



LJMU Research Online

Runswick, OR, Roca, A, Mark Williams, A, Bezodis, NE, McRobert, AP and North, JS

The impact of contextual information and a secondary task on anticipation performance: An interpretation using cognitive load theory

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/7971/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Runswick, OR, Roca, A, Mark Williams, A, Bezodis, NE, McRobert, AP and North, JS (2018) The impact of contextual information and a secondary task on anticipation performance: An interpretation using cognitive load theory. Applied Cognitive Psychology. ISSN 1099-0720

LJMU has developed **LJMU Research Online** for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

Running Head: CONTEXT, COGNITIVE LOAD AND ANTICIPATION

The impact of contextual information and a secondary task on anticipation performance: An interpretation using Cognitive Load Theory

Oliver R. Runswick (o.runswick@chi.ac.uk)^{1 2}

André Roca¹

A. Mark Williams³

Neil E. Bezodis⁴

Allistair P. McRobert⁵

Jamie S. North¹

¹ Expert Performance and Skill Acquisition Research Group, School of Sport, Health and Applied Science, St Mary's University, Twickenham, London, UK

² Department of Sport and Exercise Sciences, University of Chichester, UK

³ Department of Health, Kinesiology and Recreation, College of Health, University of Utah, USA

⁴ Applied Sports, Technology, Exercise and Medicine Research Centre, Swansea University, UK

⁵ Research Institute for Sport and Exercise Sciences, Liverpool John Moores University, UK

Accepted for publication in Applied Cognitive Psychology 01/12/2017

Corresponding author:

Oliver Runswick

Department of Sport and Exercise Sciences

University of Chichester

College Lane

Chichester

PO19 6PE

Email: o.runswick@chi.ac.uk

Key Words: perceptual-cognitive expertise; working memory; dual-task performance; verbal reports

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

Abstract

When performing under severe time constraints, sports performers use kinematic and contextual information to facilitate anticipation. We examined the relative importance of these two information sources and their impact on cognitive load and anticipation performance. Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) predicts that adding more information sources to a task will increase cognitive load in less-skilled but not skilled performers. Skilled and less-skilled cricket batters anticipated deliveries from bowlers on a life-size screen under four conditions that manipulated access to contextual information and included a secondary task. The presence of context enhanced anticipation accuracy for both skilled and less-skilled groups, without affecting cognitive load. Skilled performers used sequencing and game-related contextual information in addition to kinematic information to facilitate anticipation, while both groups reported using information pertaining to opponent positioning. Findings highlight the importance of context in anticipation and suggest that the addition of context may not necessarily negatively impact cognitive load.

CONTEXT, COGNITIVE LOAD AND ANTICIPATION

1 Roca, Ford, McRobert, and Williams (2013) showed that multiple processes underpin skilled anticipation, not
2 only the pick-up of visual kinematic information in the form of postural cues and pattern recognition, but also
3 the use of situational probabilities which arise from the use of contextual information. More recently, Murphy et
4 al. (2016) used a novel approach to compare how tennis players made anticipation judgments when viewing
5 rallies presented as normal video and animated footage in which postural information was removed. These
6 authors demonstrated that both kinematic and contextual information contribute to anticipation and that effective
7 processing of contextual information is a strong predictor of expert performance.

8 While Müller and Abernethy (2012) acknowledge the potential importance of early information in
9 striking sports, the model outlines the limited scope of empirical evidence concerning the use of contextual
10 information sources such as the game situation. This omission in the literature is notable and it was highlighted
11 again by Cañal-Bruland and Mann (2015) who identified three areas that require investigation in order to
12 develop a clearer picture of the role of context in skilled anticipation. First, research is needed to identify the
13 specific sources of contextual information employed. Second, research is needed to examine how the different
14 sources of contextual information interact with the pick-up of biological motion information. Third, research is
15 need to develop a clearer picture of how the specific situation and circumstances shape the use of contextual
16 information. Furthermore, only a few researchers have explored how multiple sources of contextual information
17 may interact to facilitate anticipation and, importantly, how they combine with the availability of kinematic
18 information (Morris-Binelli & Müller, 2017; Roca & Williams, 2016).

19 In investigating context, researchers have applied the term to describe a variety of information sources.
20 Runswick, Roca, Williams, Bezodis, and North (2017) differentiate between *situation-specific* and *non*
21 *situation-specific* contextual information. The former relates to information sources that are changeable and
22 unique to that specific event, such as game score and opponent positions, whereas the latter pertains to those that

1 are more stable, such as a team's past performances and playing style. In this paper, we focus on the situation-
2 specific sources of contextual information that can be readily manipulated and applied to experimental designs
3 and learning environments. Several researchers have identified pertinent sources of situation-specific contextual
4 information. For example, knowledge of game score (Farrow & Reid, 2012), the sequence in which information
5 is displayed (McRobert, Ward, Eccles, & Williams, 2011), knowledge of opponent position (Loffing &
6 Hagemann, 2014), and information concerning positioning of both opposing players and team-mates (Paull &
7 Glencross, 1997), have been shown to enhance the ability to anticipate. Runswick et al. (2017) manipulated
8 multiple sources of situation-specific contextual information while skilled cricket batsmen faced a bowler in-
9 situ. The results showed that adding multiple sources of context to a complex task affected movement execution
10 but did not affect the levels of mental effort invested by skilled performers. This latter finding can be interpreted
11 using Cognitive Load Theory (CLT; de Jong, 2010; Sweller, 1988; 1994; Van Merriënboer & Sweller, 2005).

