



## LJMU Research Online

**Runswick, OR, Roca, A, Williams, AM, McRobert, AP and North, JS**

**The temporal integration of information during anticipation**

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/8759/>

### 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, Williams, AM, McRobert, AP and North, JS (2018)  
The temporal integration of information during anticipation. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 37. pp. 100-108. ISSN 1469-0292**

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](mailto:researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk)

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

- Skilled performers anticipate more accurately based on context alone.
- Skilled performers make more use of context to anticipate than less-skilled.
- Contextual information is used throughout the anticipation process.
- Kinematic information is integrated later in the anticipation process.
- Learning environments should include contextual and kinematic information sources.

## Abstract

**Objectives** When performing actions under severe time pressure, the ability to anticipate is vital to performance. Skilled anticipation is underpinned by the use of both kinematic cues and contextual information, yet there have been few published reports examining how, and when, these two sources interact during anticipation.

**Design** This study employed a mixed experimental design. The between participants factor was skill level (skilled vs less-skilled) and the repeated measures factor was occlusion point (pre-run, mid-run, pre-release, post-release).

**Method** Altogether, 18 skilled and 18 less-skilled cricket batters anticipated deliveries from bowlers in a video-based simulation task where the footage was occluded at four-time points relative to ball release. Participants rated the importance of different sources of information when making their judgements at each occlusion point.

**Results** Skilled batters anticipated the deliveries significantly more accurately than the less-skilled group at all occlusion points ( $p < 0.05$ ). The skilled group judged the use of both contextual information and visual information to be more important when anticipating compared to the less-skilled group. Kinematic cues were only considered important to anticipation in the final moments of the bowling sequence (i.e., immediately prior to ball release), whereas contextual information was used throughout the action, albeit mostly by the skilled group.

**Conclusions** Findings enhance our understanding of the processes underpinning anticipation and present implications for the design of training programmes to improve anticipation.

Key Words: perceptual-cognitive expertise; context; cricket; postural cues.

**The temporal integration of information during anticipation**

Oliver R. Runswick (o.runswick@chi.ac.uk)<sup>1 2</sup>

André Roca<sup>1</sup>

A. Mark Williams<sup>1 3</sup>

Allistair P. McRobert<sup>4</sup>

Jamie S. North<sup>1</sup>

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

<sup>2</sup> Department of Sport and Exercise Science, University of Chichester, Chichester UK

<sup>3</sup> Department of Health, Kinesiology and Recreation, College of Health, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, USA

<sup>4</sup> Research Institute for Sport and Exercise Sciences, Liverpool John Moores University, UK

Corresponding author:

Oliver Runswick

Department of Sport and Exercise Sciences

University of Chichester

College Lane

Chichester

West Sussex

PO19 6PE

Email: [o.runswick@chi.ac.uk](mailto:o.runswick@chi.ac.uk)

Phone: 01243 816353

Conflicts of interest: none

## The temporal integration of information during anticipation

In domains that involve making decisions and executing actions under severe time constraints, the ability to accurately anticipate future events is vital for performance. In emergency medicine (McRobert et al., 2013), military combat (Williams, Ericsson, Ward, & Eccles, 2008) and sport (Loffing & Cañal-Bruland, 2017; Williams, Ford, Eccles, & Ford, 2011), experts have been shown to be more efficient at extracting relevant information from the environment and integrating this information with pre-existing knowledge to develop probabilistic judgements regarding future events. Two broad categories of information have been identified as being crucial during anticipation. First, skilled performers have been shown to pick up visual sources of information such as kinematic cues from the postural orientation of opponents before an action (Abernethy & Zawi, 2007). Second, skilled performers use contextual information, such as the score of the game, to build probabilities and facilitate anticipation (Loffing & Cañal-Bruland, 2017). In this paper, we use a novel approach to investigate how, and when, visual and contextual sources of information interact dynamically in the time period leading up to a key event.

To date, most researchers have focused on identifying *what* kinematic sources of information are used during skilled anticipation and *when* these information sources are most informative (e.g., Abernethy & Zawi, 2007; Müller, Abernethy, & Farrow, 2006; Savelsbergh, Williams, Van der Kamp, & Ward, 2002; Williams & Davids, 1998). An extensive body of research exists that has identified how performers pick up visual information from an opponent's actions, what part of the opponent's body this is picked up from, and when this information becomes available to the observer (see Mann, Williams, Ward, & Janelle, 2007). Savelsbergh et al. (2002) showed that expert goalkeepers in soccer were better able to predict penalty kick direction at earlier occlusion points than less-skilled goalkeepers. Moreover, they recorded gaze behaviour to show that experts spent longer periods of time focusing on the kicking leg, non-kicking leg, and the ball, particularly as the moment of foot-ball contact approached. Although the majority of researchers have sought to identify the most critical kinematic or postural cues that underpin anticipation, it is apparent that contextual information plays a crucial role (Cañal-Bruland & Mann, 2015; Loffing & Cañal-Bruland, 2017; Müller & Abernethy, 2012; Roca

61  
62  
63 & Williams, 2016).

64  
65 The term context has been used to describe a large variety of information sources that may be employed  
66 by skilled performers to underpin anticipation. Runswick, Roca, Williams, Bezodis, and North (2017)  
67 differentiated between *situation-specific* and *nonsituation-specific* contextual information. First, situation-  
68 specific context refers to sources of information that are changeable and unique to each event, such as the time  
69 left in a game and the score line. In contrast, nonsituation-specific context refers to more stable sources of  
70 information such as past team performances or the action capabilities of an opponent (e.g., Cañal-Bruland,  
71 Filius, & Oudejans, 2014; Loffing, Stern, & Hagemann, 2015). In this paper, we focus on situation-specific  
72 context, which comprises several different sources of information. For example, knowledge of game score  
73 (Farrow & Reid, 2012), the sequence in which information is displayed (McRobert, Ward, Eccles, & Williams,  
74 2011), information concerning opponent positioning (Loffing & Hagemann, 2014), and the position of opposing  
75 players and teammates (Paull & Glencross, 1997) have all been shown to enhance anticipation. Yet, there  
76 remains a paucity of research investigating the role that context plays in anticipation and how and when it may  
77 interact with the emergence of visual information.  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92

