cardiac vagal activity
18 ($r = -.33$, $p < .05$). Key significant correlations of interest in the high pressure condition were working
19 memory score and task cardiac vagal activity ($r = -.40$, $p < .01$). Positive correlations between resting
20 cardiac vagal and task ($r = .59$, $p < .01$), post task ($r = .57$, $p < .01$), and recovery ($r = .31$, $p < .05$).

21

22

23

Table 3 - Correlation Matrix for all Variables (Low Pressure Condition)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. DSRS	-														
2. MSRS	.61**	-													
3. Trait EI - Well-Being	-.37**	-.42**	-												
4. Trait EI - Self-Control	-.21	-.57**	.48**	-											
5. Trait EI - Emotionality	-.52**	-.48**	.69**	.45**	-										
6. Trait EI - Sociability	-.27	-.19	.51**	.18	.54**	-									
7. Trait EI - Global Score	-.46**	-.56**	.85**	.70**	.87**	.65**	-								
8. Attention Towards Task	.24	.21	.03	-.08	-.03	.01	-.04	-							
9. Attention Towards Self	.16	.15	-.18	-.32*	-.12	-.06	-.24	-.17	-						
10. Demand/Resource Ratio	-.04	-.41**	.16	.54**	.23	.13	.37**	-.06	-.14	-					
11. Resting CVA	.21	.12	-.08	-.05	-.17	-.12	-.15	.06	.01	-.04	-				
12. Task CVA	.36**	.22	-.18	-.00	-.33*	-.13	-.21	-.03	.02	.04	.61**	-			
13. Post Task CVA	.02	.09	-.04	-.05	-.03	-.09	-.07	.14	-.12	-.08	.55**	.47**	-		
14. Reactivity CVA	.25	.16	-.14	.04	-.25	-.05	-.12	-.10	.01	.10	-.21	.64**	.05	-	
15. Recovery CVA	-.35*	-.13	.14	-.05	.30*	.05	.15	.16	-.14	-.12	-.09	-.56**	-.45**	-.60**	-
16. Working Memory Score	.14	.22	-.06	-.06	-.24	-.03	-.16	.02	.10	-.06	.01	.11	-.06	.13	-.18

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

Note: DSRS = Decision reinvestment total score; MSRS = Movement reinvestment total score; Trait EI = Trait Emotional Intelligence; CVA = Cardiac Vagal Activity

Table 4 - Correlation Matrix for all Variables (High Pressure Condition)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. DSRS	-														
2. MSRS	.61**	-													
3. Trait EI - Well-Being	-.37**	-.42**	-												
4. Trait EI - Self-Control	-.21	-.57**	.48**	-											
5. Trait EI - Emotionality	-.52**	-.48**	.69**	.45**	-										
6. Trait EI - Sociability	-.27	-.19	.51**	.18	.54**	-									
7. Trait EI - Global Score	-.46**	-.56**	.85**	.70**	.87**	.65**	-								
8. Attention Towards Task	.01	.04	.09	-.02	.00	-.02	.02	-							
9. Attention Towards Self	.12	.04	-.17	-.19	-.01	.05	-.12	.05	-						
10. Demand/Resource Ratio	.11	-.18	.19	.52**	.12	.01	.27	-.08	-.18	-					
11. Resting CVA	-.24	-.00	-.11	-.22	-.00	.01	-.11	.07	.08	-.15	-				
12. Task CVA	-.09	.04	-.03	-.17	.10	.07	-.02	-.27	.00	-.12	.59**	-			
13. Post Task CVA	-.08	.06	.07	-.19	.06	.19	.03	.03	.02	.04	.57**	.37**	-		
14. Reactivity CVA	.19	.02	.06	-.19	.00	.27	-.27	-.10	.11	.03	-.24	.21	-.12	-	
15. Recovery CVA	-.11	.06	.54	-.10	.05	.15	.04	.16	.09	-.00	.31*	-.07	.80**	-.37**	-
16. Working Memory Score	-.04	.13	-.03	-.08	-.03	-.01	-.06	.18	-.15	.04	-.17	-.40**	-.07	-.08	.05

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

Note: DSRS = Decision reinvestment total score; MSRS = Movement reinvestment total score; Trait EI = Trait Emotional Intelligence; CVA = Cardiac Vagal Activity