12 The CLT is a well-established theory of instructional design that originates from problem solving tasks
13 in educational psychology. The theory assumes that the capacity of working memory is limited and the cognitive
14 load associated with a task determines how much of this capacity is used. Cognitive load is created in three
15 ways, intrinsic, extraneous, and germane load, each with specific implications for optimizing task design
16 (Moreno & Park, 2010). The intrinsic load refers to the difficulty of the task itself and depends on the prior
17 knowledge of the learner (Sweller, 1994). The extraneous cognitive load refers to the way an instructional task
18 is presented (Sweller, Chandler, Tierney, & Cooper, 1990). Germane load (Sweller, van Merriënboer, & Paas,
19 1998) consists of the cognitive resources devoted to schema acquisition and automatization (the development of
20 specific cognitive representations to automatically process information). These three sources are additive, and
21 they combine to create the total cognitive load. An increase in intrinsic and extraneous load can negatively affect
22 learning due to a lack of available memory capacity for germane load and the building and modifying schemata.

1 If the total load becomes excessive, performance on the task can be negatively affected (Paas, Renkle, &
2 Sweller, 2003).

3 The expertise reversal effect (Kalyuga, Ayres, Chandler, & Sweller, 2003) suggests that the predictions
4 of CLT, such as increasing the complexity of a task causing an increase in cognitive load, do not hold for more
5 experienced performers like those tested by Runswick et al. (2017). The suggestion is that experienced
6 performers can automatically integrate extra task-relevant information using existing schemata without any
7 impact on cognitive load. Presenting a task in a more complex manner would not increase extraneous load for
8 experienced performers, whereas it would for those with less experience who do not have existing schemata to
9 integrate task-relevant information automatically. Initially, work with CLT focused on reducing extraneous load
10 in inexperienced learners using classroom tasks (e.g., Sweller, 1988), but subsequently its application has been
11 extended to other domains which contain a number of sources of task-relevant information and to more skilled
12 learners. For example, CLT has been applied to training in medicine and to human factors (e.g., Engström,
13 Markkula, Victor, & Merat, 2017; Leppink & Duvivier, 2016; Young, van Merriënboer, Durning, & Ten Cate,
14 2014). de Jong (2010) suggested that CLT should apply to highly complex tasks for which learners must use all
15 available resources to make decisions in a very short time (e.g., flying a plane). However, CLT and the expertise
16 reversal effect have not been applied to understanding the execution of temporally-constrained interceptive
17 actions in skilled or less-skilled performers.

18 The CLT has usually made assumptions about the effect of increasing cognitive load on learning, but the
19 effect that cognitive load has on performing the primary task can also be important. Other theories based on a
20 limited capacity working memory that investigate anxiety, such as attentional control theory (Eysenck,
21 Derakshan, Santos, & Calvo, 2007), have extensively investigated working-memory capacity and performance
22 under anxiety. However, few researchers have investigated how other sources of load, such as those outlined in

1 CLT affect performance. In vehicle driving tasks, it has been shown that increased cognitive load has a negative
2 effect on aspects of driving performance requiring cognitive control (Engström et al., 2017) and that changes
3 can result in modifications to visual attention (Lee, Lee, & Boyle, 2007). However, the addition of information
4 that is relevant to the primary task (e.g., contextual information) has not been investigated in complex, time-
5 constrained skills. While researchers investigating CLT have focused on simple tasks with less-skilled
6 performers, investigations into context and anticipation have primarily focused on skilled performers. No
7 attention has been focused on whether less-skilled performers can use and integrate contextual and kinematic
8 information sources to develop anticipation (Morris-Binelli & Müller, 2017; Müller & Abernethy, 2012). The
9 application of CLT to investigate cognitive load, context, and anticipation performance in a study utilizing
10 skilled and less-skilled groups offers an opportunity to address these shortcomings in the literature.

11 Performance on a secondary task has been suggested as a useful method for assessing the attentional load
12 placed on a performer (de Jong, 2010; Ellmers, Cocks, Dumas, Williams, & Young, 2016). Since the
13 secondary task is not relevant to the primary task, no existing schemata would exist for any skill level and the
14 secondary task should add load. According to CLT, the effect of adding too much contextual information would
15 increase extraneous load in less-skilled performers in a similar fashion to an unrelated secondary task. In
16 experienced performers, however, this would not be the case because contextual information could be
17 automatically processed through existing schemata. If the addition of contextual information causes excessive
18 cognitive load in less-skilled performers, identifying which information sources are most important in skilled
19 anticipation can guide the application of CLT in a new domain, ensuring that only key information is presented
20 during practice and that working memory is not overloaded.

21 In this paper, we examine the effect of contextual information on anticipation performance and explore
22 the relative importance of kinematic and contextual information, as well as how these two sources of

1 information interact to facilitate anticipation. We use a video-based anticipation task involving cricket and
2 manipulate access to contextual information while introducing a secondary task to examine the effects of
3 context on anticipation performance and cognitive load in skilled and less-skilled performers. Furthermore, we
4 build on previous literature that has identified the sources of contextual information that aid anticipation by
5 including a variety of these sources in the experimental design, allowing for the investigation of how different
6 sources are used during the anticipation process. We predicted, based on CLT and Müller and Abernethy's
7 (2012) model of anticipation in striking sports, that the addition of context would improve anticipation accuracy
8 in skilled performers. In contrast, we predicted that the presence of context would reduce anticipation accuracy
9 in less-skilled performers, who would not be able to automatically integrate contextual information without
10 greatly increasing cognitive load. Furthermore, we hypothesized that context would cause increased cognitive
11 load and negatively affect performance on both primary and secondary tasks in the less-skilled group. We also
12 predicted that both skilled and less-skilled groups would show a reduction in anticipation accuracy under
13 secondary task conditions because of the increase in cognitive load due to the lack of access to task-specific
14 schemata to automatically integrate non-task relevant information.

