



PRIFYSGOL
BANGOR
UNIVERSITY

Assessing ocular activity during performance of motor skills using electrooculography

Gallicchio, Germano; Cooke, Andrew; Ring, Christopher

Psychophysiology

DOI:
[10.1111/psyp.13070](https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.13070)

Published: 01/07/2018

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):
Gallicchio, G., Cooke, A., & Ring, C. (2018). Assessing ocular activity during performance of motor skills using electrooculography. *Psychophysiology*, 55(7), [e13070].
<https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.13070>

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

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

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

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

1 **Assessing ocular activity during performance of motor skills using electrooculography**

2

3 Germano Gallicchio,^a Andrew Cooke,^b and Christopher Ring^a

4

5 ^a School of Sport, Exercise & Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Birmingham, UK

6 ^b School of Sport, Health & Exercise Sciences, Bangor University, UK

7

8

9

10 Corresponding Author: Germano Gallicchio
11 School of Sport, Exercise & Rehabilitation Sciences
12 University of Birmingham
13 Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK
14 Email: germano.gallicchio@gmail.com

15

16 *Running head:* Eye Quietness and Quiet Eye in Golf Putting

17

Abstract

Eye-tracking research has revealed that, compared to novices, experts make longer ocular fixations on the target of an action when performing motor skills, that is they have a longer *quiet eye*. Remarkably, the reason why a longer quiet eye aids movement has yet to be established. There is a need for interdisciplinary research and new measures to accelerate progress on the mechanistic understanding of the phenomenon. With the aim to provide researchers with new tools, we assessed the utility of electrooculography (EOG) to examine ocular activity while 10 experts and 10 novices putted golf balls. We measured quiet eye durations, distinguishing its pre- and postmovement initiation components, and developed a novel time-varying index of ocular activity, eye quietness, computed as the variability of the EOG in short time intervals: lower values correspond with greater quietness. Finally, we measured movement durations using a combination of infrared and sound sensors. Experts had longer postmovement initiation quiet eye compared to novices; however, total and premovement quiet eye durations did not differ between groups. Eye quietness was inversely correlated with quiet eye duration, and was greatest immediately after movement initiation. Importantly, movement duration correlated positively with postmovement initiation quiet eye and negatively with eye quietness shortly after movement initiation. This study demonstrates the utility of assessing ocular activity during performance of motor skills using EOG. Additionally, these findings provide evidence that expert-novice differences in ocular activity may reflect differences in the kinematics (e.g., movement duration) of how experts and novices execute motor skills.

Key words: EOG; Eye Quietness; Golf putting; Ocular behavior; Quiet Eye

1. Introduction

The study of eye movements during performance of motor skills can yield important information to understand how individuals control their actions. In a seminal study, Vickers (1992) used camera-based eye-tracking to examine the gaze of 12 experienced golfers – comprising five skilled golfers (mean handicap 6.2) and seven less skilled golfers (mean handicap 14.1)¹ – as they putted balls to a 3 m distant hole. Vickers found that, compared to the less skilled golfers, skilled golfers made fewer and longer fixations on the ball prior to movement initiation, during movement execution, and even after movement completion. In the intervening 25 years since this influential initial report of visual gaze control in putting, researchers have used camera-based eye-tracking to examine individuals' ocular activity, and especially their *quiet eye*, during performance of motor skills.

The quiet eye is defined as the final ocular fixation on the target location (e.g., the ball in golf putting), with onset occurring prior to initiation of a critical phase of the movement and offset occurring when the gaze deviates from the target location (Vickers, 1996, 2007). A compelling body of literature has reported that experts show longer quiet eye durations than novices for a variety of motor skills, ranging from precision sports to surgery (for reviews see Gonzalez, Causer, Miall, Grey, Humphreys, & Williams, 2017; Rienhoff, Tirp, Strauß, Baker, & Schorer, 2016; Vickers, 2007; Wilson, Causer, & Vickers, 2015; for meta-analyses see Lebeau, Liu, Sáenz-Moncaleano, Sanduvete-Chaves, Chacón-Moscoso, Becker, & Tenenbaum, 2016;

¹ Golf handicap represents the number of strokes taken in relation to the number of strokes expected to be taken to complete a round of golf. It indexes golfers' ability: the lower the value, the better the player.

1 Mann, Williams, Ward, & Janelle, 2007). For instance, Walters-Symons, Wilson, and Vine
2 (2017) tested 18 experienced golfers (mean handicap 5.7) and 21 novices (no formal handicap),
3 as they putt balls to a 10 foot (i.e., 3 m) distant hole. They found that the experienced golfers
4 had longer quiet eye durations ($M = 1.9$ s) than the novices ($M = 1.2$ s). Due to the extensive
5 research, long quiet eye is currently considered a feature of expertise and is often cited along
6 classic models of skill acquisition (e.g., Fitts & Posner, 1967) whereby experts have greater
7 movement accuracy, consistency, automaticity, and efficiency than novices.

8 Despite the robustness of the quiet eye phenomenon in revealing differences between
9 expertise levels, there is no consensus on whether and how the quiet eye influences motor
10 performance (e.g., Causer, 2016; Williams, 2016; Wilson, Wood, & Vine, 2016). A number of
11 possible cognitive mechanisms have been proposed. The dominant hypothesis (Vickers, 1996)
12 contends that movement-related visual processing is enhanced and movement parameters, such
13 as force and direction, are programmed during the quiet eye period. Therefore, an extended quiet
14 eye period could lead to improved motor programming and, consequently, to enhanced motor
15 performance. Other hypotheses argue that a longer quiet eye duration allows inhibition of task-
16 irrelevant processing (Klostermann, Kredel, & Hossner, 2014) or promotes an external focus of
17 attention (Vine, Moore & Wilson, 2014), which has been associated with improved motor
18 performance (Wulf, 2013). An alternative hypothesis is that the quiet eye reflects psychomotor
19 quiescence. Accordingly, rather than eliciting cognitive benefits, the longer quiet eye of experts
20 could be associated with (or be a consequence of) the cleaner and more consistent movement
21 kinematics of expert compared to novice performers, such as a slower and more stable swing in
22 golf putting (Cooke et al., 2014; Delay et al., 1997; Sim & Kim, 2010).

23 None of the studies to date have provided unequivocal empirical evidence that a longer

1 quiet eye is directly associated with enhanced visual perception or cognitive processing, while
2 our newly suggested kinematic hypothesis has yet to be tested at all. To shed light on these
3 fundamental questions of why experts have a longer quiet eye than novices and why a longer
4 quiet eye aids performance, researchers have been encouraged to employ objective
5 psychophysiological measures to simultaneously assess cognitive, physiological and kinematic
6 variables (for review of research in sport psychophysiology, see Cooke, 2013; Hatfield, Haufler,
7 Hung, & Spalding, 2004). Unfortunately, the simultaneous assessment of eye-movements with
8 such psychophysiological and kinematic variables is a challenge for camera-based eye trackers;
9 the primary and often only technique used to assess ocular activity by previous quiet eye and
10 human performance research. Fortunately, an alternate psychophysiological tool used to record
11 eye movements exists. Electrooculography (EOG) measures time-varying changes in the electric
12 dipoles of the eyes, by recording voltage differences from electrodes placed close to the eyes
13 (Young & Sheena, 1975; Shackel, 1967). A goal of this study is to apply novel EOG methods to
14 quiet eye research and shed new light on the relationship between ocular activity and
15 performance. Some advantages of EOG for quiet eye researchers are as follows.