1 **3.3. The contribution of coping-related variables to cardiac vagal activity in low pressure**
 2 **condition**

3 There were no predictors for resting cardiac vagal activity. For task cardiac vagal activity the
 4 first predictor extracted was the level of resting cardiac vagal activity (adjusted $R^2 = 0.37, p < .001$).
 5 The second predictor extracted was DSRS (adjusted $R^2 = 0.06, p < .001$). The two predictors together
 6 accounted for 43% of the variance in task vagal activity. For post task the first and only predictor
 7 extracted was the level of resting cardiac vagal activity (adjusted $R^2 = 0.29, p < .001$). For cardiac
 8 vagal reactivity, there were no predictors. For cardiac vagal recovery, the first and only predictor
 9 extracted was decision reinvestment (adjusted $R^2 = 0.10, p = .014$).

10 Table 5 - Multiple (stepwise) Regressions for cardiac vagal activity in Low Pressure Condition

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	<i>t</i>
	B	Std Error	β	
Task CVA				
1 Resting CVA	.78	.14	.61	5.27**
2 Resting CVA	.71	.14	.55	4.90**
DSRS	.01	.00	.25	2.20**
Post Task CVA				
1 Resting CVA	.65	.14	.55	4.57**
Recovery CVA				
1 DSRS	-.01	.00	-.35	2.56*

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

Note: CVA = Cardiac Vagal Activity, DSRS = Decision reinvestment score

If regressions had no predictors they were excluded from the table.

11
 12 **3.4. The contribution of coping-related variables to cardiac vagal activity in the high**
 13 **pressure condition**

14 For resting cardiac vagal activity no predictors were found. For task cardiac vagal the first
 15 and only predictor extracted was the level of resting cardiac vagal activity (adjusted $R^2 = 0.34, p < .001$).
 16 For post task cardiac vagal activity trait the first and only predictor extracted was resting
 17 cardiac vagal activity (adjusted $R^2 = 0.34, p < .001$). For cardiac vagal reactivity, no predictors were

1 found. For cardiac vagal recovery the first (and only) predictor extracted for cardiac vagal recovery
 2 was resting cardiac vagal activity (adjusted $R^2 = 0.08$, $p = .028$).

3 Table 6 - Multiple (stepwise) Regressions for Cardiac Vagal Activity in High Pressure Condition

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	<i>t</i>
	B	Std Error	β	
Task CVA				
1 Resting CVA	.49	.09	.59	5.11**
Post Task CVA				
1 Resting CVA	.56	.11	.57	4.82**
Recovery CVA				
1 Resting CVA	.36	.15	.31	2.27*
Working Memory				
1 Task CVA	-15.84	5.28	-.40	-2.99*

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

Note: CVA = Cardiac Vagal Activity

If regressions had no predictors they were excluded from the table.

12 **3.5. The contribution of coping-related variables and cardiac vagal activity on working**
 13 **memory performance in low and high pressure conditions**

14 For performance prediction all trait, state psychological variables and cardiac vagal activity
 15 variables were entered at this stage. There were no predictors found for working memory performance
 16 for the low pressure condition. In the high pressure condition working memory performance was
 17 predicted by task cardiac vagal activity (adjusted $R^2 = 0.14$, $p = .004$).

18 **4. Discussion**

19 The aim of this study was to assess the predictive role of coping related variables (trait emotional
 20 intelligence, reinvestment, challenge and threat appraisals, and cardiac vagal activity) on levels of
 21 cardiac vagal activity and working memory performance under low and high pressure conditions.
 22 Firstly, the predictors of cardiac vagal activity will be discussed and secondly the predictors for
 23 working memory performance.

1 **4.1. Resting Cardiac Vagal activity**

2 Hypothesis 1 predicted that trait emotional intelligence would be positively associated with
3 resting cardiac vagal activity was not supported. In both low pressure and high pressure conditions
4 trait EI global score and factors did not emerge as predictors for resting cardiac vagal activity. This
5 prediction was based on previous research where trait EI predicted resting cardiac vagal activity, in
6 particular the subscale of wellbeing (Laborde et al., 2015b). In contrast other research exploring
7 similar aims found no association with trait EI and resting cardiac vagal activity (Laborde et al.,
8 2011). Given the inconsistent findings in the prediction of resting cardiac vagal activity with trait EI,
9 it may be linked to the fact that studies have only taken a snap shot of cardiac vagal activity over five
10 minutes. As cardiac vagal activity can be influenced by many transient variables (Laborde et al.
11 2017), it may be that stable predictors such as traits should be matched to more longitudinal measures
12 of cardiac vagal activity to draw sound conclusions. Notwithstanding, this warrants further
13 investigation into the relationship between trait EI and resting cardiac vagal activity.

