

# LJMU Research Online

McGreary, M, Jackman, PC, Eccles, DW and Whitehead, A

Think aloud research in sport and exercise psychology: A focused mapping review and synthesis

https://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/22134/

Article

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

McGreary, M, Jackman, PC, Eccles, DW and Whitehead, A ORCID logoORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0611-364X (2024) Think aloud research in sport and exercise psychology: A focused mapping review and svnthesis. Sport. Exercise. and Performance Psychology. 13 (1). ISSN 2157-

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 <a href="mailto:researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk">researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk</a>

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

# Think aloud research in sport and exercise psychology: A focused mapping review and synthesis.

Michael McGreary @mike\_mcgreary Keele University <u>M.j.mcgreary@keele.ac.uk</u>

\*corresponding author

Patricia Jackman @Trish\_Jackman University of Lincoln <u>PJackman@lincoln.ac.uk</u>

David W. Eccles @DavidWEccles Florida State University Deccles@admin.fsu.edu

Amy Whitehead

@a\_whitehead1

Liverpool John Moores University

a.e.whitehad@ljmu.ac.uk

#### Abstract

Use of Ericsson and Simon's (1980, 1993) think aloud (TA) method within sport and exercise psychology research has increased in recent years. The purpose of this review was to map current research that has used the TA method with athletes and exercisers by synthesising published literature that has adopted the TA method to investigate athlete or exerciser cognitions during task performance. Seven electronic databases were searched three times, with a final search conducted in April 2023. Thirty-six studies satisfying the eligibility criteria were included. Several methodological issues were identified including misunderstandings about the nature of the TA method, leading to the use of methods different from and sometimes antithetical to those proposed by Ericsson and Simon (1980, 1993). Other issues identified concerned participant samples, TA training, ecological validity of tasks, and defining the standard of participants. Theoretical misconceptions, methodological considerations, and recommendations for future research using the TA method to generate understanding of participant cognitions during task performance in sport and exercise are discussed. This review documents the extent and nature of the use of the TA method within sport and exercise psychology research and can guide researchers seeking to conduct high-quality research involving the TA method in future.

*Keywords*: Cognition, Concurrent verbalisations, Cognitive process tracing, Think aloud method, best practice, Research methods

1

#### Think aloud research in sport and exercise psychology: A focused mapping review and synthesis

2 For some time, the cognitions of athletes, exercisers, and processes underlying expertise have 3 been of significant interest to researchers in the field of sport and exercise psychology (Eccles, 2012; 4 Moran et al., 2019). In seeking to understand what athletes and exercisers think about in sport, 5 researchers have used a variety of qualitative and quantitative methods. For example, cognitive 6 processes have been studied through qualitative methods such as interviews (e.g., Bennet et al., 7 2016), video recordings coupled with interviews (e.g., Macquet, 2009; Macquet et al., 2012; Mulligan 8 et al., 2012), and researcher observations combined with interviews (e.g., Macquet & Fleurance, 9 2007). Similarly, quantitative methods, including psychometrics (e.g., Mansell & Turner, 2022), 10 electroencephalographic (EEG) measures (e.g., Holmes & Wright, 2017), and functional near infrared 11 spectroscopy (fNIRS; e.g., Robinson et al., 2021), have been employed to study cognitive processes. 12 More recently, researchers have sought to expand understanding of cognitions in sport by adopting 13 an alternative method to collect data during athletic performance – the think aloud (TA) method. 14 Originally proposed by Ericsson and Simon (1980, 1993), the TA method was developed to generate 15 information about thought processes mediating task performance by asking participants to verbally 16 think aloud while performing a task or verbally recalling thoughts immediately following completion of a task. 17

18 Prior to the proposal of Ericsson and Simon's (1993) method, researchers often had been wary 19 of individuals' verbal reports about their thinking, such as those elicited by researcher-posed questions like, "In this game situation, why did you decide to pass the ball rather than keep it?" and 20 21 "When you look at a menu, how do you decide what to eat?" Researchers had provided evidence that 22 people asked such questions often provided inaccurate verbal reports about their cognitions and had 23 theorized that this was because people have limited conscious access to these thoughts (Nisbett & 24 Wilson, 1977). Ericsson and Simon's (1980, 1993) response to these concerns was to suggest that 25 people can verbalize accurately about their cognitions when they are provided with specific elicitation 26 conditions and proposed a method (i.e., the TA method) that enabled researchers to achieve these conditions within their studies. Thus, the method of eliciting thoughts that they proposed offered
researchers with a new opportunity to obtain rich verbal data proposed to provide insights into the
cognitions underpinning human performance.

30 Ericsson and Simon (1993) proposed a theoretical framework as the basis for their TA method. 31 This framework set out the ways that verbal reports of thinking might be generated when an individual 32 is asked to TA during the execution of a task (e.g., Arsal et al., 2016; Kaiseler et al., 2013; Nicholls & Polman, 2008). This framework is termed the verbalisation framework. Level 1 verbalisation was 33 34 described as the vocalisation of inner speech. For instance, participants would simply verbalise their 35 inner thoughts during task performance. Level 2 verbalisation was proposed to involve the verbal 36 encoding and vocalisation of an internal representation that is not originally in verbal code; 37 verbalisations are proposed to reflect stimuli within the participants' attentional focus (e.g., verbal 38 encoding and vocalisation of scents, visual stimuli, or movement). Their assumption was that Level 1 39 and 2 verbalisations offered a representation of information in short-term memory (STM) during task 40 performance (Ericsson & Simon, 1993). As such, Ericsson and Simon (1993) argued that Level 1 and 2 41 verbalisations could provide a representation of information involved in the mediation of ongoing task 42 performance and typically aligned with a postpositivist/cognitivist underpinning.

43 By contrast, Level 3 verbalisation were proposed to move beyond simply verbalising 44 information heeded in STM during task performance and instead involve the individual providing 45 explanations for their thought processes. The provision of such explanations requires retrieval of 46 information from long-term memory, and therefore involve more than simply verbalising information 47 present in STM during task performance. Consequently, Level 3 verbalisations were not considered as representative of thoughts mediating ongoing performance (Ericsson & Simon, 1993). Ericsson and 48 49 Simon (1993) proposed that most traditional forms of researcher-posed questions afforded 50 respondents the opportunity to provide Level 3 verbalisations. Furthermore, the likelihood that 51 respondents provide Level 3 verbalisations was considered to be increased when they were unable to 52 provide Level 1 and 2 verbalisations, as it was suggested that their thoughts were not available within

53 working memory; that is, when the respondent had no conscious access to these thoughts. When an 54 individual is asked to report on their cognitions but is unable to access them, it is proposed that they 55 often access implicit theories about these cognitions, which are fundamental assumptions about how 56 the world generally works, to provide the report (Ericsson & Simon, 1993). The problem with implicit 57 theories is that they are often unrelated to the individual's actual cognitions. Consequently, Ericsson 58 and Simon (1993) proposed that what was needed to obtain valid and reliable insights into the 59 thoughts mediating task performance was a method of eliciting verbal reports of thinking that 60 constrained the respondent as much as possible to provide only Level 1 and 2 verbalisations. To this 61 end, Ericsson and Simon (1980) proposed the TA method of eliciting verbal reports of thinking, which 62 was aimed at maximising the provision of Level 1 and Level 2 verbalisations and minimising the 63 provision of Level 3 verbalisations.