93 In their two-stage model, Müller and Abernethy (2012) propose that, when executing an interceptive  
94 action, performers are likely to use a combination of contextual and kinematic information to guide early  
95 movements, such as foot position. Information from ball flight is then used to fine-tune a movement response  
96 (such as manipulating the bat face). However, the authors acknowledge the paucity of research investigating  
97 contextual sources of information and the lack of knowledge relating to *when* in the process context is used and  
98 how it interacts with the kinematic information available prior to ball-flight. Cañal-Bruland and Mann (2015)  
99 identified three key areas for future research in an effort to develop a clearer picture of the processes  
100 underpinning skilled anticipation: (i) identifying sources of contextual information; (ii) investigating how these  
101 sources are integrated; and (iii) developing a picture of how different circumstances shape the use of contextual  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111

121  
122  
123 information. Murphy et al. (2016) addressed the call to highlight the importance of context in anticipation by  
124  
125 using a novel approach in which tennis rallies were animated and, therefore, postural information was removed  
126  
127 entirely from the display. Skilled performers made more accurate anticipation judgements compared to novices  
128  
129 despite the complete absence of postural cues, suggesting that the skilled participants were able to use  
130  
131 contextual information to inform their anticipation judgments. While Murphy et al. (2016) provide evidence for  
132  
133 the importance of contextual information, researchers have seldom evaluated the importance of contextual  
134  
135 information in conjunction with postural cues or identified the key time periods during which each source of  
136  
137 information may be used. Published research may be presenting a somewhat incomplete picture of the  
138  
139 perceptual and cognitive processes underpinning anticipation, and particularly when different sources of  
140  
141 information are used and how they interact.  
142  
143

144  
145 In one recent exception, Runswick et al. (2018) collected verbal reports in a cricket anticipation task that  
146  
147 focused on the first stage of Müller and Abernethy's (2012) model and manipulated multiple sources of  
148  
149 contextual information (e.g., game score, field placings, time of match). These authors reported more accurate  
150  
151 anticipation when context was present, while verbal reports suggested that skilled performers used current and  
152  
153 previously available contextual sources of information in a more equitable manner than less-skilled performers.  
154  
155 These results suggest that the addition of context underpinned anticipation in skilled performers. However, in  
156  
157 the study by Runswick et al. (2018) all stimuli were occluded at the same time point (i.e., immediately prior to  
158  
159 ball release), such that the issue of *when* in the action different sources of information are used and how they  
160  
161 dynamically interact with one another as their relative importance varies over time were not examined. We  
162  
163 address these limitations in the current paper by examining how multiple sources of information (both visual and  
164  
165 contextual) contribute to anticipation across different time points.  
166  
167

168  
169 Previously, researchers have identified that when anticipating, experts report greater use of higher-order  
170  
171 cognitive processes compared to their less-skilled counterparts; the latter relying more so on bottom-up  
172

181  
182  
183 processing (McRobert et al., 2011; Murphy et al., 2016). Runswick et al. (2018) extended this work by  
184  
185 identifying a link between higher-order statements and the use of contextual information. Verbal reports were  
186  
187 categorised based on the higher-order planning, prediction, and evaluation statements, and stimulus-driven  
188  
189 monitoring statements (cf., McRobert et al., 2011; Murphy et al., 2016; North, Ward, Ericsson & Williams,  
190  
191 2011). However, in a refinement to previous approaches, the verbal reports were categorised in terms of the use  
192  
193 of contextual and visual information sources. It was reported that the processing of kinematic cues was linked to  
194  
195 monitoring statements that were typically articulated by less-skilled performers, while the high-order statements  
196  
197 used more by skilled performers were linked to the use of contextual information. Skilled performers were more  
198  
199 likely to make judgements through the use of contextual information providing them with a crucial advantage in  
200  
201 the anticipation process. Less-skilled counterparts are more reliant on kinematic information meaning  
202  
203 judgements. The use of contextual information that is available early could inform earlier anticipatory  
204  
205 judgement. However, it remains unclear exactly *when* in the process these information sources are used and how  
206  
207 they interact during anticipation.  
208  
209

210  
211 In the current paper, we use a video-based cricket anticipation task to manipulate the time points at  
212  
213 which visual and contextual sources of information were presented. We build on the work of Abernethy (1990),  
214  
215 who asked participants to rate the importance of different visual sources of information during anticipation, by  
216  
217 also including categories of contextual information available before the action begins. We predicted, based on  
218  
219 previous research (e.g., Loffing & Hagemann, 2014; Müller & Abernethy, 2012; Murphy et al., 2016), that  
220  
221 skilled players would anticipate more accurately than the less-skilled group across occlusion conditions.  
222  
223 Furthermore, based on previous research involving verbal reports (McRobert et al., 2011; Murphy et al., 2016),  
224  
225 we predicted that skilled performers would rate contextual information as being more useful than less-skilled  
226  
227 performers. Moreover, we predicted that skilled performers would use visual information from kinematic cues  
228  
229 that become available later in the process to update situational probabilities already formed using sources of  
230  
231



241  
242  
243 context. In contrast, given previously published verbal report data which suggest less-skilled performers do not  
244  
245 utilise contextual sources of information (McRobert et al., 2011; Murphy et al., 2016), we predicted that these  
246  
247 participants would rate contextual information sources as being less important across all occlusion conditions  
248  
249 and would solely rely on visual information that emerges in the later occlusion conditions. Finally, we predicted  
250  
251 that, as more sources of information emerge (i.e., as the sequence evolves over time) that anticipation accuracy  
252  
253 will improve, with the highest accuracy being observed when early ball flight information is present (Müller &  
254  
255 Abernethy, 2012).  
256  
257

