
This item was submitted to [Loughborough's Research Repository](#) by the author.
Items in Figshare are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

Contextual factors influencing decision making: Perceptions of professional soccer players

PLEASE CITE THE PUBLISHED VERSION

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.04.001>

PUBLISHER

© Elsevier

VERSION

AM (Accepted Manuscript)

PUBLISHER STATEMENT

This paper was accepted for publication in the journal *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* and the definitive published version is available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.04.001>

LICENCE

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0


REPOSITORY RECORD

Levi, Hannah R., and Robin Jackson. 2019. "Contextual Factors Influencing Decision Making: Perceptions of Professional Soccer Players". figshare. <https://hdl.handle.net/2134/32726>.

Accepted Manuscript

Contextual factors influencing decision making: Perceptions of professional soccer players

Hannah R. Levi, Robin C. Jackson



PII: S1469-0292(17)30504-6

DOI: [10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.04.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.04.001)

Reference: PSYSPO 1346

To appear in: *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*

Received Date: 26 July 2017

Revised Date: 6 April 2018

Accepted Date: 6 April 2018

Please cite this article as: Levi, H.R., Jackson, R.C., Contextual factors influencing decision making: Perceptions of professional soccer players, *Psychology of Sport & Exercise* (2018), doi: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.04.001.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Running head: CONTEXTUAL FACTORS INFLUENCING DECISION MAKING

Contextual Factors Influencing Decision Making: Perceptions of Professional Soccer Players

Hannah R. Levi

School of Sport, Exercise and Health Sciences, Loughborough University¹, UK

&

Robin C. Jackson

School of Sport, Exercise and Health Sciences, Loughborough University, UK

¹Present Address: School of Sport, Health and Applied Science, St Mary's University, UK

Corresponding author: Hannah Levi
School of Sport, Health and Applied Science
St Mary's University
Strawberry Hill
Twickenham, UK
TW1 4SX
Tel: +44 (0)7530925323
Email: 166925@live.stmarys.ac.uk

Contextual Factors Influencing Decision Making: Perceptions of Professional Soccer Players

Abstract

Objectives: This study sought to explore highly-skilled soccer players' perceptions of how contextual factors influence their decision making during matches.

Design: A qualitative design was used in which individual semi-structured interviews were conducted with eight professional male soccer players aged between 18 and 22 years.

Method: An interview schedule was designed to explore the perceived influence of a range of situational factors on decision making during matches. The interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. The data were analysed via an inductive thematic analysis.

Results: Seven themes were identified from the data. The four dynamic contextual themes were: (a) personal performance, (b) score status, (c) momentum, and (d) external/coach instructions. The three static contextual themes were: (a) match importance, (b) personal pressures, and (c) preparation.

Conclusions: The results highlight the importance of considering the dynamic and static context within which highly-skilled soccer players make decisions.

Keywords: context, decision making, soccer

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Running head: CONTEXTUAL FACTORS INFLUENCING DECISION MAKING

Contextual Factors Influencing Decision Making: Perceptions of Professional Soccer Players

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

25 Abstract

26 *Objectives:* This study sought to explore highly-skilled soccer players' perceptions of how
27 contextual factors influence their decision making during matches.

28 *Design:* A qualitative design was used in which individual semi-structured interviews were
29 conducted with eight professional male soccer players aged between 18 and 22 years.

30 *Method:* An interview schedule was designed to explore the perceived influence of a range of
31 situational factors on decision making during matches. The interviews were recorded and
32 transcribed verbatim. The data were analysed via an inductive thematic analysis.

33 *Results:* Seven themes were identified from the data. The four dynamic contextual themes
34 were: (a) personal performance, (b) score status, (c) momentum, and (d) external/coach
35 instructions. The three static contextual themes were: (a) match importance, (b) personal
36 pressures, and (c) preparation.

37 *Conclusions:* The results highlight the importance of considering the dynamic and static
38 context within which highly-skilled soccer players make decisions.

