

Please cite the Published Version

Wood, GW, Vine, SJ, Parr, JVV and Wilson, MR (2017) Aiming to deceive: Examining the role of the quiet eye during deceptive aiming actions. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 39 (5). pp. 327-338. ISSN 0895-2779

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2017-0016>

Publisher: Human Kinetics

Version: Accepted Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/619360/>

Usage rights: © In Copyright

Additional Information: This is an Author Accepted Manuscript provided by Human kinetics of a paper accepted for publication in *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*.

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

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

RUNNING HEAD: DECEPTION AND THE QUIET EYE

TITLE: Aiming to deceive: Examining the role of the quiet eye during deceptive aiming actions

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

Abstract

In three experiments, we explored the use of deceptive gaze in soccer penalty takers using eye-tracking equipment. In Experiment 1, players competed against a goalkeeper while taking unconstrained shots. Results indicated that when players used deception (looking to the opposite side to which they shot) they extended the duration of their final aiming (quiet-eye; QE) fixation and maintained shooting accuracy. In Experiment 2, with no goalkeeper present players still used extended QE durations when using a deceptive strategy, but this time their accuracy suffered. In Experiment 3, we manipulated the goalkeeper's location while controlling for the use of peripheral vision and memory of goal size. Results indicated that increased QE durations were required when using deceptive aiming, and that accuracy was influenced by the position of the goalkeeper. We conclude that during deceptive aiming, soccer players maintain accuracy by covertly processing information related to the goalkeeper's location.

Keywords: Deception, Gaze, Penalty kicks, Soccer, Head-fakes, Peripheral vision

Introduction

1
2 The ability to predict the mental state and behavioral intentions of others from their gaze
3 direction has been fundamental to our evolutionary success (Emery, 2000). Accordingly,
4 humans have developed a predisposition to focus on the gaze direction of others when attempting
5 to interpret and anticipate their future actions (Blakemore, Winston, & Frith, 2004). For example,
6 Nummenmaa, Hyona and Hietanen (2009) have shown that pedestrians use eye-movements to
7 indicate their intended direction of travel, and that approaching pedestrians use this information
8 to avoid collisions. However, the predisposition to focus on the gaze of others can be exploited
9 through the use of deceptive gaze behaviors that aim to disguise the deceiver's future intentions
10 (Emery, 2000). Such deceptive behaviors are readily observable in sport (Güldenpenning, Kunde
11 & Weigelt, 2017).

12 In a sporting context these deceptive behaviors are often referred to as 'head-fakes' (e.g.,
13 Basketball; Kunde, Skirde & Weigelt, 2011) and are characterized by performers faking gaze in
14 one direction whilst shooting or passing to another. At the heart of their use is a deliberate
15 attempt to misdirect the attention of an opponent and negatively influence their responsive
16 actions in order to create a performance advantage. Despite their frequency in sport, there have
17 been few empirical studies that have explored the cognitive factors behind their use (Kunde et al,
18 2011). Those that have done so have focused on expert and novice differences in the ability to
19 detect deceptive actions across a range of sports; including handball (Canal-Bruland & Schmidt,
20 2009; Canal-Bruland, van der Kamp, & van Kesteren, 2010), rugby (Jackson, Warren, &
21 Abernethy, 2006), basketball (Sebanz & Shiffrar, 2009) and soccer goalkeeping (Dicks, Uehara,
22 & Lima, 2011; Smeeton & Williams, 2012; Tomeo, Cesari, Aglioti, & Urgesi, 2012). The
23 consensus from these studies suggests that experts are better able to detect deceptive behaviors

1 and this advantage seems to be attributable to their superior experience in both perceiving and
2 performing the observed actions (Canal-Bruland et al, 2010). While the ability of the observer to
3 detect deceptive actions has obvious and important implications for performance in sport, there
4 are consequences of employing such behaviors from the deceiver's perspective.

5 Evidence for such implications comes from both motor control research suggesting that
6 visually-guided motor performance is optimized when the gaze system provides advanced target
7 information to the motor system (Land, 2009), and from cognitive psychology research
8 suggesting that deceptive behaviors are inherently more cognitively complex (Zuckerman,
9 DePaulo, & Rosenthal, 1981). Therefore, employing head-fakes – which disassociate gaze from
10 aiming intention – should have a detrimental impact on performance, particularly in aiming tasks
11 where the processing of target related parameters is crucial. Indeed, dissociation of gaze and
12 aiming intention impairs performance in simple visuomotor tasks such as pointing (Neggers &
13 Bekkering, 2001) and more dynamic tasks such as driving (Wilson, Chattington, & Marple-
14 Horvat, 2008). Therefore, any benefit of employing head-fakes arising from increasing the
15 complexity of the observer's decision-making process must be weighed up against the increased
16 difficulty of performing the skill while dissociating gaze and intention.

17 In sport, this coordination of gaze and motor systems has received much research
18 attention in the exploration of key perceptual-cognitive variables that underpin expert
19 performance (see Mann, Williams, Ward, & Janelle, 2007 for a review). One such measure, the
20 quiet eye (QE; Vickers, 1996) – defined as the duration of the final fixation toward a relevant
21 target before the initiation of a critical movement - has been proposed to provide a period of
22 cognitive pre-programming of movement parameters (force, direction and velocity) immediately
23 before an aiming skill is performed (Vickers, 1996, 2007). As task complexity and pre-

1 programming demands increase, so does the QE period (Klostermann, Kredel, & Hossner, 2013;
2 Sun, Zhang, Vine, & Wilson, 2016; Williams, Singer, & Frehlich, 2002; Wood, Vine & Wilson,
3 2013). It is therefore probable that deceptive visuomotor actions will also require such extensions
4 of cognitive pre-programming in order to compensate for the dissociation between gaze and
5 aiming intention and the resultant increase in task demands that arise.

6 Furthermore, this dissociation is likely to have implications for the overt and covert
7 attentional processes used during QE durations. Unlike typical aiming skills where the target is
8 fixated during (e.g., darts) or before (e.g., golf-putting) the critical movement using overt
9 attentional processes (via foveal vision; Vickers, 2007), deceptive aiming actions are likely to
10 rely on covert attentional processes (via peripheral vision) in order to extract target-related
11 information necessary to parameterize the shot and ensure accuracy. Interestingly, covert
12 attentional processes have also been shown to increase QE aiming durations (Querfurth,
13 Schücker, de Lussanet, & Zentgraf, 2016) possibly due to the inhibition of not-to-be
14 parameterized movement variants (Klostermann, Kredal & Hossner, 2014). Taken together, this
15 may suggest a degree of flexibility regarding the attentional processes underpinning the QE and
16 the type of information that can be used during QE durations to guide accurate aiming.

17 One sporting task where deceptive eye-movements have been recently shown to be
18 prevalent is the soccer penalty kick. Early research (Kuhn, 1988) identified two aiming
19 strategies: keeper-dependent - where the kicker focuses on the movements of the goalkeeper and
20 responds by shooting in the opposite direction to which (s)he dives; and keeper-independent -
21 where the kicker aligns gaze with aiming intention and looks where they intend to shoot. Wood
22 and Wilson (2010a) uncovered a third strategy, which they labeled the opposite-independent
23 strategy; characterized by players looking to the opposite side of the goal to which they shoot, a

1 behavior that is often colloquially referred to in soccer as “giving him/her the eyes”. At the heart
2 of this strategy is the deliberate attempt to deceive or mislead the goalkeeper in order to disguise
3 the kicker’s true aiming intention (Wood & Wilson, 2010a).

