



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Jalali, S., Martin, S. E., Ghose, T., Buscombe, R. M., Solomon, J. A. & Yarrow, K. (2019). Information accrual from the period preceding racket-ball contact for tennis ground strokes: Inferences from stochastic masking. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(AUG), 1969. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01969

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/22654/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01969>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

2 Information accrual from the period preceding racket-
3 ball contact for tennis ground strokes: Inferences from
4 stochastic masking

5
6 Sepehr Jalali ¹, Sian E. Martin ¹, Tandra Ghose ², Richard M. Buscombe ³, Joshua A. Solomon ⁴ &
7 Kielan Yarrow ^{1*}

8
9 ¹ *Department of Psychology, City, University of London, London, U.K.*

10 ² *Department of Psychology, Technische Universität Kaiserslautern, Germany*

11 ³ *School of Health Sport and Bioscience, University of East London, U.K.*

12 ⁴ *Centre for Applied Vision Science, City, University of London, London, U.K.*

13
14 Running head: Information accrual in tennis

15
16 * Author for correspondence:

17
18 Kielan Yarrow,
19 Rhind Building,
20 City, University of London
21 Northampton Square,
22 London EC1V 0HB

23
24 Tel: +44 (0)20 7040 8530

25 Fax: +44 (0)20 7040 8580

26 Email: kielan.yarrow.1@city.ac.uk

27

28

29

30

31 Abstract

32 Previous research suggests the existence of an expert anticipatory advantage, whereby skilled
33 sportspeople are able to predict an upcoming action by utilising cues contained in their opponent's
34 body kinematics. This ability is often inferred from "occlusion" experiments: Information is
35 systematically removed from first-person videos of an opponent, for example by stopping a tennis
36 video at the point of racket-ball contact, yet performance, such as discrimination of shot direction,
37 remains above chance. In this study, we assessed the expert anticipatory advantage for tennis
38 ground strokes via a modified approach, known as "bubbles", in which information is randomly
39 removed from videos at in each trial. The bubbles profile is then weighted by trial outcome (i.e. a
40 correct vs. incorrect discrimination) and combined across trials into a classification array, revealing
41 the potential cues informing the decision. In two experiments (both with N = 34 skilled tennis
42 players) we utilised either temporal or spatial bubbles, applying them to videos running from 0.8 s to
43 0 s before the point of racket-ball contact (cf. Jalali et al., 2018). Results from the spatial experiment
44 were somewhat suggestive of accrual from the torso region of the body, but were not compelling.
45 Results from the temporal experiment, on the other hand, were clear: information was accrued
46 mainly during the period immediately prior to racket-ball contact. This result is broadly consistent
47 with prior work using non-stochastic approaches to video manipulation, and cannot be an artifact of
48 temporal smear from information accrued after racket-ball contact, because no such information
49 was present.

50

51 Elite athletes demonstrate extraordinary ability in their sport of choice. While their sporting acumen
52 may seem like a fundamentally physical attribute, it is in fact scaffolded by a range of cognitive skills
53 that span the sensorimotor pipeline, from perception to action execution (Yarrow, Brown, &
54 Krakauer, 2009). One such skill that has received considerable attention from experimental
55 psychologists is the expert anticipatory advantage.

56

57 The expert anticipatory advantage in sports describes a domain-specific benefit that sportspeople
58 exhibit when predicting what is about to happen based on their opponent's current bodily
59 kinematics (as opposed to their opponent's previous action history, which provides a separate cue
60 for predicting current behaviour; Mann, Schaefers, & Cañal-Bruland, 2014). This advantage has been
61 demonstrated in experiments simulating a variety of sports, most commonly via temporal and
62 spatial occlusion methodologies (e.g. Abernethy, 1988; Jones & Miles, 1978). Hence the advantage is
63 widely exhibited, although the extent to which it benefits actual competitive performance remains
64 uncertain (van Maarseveen, Mariëtte, Oudejans, Mann, & Savelsbergh, 2018).

65

66 A typical occlusion experiment runs as follows. A sporting scenario is selected, for example a football
67 (soccer) goalkeeper attempting to save penalties (e.g. Dicks, Button, & Davids, 2010; Smeeton &
68 Williams, 2012). Videos are shot from the sportsperson's (here the goalkeeper's) perspective,
69 capturing various instances of two or more categories of outcome (for example penalties struck to
70 the left or right of the goalkeeper). In the actual experiment, participants, often varying in sports
71 expertise (e.g. novice vs. expert goalkeepers) view these videos, attempting to discriminate which
72 outcome will occur on each trial. Critically, the videos are manipulated to exclude some of their
73 visual information. In temporal occlusion, the video is usually terminated early (for example at or
74 before ball contact) so that only particular sequences of body kinematics are available to guide the
75 response. In spatial occlusion, particular features at constrained spatial locations (for example the
76 striker's hips) are also removed from the video.

77

78 The logic of these experiments is that participants will only be able to perform at above-chance
79 levels if there is information in the video to guide their decision, with performance declining towards
80 chance as this information is systematically removed. Certain sports, such as cricket, have been long-
81 running favourites in the occlusion literature (e.g. Abernethy, & Russell, 1984; Müller & Abernethy,
82 2006; Müller, Abernethy, & Farrow, 2006), but occlusion approaches have been applied to sports as
83 diverse as volleyball (e.g. Loffing, Hagemann, Schorer, & Baker, 2015) and karate (Mori, Ohtani, &
84 Imanaka, 2002).