39

40 *Keywords:* context, decision making, soccer

41 Contextual Factors Influencing Decision Making: Perceptions of Professional Soccer Players

42 1. Introduction

43 In sport, decision-making capabilities play a significant role in success with high-
44 skilled performers often required to make the right decision under extreme time pressures
45 (Kinrade, Jackson, & Ashford, 2015). Given the dynamic and complex sport environment,
46 which involves myriad decisions, researchers have focused on various aspects of the
47 decision-making process (Macquet, 2009) and have predominantly used a reductionist
48 approach to examine selected aspects of perceptual-cognitive expertise, prioritising
49 experimental control over ecological validity (Williams, 2009). Research in other time-
50 constrained settings, such as with chess players (Chase & Simon, 1973) and medical experts
51 (Verkoeijen, Rikers, Schmidt, van de Wiel, & Kooman, 2004), suggests that context is
52 critical in assisting high-quality decisions. However, given the tighter focus required in
53 experimentally-controlled designs, sport-specific studies have not considered the contextual
54 complexity of typical match situations (Schlappi-Lienhard & Hossner, 2015).

55 With such unpredictability in sport, it has been suggested that researchers would
56 benefit from going beyond examining individual perceptual-cognitive factors that guide
57 performers' decisions by considering the behavioural interaction between performers and the
58 real-life sport environment (Davids & Araújo, 2010; Travassos et al., 2013). In beginning to
59 address this shortcoming, the aim of the present study is to examine soccer players'
60 perceptions of how contextual factors influence their in-match decision making. In the
61 present study, 'context' is defined as "the circumstances that form the setting for an event"
62 (Oxford English Dictionary, 2018), in this case, circumstances before and during a match that
63 influence decision making. Accordingly, it allows players to consider a broader range of
64 environmental and personal factors than have typically been considered in studies of
65 anticipation skill.

66 1.1 Decision Making Research from an Experimental Perspective

67 Since the work of Starkes and Deakin (1984), experimental research has revealed
68 differences in the nature and type of decisions involved in sport (Bar-Eli & Raab, 2009). A
69 number of researchers have applied the expert performance paradigm to sport, commonly
70 using sport-specific film simulations to assess decision accuracy, response time and
71 movement-based responses alongside process-tracing measures such as eye movement
72 analyses and verbal reports (Ericsson & Ward, 2007). This has led to significant progress in
73 identifying factors that contribute to successful decision making. For example, in soccer,
74 superior performance was found to be characterised by faster decision times and greater
75 response accuracy, underpinned by successful decision makers using more goal-orientated
76 search strategies than their less successful counterparts (Vaeyens, Lenoir, Williams, &
77 Philippaerts, 2007). Other researchers found that skilled soccer players made more fixations
78 of shorter duration to more locations than less-skilled players when making decisions (Roca,
79 Ford, McRobert, & Williams, 2013). In the task, players observed simulated match sequences
80 filmed from the perspective of a central defender. In a second experiment, analysis of verbal
81 protocols revealed that the more skilled players made more cognitive statements on each trial,
82 reflecting greater domain-specific knowledge.

83 Sport-specific film simulation research has enhanced our knowledge of some of the
84 processes underlying superior decision making; however, there has been relatively little
85 progress made in understanding the role of contextual factors. The importance of context was
86 evident in a study by McRobert, Ward, Eccles, and Williams (2011), who manipulated the
87 information available to cricket batters. Skilled and less-skilled performers responded to
88 video simulations of opponents bowling a cricket ball under low (24 balls from six bowlers,
89 presented in random order) and high (24 balls from four bowlers, presented in six consecutive
90 balls from each bowler) context conditions. The study revealed that skilled batters were more

91 accurate during the high-context condition compared to less-skilled batters, suggesting that
92 the additional context allowed players to extract information from the relevant location more
93 efficiently. Other contextual factors such as court position, shot sequencing, (Abernethy, Gill,
94 Parks, & Packer, 2001; Murphy, Jackson, Cooke, Roca, Benguigui, & Williams, 2016), and
95 inferred probability information (Gray, 2002a; Paull & Glencross, 1997) have also been
96 found to aid judgment accuracy. Conversely, researchers have shown that response time,
97 response accuracy, or response timing may be impaired when action outcomes are
98 incongruent with expectations arising from contextual information, such as situational
99 probability information (Barton, Jackson, & Bishop, 2013), baseball pitch count (Gray,
100 2002b), and sequencing of volleyball shots (Loffing, Stern, & Hagemann, 2015). These
101 findings provide preliminary support for the value of exploring other contextual factors that
102 may be involved in sport-specific decision making. While research using sport-specific film
103 simulations has progressed our knowledge of aspects of superior decision making, research of
104 this nature lacks ecological validity in that it tends to focus on a small number of pre-
105 determined contextual factors, thereby limiting our understanding of real-life sport decisions.