4 An intriguing finding from this study was that players were just as accurate when
5 employing head-fakes as they were when using the keeper-independent strategy (looking where
6 they intended to shoot). This is surprising given the consensus of experimental research that has
7 explored the visual aiming strategies of soccer penalty takers suggests that shooting accuracy is
8 significantly impaired if players decouple gaze and aiming intention whilst shooting; for
9 example, inducing aiming fixations to the goalkeeper causes shots to be more centrally
10 distributed (Binsch, Oudejans, Bakker, & Savelsbergh, 2010; van der Kamp, 2011; Wilson,
11 Wood & Vine, 2009; Wood & Wilson, 2010a, 2010b, 2011, 2012). Therefore, how do players
12 maintain shooting accuracy despite dissociating gaze from aiming intention when employing
13 head-fakes? What compensatory visual or attentional processes are involved in protecting
14 performance? And why is this decoupling strategy not as debilitating to performance as the
15 keeper-dependent approach?

16 In the following three experiments, we aim to provide an examination of the attentional
17 and/or performance costs behind deception in soccer penalty shooting. This represents an
18 intriguing shift in research focus from the perceiver to the deceiver, and may offer an insight into
19 the compensatory processes that underpin head-fakes in aiming-based tasks. In Experiment 1 we
20 extend the work of Wood and Wilson (2010a) by examining the gaze behavior of penalty takers
21 and the effects of these on the anticipatory performance of the goalkeeper. We hypothesized that
22 when players used a deceptive strategy they would be able to maintain accuracy as long as they
23 lengthened their QE aiming fixations (to the opposite side of the goal) to compensate for

1 increased task demands (as Klostermann et al., 2013; Williams et al., 2002). We further
2 hypothesized that the deceptive nature of the strategy would negatively affect the anticipatory
3 performance of the goalkeeper – causing him to dive to the wrong side on more occasions than
4 when using the keeper-independent strategy (as Dicks et al., 2011).

5 **Experiment 1**

6 **Method**

7 *Participants*

8 Ten experienced (mean competitive experience = 9.6 years, $SD = 3.41$) male university
9 level soccer players (mean age = 20.3 years, $SD = 1.16$) and one experienced goalkeeper (age =
10 31 years; experience = 24 years) gave written consent to partake in the study after procedures
11 were approved by a local ethics committee. ¹

12 *Apparatus*

13 A standard size 5 soccer ball was shot from the standard penalty kick distance (11
14 meters) towards a full sized soccer goal (7.32 m wide x 2.44 m high) that was marked out on an
15 adjacent wall. To allow the goalkeeper to dive freely and reduce the potential for injury, gym
16 mats (32mm thickness) were used to cover the full width of the goal. Participants were fitted
17 with an Applied Science Laboratories (ASL; Bedford, MA) Mobile Eye tracker, which measures
18 eye-line of gaze at 25Hz, with respect to eye and scene cameras, mounted on a pair of glasses.
19 The system incorporates a recording device (a modified digital video cassette recorder), worn in
20 a pouch around the waist, and a laptop (Dell inspiron6400) with ‘Eyevision’ recording software
21 installed. A circular cursor, representing 1° of visual angle with a 4.5-mm lens, indicating the

1 location of gaze in a video image of the scene (spatial accuracy of $\pm 0.5^\circ$ visual angle; 0.1°
2 precision) is recorded for offline analysis.

3 *Procedure*

4 In order to familiarize participants to the testing environment and apparatus, each
5 participant attended individually and took ten practice penalty kicks with no goalkeeper present.
6 Participants were then calibrated to the eye-tracker using locations on the goal, took a single
7 block of ten penalty kicks against the goalkeeper and were told that they should try to score as
8 many kicks as possible, similar to real competition. This procedure was repeated over three
9 consecutive weeks resulting in an individual sample of 30 kicks per participant and an overall
10 potential sample of 300 kicks. In order to minimize errors in data collection, calibration was
11 checked after every kick. Previous research (Wood & Wilson, 2010a) has shown that by
12 allowing penalty takers to take a series of kicks, they naturally alternate the shooting strategies
13 they use and this allowed us to produce a mix sample of kicks without giving any instruction to
14 the players. During testing, the goalkeeper was asked to attempt to save as many shots as
15 possible and was given a minimum of 10 minutes rest between participants to prevent fatigue.

16 *Shooting Strategies*

17 Each shot taken was categorized into one of the three strategies outlined in previous
18 research (e.g., Wood & Wilson, 2010a), based on the location of the final (QE) fixation prior to
19 the initiation of the run-up. Specifically, keeper dependent (KD), final fixation on the
20 goalkeeper; keeper independent (KI), final fixation on the target area to which the ball was
21 kicked; and the deceptive kicking strategy (previously referred to as the opposite independent

1 strategy; Wood & Wilson, 2010a), final fixation to one side of the goal with a resulting shot to
2 the opposite side.

3 *Measures*

4 *Quiet eye.* Each half of the goal was divided into six zones of 61 cm and these were used
5 to map the location of the QE fixation from each post (0cm) to the center of the goal (183cm).
6 Lower numbers therefore represent a distal aiming strategy (i.e., further away from the
7 goalkeeper). QE aiming fixations were determined via frame-by-frame analysis of the eye-
8 tracker video file using Quiet-Eye Solutions analysis software and were defined as the last
9 fixation on the goal that started prior to, and extended beyond, the initiation of the run-up (as
10 Wood & Wilson, 2011). This definition of the QE therefore reflects the final fixation of the
11 aiming phase that often extends into the early part of the execution phase (run-up). A fixation
12 was classified as three or more consecutive frames (≥ 120 ms) in which the cursor stayed in the
13 same location (Vickers, 1996). The QE was therefore defined in terms of its location (distance
14 from post) and duration (ms). Interrater reliability of 85 shots revealed an agreement of 98%.

15 *Performance.* As shots hit closer to the post and further from the goalkeeper are more
16 likely to be successful (Bar- Eli & Azar, 2009; Kerwin & Bray, 2006), we measured shooting
17 accuracy by measuring the distance in centimeters from shot placement (the center of the ball) to
18 the post. Therefore, lower values reflected shots that were hit closer to the post and further from
19 the goalkeeper. Shots that missed the goal were not given an accuracy score, those that were
20 saved were given an estimated score relating to where they would have hit the goal (Wood &
21 Wilson, 2011). The location of a shot was determined via frame-by-frame analysis of the eye-
22 tracker video file using Quiet-Eye Solutions analysis software with a precision of 5 cm

1 (approximately one quarter the diameter of the ball) in the same manner as the location of the QE
2 data. Estimates of shooting accuracy from a sample of 72 shots revealed an inter-rater reliability
3 of 96%. The number of goals, saves, and misses were recorded for each strategy, as was the
4 number of times that the goalkeeper moved or dived to the opposite side to which the players
5 shot the ball. These tallies were converted to percentages (of the total number of shots taken
6 using the strategy) for subsequent comparisons.