85

86 Racket sports (e.g. badminton and squash; Abernethy, 1990; Abernethy, Bruce & Russell, 1987) have
87 been particularly well studied via occlusion techniques. The focus of the current study is the sport of
88 tennis. This sport was amongst the first to provide evidence of an expert anticipatory advantage,
89 with Jones and Miles (1978) showing that experts were above chance (and better than intermediate
90 or novice players) at guessing the landing position of a serve when the video was stopped 0.042 s
91 before ball contact. Subsequent work has found, for example, that experts extract information from
92 the time when the ball's toss is at its apex onwards when predicting spin (Goulet, Bard, & Fleury,
93 1989). The temporal occlusion method has also been adjusted slightly to present one of several
94 possible windows of visibility (0.3 seconds in duration) during service, with above-chance
95 performance for experts when viewing the video for only the 0.3 s immediately before ball contact
96 (Farrow, Abernethy, & Jackson, 2005). These temporal occlusion results are supplemented by spatial
97 occlusion studies, showing for example that experts can still discriminate the direction of tennis
98 serves at above-chance levels following removal of body regions such as the entire lower body, but
99 not when the ball's toss was occluded (Jackson & Mogan, 2007). Experts were also impaired (but to a
100 lesser extent) by removal of the arm and racket.

101

102 While the tennis serve is the most straightforward scenario to investigate, ground strokes have also
103 been probed via occlusion methods. With temporal occlusion at ball contact, experts were above
104 chance to discriminate between left/right lobs and passing shots when shutter goggles were used to
105 block vision in situ on a tennis court (Shim, Carlton, Chow, & Chae, 2005). More traditional video-
106 based studies have shown that unlike novices, experts could already predict shot direction above
107 chance at -0.12 s relative to ball contact, with further improvements for occlusion occurring at -0.08
108 and -0.04 s (Rowe, Horswill, Kronvall-Parkinson, Poulter, & McKenna, 2009). Spatial occlusion work
109 suggests that the arm/racket regions are critical when predicting ground-shot direction (Shim,
110 Carlton, & Kwon, 2006).

111


112 Video-based occlusion methods are not perfect, and our knowledge about the expert anticipatory
113 advantage has been supplemented by a variety of techniques. Such techniques include eye tracking
114 to provide information about where sportspeople attend, and animating/manipulating the opponent
115 (e.g. Cañal-Bruland, van Ginneken, van der Meer, Bart, & Williams, 2011; Ida, Fukuhara, Ishii, &
116 Inoue, 2013) including via virtual reality (Vignais, Kulpa, Brault, Presse, & Bideau, 2015). For example,
117 Ida et al. (2013) manipulated the arm/racket angles of computer-generated opponents to
118 successfully influence experts' analogue estimates of the direction, speed, and spin of a tennis serve.
119 In another study, swapping the arm/racket of stick-man representations of an opponent to that of a
120 different shot confused experts trying to predict the direction of ground strokes (Cañal-Bruland et
121 al., 2011). However, here we stay closer to the traditional occlusion approach, but attempt to
122 remedy a possible weakness of the method: Its dependency on experimenter decisions regarding
123 exactly what to occlude.

124

125 To this end, we utilise a stochastic method of video occlusion borrowed from the psychophysical
126 literature (Ahumada Jr & Lovell, 1971), specifically a form of classification-image analysis (sometimes
127 called reverse correlation) known as bubbles (Gosselin & Schyns, 2001). Bubbles are Gaussian-

128 profiled windows of visibility that reveal the information from an otherwise masked (e.g. uniform
 129 grey) display. In the temporal domain, they are rather like the occlusion approach of Farrow et al.
 130 (2005) who displayed only a 0.3 second window of information from a video at a time. However,
 131 unlike in that study, which utilised a discrete set of non-overlapping windows as separate conditions,
 132 in a bubbles experiment several bubbles typically appear on each trial and the midpoint of each
 133 bubble is chosen at random. Furthermore, their Gaussian profiles remove transients and give the
 134 impression of the underlying display being smoothly revealed and subsequently re-masked (see
 135 Figure 1 for illustration). At the analysis stage, the random bubbles profiles from the different trials
 136 are binned by correctness of response and combined to produce a classification sequence. This
 137 classification can then be used to highlight the regions from which information must have been
 138 utilised to generate correct discriminations.

139



140

141

142 *Figure 1. Example stimuli, shown as snapshots from video every 100 ms. A. Video occluded at point of*
 143 *racket-ball contact but with no bubbles manipulation (equivalent to pre-test trials here). B. Temporal*
 144 *bubbles permit viewing of entire image, but only at certain times. C. Spatial bubbles permit viewing*
 145 *of only certain regions of the image, but across all (pre-contact) frames.*

146 Although bubbles are typically applied to sparse, tightly controlled psychophysical stimuli, their
147 applicability to a complex real-world scenario like tennis anticipation has been demonstrated
148 recently (Jalali, Martin, Murphy, Solomon, & Yarrow, 2018). In that study, we had both novice and
149 competent tennis players view opponents in both service and forehand-groundstroke scenarios. We
150 did not stop the video at racket-ball contact, but the structure of the experiment encouraged
151 participants to respond as fast as possible while maintaining an acceptable level of accuracy. The
152 bubbles technique proved effective in both the temporal and spatial domains but it suggested that
153 our participants were primarily utilising information from the beginning of the ball's trajectory off
154 the racket face rather than their opponent's pre-contact kinematics. However, the temporal
155 classification sequence did imply possible information accrual just prior to racket-ball contact as
156 well, but this interpretation remained speculative. The reason is that the bubbles technique yields a
157 classification sequence in which very discrete information sources can become smeared (i.e.
158 exaggerated in extent), such that an information source at or just after racket-ball contact might
159 spread back to appear significant in the immediately preceding frames.

160

161 Here, we again use bubbles to attempt to find evidence of an expert anticipatory advantage in
162 tennis. Our aim is to quantify the extent of the temporal and spatial regions, prior to ball contact,
163 from which skilled tennis players are able to extract useful information about shot direction, but
164 using a stochastic masking technique (i.e. bubbles). The implementation of the bubbles method does
165 not require any intuitions about information sources which need to be designed as separate
166 conditions, but rather allows any region of information to emerge in a bottom-up manner. As such,
167 we believe it provides a useful form of methodological triangulation relative to traditional occlusion
168 approaches. However, we made an important change relative to our previous study: We stopped the
169 video at racket-ball contact, with bubbles appearing at random up to that point but no information
170 ever provided afterwards. This change guarantees that any information sources we identify, even if
171 near the point of racket-ball contact, are not the result of the aforementioned temporal smear

172 arising at the analytic stage. We also focus on ground strokes only, without considering services. To
173 presage our results, we find unequivocal evidence for the utilisation of kinematic information by
174 competent tennis players, but only for the period immediately prior to ball contact.