16 First, the eyes move at speeds up to 100 Hz (Krauzlis, Goffart, & Hafed, 2017).
17 Therefore, based on Nyquist-Shannon sampling theorem (Shannon, 1948), ocular activity should
18 be sampled at least at 200 Hz (corresponding to 1 data point every 5 ms) to prevent aliasing and
19 avoid temporal distortions (i.e., key features of the signal are missed or altered). Because typical
20 camera-based mobile eye-tracking systems sample data at 30 Hz, (i.e., 1 frame every 33 ms)
21 researchers have expressed the need for tools with greater temporal sensitivity than the ones used
22 to date (e.g., Causer, 2016; Gonzalez et al., 2017; Williams, 2016). Typical systems for
23 psychophysiological recording have a sampling frequency of 512 Hz (i.e., 1 voltage value every

1 2 ms) or higher. Accordingly, the EOG offers sufficient temporal precision to fully capture time-
2 varying ocular activity.²

3 Second, by definition, the quiet eye period can extend beyond movement initiation and
4 even beyond movement completion as long as the eyes are on the target (Vickers, 1996, 2007).
5 Because the preprogramming of movement parameters such as direction and force ends with
6 movement initiation, mechanistic studies of the quiet eye should benefit from distinguishing the
7 pre- and postmovement initiation components of the quiet eye period. Surprisingly, only a few
8 recent camera-based studies have reported these components in a golf putting task (Causer,
9 Hayes, Hooper, & Bennett, 2017; Vine, Lee, Moore, & Wilson, 2013; Walters-Symons, Wilson,
10 Klostermann, & Vine, 2017). Causer et al. (2017) found that for novice golfers (no formal
11 handicap), longer quiet eye durations were associated with better performance (lower radial
12 error) in both the pre- and postmovement initiation phases of the putt. Vine et al. (2013) found
13 that for experts (mean handicap 3.6) only the postmovement initiation component of the quiet
14 eye distinguished holed from missed putts (longer duration for holed putts). Finally, Walters-
15 Symons et al. (2017) tested experienced golfers (mean handicap 6.4) and found that, compared to
16 shorter putts (4 feet, 1.2 m), longer putts (8 feet, 2.4 m) were associated with less accuracy and
17 longer postmovement initiation quiet eye durations. They also found no differences in
18 premovement initiation quiet eye durations between long and short putts. These findings cast

² The influence of sampling rate on ocular activity has been investigated by Helsen, Starkes, Elliot, and Ricker (1998). They sampled ocular activity at 60 and 120 Hz using camera-based eye-tracking while participants performed a finger movement task. They found that the two sampling rates produced different results for saccade durations but not for fixation durations.

1 doubt on any quiet eye mechanism that concerns what happens before movement initiation, such
2 as improved preprogramming of movement parameters. By exploiting the multi-measure
3 approach favored in psychophysiology, EOG recordings can be supplemented with external
4 transducers (e.g., an infrared sensor) to detect movement initiation, such as the beginning of the
5 backswing in golf putting (e.g., Cooke, Kavussanu, McIntyre, & Ring, 2010), thereby ensuring
6 that both pre- and postmovement initiation components of the quiet eye can be easily explored.

7 Third, the eyes are not completely still during a fixation (e.g., Krauzlis et al., 2017).
8 Therefore, identifying a quiet eye period requires a threshold criterion to be applied. Because the
9 fovea corresponds to less than 2° of the visual field (Guyton & Hall, 2006), most quiet eye
10 studies have defined fixations in terms of when gaze remains within 3° or 1° of visual angle on
11 the target location (Gonzalez et al., 2017; Lebeau et al., 2016; Vickers, 2007). Because the
12 threshold influences the duration of the fixation, whereby stringent thresholds identify shorter
13 fixations, the impact of threshold choice on quiet eye durations has been recommended as a
14 research question to better understand the quiet eye phenomenon (Gonzalez et al., 2017). One of
15 the strengths of data processing in psychophysiology is that the signal can be scored repeatedly
16 and automatically using different settings, such as voltage thresholds in the EOG.

17 Fourth, the EOG allows researchers to examine the quiet eye phenomenon from a novel
18 perspective that is commonplace in psychophysiology, where signals are measured as a function
19 of time relative to a critical event. Accordingly, instead of defining quietness using a threshold
20 and measuring quiet eye duration (see previous point), researchers could quantify the amount of
21 eye quietness as a function of time relative to movement initiation (e.g., Webb & Obrist, 1970).

22 To date, only one study has used the EOG to examine the quiet eye in a golf putting task.
23 Mann, Coombes, Mousseau, and Janelle (2011) tested 10 skilled (mean handicap 1.2) and 10 less

1 skilled golfers (mean handicap 11.3) as they putted balls to a 12 foot (i.e., 3.7 m) distant hole.
2 They computed the quiet eye by applying a voltage threshold to the EOG signal and found that
3 the more skilled golfers had longer quiet eye durations (around 2.3 s) compared to the less
4 skilled golfers (around 2.1 s). However, they only scored the premovement initiation component
5 of the quiet eye, and not the potentially more important postmovement initiation component
6 (Vine et al., 2013; Walters-Symons, Wilson, Klostermann, & Vine, 2017). Furthermore, they
7 applied an atypical threshold criterion of 100 μ V (corresponding to 5° of visual angle) to the
8 EOG signal; all other golf putting studies have employed a threshold of either 1° or 3° of visual
9 angle (for reviews see Gonzalez et al., 2017; Lebeau et al., 2016).

10 With the overarching goal of introducing psychophysiological methods to quiet eye
11 research, this study evaluated the utility of EOG in assessing ocular activity during performance
12 of motor skills. We conducted new analyses on a golf putting dataset with known expert-novice
13 and holed-missed differences for several psychophysiological indices (Cooke, Kavussanu,
14 Gallicchio, Willoughby, McIntyre, & Ring, 2014). Our primary aims were threefold. First, to
15 quantify both pre- and postmovement initiation components of the quiet eye using EOG. Second,
16 to develop a novel, time-varying measure of ocular activity in the form of eye quietness. In line
17 with the existing literature, we expected that quiet eye durations would be longer and eye
18 quietness greater in experts compared to novices and on holed putts compared to missed putts.
19 Third, we aimed to evaluate the validity of the eye quietness index by assessing its correlation
20 with quiet eye durations. We expected that the two measures would be highly negatively
21 correlated.

22 Our secondary aims were threefold. First to examine the impact of threshold level (e.g.,
23 1° or 3° of visual angle) on quiet eye duration. We expected that more stringent thresholds would

1 generate shorter quiet eye periods. Second, to determine the influence of expertise on the
2 consistency of indices of ocular activity and kinematics across putts. We expected greater
3 consistency in experts based on theoretical models arguing for decreased performance variability
4 as a function increased expertise and learning (e.g., Fitts & Posner, 1967). Finally, we examined
5 the relation between ocular activity (i.e., quiet eye durations, eye quietness) and swing duration.
6 This analysis provided the first test of our kinematic hypothesis of the relationship between quiet
7 eye and performance; namely that a longer quiet eye is associated with a cleaner and more
8 consistent technique. We expected that longer swing durations would be associated with longer
9 postmovement initiation quiet eye durations and greater eye quietness during swing execution.