14 **4.2. Task Cardiac Vagal activity**

15 Hypothesis 2 suggested resting cardiac vagal activity would predict task cardiac vagal activity
16 was supported. In the high pressure condition resting cardiac vagal activity was the sole predictor of
17 task cardiac vagal activity. Those who had higher levels of cardiac vagal activity at rest had higher
18 levels of cardiac vagal activity during the task, which is supported by previous research (Park et al.,
19 2014). Higher levels of resting cardiac vagal activity have been shown to positively influence adaptive
20 emotional responding (Thayer et al., 2009; Ruiz-Padial, Sollers, Vila and Thayer, 2003) and
21 facilitative behavioural responses during tasks (Hansen, Johnsen and Thayer 2003). This suggests that
22 individuals with higher resting cardiac vagal activity are better able to meet the demands of the task
23 by regulating themselves in stressful situations. This could be seen to be a benefit for working
24 memory performance, as higher levels of cardiac vagal activity are required in order to produce better
25 performance on tasks relying on executive functioning (Thayer et al., 2009).

26 In the low pressure condition, the first predictor of task cardiac vagal activity was resting
27 cardiac vagal activity, which replicates the findings from the high pressure condition. Therefore,
28 hypothesis 2 is further supported, as we found that higher levels of resting cardiac vagal activity

1 positively influences task cardiac vagal activity across pressure conditions. A second predictor for
2 task cardiac vagal activity was decision reinvestment. Findings suggested that higher levels of
3 decision reinvestment positively influenced cardiac vagal activity during the task. This contradicts
4 hypothesis 4 and previous findings from Laborde et al. (2014) and Laborde et al. (2015a) that showed
5 higher levels of decision reinvestment to be associated to reduced levels of task cardiac vagal activity,
6 potentially due to the role of revisiting decisions made within a task (Kinrade et al., 2010a). One
7 important point to note is that this finding was only present within the low pressure condition in the
8 present study and the effects of reinvestment are usually only present within high pressure conditions
9 (Jackson et al., 2006). This may be linked to the principle of trait activation, where individual
10 differences in personality will have a differing impact across different pressure situations (Geukes,
11 Mesango, Hanrahan and Kellmann, 2013). For example, it may be that decision reinvestment may
12 have reverse effects in low pressure conditions. This may be linked to the concept that rumination can
13 consist of contemplative and adaptive repetitive thoughts, when the valence associated to those
14 thoughts is positive (Watkins 2008). This can lead to better problem solving, planning and reduces
15 negative moods (Watkins 2008), which may then be associated with an increase in cardiac vagal
16 activity. Although the current finding is unexpected, it may be that more research needs to be
17 conducted into the role of decision reinvestment and cardiac vagal activity in differing pressure
18 conditions.

19 With regards to hypothesis 6, threat appraisals would reduce task levels of cardiac vagal
20 activity, no relationships were found and consequently the hypothesis was rejected. This hypothesis
21 was based on previous research, where threat appraisals were found to be associated to reduced
22 cardiac vagal activity (Laborde et al. 2015b). In the current study , it may be that null findings were
23 discovered as a result of the number of predictors and the shared variance within the analysis.

24 **4.3. Post Task Cardiac Vagal Activity**

25 Hypothesis 3, predicting that resting cardiac vagal activity would positively influence post
26 task cardiac vagal activity was supported. Resting cardiac vagal activity positively influenced the
27 level of post task cardiac vagal activity in both the low and high pressure conditions. Consistent with
28 previous findings resting cardiac vagal activity has shown to have many benefits across health,