175

176 Methods

177

178 Participants

179 We utilised a smorgasbord¹ sampling method, attempting to recruit participants with experience
180 playing competitive tennis by various means. Where possible, we recorded their years of experience,
181 current competitive tennis matches per year, and International Tennis Number (ITN), which is an index
182 of their standard of play and ranges from ITN 1 (a player with extensive professional tournament
183 experience and who currently holds or is capable of holding an ATP/WTA ranking) to ITN 10 (a player
184 that is just starting to play competitively). Eleven participants (8 male, 3 female, mean age 30, mean
185 years of tennis experience 13, mean matches per year 48, mean ITN 2.8) were recruited via adverts at
186 London tennis clubs and by word of mouth, and travelled to City, University of London to participate.
187 All completed both temporal and spatial bubbles sessions (see design, below).² We also took the
188 opportunistic step of developing a portable setup and taking it to the National UK University
189 championships, where we recruited participants in their down time between matches (or after they
190 had been eliminated). We tested 22 such participants in total, with 13 completing a spatial bubbles
191 session (8 male, 5 female, mean age 22, mean years' experience 11, mean matches per year 37, mean
192 ITN 2.1) and 13 completing a temporal bubbles session (8 male, 5 female, mean age 22, mean years'

¹ This is our own dubious terminology. We originally intended to recruit several separate samples and address additional questions, but recruitment proved more challenging than expected, leading us to form a composite sample.

² Most of these participants also completed sessions in which they attempted to guess the direction of serves, but our service stimuli proved extremely difficult to discriminate, thus yielding no conclusive results, and are omitted from our report for concision.

193 experience 10, mean matches per year 44, mean ITN 2.1).³ We subsequently took our portable setup
194 to a second lab (at Technische Universität Kaiserslautern) in order to exploit its proximity to an elite
195 school for sport (Heinrich Heine Gymnasium) attended by promising young tennis players and their
196 coaches. We tested 10 such participants (8 male, 2 female, median age 16) who completed both
197 spatial and temporal bubbles sessions.⁴ For the German participants we recorded their
198 “Leistungsklassen” or performance class abbreviated as LK. According to the German Tennis
199 Federation (DTB) the lowest class is LK23 and the highest LK1 consisting of top ranked players in
200 Germany. The German pool had three LK1 players, one LK23 and average of LK 10 (std 8.5). They
201 averaged 7.7 years of experience and 26 competitive matches per year. Finally, from the resulting
202 complete samples of 34 (temporal bubbles) / 34 (spatial bubbles) participants, we rejected
203 participants who were unable to perform the task significantly above chance during bubbles blocks
204 (<55%, yielding binomial $p > 0.05$ that they were simply guessing), but only for our mean classification-
205 array analysis (one of several analyses we ran; see below). We did this because an inability to perform
206 the task makes it impossible for the bubbles technique to retrieve meaningful sources of information.
207 This left final samples of 24 (spatial) and 27 (temporal) participants for mean classification-array
208 analysis. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, who were paid £10 per hour (London)
209 and €10 per hour (Germany) for their time. Ethical approval was granted by the relevant local Ethics
210 Committees at City, University of London, and Technische Universität Kaiserslautern.

211

212 *Apparatus & Stimuli*

213 We used the ground-stroke subset of video stimuli from those previously described by Jalali
214 et al. (2018). They were recorded at a tennis club using a tripod-mounted camera (frame rate 120 Hz,

³ Nine from each group completed just a single block, and four competed both. Some participants failed to report some measures of experience, particularly ITN, so the means are based only on those who responded. Three participants from this group also completed a block using service stimuli, not reported here (see footnote 2).

⁴ These participants completed two further blocks with a modified presentation sequence (a fixed rather than random ordering of opponents, to see if experiencing the same opponent repeatedly made them easier to predict) but this change did not generate any clear trend, and these blocks are not analysed here.

215 frame size 1280x720 pixels). Four club coaches/hitters of a good but not elite standard acted as models
216 and were instructed to “hit winners” without attempting explicit deception. They were situated near
217 the baseline and recorded against a largely uniform blue backdrop. They were recorded playing
218 forehand ground strokes (running rightwards from a central position to return near the singles side
219 line), directing their shots towards an imaginary receiver’s forehand or backhand. To increase image
220 resolution, the camera was positioned at the net, on a line projecting from the filmed player to the
221 imaginary receiver at the opposite baseline (height = 1.6 m, left of centre line by 1.25 m).

222 Videos were first transformed to eight-bit greyscale. Two authors picked a subset of videos
223 that were unambiguous (regarding the direction of the shot – line/cross), relatively homogeneous in
224 terms of the position of the players at the time of ball contact, and lacking in artefactual cues that
225 might allow the videos to be easily remembered for future classification (e.g. an unusual delivery
226 trajectory). In each video, the frame corresponding to ball contact and the position at which the ball
227 struck the racket head on this frame were manually identified for use in the subsequent presentation
228 and analysis (see below).