64 The TA method Ericsson and Simon (1980) proposed included two variations. The first 65 variation was termed concurrent reporting. The procedures involved in this variation provided 66 directions to the participant to: think out aloud as they perform a task and as if they were alone, think 67 out aloud only thoughts that occur to them naturally as they perform the task, and avoid describing 68 or explaining their thoughts as if in the presence of another. The second variation was termed 69 immediate retrospective reporting. Ericsson and Simon proposed that, after task completion, some 70 information remains in the STM briefly and may be elicited by asking participants to recall thoughts 71 experienced during the task immediately following task completion. The emphasis within the 72 directions provided to the participant when recalling these thoughts was to report only those thoughts 73 they could distinctly report having, however few they might be, and not to describe or explain these 74 thoughts.

There has been a recent increase in research involving use of the TA method within sport and exercise, with researchers adopting the method to study cognitions underlying the performance of various sport and exercise tasks. For example, researchers have used the TA method in studies of cricket (McGreary et al., 2021), cycling (Whitehead et al., 2018, 2019), golf (Arsal et al., 2016; Nicholls

79 & Polman, 2008), outdoor running (Samson et al., 2017), indoor 5km running (Johnson et al., 2023), 80 tennis (Swettenham et al., 2018), a postural wall sitting task (Gunn & Taylor, 2021), and snooker 81 (Welsh et al., 2018). These studies have developed novel, psychological understanding across a variety 82 of topics, including challenge and threat states (e.g., McGreary et al., 2020), stressors and coping 83 (Nicholls & Polman, 2008; Swettenham et al., 2018; Welsh et al., 2018), and pacing and attentional 84 focus (Whitehead et al., 2018, 2019). Furthermore, researchers have demonstrated that a strength of the TA method is its flexibility in terms of analytic approaches, with studies to date having involved 85 86 quantitative approaches (e.g., McGreary et al. 2020; Swettenham et al., 2018), qualitative approaches 87 (McGreary et al., 2021; Welsh et al., 2018; Whitehead & Jackman, 2021), and a mix of these two 88 approaches (Elliot et al., 2020). Despite evidence of the popularity of the TA method among sport and 89 exercise psychology researchers, attempting to capture in-event cognitions can pose significant 90 practical challenges and may be difficult to achieve in some contexts (Eccles et al., 2006; Jackman et 91 al., 2022). For example, thinking out loud while performing tasks requiring increased respiration (e.g., 92 during a sports game) is challenging, and could potentially lead to interference between these two 93 tasks (Eccles et al., 2006). However, in general, the aforementioned studies illustrate the potential 94 utility and value of the TA method in sport and exercise.

95 Despite the growing use of the TA method to explore in-task cognitions of athletes and 96 exercisers since the development of this approach by Ericsson and Simons (1993), there has been no 97 review of how this method has been used in sport and exercise. Given the emphasis placed on 98 methodological rigour and high-quality research in sport and exercise psychology (Schinke et al., 2021; 99 Smith & McGannon, 2018), it appears timely and important to synthesise and appraise current use of 100 the TA method within sport and exercise psychology, to aid researchers who wish to use this method 101 in future. Therefore, the aim of this review was to map current research that has used the TA method 102 with athletes and exercisers by synthesising published literature that has adopted the TA method to 103 investigate athlete or exerciser cognitions during task performance. Specifically, we aimed to answer 104 the following research questions in relation to sport and exercise psychology research: (a) what is the

nature of the TA method employed?, (b) what research questions has the TA method been used to answer?, (c) with what populations and in what contexts has the TA method been used?, (d) what study designs have been used that have included the TA method?, and (e) what specific procedures have been adopted in the implementation of the TA method? By addressing these research questions, we sought to advance understanding of the TA method in sport and exercise and provide researchers with recommendations for designing and conducting high-quality research involving the TA method.

111

#### Method

112 Design and Protocol

113 As we aimed to map the existing research literature involving use of the TA method within 114 sport and exercise contexts, we decided that a systematic mapping review (Campbell et al., 2023) 115 would be a suitable approach to achieve this. Systematic mapping reviews provide an overview of a 116 research area (e.g., nature and coverage), highlight areas where research has been conducted, and 117 provide avenues for future research (Berg et al., 2016). This is in contrast to other review typologies, 118 such as systematic reviews, which are intended to systematically search for, appraise, and synthesise 119 research evidence in relation to a specific research question (Grant & Booth, 2009). We followed the 120 Evidence for Policy and Practice Information-Centre methods and procedures for a systematic 121 mapping review and synthesis (Gough et al., 2003). As we were using secondary data, this study was 122 exempt from institutional ethical approval.

#### 123 Eligibility Criteria

The eligibility criteria were developed through consultation between all authors to clearly set the boundaries of the review (Gough et al., 2003; Siddaway et al., 2019). To be included in the review, a study needed to have: (1) been a peer reviewed journal article written in the English language; (2) reported using the TA method (either concurrent or immediate retrospective reporting, as described by Eccles, 2012) as proposed by Ericsson and Simon (1980, 1993) to capture data during performances; (3) sampled athletes or exercisers; and (4) included original, empirical data. In this review, we differentiated the TA method from other approaches that might be perceived as verbal reporting (e.g.,

delayed retrospective report – Eccles, 2012; or interviewing - Bennet et al., 2016; or video feedback
coupled with interviews - Macquet, 2009; Mulligan et al., 2012; or recall interviewing – McPherson &
Kernodle, 2007) on the basis that the TA method requires participants to verbalise during task
performance or recall thoughts immediately following the completion of a task/movement (Eccles &
Arsal, 2017). For the purpose of this review, we excluded studies that did not specify that participants
were required to TA (i.e., either concurrent or immediate retrospective reporting).

137 Information Sources and Search Strategy

138 Seven electronic databases were searched by the first author: Academic Search Complete 139 Premier, APA PsycINFO, MEDLINE, PubMed, Scopus, SPORTDiscus, and Web of Science. Database 140 searches took place initially in September 2021 and November 2022, with a final search conducted in 141 April 2023. As a research team, we had expertise in using the TA method and developed the search 142 string after initial scoping searches and discussions. Accordingly, the following two blocks of Boolean 143 terms were used: (1) "think aloud" OR "concurrent verbalisation\*" OR "concurrent verbalization\*" OR "verbal report\*" OR "verbal protocol" OR "verbalis\*" OR "verbaliz\*" AND (2) sport\* OR athlete\* OR 144 145 perform\* OR exer\* OR physical\* activ\*. The first block was searched in the title and abstract field, 146 with the second block searched at full-text level, where possible (see Appendix 1 for full electronic 147 searches). Limiters were applied, where possible, to include only articles published in the English 148 language in academic journals. All articles retrieved were added to reference management software 149 (RefWorks), with duplicates removed via the automatic duplication function and manual screening. 150 Manual searches for additional studies were conducted by reviewing reference lists of included 151 studies and searching 10 relevant sport, exercise and psychology journals (Appendix 2), using 152 keywords such as "think aloud" or "think aloud method".

153 Screening Process

Screening of articles took place in two stages, with the articles screened independently by two authors at each stage. At the first stage, the titles and abstracts of all articles were screened against the eligibility criteria by the first and fourth author independently. After this, a meeting was

arranged between these authors to share their decisions and discuss any discrepancies. At the second stage, the first and fourth author reviewed each remaining study against the inclusion and exclusion criteria, and determined whether these studies satisfied the inclusion criteria. The authors then met to discuss the outcomes of this process and agree on reasons for excluding studies (see Appendix 3 for reasons for exclusion for studies at the full text stage). The level of agreement between authors at the first and second screening stages was almost perfect ( $\kappa$  = .86) and substantial ( $\kappa$  = .71), respectively.