10 **2. Method**

11 **2.1 Participants**

12 Twenty right-handed male golfers took part in this study. Ten were experts (age: $M =$
13 20.90 , $SD = 0.74$ years; experience: $M = 11.25$, $SD = 3.78$ years; handicap: $M = 1.50$, $SD = 2.32$)
14 and ten were novices (age: $M = 19.00$, $SD = 0.66$ years; experience: $M = 1.85$, $SD = 2.49$ years;
15 no formal handicap). All provided informed consent.

16 **2.2 Putting task**

17 Participants putted golf balls (diameter 4.7 cm) on an artificial flat putting surface
18 (Turftiles) to 2.4 m distant hole, using a blade-style putter (length 90 cm). The hole was of
19 regular size for novices (diameter: 10.8 cm) and half-size for experts (diameter: 5.4 cm). This
20 difference in hole size was chosen so that the two groups holed a similar number of putts and
21 thereby putting outcome (holed, missed) could be used as a factor in our analyses (cf. Babiloni et
22 al., 2008). Indeed, the performance of the two groups did not differ, $t(18) = 1.18$, $p = .25$, $r^2 = .$
23 072 , with experts holing 41% ($SD = 17\%$) and novices holing 31% ($SD = 19\%$) of putts.

1 Participants were instructed to get each ball “ideally in the hole, but if unsuccessful, to make
2 them finish as close to the hole as possible.” Addressing of the ball, movement initiation (i.e.,
3 beginning of backswing), and putter-ball impact were detected through the combination of infra-
4 red (S51-PA 2-C10PK, Datasensor, Monte San Pietro, Italy) and sound (NT1, Rode, Silverwater,
5 Australia) sensors.

6 **2.3 EOG signal**

7 Three pairs of Ag-AgCl electrodes, each with an integrated preamplifier, were applied to
8 the participant’s skin. These were placed at the bottom and outer canthi of both eyes as well as
9 on the forehead (Fp1 and Fp2 location in the 10–20 system, Jasper, 1958). Common mode sense
10 and driven right leg electrodes were used instead of ground and reference electrodes to enhance
11 the common mode rejection ratio of the signal. Voltages were recorded and digitized at 512 Hz
12 (24-bit resolution) using the ActiveTwo system (BioSemi, Netherlands). Offline, the electrodes
13 were bipolar-referenced to obtain one horizontal EOG and two vertical EOGs channels: for the
14 horizontal channel, positive and negative voltages indicated eye movements respectively to the
15 left and to the right; for the vertical channels, positive and negative voltages indicated
16 respectively upward and downward eye movements. The signals were band-pass filtered 0.1 to
17 30 Hz (FIR, Order 512) according to guidelines (Marmor et al., 2011). Epochs were extracted
18 from –9 to +3 s relative to movement initiation (i.e., beginning of backswing), unless two
19 contiguous trial epochs overlapped (in this case, the prebackswing portion was cut shorter). All
20 participants’ vertical and horizontal EOG signals are presented in the supplementary material
21 (**Supplement S1**) and examples are shown in **Figure 1A**. As golf putting is performed in the
22 frontal plane, we focused our analyses on the horizontal signals. Signal processing was
23 performed using MATLAB (MathWorks, Natick, MA).

1 **2.4 Procedure**

2 Following instrumentation and task familiarization (20 putts), participants putted 60 balls
3 in each of two counter-balanced pressure conditions. Due to the methodological nature of this
4 study, only the no-pressure condition was analyzed. It is worth noting that the null effects of
5 pressure on performance and other psychophysiological signals have been reported by Cooke et
6 al. (2014). The mean inter-putt interval for the no-pressure condition was 15.44 s ($SD = 1.90$).
7 Light conditions were kept constant throughout testing.

8 **2.5 Measures**

9 **2.5.1 Quiet eye.** The duration of the total quiet eye (QE_{total}) was measured as the time (in
10 seconds) between quiet eye onset and quiet eye offset. QE_{total} comprised the sum of the
11 premovement initiation (QE_{pre}) and postmovement initiation (QE_{post}) components. The onset and
12 offset of the quiet eye were detected using a voltage-threshold algorithm, which is described in
13 detail in the supplementary material (**Supplement S2**). This algorithm was employed twice: once
14 using a 60 μV threshold and once using a 20 μV threshold, corresponding with eye movements
15 of 3° and 1° of visual angle, respectively (Shackel, 1967; cf. Mann et al, 2011). The outputs of
16 both algorithms for all participants are presented in the supplementary material (**Supplement**
17 **S3**); examples are shown in **Figure 1B**.

18 **2.5.2 Eye quietness.** Eye quietness was operationalized as the standard deviation of the
19 horizontal EOG signal (HEOG-SD), measured in μV , within each of 12 0.5 s bins, ranging from
20 -4 to +2 s relative to movement initiation. Lower HEOG-SD values correspond with less
21 movement of the eyes, i.e., greater quietness. The bin width was chosen following exploratory
22 analyses using a range of widths (0.125, 0.25, 0.5 and 1 s): 0.5 s was sufficiently brief to capture
23 variation in eye quietness in the context of golf putting whereas 1 s was too coarse.

1 **2.5.3 Putting times.** Address time was measured as the time, in seconds, between the
2 positioning of the putter head next to the ball and movement initiation (i.e., beginning of
3 backswing). Swing time was measured as the time, in seconds, between movement initiation and
4 putter-ball impact.

5 **2.5.4 Performance.** Performance was measured as the percentage of holed putts.

6 **2.6 Data reduction and statistical analyses**

7 Putting times, quiet eye and eye quietness measures were computed for each putt. These
8 were used to compute each participant's (a) arithmetic mean, as an index of the average value,
9 and (b) standard deviation, as an index of variability across putts. Analyses involving quiet eye
10 durations were conducted twice, separately for the two thresholds (60 and 20 μV).

11 **2.6.1 Group, outcome, and time differences.** Differences in quiet eye durations and
12 putting times were examined using 2 Group (expert, novice) \times 2 Outcome (holed, missed)
13 ANOVAs, with group as a between-subjects factor and outcome as a within-subjects factor.
14 Differences in eye quietness were examined using 2 Group (expert, novice) \times 2 Outcome (holed,
15 missed) \times 12 Time (0.5 s bins from -4 to $+2$ s) ANOVA, with group as a between-subjects factor
16 and outcome and time as within-subjects factors. The multivariate solution was adopted where
17 appropriate (Vasey & Thayer, 1987) and Wilks' lambda (λ) reported. Univariate partial eta-
18 squared (η^2_p) was reported as a measure of effect size, with values of .02, .13, and .26 reflecting
19 small, medium, and large effects, respectively (Cohen, 1992). Significant interactions were
20 interrogated using posthoc t-tests (reported for $p < .05$).

21 **2.6.2 Relations between quiet eye and eye quietness.** Pearson's correlations were
22 conducted between quiet eye durations and eye quietness (HEOG-SD) to examine the
23 relationship between the two indices of ocular activity. Only relevant comparisons were

1 considered: QE_{pre} with premovement initiation eye quietness and QE_{post} with postmovement
2 initiation eye quietness.