229 The experiment was controlled by computers running scripts written in Matlab® (The
230 Mathworks, Natick, U.S.A.) using the Psychophysics Toolbox (Brainard, 1997; Kleiner et al., 2007;
231 Pelli, 1997). Video stimuli were presented via either a CRT monitor (for sessions at City, University of
232 London), a short-throw gaming projector (Optoma® GT760; for sessions at Kaiserslautern and
233 temporal sessions at UK university championships), or a MacBook® Pro (spatial sessions at UK
234 university championships). The former two displays had a vertical refresh rate of 120 Hz, while the
235 latter refreshed at 60 Hz, playing a down-sampled video. Only a central 600 x 400 pixel region of
236 each video that excluded irrelevant peripheral information was presented. Displays were presented
237 at around eye level and viewed at an appropriate distance in order to present the opposing tennis
238 player with a height subtending $\sim 4^\circ$ visual angle (approximating their size as seen from the baseline
239 during actual play). Participants responded by either stepping rightward or leftward, thus lifting the
240 corresponding foot from one of two digital pedals, monitored at 100,000 Hz via a 16 bit A/D card

241 (National Instruments X-series PCIe-6323; for sessions at City) or by pressing an appropriate arrow
242 key on a computer keyboard (all other sessions).

243

244 *Design & Procedure*

245 There were two types of session incorporating either temporal or spatial bubbles blocks with
246 participants completing one or both of these sessions, and in some cases up to two additional sessions
247 not reported here (see footnotes 2-4). Each session took around an hour, and consisted of three
248 blocks: One practice, one pre-test, and one bubbles block (in that order). During practice, participants
249 viewed a small number of videos (between 10 and 24 depending on the experimental location; 50%
250 to forehand, 50% to backhand) containing any of four players (8 possible videos per player) but with
251 a preponderance of videos (70%) from one player and fewer videos (10% each) from the remaining
252 three players, who were saved mainly for the experimental trials (see below). Videos were randomised
253 with replacement.

254 Videos presentations began at -0.8 s relative to racket-ball contact. The practice block
255 constituted a warm-up in which trials terminated at $+0.2$ s relative to racket-ball contact to provide
256 clear information about the trajectory of the ball off the racket head. By contrast, in pre-test and
257 bubbles blocks, videos terminated at racket-ball contact (replaced with a uniform grey screen) or at
258 the time of response if earlier than this.

259 For these pre-test and bubbles blocks, 24 new videos (8 per player, 50% to forehand and 50%
260 to backhand) were selected from the three players seen less often during practice. For the pre-test,
261 the videos were presented between one and four times each in a random order, yielding a block of
262 either 24 trials (City and Kaiserslautern) or 96 trials (UK university championships). These differences
263 reflected the fact that City and Kaiserslautern participants typically performed multiple sessions, so
264 could have their pre-test data combined across them. For the critical bubbles block, these videos were
265 presented a further 16 times each in a random order, yielding a block of 384 trials. Participants
266 responded without any deadline. Trials with presentation glitches, i.e. where one or more frames were

267 dropped after the -0.2 s time point, were re-randomised and repeated at the end of the block.
 268 Feedback about correctness was provided after every trial.

269 Importantly, during bubbles trials only, the videos were subjected to random masking via
 270 the application of bubbles (see Figure 1; for videos showing examples of temporal and spatial
 271 bubbles, see videos 1 and 2 respectively from Jalali et al. (2018), available at
 272 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02229/full#supplementary-material>).

273 Individual bubbles were combined to generate bubbles profiles in one (temporal) or two (spatial)
 274 dimensions. The number of bubbles presented began at 8 or 20 for temporal and spatial sessions
 275 respectively. In principle, this (maximum) number could then be adjusted downwards via a QUEST
 276 staircase (Watson & Pelli, 1983) varying the number of bubbles in order to try and maintain
 277 participants' performance at around 75% correct (i.e. lowering the number of bubbles if the task was
 278 too easy). However, as discussed further below, this was never required as the task was very hard
 279 even in the absence of any masking. The profile of each individual bubble was that of a 1, or 2-
 280 dimensional Gaussian density function, scaled to have unit height. In the temporal sessions its width
 281 (σ) was 3 frames; in the spatial sessions its width was 12 pixels (vertically and horizontally).⁵

282 Bubble mean positions were selected at random within a domain extending throughout the
 283 relevant space of the video. Bubbles profiles were determined by combining the individual bubbles
 284 together. This was achieved by first reflecting bubble magnitudes around 0.5, then multiplying them
 285 together, and finally re-reflecting:
 286

287

$$(1) \text{ Bubbles} = 1 - \prod_{b=1}^B (1 - \text{bubble}_b)$$

289

290 Pixel intensities were then calculated for display as the mean pixel intensity plus the difference
 291 between original and mean intensities multiplied by the Bubbles profile at each point. Expressed in

⁵ To speed calculations, each bubble was rounded to zero beyond 4 (temporal) or 3 (spatial) σ from its centre.

292 terms of Weber contrasts, pixels were displayed at their original Weber contrasts multiplied by the
 293 Bubbles profile.

294

295 *Data Analysis*

296 The saved Bubbles profiles from each trial formed the starting point in generating
 297 classification sequences (temporal conditions) or images (spatial conditions), which reveal the regions
 298 from which information supporting a correct response has been extracted. We calculated these
 299 classification arrays as per our previous report (Jalali et al., 2018). First, for the spatial condition only,
 300 Bubbles were re-centred so that the profile (saved in video coordinates) was translated to a new
 301 coordinate frame, centred on the ball at the time of racket-ball contact. Next, for each participant, a
 302 weighted sum of (re-centred) Bubbles profiles yielded the raw classification array. The sum weights
 303 profiles from correct trials positively and profiles from incorrect trials negatively:

304

$$305 \quad (2) \quad RCA = \sum_{c=1}^C \text{Bubbles}_c - \sum_{i=1}^I \text{Bubbles}_i$$

306

307 However, in order to provide more intuitive values for visualising and combining data across
 308 participants, raw classification arrays were normalised to a z-like format. This was achieved via a
 309 permutation approach. For each of 2000 iterations, correct/incorrect labels were randomly re-
 310 assigned (without replacement) to individual trials. The means and standard deviations at each point
 311 (i.e. each frame and/or pixel) calculated over these 2000 permutations were used to z-score the
 312 classification array. This yielded an array varying around zero with positive values indicating regions
 313 of possible information accrual.