### 164 Data Extraction and Synthesis

165 To answer our research questions, the following information was extracted and analysed by 166 the first author: nature of TA method employed; research questions being answered; sample 167 characteristics and context; and study design (e.g., TA training provided, philosophical position). Given 168 the exploratory nature of this review, we followed guidelines for narrative synthesis (Popay et al., 169 2006). The first author read each study twice to become familiar with the dataset and obtain textual 170 information to inform the synthesis. Some studies included as part of this review also collected non-171 TA data (e.g., eye tracking). However, given that the review was only concerned with the TA method, 172 only data relevant to answering the research questions were synthesised, although data gathered 173 from other techniques are discussed to offer context. To facilitate synthesis of findings related to the 174 five research questions, relevant information was extracted and organised into a table (see Table 1). 175 Following the synthesis of the included studies, members of the research team met to engage in a 176 process of critical peer debrief (Smith & McGannon, 2018). This involved the first author sharing initial 177 findings and members of the research team offering critical feedback to encourage the first author to reflect on and challenge their initial synthesis, which helped to further develop the analysis and 178 179 findings presented (see below). Although mapping reviews do not involve study quality checks 180 (Campbell et al., 2023; Grant & Booth, 2009), as we sought to develop findings that could help 181 researchers seeking to use the TA method in sport and exercise in the future, we offer critique on the 182 TA methods used within the included studies in our results and discussion sections.

# 183 Transparency and Openness

184	The study design, methods used, and data are described in detail. We cited the research
185	articles included in the review appropriately in the text and in the reference list. As outlined, we
186	followed the Evidence for Policy and Practice Information-Centre methods and procedures for a
187	systematic mapping review and synthesis (Gough et al., 2003). The review was not pre-registered,
188	but all materials relevant to the review are presented in the main article or supplementary files.
189	Results
190	Of the 5,340 records identified through the electronic and manual searches, 36 studies
191	published in 32 articles published between 2008 and 2023 satisfied the eligibility criteria (see flow
192	chart; Appendix 4). The main reason for exclusion at the full-text stage was that articles did not fully
193	satisfy the inclusion criteria pertaining to the TA method, which was reporting using Ericsson and
194	Simon's (1980, 1993) TA method.
195	[INSERT TABLE 1 AROUND HERE]
196	Main Synthesis
197	The synthesis of key information related to each of the review questions is presented in Table
198	1. Findings pertinent to each research question are presented in the following sections.
199	Nature of Method Employed
200	In the majority of studies, the TA method employed appeared to be consistent with Ericsson
201	and Simon's (1980, 1993) proposed method (k = 32; 88.89%). Although claiming to have used Ericsson
202	and Simon's (1980, 1993) TA method, the remaining four studies (11.11% - Oliver et al., 2021; Rose &
203	Parfitt, 2010; Welsh et al., 2018; Whitehead et al., 2015) were coded as 'other' for TA method
204	employed because the description within the study of the TA method was not consistent with and, in
205	some cases, was antithetical to the TA method described by Ericsson and Simon (1980, 1993). In three
206	of these other studies, participants were encouraged to explain their thought processes (i.e., provide
207	Level 3 verbal reports, which Ericsson and Simon's method is explicitly designed to avoid) rather than
208	to simply verbalise their thoughts as they occurred (i.e., provide Level 1 or Level 2 verbal reports),

which Ericsson and Simon's method is explicitly designed to encourage. In the remaining study (Rose & Parfitt, 2010), other instructions (i.e., an unspecified concurrent verbal reporting method) were provided to participants that departed from the method proposed by Ericsson and Simon. For some of the subsequent sections (research questions, contextual information, TA training) related to each research question, we split the findings into two subsections: (1) those that were consistent with the TA method proposed by Ericsson and Simon (1980, 1993), and (2) those that were not consistent with the TA method proposed by Ericsson and Simon, despite reporting that this method was used.

# 216 Research Questions

217 Studies that used the TA method as proposed by Ericsson and Simon (1980, 1993) did so to 218 explore a range of research questions; see Table 1 for detailed research questions. Broadly, skill-level 219 differences or skill acquisition was a topic area explored commonly (k = 21) and consisted primarily of 220 researchers exploring differences in thought processes between two or more differently skilled groups 221 of performers (k = 18), especially between novice/amateur/less-skilled and elite/professional/higher-222 skilled (k = 17). A further six studies explored stressors and coping, with these studies underpinned by 223 theories such as the transactional model of stress and coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), the cognitive-224 motivational-relation approach (Lazarus, 1999), and the theory of challenge and threat states in 225 athletes (Jones et al., 2009). Similarly, within this topic, researchers also explored gender differences 226 in stressors and coping responses (study 1 and 2 by Kaiseler et al., 2013; Swettenham et al., 2018). 227 Researchers exploring gender differences also referred to both the dispositional hypothesis (Tamres 228 et al., 2002) and the situational hypothesis (Sigmon et al., 1995). Finally, there were several studies 229 that explored a wide variety of psychological constructs that can be broadly classified as attentional foci. For example, researchers explored (meta)cognition (Whitehead & Jackman, 2021), attributional 230 231 retraining (Moffat et al., 2021), exercise cognitions (Gunn & Taylor 2021), differences in cognitions 232 between well-trained, trained and recreationally trained runners (Johnson et al., 2023), long-distance 233 running cognitions (Samson et al., 2017), pacing strategies/changes in cognitions (Whitehead et al., 234 2018), and changes in cognitions/decision making (Whitehead et al., 2019).

235 Studies that did not use Ericsson and Simon's (1980, 1983) TA method, despite claiming that 236 this method was employed (i.e., those studies coded as 'other'), addressed topics that were broadly 237 similar. For example, researchers interested in attentional foci explored (meta)cognition (Oliver et al., 238 2020) and exercise cognitions (Rose & Parfit, 2010). Welsh et al. (2018) explored cognitions related to 239 stressors and coping, and Whitehead et al. (2015) explored the congruence between verbal data and 240 retrospective interviews in golfers. Across these studies, researchers encouraged the participants to 241 verbalise both the the 'why' and 'what' with regards to verbal data, which goes against Ericsson and Simon's (1980, 1993) method, who stated experimenters should not allow participants to "theorize 242 243 about their processes" (i.e., the why) but instead we should be "leaving the theory-building part of 244 the enterprise to the experimenter" (Ericsson & Simon, 1980, p. 221).

### 245 Contextual Information

246 A total of 686 participants (603 males and 83 females) took part in the 32 studies (M = 21.44 247 participants, SD = 13.74, range = 5-64) that aligned with Ericsson and Simon's (1980, 1993) method. 248 For studies that provided age information (k = 29), the weighted mean age was: 16.27 years (range = 249 13.17-17.50) for youth-only studies (i.e., < 18 years of age; n = 55; k = 5); 19.93 years (range = 14.62) 250 to 26.35; n = 76) for studies combining adults and youths (k = 2); and 25.83 years (range = 19.72 to 251 48.51; n = 516) for studies only recruiting adults (k = 22). In total, 31 of the 32 studies were conducted 252 in sport, with only one study involving exercise or an exercise-related activity (i.e., wall sitting postural 253 task, Gunn & Taylor, 2021). In terms of specific activities, most studies were conducted in golf (k = 9) 254 or cycling (k = 6), followed by cricket (k = 5), soccer (k = 4) and tennis (k = 3). There was an even split 255 between studies that collected data in a laboratory-based environment (k = 16) and in a more 256 naturalistic environment (e.g., golf course; k = 16). However, of those that collected data in a 257 naturalistic environment, the majority (k = 12) were researcher-simulated scenarios or competitions. 258 Only five studies collected data during a real, non-simulated, competitive scenario, including in cycling 259 (Whitehead et al., 2017, study 1 and 2 by Whitehead et al., 2018); cricket (McGreary et al., 2021), and 260 golf (Oliver et al., 2021).