106 1.2 Toward a more Naturalistic Approach to Understanding Decision Making

107 One method employed to enhance ecological validity in the study of decision making
108 is ‘naturalistic decision making’ (NDM), which centres around decisions made in natural
109 situations (Schläppi-Lienhard & Hossner, 2015). NDM research considers complex, real-
110 world settings that acknowledge the dynamic and uncertain conditions and real-time reactions
111 to these uncertainties. NDM studies have investigated decision making in various high-
112 pressure fields such as firefighting, nuclear power plants, aviation, military, paramedics and
113 sport (Macquet, 2009). In sport, the primary method of data collection is self-confrontation
114 interviews, in which each participant is confronted with a video of themselves playing in a
115 real match and is asked to “think aloud” (Macquet, 2009). Unlike laboratory studies using

116 film simulations, which require immediate responses to an observed scenario, self-
117 confrontation interviews do not involve actively making any decisions, but rather focus on a
118 discussion around previously made decisions. The idea is to elicit concurrent cognitions and
119 salient features considered by the players during their own real-life impromptu match
120 decisions (Hoffman, Shadbolt, Burton, & Klein, 1995).

121 NDM research in the sport domain has revealed the significance of match-specific
122 contextual factors. One study revealed that expert badminton players only tried to finish a
123 point when situational conditions of the rally were perceived to be favourable to winning the
124 point (Macquet & Fleurance, 2007). More broadly, the players expressed that their intentions
125 and decisions reflected the contextual development of a rally and that their situational
126 understanding was informed by past events and current player competencies. Macquet and
127 Kragba's (2015) study of basketball players produced analogous findings, in which the
128 players revealed that they considered teammates' and opponents' placements, moves, and
129 actions, when assessing the situation and anticipating how the situation would develop.
130 Similarly, a study of handball players illustrated that decision making relied, at least in part,
131 on situational progression of the match (Lenzen, Theunissen, & Cloes, 2009). More
132 specifically, the players' verbal reports suggested that their decision making involved
133 perception, knowledge, expectations, and contextual elements, demonstrating the influence of
134 dynamic contextual factors on the players' decisions. While extant literature has highlighted
135 the value of considering individual contextual factors when exploring decision making in
136 sport, the research remains limited in its ability to capture the full complexity of contextual
137 influences (McRobert et al., 2011).

138 1.3 Study Objective

139 Overall, while the NDM research has made progress in understanding the role of
140 contextual information and its interaction with perceptual-cognitive processes in sport, there

141 appears to be a narrow focus of self-confrontation interviews as the method for data
142 collection. In self-confrontation interviews, the performer is restricted to deliberating on
143 specific decisions made within the particular context of a single match. This method,
144 therefore, does not allow for a broader consideration of the types of decisions made in sport
145 and the perceived importance of contextual factors. In an effort to capture a wider array of
146 contextual factors involved in decision making in top-level soccer, the present study
147 employed semi-structured interviews to examine professional players' perceptions of how
148 contextual factors influence their decision making. Semi-structured interviews allow
149 performers to organically recognise salient contextual factors and their influence on the types
150 of decisions made in soccer more generally, without limitation of discussion around decisions
151 made in a single match. Accordingly, the objective of the study was to identify contextual
152 factors the players perceived to be important and how they influence the decision-making
153 process.

154 2. Method

155 2.1 Participants

156 Eight male professional soccer players participated in the study. The participants had
157 a mean age of 19.0 years ($SD = 1.4$, range = 4.0), had been competing at the professional
158 level for a mean of 2.0 years ($SD = 1.9$), and included two defenders, four midfielders, and
159 two attackers.

160 2.2 Recruitment

161 Following approval from the University's Ethical Approval Committee, purposive
162 sampling was used to recruit elite level participants from a highly successful English Premier
163 League Soccer Academy Under-23 team. The participants were initially informed about the
164 nature and purpose of the study by their coach and those who expressed an interest in
165 participating were then scheduled to meet with the researcher. More specific details of the

166 research study were then given to participants and interviews were scheduled with those who
167 agreed to participate.

168 2.3 Interview Guide

169 To gather relevant data, a semi-structured interview guide was developed in
170 accordance with the principles set out by Braun and Clarke (2006). The interview guide was
171 then checked and modified following a pilot interview, which highlighted the need to
172 rephrase and reorder some of the questions.