15 **Method**

16 **Participants**

17 In order to test predictions of CLT, a comparison between less-skilled participants and performers who
18 have had the opportunity to develop schemata through exposure to match-play context was required. Therefore,
19 nine skilled male cricket batsmen (M age = 22.6 ± 7.8 years) who played at a minimum of club first team level
20 (M experience = 13.6 ± 6.3 years) and nine less-skilled male participants (M age = 28.9 ± 6.7 years) with no
21 competitive cricket experience volunteered to participate. Five of the skilled players had experience at county
22 level and one at international level. Although the less-skilled participants had no experience of playing in a

1 cricket match, they all resided in a cricket-playing nation and therefore could have experienced exposure to non-
2 competitive cricket in a physical education context. As a result, this group were labelled as less-skilled rather
3 than novice. The research was conducted in accordance with the ethical guidelines of the lead institution and
4 written informed consent was obtained from all participants at the outset.

5 **Dependent Measures**

6 **Anticipation Performance.** Participants viewed occluded clips of cricket bowlers and were asked to
7 predict the point the ball would have passed the stumps, marking this on diagrams scaled down to $8 \times$ smaller
8 than game size to fit a single A4 sheet. The radial error from correct ball location was measured and scaled back
9 up to quantify anticipation accuracy at game scale (i.e., how far the bat would have been from the ball). Trials
10 repeated across both conditions were used for analysis to negate any effect of variations in trial difficulty. To
11 improve engagement with the task, participants were asked to play the appropriate shot to hit or leave the ball at
12 the time they thought the ball would have passed them (as per instructions used by McRobert, Williams, Ward,
13 and Eccles, 2009; McRobert et al., 2011). Deciding whether to play at a delivery or 'leave' (not play a shot at
14 the ball) is a key skill in cricket batting. Skilled batsmen need to be able to accurately decide where the ball will
15 pass stumps and whether it is likely to hit the stumps if it is not intercepted.

16 **Secondary Task Performance.** Secondary task performance was defined as the number of correct
17 responses verbalized. The number of correct responses per second in both single and dual-task counting was
18 calculated to negate any effect of difference in trial length. The participants' ability to perform the secondary
19 counting task concurrently to the primary task, both with and without context, was quantified by using the dual-
20 task cost (DTC) formula, $DTC (\%) = 100 (\text{single-task score} - \text{dual-task score}) / \text{single-task score}$ (Ellmers et al.,
21 2016; McDowd, 1986). The higher the dual-task cost, the poorer the counting performance when performed
22 alongside the primary anticipation task compared with when performed in isolation.

23 **Mental Effort.** The Rating Scale for Mental Effort (RSME) was used to assess how context and a

1 secondary task affected mental effort. It is a one-dimensional linear scale which runs from 0-150 with zero
2 corresponding to not at all effortful, 75 corresponding to moderately effortful, and 150 to very effortful. The
3 scale has been reported as a valid and reliable measure of mental effort (see Veltman & Gaillard, 1996). Scores
4 from the RSME were collected on six occasions in each condition and always after a repeated trial to allow for
5 direct repeated measures comparison between control and context.

6 **Verbal Reports.** Retrospective verbal reports were collected on six occasions in each condition. These
7 were always collected after a repeated trial to allow for direct comparison of the same trials across conditions.
8 Participants were not required to include numbers from the secondary counting task in reports. Verbal reports
9 were transcribed verbatim and coded into two sets of four categories. First, statements were coded into cognitive
10 categories based on the structure outlined by Ericsson and Simon (1993), and developed by Ward, Williams, and
11 Ericsson (2003), that has been used previously to investigate mechanisms underpinning anticipation (McRobert
12 et al., 2011; Murphy et al., 2016; North, Ward, Ericsson, & Williams, 2011; Roca, Ford, McRobert, & Williams,
13 2011). Cognitive categories included: (i) *monitoring statements*, recalling descriptions of current events and
14 current actions; (ii) *planning*, referring to potential decisions on a course of action to anticipate an outcome
15 event; (iii) *predictions*, referring to statements anticipating or highlighting possible future events; and (iv)
16 *evaluations*, referring to statements making some form of comparison, assessment or appraisal of events that are
17 situation-, task-, or context-relevant. Second, reports were coded into categories based on the sources of
18 information. Categories based on previously discussed information sources included: (i) *kinematic*, statements
19 that mention cues from the bowler's body (McRobert et al., 2011); (ii) *sequencing*, statements that mention
20 events of previous deliveries or actions (McRobert et al., 2011); (iii) *game situation*, statements that mention the
21 score or time left in the game (Farrow & Reid, 2012; Paull & Glencross, 1997); and (iv) *field positioning*,
22 statements that mention the position of the opposition fielders (Loffing & Hagemann, 2014; Paull & Glencross,
23 1997).

1 **Procedure**

2 We used the same stimuli as previously employed by McRobert et al. (2009). Ten (M age = 19.5 ± 2.5
3 years) county-level cricket bowlers (six fast; four spin) were recruited to create the video-based test stimuli. A
4 camera was positioned on the batting crease at a height of 1.7 m and in line with middle stump so that it
5 represented a typical viewing perspective while batting. The different bowlers were recorded delivering a full
6 over (six deliveries) as they would in a game situation, yielding 60 unique deliveries. Footage was occluded
7 immediately prior to ball release, focusing on the first stage of Müller and Abernethy's (2012) model in which
8 situational probabilities are used. Clips were divided into two blocks of 36 deliveries (12 deliveries were
9 repeated in the two conditions to allow for direct repeated measures comparison).