261 Participants were sampled across a range of expertise and experience levels, ranging from 262 novices to elite athletes. However, inconsistency and ambiguity in the terminology used to describe 263 the level of participants made between-study comparisons difficult. To illustrate this heterogeneity, 264 the terminology adopted to define either the athletic ability or experience of participants included the 265 following: amateur (k = 5), skilled (k = 4), less skilled (k = 4), high-skilled (k = 4), competitive amateur 266 (k = 4), trained (k = 4), untrained (k = 3), low-skilled (k = 2), expert (k = 2), elite junior (k = 2), professional 267 (k = 1), elite senior (k = 1), intermediate (k = 1), beginner (k = 1), semi-elite (k = 1), sub-elite (k = 1), 268 semi-professional (k = 1), successful elite (k = 1), recreationally-trained (k = 1), well-trained (k = 1), and 269 moderately skilled (k = 1)

270 For studies coded as 'other' (k = 4), a total of 106 participants (59 males and 47 females) were 271 included (M = 26.50 participants, SD = 25.25, range = 7-60). Two studies recruited adults only (Rose & 272 Parfitt, 2010, Welsh et al., 2018), one study involved both youths and adults (Whitehead et al., 2015), 273 and one study did not state the age of their participants (Oliver et al., 2020). Three of the four studies 274 were conducted in sport (golf k = 2; snooker k = 1), with one study involving exercise or an exercise-275 related activity (indoor treadmill-based running – Rose & Parfitt, 2010). Due to the smaller sample size 276 of studies, there was less heterogeneity in the categorisation of participant ability. Nevertheless, 277 descriptions of participants were still wide ranging and included skilled (k = 1), novice (k = 1), super-278 elite (k = 1), elite (k = 1), professional (k = 1), club-level (k = 1), high active (k = 1) and low active (k = 1)279 1). Again, there was an even split between studies that collected data in a laboratory-based 280 environment (k = 2) and in a more naturalistic environment (e.g., golf course; k = 2); of the two 281 naturalistic environments, both were researcher-simulated scenarios (e.g., six holes on a golf course).

282 Study Design and Research Paradigm

Our synthesis demonstrated the diverse range of study designs used in research involving the TA method. Of the 36 studies reviewed, 17 studies were classified as quantitative, 12 were mixed methods (i.e., presented qualitative and quantitative results), and seven were defined as qualitative. Studies that quantified qualitative data (e.g., analysed the frequency of verbalisations) were classified as quantitative papers if results were presented using numeric data. Twenty-three studies did not explicitly state their research paradigm, including for quantitative (k = 11), mixed methods (k = 9), and qualitative (k = 3) studies. In total, 13 studies stated their research paradigm and of the seven mixed method studies, five qualitative studies, and one quantitative study that provided this information, the majority (k = 10; 76.9%) were reported to be underpinned by post-positivism, two studies (McGreary et al., 2021; Welsh et al., 2018) by subjectivism/constructivism, and one study (Whitehead & Jackman, 2021) by critical realism.

# 294 TA Training

295 Within research involving the TA method, training participants to TA during the task is an 296 important stage (Eccles & Arsal, 2017). All studies (100%) that used the TA method as proposed by 297 Ericsson and Simon's (1980, 1993) detailed the training procedures adopted. In contrast, only 75% of 298 the "other" studies (i.e., those that did not use Ericsson and Simon's TA method, despite claiming that 299 this method was employed) detailed the TA training procedures adopted. Of those that detailed the 300 instructions provided (k = 35) they cited either adopting Ericsson and Simon's (1980; 1993) training 301 protocol, an adapted version of this protocol (e.g., Birch & Whitehead, 2020; Eccles, 2012; Ericsson & 302 Kirk, 2001), or a combination of these recommendations (e.g., Elliot et al., 2020). The instructions 303 provided primarily involved non-task specific exercises, such as a mental arithmetic task, problem-304 solving task, counting dots on a page, or a verbal-recall exercise. Birch and Whitehead (2020) also 305 suggested adding task-specific exercises alongside traditional TA training to increase familiarity. 306 Training was typically deemed sufficient when both (a) participants had completed some form of 307 training and (b) the researchers judged that the participant understood what TA involved and could 308 demonstrate that they could successfully TA during a task.

309

#### Discussion

In this systematic mapping review, we aimed to identify and synthesise published research that has used the TA method with athletes and exercisers. A total of 36 studies were sourced from 32 independent journal articles. This review has highlighted the growing and contemporary nature of

studies involving use of the TA method within sport and exercise, with over two-thirds of such studies published within the seven years prior to the review (2016-2023). Furthermore, the TA method has also been used across a variety of youth and adult athlete samples, as well as across nine independent sports and two exercise-related activities, although most studies (*k* = 34) were conducted in sport. By examining the nature of the TA method employed, what TA was used for, contextual information, study designs, and TA training in published studies involving the TA method in sport and exercise, this review offers a number of contributions that can guide future research.

# 320 Theoretical Misconceptions

321 In this review, we identified some misconceptions of the verbalisation framework proposed 322 by Ericsson and Simon's (1993), which was used as the basis of the procedures employed to elicit TA. 323 The goal of the TA method proposed by Ericsson and Simon (1993) was to provide the participant with 324 instructions that encourage them to only verbalize information heeded in STM during task 325 performance. That is, Ericsson and Simon wanted participants to only provide Level 1 and Level 2 326 verbalizations. Studies that instructed participants to engage in Level 3 verbalisations while claiming 327 to be aligned to Ericsson and Simon's TA method did so erroneously, because their method was 328 concerned foremost with minimizing the extent to which participants engaged in Level 3 329 verbalisations. While Ericsson and Simon's method was designed to avoid Level 3 verbalisations, 330 studies in which researchers have encouraged these verbalisations have been published within the 331 last four years, indicating that researchers are interesting in using alternative methods of eliciting 332 verbal reports of thinking. Nonetheless, most researchers have used Ericsson and Simon's (1993) 333 method as it was intended by attempting to capture information within the short-term memory during task performance (e.g., Level 1 and Level 2 verbalisations). They have also followed Ericsson and 334 335 Simon's guidance that researchers interested in understanding the functions of thoughts verbalized 336 during task performance should not be tempted ask performers to explain their thoughts (i.e., Level 3 337 verbalisations). As Ericsson and Simon proposed, performers asked to explain their thoughts might 338 not have conscious access to such information and instead might propose explanations based on

information unrelated to these thoughts such as implicit theories of thinking (Nisbett & Wilson, 1977).
Instead, given concerns about the reliability of participants' explanations of the functions of their
thoughts, Ericsson and Simon advised that researchers (i.e., not participants) generate such
explanations based on participants' Level 1 and Level 2 verbalisations and subsequently test their
hypotheses about these explanations via further experimentation.