1 emotional regulation and stress management (Thayer et al., 2009; Ruiz-Padial et al., 2003; Hansen et
2 al., 2003), the higher the levels of cardiac vagal activity at rest, the better able individuals can
3 successfully regulate and adapt during stress. Post task recovery is a crucial indicator of the
4 adaptability of an organism as it determines the ability to effectively return to resting level after facing
5 a stressful event (Stanley, Peake, and Buchheit, 2013). Conversely, lower levels of post task cardiac
6 vagal activity reflects the result of poor self-regulation, as a return to resting level is achieved slower
7 or not at all (Berna, Ott, and Nandrino, 2014). More efficient return to resting levels enables the
8 individual to face another potential stressor. In demanding environments where multiple stressors are
9 presented in rapid succession with changing intensity this would be crucial. Such a finding has
10 application not only to athletes in sporting situations but further to other occupations who function
11 under situations of pressure such as air traffic control officers, accident and emergency doctors. These
12 findings suggest a higher level of resting cardiac vagal activity fosters more effective cardiac vagal
13 recovery, because a larger cardiac vagal activity is available in the first instance, which allows for a
14 greater uptake of self-regulation resources.

15 **4.4. Cardiac Vagal Recovery**

16 In the low pressure condition decision reinvestment was negatively associated with cardiac
17 vagal recovery. Individuals who were higher in decision reinvestment, had decreased cardiac vagal
18 recovery after the stressful task. This may suggest that the high reinvestors were thinking back to their
19 previous performance even after the task had finished and therefore this prompted a decrease in
20 cardiac vagal recovery. It is not uncommon for those high in this trait to ruminate about past decisions
21 (Kinrade et al., 2010a). Previous research found that high levels of decision reinvestment caused a
22 larger decrease in cardiac vagal activity during a task (Laborde et al., 2014). However, this is a new
23 finding when compared to previous research, as decision reinvestment has not been assessed with
24 cardiac vagal recovery. A point of interest is that the opposing pattern was discovered for task cardiac
25 vagal activity, where those higher in decision reinvestment had higher levels of cardiac vagal activity.
26 It may be that during the task, participants used adaptive repetitive thoughts to solve the task, and
27 after the task the participants then thought back to their performance perhaps in a negative light,
28 which caused a decrease in cardiac vagal activity. This may be an interesting avenue for future

1 research and interventions to help athletes recover more effectively, particularly if the sport contains
2 multiple time points of breaks in play such as tennis.

3 In the **high** pressure condition, hypothesis 3, assuming that resting cardiac vagal activity
4 would predict phasic cardiac vagal activity, was supported. It was found that higher levels of resting
5 cardiac vagal activity positively influenced the recovery process from task to recovery. This is in line
6 with the notion that higher levels of resting cardiac vagal activity promote cardiac vagal activity
7 enhancement under stress due to an enhanced ability to effectively uptake self-regulatory resources
8 (Park et al., 2015; Park et al., 2014; Segerstrom and Nes, 2007).

9

10 **4.5. Working Memory Performance**

11 Hypothesis 4, predicting that lower decision reinvestment and higher resting and task cardiac
12 vagal activity would positively influence working memory performance, was not supported. It was
13 also predicted that a smaller decrease in cardiac vagal reactivity would positively influence working
14 memory performance (hypothesis 5). Findings related to cardiac vagal activity and working memory
15 performance were only present in the high pressure condition, which reflect previous findings
16 (Laborde et al., 2015a). In the current study there was a negative relationship between working
17 memory performance and levels of task cardiac vagal activity, which would partially support
18 hypothesis 4 and reject hypothesis 5. Lower levels of task cardiac vagal activity positively affected
19 working memory performance. Theoretically this is not supported by the neurovisceral integration
20 model, as higher executive functioning performance is associated to high levels of cardiac vagal
21 activity, and that a decrease from resting to task will negatively affect executive performance (Thayer
22 and Lane, 2000). In previous work higher levels of resting cardiac vagal activity were positively
23 associated to working memory performance (Laborde et al., 2015a; Hansen et al., 2003). **However,**
24 **Hansen and colleagues (2003) found a suppression in RMSSD over the course of the working**
25 **memory task. This was suggested to be linked to sustained attention, as the duration and intensity of**
26 **the task increases, and so does the demand on the organism (Porges, 1992). Considering the working**
27 **memory task was 15 minutes in length and the task cardiac vagal activity measure was derived from**
28 **the final five minutes, it could be that the negative relationship demonstrates successful adaptation**

1 across the time. This may suggest that those who performed better used up their self-regulation
2 resources across the task, resulting in a reduction in cardiac vagal activity at the end of the task. More
3 explorations of the different tonic and phasic measurement points for cardiac vagal activity in
4 combination to different types of working memory tasks and environmental demands are needed to
5 further understand the role of cardiac vagal activity and working memory performance.