10 To ensure there was no context displayed in the control condition, footage showed only the bowler with
11 no further contextual information and no two deliveries from the same bowler were displayed consecutively.
12 The sequencing of information in cricket has been identified as an important source of context (McRobert et al.,
13 2011). The context condition showed sequences of six deliveries from the same bowler (as would be seen in a
14 match) and included information about field settings and game situation. A panel of three independent qualified
15 cricket coaches viewed the full non-occluded footage and agreed upon a game situation and field that would be
16 tactically appropriate for the location of the deliveries in each over in order to maintain congruence between
17 visual and contextual information and avoid any element of deception in the presentation of context. Participants
18 received information on the game score, including the number of overs bowled, runs scored and wickets taken
19 prior to seeing the delivery (i.e. as if looking at a scoreboard) and were informed that the format was a one-day
20 international (50 over) match. The field settings were displayed on a schematic representation prior to seeing the
21 bowler, and a matching field layout was established using cones around the participant so that field information
22 was available throughout the delivery (see Runswick et al., 2017).

CONTEXT, COGNITIVE LOAD AND ANTICIPATION

1 In half of the trials in the control and context conditions, participants performed a secondary task of
2 counting backwards in multiples of seven from a random number between 100 and 200. In dual-task conditions,
3 participants were given the random number immediately at the start of the trial and were instructed to continue
4 counting backwards in sevens until the clip occluded. All trials that were repeated across the two main
5 conditions had matching dual-task conditions allowing for direct comparison of the effects of context (six
6 involved a secondary task and six did not). The footage was displayed on a life-size screen, projected from the
7 side using a horizontal keystone projector (Epson-X31, Japan). A regulation size batting crease and stumps were
8 placed in front of the screen to allow participants to bat against the bowlers in a realistic fashion. Conditions
9 were counterbalanced to negate ordering effects.

10 Participants recorded a 30-second baseline measure for backwards counting which involved sitting down
11 and counting backwards in sevens from 150 for 30 seconds (Ellmers et al., 2016) and underwent training in
12 providing verbal reports using Ericsson and Kirk's (2001) adaptation of Ericsson and Simon's (1993) original
13 protocol. Training included instruction on thinking aloud and giving immediate retrospective verbal reports by
14 solving a range of generic and domain-specific tasks (see Eccles, 2012). The verbal report training protocol
15 lasted approximately 30 minutes. Participants were informed how to use the RSME (Zijlstra, 1993) and response
16 sheets, and were given a regulation size cricket bat and asked to stand in front of the stumps to face a
17 familiarization trial for both conditions. Participants were asked to practice giving retrospective verbal reports
18 during the familiarization trials. If these reports were not satisfactory due to the tendency of participants to
19 summarize or explain their thought processes, the participant was reminded of the training he had received and
20 further practice attempts provided. Less-skilled players were given no instruction on how to bat. However, they
21 were informed that in cricket the bowler can bowl a legal delivery anywhere between the wide lines marked on
22 the crease, the ball does not have to be aimed at the stumps and can bounce once before reaching the batter
23 (unlike pitching over the plate in baseball).

1 anticipation accuracy in the skilled group than the less-skilled group. There was a significant context \times dual-task
 2 interaction. The greatest positive effect on anticipation accuracy occurred when context was coupled with the
 3 secondary task ($F_{1,16} = 13.27, p = 0.02, \eta_p^2 = 0.45$). No group \times context interaction and no three-way interaction
 4 between group \times context \times dual-task were found ($F \leq 3.05, p > 0.05$).



5
 6 Figure 1. The anticipation scores measured in radial error for skilled and less-skilled performers with and
 7 without context (with SE bars).

8

9 **Cognitive Load**

10 **RSME.** There was no difference in mental effort scores between groups ($M_{\text{score}} \pm SD$; skilled $67.31 \pm$
 11 17.09 ; less-skilled $55.25 \pm 12.90, F_{1,16} = 2.84, p = 0.11, \eta_p^2 = 0.15$). The addition of context had no effect on
 12 mental effort scores in the skilled (control 66.98 ± 15.46 ; context 68.09 ± 17.76) or the less-skilled group
 13 (control 53.96 ± 14.20 ; context $56.56 \pm 14.28, F_{1,16} = 0.39, p = 0.54, \eta_p^2 = 0.02$). However, mental effort scores

1 were significantly higher with backwards counting (71.74 ± 14.17) than without (50.83 ± 17.64 , $F_{1,16} = 58.41$, p
 2 < 0.01 , $\eta_p^2 = 0.79$). No interactions were reported (all $F \leq 3.05$, all $p > 0.05$).





Figure 2. The dual task costs for skilled and less-skilled performers with and without context (with SE bars).

17 **Secondary Task Performance.** The two groups showed no significant differences in counting
 18 performance across the dual-task conditions (Figure 2). There was no effect of group ($M_{DTC} \pm SD$; skilled -2.21
 19 $\pm 19.41\%$; less-skilled $-12.25 \pm 25.16\%$, $F_{1,16} = 0.80$, $p = 0.39$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.05$) on DTC. There was also no effect of
 20 context on DTC for the skilled (control $-0.69 \pm 24.39\%$; context $-3.72 \pm 21.10\%$) or less-skilled groups (control
 21 $-11.04 \pm 30.98\%$, context $-13.45 \pm 25.19\%$; $F_{1,16} = 0.37$, $p = 0.55$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.02$) and no significant interactions (all
 22 $F \leq 3.05$, all $p > 0.05$).