344 As stated, some researchers have acted against these recommendations (and in some cases while erroneously claiming that their methods are aligned with Ericsson and Simon's TA method) by 345 allowing and even promoting the elicitation of Level 3 verbalisations. The information obtained from 346 347 these studies might be useful in addressing various research aims but researchers must be clear that 348 these alternative methods of eliciting verbal reports about thinking are not associated with Ericsson 349 and Simon's (1993) TA method. In addition, before using the TA method, we encourage researchers 350 to consult accessible primers on the method with the aim of gaining a good understanding of the 351 theory and procedures associated with the method. In this regard, we recommend the 1980 journal 352 article by Ericsson and Simon because it is more accessible than the 1993 text by Ericsson and Simon, 353 and we also recommend the journal article by Eccles and Arsal (2017) for its relative brevity and 354 plainness of language.

# 355 Methodological Considerations

356 Most studies required participants to complete tasks either in a lab-based setting (e.g., Roca 357 et al., 2021) or in a simulated environment, such as a simulated 6-hole golf match (e.g., Whitehead & 358 Jackman, 2021). Few studies collected data in an ecologically valid, naturalistic setting. Such a trend is 359 likely understandable in many sporting contexts, as generating TA data during competitive situations 360 may be practically unfeasible (e.g., during a rugby union match). That said, where possible and 361 practically feasible, researchers should consider exploring the cognitions and thought processes of 362 athletes and exercisers within ecologically valid settings. For example, McGreary et al. (2021) explored 363 the stressors and coping strategies of cricket bowlers during a competitive match, thus generating 364 novel information within a naturalistic setting. Studies set in more ecologically valid contexts would

afford greater insights into the range of contextual cues that performers draw from to inform their thinking and decision-making during performance. For example, previous research (e.g., Williams et al., 2011) has highlighted that expert performers are able to identify multiple contextual cues from their environment (e.g., position of opponents, time remaining, current score etc.,) to inform their decision-making processes during performance. By contrast, studies set in laboratory environments typically do not permit full representation of such cues and thus limit understanding of cognitive processes underpinning sport performance.

372 Furthermore, most studies primarily used the TA method in a single data-collection session. 373 However, researchers have previously highlighted the potential limitations of such 'drive-by' 374 approaches in the case of qualitative interviews, arguing participants could be regarded as nothing 375 more than "data sources" (Chamberlain, 2012, p. 4). In the context of collecting data on athlete 376 cognitions via the TA method, a solitary data collection session only offers a researcher a single 377 snapshot into athlete/exerciser cognitions and limit what can be inferred from these data. 378 Furthermore, given the variations that can arise for athletes and exercisers within and between 379 activities, collecting data across multiple performances, for example, could open up new opportunities 380 for within-person analysis. Furthermore, we suggest that researchers should consider how the TA 381 method can be combined with other methods to generate novel-and potentially different-382 perspectives on participants' cognitions. Methods such as event-focused interviews (Jackman et al., 383 2022), observations, and visual media (e.g., head-mounted video recordings - Mackenzie & Kerr, 2012) 384 could be combined with the TA method to diversify the information generated. For example, during 385 ongoing performance, cognitions (e.g., by an equestrian) could be captured by the TA method, and the behaviours these cognitions give rise to (e.g., changes in the spatial locations and actions of the 386 387 horse and equestrian) could be captured by head-mounted video camera. Furthermore, some 388 researchers have used TA in combination with eye-tracking (Murphy et al., 2016) and fNRIS (Robinson 389 et al., 2021), which hold promise as potential new ways integrate the TA method into multi-disciplinary 390 research.

391 Several studies within this review reported gender differences in athlete cognitions (e.g., 392 Kaiseler et al., 2012a, 2012b; Swettenham et al., 2018). For example, Swettenham et al. (2018) 393 indicated gendered differences in the types of stressors verbalised during practice and competition, 394 with male athletes more likely to verbalise external and physical stressors during practice and 395 performance stressors during competition. In comparison, female participants were more likely to 396 verbalise performance stressors during practice and external stressors during competition. Their 397 findings offered support to the Situational Hypothesis (Rosario et al., 1988) which details gendered 398 differences in coping responses are as a result of male and female participants appraising the same 399 situation differently. While this research shows potential gendered differences in the cognitive 400 processes of athletes, over 80% of participants sampled by studies included in the review were male. 401 While the underrepresentation of participants that do not identify as male is a broader issue for sport 402 psychology (Walton et al., 2022) and sport science research (Cowley et al., 2021) rather than a specific 403 TA method issue, researchers that have used the TA method and examined gender differences have 404 identified some contrasts, albeit these differences are limited to a relatively small number of studies. 405 Therefore, aligned with calls for researchers to address gender inequalities that currently exist in sport 406 and exercise science (Cowley et al., 2021; Walton et al., 2022) and to utilise theoretical perspectives 407 that consider gender to explain findings (Walton et al., 2022), we encourage researchers seeking to 408 use TA in future to direct greater attention towards gendered aspects of cognition.

409 Another trend across the included studies was that most participants recruited were adults. 410 Specifically, of the 31 studies that provided information related to participants, 23 were adult-only 411 studies. However, as has been demonstrated by a small number of studies, use of the TA method 412 appears to be feasible, at least in youths aged 13-18 years, and findings from studies that have made 413 use of this method offer further insight into the thought processes of junior athletes and/or exercisers 414 during task performance. For example, Elliot et al. (2020) explored differences in thought processes 415 between adult and junior Australian Rules footballers during a set-shot goal attempt and findings such 416 as these could further enhance understanding of how different groups may develop and acquire skills,

which would have applied implications for coaches and practitioners. Therefore, to better understand
the development and acquisition of skills, more TA data needs to be collected from younger
participants.

420 The tendency to prioritise adult-only studies could be explained by the increased ethical 421 complexities of working with youth athletes, but on the other hand, researchers may have perceived 422 that the complexities required of 'thinking aloud' while performing might be too great for youths. It is 423 worth noting, however, that the training provided to youths and adults did not differ in any study in 424 our review that involved youth participants. Furthermore, no TA training approaches cited (e.g., Birch 425 & Whitehead, 2019; Eccles, 2012; Ericsson & Simons, 1993; Ericsson & Kirk, 2001) were developed 426 specifically for young people. Consequently, this begs the question as to whether the training provided 427 to youth participants in sport and exercise is fit for purpose. Future research should look to explore, 428 firstly, whether TA training is suitable for and acceptable to junior participants and, secondly, whether 429 there is a more suitable training protocol that could be offered to junior participants. Similarly, future 430 research should look to explore in more detail the cognitions of junior athletes during the performance 431 of tasks.

432 While many studies did not explicitly state their research paradigm, most of the studies 433 appeared to be underpinned by post-positivism. However, there was evidence of a growing number 434 of more recent studies (all published within the last four years) adopting more 435 subjectivist/interpretivist positions, once again highlighting the flexible nature of TA. Based on these 436 findings concerning philosophical positions and in keeping with recommendations for sport and 437 exercise psychology research (e.g., Smith & McGannon, 2018), it is important for future research to 438 consider the broad range of paradigms that can be adopted as a way to generate different forms of 439 knowledge. Nevertheless, it is important to recognise that results generated from different 440 philosophical approaches are simply different and not better or worse (Eccles & Arsal, 2017). Furthermore, it is important for researchers to note that we concur with the view that similar to other 441 442 forms of participant talk (e.g., interview conversation, see Randell & Phoenix, 2009), the TA method

443 does not "provide an insight into the subjectivity of participant experience" (Smith & Sparkes, 2016.444 p. 108).