314 In order to draw statistical inferences across large arrays while controlling familywise type 1 error
 315 appropriately, data from all participants who were able to perform the task at significantly above-
 316 chance levels during bubbles blocks were combined and assessed via both cluster and t_{\max} (also known
 317 as pixel or single-threshold) corrected permutation tests. These methods, derived from the

318 neuroimaging literature (Blair & Karniski, 1993; Nichols & Holmes, 2002) are standard approaches for
319 solving the multiple comparison problem with large sets of potentially correlated and non-normal
320 data. Our particular implementation is more fully described in Jalali et al. (2018).

321 We also addressed a prediction particular to the data collected in these experiments, which, unlike
322 typical bubbles experiments, were derived from participants who rarely achieved 75% correct in a
323 two-choice discrimination. We reasoned that the variability in performance across participants might
324 be utilised in statistical inference. Bubbles are most efficient with 75% correct performance (Gosselin
325 & Schyns, 2001) and would be expected to become less efficient, and thus produce classification arrays
326 more dominated by random noise, with lower levels of discrimination performance. We would
327 therefore expect that for an information-carrying region, there should be a positive correlation across
328 participants between the magnitude of the classification array at that point and discrimination
329 performance. We tested this prediction in a manner exactly analogous to the cluster / t_{\max} approach,
330 but using Pearson's r -statistic in place of Student's t -statistic in order to formulate cluster and r_{\max}
331 corrected permutation correlations. Where t -based tests reveal significant regions of information, r -
332 based tests reveal regions more successfully exploited by better participants. All reported p values are
333 two-tailed, unless otherwise noted.

334

335

336 Results

337

338 *Pre-tests*

339

340 In pre-test trials, participants saw the videos without degradation, but terminating at the point of
341 racket-ball contact. Pre-tests were identical in spatial and temporal sessions, and our samples were
342 not fully overlapping between these experiments, so data were collated across all 43 unique
343 participants. Participants showed some ability to discriminate the direction of tennis ground strokes

344 in the absence of information about the ball's trajectory off the racket head (mean proportion
345 correct = 0.632, SD = 0.093) and they did so on average at a level significantly above chance:
346 Modelling these binomial data in the most appropriate way (i.e. with a general linear mixed model
347 (GLMM) with logistic link function, incorporating a random term for the intercept) revealed a fixed
348 intercept term of 0.55, which differed significantly from zero, i.e. the null hypothesis of scoring 50%
349 correct ($t_{[42]} = 9.25$, $p < 10^{-10}$). For the subsets of U.K. participants reporting ITNs (N = 18), years of
350 playing experience (N = 31), or matches per year (N = 27), these variables were each entered as lone
351 predictors in separate GLMMs but failed to significantly correlate with discrimination performance
352 (all $p > 0.29$). However, matches per year did become a significant positive predictor of performance
353 (odds ratio = 1.011, 95% CI 1.004-1.18, $t_{[24]} = 3.28$, $p = 0.003$) when an outlying participant (claiming
354 150 competitive matches per year) was excluded.


355

356 *Temporal Bubbles*

357

358 In temporal bubbles trials, videos ran to the point of racket-ball contact, but only those periods
359 revealed by randomly placed temporal bubbles were visible (Figure 1b). The Bubbles profiles from
360 each trial were combined with accuracy data to create classification sequences for each participant.
361 The mean z-scored classification sequence across participants is shown in Figure 2a, with positive
362 values denoting regions from which information may have been extracted. No frames were
363 significant after t_{\max} correction, but a subset of frames (from 86 onwards, i.e. from around 0.083s
364 before racket-ball contact) contribute to a significant cluster ($p = 0.013$). Cluster-based testing
365 corrects for familywise error on the overall inference that the classification image differs reliably
366 from zero, but does not imply that every point within the cluster is significant (Groppe, Urbach, &
367 Kutas, 2011), particularly in combination with the smoothing effects of bubbles (see Jalali et al.,
368 2018, for further discussion). However, it is clear that some information was successfully extracted
369 from the moment just before racket-ball contact.

370



371

372

373 *Figure 2. Results from temporal bubbles experiment. Error bars denote 95% confidence intervals.*

374 *Shaded regions denote significant clusters. A. Mean z-scored classification sequence. B. Correlations*

375 *between classification sequences and classification performance across participants.*

376

377 Figure 2b shows additional results from a second statistical analysis. Here, instead of assessing the

378 mean classification sequence for just those participants who were still able to perform above chance

379 even during bubbles blocks, we assessed the correlation (for the entire sample of participants)

380 between individual classification sequences and discrimination success. The raw r values have been

381 transformed to permit the creation of a constant confidence interval which clarifies where possible

382 clusters emerge. This happens wherever the confidence interval does not include zero, i.e. for r

383 values that are significant without any familywise correction. However, these transformed r values
384 retain their basic meaning, in the sense that positive values represent frames where more successful
385 participants (in terms of their ability to do the task) showed more positive classification sequence
386 magnitudes. Our participants varied considerably in their ability to perform the task (between 50
387 and 75% correct). Because bubbles should be most effective (revealing pronounced peaks at points
388 where useful information is extracted) for participants who approach 75% performance, and much
389 less effective (reflecting mainly noise) for participants who are just guessing, these correlations are
390 informative. Interestingly, the correlation analysis reveals a cluster with the exact same temporal
391 extent as that found in the mean classification image ($p = 0.029$). Of course, these two analyses
392 cannot be considered as independent tests. However, we believe they can sometimes be
393 complementary to one another, as will become clearer in our spatial results.