173 The interview guide opened with questions about the participant's decision making
174 associated with their playing position, then targeted contextual factors relating to coach
175 instructions before and during a match, perceived personal, own team, and opposing team
176 strengths and weaknesses, the referee, and a range of specific situational factors. There was a
177 question regarding the extent to which training took into account the contextual factors
178 discussed before ending with giving the participants an opportunity to share any additional
179 contextual factors they believe impact their decision making. Sample questions included:
180 "can you describe the decision making part of playing in your position?", "to what extent do
181 you think instructions given to you during a match influence your decision making?", and "is
182 there anything else that you would like to add that you think influences your decisions during
183 matches?".

184 While the broad structure of the interview was the same for all participants, the order
185 of questions was dependent on participants' responses. The interviewer always started by
186 asking for an example of a decision-making scenario from a match to get the participant
187 thinking about specific match situations. After the first example, the interviewer asked for
188 additional examples whenever contextual factors were reported to affect decision making.
189 Impromptu clarification and elaboration probes were used throughout the interview. For
190 example, questions such as, "in what way?", and "can you give me an example?" were used

191 to gain further insight into how a contextual factor influenced their decision making. Thus,
192 while the interview was structured around broad contextual themes, there was scope for
193 exploring in more depth those deemed to have an effect on decision making, for example,
194 through use of elaboration probes.

195 2.4 Data Collection Procedure

196 Prior to their interview, each participant was given a written and verbal
197 description of the study and its objectives. Each participant was made aware that all the
198 information they shared would remain confidential, would be used solely for the purpose of
199 the study, and that only a generic and anonymous summary of potential practical implications
200 arising from the study would be made available to their coaches. They then signed a consent
201 form and completed a participant information form.

202 The interviews were conducted in a quiet room on the soccer academy premises for
203 participant convenience. All interviews were scheduled either prior to or following a training
204 session and lasted between 26 and 43 minutes ($M = 35.91$ minutes, $SD = 6.74$ minutes). The
205 interviews were not conducted under time pressure and therefore none had to be aborted.

206 A semi-structured interview is often more conversational than a strictly structured
207 interview (Smith, 1995); therefore, the contextual factors that were most salient to
208 participants became apparent through discussion. This flexible approach allowed for
209 unexpected findings to emerge since participants were encouraged to discuss contextual
210 factors unconstrained by pre-determined questions. The interviewer had competed in soccer
211 at a professional level and therefore possessed contextual knowledge and understanding of
212 the sport-specific terminology. Consequently, the interviewer did not have to ask for
213 additional clarification questions about use of 'jargon', which facilitated the development of
214 good rapport and ease of conversation with the participants.

215 2.5 Data Analysis

216 Each interview was recorded and transcribed verbatim. To ensure confidentiality and
217 anonymity throughout the analytic process, pseudonyms were assigned to each participant.
218 The interviews were read twice in order to fully immerse the researcher in the transcripts. The
219 data were then analysed using an inductive thematic analysis. This method generates an
220 analysis from the data itself (i.e., inductive) and is therefore not constrained by pre-existing
221 theory (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

222 The analysis followed a recursive process based on the six phases developed by Braun
223 and Clarke (2006). The first phase involved becoming familiar with the data through
224 transcription, preliminary readings, and making note of initial observations and ideas. The
225 second phase entailed a process of complete coding in which features related to the influence
226 of contextual factors on decision making were coded across the entire data set and then
227 collated. In the third and fourth phase, the relevant codes were organised into potential related
228 yet distinct themes, which were then cross-checked with the coded extracts and full data set
229 and finally generated into a thematic ‘map’ of the analysis. The process of creating a thematic
230 ‘map’ comprised of combining the first and second-order themes into suitable groups. The
231 next stage consisted of an ongoing analysis to refine the detailed features of each theme,
232 along with finalising clear definitions and names for each. The sixth and final phase required
233 producing the written report through a selection of apt and compelling extract examples that
234 relate the analysis to the research question and appropriate literature.

235 3. Results and Discussion

236 Given the contention surrounding what constitutes validity in qualitative inquiry, this
237 study is in accordance with the eight key criteria proposed by Tracy (2010): worthy topic,
238 rich rigor, sincerity, credibility, resonance, significant contribution, ethics, and meaningful
239 coherence. From the data, seven contextual themes emerged that were perceived as having an
240 influence on the players’ decision making. These were grouped under two higher-order

241 themes according to their static or dynamic nature. The four dynamic contextual themes
242 were: personal performance, score status, momentum, and external/coach instructions. The
243 three static contextual themes were: match importance, personal pressures, and preparation.