#### 445 Future Research and Applied Implications

446 Across the included studies, there were several broad topic areas that researchers based their 447 research questions and objectives around. As most studies explored these topics within a sporting 448 context, researchers interested in understanding thinking within exercise populations could consider 449 using the TA method in future research. For example, researchers interested in the cognitions of 450 participants in physical activity could use the TA method to compare the cognitions of participants 451 who engage in low, moderate, and high levels of activity, or across different levels of exercise intensity 452 and viewed in line with contemporary theoretical frameworks (e.g., Ekkekakis' [2005] dual mode 453 theory of affective responses to exercise). Such findings could be used to offer support to such theories 454 by allowing the researcher to better understanding cognitive processes (e.g., self-efficacy, goals, 455 attributions etc.,) which have been theorised to influence individuals' affective responses to exercise. 456 Similarly, findings could aid researchers and practitioners' understanding of cognitive processes during 457 exercise, and potentially aid in the design and delivery of programmes aimed at increasing and 458 maintaining physical activity in insufficiently active populations. Furthermore, recent research, such 459 as the applied case study conducted by Moffat et al. (2021), has highlighted the novel and diverse 460 ways through which the TA method can be used. Specifically, the authors used the TA method to elicit 461 verbal reports that were then used as part of an attribution retraining process and showed how such 462 training improved athletes' emotional control capabilities (although we ask the reader not to use the 463 authors' description of the method as a guide to its use because the description contains some misunderstandings about the theoretical basis for the method, even if the method appears to have 464 465 been used correctly). In turn, this demonstrates the flexibility of the TA method and offers preliminary 466 evidence of how it can be used in applied practice.

467 Furthermore, future research could explore the utility of TA as an applied tool for sport and 468 exercise psychology interventions, the TA method, as Ericsson and Simon presented it, could be used

469 when we are interested in understanding, and changing via intervention, a performer's thinking. The 470 TA method could align well with cognitive-behaviourally-focussed approaches, such as rational 471 emotive behaviour therapy (REBT), by allowing the practitioner to collect verbalised data during 472 performance and collaboratively work with the athlete to identify irrational beliefs and replace them 473 with more rational beliefs (Turner, 2016). Similarly, it could be used to explore aspects of a performer's 474 use of pre-performance routines (PPR) by examining the extent to which there is evidence of desirable 475 and less desirable components of the PPR such as self-talk or cue words and then to use it again, over 476 time, during and following PPR training to examine how the PPR has changed over time according to 477 verbalized thoughts following the training. Finally, further exploration of non-Western-centric usage 478 of TA could also be a potential line of inquiry for future researchers.

# 479 Limitations of the Review

480 In this review, we aimed to identify and synthesise published literature that has used the TA 481 method in studies that sampled athletes and exercisers. While there are a number of key strengths 482 associated with this review, such as the thorough trustworthiness process at each stage of the review 483 (search strategy to data extraction), it is important to recognise a number of limitations. First, as this 484 was a mapping review, the focus was on investigating the use of the TA method, with less focus on 485 synthesizing results from included studies to draw overall conclusions. Second, papers were excluded 486 if they had not sampled athletes or exercisers (e.g., coaches, judges); therefore, the issues discussed 487 relate only to studies involving the TA method that have been employed with these population 488 samples. Third, eligible papers that were not peer-reviewed articles or had not been written or 489 translated into the English language may have been excluded, leaving the findings potentially open to 490 publication and language bias. While we recognise these limitations due to the nature of the mapping 491 review we employed, many of these limitations could not be avoided.

492

#### Conclusion

In this review, we aimed to identify and synthesise TA research within sport and exercise. We cover
15-years' of publications and found that the majority of publications within the previous seven years.

495	The review is the first of its kind to detail the nature of TA method employed, what the TA method
496	was used for, contextual information, study designs, and TA training in published studies that have
497	used the TA method in sport and exercise. By doing so, we identified several limitations associated
498	with previous research that has involved the TA method, while also offering suggestions for future
499	research to ensure consistent and best methodological practice when adopting the TA method.
500	Finally, this review provides directions for future researchers using the TA method to further expand
501	the scope of research and enhance methodological rigour.
502	Disclosure Statement
503	The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.
504	Data Accessibility Statement
505	The authors confirm that the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the
506	article [and/or] its supplementary materials.
507	Reference List
508	Arsal, G., Eccles, D.W., & Ericsson, K.A. (2016). Cognitive mediation of putting. Use of a think-aloud
509	measure and implications for studies of golf putting in the laboratory. Psychology of Sport
510	and Exercise, 27, 18-27. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.07.008">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.07.008</a>
511	Bahrick, H. P., Hall, L. K., & Berger, S. A. (1996). Accuracy and distortion in memory for high school
512	grades. Psychological Science, 7(5), 265-271. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-
513	<u>9280.1996.tb00372.x</u> Bennett, E. V., Scarlett, L., Hurd Clarke, L., & Crocker, P. R. (2016).
514	Negotiating (athletic) femininity: The body and identity in elite female basketball players.
515	Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 9(2), 233-246.
516	https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2016.1246470
517	Ball, L. J., Marsh, J. E., Litchfield, D., Cook, R. L., & Booth, N. (2015). When distraction helps: Evidence
518	that concurrent articulation and irrelevant speech can facilitate insight problem
519	solving. Thinking & Reasoning, 21(1), 76-96. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/13546783.2014.934399</u>

- 520 Berg, R. C., Munthe-Kaas, H. M., & Ross, M. W. (2016). Internalized homonegativity: A systematic
- 521 mapping review of empirical research. *Journal of homosexuality*, *63*(4), 541-558.

522 https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2015.1083788

- 523 Birch, P. D., & Whitehead, A. E. (2020). Investigating the comparative suitability of traditional and
  524 task-specific think aloud training. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 127(1), 202-224.
- 525 https://doi.org/10.1177/0031512519882274
- 526 Campbell, F., Tricco, A. C., Munn, Z., Pollock, D., Saran, A., Sutton, A., ... & Khalil, H. (2023). Mapping
   527 reviews, scoping reviews, and evidence and gap maps (EGMs): the same but different—the
- 528 "Big Picture" review family. Systematic reviews, 12(1), 45. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-
- 529 <u>023-02224-2</u>
- 530 Calmeiro, L., & Tennenbaum, G. (2011). Concurrent verbal protocol analysis in sport: Illustration of
- 531 thought processes during a golf-putting task. *Journal of Clinical Sport Psychology*, 5(3), 223-
- 532 236. <u>https://doi.org/10.1123/jcsp.5.3.223</u>
- 533 Cowley, E. S., Olenick, A. A., McNulty, K. L., & Ross, E. Z. (2021). "Invisible sportswomen": the sex
- 534 data gap in sport and exercise science research. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity*

535 *Journal*, *29*(2), 146-151. <u>https://doi.org/10.1123/wspaj.2021-0028</u>

- 536 Chamberlain, K. (2012). *Do you really need a methodology*. QMiP Bulletin, 13(59), e63.
- 537 Eccles, D. (2012). Verbal reports of cognitive processes. In G. Tenenbaum, R. C. Eklund, & A. Kamata,.
- 538 (Eds.). Handbook of Measurement in Sport and Exercise Psychology (pp. 103-117).
- 539 Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics. <u>https://doi.org/10.5040/9781492596332.ch-011</u>
- 540 Eccles, D. W., & Arsal, G. (2017). The think aloud method: What is it, and how do I use it? *Qualitative*
- 541 *Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 9*(4), 514-531.
- 542 https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2017.1331501
- 543 Eccles, D. W., Walsh, S. E., & Ingledew, D. K. (2006). Visual attention in orienteers with different
- 544 levels of experience. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 24,* 77-87.
- 545 http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02640410400022

- 546 Ekkekakis, P. (2005). *The study of affective responses to acute exercise: The dual-mode model*. In R.
- 547 Stelter & K.K. Roessler (Eds.) New approaches to sport and exercise psychology (pp. 119146).
  548 Oxford, United Kingdom: Meyer & Meyer Sport
- 549 Elliott, S., Whitehead, A., & Magias, T. (2020). Thought processes during set shot goalkicking in
- 550 Australian Rules football: An analysis of youth and semi-professional footballers using Think
- 551 Aloud. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *48*, 101659.