## 260 Method

### 262 Participants

264  
265 Altogether, 18 skilled cricket batsmen (M age =  $24.9 \pm 7.7$  years) who played at least at club level in the  
266  
267 UK (M experience =  $15.2 \pm 7.9$  years) and 18 less-skilled participants (M age =  $27.9 \pm 9.6$  years) with no  
268  
269 experience of playing competitive cricket volunteered to participate. A total of 8 of the skilled players had  
270  
271 experience at national representative level (minor county or above). The less-skilled group all resided in a  
272  
273 cricket-playing nation and therefore could have experienced some exposure to non-competitive cricket in a  
274  
275 physical education or street-sport context. As a result, this group was labelled as less-skilled rather than novice.  
276  
277 We conducted an a-priori power analysis using G\*power (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). The  
278  
279 calculation was based on main effect sizes for anticipation accuracy for group and context from McRobert et al.  
280  
281 (2011) who used the same task and group classifications across two context conditions. The within-factor effect  
282  
283 size was lower than the between factor effect size was used ( $\eta_p^2 = 0.49$ ). We set a moderate correlation ( $r = 0.3$ )  
284  
285 and power at 0.8. The total sample size required was  $n = 6$ . The research was conducted in accordance with the  
286  
287 ethical guidelines of the lead institution and written informed consent was obtained from all participants at the  
288  
289 outset.  
290

**Stimuli**

We used the same stimuli as employed by McRobert, Williams, Ward, and Eccles (2009). Ten (M age =  $19.5 \pm 2.5$  years) county-level cricket bowlers (six fast; four spin) were recruited to create the video-based test stimuli. A camera was positioned on the batting crease at a height of 1.7 m and in line with middle stump so that it represented a typical viewing perspective while batting. The different bowlers were recorded delivering a full over (six deliveries) as they would in a game situation, yielding 60 unique deliveries. One of these original deliveries was selected from each bowler based on the ability to build a realistic congruent field setting and game situation to match the ball location. A panel of three independent and qualified cricket coaches viewed the full non-occluded footage and agreed upon a game situation and field that would be tactically appropriate for the location of each delivery, aiming to maintain congruence between visual and contextual information and avoid context becoming deceptive. The selected delivery from each bowler was occluded at four-time points to create 40 trials, ten unique deliveries repeated across four occlusion conditions. These included: (i) *pre-run*, participants were only exposed to contextual information (the game situation and field setting) and received no kinematic information (the bowler was not shown); (ii) *mid-run*, the trial was occluded mid run-up, this point was defined as the frame midway between the bowlers run-up initiation and ball release, chosen in order to investigate a time point directly between pre-run and pre-release; (iii) *pre-release*, the trial was occluded immediately prior to ball release to allow participants to see all relevant kinematic cues prior to ball flight (Runswick et al., 2018); (iv) *post-release*, the clip was occluded after 80ms of ball flight to investigate the use of early ball flight information (McRobert et al., 2009; 2011). Participants were unaware that they were seeing repeated deliveries and trials from a single bowler were shown in blocks to allow for sequencing effects and to be more realistic to a game (Broadbent et al., 2017; McRobert et al., 2011). The order in which occlusion conditions were shown was counterbalanced to negate order effects. For every trial, participants received information on the game score, which included the number of overs bowled, runs scored, and wickets taken

361  
362  
363 prior to seeing the delivery (as looking at a scoreboard). Participants were informed that the format was a one-  
364  
365 day international (50 over) match and all field settings were designed for deliveries bowled to right-handed  
366  
367 batters. The field settings were displayed on a schematic representation prior to seeing the bowler (see Runswick  
368  
369 et al., 2017; Figure 1).  
370

### 371 **Dependent Measures**

372  
373 **Anticipation Accuracy.** Participants marked the predicted location the ball would have passed the  
374  
375 stumps on diagrams scaled down to eight × smaller than game size to fit a single A4 sheet. The radial error from  
376  
377 correct ball location was measured and scaled back up to quantify anticipation accuracy at game scale (i.e., how  
378  
379 far the bat would have been from the ball; see McRobert et al., 2011).  
380  
381

382  
383 **Information Scores.** Participants rated the usefulness of five different sources of information during  
384  
385 anticipation on a Likert-scale from zero to ten, where zero indicated the information was not present or had no  
386  
387 use at all, and ten indicated the source of information was extremely useful during anticipation. Sources were  
388  
389 not ranked, and multiple sources could receive the same score with a maximum total information score of 50  
390  
391 across all five information sources. This approach has been used previously in the literature. Abernethy (1990)  
392  
393 asked participants to rate the importance of seven specific visual cue sources; the player's head, racket, lower  
394  
395 body, trunk, playing side arm, other arm, and court position. In our approach, categories were adapted to include  
396  
397 sources of contextual information and were linked to sources of information previously identified in the  
398  
399 literature as contributing to anticipation and identified in a previous study using verbal reports in a cricket  
400  
401 batting task (Runswick et al., 2018). The possible information sources included: (i) *bowler's body*, visual  
402  
403 information gained from cues from the bowler's body or run up (Müller et al., 2006); (ii) *sequencing*,  
404  
405 information gained from events of previous deliveries or actions (McRobert et al., 2011); (iii) *game situation*,  
406  
407 information gained from the score or time left in the game (Farrow & Reid, 2012; Paull & Glencross, 1997); (iv)  
408  
409 *field positioning*, information gained from the position of the opposition fielders (Loffing & Hagemann, 2014;  
410  
411

421  
422  
423 Paull & Glencross, 1997); and (v) *ball flight*, visual information gained from the flight of the ball (Abernethy,  
424 1990; Müller et al., 2009). To compare the use of contextual information and visual information directly, the  
425 five sources were placed in categories of contextual and visual sources. The contextual information referred to  
426 sources of information gained prior to the initiation of the delivery. Visual sources referred to novel visual  
427 information emerging during the process of a delivery. The means were taken from sequence, game situation  
428 and field setting scores to create a context score, and from bowler's body and ball flight scores to create a visual  
429 information score.  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437

### 438 **Procedure**

439 Participants were initially instructed how to use response sheets for both ball location predictions and  
440 information source scores. For each trial, when the screen occluded, participants were asked to mark the  
441 predicted point the ball would have passed the stumps on a scaled diagram. Previously, researchers (e.g.,  
442 McRobert et al., 2011) have shown the importance of sequencing effects (seeing multiple deliveries from the  
443 same bowler consecutively) for gaining information to aid anticipation. To allow for this information to be used,  
444 multiple deliveries from the same bowler were shown consecutively as would be experienced in a game and  
445 information score ratings were taken on the third and fourth trial from each bowler. By counterbalancing the  
446 order in which clips were shown, five sets of information scores were available for each occlusion condition per  
447 participant, a total of 20 scores from the 40 trials.  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458