6 **4.6. Limitations**

7 To reflect on the findings, the limitations of the current study must be acknowledged. Firstly, the
8 nature of the study was laboratory based on a computer task, which can be considered to be quite
9 removed from the sporting environment. However, working memory can play an important role in
10 cognitive sporting functions such as reasoning and problem solving (Just and Carpenter, 1992).
11 Although where possible the time of day for testing was accounted for in some cases it was not
12 logistically possible for the participant to be tested at the same exact time of day. As HRV has a
13 circadian rhythm this may influence the readings taken (Laborde et al. 2017), this is therefore
14 acknowledged as a limitation regarding the measurement of HRV in this particular study. Sample size
15 could have been increased, given other studies of a similar nature had slightly more participants
16 (Laborde et al., 2015). Another issues in regards to sample is the fact that the sample was heavily
17 biased towards team sports (40) and only had 9 individual sport athletes. This may affect the
18 personality results, as team sports showed differences in personality when compared to those who
19 competed in individual sports (Laborde et al., 2016). Future research should explore the findings
20 either with purely individual athletes or achieve an equal split between the sporting disciplines, or
21 with non-sporting samples that also face the need to have effective working memory performance,
22 such as air traffic control officers.

23 **5. Conclusion**

24 To conclude, the current study has developed knowledge around how coping related variables and
25 cardiac vagal activity may be associated to working memory performance under pressure. At the
26 theoretical level, we further supported the importance of resting cardiac vagal activity as an enduring
27 resource for self-regulation under differing pressure demands, maintaining the need for its inclusion in

1 pressure research. Decision reinvestment was the only trait that directly influenced cardiac vagal
2 activity during and after the working memory task. We found that decision reinvestment may
3 influence cardiac vagal activity differently across points in experimental tasks. In particular, the role
4 of valence in rumination should be examined (Watkins 2008), in order to determine adaptive and
5 maladaptive patterns associated with decision reinvestment. On this occasion, there was evidence to
6 suggest that higher levels of task cardiac vagal activity were negatively associated with working
7 memory performance. This contradicts previous theory and potentially requires further investigation,
8 or multiple measures of working memory performance should be addressed across the task, given
9 sustained attention tends to reduce cardiac vagal activity over time (Hansen 2003). At the applied
10 level, practitioners should monitor cardiac vagal activity to reap the benefits of understanding
11 psychophysiological reactions. A further consideration is how decision reinvestment may directly
12 affect athlete's psychophysiological functioning, and how to potentially enhance this through
13 understanding adaptive and maladaptive rumination patterns in pressurised events.

14 **Acknowledgements**

15 The researchers would like to thank David Barlow, Gabrielle Rowsell and Georgina Moulton for their
16 fantastic support during data collection.

17 **Funding**

18 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or
19 not-for-profit sectors.

20

21 **References**

- 22 Appelhans, B. M., and Luecken, L. J. (2006). Heart rate variability as an index of regulated emotional
23 responding. *Review of General Psychology*, 10(3), 229-240. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.10.3.229
24 Beilock, S. L., and Carr, T. H. (2001). On the fragility of skilled performance: What governs choking
25 under pressure? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 130(4), 701-725.
26 doi:10.1037//0096-3445.130.4.701
27 Berna, G., Ott, L., and Nandrino, J. L. (2014). Effects of emotion regulation difficulties on the tonic
28 and phasic cardiac autonomic response. *PLoS ONE*, 9(7). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.010297