552 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2020.101659

- 553 Ericsson, K. A., & Simon, H. A. (1980). Verbal reports as data. Psychological Review, 87(3), 215-
- 554 251. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.87.3.215</u>
- 555 Ericsson, K. A., & Simon, H. A. (1993). *Verbal Reports and Data*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ericsson, K. A., & Kirk, E. (2001). *Instructions for giving retrospective verbal reports*. Unpublished
   manuscript. Florida State University. Department of Psychology.
- 558 Gough, D. A., Kiwan, D., Sutcliffe, K., Simpson, D., & Houghton, N. (2003). A systematic map and
- 559 synthesis review of the effectiveness of personal development planning for improving

560 student learning. London: EPPICentre, Social Science Research Unit

- 561 Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and associated
- 562 methodologies. *Health information & libraries journal, 26*(2), 91-108.
- 563 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x
- 564 Gunn, C. P., & Taylor, I. M. (2021). Using the think aloud protocol to measure desire-goal conflict and
- 565 conflict resolution in a postural persistence task. *Measurement in Physical Education and*
- 566 *Exercise Science*, 25(2), 87-94. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/1091367x.2020.1835663</u>
- Holmes, P. S., & Wright, D. J. (2017). Motor cognition and neuroscience in sport psychology. *Current opinion in psychology*, *16*, 43-47. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.03.009</u>
- Jackman, P. C., Schweickle, M. J., Goddard, S. G., Vella, S. A., & Swann, C. (2022). The event-focused
- 570 interview: what is it, why is it useful, and how is it used? *Qualitative Research in Sport*,
- 571 *Exercise and Health*, 1-14. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2021.1904442</u>

- Johnson, L. J., Doncaster, G., Cronin, L., Williams, C., Varga, J., & Marchant, D. (2023). Well-trained,
- 573 trained and recreationally trained runners' cognition during a 5km tempo run: a think aloud
- 574 study. International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 1-21.
- 575 https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2023.2207104
- 576 Jones, M., Meijen, C., McCarthy, P. J., & Sheffield, D. (2009). A theory of challenge and threat states
- 577 in athletes. International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 2(2), 161-180.

578 https://doi.org/10.1080/17509840902829331

- 579 Kaiseler, M., Polman, R. C., & Nicholls, A. R. (2013). Gender differences in stress, appraisal, and
- 580 coping during golf putting. International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 11(3), 258-
- 581 272. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2013.749004</u>
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Coping and adaptation. In W. D. Gentry (Ed.). The Handbook of

583 *Behavioral Medicine* (pp. 282-325). New York: Guilford.

- Lazarus, R. S. (1999). Stress and Emotion: A New Synthesis. New York: Springer.
- 585 Mackenzie, S. H., & Kerr, J. H. (2012). Head-mounted cameras and stimulated recall in qualitative
- 586 sport research. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 4*(1), 51-61.
- 587 https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2011.653495
- 588 Macquet, A.C. (2009). Recognition within the decision making process: A case study of expert
- 589 volleyball players. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 21*, 46-79.
- 590 https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200802575759
- 591 Macquet, A-C., Eccles, D. W., & Barraux, E. (2012). What makes an orienteer an expert? A case study
- 592 of a highly elite orienteer's concerns in the course of competition. Journal of Sports Sciences,
- 593 *30,* 91-99. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02640414.201</u>
- 594 Macquet, A. C., & Fleurance, P. (2007). Naturalistic decision making in expert badminton players.
- 595 *Ergonomics, 50*(9), 1433-1450. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/00140130701393452</u>

- 596 Mansell, P. C., & Turner, M. J. (2022). Testing the REBT-I model in athletes: Investigating the role of
- self-confidence between irrational beliefs and psychological distress. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *63*, 102284. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2022.102284</u>

- 599 McGreary, M., Eubank, M., Morris, R., & Whitehead, A. (2020). Thinking Aloud: Stress and Coping in
- 600 Junior Cricket Batsmen During Challenge and Threat States. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*,

601 127(6), 1095-1117. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0031512520938911</u>

- 602 McGreary, M., Birch, P., Eubank, M., & Whitehead, A. (2021). Thinking Aloud. A qualitative analysis
- 603 of stressors and coping responses in cricket bowlers during a competitive match. *Qualitative*
- 604 *Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 1-18. <u>1080/2159676X.2020.1829013</u>
- 605 McPherson, S. L., & Kernodle, M. (2007). Mapping two new points on the tennis expertise
- 606 continuum: Tactical skills of adult advanced beginners and entry-level professionals during
- 607 competition. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 25(8), 945-959.
- 608 https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410600908035
- 609 Moffat, Z. L., McCarthy, P. J., & McCann, B. (2021). Shifting Attributions, Shaping Behavior: A Brief
- 610 Intervention With Youth Tennis Players. *Case Studies in Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 5(1),
- 611 69-78. <u>https://doi.org/10.1123/cssep.2020-0036</u>
- Moran, A., Campbell, M., & Toner, J. (2019). Exploring the cognitive mechanisms of expertise in
- 613 sport: Progress and prospects. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 42*, 8-15.
- 614 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.12.019</u>
- Mulligan, D., McCracken, J., & Hodges, N. J. (2012). Situational familiarity and its relation to decision
- 616 quality in ice-hockey. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 10*, 198-210.
- 617 https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2012.672009
- Murphy, C. P., Jackson, R. C., Cooke, K., Roca, A., Benguigui, N., & Williams, A. M. (2016). Contextual
- 619 information and perceptual-cognitive expertise in a dynamic, temporally-constrained
- 620 task. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 22(4), 455-
- 621 470. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/xap0000094</u>

- 622 Nicholls, A.R., & Polman, R. C. J. (2008). Think aloud: Acute stress and coping strategies during golf
- 623 performances. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping, 21,* 283-294.

624 https://doi.org/10.1080/10615800701609207

- 625 North, J. S., Ward, P., Ericsson, A., & Williams, A. M. (2011). Mechanisms underlying skilled
- 626 anticipation and recognition in a dynamic and temporally constrained

627 domain. *Memory*, 19(2), 155-168. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2010.541466</u>

- 628 Oliver, A., McCarthy, P. J., & Burns, L. (2021). Using a "think aloud" protocol to understand meta-
- 629 attention in club-level golfers. International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 19(5),
- 630 780-793. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2020.1766536</u>
- 631 Popay, J., Roberts, H., Sowden, A., Petticrew, M., Arai, L., Rodgers, M., & Duffy, S. (2006). Guidance
- 632 on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews. A product from the ESRC
  633 methods programme Version, 1 (1), 92.
- 634 Randall, W. L., & Phoenix, C. (2009). The problem with truth in qualitative interviews: reflections
- from a narrative perspective. *Qualitative research in sport and exercise*, *1*(2), 125-140.
- 636 https://doi.org/10.1080/19398440902908993
- 637 Robinson, N. J., Montgomery, C., Swettenham, L., & Whitehead, A. (2021). A pilot study investigating
- 638 cortical haemodynamic and physiological correlates of exercise cognition in trained and
- 639 untrained cyclists over an incremental self-paced performance test, while thinking
- aloud. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *54*, 101912.