### 459 **Data Analysis**

460 In order to ensure participants were using the contextual information presented to them without relying  
461 on consistent predictions (i.e., top of off stump), the coordinates of skilled responses were recorded from three  
462 of the ten pre-run trials in which the bowler was not shown. This procedure allowed us to quantify the direction  
463 of change between predictions related to the presentation of context. Trials with different outcomes were  
464 selected for this analysis: full length and close to off stump; good length and wide outside off stump; and a short  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480

length delivery over leg stump. Pearson's correlation coefficients were used to analyse relationships between the change in coordinates of the correct response (which context was designed to lead to) and the change in skilled predictions. To examine anticipation accuracy, a two-way mixed design ANOVA was used to analyse between-participant effects (skilled and less-skilled groups) and occlusion condition within-participant effects (pre-run, mid-run, pre-release, and post-release occlusion conditions). To examine the information scores, a separate three-way mixed design ANOVA was used to analyse the effects of group (skilled and less-skilled), occlusion condition (pre-run, mid-run, pre-release, and post-release), and source of information (bowler's body, sequencing, game situation, field setting, ball flight). To further examine the information scores, the sources of information were grouped in to visual information and contextual information and a three-way mixed design ANOVA was used to analyse the effects of group (skilled and less-skilled), occlusion condition (pre-run, mid-run, pre-release, and post-release), and source of information (visual, contextual). The alpha level ( $p$ ) for statistical significance was set at 0.05. A Bonferroni adjustment was employed when multiple comparisons were being made in order to lower the significance threshold and avoid Type I errors (McLaughlin & Sainani, 2014). The corrected alpha level was  $p = .009$  for occlusion condition post hoc comparisons and the corrected alpha level was  $p = .005$  for information source post hoc comparisons. Corrected  $p$  values are displayed for post hoc analyses. Violations of sphericity were corrected for by adjusting the degrees of freedom using the Greenhouse Geisser correction when epsilon was less than 0.75 and the Huynh-Feldt correction when greater than 0.75 (Girden, 1992). Partial eta squared ( $\eta_p^2$ ) was used as a measure of effect size for all analyses.

## Results

### Context Check

The change in prediction locations that were displayed in pre-run trials where only context was presented are shown in Figure 2. Changes in correct outcome coordinates and predicted outcome coordinates for both vertical ( $r = .99, p = .04$ ) and horizontal coordinates ( $r = .99, p = .02$ ) displayed significant correlations,

541  
542  
543 confirming that the context presented was being used to influence responses.  
544

### 545 **Anticipation Accuracy**

546  
547 **Main Effects.** The anticipation accuracy scores for skilled and less-skilled groups across occlusion conditions  
548 are presented in Figure 3. The two-way mixed design ANOVA showed that the skilled group ( $M_{\text{radial error}} \pm SD$ ;  
549  $26.9 \pm 4.1$  cm) were more accurate at anticipating ball location than the less-skilled group ( $37.8 \pm 7.9$  cm;  $F_{3, 32}$   
550  $= 26.84, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .44$ ). There was a significant effect of occlusion condition on the anticipation accuracy of  
551 both groups ( $F_{3, 32} = 10.14, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .23$ ). There was no interaction between skill level and occlusion  
552 condition ( $F_{3, 32} = 0.59, p = .59, \eta_p^2 = .02$ ).  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559

560 **Post Hoc Analysis.** The skilled (pre-run  $27.6 \pm 4.7$  cm, post-release  $23.7 \pm 4.2$  cm) and less-skilled  
561 groups (pre-run  $38.4 \pm 8.7$  cm, post-release  $36.1 \pm 9.9$  cm) anticipated more accurately in the post-release  
562 condition than the pre-run condition ( $p = .006$ ). The skilled (mid-run  $26.0 \pm 4.2$  cm, pre-release  $30.2 \pm 6.7$  cm)  
563 and less-skilled (mid-run  $36.6 \pm 7.6$  cm, pre-release  $40.1 \pm 9.9$  cm) groups anticipated more accurately in the  
564 mid-run condition than the pre-release condition ( $p < .001$ ). Both skilled (pre-release  $30.2 \pm 6.7$  cm, post-release  
565  $23.7 \pm 4.2$  cm) and less-skilled (pre-release  $40.1 \pm 9.9$  cm, post-release  $36.1 \pm 9.9$  cm) groups anticipated more  
566 accurately in the post-release condition than the pre-release condition ( $p < .001$ ). There was no difference in  
567 anticipation accuracy between the pre-run and mid-run, mid-run and post-release condition and the pre-run and  
568 pre-release conditions ( $p > .009$ ).  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578

### 579 **Information Scores**

580  
581 **Main Effects.** The total information score reported in each occlusion condition by skilled and less-skilled  
582 groups are reported in Figure 4. The three-way mixed design ANOVA showed that there was a significant effect  
583 of group on the information scores reported, with the skilled group reporting information sources as being more  
584 useful to anticipation across all temporal occlusion conditions ( $F_{1, 34} = 23.59, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .41$ ). There was a  
585 significant effect of occlusion condition on the information scores reported ( $F_{3, 32} = 109.29, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .76$ )  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600