- 1 Berntson, G., Bigger, T., Eckberg, D. L., Grossman, P., Kaufmann, P. G., Malik, M., . . . Van Der
2 Molenk, M. W. (1997). Heart rate variability: Origins, methods, and interpretive caveats. *Psy-*
3 *chophysiology*, 34(6), 623–648. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.1997.tb02140.x)
4 [8986.1997.tb02140.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.1997.tb02140.x)
- 5 Baumeister, R. F. (1984). Choking under pressure: Self-consciousness and paradoxical effects of
6 incentives on skillful performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(3), 610-
7 620. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.46.3.610
- 8 Camm, J. A., Malik, M., Bigger, J. T., Breithardt, G., Cerutti, S., Cohen, R. J., . . . Task Force of the
9 European Society of Cardiology and the North American Society of Pacing and
10 Electrophysiology. (1996). Heart rate variability: Standards of measurement, physiological
11 interpretation and clinical use. *Circulation*, 93, 1043–1065. [https://doi.org/10.1161/01.CIR.](https://doi.org/10.1161/01.CIR.93.5.1043)
12 [93.5.1043](https://doi.org/10.1161/01.CIR.93.5.1043)
- 13 Chell, B. J., Graydon, J. K., Crowley, P. L., and Child, M. (2003). Manipulated stress and
14 dispositional reinvestment in a wall-volley task: An investigation into controlled processing.
15 *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 97(2), 435-448.
- 16 Diamond, A. (2013). Executive Functions. *Annual Reviews in Psychology*, 64, 135-168.
- 17 Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. 3rd Ed. London: Sage.
- 18 Furley, P. and Memmet, D. (2010). The role of working memory in sport. *International Review of*
19 *Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 3(2),171-194.
- 20 Geukes, K., Mesagno, C., Hanrahan, S. J., and Kellmann, M. (2013). Performing under pressure in
21 private: Activation of self-focus traits. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise*
22 *Psychology*, 11(1), 11-23. doi:10.1080/1612197X.2012.724195
- 23 Gutierrez- Cobo, M.J, Cabello, R., and Fernandez-Berrocal, P (2016). The Relationship between
24 Emotional Intelligence and Cool and Hot Cognitive Processes: A Systematic Review.
25 *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, Vol 10 (2016). doi:10.3389/fnbeh.2016.00101/full
- 26 Hansen, A. L., Johnsen, B. H., and Thayer, J. F. (2003). Vagal influence on working memory and
27 attention. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 48(3), 263-274. doi:10.1016/S0167-
28 8760(03)00073-4
- 29 Hardy, L., Martin, N., and Mullen, R. (2001). Effect of task-relevant cues and state anxiety on motor
30 performance. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 92(3 PART 1), 943-946.
- 31 Jackson, R. C., Ashford, K. J., and Norsworthy, G. (2006). Attentional focus, dispositional
32 reinvestment, and skilled motor performance under pressure. *Journal of Sport and Exercise*
33 *Psychology*, 28(1), 49-68.
- 34 Jones, M., Meijen, C., McCarthy, P. J., and Sheffield, D. (2009). A Theory of Challenge and Threat
35 States in Athletes. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 2(2), 161-180.
- 36 Just, M. A., and Carpenter, P. A. (1992). A capacity theory of comprehension: Individual differences
37 in working memory. *Psychological Review*, 99(1), 122-149. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.99.1.122
- 38 Kinrade, N. P., Jackson, R. C., and Ashford, K. J. (2010a). Dispositional reinvestment and skill failure
39 in cognitive and motor tasks. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 11(4), 312-319.
- 40 Kinrade, N. P., Jackson, R. C., Ashford, K. J., and Bishop, D. T. (2010b). Development and validation
41 of the Decision-Specific Reinvestment Scale. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 28(10), 1127-1135.
- 42 Laborde, S., and Allen, M. (2016). Personality-Trait-Like Individual Differences: Much More Than
43 Noise in the Background for Sport and Exercise Psychology. In M. Raab, P. Wylleman, R.
44 Seiler, A.-M. Elbe, and A. Hatzigeorgiadis (Eds.), *Sport and Exercise Psychology Research*
45 *from Theory to Practice*. London: Elsevier.
- 46 Laborde, S., Brull, A., Weber, J., and Anders, L. S. (2011). Trait emotional intelligence in sports: A
47 protective role against stress through heart rate variability? *Personality and individual*
48 *differences*, 51(1), 23-27.
- 49 Laborde, S., Dosseville, F., and Scelles, N. (2010). Trait emotional intelligence and preference for
50 intuition and deliberation: Respective influence on academic performance. *Personality and*
51 *Individual Differences*, 49(7), 784-788. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2010.06.031
- 52 Laborde, S., Furley, P., and Schempp, C. (2015a). The relationship between working memory,
53 reinvestment, and heart rate variability. *Physiology and Behavior*, 139, 430-436.
54 doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2014.11.036