1 Verbal Reports

2 **Cognitive:** There was no effect of group on the number of statements reported ($M_{\text{statements per trial}} \pm SD$;
3 skilled 6.2 ± 1.9 , less-skilled 5.0 ± 1.8 , $F_{1, 16} = 1.8$, $p = 0.20$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.10$). The addition of context significantly
4 increased the number of statements reported (Figure 3; control 5.1 ± 0.4 , context 6.1 ± 0.5 ; $F_{1, 16} = 9.96$, $p <$
5 0.01 , $\eta_p^2 = 0.38$). There was a significant effect of statement type ($F_{3, 14} = 17.30$, $p < 0.01$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.52$) and a
6 significant context \times statement type interaction showing a decrease in monitoring statements and increase in all
7 other types in the presence of context ($F_{3, 14} = 9.60$, $p < 0.01$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.38$). There was a significant statement type
8 \times group interaction ($F_{3, 14} = 5.03$, $p < 0.01$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.24$). The skilled group reported more planning (skilled $1.3 \pm$
9 0.9 , less-skilled 0.4 ± 0.5), prediction (skilled 1.6 ± 0.7 , less-skilled 1.2 ± 0.9) and evaluation statements (skilled
10 1.3 ± 0.4 , less-skilled 0.6 ± 0.47), while the less-skilled group relied on monitoring (skilled 2.0 ± 1.1 , less-
11 skilled 2.8 ± 0.8). There was a significant three-way interaction between group \times context \times statement type ($F_{3, 14}$
12 $= 3.81$, $p = 0.02$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.19$). While skilled performers showed a decrease in monitoring statements (control 2.4
13 ± 1.4 , context 1.6 ± 1.1) and an increase in planning (control 0.9 ± 0.7 , context 1.7 ± 1.3) and evaluation (control
14 0.6 ± 0.3 , context 1.9 ± 0.7) due to context, participants in the less-skilled group only showed a small increase in
15 prediction statements with context (control 1.1 ± 0.8 , context 1.2 ± 1.1). There was no effect of secondary task
16 on cognitive verbal reports (all $F \leq 3.05$, all $p > 0.05$).




1

2 Figure 3. Verbal report statements relating to cognitive categories used by each group in context and control
 3 conditions (with SE bars).

4 **Information Sources:** There was no effect of group on the number of statements reported ($M_{\text{statements per}}$
 5 $\text{trial} \pm SD$; skilled 3.4 ± 1.6 , less-skilled 3.1 ± 1.3 , $F_{1, 16} = 0.25$, $p = 0.63$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.02$). The addition of context
 6 significantly increased the number of statements reported (control 2.8 ± 1.4 , context 3.7 ± 1.7 ; $F_{1, 16} = 9.58$, $p =$
 7 0.01 , $\eta_p^2 = 0.37$). There was a significant effect of statement type ($F_{3, 14} = 41.92$, $p > 0.01$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.72$) and a
 8 significant context \times statement type interaction showing a decrease in kinematic statements and increase in all
 9 other information sources in the presence of context ($F_{3, 14} = 15.61$, $p < 0.01$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.49$). An interaction between
 10 statement type \times group ($F_{3, 14} = 3.32$, $p = 0.03$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.17$) showed that the less-skilled group (2.6 ± 1.2) relied
 11 more heavily on kinematic information than the skilled group (1.9 ± 1.2), who reported more statements relating
 12 to sources of contextual information (skilled 0.5 ± 0.4 , less-skilled 0.2 ± 0.2). There was a three-way interaction

1 between statement type \times group \times context ($F_{3, 14} = 6.16, p < 0.01, \eta_p^2 = 0.49$; Figure 4). The skilled group
 2 reported more contextual statements (control 0.4 ± 0.2 , context 2.7 ± 0.1) and less kinematic statements (control
 3 2.4 ± 1.4 , context 1.3 ± 1.0) in the presence of context. The less-skilled group still relied heavily on kinematic
 4 cues but did show a small increase in the reporting of sequence (control 0.1 ± 0.2 , context 0.2 ± 0.4) and field
 5 position statements (control 0.1 ± 0.1 , context 0.7 ± 0.6). The secondary task had no effect on the information
 6 sources reported (all $F \leq 3.05$, all $p > 0.05$).



7
 8 Figure 4. The verbal report statements relating to information sources used by each group in context and
 9 control conditions (with SE bars).

10

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Discussion

We examined how context and the additions of a secondary task affected cognitive load and anticipation performance in skilled and less-skilled performers. In line with our hypothesis, the presence of context had a positive effect on anticipation accuracy for skilled participants, but contrary to our prediction less-skilled performers also improved their anticipation accuracy when contextual information was presented. These improvements occurred without affecting cognitive load measures for both groups, suggesting that context did not induce excessive cognitive load in the skilled or less-skilled performers. The improvement in anticipation performance when context was added replicates the findings of McRobert et al. (2011), who showed the addition of sequencing information improved anticipation accuracy in the same task. Moreover, our finding supports the suggestion made by Müller and Abernethy (2012) that skilled performers may generate situational probabilities based on context. Our novel finding that context was also advantageous for less-skilled performers without affecting cognitive load challenges the proposals of CLT that suggest such information would need to be consciously processed, thereby increasing extraneous load.

The verbal report data support the findings of McRobert et al. (2011) and Murphy et al. (2016). Skilled performers reported more statements relating to higher-order cognitive processes such as evaluation, planning, and prediction-type thoughts and the presence of contextual information added to this main effect. In contrast, less-skilled performers continued to rely mainly on stimulus-driven monitoring statements. The verbal report data revealed the extent to which the groups were able to use the different sources of contextual information available. Both groups referred to kinematic information from the bowler in the absence of context, but when context was provided skilled performers reported statements relating to sequencing and game information in addition to kinematic information. Both groups reported using information concerning opponent’s positioning. As expected, skilled performers were able to integrate all the available sources of contextual information with

1 kinematic sources to improve anticipation. These findings extend the work of Loffing and Hagemann (2014) by
2 showing that the positions of opponents who do not directly play the ball themselves still affect anticipation and
3 the underlying cognitive processes. Moreover, our data support the findings of Farrow and Reid (2012), who
4 reported that the addition of game score information facilitates anticipation. Our results also support Paul and
5 Glencross (1997), who showed that on-base position and count information in baseball had a significant impact
6 on prediction of the pitch. In the future, researchers could systematically manipulate access to each source of
7 information present in the specific task to quantify the degree to which each influences anticipation.