3 **2.6.3 Impact of threshold on quiet eye durations.** We employed 300 different
4 thresholds, ranging from 2 to 600 μV (in 2 μV increments), corresponding to a range of 0.1 to
5 30° (in 0.1° increments) of visual angle. For each threshold we evaluated group differences
6 through independent-sample t-tests.

7 **2.6.4 Correlates of performance.** Pearson's correlations were conducted between the
8 percentage of holed putts and (a) quiet eye durations, (b) eye quietness, and (c) putting times.
9 These correlations were performed separately for each group due to the different hole sizes (i.e.,
10 task difficulties) used for these two groups.

11 **2.6.5 Relations between putting times and ocular activity.** Pearson's correlations were
12 conducted to explore the relations between ocular activity (quiet eye and eye quietness) and
13 putting times (address and swing times).

14 **3. Results**

15 **3.1 Group, outcome, and time differences**

16 **3.1.1 Quiet eye.** The mean (*SD*) quiet eye durations for each group's holed and missed
17 putts are presented in **Table 1**. More and greater expert-novice differences were detected using
18 the more restrictive 20 μV threshold than the 60 μV threshold. It is noteworthy that QE_{total} and
19 QE_{pre} durations did not differ between experts and novices. However, experts had longer QE_{post}
20 (for 60 μV and 20 μV thresholds) than novices. In terms of variability across putts, experts had
21 less variable QE_{total} and QE_{pre} durations (for 60 μV threshold) but more variable QE_{post} duration
22 (for 20 μV threshold) compared to novices.

23 **3.1.2 Eye quietness.** The mean (*SE*) HEOG-SD measures of eye quietness as a function

1 of group, outcome, and time are illustrated in **Figure 2**. A consistent time-varying cubic pattern
2 can be seen: ocular activity increased during the movement preparation phase (–4 to –1 s),
3 peaking just before movement initiation (c. –1 s), before dropping, with a trough around
4 movement execution (0 s), and then increasing again after the ball was struck (c. 1 s).

5 The 2 Group \times 2 Outcome \times 12 Time ANOVA conducted on the mean HEOG-SD
6 revealed a main effect for time, $F(11,8) = 7.87, p = .004, \lambda = .085, \eta^2_p = .247$, and a Group \times
7 Time interaction, $F(11,8) = 9.95, p = .002, \lambda = .068, \eta^2_p = .141$. Independent-sample t-tests
8 revealed that, compared to novices, experts had greater HEOG-SD from –2.5 to –1.5 s and
9 smaller HEOG-SD from 0 to 1 s. No effects emerged for group, $F(1,18) = 0.96, p = .34, \eta^2_p =$
10 $.051$, outcome, $F(1,18) = 0.51, p = .49, \eta^2_p = .027$, Group \times Outcome, $F(1,18) = 1.11, p = .31, \eta^2_p$
11 $= .058$, Outcome \times Time, $F(11,8) = 0.65, p = .75, \lambda = .528, \eta^2_p = .070$, nor Group \times Outcome \times
12 Time, $F(11,8) = 0.78, p = .65, \lambda = .481, \eta^2_p = .044$.

13 The 2 Group \times 2 Outcome \times 12 Time ANOVA conducted on the variability of HEOG-
14 SD revealed a main effect for time, $F(11,8) = 5.24, p = .01, \lambda = .122, \eta^2_p = .414$, namely, a cubic
15 (increase, decrease, increase) pattern. No effects emerged for group, $F(1,18) = 0.27, p = .61, \eta^2_p$
16 $= .015$, outcome, $F(1,18) = 1.11, p = .31, \eta^2_p = .058$, Group \times Outcome, $F(1,18) = 0.72, p = .41,$
17 $\eta^2_p = .038$, Outcome \times Time, $F(11,8) = 3.13, p = .06, \lambda = .189, \eta^2_p = .115$, Group \times Time, $F(11,8)$
18 $= 2.84, p = .07, \lambda = .204, \eta^2_p = .139$, or Outcome \times Group \times Time, $F(11,8) = 0.85, p = .61, \lambda =$
19 $.462, \eta^2_p = .023$.

20 **3.1.3 Putting times.** The mean (*SD*) putting times for each group's holed and missed
21 putts are presented in **Table 1**. Experts had longer swing times and less address time variability
22 (indicative of greater consistency across putts) than novices.

23 **3.2 Relation between quiet eye and eye quietness**

1 Quiet eye durations were negatively correlated with HEOG-SD in both the pre- and
2 postmovement initiation phases, most notably and prominently in the second before and the
3 second after the onset of the backswing (see **Table 2**). As expected, these analyses confirm an
4 inverse association between the quiet eye and eye quietness measures.

5 **3.3 Impact of threshold level on quiet eye duration**

6 To further explore the impact of threshold level on expert-novice differences in the quiet
7 eye, we computed their quiet eye durations corresponding to visual angles of 0.1 to 30° (2 to 600
8 μV). Importantly, experts never exhibited longer durations of QE_{total} (**Figure 3A**) or QE_{pre}
9 (**Figure 3B**) than novices. Unexpectedly, compared to experts, novices showed longer QE_{total}
10 durations at extremely high thresholds spanning approximately 400-500 μV (i.e. 20-25° of visual
11 angle) as well as longer QE_{pre} durations at high to extremely high thresholds spanning 100-500
12 μV (5°-25° of visual angle). Finally, experts displayed longer QE_{post} durations than novices at
13 thresholds of 20-150 μV , corresponding to 1°-7° of visual angle, which overlap with those used
14 in camera-based research.

15 **3.4 Correlates of performance**

16 For experts, the percentage of holed putts was unrelated to putting times, quiet eye
17 durations, and eye quietness, with two exceptions (see **Supplement S4**). Expert performance was
18 negatively correlated with mean HEOG-SD in only the -2 to -1.5 s ($r = -.76, p = .01$) and 1.5 to
19 2 s ($r = -.71, p = .02$) bins, indicating that more putts were holed by players whose eyes were
20 quieter within these intervals. For novices, the percentage of holed putts was unrelated to putting
21 times, quiet eye durations, and eye quietness, with three exceptions (see **Supplement S4**).
22 Novice performance was negatively correlated with the QE_{total} ($r = -.63, p = .05$) and QE_{pre} ($r =$
23 $-.63, p = .05$) with the 60 μV threshold, showing that more putts were holed by players with

1 shorter total and premovement initiation quiet eye durations. Lastly, novices' performance was
2 positively correlated with mean HEOG-SD in just the -0.5 to 0 s bin ($r = .73$, $p = .02$), indicating
3 that more putts were holed by participants whose eyes were less quiet within this interval.

4 **3.5 Relations between putting times and ocular activity**

5 Pearson's correlations were computed between premovement initiation ocular activity
6 and address times as well as between postmovement initiation ocular activity and swing times
7 (**Supplement S5**). These analyses showed that address times were unrelated to quiet eye and eye
8 quietness. Crucially, ocular activity after backswing initiation was associated with the duration of
9 the swing time. Namely, swing times correlated positively ($r = .52$, $p = .02$) with QE_{post} ($60 \mu\text{V}$
10 threshold) and negatively ($r = -.63$, $p = .003$) with HEOG-SD measured 0.5 to 1 s after swing
11 initiation. Thus, participants with longer putting strokes were characterized by longer
12 postmovement initiation quiet eye durations and greater quietness around impact with the ball.