7 *Data Analysis*

8 A one-way repeated measures ANOVA was used to compare differences in the location
9 and duration of QE, and shooting accuracy for each of the three shooting strategies identified by
10 Wood and Wilson (2010a). Significant effects were followed up with Bonferroni corrected
11 pairwise comparisons and effect sizes were reported using eta squared statistics (η^2). To assess
12 the effectiveness of each strategy, the outcome of the shot (goal, miss, save) and the direction
13 that the goalkeeper dived (correct/incorrect side to the eventual shot) was analyzed using
14 hierarchical log linear regression and significant interactions were followed up using chi-squared
15 tests at each level of the variable. Effect sizes were reported using Cramer's V statistics with 0.1,
16 0.3 and 0.5 representing small, medium and larger effect sizes respectively (Cohen, 1998).

17 **Results**

18 *Descriptive Statistics*

19 Out of the 300 kicks taken; 65 were executed with a keeper-dependent strategy; 92 with a
20 keeper-independent strategy; and 85 with the deceptive strategy. A further 32 kicks were
21 executed with no target-focused fixations on the goal or goalkeeper and 26 were not coded due to
22 calibration issues (e.g., loss of calibration).

1 *Quiet Eye*

2 ANOVA revealed a significant difference between the location of QE across strategies,
3 $F(2,241) = 489.10, p < .001, \eta^2 = .80$. The keeper-dependent shots had more centralized QE
4 locations compared to keeper-independent ($p < .001$) and deceptive shots ($p < .001$). No
5 significant differences were evident in QE locations between keeper-independent and deceptive
6 shots ($p = .658$). The QE duration of these fixations was also significantly different, $F(2,239) =$
7 $5.80, p = .003, \eta^2 = .05$, with deceptive kicks having significantly longer QE durations than
8 keeper-independent shots ($p = .002$). No significant difference was evident in QE durations
9 between deceptive and keeper-dependent shots ($p = .352$) or between keeper-dependent and
10 keeper-independent shots ($p = .377$). These data are presented in Table 1.

11 *Performance*

12 ANOVA revealed a significant difference between shooting accuracy across kicking
13 strategies, $F(2,203)^2 = 7.10, p = .001, \eta^2 = .06$. Specifically, keeper-dependent shots were
14 significantly more centralized compared to keeper-independent ($p = .001$) and deceptive shots (p
15 $= .010$). No significant difference was evident between shooting accuracy for keeper-
16 independent and deceptive shots ($p = 1.000$).

17 Hierarchical log linear regression revealed no significant effect between strategy used
18 and the number of goals, misses and saves, $\chi^2(2) = 6.52, p = .164, V = .102$. A significant effect
19 was found in the goalkeeper's reaction to each strategy, $\chi^2(2) = 10.34, p = .006, V = .207$. When
20 players employed the deceptive strategy there was a significant decrease in the anticipatory
21 performance of the goalkeeper compared to keeper-independent, $\chi^2(1) = 6.70, p = .010, V =$
22 $.195$, and keeper-dependent, $\chi^2(1) = 8.15, p = .004, V = .224$, shots. No significant differences

1 were evident between the goalkeeper's anticipatory behavior between keeper-dependent and
2 keeper-independent shots, $\chi^2(1) = .28, p = .599, V = .084$. These data are presented in Table 2.

3 **Discussion**

4 In this first experiment we investigated the gaze strategies of soccer players as they
5 attempted to score penalties against a goalkeeper in an unconstrained environment. Specifically,
6 we hoped to examine if deceptive gaze behavior was effective in deceiving the goalkeeper, and if
7 compensatory extensions to pre-programming visual attention protected against any accuracy
8 impairment caused by the dissociation between gaze and aiming intention. The results of this
9 first experiment partially supported our hypotheses, with players exhibiting significantly longer
10 QE durations when employing the deceptive strategy compared to when they aligned gaze with
11 aiming intention (keeper-independent strategy).

12 One potential caveat to this interpretation is our assumption that the extended QE
13 durations seen in deceptive kicks are indicative of supplementary and compensatory pre-
14 programming. An alternative explanation for these extended QE durations could be that players
15 are deliberately attempting to exaggerate their gaze behavior (and deceptive intention) in order to
16 'sell' the head-fake to the goalkeeper. In fact, exaggerated gaze behaviors are synonymous with
17 deception (e.g., lie detection; Mann, Vrij, Leal, Granhag, Warmelink, & Forrester, 2012) and
18 deceptive actions (e.g., magic; Rieiro, Martinez-Conde & Macknik, 2013), and it has previously
19 been shown that soccer penalty takers do use exaggerated body cues when attempting to fool the
20 goalkeeper (Smeeton & Williams, 2012). An 'exaggeration' explanation, however, does not
21 explain how players maintained their shooting accuracy despite the dissociation of gaze from
22 aiming intention that is synonymous with poor performance in this task (Binsch et al., 2010; van

1 der Kamp, 2011; Wilson et al., 2009; Wood & Wilson, 2010a, 2010b, 2011, 2012). A further
2 potential explanation is that players used information gathered from goal scanning behavior prior
3 to their final (deceptive) fixation to aim their kick accurately. However, out of the 85 shots taken
4 with the deceptive strategy, only 19 shots (22%) were taken after players made a fixation to the
5 side of the goal to which they would eventually shoot. By negating the need to exaggerate
6 deception and preventing any pre-shot scanning behavior, in Experiment 2 we will explore the
7 possibility that players are using some form of covert processing of target-related information in
8 order to compensate for not looking to where they intend to shoot.

9 A further interesting finding from Experiment 1 was that there was no significant
10 difference between QE durations when players used a deceptive strategy compared to when they
11 used a keeper-dependent strategy (Table 1), yet the accuracy scores between these strategies
12 differed significantly (Table 2). While both strategies purposefully dissociate gaze from aiming
13 intention prior to shooting, the effect that this had on performance suggests that there are
14 fundamentally different attentional processes being used to guide the eventual kick. Specifically,
15 we propose that the deceptive strategy is an aiming strategy where auxiliary target-related
16 information, extracted through covert attentional processes, is being processed in order to guide
17 accurate shooting. On the other hand, the keeper-dependent strategy is an overt attentional
18 strategy that is reflective of an anticipatory, temporally constrained behavior that is linked to the
19 movements of the goalkeeper (Van der Kamp, 2011). By fixating on the goalkeeper, it may be
20 possible to detect movement cues regarding which way he might dive and therefore reduce the
21 demands for accurate aiming (shooting into the now open goal on the other side). However,
22 previous research has suggested that the goalkeeper dependent strategy is associated with a loss

1 of self-reported control (Wood & Wilson, 2012) and can be problematic if the goalkeeper delays
2 moving (van der Kamp, 2006).

3 Finally, when players utilized deceptive gaze they significantly disrupted the anticipatory
4 performance of the goalkeeper, with him diving to the opposite direction to which the ball was
5 shot on significantly more occasions (54%) compared to when players shot with non-deceptive
6 keeper-dependent (30%) and keeper-independent (34%) strategies. While the effectiveness of
7 deceptive behaviors for negatively biasing goalkeeper anticipation has been reported in previous
8 studies (e.g., Smeeton & Williams, 2012), this study highlights further benefits of using
9 deception when taking soccer penalties. Not only are players more likely to deceive the
10 goalkeeper – who tends to fixate the penalty taker’s head during this aiming period (see Dicks,
11 Button, & Davids, 2010) - but they can be just as accurate in their shooting by exaggerating this
12 long fixation to the ‘wrong’ side.

13 In summary, in this first experiment we showed that the maintenance of shooting
14 accuracy seen when using the deceptive strategy seemed to be underpinned by extended QE
15 durations that provide covert supplementary pre-programming time and resources as a way of
16 compensating for the decoupling of gaze and aiming intention. In experiment 2, we hoped to
17 solidify these conclusions by removing the need for deception, and by removing the goalkeeper,
18 in order to control for exaggeration effects of increased QE duration.