8 Although the less-skilled participants had no previous experience of competitive match-play, they
9 reported using field settings and sequencing information, albeit sparsely, with no effect on cognitive load. These
10 findings suggest that even a limited use of context was enough to have a significant impact on the anticipation
11 performance of the less-skilled group. It is possible that the less-skilled group were able to quickly learn the
12 relevance of the opposition field placings and this effect had a significant impact on anticipation accuracy.
13 However, the less-skilled group did not report a single statement mentioning the use of the game score. This
14 may be because a more detailed understanding of the game is required before this information source becomes
15 relevant to the process, suggesting this may be an especially high-level process in this particular domain.
16 Alternatively, it is possible that instead of attempting to take this information into account, the less-skilled
17 batters elected to prioritize the information they could use that was relevant to the task and ignore other
18 information sources, negating any extra load on working memory resources. It may be vital for less-skilled
19 performers to quickly learn the relevance of contextual information sources in order to develop an understanding
20 of congruency between context and kinematic information and the potential susceptibility to deception that
21 could be present if relying solely on one source (e.g., Gray, 2002; Jackson, Warren, & Abernethy, 2006; Kunde,
22 Skinde, & Weigelt, 2011).

CONTEXT, COGNITIVE LOAD AND ANTICIPATION

1 The reliance upon kinematic information sources, in the absence of context, and the fact that even less-
2 skilled performers could make some use of context, suggests that studies testing anticipation in the absence of
3 context will have likely induced performers to be over-reliant on kinematic information. For example, while
4 Muller et al. (2006) provided valuable insights and furthered knowledge and understanding around how advance
5 postural cues inform anticipation, they did not consider the potential influence of context. The findings
6 presented here, while only investigating the first stage of anticipation identified in Müller and Abernethy's
7 (2012) model, suggest that the absence of available context prior to ball-release in previous investigations may
8 have increased the performers' reliance on kinematic information, exaggerating the influence of this when
9 compared to performance environments (i.e., match play) where additional information sources are present. In
10 this study, we included contextual information sources and showed that skilled performers use this information
11 in conjunction with kinematic information in a more balanced fashion to anticipate.

12 In contrast to our hypothesis and previous literature (e.g., Calvo & Ramos, 1989; Ellmers, et al., 2016),
13 the introduction of a secondary task improved anticipation accuracy in both groups, while context had a larger
14 positive effect on performance when coupled with a secondary task. This may have occurred because the
15 primary anticipation task required the use of more automatic processes to combine high-order contextual
16 information and lower-order sources of kinematic information, and because the secondary task induced more
17 efficient processing by limiting explicit conscious control. Engström et al. (2017) suggested that adding
18 cognitive load during a vehicle-driving task may only negatively affect processes under conscious control and
19 could potentially have a positive effect on more automatic processes. The use of a secondary task could induce
20 the prioritization of more relevant information sources in working memory and force the performer to ignore
21 non-relevant sources in order to avoid overloading resources. This prioritization could result in the use of more
22 simple heuristics such as 'Take The First', that have been shown to facilitate decision making performance in

1 sports tasks (e.g., Johnson & Raab, 2003). Beyond the performance effect, CLT predicts that if working memory
2 is taken up by the secondary task it is possible that learning will be hampered. Our findings from using a
3 secondary-task introduces the possibility of extending the use of such tasks beyond measuring cognitive load to
4 use in studies that test the impact of working memory resources on learning, as well as investigating the
5 mechanisms that underpin how the secondary task improved anticipation accuracy.

6 Although we did not directly assess learning, by measuring cognitive load we are able to use the
7 predictions of CLT to draw conclusions about how context in instructional design could potentially impact
8 learning. By testing CLT and finding that context facilitated anticipation performance prior to ball release but
9 did not increase task complexity to the extent that extraneous load and therefore cognitive load were affected,
10 we offer support for the use of contextual information in representative learning environments to facilitate the
11 development of anticipation in all levels of performer. Specifically, we have shown that even less-skilled
12 performers have the ability to quickly learn the meaning of, and to use some specific sources of, contextual
13 information to aid anticipation. However, some sources of context, such as game score, may require performers
14 to have a more detailed understanding before they are used in training and so may reflect the highest level of
15 cognitive processing utilized by skilled performers.

16 While we acknowledge the potential limitations of verbal reports, which may not account for sub-
17 conscious processes that cannot be verbalised, we have addressed a gap in the understanding of anticipation
18 identified by Müller and Abernethy (2012), by showing the relative importance of kinematic and contextual
19 information and how they may interact prior to ball release. We used a novel combination of methods and a
20 novel application of CLT to investigate the use of different information sources, including how these impact
21 cognitive load in the anticipation process prior to ball release. However, we did not use multiple occlusion
22 points to directly probe the use of information well before the bowler's delivery stride, which would be

1 important to explain the time at which context is used. In future, researchers should look to gain an
2 understanding of how the importance of different information sources varies across time (e.g., from the start of
3 the run-up to the moment of ball release in a cricket bowling task). Furthermore, the positive effect of the
4 secondary task was unexpected and further investigation into the use of secondary tasks to induce the use of
5 more automated processes is necessary (cf. Farrow, Reid, Buzzard, & Kovalchik, 2017).