13 **4. Discussion**

14 This report explored the utility of EOG in the study of ocular activity during performance
15 of a motor skill. Specifically, we conducted the first analysis of the effects of expertise on both
16 pre- and postmovement initiation quiet eye components in golf putting. We also developed a new
17 measure of movement-related ocular activity in the form of eye quietness, inversely related with
18 quiet eye duration. The analyses generated a number of novel findings shedding light on the
19 mechanisms underpinning the relationship between ocular activity and motor behavior. These
20 effects are discussed below.

21 **4.1 Quiet eye**

22 A primary aim was to quantify both pre- and postmovement initiation components of the
23 quiet eye using EOG and a secondary aim was to examine the impact of threshold level on quiet

1 eye duration. We examined quiet eye durations at threshold levels corresponding with 3° and 1°
2 of visual angle (i.e., respectively, 60 μ V and 20 μ V; Shackel, 1967), typically used in the quiet
3 eye literature. As expected, quiet eye durations were longer with 3° (around 2 s for experts and
4 2.5 s for novices) than with 1° (around 0.7 s for experts and 0.6 s for novices). However,
5 contrary to expectations, total quiet eye duration (i.e., QE_{total}) did not distinguish experts from
6 novices. Interestingly, group differences emerged when the quiet eye period was broken down
7 relative to the moment of movement initiation. Compared to novices, experts showed a shorter,
8 albeit not significant, premovement initiation quiet eye (i.e., QE_{pre}), and longer postmovement
9 initiation quiet eye (i.e., QE_{post}) (**Table 1**). Further analyses revealed that there was no threshold
10 setting at which experts had a longer total quiet eye (QE_{total}) or premovement initiation quiet eye
11 (QE_{pre}) than novices. Instead, experts only had shorter durations than novices, although this
12 difference was significant only for threshold levels that were larger than typically used in
13 literature (**Figure 3A** and **3B**). These analyses also confirmed that experts showed a longer
14 postmovement initiation quiet eye (QE_{post}) than novices (**Figure 3C**).

15 That the postmovement initiation component of the quiet eye was more sensitive than the
16 premovement initiation component of the quiet eye in revealing differences in putting
17 performance in experienced golfers is consistent with two previous studies (Vine et al., 2013,
18 2015). First, Vine et al. (2013) tested 50 expert golfers (mean handicap 3.6) as they putted balls
19 to a 5 foot (i.e., 1.5 m) distant hole. They examined the quiet eye in different phases of the putt
20 and found that, compared to missed putts, holed putts were characterized by a longer
21 postmovement initiation quiet eye, whereas the premovement initiation quiet eye was not
22 different. Second, Vine et al. (2015) tested 27 experienced golfers (mean handicap 5.8) as they
23 putted balls to a 10 foot (i.e., 3 m) distant hole. Participants' view of the ball was occluded either

1 before or after movement initiation, through a liquid crystal glass panel – positioned above the
2 ball –turning opaque. The authors found that, compared to a no-occlusion condition,
3 performance was impaired by postmovement initiation occlusion but not by premovement
4 initiation occlusion. Taken together, these findings were interpreted as evidence that visual
5 information was actively processed only after movement initiation (i.e., during the execution of
6 the movement), suggesting that postmovement initiation quiet eye was involved in the online
7 control of movement (Vine et al. 2015). However, it has to be noted that this interpretation may
8 not apply to novices (Causer et al., 2017).

9 To our knowledge, this is the first golf putting study to separately examine quiet eye
10 durations before and after movement initiation in an expert-novice design. The fact that effects
11 of expertise, as well as of performance, emerged only after movement initiation, i.e., when
12 movement preprogramming is completed, raises doubts on the interpretation of the quiet eye as
13 correlate of motor programming (Vickers, 1996). Further mechanistic psychophysiological
14 research is needed to clarify this issue. The EOG methodology developed here offers a promising
15 tool to permit such research.

16 **4.2 Eye quietness**

17 Our primary purposes here were to develop a novel time-based EOG measure of eye-
18 quietness, and to evaluate its validity by assessing correlations with our measure of quiet eye.
19 We examined ocular activity as a function of time by computing the variability (standard
20 deviation) of the EOG signal in short intervals (500 ms). This index allowed us to evaluate not
21 only how long the eyes remained “quiet” but also how “quiet” the eyes were for intervals
22 overlapping the quiet eye period. Time-varying statistical analyses revealed that eye quietness
23 fluctuated over time, decreasing prior to movement initiation, increasing around movement

1 execution, and then finally decreasing after movement completion (**Figure 2**). It is interesting to
2 note that the eyes were quietest immediately after movement initiation. Group differences
3 emerged in the second after the ball was struck, which were times that roughly overlapped
4 movement execution, when experts kept their eyes quieter compared to novices. Experts also
5 showed more ocular activity than novices around 2 s prior to movement initiation, perhaps
6 indicative of them taking a final look at the hole consistently at that time (**Supplement S1**).

7 As expected, these results for eye quietness broadly match those for quiet eye durations,
8 i.e., greater postmovement initiation eye quietness corresponded with longer quiet eye duration,
9 whereas less premovement initiation eye quietness corresponded with shorter quiet eye duration.
10 Indeed, further analyses confirmed our hypothesis that eye quietness would correlate negatively
11 with quiet eye durations, particularly at times immediately preceding and following movement
12 initiation (**Table 2**), concurrently validating eye quietness as a measure of ocular activity. This
13 new measure of movement-related ocular activity promises to be especially useful for future
14 multi-method psychophysiological investigations, where it will allow time-synchronized
15 analyses of ocular activity with other signals of interest such as EEG. This research is needed to
16 shed further light on the mechanisms that underpin motor performance.

17 **4.3 Consistency**

18 We hypothesized that consistency of ocular activity across putts would be greater in
19 experts than novices. The analyses of the variability (standard deviation) across putts for quiet
20 eye durations and address times revealed that experts generally showed greater consistency than
21 novices (**Table 1**), in line with classic models of motor skill acquisition (e.g., Fitts & Posner,
22 1967). Such group differences are also noticeable from inspection of the individual EOG
23 waveforms (**Supplement S1**). This consistency effect may reflect the fact that experts have a

1 more consolidated and permanent putting routine than novices, involving address time as well as
2 ocular behavior.

3 **4.4 Performance effects**

4 We predicted, based on extant literature, that quiet eye durations would be longer, and
5 eye quietness greater, for holed compared to missed putts. No differences emerged comparing
6 holed and missed putts for all measures of ocular activity and movement times (**Table 1**).
7 However, performance effects were detected when we considered the variability of participants
8 separately within each group (**Supplement S4**). Correlation analyses revealed that among the
9 novices, those with shorter quiet eye durations (total and premovement initiation quiet eye) and
10 less eye quietness immediately before movement initiation holed more putts. This finding is in
11 contrast with the view that longer quiet eye leads to better performance (Vine et al., 2014) but is
12 consistent with the finding of this study that, on average, experts showed shorter total and
13 premovement initiation quiet eye durations than novices. In other words, the novices that showed
14 ocular activity more similar to that of the experts performed better. For the experts, those with
15 greater eye quietness two seconds before and after movement initiation holed more putts. These
16 findings may indicate that better performance was achieved by experts who moved their eyes
17 less before putting (perhaps because they did not need to look at the hole as often, due to
18 superior green-reading abilities) and after movement completion (perhaps because the ball ended
19 in the hole more often or was rolling directly to the target and, therefore, there was less need to
20 track it in some other spatial locations).