244 3.1 Dynamic themes

245 The players revealed that their decisions on the pitch relied on the situational
246 development, or in other words, the dynamic nature of the match. More specifically,
247 participants suggested that certain dynamic contextual factors, such as positive perceptions of
248 their performance, a winning score status, and positive momentum resulted in more confident
249 decision making, which was often characterised by experimental or risky decisions. The
250 players also suggested that in certain contexts within a match, instructions from their coach
251 were valued while in others they could hinder the decision making process. This reveals how
252 the transient and dynamic nature of the match impacts the internal psychological process
253 through which players make decisions.

254 3.1.1 Personal performance. Every player highlighted that their perceptions of
255 personal performance during a match impacted the decisions they made. More specifically,
256 their own performance was a key source of confidence for the players, with high confidence
257 leading to more adventurous decision making and low confidence leading to more
258 conservative decision making:

259 With me, if I'm like playing well, I'll try anything, so like, it's more of a confidence
260 thing, like, if when the ball comes to me, the first thing I normally try and do is 'right
261 get a safe pass off' and then build from there. And then if I'm having a bad game, I
262 think 'right I'm just gonna play safe' so it would effect my decisions... but if I'm
263 having like a really good game then my confidence goes up and I'll just try anything.

264 (Matt)

265 All of the participants spoke about how their confidence increased throughout the
266 match when they were playing well, which progressively increased their willingness to make
267 more risky decisions. Moreover, some players suggested that the first five or ten minutes of a
268 match were disproportionately important for building confidence. For example, when talking
269 about making more risky decisions, one player expressed:

270 I think what does have an effect, say your first five minutes of a game or your first ten
271 minutes if you're playing well then... I would say more importance on the start of the
272 game than necessarily previous games or training sessions. (Henry)

273 It is evident that a large part of confident decision making during a match was
274 dependent on their performance *on the day*. Whether it be through the first five or 10 minutes
275 or throughout the entire match this aligns with Bandura's (1997) self-efficacy theory,
276 specifically the prediction that performance accomplishments will elicit the most potent
277 effects upon self-efficacy. While the participants used the term 'confidence', their comments
278 also highlight the situational and time-specific nature of their self-efficacy in regard to
279 decision making.

280 3.1.2 Score Status. The participants identified that score status often impacts the
281 types and emotional valence of decisions they make throughout a match. More specifically,
282 they identified being in a winning position as a prominent determinant of making more
283 confident decisions, while being in a losing position was recognised as a basis for more
284 communication to guide their decisions. For example, John exclaimed, "when we're winning
285 I feel confident in my decisions", while another player highlighted the link between winning,
286 confidence and effective decision making:

287 Simon: If you're winning I think you're probably naturally making better decisions.

288 Interviewer: Why? Why do you think that?

289 Simon: Erm confidence.

290 Some players posited that being in the lead during a match was essential for making
291 confident decisions. This is consistent with previous research in which winning was found to
292 significantly predict confidence in males (Jones, Swain, & Cale, 1991) and that, in
293 comparison to females, male performers place a greater emphasis on winning, beating others,
294 and successful competition outcomes (Hays, Maynard, Thomas, & Bawden, 2007). While it
295 is beneficial for performers to gain confidence from taking the lead during a match, the fact
296 that confident decision making is so reliant on the scoreline again highlights its potentially
297 transient nature. Sensitivity to the context in which one is performing is clearly important;
298 however, there appears significant scope for developing decision-making skills that are more
299 robust and resilient to the situational context.

300 When confronted with a situation in which the team was losing, the players revealed
301 that they had a greater inclination to allow others to guide their decisions. Whether from
302 teammates or coaches, communication was considered fundamental to avoid conceding more
303 goals:

304 If we're losing of course, and they wanna switch it around and start pressing the ball
305 back and going to score, then it's vital we listen, there is communication, 'cause if no
306 one's talking then we probably concede more and more goals. (Brad)

307 When a team is losing, or feeling a lack of control of the game, it is reasonable to
308 want to change the tactics or style of play and these comments reflect the perceived
309 importance of communication in ensuring this is done cohesively (Carron, Colman, Wheeler,
310 & Stevens, 2002). There is mixed evidence regarding the relationship between score status
311 and frequency of communication. In a study of netball, researchers found that more frequent
312 on-court talk was associated with less-successful outcomes (LeCouteur & Feo, 2011).
313 Conversely, in a study of tennis, winning doubles pairs exchanged twice as many messages as
314 losing teams (Lausic, Tenebaum, Eccles, Jeong, & Johnson, 2009). The present interviews

315 suggest that increased communication between players is simply a response to tactical
316 changes resulting from score status, and this is perceived to be beneficial.