6 In summary, we analyzed cognitive processes through verbal reports and coordinated survey instruments
7 to examine how situation-specific context affects cognitive load and anticipation performance in skilled and
8 less-skilled performers. We have shown that the presence of context facilitates anticipation accuracy in both
9 groups, and that this occurred without any effect on cognitive load. A balanced use of different information
10 sources such as sequencing, opponent field positioning and game score, and less reliance on the use of visual
11 kinematic information sources underpinned skilled anticipation. These findings have implications for the use of
12 Cognitive Load Theory in complex perceptual-motor tasks, as well as in the implementation of training designs
13 that include contextual sources of information to improve the training of anticipation.

14

15

References

- 16 Abernethy, B., & Wollstein, J. (1989). Improving anticipation in racquet sports. *Sports Coach, 12*, 15-18.
- 17 Abernethy, B., & Zawi, K. (2007). Pickup of essential kinematics underpins expert perception of movement
18 patterns. *Journal of Motor Behaviour, 39*, 353-367.
- 19 Calvo, M. G., & Ramos, P. M. (1989). Effects of test anxiety on motor learning: The processing efficiency
20 hypothesis. *Anxiety Research, 2*, 45-55.

- 1 Canal-Bruland, R., & Mann, D. L. (2015). Time to broaden the scope of research on anticipatory behaviour: a
2 case for the role of probabilistic information. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6*:1518.
3 doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01518
- 4 de Jong, T. (2010). Cognitive load theory, educational research, and instructional design: some food for thought.
5 *Instructional Science, 38*, 105-134.
- 6 Eccles, D. W. (2012). Verbal reports of cognitive processes. In G. Tenenbaum, R. C. Eklund, & A. Kamata,
7 *Measurement in Sport and Exercise Psychology*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- 8 Ellmers, T. J., Cocks, A. J., Doumas, M., Williams, A. M., & Young, R. J. (2016). Gazing into Thin Air: The
9 Dual-Task Costs of Movement Planning and Execution during Adaptive Gait. *PLOS One*.
10 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0166063
- 11 Engström, J., Markkula, G., Victor, T., & Merat, N. (2017). Effects of cognitive load on driving performance.
12 *Human Factors*. doi:10.1177/0018720817690639
- 13 Ericsson, K. A., & Kirk, E. (2001). *Instructions for giving retrospective verbal reports*. Tallahassee, FL: Florida
14 State University.
- 15 Ericsson, K. A., & Simon, H. (1993). *Protocol analysis: Verbal reports as data (rev. ed.)*. Cambridge, MA:
16 Bradford Books/ MIT Press.
- 17 Eysenck, M. W., Derakshan, N., Santos, R., & Calvo, M. G. (2007). Anxiety and Cognitive Performance:
18 Attentional Control Theory. *Emotion, 7*, 336-353.
- 19 Farrow, D., Reid, M., Buzzard, T., & Kovalchik, S. (2017). Charting the developments of sport expertise:
20 challenges and opportunities. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*.

- 1 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2017.1290817>
- 2 Farrow, D., & Reid, M. (2012). The contribution of situational probability information to anticipatory skill.
3 *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 15, 368-373.
- 4 Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis
5 program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39, 175-191
- 6 Girden, E. R. (1992). ANOVA: Repeated Measures. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- 7 Gray, R. (2002). Behaviour of college baseball players in a virtual batting task. *Journal of Experimental*
8 *Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 11, 1131-1148.
- 9 Jackson, R. C., Warren, S., & Abernethy, B. (2006). Anticipation skill and susceptibility to deceptive
10 movement. *Acta Psychologica*, 123, 355-371.
- 11 Johnson, J. G., & Raab, M. (2003). Take The First: Option-generation and resulting choices. *Organizational*
12 *Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 91, 215-229.
- 13 Kalyuga, S., Ayres, P., Chandler, P., & Sweller, J. (2003). The expertise reversal effect. *Educational*
14 *Psychology*, 38, 23-31.
- 15 Kunde, W., Skirde, S., & Weigelt, M. (2011). Trust my face: Cognitive factors of head fakes in sports. *Journal*
16 *of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 17, 110-127.
- 17 Lee, Y. C., Lee, J. C., & Boyle, L. N. (2007). Visual attention in driving: the effects of cognitive load and visual
18 disruption. *Human Factors*, 49, 721-733.
- 19 Leppink, J., & Duvivier, R. (2016). Twelve tips for medical curriculum design from a cognitive load theory

- 1 perspective. *Medical Teacher*, 38, 669-674.
- 2 Loffing, F., & Cañal-Bruland, R. (2017). Anticipation in sport. *Current Opinion in Psychology*,
3 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.copsy.2017.03.008>
- 4 Loffing, F., & Hagemann, N. (2014). On-court position influences skilled tennis players' anticipation of shot
5 outcome. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 36, 14-26.
- 6 Loffing, F., Stern, R., & Hagemann, N. (2015). Pattern-induced expectation bias in visual anticipation of action
7 outcomes. *Acta Psychologica*, 161, 45-53.
- 8 Mann, D. L., Schaefer, T., & Cañal-Bruland, R. (2014). Action preferences and the anticipation of action
9 outcomes. *Acta Psychologica*, 152, 1-9.
- 10 Mann, D. T. Y., Williams, A. M., Ward, P., & Janelle, C. M. (2007). Perceptual-cognitive expertise in sport: A
11 meta-analysis. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 29, 457-478. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsep.29.4.457)
12 [jsep.29.4.457](http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsep.29.4.457)
- 13 McDowd, J. M. (1986). The effects of age and extended practice on divided attention Performance. *The*
14 *Journals of Gerontology*, 41, 764-769.
- 15 McLaughlin, M. J., & Sainani, K. L. (2014). Bonferroni, Holm, and Hochberg corrections: Fun names, serious
16 changes to p values. *PM & R*, 6, 544-546.
- 17 McRobert, A. P., Ward, P., Eccles, D. W., & Williams, A. M. (2011). The effect of manipulating context-
18 specific information on perceptual-cognitive processes during a simulated anticipation task. *British*
19 *Journal of Psychology*, 102, 519-534.
- 20 McRobert, A. P., Williams, A. M., Ward, P., & Eccles, D. W. (2009). Tracing the process of expertise in a