21 **4.5 Kinematic hypothesis**

22 Our final prediction was that longer swing durations would be associated with longer
23 postmovement initiation quiet-eye durations and greater eye quietness during swing execution.

1 Experts took around 200 ms longer than novices to swing the putter and hit the ball (**Table 1**).
2 This finding is consistent with studies that have examined expert-novice differences for
3 movement kinematics in golf putting (e.g., Delay et al., 1997). The fact that experts showed less
4 ocular activity (i.e., greater eye quietness) than novices at times overlapping the execution of the
5 swing suggests a connection between ocular activity and movement duration. Further analyses
6 confirmed that swing duration correlated positively with the duration of the postmovement
7 initiation quiet eye (i.e., QE_{post}) and negatively with eye quietness 0.5 to 1 s after movement
8 initiation (**Supplement S5**). These results suggests that group differences for postmovement
9 initiation ocular activity, discussed above, may be explained, at least in part, by the fact that
10 experts took longer to perform the movement compared to novices. This provides promising
11 evidence for the kinematic hypothesis as a mechanism to explain individual differences in gaze
12 behavior. Specifically, keeping a quiet eye during the swing may enhance postural stability and
13 permit a smoother movement execution. Alternatively, a longer and smoother technique may
14 prompt a longer quiet eye and greater eye quietness during the swing. Indeed, compared to
15 novices, experts swing the putter with lower variability in the axis perpendicular to the putting
16 line (Cooke et al., 2014; Sim & Kim, 2010). The hypothesis that quiet eye represents a correlate
17 of stability during the movement execution is worthy of more direct examination by future
18 research. For example, studies could manipulate features of the movement (e.g., by varying
19 putting distance; Delay et al., 1997) and examine their impact on putting kinematics (e.g., swing
20 duration, smoothness, stability) as well as ocular activity to provide more direct tests of the
21 kinematic hypothesis.

22 **4.6 Limitations and Directions**

1 The findings of this study need to be considered in light of some limitations. First, the
2 EOG measures eye movements relative to the head and, therefore, head movements are
3 confounded with eye movements (Young & Sheena, 1975). For example, a shift in gaze to the
4 left with a still head generates an EOG signal that looks similar to a head movement to the right
5 with a still gaze: in both cases the eyes move to the left but indicate a saccade and a fixation,
6 respectively. In the present study we were able to observe that all participants rested their head
7 above the ball during the final seconds before and during movement. Nonetheless, it would be
8 better for future studies to directly measure head movements to control for this source of bias.
9 Second, we computed quiet eye durations using the EOG signal from only the horizontal
10 channel. However, to increase reliability and generalizability of this method to a variety of
11 movement tasks, future studies could develop better algorithms that combine information from
12 both the vertical and horizontal EOG channels. Third, we acknowledge that the equivalence of
13 $20 \mu\text{V}$ on the horizontal EOG signal with 1° of visual angle is an oversimplification (Shackel,
14 1967). In fact, the corneo-retinal potential that generates the electrical activity that is detected by
15 the EOG changes according to ambient luminance (Young & Sheena, 1975). This effect does not
16 bias our findings because light conditions were kept constant throughout testing and adaptations
17 to luminance changes occur over the course of several minutes (Marmor et al., 2011).
18 Nonetheless, we recommend that researchers calibrate the EOG signal to visual stimuli placed at
19 a known distance in visual angles, for each participant, to account for inter-individual variability.
20 Fourth, differently from eye-tracking, the EOG does not provide spatial information on gaze
21 location. For example, we could not distinguish whether, during the quiet eye period, the gaze
22 was on the target (i.e., the ball) or on a location near the target (e.g., putting surface, putter head).
23 In light of the fact that less skilled golfers make more fixations than more skilled golfers prior to

1 backswing initiation (e.g., Vickers, 1992), this limitation may explain why our finding that
2 novices had longer premovement initiation quiet eye durations than experts departs from what is
3 reported in most other quiet eye studies. Fifth, experts puttied to a smaller hole than novices. This
4 ensured that the two groups achieved a similar number of holed and missed putts. However, the
5 novelty of putting to a smaller hole may have affected experts' preparatory processes and their
6 ocular behaviour. Finally, EOG can provide complementary information to eye-tracking.
7 Therefore, future studies would do well to concurrently record eye-tracking and EOG to combine
8 the greater spatial resolution of the former with the greater temporal resolution of the latter.

9 **4.7 Conclusion**

10 This study demonstrated the utility of new EOG-based methods as complementary
11 techniques to camera-based eye-tracking to assess ocular activity during execution of motor
12 skills. By incorporating EOG methods, quiet eye research should benefit from the body of
13 knowledge produced by psychophysiological research about expertise and performance in motor
14 control (for review of studies see Cooke, 2013; Hatfield, Hauf, Hung, & Spalding, 2004). This
15 interdisciplinarity should provide novel viewpoints on pressing issues, such as the *efficiency*
16 *paradox* (Mann, Wright, & Janelle, 2016), questioning the function of a longer quiet eye when
17 most psychomotor indices, including those of brain activity, indicate that expertise is associated
18 with quietening of task-irrelevant activity and enhancement of task-relevant activity (e.g.,
19 Gallicchio, Cooke, & Ring, 2017). The evidence garnered here favors a more parsimonious
20 explanation for previously identified expert-novice differences in quiet eye duration; they could
21 simply reflect experts' better and smoother technique.

22

References

- 1
- 2 Babiloni, C., Del Percio, C., Iacoboni, M., Infarinato, F., Lizio, R., Marzano, N., ... Eusebi, F.
- 3 (2008). Golf putt outcomes are predicted by sensorimotor cerebral EEG rhythms. *Journal*
- 4 *of Physiology*, 586, 131-139. <https://doi.org/10.1113/jphysiol.2007.141630>
- 5 Causer, J. (2016). The future of quiet eye research – comment on Vickers. *Current Issues in*
- 6 *Sport Science*, 1, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.15203/CISS_2016.103
- 7 Causer, J., Hayes, S. J., Hooper, J. M., & Bennett, S. J. (2017). Quiet eye facilitates sensorimotor
- 8 preprogramming and online control of precision aiming in golf putting. *Cognitive*
- 9 *Processing*, 18(1), 47-54. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-016-0783-4>
- 10 Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 155–159.
- 11 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155>
- 12 Cooke, A. (2013). Readyng the head and steadyng the heart: A review of cortical and cardiac
- 13 studies of preparation for action in sport. *International Review of Sport and Exercise*
- 14 *Psychology*, 6, 122–138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2012.724438>
- 15 Cooke, A., Kavussanu, M., McIntyre, D., & Ring, C. (2010). Psychological, muscular and
- 16 kinematic factors mediate performance under pressure. *Psychophysiology*, 47(6), 1109-
- 17 1118. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.2010.01021.x>
- 18 Cooke, A., Kavussanu, M., Gallicchio, G., Willoughby, A., McIntyre, D., & Ring, C. (2014).
- 19 Preparation for action: Psychophysiological activity preceding a motor skill as a function
- 20 of expertise, performance outcome, and psychological pressure. *Psychophysiology*, 51(4),
- 21 374-384. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.12182>
- 22 Cousineau, D. (2005). Confidence intervals in within-subject designs: A simpler solution to
- 23 Loftus and Masson's method. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, 1, 42–