394

395 *Spatial Bubbles*

396

397 In the spatial bubbles task, only particular areas of the video image were visible at random on each
398 trial (Figure 1b). Data from our spatial bubbles experiment are shown in Figures 3 and 4. Figure 3
399 shows the mean classification image, along with associated statistical inferences, for participants
400 able to perform the bubbles task above chance. The top part of the figure shows the classification
401 image itself, while in the bottom part of the figure statistical thresholding has been applied to reveal
402 a single large significant cluster ($p = 0.0005$). This cluster also incorporates two smaller regions that
403 additionally survive t_{\max} correction. This contrast *should* illustrate spatial areas from which visual
404 information was accrued. However, the result is unconvincing. Although the cluster does include a
405 region over the position of the opposing player's body at the time of ball contact, this region only
406 appears within the cluster by virtue of a slim connection to a larger and more pronounced region.
407 The larger region might, at best, be considered to have overlaid parts of the opponent's body at the
408 beginning of the video, when they started their run to intercept the ball. However, this larger region

409 would be inconsistent with the results of the temporal experiment, which suggested that useful
 410 information guiding the decision was not extracted until near the time of racket-ball contact.
 411




414 *Figure 3. Classification image results from the spatial bubbles experiment. Results are overlaid on an*
 415 *image of the mean of all presented videos for the frames capturing racket-ball contact, centred on*
 416 *the point of racket-ball contact (hence constituent images do not perfectly align). However, the*
 417 *results of the spatial analysis are not specific to any one time point. A. Transparent red peaks denote*
 418 *mean classification-image intensity normalized to the cluster threshold value used in permutation*

419 *testing (i.e., values more extreme than ± 1 formed potential clusters). B. Solid coloured regions were*
420 *significant in cluster/ t_{max} permutation testing, suggesting information might have been extracted*
421 *from this part of the video. Transparent red regions denote non-significant clusters.*

422

423 Our complementary correlation-based analysis is shown in Figure 4, which in this case appears
424 somewhat instructive. The format is the same as for the mean classification image shown in Figure 3
425 with the raw correlations shown at the top, and statistical thresholding applied at the bottom.
426 However, in this case it is normalised correlation (r) values that are being illustrated and assessed for
427 cluster or r_{max} based significance. No significant clusters were observed, but there is one non-
428 significant cluster worthy of mention (one-tailed $p = 0.096$; all other clusters one-tailed $p > 0.36$)
429 which sits over the position of the opponent's body at the time of ball contact. This suggests a trend
430 for those participants better able to discriminate shot duration during spatial bubbles sessions to
431 have classification images that show stronger peaks in this region. In combination with the data from
432 our analysis of the mean classification image (Figure 3), this result suggests that much (or all) of the
433 cluster revealed there may represent a false positive, as it was no more likely to emerge in
434 participants for whom bubbles had a good chance of actually working than it was for participants for
435 whom bubbles could reveal only noise.

436



437

438

439 *Figure 4. Correlation results from the spatial bubbles experiment. Results are overlaid on an image of*
 440 *the mean of all presented videos for the frames capturing racket-ball contact, centred on the point of*
 441 *racket-ball contact (hence constituent images do not perfectly align). However, the results of the*
 442 *spatial analysis are not specific to any one time point. A. Transparent red peaks denote correlations*
 443 *between classification-image intensities and discrimination performance, normalized to the cluster*
 444 *threshold value used in permutation testing (i.e., values more extreme than ± 1 formed potential*
 445 *clusters). B. Transparent red regions denote points where the cluster threshold (representing a*

446 *significant correlation in the absence of familywise correction) was exceeded, but resulted in only*
447 *non-significant clusters.*

448

449

450 Discussion

451

452 In our experiments, competent but non-elite tennis players first attempted to discriminate the
453 direction of upcoming forehand ground strokes from videos of a tennis opponent, based only on
454 information available prior to the point of racket-ball contact. On average, they were able to do so,
455 in line with previous reports (Rowe et al., 2009; Shim et al., 2006). Unlike previous reports, we went
456 on to remove additional information using a stochastic approach to video manipulation, by
457 introducing bubbles rather than by applying systematic masking or image manipulation in a
458 particular set of planned conditions. Our main finding was that participants used information from
459 the period immediately before racket-ball contact, specifically within a window reaching back
460 approximately 0.083s, to perform the direction-discrimination task. Because this information source
461 precedes racket-ball contact, it cannot include the trajectory of the ball off the racket head.

462

463 Our temporal results seem fairly consistent with previous reports. For example, Rowe et al. (2009)
464 had tennis experts (broadly comparable to ours in competence, with ITNs of 2-4) judge forehand and
465 backhand ground strokes (going to either the right or left) from videos which could be occluded at
466 between -0.12 and +0.04s relative to racket-ball contact. They found that experts could predict
467 undisguised shot direction at approaching 75% correct when the video stopped at racket-ball
468 contact, falling to around 60% when models were attempting disguise (c.f. 63% mean performance
469 during pre-test here; note that our models were instructed only to “hit winners”, but were
470 presented to participants with smaller spatial extents than those of Rowe et al., to be more
471 consistent with typical match viewing). Rowe et al. (2009) also found that experts could still

472 discriminate the direction of ground strokes significantly above chance when the video stopped at
473 either 0.12 or 0.08s before racket-ball contact, but performed better with occlusion at 0 s. These
474 results imply some accrual from roughly the temporal window we obtained here (in order to show
475 improvement) but also some additional accrual from earlier frames (in order to still be performing
476 above chance). Indeed, a similar study utilising stick-man graphics in place of videos even found
477 above-chance performance with occlusion at -0.24s, although performance actually then trended
478 worse with occlusion at -0.16, -0.08 or 0 ms (Cañal-Bruland et al., 2011).

479

480 Our method was in principal well-suited to find the locus of any such early periods of information
481 accrual, because bubbles could appear at any point back to 0.8s before ball contact. Several
482 possibilities should be considered regarding why we failed to find any such loci, reflecting the
483 various limitations of our approach. The first relates to statistical power. Bubbles is a trial-hungry
484 technique, with typical psychophysical applications using fairly simple stimuli and also very large
485 numbers of trials (Gosselin & Schyns, 2001). This limitation is exacerbated when performance is only
486 a little above chance even in the absence of any bubbles, as was the case here. Indeed, pre-test
487 performance suggests that our stimuli were very challenging to discriminate for most participants, so
488 perhaps our stimuli simply didn't contain usable information as early as the videos used in other
489 studies, or perhaps it was sufficiently subtle that bubbles could not reveal it.