19 **Experiment 2**

20 **Participants**

21 Twenty-five right-footed male university soccer players (mean age = 20.7 years, $SD =$
22 1.69), who were not involved in Experiment 1, volunteered to take part. All participants gave

1 written consent to partake in the study after procedures were approved by a local ethics
2 committee.

3 **Apparatus**

4 The same goal dimensions were marked out on a plain wall as in Experiment 1.
5 Participants were fitted with an Applied Science Laboratories (ASL; Bedford, MA) Mobile Eye-
6 5 eye tracker, which measures eye-line of gaze at 30Hz.

7 **Procedure**

8 Participants attended the lab individually and were first given ten practice kicks before
9 being calibrated to the eye-tracker using nine calibration points located on the goal. The KI and
10 deceptive kicking strategies were then explained to the participants and they were told that they
11 would be required to take kicks, while alternating these strategies. Participants always looked to
12 the right-hand side bottom corner of the goal (from their perspective) but alternated where they
13 shot to depending on the strategy employed. They then took five practice shots using each
14 strategy. Each participant then took 30 kicks (two counterbalanced blocks of 15 kicks) using
15 alternate kicking strategies. This produced a total sample of 750 kicks (375 for each strategy).
16 After each shot the experimenter reminded the kicker of the next strategy to be used. During the
17 experiment, participants' eye-movements were monitored on a laptop to ensure they adhered to
18 the gaze instructions and only looked where directed prior to shooting. When they did not adhere
19 to these instructions, they were told that the kick was invalid and they were required to retake the
20 shot.

21 **Measures and Data Analysis**

1 Shooting accuracy was measured using Kinovea video analysis software
2 (<http://www.kinovea.org/>) and interrater reliability scores, based on a sample of 50 shots, was
3 94%. Using a scaling factor that was visible in the scene view of the eye-tracker (i.e., the height
4 of the post), we measured the distance (cm) from the center of the ball when it hit the wall and
5 the post. QE durations were measured in exactly the same manner as Experiment 1. Gaze data
6 for two participants were lost due to corrupt video files. Interrater reliability scores for the
7 location and duration data on a sample of 50 shots was 98% and 93% respectively. Paired sample
8 *t*-tests were used to explore differences in QE locations, QE durations and shooting accuracy
9 across KI and deceptive kicking strategies. Effects sizes were reported using Cohen's *d* statistic
10 where 0.2, 0.5 and 0.8 represented small, medium and large effect sizes respectively (Cohen,
11 1998).

12 **Results**

13 *Quiet-eye.* A significant difference between QE durations, $t(22) = 2.94, p = .008, d = .55$,
14 revealed that a deceptive strategy required longer QE durations compared to the KI strategy. No
15 significant difference was found between the location of this fixation across deceptive and KI
16 strategies, $t(22) = .405, p = .689, d = .08$. (See Table 3).

17 *Performance.* A significant difference in shooting accuracy, $t(24) = 2.48, p = .020, d =$
18 $.62$, revealed that players were significantly less accurate when shooting with a deceptive
19 strategy compared to the KI strategy (See Table 3).

20 **Discussion**

21 This second experiment was designed to explore the possibility that the extensions of QE
22 durations seen in Experiment 1 were attributable to the pre-programming of more complex shot

1 information due to the deliberate decoupling of gaze and aiming intention - rather than merely
2 trying to exaggerate the 'head fake' to the goalkeeper. Our data, at least partially, support the
3 former rather than latter explanation. With no goalkeeper present, there was no longer any need
4 for the players to attempt to be deceptive and exaggerate their gaze, yet they still extended their
5 QE durations. From this, we conclude that the increased complexity of the shot imposed
6 supplementary processing demands on the players resulting in extensions to QE aiming durations
7 (Klostermann et al 2013; Williams 2002).

8 However, in contrast to Experiment 1, these extensions to QE aiming durations did not
9 help kickers to maintain shooting accuracy when using deceptive kicks, as shots taken with this
10 strategy became significantly centralized (~ 23cm) and therefore less accurate compared to KI
11 shots. One explanation for this reduction in accuracy may be that eliminating pre-kick scanning
12 behavior meant that players did not have the necessary information to guide their shot. However,
13 as relatively few shots were taken in experiment 1 using this behavior, it is unlikely that this can
14 explain the effect.

15 A further explanation is that some important information, which players depended on to
16 help guide their shot in Experiment 1, was missing in Experiment 2: the goalkeeper (Masters,
17 van der Kamp, & Jackson, 2007). Consequently, players could have resorted to using peripheral
18 vision and/or memory of the goal dimensions to try to maintain shooting accuracy to the opposite
19 side of the goal. Interestingly, these explanations may explain why shots became less accurate.
20 First, targets focused on in the periphery look smaller than targets focused on in the fovea
21 (Newsome, 1972). Therefore, if the players resorted to using peripheral vision to guide their shot,
22 the goal would have looked smaller than it actually was which could impair shooting
23 performance (Wood et al, 2015). Similarly, using an internal representation of the dimensions of

1 the goal to guide their shot is inefficient as previous research has suggested that “*stored target*
2 *information serving memory-guided action is susceptible to a compression of visual space in*
3 *memory such that the egocentric distance of a remembered target is underestimated*” (Heath &
4 Binsted, 2007, p. 169). For the final experiment, we devised a penalty-kicking task that would
5 allow an exploration of the importance of the spatial location of the goalkeeper during deceptive
6 penalty shots whilst reducing the contribution of information in peripheral vision and memory.

7 **Experiment 3**

8 Research in penalty taking has highlighted that penalty takers are very sensitive to the
9 spatial relationship between the goalkeeper’s position and the goal posts that constrain the target
10 area (Masters et al., 2007). Indeed, these authors demonstrated that when a goalkeeper creates
11 even 0.5 % differences in space in the goal by standing marginally off-center, penalty-takers can
12 reliably discriminate which side has more space at above chance levels, despite reporting that
13 their decisions are guessed (see also Noël, van der Kamp, & Memmert, 2015). It is therefore
14 likely that the goalkeeper’s position provides information critical for the processing of spatial
15 parameters important for aiming. We therefore suggest that in order to simplify the computation
16 problem in aiming with a deceptive gaze strategy, soccer players apply a mirroring algorithm –
17 effectively converting the kicking angle for the side they fixate (made by the triangle between
18 the ball, the post and the goalkeeper), to the opposite (un-fixated) side (see Figure 1).

19 The aim of this third experiment was to explore the contribution that spatial information
20 provided by the goalkeeper’s location provides towards the maintenance of shooting accuracy
21 when gaze and aiming intention are decoupled, while attempting to eliminate goal-related
22 information from peripheral vision and memory. We again hypothesize that when players

1 decouple gaze from aiming intention, they will employ compensatory extensions in QE durations
2 (as in Experiment 1 and 2). We suggest that the difference in performance between Experiments
3 1 and 2 is due to the removal of information from the relative space between goalkeeper and post
4 from one side of the goal, which is utilized in the formulation of a shot to the opposite side of the
5 goal. In order to test this, we experimentally manipulated the position of the goalkeeper (moving
6 closer to the post) and hypothesize that this would disrupt subsequent performance (Figure 1).