- 1 simulated anticipation task. *Ergonomics*, 52, 474-483.
- 2 Moreno, R., & Park, B. (2010). Cognitive Load Theory: Historical Developments and Relation to Other
3 theories. In J. L. Plass, R. Moreno, & R. Brunken, *Cognitive Load Theory*. NY: Cambridge University
4 Press.
- 5 Morris-Binelli, K., Müller, S. (2017). Advancements to the understanding of expert visual anticipation skill in
6 striking sports. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*
- 7 Müller, S., & Abernethy, B. (2012). Expert anticipatory skill in striking sports: A review and a model. *Research*
8 *Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 83, 175-187.
- 9 Müller, S., Abernethy, B., & Farrow, D. (2006). How do world-class cricket batsmen anticipate a bowler's
10 intention? *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 59, 2162-2186.
- 11 Murphy, C. P., Jackson, R. C., Cooke, K., Roca, A., Benguigui, N., & Williams, A. M. (2016). Contextual
12 information and perceptual-cognitive expertise in a dynamic, temporally-constrained task. *Journal of*
13 *Experimental Psychology Applied*, 22, 455-470.
- 14 North, J. S., Ward, P., Ericsson, A., & Williams, A. M. (2011). Mechanisms underlying skilled anticipation and
15 recognition in a dynamic and temporally constrained domain. *Memory*, 19, 155-168.
- 16 Paas, F., Renkl, A., & Sweller, J. (2003). Cognitive load theory and instructional design: Recent developments.
17 *Educational Psychologist*, 38, 1-4.
- 18 Paull, G., & Glencross, D. (1997). Expert perception in decision making in Baseball. *International Journal of*
19 *Sport Psychological*, 28, 35-56.
- 20 Roca, A., Ford, P. R., McRobert, A. P., & Williams, A. M. (2013). Perceptual-cognitive skills and their

- 1 interaction as a function of task constraints in soccer. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 35, 144-
2 155.
- 3 Roca, A., Ford, P. R., McRobert, A. P., & Williams, A. M. (2011). Identifying processes underpinning
4 anticipation and decision-making in a dynamic time-constrained task. *Cognitive Processing*, 12, 301-
5 310.
- 6 Roca, A., & Williams, A. M. (2016). Expertise and the interaction between different perceptual-cognitive skills:
7 Implications for testing and training. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7:792(10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00792).
- 8 Runswick, O. R., Roca, A., Williams, A. M., Bezodis, N. E., & North, J. S. (2017). The effects of anxiety and
9 situation-specific context on perceptual-motor skill: A multi-level investigation. *Psychological Research*.
10 doi:10.1007/s00426-017-0856-8
- 11 Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects of learning. *Cognitive Science*, 15, 257-285.
- 12 Sweller, J. (1994). Cognitive load theory, learning difficulty, and instructional design. *Learning and Instruction*,
13 4, 295-312.
- 14 Sweller, J. (2015). In academe, what is learned and how is it learned? *Current Directions in Psychological*
15 *Science*, 24, 190-194.
- 16 Sweller, J. (2016). Working memory, long-term memory and instructional design. *Journal of Applied Research*
17 *in Memory and Cognition*, 5, 360-367.
- 18 Sweller, J., Chandler, P., Tierney, P., & Cooper, M. (1990). Cognitive load as a factor in the structuring of
19 technical material. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 119, 176-192.
- 20 Sweller, J., van Merriënboer, J., & Paas, F. (1998). Cognitive architecture and instructional design. *Educational*

- 1 *Psychology Review*, 10, 251-296.
- 2 van Merriënboer, J. J., & Sweller, J. (2005). Cognitive Load Theory and complex learning: Recent
3 developments and future directions. *Educational Psychology Review*, doi:10.1007/s10648-005-3951-0
- 4 Veltman, J. A., & Gaillard, A. W. (1996). Physiological indicies of workload in a simulated flight task.
5 *Biological Psychology*, 42, 323-342.
- 6 Ward, P., Williams, A. M., & Ericsson, K. A. (2003). Underlying mechanisms of perceptual-cognitive expertise
7 in soccer. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 25, S136.
- 8 Williams, A. M. (2009). Perceiving the intentions of others: How do skilled performers make anticipation
9 judgments? In M. Raab, J. G. Johnson, & H. R. Heekeren (Eds.), *Progress in brain research: Vol. 174.*
10 *Mind and motion: The bidirectional link between thought and action* (pp. 73-83). Amsterdam,
11 Netherlands: Elsevier.
- 12 Williams, A. M., & Davids, K. (1998). Visual search strategy. selective attention, and expertise in soccer.
13 *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 69, 111-128.
- 14 Young, J. Q., Van Merriënboer, J., Durning, S., & Ten Cate, O. (2014). Cognitive load thoery: Implications for
15 medical education: AEE Guide No. 86. *Medical Teacher*, 36, 371-384.
- 16 Zijlstra, F. R. (1993). *Efficiency in work behaviour; A design approach for modern tools*. Delft, Netherlands:
17 Delft University Press.

18