601  
602  
603 and a significant difference between the scores given to the different information sources ( $F_{4, 31} = 77.86, p < .01,$   
604  $\eta_p^2 = .70$ ). There was a significant interaction between information sources and group ( $F_{4, 31} = 11.94, p < .01, \eta_p^2$   
605  $= .26$ ). Skilled participants reported higher use of game situation and field settings across all occlusion  
606 conditions, as well as higher use of ball-flight information in the post-release condition. In addition, there was a  
607 significant occlusion condition  $\times$  information source interaction ( $F_{12, 23} = 148.91, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .81$ ), showing  
608 that the perceived importance of each information source was highly dependent on the occlusion condition for  
609 both groups. The information scores provided by skilled and less-skilled groups across the occlusion conditions  
610 and categories are highlighted in Figure 5. A significant occlusion condition  $\times$  group interaction ( $F_{3, 32} = 4.66, p$   
611  $= .01, \eta_p^2 = .12$ ) and a significant three-way occlusion condition  $\times$  information source  $\times$  group interaction ( $F_{12, 23}$   
612  $= 3.241, p = .01, \eta_p^2 = .09$ ) showed that the contextual information sources of game situation, field settings, and  
613 sequencing information were dominant in early occlusion conditions for both groups, but the skilled group  
614 reported higher scores. Visual information (bowler's body and ball-flight) became more important later on,  
615 particularly in the post-release condition in which skilled performers reported ball flight information of higher  
616 importance than less-skilled players.  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632

633 **Post Hoc Analysis.** Significant increases in the total information scores were reported at later occlusion  
634 conditions (i.e., participants reported they were able to extract more useful/meaningful information to aid  
635 anticipation as the sequence evolved) ( $p$ 's  $< .005$ ), apart from between mid-run and pre-release conditions ( $p$   
636  $= .009$ ). In total, across occlusion conditions all information sources were scored higher overall than ball flight  
637 ( $p < .001$ ). The field setting was scored higher than the use of game situation and bowler's body ( $p < .001$ ) but  
638 not different to sequencing ( $p = .011$ ). Sequencing was scored higher than bowler's body ( $p = .005$ ) with no  
639 difference between sequencing and game situation ( $p = .007$ ) or bowler's body and game situation ( $p = 1.00$ ).  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647

### 648 **Contextual and Visual Information**

649 **Main Effects.** The increase in importance of visual information across occlusion conditions is  
650  
651

661  
662  
663 highlighted in Figure 6. In the post-release condition, the skilled performers again reported ball flight  
664  
665 information to be of higher importance than less-skilled counterparts. The three-way mixed ANOVA showed a  
666  
667 significant effect of information sources ( $F_{1, 34} = 124.82, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .79$ ). There was a significant interaction  
668  
669 between information source and group ( $F_{1, 34} = 17.11, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .34$ ) with skilled participants reporting  
670  
671 higher use of contextual information sources throughout and visual information at post-release than the less-  
672  
673 skilled group, who showed a consistently lower score for contextual information. Also, there was a significant  
674  
675 interaction between occlusion condition and information source ( $F_{12, 23} = 322.77, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .91$ ), showing a  
676  
677 dominance of contextual information over visual information at pre-run and mid-run occlusion conditions with  
678  
679 visual information becoming dominant at pre-release. There was a significant occlusion condition  $\times$  group  
680  
681 interaction ( $F_{3, 32} = 6.87, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .17$ ) and a significant three-way occlusion condition  $\times$  information source  
682  
683  $\times$  group interaction ( $F_{3, 32} = 6.286, p = .01, \eta_p^2 = .16$ ). These interactions showed that contextual information was  
684  
685 the dominant information source at early pre-run and mid-run conditions for both groups, but the skilled group  
686  
687 reported higher scores for context across all occlusion conditions.  
688  
689

690  
691 **Post Hoc Analysis.** Tests showed a significant difference in the reported contextual and visual  
692  
693 information scores in all occlusion conditions; information scores were not the same for any two occlusion  
694  
695 conditions ( $p$ 's  $< .01$ ).  
696  
697

## 700 Discussion

701  
702 We examined the temporal integration of visual and contextual information during anticipation. We  
703  
704 predicted that skilled performers would anticipate more accurately than less-skilled performers (e.g., McRobert  
705  
706 et al., 2011; Murphy et al., 2016). We hypothesised that skilled performers would prioritise the use of contextual  
707  
708 information and update predictions when more up to date visual information became available later in the  
709  
710 action. Conversely, we predicted that less-skilled performers would be less able to use contextual information  
711  
712



721  
722  
723 and would rely on visual information (Murphy et al., 2016; Runswick et al., 2018). As more sources of  
724  
725 information appeared during the sequence, anticipation accuracy was predicted to improve, with the highest  
726  
727 accuracy being predicted to be observed when early ball flight information is present (cf., Müller & Abernethy,  
728  
729 2012; Müller et al., 2009).  
730  
731

732 As predicted, the skilled group were more accurate in anticipating than the less-skilled group across all  
733  
734 occlusion conditions. This finding supports a large body of literature showing that skilled performers are better  
735  
736 able to use available information to make accurate judgements about the outcomes of events in the near future  
737  
738 (see Loffing & Cañal-Bruland, 2017). However, there was no interaction between skill level and occlusion  
739  
740 condition. The absence of the predicted interaction between skill group and occlusion condition suggests that the  
741  
742 anticipation performance of both groups changed in the same fashion as more visual information became  
743  
744 available. While the temporal integration of information across time points did not differ for skilled and less-  
745  
746 skilled performers, skilled performers rated all sources of information as being more useful. The use of  
747  
748 contextual information underpinned the skill level difference up until the ball was released, whereas later  
749  
750 differences were underpinned by superior use of visual information from early ball-flight.  
751  
752

753 The skilled group showed superior ability to accurately anticipate the outcome of the delivery in the pre-  
754  
755 run condition, in which no information from the bowler was present. This finding supports the assertion that  
756  
757 sources of contextual information must play a key role in anticipation. When the only information that was  
758  
759 available was the position of the opposition fielders, the game situation, and information gained from preceding  
760  
761 events, skilled performers were able to anticipate significantly more accurately than less-skilled performers  
762  
763 (despite being presented with no information whatsoever from the bowler). Findings support previous  
764  
765 suggestions that contextual information is used prior to ball-flight (Farrow & Reid, 2012; Loffing & Hagemann,  
766  
767 2014; McRobert et al., 2011; Müller & Abernethy, 2012; Paull & Glencross, 1997). Skilled performers were  
768  
769 more accurate in their anticipation judgements and reported more use of contextual information sources  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780