7 **Methods**

8 *Participants*

9 Twenty-three experienced (mean experience = 12.83 years, $SD = 3.72$) right-footed male
10 university level soccer players (mean age = 20.3 years, $SD = 1.52$), who were not involved in
11 Experiments 1 or 2, gave written consent to partake in the study after procedures were approved
12 by a local ethics committee.

13 *Apparatus*

14 Participants wore the same eye-tracker as in Experiment 2 and shot to two randomized
15 goals that were projected (Hitachi XGA, CP-X275) onto a blank wall from a distance of 6-
16 meters. Goal and goalkeeper projections were used in order to (1) allow for the alternation of
17 goal size and goalkeeper location in an efficient manner; (2) allow for the elimination of target-
18 related information from peripheral vision without constraining the vision of the kicker, and (3)
19 allow for the maintenance of the spatial relationship between the goalkeeper and goal while
20 eliminating the negative effect his/her mere presence can have (Navarro, van der Kamp,
21 Ranvaud & Savelsbergh, 2013; Wood & Wilson 2010a; Wilson et al., 2009). Due to the need to
22 project the goal, the distance of the penalty shot was reduced and we therefore decided to use a

1 modified (indoor) penalty kick with a restricted (1-step) run up (as used by Wood & Wilson,
2 2010a). By controlling these aspects of the experimental design, we can be more confident that
3 any effects observed from the manipulation of goalkeeper position are attributable to the spatial
4 manipulation alone.

5 Each projected goal measured two meters in height but differed in width (4 v 3.6 meters;
6 see Figure 2). These differing sizes were incorporated to reduce the impact of memory of goal
7 size in the aiming task and minimize any learning effects from repeatedly shooting to the same
8 goal³. To minimize the use of peripheral vision, only the right half of each goal was shown. All
9 presented goals also had a projected image of a goalkeeper (height 1.80m) that was situated in
10 two counterbalanced locations (directly in the center of the goal ‘center’ and then 0.5 meters to
11 the right ‘off-center’). For each goal, a colored target (30cm x 30cm) was visible in the bottom
12 right-hand corner. A green target signaled to the player that he was to shoot with the KI strategy
13 (look where he was shooting) and a red target signaled to the player to shoot with a deceptive
14 strategy (look at the target but attempt to hit the same location on the opposite side of the goal).
15 Players shot using an indoor Mitre Cyclone football of standard inflation. Shot location was
16 recorded using a Panasonic SDR-S26 (60Hz) camcorder that was located one meter to the right
17 of the penalty spot.

18 *Procedure*

19 Players attended individually and once calibrated to the eye-tracker, they took 10 practice
20 shots to familiarize themselves with the ball, shooting distance and goal projections. Players
21 were then shown examples of each goal with differing goalkeeper positions and both colored
22 targets. Players were told that they should attempt to shoot as close to the post as possible;

1 whether that was the post in the direction that they were shooting (KI strategy) or the estimated
2 post location in the opposite corner of the goal (deceptive strategy). It was explained to
3 participants that before each shot they were required to turn around with their back facing the
4 goal. The researcher would then give a verbal indication for them to turn around and take their
5 next shot. It was further explained that on foot-to-ball contact the projected goal would disappear
6 (manually controlled by the first author) and when they noticed it had disappeared they were
7 required to turn around with their back to goal and await their next shot. During this period, a
8 projection of the full sized goal was displayed as a frame of reference for post-hoc video analysis
9 of the accuracy of each shot (see Measures). The next target configuration was then projected,
10 the ball replaced on the penalty spot by a researcher, and the participant was instructed to turn
11 around and take their next kick. This procedure was incorporated to minimize the participant's
12 ability to use knowledge of results of previous shot to support subsequent shots (Wood, Vine &
13 Wilson, 2013). Participants repeated this procedure for three blocks of twelve kicks (36 kicks)
14 yielding a total sample of 828 kicks (414 kicks for each strategy). Each block was preceded by a
15 calibration chart to ensure calibration of the eye tracker was maintained. A mean value for each
16 participant in each condition was computed and used for subsequent analyses.

17 *Measures*

18 *Quiet eye.* Due to the adoption of a simplified penalty kicking task (with no run-up) the
19 QE was defined as the location and duration of the last fixation on the target (situated in the
20 bottom corner of the goal) prior to foot-to-ball contact (as Wood & Wilson, 2010a). As such the
21 definition still reflects the final aiming fixation before initiating the start of the first movement in
22 the penalty taking action (the run up in experiments 1 and 2; and the swing of the leg to kick the
23 ball in experiment 3; see also Binsch et al., 2010). QE aiming fixations were determined via

1 frame-by-frame analysis of the eye-tracker video file using Quiet-Eye Solutions analysis
2 software and a fixation was classified as three or more consecutive frames (≥ 120 ms) in which
3 the cursor stayed in the same location (Vickers, 1996). Interrater reliability scores for the
4 location and duration data on a sample of 50 shots was 98% and 94% respectively.

5 *Performance* was measured as the distance (cm) between the center of the ball as it hit
6 the wall and the projection of the goalpost using Kinovea video analysis software. As in
7 Experiments 1 and 2, lower values reflected shots that were hit closer to the post and further
8 from the goalkeeper. Interrater reliability scores on a sample of 50 shots was 96%.

9 *Data Analysis*

10 Quiet eye and performance data were subjected to 2 x 2 repeated measures ANOVAs
11 (strategy x goalkeeper location) and significant interaction effects were followed up with
12 Bonferroni corrected pairwise comparisons. Effect sizes were reported using partial eta squared
13 statistics (η_p^2) where 0.1, 0.6 and 1.4 represented small, medium and large effects sizes
14 respectively (Cohen, 1998).

15 **Results**

16 *Quiet Eye*

17 For QE duration, ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for kicking strategy, $F(1,20)$
18 $= 62.50$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .76$, but not for goalkeeper location, $F(1,20) = 0.07$, $p = .93$, $\eta_p^2 = .00$.
19 The interaction between goalkeeper location and strategy was non-significant, $F(2,40) = 2.69$, p
20 $= .12$, $\eta_p^2 = .12$ (See Table 4). The deceptive strategy involved significantly longer QE durations
21 to the projected target than the KI strategy. No significant differences were found for the location

1 of this fixation across kicking strategies, $F(1,20) = .11, p = .746, \eta_p^2 = .01$, or goalkeeper
2 locations, $F(1,20) = .37, p = .549, \eta_p^2 = .02$, and the interaction was not significant, $F(1,20) =$
3 $.01, p = .932, \eta_p^2 = .00$.

4 *Performance*

5 A significant main effect was found for strategy, $F(1,21) = 32.79, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .61$, and
6 for goalkeeper location, $F(1,21) = 10.82, p = .003, \eta_p^2 = .27$. A significant interaction, $F(2,42) =$
7 $7.57, p = .012, \eta_p^2 = .27$, between strategy and goalkeeper position was also revealed. Post hoc
8 pairwise *t*-tests showed that when players used the deceptive strategy they were significantly
9 more accurate when the goalkeeper was located in the center of the goal compared to when he
10 was off-center ($p = .001$). The position of the goalkeeper did not significantly affect shooting
11 accuracy when players used the KI strategy ($p = .972$; See Table 4). However, when the
12 goalkeeper was located in the center of the goal the shooting accuracy of KI shots was
13 significantly more accurate ($p < .001$) than shots taken with the deceptive strategy.