- 1 45. <https://doi.org/10.20982/tqmp.01.1.p042>
- 2 Delay, D., Nougier, V., Orliaguet, J., & Coello, Y. (1997). Movement control in golf putting.
3 *Human Movement Science, 16*, 597–619. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-9457\(97\)00008-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-9457(97)00008-0)
- 4 Fitts, P. M., & Posner, M. I. (1967). *Human performance*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- 5 Gallicchio, G., Cooke, A., & Ring, C. (2017). Practice makes efficient: Cortical alpha
6 oscillations are associated with improved golf putting performance. *Sport, Exercise &*
7 *Performance Psychology, 6*(1), 89-102. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000077>
- 8 Gonzalez, C. C., Causer, J., Miall, R. C., Grey, M. J., Humphreys, G., & Williams, A. M. (2017).
9 Identifying the causal mechanisms of the quiet eye. *European Journal of Sport Science,*
10 *17*(1), 74-84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2015.1075595>
- 11 Guyton, A. C., & Hall, J. E. (2006). *Textbook of medical physiology* (11th Ed.). Philadelphia,
12 PA: Elsevier Inc.
- 13 Hatfield, B. D., Haufler, A. J., Hung, T. M., & Spalding, T. W. (2004). Electroencephalographic
14 studies of skilled psychomotor performance. *Journal of Clinical Neurophysiology, 21,*
15 *144–156.* <https://doi.org/10.1097/00004691-200405000-00003>
- 16 Helsen, W. F., Starkes, J. L., Elliott, D., & Ricker, K. L. (1998). Sampling frequency and the
17 study of eye-hand coordination in aiming. *Behavior Research Methods, 30*(4), 617-623.
18 <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03209479>
- 19 Jasper, H. H. (1958). The ten-twenty electrode system of the International Federation.
20 *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology, 17*, 37–46.
- 21 Klostermann, A., Kredel, R., & Hossner, E. J. (2014). On the interaction of attentional focus and
22 gaze: The quiet eye inhibits focus-related performance decrements. *Journal of Sport and*
23 *Exercise Psychology, 36*(4), 392-400. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2013-0273>

- 1 Krauzlis, R. J., Goffart, L., & Haged, Z. M. (2017). Neuronal control of fixation and fixational
2 eye movements. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 372(1718), 1-12.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2016.0205>
- 4 Lebeau, J. C., Liu, S., Sáenz-Moncaleano, C., Sanduvete-Chaves, S., Chacón-Moscoso, S.,
5 Becker, B. J., & Tenenbaum, G. (2016). Quiet eye and performance in sport: A meta-
6 analysis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 38(5), 441-457.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2015-0123>
- 8 Mann, D. T., Coombes, S. A., Mousseau, M. B., & Janelle, C. M. (2011). Quiet eye and the
9 Bereitschaftspotential: Visuomotor mechanisms of expert motor performance. *Cognitive*
10 *Processing*, 12(3), 223-234. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-011-0398-8>
- 11 Mann, D. T., Wright, A., & Janelle, C. M. (2016). Quiet eye: The efficiency paradox – comment
12 on Vickers. *Current Issues in Sport Science*, 1, 1-4.
13 https://doi.org/10.15203/CISS_2016.111
- 14 Mann, D. T., Williams, A. M., Ward, P., & Janelle, C. M. (2007). Perceptual-cognitive expertise
15 in sport: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 29(4), 457-478.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.29.4.457>
- 17 Marmor, M. F., Brigell, M. G., McCulloch, D. L., Westall, C. A., Bach, M., & International
18 Society for Clinical Electrophysiology of Vision. (2011). ISCEV standard for clinical
19 electro-oculography (2010 update). *Documenta Ophthalmologica*, 122(1), 1-7.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10633-011-9259-0>
- 21 Pfister, R., & Janczyk, M. (2013). Confidence intervals for two sample means: Calculation,
22 interpretation, and a few simple rules. *Advances in Cognitive Psychology*, 9(2), 74-80.
23 <https://doi.org/10.5709/acp-0133-x>

- 1 Rienhoff, R., Tirp, J., Strauß, B., Baker, J., & Schorer, J. (2016). The ‘quiet eye’ and motor
2 performance: a systematic review based on Newell’s constraints-led model. *Sports*
3 *Medicine*, 46(4), 589-603. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-015-0442-4>
- 4 Sim, M., & Kim, J. U. (2010). Differences between experts and novices in kinematics and
5 accuracy of golf putting. *Human Movement Science*, 29, 932–946.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2010.07.014>
- 7 Shackel, B. (1967). Eye movement recording by electro-oculography. In P. H. Venables, & I.
8 Martin (Eds.), *A manual of psychophysiological methods*. Amsterdam, North-Holland:
9 Pub. Co.
- 10 Shannon, C. E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell System Technical*
11 *Journal*, 27(3), 379-423.
- 12 Vasey, M. W., & Thayer, J. F. (1987). The continuing problem of false positives in repeated
13 measures ANOVA in psychophysiology: A multivariate solution. *Psychophysiology*, 24,
14 479–486. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.1987.tb00324.x>
- 15 Vickers, J. N. (1992). Gaze control in putting. *Perception*, 21(1), 117-132.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1068/p210117>
- 17 Vickers, J. N. (1996). Visual control when aiming at a far target. *Journal of Experimental*
18 *Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 22(2), 342.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.22.2.342>
- 20 Vickers, J. N. (2007). *Perception, cognition, and decision training: The quiet eye in action*.
21 Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- 22 Vine, S. J., Lee, D., Moore, L. J., & Wilson, M. R. (2013). Quiet eye and choking: Online
23 control breaks down at the point of performance failure. *Medicine & Science in Sports &*

- 1 *Exercise*, 45(10), 1988-1994. <https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e31829406c7>
- 2 Vine, S. J., Moore, L. J., & Wilson, M. R. (2014). Quiet eye training: The acquisition, refinement
3 and resilient performance of targeting skills. *European Journal of Sport Science*, 14(S1),
4 S235-S242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2012.683815>
- 5 Vine, S. J., Lee, D. H., Walters-Symons, R., & Wilson, M. R. (2015). An occlusion paradigm to
6 assess the importance of the timing of the quiet eye fixation. *European Journal of Sport*
7 *Science*, 17(1), 85-92.
8 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17461391.2015.1073363>
- 9 Walters-Symons, R., Wilson, M., Klostermann, A., & Vine, S. (2017). Examining the response
10 programming function of the Quiet Eye: Do tougher shots need a quieter eye? *Cognitive*
11 *processing*, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-017-0841-6>
- 12 Walters-Symons, R., Wilson, M., & Vine, S. (2017). The quiet eye supports error recovery in
13 golf putting. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 31, 21-27.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.03.012>
- 15 Webb, R. A., & Obrist, P. A. (1970). The physiological concomitants of reaction time
16 performance as a function of preparatory interval and preparatory interval series.
17 *Psychophysiology*, 6(4), 389-403. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.1970.tb01749.x>
- 18 Williams, A. M. (2016). Quiet eye vs. noisy brain: The eye like the brain is always active –
19 comment on Vickers. *Current Issues in Sport Science*, 1, 1-3.
20 https://doi.org/10.15203/CISS_2016.116
- 21 Wilson, M. R., Causer, J., & Vickers, J. N. (2015). Aiming for excellence. In J. Baker, & D.
22 Farrow (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of sport expertise*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- 23 Wilson, M. R., Wood, G. W., & Vine, S. J. (2016). Say it quietly, but we still do not know how