641 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2021.101912</u>

- 642 Roca, A., Ford, P. R., & Memmert, D. (2021). Perceptual-cognitive processes underlying creative
- 643 expert performance in soccer. *Psychological Research*, *85*, 1146-1155.
- Rosario, M., Shinn, M., Morch, H., & Huckabee, C. B. (1988). Gender differences in coping and social
- 645 supports: Testing socialization and role constraint theories. *Journal of Community*
- 646 *Psychology, 16*, 55-69. doi: 10.1002/1520-6629(198801)16:1

- 647 Rose, E. A., & Parfitt, G. (2010). Pleasant for some and unpleasant for others: a protocol analysis of
- 648 the cognitive factors that influence affective responses to exercise. *International Journal of*649 *Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 7(1), 1-15.
- 650 Runswick, O. R., Roca, A., Mark Williams, A., Bezodis, N. E., McRobert, A. P., & North, J. S. (2018). The
- 651 impact of contextual information and a secondary task on anticipation performance: An
- 652 interpretation using cognitive load theory. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 32(2), 141-149.
- 653 <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3386</u>
- Samson, A., Simpson, D., Kamphoff, C., & Langlier, A. (2017). Think aloud: An examination of distance
- 655 runners' thought processes. International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 15(2),
- 656 176-189. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2015.1069877</u>
- 657 Schinke, R. J., Mellalieu, S., Ntoumanis, N., Kavussanu, M., Standage, M., Strauss, B., & Papaioannou,
- A. (2021). Getting published: Suggestions and strategies from editors of sport and exercise
  psychology journals. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *33*(6) 1-14.
- 660 https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2020.1741725
- 661 Siddaway, A. P., Wood, A. M., & Hedges, L. V. (2019). How to do a systematic review: a best practice
- 662 guide for conducting and reporting narrative reviews, meta-analyses, and meta-syntheses.
- 663 Annual Review of Psychology, 70, 747-770. <u>https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-</u>
- 664 <u>102803</u>
- Sigmon, S. T., Stanton, A. L., & Snyder, C. R. (1995). Gender differences in coping: A further test of
  socialization and role constraint theories. *Sex Roles, 33*(9-10), 565-587.
- 667 <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01547718</u>
- 668 Smith, B., & Sparkes, A. C. (2016). Qualitative interviewing in the sport and exercise sciences.
- 669 Routledge Handbook of Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise, 103-123.
- 670 Smith, B., & McGannon, K. R. (2018). Developing rigor in qualitative research: Problems and
- 671 opportunities within sport and exercise psychology. *International Review of Sport and*
- 672 *Exercise Psychology, 11*(1), 101-121. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2017.1317357</u>

- 673 Stephenson, J., Cronin, C., & Whitehead, A. E. (2020). "Suspended above, and in action": Think Aloud
- as a reflective practice tool. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 7(1), 11-21.

675 <u>https://doi.org/10.1123/iscj.2018-0022</u>

- 676 Swann, C., Moran, A., & Piggott, D. (2015). Defining elite athletes: Issues in the study of expert
- 677 performance in sport psychology. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 16*, 3-14.
- 678 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.07.004</u>
- 679 Swettenham, L., Eubank, M., Won, D., & Whitehead, A. E. (2018). Investigating stress and coping
- 680 during practice and competition in tennis using think aloud. *International Journal of Sport*
- 681 *and Exercise Psychology*, 1-21. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2018.1511622</u>
- 682 Tamres, L. K., Janicki, D., & Helgeson, V. S. (2002). Sex differences in coping behavior: A meta-
- 683 analytic review and an examination of relative coping. *Personality and Social Psychology*

684 *Review, 6*(1), 2-30. <u>https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0601\_1</u>

- Turner, M. J. (2016). Rational emotive behavior therapy (REBT), irrational and rational beliefs, and
  the mental health of athletes. *Frontiers in psychology*, *7*, 1423.
- 687 <u>https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01423</u>
- 688 Walton, C. C., Gwyther, K., Gao, C. X., Purcell, R., & Rice, S. M. (2022). Evidence of gender imbalance
- 689 across samples in sport and exercise psychology. International Review of Sport and Exercise
- 690 Psychology, 1-19. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2022.2150981</u>
- 691 Welsh, J.C., Dewhurst, S.A., & Perry, J. L. (2018). Thinking aloud: An exploration of cognitions in

692 professional snooker. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 36*, 197-208.

- 693 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.03.003
- 694 Whitehead, A. E., Cropley, B., Huntly, T., Miles, A., Quayle, L., & Knowles, Z. (2016). 'Think Aloud':
- Toward a framework to facilitate reflective practice amongst rugby league coaches.
- 696 International Sport Coaching Journal, 3(3), 269-286. <u>https://doi.org/10.1123/iscj.2016-0021</u>

697 Whitehead, A. E., & Jackman, P. C. (2021). Towards a framework of cognitive processes during
698 competitive golf using the Think Aloud method. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *53*,

699 101869. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2020.101869

- 700 Whitehead, A.E., Taylor, J.A., & Polman, R. C. (2016). Evidence for skill level differences in the
- 701 thought processes of golfers during high and low pressure situations. *Frontiers in*

702 Psychology, 6, 19-74. <u>https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01974</u>

- 703 Whitehead, A. E., Jones, H.S., Williams, E. L., Dowling, C., Morley, D., Taylor, J. E., & Polman, R. C.
- 704 (2017). Changes in cognition over a 16.1km cycling time trial using Think Aloud protocol:
- 705 Preliminary evidence. International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 1-9.
- 706 <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2017.1292302</u>
- 707 Whitehead, A. E., Jones, H. S., Williams, E. L., Rowley, C., Quayle, L., Marchant, D., & Polman, R. C.
- 708 (2018). Investigating the relationship between cognitions, pacing strategies and
- performance in 16.1km cycling time trials using a think aloud protocol. *Psychology of Sport*

710 *and Exercise, 34*, 95-109. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.10.001</u>

- 711 Whitehead, A. E., Jones, H. S., Williams, E. L., Dowling, C., Morley, D., Taylor, J. A., & Polman, R. C.
- 712 (2019). Changes in cognition over a 16.1 km cycling time trial using Think Aloud protocol:
- 713 Preliminary evidence. International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 17(3), 266-274.
- 714 https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2017.1292302
- 715 Whitehead, A. E., Taylor, J. A., & Polman, R. C. (2015). Examination of the suitability of collecting in

event cognitive processes using Think Aloud protocol in golf. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6,* 

- 717 1083. <u>https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01083</u>
- 718 Williams, A. M., Ford, P., Eccles, D. W., & Ward, P. (2011). Perceptual-cognitive expertise in sport and
- 719 its acquisition: Implications for applied cognitive psychology. Applied Cognitive Psychology,
- 720 *25,* 432-442. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/acp.1710