14 **Discussion**

15 The aim of this final experiment was to explore the contribution that angular information
16 pertaining to the goalkeeper's location makes to the maintenance of shooting accuracy when
17 players disassociate gaze from aiming intention during head-fakes. As predicted and in line with
18 the two previous experiments, a deceptive shooting strategy induced significantly longer QE
19 aiming durations in order to compensate for the decoupling of gaze from aiming intention.
20 Furthermore, when we manipulated the spatial location of the goalkeeper during deceptive shots
21 shooting accuracy centralized significantly (Table 4). Therefore, when the visual angle between
22 goalkeeper and post was made more acute, resultant shooting angle also became more acute and

1 shots became centralized. However, in contrast to Experiment 1, this time we found that the
2 deceptive strategy was not as accurate as the KI strategy when the goalkeeper was located in the
3 center of the goal, despite longer aiming durations.

4 There are a number of differences between the two experiments that might explain why
5 we failed to replicate the maintenance of accuracy from Experiment 1. First, the KI condition in
6 Experiment 3 was effectively a simple aiming task; with no need to beat the goalkeeper, players
7 were free to allocate all of their attentional resources to the preprogramming of target-related
8 information necessary for accurate shooting. In Experiment 1, this was not as straightforward
9 and the goalkeeper would likely receive covert attention in all attempts (KI, KD, and deceptive).
10 The KI data from Experiment 3 underlines the accuracy that players are capable of if they can
11 learn to adapt to, or ignore, the presence of the goalkeeper. It also suggests that training these
12 attentional abilities offers scope for practical interventions for penalty takers (e.g., Wood, Jordet
13 & Wilson, 2015).

14 Second, in this experiment, the choice of strategy was driven by the experimental
15 manipulation rather than an active decision from the participant (cf. Experiment 1). Therefore,
16 there are likely additional attentional demands in inhibiting the proponent response to shoot to
17 the target and to inhibit gaze from being directed to the opposite side of the goal to the abstract
18 target (similar to attentional effects seen in Stroop aiming tasks; see Wood, Vine & Wilson,
19 2015). While these differences make performance comparisons across experiments problematic
20 they do not undermine the central findings regarding our first hypothesis: Deceptive gaze
21 increased task complexity and induced compensatory extensions in QE durations.

22

General Discussion

1 The results of all three experiments showed that when players use deceptive gaze they
2 engage in the supplementary processing of other target-related information (evidenced through
3 extensions in QE durations) in order to maintain performance. Specifically, the location of the
4 goalkeeper and the relative geometric information this provides seem a particularly important
5 source of information that players can use during deceptive kicks. While these three experiments
6 were focused on the task of penalty kicks, the findings have wider implications for: (1)
7 understanding the attentional and performance costs of employing deceptive gaze strategies in
8 general; (2) the mechanisms behind the QE phenomenon in aiming tasks; and (3) the utility of
9 angular information and peripheral vision in the control of skilled action.

10 First, despite the widespread use of deceptive gaze in sport, little empirical evidence
11 exists to support the utility of such behaviours and no studies have explored the attentional cost
12 behind their use. What is clear from this research is that decoupling gaze from aiming intention
13 increases the complexity of the aiming action, increases the demands of the task and requires
14 supplementary pre-programming of other, more complex, target-related information (e.g.,
15 goalkeeper location) in an attempt to safeguard against performance decrements. When this
16 important information is missing (Experiment 2) or manipulated (Experiment 3) then shooting
17 accuracy suffers despite extended QE durations.

18 However, if a goalkeeper makes use of this deceptive gaze information to help base
19 his/her decision on which side to dive (Dicks et al., 2010), then this might be a useful strategy for
20 players to use, as there is no longer a need for a high level of accuracy. Research exploring the
21 effectiveness of gaze misdirection in magicians does provide a cautionary note however (Cui,
22 Otero-Millan, Macknik, Mac King, Martinez-Conde, 2011; Rieiro et al, 2013). While magicians
23 believe that gaze misdirection is one of the most powerful tools in their repertoire, conjuring

1 tricks are just as effective when the magician's gaze is occluded (Rieiro et al, 2013). Therefore,
2 the compulsion to employ head-fakes probably stems from an overinflated view of the
3 importance of gaze in deceiving the observer. If direction of gaze has little influence on the
4 decision making of goalkeepers then players might find it useful to combine these strategies by
5 looking where they intend to shoot while also employing exaggerated and deceptive body
6 movements to the opposite direction. Future research should seek to understand the role of
7 player's gaze in guiding the decision making of goalkeepers.

8 Second, our results support the information processing account for how longer QE
9 durations support far aiming performance. In this explanation, the QE is proposed to be related to
10 the length of time required for the pre-programming of target related information and the fine-
11 tuning of movement responses (Vickers, 1996, 2007). Recent research has found support for this
12 proposal by correlating longer QE durations with more difficult task demands (e.g., Klostermann
13 et al., 2013; Williams et al., 2002); with neural measures of pre-programming (e.g.,
14 Bereitschaftspotential, Mann et al., 2011); and by utilizing illusions to bias pre-planning (Wood
15 et al., 2013). In Experiment 1, players revealed significantly longer QE durations when adopting
16 a deceptive strategy, and in Experiments 2 and 3, players utilized significantly longer QE
17 durations when the task was more difficult (shooting to a mirror position as opposed to what they
18 fixated on). One issue with trying to interpret the compensatory nature of this extended QE
19 duration is that while longer QE durations are generally associated with better performance, they
20 are also associated with increased task difficulty; conditions when performance is likely to be
21 poorer (see Walters-Symons et al., in press, for further discussion). As such, we are unable to
22 dissociate the combined and opposite effects of manipulation and performance outcome on QE
23 with this design.

1 Third, while the QE is defined in terms of point of gaze, there has been little interest in
2 exploring exactly what type of information is being processed during QE durations (Williams,
3 2016). Our results suggest that in the context of deceptive aiming strategies, the QE is used for
4 the covert extraction and processing of target-related information related to the spatial
5 positioning of the goalkeeper. Overall while our findings support the assumption that the QE is a
6 period reflecting the extraction and pre-programming of target-related information, it seems that
7 there is a degree of plasticity regarding the type of information that can be used to support
8 successful aiming actions - even within the same task.

9 To conclude, the results of these experiments suggest that there is an attentional cost of
10 using deceptive gaze strategies in visuomotor tasks, which require covert compensatory
11 adaptations to attentional control. As far as we are aware, this is the first study that has explored
12 the cost of deceptive head-fakes and the effectiveness of deceptive gaze from the deceiver's
13 perspective. As such, many questions remain to be answered surrounding the utility of such
14 behaviours and how attentional adaptations compensate for the increased complexity that is
15 inherent with their use. Hopefully this can be a fruitful line of research in the near future.

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

Footnotes

2

1 These participants are the control group whose performance data in retention and
3 shootout conditions was compared to a quiet eye trained group in Wood and Wilson
4 (2011). These shot strategy and performance data from the three weeks of training have
5 not previously been reported.

6

2 The reduced degrees of freedom are due to 38 kicks missing the target and 59 kicks being
7 uncodeable (due to the location not being picked up by the gaze registration system).

8

3 We collapsed the data for both goal sizes for subsequent analyses as we did not have
9 specific hypotheses related to goal size.