317 3.1.3 Momentum. Another dynamic situational factor that affected the players'
318 decision making was momentum, which was described as a period during which one team
319 had large amounts of possession and/or instigated repeated attacking play. Despite the feeling
320 of momentum usually only lasting a few minutes in a match, it appeared that this was
321 sufficient to influence the confidence of players' decision making. For example, one player
322 said, "I think, well, when you have momentum you have more confidence" (Craig). Despite
323 limited research in this area, this finding is consistent with the reconceptualised model of
324 sport confidence in which situational favourableness was identified as a salient source of
325 confidence for athletes (Vealey, Hayashi, Garner-Holman, & Giacobbi, 1998). Situational
326 favourableness represents the idea that performers gain confidence in situations where they
327 feel the breaks are in their favour. Interestingly, such favourableness is apparent regardless of
328 the score, suggesting an alternative, if somewhat unreliable, source of decision making
329 confidence.

330 In light of the quotes that suggest confidence is generated through momentum, it is
331 perhaps unsurprising that when momentum was not in their favour, players made less-
332 confident decisions or employed a more conservative decision making strategy to try to
333 counteract momentum:

334 If you [are] against it, against momentum, I think it's quite difficult. You gotta do like
335 the basic things right and not take risks. You just gotta try and keep it simple and just
336 do all the basic things properly just to get that bit of pressure and momentum off you
337 a little bit and try and lift your team up. (Scott)

338 While Scott did not explicitly acknowledge a lack of confidence when momentum
339 was against his team, he referred to the importance of 'keeping it simple', in contrast to the

340 more risky or low-probability decisions the players identified as making when confident. This
341 is an apt example of the powerful yet transient influence of context on decision making. A
342 contextual factor, momentum, over which players perceived that they had little control and
343 that lasted only a few minutes, nonetheless resulted in strategic deployment of a more risk-
344 averse and interactive decision making strategy. Rather than trying to score a goal, the
345 primary concern of players shifted to low-risk decisions, the outcomes of which were more
346 assured. Previous decision-making research in soccer has primarily focused on offensive
347 scenarios; however, the value attached to more conservative decision making in certain match
348 situations highlights the importance of considering the context in which decisions are made to
349 develop a more comprehensive understanding of in-event decision making. In certain
350 contexts, decisions that lead to a goal-scoring opportunity would not necessarily be
351 considered superior, as has been assumed in more offence-focused studies (Roca et al., 2013;
352 Vaeyens et al., 2007).

353 3.1.4 Coach instructions. Throughout the interviews, it became apparent that there
354 were certain contexts in which coach instructions were valued and others where they were
355 considered potentially detrimental to decision making. For example, when the players were
356 given advice while they were in possession of the ball, they felt this interfered with the
357 fluency of their decision-making process:

358 I don't like it when I'm playing football and especially, you know, like, if you play
359 right or left back, you're right by the touchline and sometimes if you're right by the
360 dug out, you get the ball at your feet and someone will go 'ah give it to Joe' and in my
361 head I'm already thinking I'm gonna pass it to someone else, then I'm like 'ooh', so I
362 don't like it when they say something. I'd rather just in the moment, I'd rather I just
363 make the decision. (Matt)

364 Some of the players articulated how they often made decisions before receiving the
365 ball so when they were given instructions after gaining possession of the ball the decision-
366 making process was more challenging. These players expressed negative reactions caused by
367 ill-timed instructions, noting how they can “put you off your game” (John) and “I wouldn’t
368 say confuse I would say if anything maybe annoyed” (Henry). The danger with triggering
369 ‘reinvestment’ of explicit processes is well established in the motor skill literature and similar
370 individual difference factors have been identified in decision making (Kinrade et al., 2015).
371 Accordingly, the role of in-event instructions in triggering these processes warrants further
372 investigation.

373 In certain contexts such as in areas of perceived weakness, or following poor
374 decisions, the participants expressed a preference for guidance on decision making. For
375 example, one player articulated the importance of listening to advice after making an error:

376 If you made a mistake and they’re trying to tell you to do it differently and that will
377 help you not make a mistake, then yeah, you should listen to what they’re saying a
378 hundred per cent. (Simon)

379 This was reflected in position-specific preferences, in which attacking players
380 expressed a stronger preference for in-match instructions from their coach for defensive
381 decisions, in contrast to preferring more freedom to make decisions in attacking decision-
382 making situations. The reverse was true for defensive players. Taken together, this indicates
383 situation-specific expertise is an important contextual factor that influences the decision-
384 making process, even within a group who are highly skilled. This is reflected in a preference
385 for using personal judgement in areas of perceived proficiency, and for seeking guidance in
386 situations of perceived weakness. This is consistent with a recent study in Australian-rules
387 football, which showed that experienced players relied more on their “know-how” to guide
388 their decisions, whereas less-experienced players were more likely to adhere to coach

389 instructions (Buszard, Farrow, & Kemp, 2013). By implication, coaches and managers may
390 benefit from prioritising in-match instructions regarding areas of perceived weakness in their
391 players.