490

491 A second possibility is that information must be integrated over a protracted period, or combined
492 from both of two temporally distinct epochs, during early shot preparation, in order to be usable.
493 Such temporally complex cues would still be present in standard temporal occlusion approaches
494 where videos run continuously until a single occlusion point. However, while classification arrays can
495 in principle reveal these kinds of features with enough trials, the bubbles approach is most efficient
496 when the temporal extent of a cue is approximately matched to the temporal extent of an individual
497 bubble (see for example the simulations presented by Jalali et al., 2018). Note that various

498 suggestions have been made within the bubbles literature to address this issue (Blais, Roy, Fiset,
499 Arguin, & Gosselin, 2012; Chauvin, Worsley, Schyns, Arguin, & Gosselin, 2005) and might be
500 considered in future research on sports.

501

502 Regardless of whether there were any earlier information sources that went undetected in our
503 experiment, we can at least assert with confidence that useful information was extracted from our
504 videos immediately prior to racket-ball contact (although, as noted in the methods, we cannot assert
505 that every individual frame highlighted by our cluster test was important). This ability may be learnt
506 through regular match play, generalizing immediately to the particular opponents encountered here.
507 It is also possible that the ability to anticipate was actually learnt entirely during the experiment,
508 given that each stimulus was encountered multiple times. The correlation between pre-test
509 performance and matches per year suggests that more regular players are at least quicker to learn
510 their new opponent's kinematic "gives" (or perhaps they are quicker to learn other spurious cues in
511 our videos, although we took steps to minimise these). However, this result must be considered
512 tentative, as it was both exploratory, and relied on the exclusion of an outlying participant.

513

514 Our results from spatial bubbles sessions were not compelling and can at best be considered
515 suggestive that our participants may have extracted some information from the torso region of their
516 opponents. This would presumably be during the temporal window revealed by the temporal
517 bubbles sessions, but the experiments are independent so this need not necessarily be the case. The
518 need to apply statistical control across a much larger 2D space, relative to our temporal
519 experiments, may have left our spatial experiment underpowered. We have previously shown that
520 spatial bubbles can be effective with a setup and sample size similar to this one (Jalali et al., 2018),
521 but in that case performance was nearer to 75% correct for all participants. Previous spatial
522 occlusion work with video stimuli has been more conclusive. Shim et al. (2006) used a four-choice
523 task (ground strokes or lobs to forehand or backhand), and found that removing the racket/arm

524 impaired discrimination of videos when viewing was stopped at racket-ball contact. This suggests
525 that these distal regions, which did not emerge in our analysis despite the fact that we centred our
526 co-ordinate frame (and thus maximised power) at the racket head, are in fact important. However,
527 they also observed performance which was still well above chance after these regions had been
528 occluded. Therefore, participants must also have extracted information from other parts of the
529 video, presumably proximal body segments, although the pattern of data was inconclusive in this
530 regard. Indeed, some results from more recent studies using computer graphics in place of real
531 videos suggest primacy for the proximal body: Fukuhara, Ida, Ogata, Ishii, and Higuchi (2017) found
532 that an opponent rendered with a realistic body (but only point-light information for their arm and
533 racket) was better predicted than one with a realistic arm and racket but only a point-light body.

534

535 In conclusion, we have replicated classic research showing that skilled tennis players can anticipate
536 upcoming shots based on their opponent's body kinematics. We also used a novel stochastic
537 masking approach in order to highlight the role of the period immediately preceding racket-ball
538 contact in supporting this ability. Although our bubbles approach could in principal have revealed a
539 wider range of information sources relative to traditional occlusion studies (where a limited set of
540 masking conditions must be selected in advance) in practice we have revealed, if anything, fewer
541 such loci. The approach may still have merit, but primarily as a means of methodological
542 triangulation, making an inference based on multiple complementary approaches, such as the
543 temporal result observed here, more secure.

544

545

546 Acknowledgements

547

548 SJ and SM were funded by BBSRC grant BB/K01479X/1 awarded to KY and JS.

549

550 References

- 551 Abernethy, B. (1990). Anticipation in squash: Differences in advance cue utilization between expert
552 and novice players. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 8(1), 17-34.
- 553 Abernethy, B., & Russell, D. G. (1984). Advance cue utilisation by skilled cricket batsmen. *Australian*
554 *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 16, 2-10.
- 555 Abernethy, B. (1988). The effects of age and expertise upon perceptual skill development in a
556 racquet sport. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 59(3), 210-221.
- 557 Abernethy, B., & Russell, D. G. (1987). The relationship between expertise and visual search strategy
558 in a racquet sport. *Human Movement Science*, 6(4), 283-319.
- 559 Ahumada Jr, A., & Lovell, J. (1971). Stimulus features in signal detection. *The Journal of the*
560 *Acoustical Society of America*, 49(6B), 1751-1756.
- 561 Blair, R. C., & Karniski, W. (1993). An alternative method for significance testing of waveform
562 difference potentials. *Psychophysiology*, 30(5), 518-524.
- 563 Blais, C., Roy, C., Fiset, D., Arguin, M., & Gosselin, F. (2012). The eyes are not the window to basic
564 emotions. *Neuropsychologia*, 50(12), 2830-2838.
- 565 Brainard, D. H. (1997). The psychophysics toolbox. *Spatial Vision*, 10, 433-436.
- 566 Cañal-Bruland, R., van Ginneken, W. F., van der Meer, Bart R, & Williams, A. M. (2011). The effect of
567 local kinematic changes on anticipation judgments. *Human Movement Science*, 30(3), 495-503.
568 doi:10.1016/j.humov.2010.10.001
- 569 Chauvin, A., Worsley, K. J., Schyns, P. G., Arguin, M., & Gosselin, F. (2005). Accurate statistical tests
570 for smooth classification images. *J. Vis.*, 5(9), 659-667.