References

- 1
- 2 Bar-Eli, M., & Azar, O. H. (2009). Penalty kicks in soccer: an empirical analysis of shooting
3 strategies and goalkeepers' preferences. *Soccer & Society, 10*, 183-191.
4 doi:10.1080/14660970802601654.
- 5 Binsch, O., Oudejans, R. R., Bakker, F. C., & Savelsbergh, G. J. (2010). Ironic effects and final
6 target fixation in a penalty shooting task. *Human Movement Science, 29*(2), 277-288. doi:
7 10.1016/j.humov.2009.12.002.
- 8 Blakemore, S. J., Winston, J., & Frith, U. (2004). Social cognitive neuroscience: where are we
9 heading? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 8*(5), 216-222. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2004.03.012
- 10 Cañal-Bruland, R., & Schmidt, M. (2009). Response bias in judging deceptive movements. *Acta*
11 *Psychologica, 130*(3), 235-240. doi: 10.1016/j.actpsy.2008.12.009.
- 12 Cañal-Bruland, R., van der Kamp, J., & van Kesteren, J. (2010). An examination of motor and
13 perceptual contributions to the recognition of deception from others' actions. *Human*
14 *Movement Science, 29*(1), 94-102. doi: 10.1016/j.humov.2009.10.001.
- 15 Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence
16 *Earlbaum Associates.*
- 17 Cui, J., Otero-Millan, J., Macknik, S. L., King, M., & Martinez-Conde, S. (2011). Social
18 misdirection fails to enhance a magic illusion. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 5*, 103.
19 doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2011.00103.
- 20 Dicks, M., Button, C., & Davids, K. (2010). Examination of gaze behaviors under in situ and
21 video simulation task constraints reveals differences in information pickup for perception

- 1 and action. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 72(3), 706-720. doi:
2 10.3758/APP.72.3.706
- 3 Dicks, M., Uehara, L., & Lima, C. (2011). Deception, individual differences and penalty kicks:
4 implications for goalkeeping in Association football. *International Journal of Sports
5 Science and Coaching*, 6(4), 515-522. doi: 10.1260/1747-9541.6.4.515
- 6 Emery, N.J. (2000). The eyes have it: The neuroethology, function and evolution of social gaze.
7 *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 24, 581–604. doi: 10.1016/S0149-
8 7634(00)00025-7
- 9 Güldenpenning, I., Kunde, W., & Weigelt, M. (2017). How to Trick Your Opponent: A Review
10 Article on Deceptive Actions in Interactive Sports. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. doi:
11 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00917
- 12 Heath, M., & Binsted, G. (2007). Visuomotor memory for target location in near and far
13 reaching spaces. *Journal of motor behavior*, 39(3), 169-177. doi:
14 10.3200/JMBR.39.3.169-178
- 15 Jackson, R. C., Warren, S., & Abernethy, B. (2006). Anticipation skill and susceptibility to
16 deceptive movement. *Acta Psychologica*, 123(3), 355-371. doi
17 10.1016/j.actpsy.2006.02.002
- 18 Kerwin, D. G., & Bray, K. (2006). Measuring and modelling the goalkeeper's diving envelope in
19 a penalty kick. *The Engineering of Sport*, 6(8), 321-326.

- 1 Klostermann, A., Kredel, R., & Hossner, E. J. (2013). The "Quiet Eye" and motor performance:
2 Task demands matter! *Journal of Experimental Psychology. Human Perception and*
3 *Performance*. doi: [10.1037/a0031499](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031499)
- 4 Klostermann, A., Kredel, R., & Hossner, E. J. (2014). On the interaction of attentional focus and
5 gaze: the quiet eye inhibits focus-related performance decrements. *Journal of Sport and*
6 *Exercise Psychology*, *36*(4), 392-400. doi: [10.1123/jsep.2013-0273](https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2013-0273)
- 7 Kuhn, W. (1988). Penalty-kick strategies for shooters and goalkeepers. *Science and Football*,
8 489-492.
- 9 Kunde, W., Skirde, S., & Weigelt, M. (2011). Trust my face: Cognitive factors of head-fakes in
10 sports. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, *17*(2), 110. doi: [10.1037/a0023756](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023756)
- 11 Land, M. F. (2009). Vision, eye movements, and natural behavior. *Visual Neuroscience*, *26*(1),
12 51-62. doi: [10.1017/S0952523808080899](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0952523808080899)
- 13 Mann, S., Vrij, A., Leal, S., Granhag, P. A., Warmelink, L., & Forrester, D. (2012). Windows to
14 the soul? Deliberate eye contact as a cue to deceit. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *36*(3),
15 205-215. doi: [10.1007/s10919-012-0132-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-012-0132-y)
- 16 Mann, D. T., Williams, A. M., Ward, P., & Janelle, C. M. (2007). Perceptual-cognitive expertise
17 in sport: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *29*(4), 457. doi:
18 [10.1123/jsep.29.4.457](https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.29.4.457)
- 19 Masters, R. S. W., Van der Kamp, J., & Jackson, R. C. (2007). Imperceptibly off-center
20 goalkeepers influence penalty-kick direction in soccer. *Psychological Science*, *18*(3),
21 222-223. doi: [10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01878.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01878.x)

- 1 Navarro, M., van der Kamp, J., Ranvaud, R., & Savelsbergh, G. J. (2013). The mere presence of
2 a goalkeeper affects the accuracy of penalty kicks. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *31*(9), 921-
3 929. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2012.762602
- 4 Neggers, S. F. W., & Bekkering, H. (2001). Gaze anchoring to a pointing target is present during
5 the entire pointing movement and is driven by a non-visual signal. *Journal of*
6 *Neurophysiology*, *86*(2), 961-970.
- 7 Newsome, L. R. (1972). Visual angle and apparent size of objects in peripheral vision.
8 *Perception & Psychophysics*, *12*(3), 300-304.
- 9 Noël, B., van der Kamp, J., & Memmert, D. (2015). Implicit goalkeeper influences on goal side
10 selection in representative penalty kicking tasks. *PloS one*, *10*(8),
11 10.1371/journal.pone.0135423
- 12 Nummenmaa, L., Hyönä, J., & Hietanen, J. K. (2009). I'll walk this way: Eyes reveal the
13 direction of locomotion and make passers-by look and go the other way. *Psychological*
14 *Science*, *20*(12), 1454-1458. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02464.x
- 15 Querfurth, S., Schücker, L., de Lussanet, M. H., & Zentgraf, K. (2016). An Internal Focus Leads
16 to Longer Quiet Eye Durations in Novice Dart Players. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7*. doi:
17 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00633
- 18 Rieiro, H., Martinez-Conde, S., & Macknik, S. L. (2013). Perceptual elements in Penn & Teller's
19 "Cups and Balls" magic trick. *PeerJ*, *1*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7717/peerj.19>
- 20 Sebanz, N., & Shiffrar, M. (2009). Detecting deception in a bluffing body: The role of expertise.
21 *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *16*(1), 170-175. doi: 10.3758/PBR.16.1.170

- 1 Smeeton, N. J., & Williams, A. M. (2012). The role of movement exaggeration in the
2 anticipation of deceptive soccer penalty kicks. *British Journal of Psychology*, *103*(4),
3 539-555. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8295.2011.02092.x
- 4 Sun, G., Zhang, L., Vine, S.J., & Wilson, M.R. (2016). The quiet eye provides pre-planning and
5 online control support for interceptive task performance. *Journal of Sport & Exercise*
6 *Psychology*, *38*(5), 458-469, doi: 10.1123/jsep.2016-0012
- 7 Tomeo, E., Cesari, P., Aglioti, S. M., & Urgesi, C. (2012). Fooling the kickers but not the
8 goalkeepers: behavioral and neurophysiological correlates of fake action detection in
9 soccer. *Cerebral Cortex*, *23*(11), 2765-2778. doi: 10.1093/cercor/bhs279
- 10 Van der Kamp, J. (2006). A field simulation study of the effectiveness of penalty kick strategies
11 in soccer: Late alterations of kick direction increase errors and reduce accuracy. *Journal*
12 *of Sports Sciences*, *24*(5), 467-477. doi: 10.1080/02640410500190841
- 13 Van der Kamp, J. (2011). Exploring the merits of perceptual anticipation in the soccer penalty
14 kick. *Motor Control*, *15*(3), 342-358. doi: 10.1123/mcj.15.3.342
- 15 Vickers, J.N. (1996). Visual control when aiming at a far target. *Journal of Experimental*
16 *Psychology. Human Perception and Performance*, *2*, 324–354. doi: 10.1037/0096-
17 1523.22.2.342
- 18 Vickers, J. N. (2007). *Perception, cognition and decision training: the quiet eye in action*.
19 Champaign; IL. Human Kinetics.