- 1 Quiet Eye training works – comment on Vickers. *Current Issues in Sport Science*, 1, 1-3.
2 https://doi.org/10.15203/CISS_2016.117
- 3 Wulf, G. (2013). Attentional focus and motor learning: A review of 15 years. *International*
4 *Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 6, 77-104.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2012.723728>
- 6 Young, L. R., & Sheena, D. (1975). Survey of eye movement recording methods. *Behavior*
7 *Research Methods*, 7(5), 397-429. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03201553>

1 **Table 1.** Mean (*SD*) of quiet eye durations (QE_{total} , QE_{pre} , and QE_{post}), computed with 60 and 20 μV threshold levels, and
 2 putting times (address and swing times), with the results of the 2 Group (expert, novice) \times 2 Outcome (holed, missed) mixed
 3 ANOVAs. Values were examined as average (e.g., QE_{total}) and standard deviation (e.g., $SD QE_{total}$) across putts.

Measures	Experts (n = 10)		Novices (n = 10)		Group		Outcome		Group \times Outcome	
	Holed	Missed	Holed	Missed	$F(1,18)$	η^2_p	$F(1,18)$	η^2_p	$F(1,18)$	η^2_p
Quiet eye durations (s), 60 μV										
QE_{total}	1.983 (0.60)	2.002 (0.52)	2.400 (1.65)	2.557 (1.72)	0.78	.041	0.66	.035	0.40	.022
QE_{pre}	1.032 (0.49)	1.061 (0.50)	1.848 (1.59)	2.014 (1.63)	2.88	.138	0.81	.043	0.40	.022
QE_{post}	0.952 (0.21)	0.942 (0.23)	0.552 (0.25)	0.543 (0.21)	16.49**	.478	0.26	.014	0.00	0.00
$SD QE_{total}$	0.57 (0.43)	0.55 (0.35)	1.15 (0.83)	1.19 (0.62)	6.61*	.268	0.01	.000	0.07	.003
$SD QE_{pre}$	0.46 (0.49)	0.44 (0.38)	1.06 (0.86)	1.11 (0.68)	6.28*	.259	0.03	.002	0.07	.004
$SD QE_{post}$	0.21 (0.12)	0.22 (0.08)	0.25 (0.06)	0.25 (0.08)	0.73	.039	0.05	.003	0.22	.012
Quiet eye durations (s), 20 μV										
QE_{total}	0.705 (0.25)	0.655 (0.21)	0.664 (0.54)	0.627 (0.44)	0.04	.002	4.03	.183	0.08	.004
QE_{pre}	0.417 (0.19)	0.381 (0.13)	0.497 (0.51)	0.454 (0.41)	0.25	.014	2.91	.139	0.02	.001
QE_{post}	0.288 (0.11)	0.275 (0.11)	0.167 (0.06)	0.173 (0.07)	8.29*	.884	0.13	.007	0.89	.047
$SD QE_{total}$	0.33 (0.13)	0.32 (0.09)	0.38 (0.29)	0.38 (0.25)	0.38	.020	0.35	.019	0.02	.001
$SD QE_{pre}$	0.27 (0.11)	0.25 (0.08)	0.35 (0.30)	0.34 (0.28)	0.82	.044	0.89	.047	0.04	.002
$SD QE_{post}$	0.16 (0.07)	0.16 (0.08)	0.08 (0.04)	0.10 (0.05)	8.73**	.327	1.02	.054	0.51	.027
Putting times (s)										
Address	2.92 (0.81)	2.99 (0.90)	4.79 (3.3)	4.43 (2.78)	2.79	.134	1.16	.061	2.47	.121
Swing	0.89 (0.15)	0.90 (0.16)	0.71 (0.14)	0.71 (0.15)	8.53**	.321	0.44	.024	0.15	.008
SD Address	0.78 (0.60)	0.79 (0.48)	1.96 (1.47)	2.15 (1.60)	6.19*	.256	1.54	.079	1.13	.059
SD Swing	0.04 (0.02)	0.06 (0.09)	0.07 (0.03)	0.20 (0.44)	1.35	.070	1.18	.062	0.66	.036

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

4

1 **Table 2.** Pearson's correlations between quiet eye durations (QE_{pre} and QE_{post}), computed
2 with 60 and 20 μV threshold levels, and eye quietness (HEOG-SD), computed in different time
3 intervals relative to backswing initiation. The table shows only relevant comparisons (e.g.,
4 premovement initiation quiet eye with premovement initiation eye quietness).

5

HEOG-SD (μV)	QE_{pre} (s)		QE_{post} (s)	
	60 μV	20 μV	60 μV	20 μV
-4 to -3.5 s	-.50*	-.34	-	-
-3.5 to -3 s	-.41	-.21	-	-
-3 to -2.5 s	-.38	-.07	-	-
-2.5 to -2 s	-.34	-.02	-	-
-2 to -1.5 s	-.33	-.11	-	-
-1.5 to -1 s	-.64**	-.35	-	-
-1 to -0.5 s	-.62**	-.50*	-	-
-0.5 to 0 s	-.48*	-.49*	-	-
0 to 0.5 s	-	-	-.91***	-.80***
0.5 to 1 s	-	-	-.53*	-.33
1 to 1.5 s	-	-	.11	-.18
1.5 to 2 s	-	-	.19	.29

* $p \leq .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

6

Figure captions

Figure 1. Panel A: Horizontal and vertical (left and right eye) EOG signals. Voltages (μV) are represented as function of time (s). Voltage increases indicate eye movements to the left or upward; voltage decreases indicate movements to the right or downward. Eye blinks are evident in the vertical EOG signals. Panel B: Output of the QE algorithm with 60 and 20 μV thresholds. Thick colored lines indicate the quiet eye period in its premovement initiation (QE_{pre}) and postmovement initiation (QE_{post}) components.

Figure 2. Eye quietness, i.e., HEOG-SD (μV), (panels A, B, and C) and its variability across putts, i.e., SD HEOG-SD (μV), (panels D, E, and F) as a function of time (s) from -4 to 2 s and either group (experts, novices) or outcome (holed, missed). HEOG-SD is inversely related to eye quietness: lower values indicate greater quietness. Panels A and D show Group \times Time effects. Error bars indicate between-subject *SE*. Panels B and E show Outcome \times Time effects for the experts. Panels C and F show Outcome \times Time effects for the novices. Error bars indicate within-subject *SE* computed through normalization of the outcome factor (Cousineau, 2005).

Figure 3. Durations (s) of total (QE_{total} , panel A), premovement initiation (QE_{pre} , panel B), and postmovement initiation (QE_{post} , panel C) quiet eye, as a function of threshold (μV and corresponding degrees of visual angle). The solid and dashed lines represent mean durations, respectively for experts and novices. The two colored bars above the x-axis indicate r^2 and p values associated with the independent-sample t-tests conducted on group differences ($df = 18$). The shaded areas represent the *SE* of each group's means and were computed using pooled estimates, hence corresponding with the independent-sample t-tests (Pfister & Janczyk, 2013).