392 3.2 Static themes

393 During the interviews the participants revealed that to understand in-event decision
394 making, one must also look beyond the dynamic context of the match to that of more
395 external, or static contextual factors. The participants recognised that contextual factors that
396 did not change throughout the match, such as the match importance, personal pressures, and
397 preparation, contributed to the decisions they made on the pitch. More specifically, whether
398 in response to the importance of a match or personal incentives to play well, the players
399 suggested that perceived pressure sometimes impaired the spontaneity or fluency of their
400 decision making. Furthermore, players' perceptions of how they had prepared for the match
401 influenced the decisions they made on the day.

402 3.2.1 Match importance. In addition to the contextual factors that develop during a
403 match the participants suggested that the broader significance of the match also influences
404 their decision making on the pitch. There was considerable variability in the amount of
405 pressure perceived by the participants and the extent to which this was affected by the
406 importance of the match. Indeed, one participant described being indifferent to the
407 significance of the match, going as far as to say, "yeah for sure I don't feel the pressure"
408 (John), while another participant was clear that match importance had adversely affected his
409 decision making:

410 In a cup final you want to win, like, a lot more, so it may be that you make a few rash
411 decisions because you're, you wanna score so much that you actually make the wrong
412 one a couple of times. (Henry)

413 This participant revealed that perceived pressure led to more direct, rushed, and even
414 rash decisions. In contrast to the effect of coach instructions that may confuse and slow down
415 the decision-making process, the comments are more consistent with attention control theory,
416 in particular with reduced inhibition of responses and greater influence of the stimulus-driven
417 attentional system (Eysenck, Derakshan, Santos, & Calvo, 2007).

418 Variability in reactions to match significance reflects evidence supporting the
419 importance of individual difference factors in responses to pressure situations. For example,
420 trait activation theory predicts that specific trait-relevant situational cues trigger behavioural
421 responses to situations (Tett & Guterman, 2000), while other researchers have identified an
422 inverse relationship between neuroticism and performance under pressure in decision making
423 scenarios (Byrne, Silasi-Mansat, & Worthy, 2015). Individual differences in the propensity
424 for reinvesting conscious control and ruminating over past poor decisions are also strong
425 predictors of poor decision making under pressure in sport (Jackson, Kinrade, Hicks, &
426 Wills, 2013; Kinrade et al., 2015). The implication of this is that a full understanding of
427 decision making requires consideration of both the external and internal context in which
428 situations are experienced and decisions made. More detailed knowledge of these
429 relationships should lead to practical benefits in terms of individualised preparation for
430 important events.

431 3.2.2 Personal pressures. During the interviews, the participants were invited to
432 identify additional sources of pressure they believed influenced their decision making. At this
433 stage a number of sources of perceived pressure were revealed as having the potential to
434 impact on-field decision making. For example, one player referred to the on-going pressure
435 associated with regularly competing at this level, stating, “in football there’s always
436 something at stake” (Craig). Contractual status was also identified as an additional influence
437 and potential source of pressure:

438 If you're on the verge of getting a new contract you want to give yourself the best
439 negotiation cards that you can have then you get pressure from that... because you're
440 playing on maybe two-year contracts one-year contracts three-year contracts so your
441 future is as much as you're playing for that game you're also playing for the next
442 game so staying in the team is one thing. (Craig)

443 Researchers have identified a range of internal and external sources of perceived
444 pressure (Rushall & Sherman, 1987) and these examples highlight the broader competitive
445 and organisational context in which players perform. The effect of additional sources of
446 pressure on decision making has been established in other domains such as public health
447 (Zardo, Collie, & Livingstone, 2014) but is yet to be systematically examined in more time-
448 constrained decision making such as those found in sports and therefore warrants further
449 investigation.