- 1 Laborde, S., Guillén, F., and Mosley, E. (2016). Positive personality-trait-like individual differences
2 in athletes from individual- and team sports and in non-athletes. *Psychology of Sport and*
3 *Exercise*, 26, 9-13. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.05.009
- 4 Laborde, S., Lautenbach, F., and Allen, M. S. (2015b). The contribution of coping-related variables
5 and heart rate variability to visual search performance under pressure. *Physiology and*
6 *Behavior*, 139, 532-540. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2014.12.003
- 7 Laborde, S., Mosley, E., & Mertgen, A. (in press). Vagal tank theory: a functional approach to self-
8 regulation resources, bridging the gap between neurophysiology, cognitive psychology, and
9 social psychology. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*. doi:10.3389/fnins.2018.00458
- 10 Laborde, S., Mosley, E., and Thayer, J. F. (2017). Heart Rate Variability and Cardiac Vagal Tone in
11 Psychophysiological Research - Recommendations for Experiment Planning, Data Analysis,
12 and Data Reporting. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1-18. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00213
- 13 Laborde, S., Raab, M., and Kinrade, N. P. (2014). Is the ability to keep your mind sharp under
14 pressure reflected in your heart? Evidence for the neurophysiological bases of decision
15 reinvestment. *Biological Psychology*, 100, 34-42. doi:10.1016/j.biopsycho.2014.05.003
- 16 Leach, J., and Griffith, R. (2008). Restrictions in working memory capacity during parachuting: a
17 possible cause of 'no pull' fatalities. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 22(2), 147-157.
18 doi:10.1002/acp.1364
- 19 Lesage, F. X., Berjot, S., and Deschamps, F. (2012). Clinical stress assessment using a visual
20 analogue scale. *Occupational Medicine*, 62(8), 600-605. doi:10.1093/occmed/kqs140
- 21 Malhotra, N., Poolton, J. M., Wilson, M. R., Omuro, S., and Masters, R. S. W. (2015). Dimensions of
22 movement specific reinvestment in practice of a golf putting task. *Psychology of Sport and*
23 *Exercise*, 18, 1-8. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.11.008
- 24 Malik, M., Camm, A. J., Bigger Jr, J. T., Breithardt, G., Cerutti, S., Cohen, R. J., Singer, D. H. (1996).
25 Heart rate variability. Standards of measurement, physiological interpretation, and clinical
26 use. *European Heart Journal*, 17(3), 354-381.
- 27 Masters, R., and Maxwell, J. (2008). The theory of reinvestment. *International Review of Sport and*
28 *Exercise Psychology*, 1(2), 160-183.
- 29 Masters, R. S. W., and Maxwell, J. P. (2004). Implicit motor learning, reinvestment and movement
30 disruption: What you don't know won't hurt you? In A. M. Williams and N. J. Hodges (Eds.),
31 *Skill Acquisition in Sport: Research, Theory and Practice* (pp. 207-288). London: Routledge.
- 32 Malliani, A., Lombardi, F., and Pagani, M. (1994). Power spectrum analysis of heart rate variability: a
33 tool to explore neural regulatory mechanisms. *British heart journal*, 71(1), 1.
- 34 Mullen, R., Hardy, L., and Oldham, A. (2007). Implicit and explicit control of motor actions:
35 Revisiting some early evidence. *British Journal of Psychology*, 98(1), 141-156.
36 doi:10.1348/000712606X114336
- 37 Mullen, R., Hardy, L., and Tattersall, A. (2005). The Effects of Anxiety on Motor Performance: A
38 Test of the Conscious Processing Hypothesis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*,
39 27(2), 212.
- 40 Navarro, M., Miyamoto, N., van der Kamp, J., Morya, E., Ranvaud, R., and Savelsbergh, G. J. P.
41 (2012). The Effects of High Pressure on the Point of No Return in Simulated Penalty Kicks.
42 *Journal Of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 34(1), 83-101.
- 43 Park, G., Vasey, M. W., Van Bavel, J. J., and Thayer, J. F. (2014). When tonic cardiac vagal tone
44 predicts changes in phasic vagal tone: The role of fear and perceptual load. *Psychophysiology*,
45 51(5), 419-426.
- 46 Petrides, K. V. (2009). *Technical manual for the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire*
47 *(TEIQue)*. In. London: London Psychometric Laboratory.
- 48 Petrides, K. V., and Furnham, A. (2003). Trait emotional intelligence: behavioural validation in two
49 studies of emotion recognition and reactivity to mood induction. *European Journal of*
50 *Personality*, 17(1), 39-57.
- 51 Petrides, K. V., Pita, R., and Kokkinaki, F. (2007). The location of trait emotional intelligence in
52 personality factor space. *British Journal of Psychology*, 98(2), 273-289.
53 doi:10.1348/000712606X120618