781  
782  
783 compared to less-skilled performers, supporting previous published reports which show that skilled performers  
784 employ the use of contextual information (McRobert et al., 2011; Murphy et al., 2016; Runswick et al., 2018).  
785  
786 While much of the literature investigating anticipation has focused on the use of visual kinematic information,  
787  
788 we have built on this evidence base by showing that the use of contextual information available prior to the  
789  
790 initiation of the event is a key feature of skilled anticipation. Furthermore, we have shown that this information  
791  
792 can be used earlier in the action before any visual cues from the opponent appear and that previous researchers  
793  
794 who have investigated anticipation using only visual information sources without context may not have included  
795  
796 all relevant information in their experimental designs.  
797  
798

800           When early sources of visual information from the bowler became available in the mid-run condition,  
801  
802 which showed the first half of the bowler's run up, anticipation accuracy did not improve in either group  
803  
804 compared to the pre-run condition. Both groups did, however, report some limited use of information from the  
805  
806 bowler's body in this period. This finding suggests that, despite participants reporting some use of postural cues,  
807  
808 the visual kinematic information that was present at this early part of the sequence was not pertinent to the  
809  
810 outcome of the delivery. It is possible that participants did consider using information from the bowler's body to  
811  
812 predict the nature of the delivery (i.e., fast or spin), but this information is not sufficiently powerful to inform  
813  
814 judgement of the delivery location. Previously, researchers using the temporal occlusion paradigm have focused  
815  
816 on identifying the time at which key sources of kinematic information emerge and have typically reported that  
817  
818 early time points contain relatively little meaningful information (e.g., Savelsbergh et al., 2002). Our data  
819  
820 supports these conclusions, but in addition show that the presence of contextual information at these early time  
821  
822 points contains valuable information that can be used to inform future anticipation judgements and the visual  
823  
824 information that follows may confirm rather than improve these predictions.  
825  
826  
827

828           Following the mid-run condition, anticipation accuracy was significantly worse in the pre-release  
829  
830 occlusion condition that occurred after the run up and bowling action had been completed. It was predicted,  
831

841  
842  
843 based on previous literature (Müller et al., 2009), that due to the presence of pertinent postural cues in this  
844  
845 condition, anticipation accuracy in the skilled group would improve compared to pre-run and mid-run conditions  
846  
847 and to a greater extent than the novice group. However, contrary to these predictions, participants were less  
848  
849 accurate compared to mid-run and post-release conditions, suggesting visual information available later in the  
850  
851 run up and during the bowling action had a negative effect on anticipation accuracy. Triolet et al. (2013)  
852  
853 displayed a similar decrease in the anticipation accuracy of tennis players between 120 ms prior to ball contact  
854  
855 and 60 ms after ball contact. This finding was explained by later anticipatory decisions being caused by neutral  
856  
857 tactical situations, meaning predictions were based on kinematic rather than tactical information. Our findings  
858  
859 support this conclusion by showing the use of visual information increased in the pre-release condition and was  
860  
861 accompanied by a drop in accuracy. While postural cues still offer information for anticipation, this may not  
862  
863 lead to responses as accurate as those produced using contextual or early ball flight information.  
864  
865

866  
867 When just 80ms of ball flight was displayed in the post-release occlusion condition, there was a dramatic  
868  
869 improvement in anticipation accuracy compared to pre-release. Previously, researchers have identified the  
870  
871 importance of using early ball flight information in cricket, especially in skilled performers (e.g., Abernethy,  
872  
873 1990; Müller & Abernethy, 2012). The skilled group scored the use of ball flight higher in the post-release  
874  
875 condition and showed a greater improvement in anticipation accuracy than the less-skilled group. Skilled  
876  
877 performers in fast-ball sports are still able to intercept balls that are projected at high velocity from projection  
878  
879 machines, from which no postural cues are available at all (Pinder, Renshaw, & Davids, 2009). Therefore, final  
880  
881 anticipatory judgements may need to occur post-ball release in early ball flight. This means, in fast ball sports,  
882  
883 the final judgement may not occur until after a response action has had to be initiated, with these movements  
884  
885 being initiated in such a way that they can be updated based on later predictions (see Bootsma & van Wieringen,  
886  
887 1990; Stone, Panchuk, Davids, North, & Maynard, 2014).  
888  
889

890 In this paper, we have extended the two-stage model proposed by Müller and Abernethy, (2012) by  
891

901 showing that contextual information (available prior to visual information from an opponent) remains important  
902  
903 to anticipation judgements consistently throughout a trial. The perceived use of visual information develops  
904  
905 through the trial as additional sources of information appear, until it finally becomes more useful than contextual  
906  
907 information at ball release. We have built on findings reported by Runswick et al. (2018) who used clips  
908  
909 occluded at ball release and showed, using verbal report data, that skilled performers reported a balanced use of  
910  
911 information sources. The current study adds to these findings by showing *when* information is important and  
912  
913 that the use of context begins early in the anticipation process, while visual information is added later and gains  
914  
915 more importance nearer ball release.  
916  
917  
918  
919

920 We have produced novel findings by identifying the time at which different sources of information are  
921  
922 used in anticipation and the effect this has on performance. We have addressed a gap in the literature by  
923  
924 investigating the integration of different information sources over time during anticipation. However, this study  
925  
926 was limited in its use of a simple pen and paper response and requirement for participants to explicitly monitor  
927  
928 the information used. It is possible that skilled performers do not always have conscious awareness of how they  
929  
930 make judgements and perform actions, so care should be taken when interpreting explicit judgements. While it  
931  
932 is difficult to measure information use without encouraging explicit monitoring processes, findings should be  
933  
934 replicated in tasks that integrate decisions and movement responses (Dicks, Button, & Davids, 2010). Moreover,  
935  
936 information use could be affected by the time at which a final decision is made and this time point can be  
937  
938 variable depending on the situation (Triolet et al., 2013). In future, researchers should further establish the  
939  
940 relative contribution of information sources and develop refined methods to measure this issue at the point in  
941  
942 time at which final judgements are made *in-situ*. In this study, the information sources were designed to be  
943  
944 congruent with one another and lead to the same probabilities, yet this relationship between information sources  
945  
946 may not always occur in performance environments (Cañal-Bruland & Schmidt, 2009; Gray, 2002). Further  
947  
948 research is needed to examine whether congruent or incongruent (visual and contextual information leading to  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960