- 571 Dicks, M., Button, C., & Davids, K. (2010). Availability of advance visual information constrains
572 association-football goalkeeping performance during penalty kicks. *Perception, 39*(8), 1111-
573 1124.
- 574 Farrow, D., Abernethy, B., & Jackson, R. C. (2005). Probing expert anticipation with the temporal
575 occlusion paradigm: Experimental investigations of some methodological issues. *Motor Control,*
576 *9*(3), 330-349.
- 577 Fukuhara, K., Ida, H., Ogata, T., Ishii, M., & Higuchi, T. (2017). The role of proximal body information
578 on anticipatory judgment in tennis using graphical information richness. *PLoS One, 12*(7),
579 e0180985.
- 580 Gosselin, F., & Schyns, P. G. (2001). Bubbles: A technique to reveal the use of information in
581 recognition tasks. *Vision Research, 41*(17), 2261-2271.
- 582 Goulet, C., Bard, C., & Fleury, M. (1989). Expertise differences in preparing to return a tennis serve: A
583 visual information processing approach. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 11*(4), 382-
584 398.
- 585 Groppe, D. M., Urbach, T. P., & Kutas, M. (2011). Mass univariate analysis of event-related brain
586 potentials/fields I: A critical tutorial review. *Psychophysiology, 48*(12), 1711-1725.
- 587 Ida, H., Fukuhara, K., Ishii, M., & Inoue, T. (2013). Perceptual response and information pick-up
588 strategies within a family of sports. *Human Movement Science, 32*(1), 106-120.
589 doi:10.1016/j.humov.2012.08.002
- 590 Jackson, R. C., & Mogan, P. (2007). Advance visual information, awareness, and anticipation skill.
591 *Journal of Motor Behavior, 39*(5), 341-351.

- 592 Jalali, S., Martin, S. E., Murphy, C. P., Solomon, J. A., & Yarrow, K. (2018). Classification videos reveal
593 the visual information driving complex real-world speeded decisions. *Frontiers in Psychology*,
594 9:2229.
- 595 Jones, C. M., & Miles, T. R. (1978). Use of advance cues in predicting the flight of a lawn tennis ball.
596 *Journal of Human Movement Studies*, 4(4), 231-235.
- 597 Kleiner, M., Brainard, D., Pelli, D., Ingling, A., Murray, R., & Broussard, C. (2007). What's new in
598 psychtoolbox-3. *Perception*, 36(14), 1.
- 599 Loffing, F., Hagemann, N., Schorer, J., & Baker, J. (2015). Skilled players' and novices' difficulty
600 anticipating left- vs. right-handed opponents' action intentions varies across different points in
601 time. *Human Movement Science*, 40, 410-421.
- 602 Mann, D. L., Schaefers, T., & Cañal-Bruland, R. (2014). Action preferences and the anticipation of
603 action outcomes. *Acta Psychologica*, 152, 1-9.
- 604 Mori, S., Ohtani, Y., & Imanaka, K. (2002). Reaction times and anticipatory skills of karate athletes.
605 *Human Movement Science*, 21(2), 213-230.
- 606 Müller, S., & Abernethy, B. (2006). Batting with occluded vision: An in situ examination of the
607 information pick-up and interceptive skills of high- and low-skilled cricket batsmen. *Journal of*
608 *Science and Medicine in Sport / Sports Medicine Australia*, 9(6), 446-458.
- 609 Müller, S., Abernethy, B., & Farrow, D. (2006). How do world-class cricket batsmen anticipate a
610 bowler's intention? *Q.J.Exp.Psychol.(Colchester.)*, 59(12), 2162-2186.
- 611 Nichols, T. E., & Holmes, A. P. (2002). Nonparametric permutation tests for functional neuroimaging:
612 A primer with examples. *Human Brain Mapping*, 15(1), 1-25.

- 613 Pelli, D. G. (1997). The VideoToolbox software for visual psychophysics: Transforming numbers into
614 movies. *Spatial Vision*, 10(4), 437-442.
- 615 Rowe, R., Horswill, M. S., Kronvall-Parkinson, M., Poulter, D. R., & McKenna, F. P. (2009). The effect
616 of disguise on novice and expert tennis players' anticipation ability. *Journal of Applied Sport
617 Psychology*, 21(2), 178-185.
- 618 Shim, J., Carlton, L. G., Chow, J. W., & Chae, W. (2005). The use of anticipatory visual cues by highly
619 skilled tennis players. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, 37(2), 164-175. doi:10.3200/JMBR.37.2.164-
620 175
- 621 Shim, J., Carlton, L. G., & Kwon, Y. (2006). Perception of kinematic characteristics of tennis strokes
622 for anticipating stroke type and direction. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 77(3), 326-
623 339.
- 624 Smeeton, N. J., & Williams, A. M. (2012). The role of movement exaggeration in the anticipation of
625 deceptive soccer penalty kicks. *British Journal of Psychology (London, England: 1953)*, 103(4),
626 539-555.
- 627 van Maarseveen, Mariëtte J J, Oudejans, R. R. D., Mann, D. L., & Savelsbergh, G. J. P. (2018).
628 Perceptual-cognitive skill and the in situ performance of soccer players. *Quarterly Journal of
629 Experimental Psychology (2006)*, 71(2), 455-470.
- 630 Vignais, N., Kulpa, R., Brault, S., Presse, D., & Bideau, B. (2015). Which technology to investigate
631 visual perception in sport: Video vs. virtual reality. *Human Movement Science*, 39, 12-26.
632 doi:10.1016/j.humov.2014.10.006
- 633 Watson, A. B., & Pelli, D. G. (1983). QUEST: A bayesian adaptive psychometric method. *Attention,
634 Perception, & Psychophysics*, 33(2), 113-120.

635 Yarrow, K., Brown, P., & Krakauer, J. W. (2009). Inside the brain of an elite athlete: The neural
636 processes that support high achievement in sports. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *10*(8), 585-
637 596. doi:10.1038/nrn2672

638