- 1 Poolton, J., Siu, C. M., and Masters, R. (2011). The Home Team Advantage Gives Football Referees
2 Something to Ruminare About. *International Journal Of Sports Science and Coaching*, 6(4),
3 545-552.
- 4 Porges, S. W. (1995). Orienting in a defensive world: Mammalian modifications of our evolutionary
5 heritage. A Polyvagal Theory. *Psychophysiology*, 32 (4), 301-318.
- 6 Ruiz-Padial, E., Sollers Iii, J. J., Vila, J., and Thayer, J. F. (2003). The rhythm of the heart in the
7 blink of an eye: Emotion-modulated startle magnitude covaries with heart rate
8 variability. *Psychophysiology*, 40(2), 306.
- 9 Ryan, R. M. (1982). Control and information in the intrapersonal sphere: An extension of cognitive
10 evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43(3), 450-461.
11 doi:10.1037/0022-3514.43.3.450
- 12 Sanchez-Ruiz, M.-J., Mavrouli, S., and Poullis, J. (2013). Trait emotional intelligence and its links to
13 university performance: An examination. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54, 658-
14 662. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2012.11.013
- 15 Segerstrom, S. C., and Nes, L. S. (2007). Heart Rate Variability Reflects Self-Regulatory Strength,
16 Effort, and Fatigue. *Psychological Science* (0956-7976), 18(3), 275-281. doi:10.1111/j.1467-
17 9280.2007.01888.x
- 18 Stanley, J., Peake, J. M., and Buchheit, M. (2013). Cardiac parasympathetic reactivation following
19 exercise: implications for training prescription. *Sports Medicine*, 43(12), 1259-1277.
20 doi:10.1007/s40279-013-0083-4
- 21 Thayer, J. F., Ahs, F., Fredrikson, M., Sollers, J. J., and Wager, T. D. (2012). A meta-analysis of heart
22 rate variability and neuroimaging studies: implications for heart rate variability as a marker of
23 stress and health. *Neuroscience And Biobehavioral Reviews*, 36(2), 747-756.
24 doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2011.11.009
- 25 Thayer, J.F, Hansen, A. L., Saus-Rose, E., and Johnsen, B. H. (2009). Heart rate variability,
26 prefrontal neural function, and cognitive performance: the neurovisceral integration
27 perspective on self-regulation, adaptation, and health. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 37,
28 141-153.
- 29 Thayer, J. F., and Lane, R. D. (2000). A model of neurovisceral integration in emotion regulation and
30 dysregulation. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 61(3), 201-216. doi:10.1016/S0165-
31 0327(00)00338-4
- 32 Tomaka, J., Blascovich, J., Kelsey, R. M., and Leitten, C. L. (1993). Subjective, physiological, and
33 behavioral effects of threat and challenge appraisal. *Journal of Personality and Social
34 Psychology*, 65(2), 248-260. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.65.2.248
- 35 Tarvainen, M. P., Niskanen, J. P., Lipponen, J. A., Ranta-Aho, P. O., and Karjalainen, P. A. (2014).
36 Kubios HRV–heart rate variability analysis software. *Computer methods and programs in
37 biomedicine*, 113(1), 210-220.
- 38 Turner, M. L., and Engle, R. W. (1989). Is working memory task dependant? *Journal of Memory and
39 Language*, 28(2), 127-154.
- 40 Turner, M. J., Jones, M. V., Sheffield, D., and Cross, S. L. (2012). Cardiovascular indices of
41 challenge and threat states predict competitive performance. *International journal of
42 psychophysiology*, 86(1), 48-57.
- 43 Unsworth, N., Heitz, R. P., Schrock, J. C., and Engle, R. W. (2005). An automated version of the
44 operation span task. *Behavior Research Methods*, 37(3), 498-505.
- 45 Watkins, E.R. (2008). Constructive and unconstructive repetitive thought. *Psychological Bulletin*,
46 134(2), 163-206.