961  
962  
963 contrasting probabilities) relationships between information sources can affect anticipation.  
964

965 In summary, we report that skilled performers are better able to anticipate based on contextual  
966 information alone and that they make more use of contextual information throughout the anticipation process  
967 when compared with less-skilled counterparts. Furthermore, we have reported the first study to investigate the  
968 time that contextual information is utilised in the anticipation process and when the use of this information may  
969 be integrated with stimulus driven kinematic information. We report that contextual information is present and  
970 employed throughout the process with visual information being added later as the action evolves. Findings  
971 suggest that, where relevant, it is important to present access to both context and visual information in future  
972 research designs, as well as in practice designs, in order to more accurately represent the conditions that exist  
973 during performance.  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986

### 987 References

- 988  
989 Abernethy, B. (1990) Anticipation in squash: Differences in advance cue utilization between expert and novice  
990 players. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 8, 17-34, DOI: 10.1080/02640419008732128  
991  
992  
993 Abernethy, B., & Zawi, K. (2007). Pickup of essential kinematics underpins expert perception of movement  
994 patterns. *Journal of Motor Behaviour*, 39, 353-367, DOI: 10.3200/JMBR.39.5.353-368  
995  
996  
997  
998 Bootsma, R. J., & van Wieringen, P. C. W. (1990). Timing an attacking forehand drive in table tennis. *Journal*  
1000 *of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 16, 21-29, DOI: 10.1037/0096-  
1001 1523.16.1.21  
1002  
1003  
1004  
1005  
1006 Broadbent, D. P., Ford, P. R., O'Hara, D. A., Williams, A. M., Causer, J. (2017). The effect of a sequential  
1007 structure of practice for the training of perceptual-cognitive skills in tennis. *PLoS One*, DOI:  
1008 10.1371/journal.pone.0174311  
1009  
1010  
1011  
1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017  
1018  
1019  
1020

## INTEGRATION OF INFORMATION IN ANTICIPATION

- 1021  
1022  
1023 Cañal Bruland, R., Filius, M. A., & Oudejans, R. R. D. (2015). Sitting on a fastball. *Journal of Motor*  
1024 *Behavior*, 47, 267-270, DOI:10.1080/00222895.2014.976167  
1025  
1026  
1027  
1028 Cañal-Bruland, R., & Mann, D. L. (2015). Time to broaden the scope of research on anticipatory behaviour: a  
1029 case for the role of probabilistic information. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6:1518. DOI:  
1030 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01518  
1031  
1032  
1033  
1034 Cañal Bruland, R., & Schmidt, M. (2009). Response bias in judging deceptive movements. *Acta Psychologica*. 130: 235-  
1035 240, DOI: 10.1016/j.actpsy.2008.12.009  
1036  
1037  
1038  
1039 Dicks, M., Button, C., & Davids, K. (2010). Examination of gaze behaviours under in situ and video simulation  
1040 task constraints reveals differences in information pickup for perception and action. *Attention, Perception*  
1041 *& Psychophysics*, 72, 706-720, DOI: 10.3758/APP.72.3.706  
1042  
1043  
1044  
1045  
1046  
1047 Farrow, D., & Reid, M. (2012). The contribution of situational probability information to anticipatory skill.  
1048 *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 15, 368-373, DOI: 10.1016/j.jsams.2011.12.007  
1049  
1050  
1051  
1052 Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G\*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis  
1053 program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39, 175-191,  
1054 DOI: 0.3758/BF03193146  
1055  
1056  
1057  
1058  
1059 Girden, E. R. (1992). *ANOVA: Repeated Measures*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.  
1060  
1061  
1062 Gray, R. (2002). Behaviour of college baseball players in a virtual batting task. *Journal of Experimental*  
1063 *Psychology Human Perception and Performance*, 11, 1131-1148, DOI: 10.1037//0096-1523.28.5.1131  
1064  
1065  
1066  
1067 Loffing, F., & Cañal-Bruland, R. (2017). Anticipation in sport. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 16, 6-11, DOI:  
1068 10.1016/j.copsy.2017.03.008  
1069  
1070  
1071 Loffing, F., & Hagemann, N. (2014). On-court position influences skilled tennis players' anticipation of shot  
1072

- 1081  
1082  
1083 outcome. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 36, 14-26, DOI: 10.1123/jsep.2013-0082  
1084  
1085  
1086 Loffing, F., Stern, R., & Hagemann, N. (2015). Pattern-induced expectation bias in visual anticipation of action  
1087  
1088 outcomes. *Acta Psychologica*, 161, 45-53, DOI: 10.1016/j.actpsy.2015.08.007  
1089  
1090  
1091 Mann, D. Y., Williams, A. M., Ward, P., & Janelle, C. M. (2007). Perceptual–cognitive expertise in sport: A  
1092  
1093 meta-analysis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 29, 457–478, DOI: 10.1123/jsep.29.4.457  
1094  
1095  
1096 McLaughlin, M. J., & Sainani, K. L. (2014). Bonferroni, Holm, and Hochberg corrections: Fun names, serious  
1097  
1098 changes to p values. *PM & R*, 6, 544-546, DOI: 10.1016/j.pmrj.2014.04.006  
1099  
1100  
1101 McRobert, A. P., Causer, J., Vassiliadis, J., Watterson, L., Kwan, J., & Williams, A. M. (2013). Contextual  
1102  
1103 information influences diagnosis accuracy and decision making in simulated emergency medicine  
1104  
1105 emergencies. *BMJ Qual Saf*, 22, 478-484, DOI: 10.1136/bmjqs-2012-000972  
1106  
1107  
1108 McRobert, A. P., Ward, P., Eccles, D. W., & Williams, A. M. (2011). The effect of manipulating context-  
1109  
1110 specific information on perceptual-cognitive processes during a simulated anticipation task. *British*  
1111  
1112 *Journal of Psychology*, 102, 519-534, DOI: 10.1111/j.2044-8295.2010.02013.x.  
1113  
1114  
1115 McRobert, A. P., Williams, A. M., Ward, P., & Eccles, D. W. (2009). Tracing the process of expertise in a  
1116  
1117 simulated anticipation task. *Ergonomics*, 52 (4), 474-483, DOI: 10.1080/00140130802707824.  
1118  
1119  
1120 Morris-Binelli, K., Müller, S. (2017). Advancements to the understanding of expert visual anticipation skill in  
1121  
1122 striking sports. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*  
1123  
1124  
1125 Müller, S., & Abernethy, B. (2012). Expert anticipatory skill in striking sports: A review and a model. *Research*  
1126  
1127 *Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 83, 175-187.  
1128  
1129  
1130 Müller, S., Abernethy, B., & Farrow, D. (2006). How do world-class cricket batsmen anticipate a bowler's  
1131  
1132

intention? *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 59, 2162-2186, DOI:

10.1080/02643290600576595

Müller, S., Abernethy, B., Reece, J., Rose, M., Eid, M., McBean, R., Hart, T., & Abrew, C. (2009). An in-situ examination of the timing of information pick-up for interception by cricket batsmen of different skill levels. *Psychology in Sport and Exercise*, 10, 644-652, DOI: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2009.04.002

Murphy, C. P., Jackson, R. C., Cooke, K., Roca, A., Benguigui, N., & Williams, A. M. (2016). Contextual information and perceptual-cognitive expertise in a dynamic, temporally-constrained task. *Journal of Experimental Psychology Applied*, 22 (4), 455-470, DOI: 10.1037/xap0000094

North, J. S., Ward, P., Ericsson, K. A., & Williams, A. M. (2011). Mechanisms underlying skilled anticipation and recognition in a dynamic and temporally constrained domain. *Memory*, 19, 155-168, DOI: 10.1080/09658211.2010.541466

Paull, G., & Glencross, D. (1997). Expert perception in decision making in Baseball. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 28, 35-56.

Pinder, R. A., Renshaw, I., & Davids, K. (2009). Information-movement coupling in developing cricketers under changing ecological practice constraints. *Human Movement Science*, 28, 468-479, DOI: 10.1016/j.humov.2009.02.003.

Roca, A., & Williams, A. M. (2016). Expertise and the interaction between different perceptual-cognitive skills: Implications for testing and training. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7:792, DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00792

Runswick, O. R., Roca, A., Williams, A. M., Bezodis, N. E., & North, J. S. (2017). The effects of anxiety and situation-specific context on perceptual-motor skill: A multi-level investigation. *Psychological Research*, DOI: 10.1007/s00426-017-0856-8



## INTEGRATION OF INFORMATION IN ANTICIPATION

- 1201  
1202  
1203 Runswick, O. R., Roca, A., Williams, A. M., Bezodis, N. E., McRobert, A. P., & North, J. S. (2018). The impact  
1204  
1205 of contextual information and a secondary task on anticipation performance: An interpretation using  
1206  
1207 Cognitive Load Theory. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*. DOI: 10.1002/acp.3386  
1208  
1209  
1210 Savelsbergh, G. J. P., Williams, A. M., van der Kamp, J., & Ward, P. (2002). Visual search, anticipation and  
1211  
1212 expertise in soccer goalkeepers. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 20, 279-287, DOI:  
1213  
1214 10.1080/026404102317284826  
1215  
1216  
1217 Stone, J.A., Maynard, I.W., North, J.S., Panchuck, D., & Davids, K. (2015). Emergent perception-action  
1218  
1219 couplings regulate postural adjustments during performance of externally timed dynamic  
1220  
1221 interceptive actions. *Psychological Research*, 79, 829-843, DOI: 10.1007/s00426-014-0613-1  
1222  
1223  
1224 Triolet, C., Benguigui, N., Le Runigo, C., & Williams, A. M. (2013). Quantifying the nature of anticipation  
1225  
1226 in professional tennis. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, DOI: 10.1080/02640414.2012.759658  
1227  
1228  
1229 Williams, A. M., & Davids, K. (1998). Visual search strategy. selective attention, and expertise in soccer.  
1230  
1231 *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 69, 111-128, DOI: 10.1080/02701367.1998.10607677  
1232  
1233  
1234 Williams, a. M., Ericsson, K. A., Ward, P., & Eccles, D. W. (2008). Research on Expertise in Sport:  
1235  
1236 Implications for the Military. *Military Psychology*, 20(sup1), S123–S145, DOI:  
1237  
1238 10.1080/08995600701804863  
1239  
1240  
1241 Williams, A. M., Ford, P. R., Eccles, D. W., & Ward, P. (2011). Perceptual-cognitive expertise in sport and its  
1242  
1243 acquisition: Implications for applied cognitive psychology. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 25, 432–442,  
1244  
1245  
1246 DOI:10.1002/acp.1710  
1247  
1248  
1249 Williams, A. M., Ward, P., Knowles, J. M., Smeeton, N. J. (2002). Anticipation skill in a real-world task:  
1250  
1251

Figures




Figure 1. Example schematic showing location of opposition players (dotted line represents the 30 yard circle used for the fielding restrictions in One-Day International matches).

# INTEGRATION OF INFORMATION IN ANTICIPATION




Figure 2. A scale set of cricket stumps with the top of middle representing (0, 0) and axis scales showing distance scaled up to game size (cm). Coordinates of skilled responses to three pre-run trials (T8, T11 & T23) that only showed context are represented with small circles, correct response with a large circle, and the mean response of skilled participants with a large diamond.

## INTEGRATION OF INFORMATION IN ANTICIPATION




Figure 3. Mean anticipation accuracy for skilled and less-skilled groups across the four occlusion conditions (+ 1 SE).

# INTEGRATION OF INFORMATION IN ANTICIPATION




Figure 4. Mean total information scores for skilled and less-skilled groups across the four occlusion conditions (+ 1 SE).

## INTEGRATION OF INFORMATION IN ANTICIPATION




Figure 5. Mean information scores for each source for Skilled and Less-skilled groups. Shown across the four occlusion conditions (+ 1 SE).

# INTEGRATION OF INFORMATION IN ANTICIPATION




Figure 6. Mean (+ 1 SE) information scores for (A) Skilled and (B) Less-skilled participants grouped into visual (bowlers body and ball flight) and contextual (sequence, game situation and field setting) information sources. Shown across the four occlusion conditions.