- 1 Walters-Symons, R., Klostermann, A., Wilson, M. R., & Vine, S. J. (in press). Examining the
2 response programming function of the quiet eye: Do tougher shots need a quieter eye?
3 *Cognitive Processing*.
- 4 Williams, A. M. (2016). Quiet eye vs. noisy brain: The eye like the brain is always active –
5 comment on Vickers. *Current Issues in Sport Science, 1:116*. doi:
6 10.15203/CISS_2016.116
- 7 Williams, A. M., Singer, R. N., & Frehlich, S. G. (2002). Quiet eye duration, expertise, and task
8 complexity in near and far aiming tasks. *Journal of Motor Behavior, 34(2)*, 197-207. doi:
9 10.1080/00222890209601941.
- 10 Wilson, M.R, Chattington, M., Marple-Horvat, D.E. (2008). Eye movements drive steering:
11 reduced eye movement distribution impairs steering and driving performance. *Journal of*
12 *Motor Behavior, 40*, 190-202. doi: 10.3200/JMBR.40.3.190-202.
- 13 Wilson, M.R, Wood, G., & Vine, S. J. (2009). Anxiety, attentional control, and performance
14 impairment in penalty kicks. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 31(6)*, 761-775.
15 doi: 10.1123/jsep.31.6.761
- 16 Wood, G., Jordet, G., & Wilson, M. R. (2015). On winning the “lottery”: psychological
17 preparation for football penalty shoot-outs. *Journal of sports sciences, 33(17)*, 1758-
18 1765. doi: 10.1080/02640414.2015.1012103
- 19 Wood, G., Vine, S. J., & Wilson, M. R. (2013). The impact of visual illusions on perception,
20 action planning, and motor performance. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics, 75*,
21 830-834. Doi.10.3758/s13414-013-0489-y

- 1 Wood, G., Vine, S. J., & Wilson, M. R. (2016). Working memory capacity, controlled attention
2 and aiming performance under pressure. *Psychological research*, *80*, 510-517.
3 doi:10.1007/s00426-015-0673-x
- 4 Wood, G., & Wilson, M. R. (2010a). Gaze behaviour and shooting strategies in football penalty
5 kicks: implications of a 'keeper-dependent' approach. *International Journal of Sport
6 Psychology*, *41*(3), 293-312.
- 7 Wood, G., & Wilson, M. R. (2010b). A moving goalkeeper distracts penalty takers and impairs
8 shooting accuracy. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *28*(9), 937-946. doi:
9 10.1080/02640414.2010.495995
- 10 Wood, G., & Wilson, M. R. (2011). Quiet-eye training for soccer penalty kicks. *Cognitive
11 Processing*, *12*(3), 257-266. doi: 10.1007/s10339-011-0393-0
- 12 Wood, G., & Wilson, M. R. (2012). Quiet-eye training, perceived control and performing under
13 pressure. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *13*(6), 721-728.
14 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2012.05.003>
- 15 Zuckerman, M., DePaulo, B. M., & Rosenthal, R. (1981). Verbal and nonverbal communication
16 of deception. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *14*(1), 1-59. doi:
17 10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60369-X
18
19
20
21

Figure Captions

Figure 1. A visual representation of how the manipulation of goalkeeper location affects visual angle and resultant shooting performance when using a deceptive shooting strategy. The left image (Center) reveals that when the goalkeeper is in the middle of the goal, the angle created by the goalkeeper and post (a) can be mirrored to the opposite post (a'). The right image reveals that the same strategy applied to an Off Center goalkeeper would result in a smaller angle (b) being mirrored (b') which would result in a penalty being struck further away from the opposite post and closer to the center of the goal.

Figure 2. Goal projections showing the large (left) and small (right) goal, the center (left) and 'off-centre' (right) goalkeeper locations, and location of the target (bottom right) that signified to the players which shooting strategy they should use in experiment 3. The goalkeeper was presented in both 'center' and 'off-centre' locations in each goal size projection.

Figure 3. The mean (\pm s.e.m.) quiet-eye duration (top) and shooting accuracy (bottom) for each strategy (Keeper Independent (KI) and Deceptive) and each goalkeeper location in Experiment 3.

1

Tables**Table 1.** Mean (*SD*) quiet eye (QE) data for each kicking strategy: Keeper Dependent (KD), Keeper Independent (KI) and Deceptive in Experiment 1.

	KD	KI	Deceptive
Location of QE (cm)	144.92** (35.10)	83.48 (56.11)	73.41 (61.92)
QE duration (ms)	281.27 (257.93)	232.28* (137.39)	332.22 (194.16)

2 ** $p < .001$ * $p < .05$

3

4

1

Table 2. Mean (*SD*) performance data for each kicking strategy: Keeper Dependent (KD), Keeper Independent (KI) and Deceptive in Experiment 1.

	KD	KI	Deceptive
Shooting accuracy (cm)	167.17* (106.65)	116.81 (75.27)	124.24 (58.47)
Goals (%)	56.90	69.60	69.40
Saves (%)	30.80	16.30	10.60
Misses (%)	12.30	14.10	20.00
Goalkeeper dived incorrectly (%)	30.80	34.80	54.10*

2 * $p < .05$

3

4

5

6

7

8

Table 3. Mean (*SD*) quiet eye (QE) and performance data for each kicking strategy: Keeper Dependent (KI) and Deceptive strategy for Experiment 2.

	KI	Deceptive
Location of QE (cm)	50.13 (28.34)	52.39 (25.02)
QE duration (ms)	489.09** (257.93)	655.75 (322.84)
Performance (cm)	109.08* (37.88)	131.76 (35.59)

1 ** $p < .01$ * $p < .05$

2

1

Table 4. Mean (*SD*) quiet eye (QE) and performance data for each kicking strategy: Keeper Dependent (KI) and Deceptive strategy across Centre and Off-Center goalkeeper locations for Experiment 3.

	KI		Deceptive	
	Center	Off-Center	Center	Off-Center
Location of QE (cm)	36.76 (13.53)	34.70 (14.17)	35.48 (14.07)	33.81 (12.21)
QE duration (ms)	466.19 (161.74)	490.47 (226.91)	607.30** (229.48)	580.00** (214.84)
Performance (cm)	41.25 (13.38)	41.36 (18.58)	70.38 (24.46)	86.55** (25.15)

2 ** $p < .001$ * $p < .05$

3