450 3.2.3 Preparation. The players' responses throughout the interviews suggested that
451 their perceptions of how well they had prepared for a specific match influenced their decision
452 making on the pitch. Training sessions that focused on decision making were considered an
453 important determinant of in-match decision making; indeed, one player suggested that
454 training was the most influential factor, "I think game-based [training] is a massive, has a
455 massive effect on how good or bad your decision making is... I would argue potentially the
456 biggest [influence]" (Henry). Despite all the participants recognising the significance of their
457 practices on their decision making, there was considerable variation in their proposed
458 rationales for why such preparation was so influential.

459 The idea of creating habits through practice surfaced as one explanation, "you try to
460 do obviously, the things you wouldn't do in a match, in training, so you can get used to them
461 and create habits and just goes on to the pitch with you as well" (Brad). Another player
462 expressed the importance of replicating situations that are likely to occur in the match:

463 I find football personally like a memory thing, like if you can, if your brain can realise
464 that you've been in this situation before, you will be able to get out of it... so I think
465 in training if you're doing something and it comes up in a game you'll know exactly
466 what to do because it's a memory thing. (Simon)

467 Pattern recognition, visual search, and associated thought processes are important
468 determinants of decision-making proficiency (Roca et al., 2013) and participants revealed this
469 was explicitly reflected in scenarios enacted during training sessions. It was also
470 acknowledged that the training sessions during the week leading up to each match were
471 particularly powerful in relation to decision making on the pitch. One player noted that the
472 recency of training may impact his decisions, "because if you [have] been doing it all week
473 so that would probably play on your mind so I think it could change the decisions you make"
474 (Scott). Another player also fixated on the week of training between matches, suggesting that
475 the focus on the upcoming opponent was pivotal to the success of in-event decision making:

476 The last match we did practice the day before the game and it was, we were walking
477 through ways of or to defend against a team, so the team that we played like to pass
478 the ball a lot and try to go through the third to play, so we tried to make the pitches as
479 small as possible so they go around instead of through us. (John)

480 In regard to time-pressured decision making, the Take the First (TTF) heuristic
481 predicts that when confronted with familiar, yet ill-defined tasks, performers generate only a
482 very small number of options and tend to choose the first option that comes to mind (Johnson
483 & Raab, 2003). Raab and Laborde (2011) found that higher-skilled handball players
484 generated fewer options than less-skilled players and that the number of options generated
485 was negatively correlated with decision quality. Viewed through this lens, the training
486 sessions leading up to a match can be seen as 'contextual preparation', in which knowledge
487 of the opposing team's strengths, weaknesses, and tactical preferences are used to sensitise

488 players to the formations they are likely to experience and constrain the decision options they
489 might generate, resulting in faster and better decisions (Helper & Feltz, 2012). Accordingly,
490 TTF heuristic offers a potential conceptual framework for guiding how performance analysis
491 data is used to enhance in-match decision making.

492 4. Conclusion

493 In the present study we sought to identify contextual factors that professional soccer
494 players perceive to be important in influencing their decision making during a match. In light
495 of the broad nature of the research question, semi-structured interviews were conducted as
496 they allow for a general consideration of the types of contextual factors involved in decision
497 making without restriction of decisions made in one match, as is the case in self-
498 confrontation interviews. Nonetheless, it is important to acknowledge that in designing the
499 semi-structured interview protocol, a range of contextual factors were specified and these
500 may have affected the responses of participants. In particular, while great care was taken to
501 ensure individual questions were not leading, the very fact that a contextual theme was
502 mentioned may have increased participants' perceptions of its importance. To counteract this,
503 care was taken to ensure questions were frames neutrally and elaboration probes were only
504 used when participants indicated that a contextual factor affected decision making in some
505 way.

506 The present study revealed that soccer players' decisions on the pitch rely on both the
507 situational development of the match (i.e. dynamic themes) and the broader external context
508 of the match (i.e. static themes). Consistent with previous research highlighting the
509 importance of situational determinants of decision making (Lenzen et al., 2009; Macquet &
510 Fleurance, 2007; Macquet & Kragba, 2015), the present study revealed that in-match factors
511 such as perceptions of performance, a winning score status, and momentum were perceived
512 to have a significant influence on the players' ability to make more confident decisions. The

513 players also suggested that instructions from their coach during a match were sometimes
514 valuable (e.g., guidance following poor decisions), and at other times a hindrance (e.g., when
515 in possession of the ball) on their decision making process. Furthermore, the present study is
516 the first to provide (qualitative) data concerning the impact of broader static contextual
517 factors on soccer players' decision making. More specifically, the participants suggested that
518 the importance of a match and personal incentives to play well sometimes impaired the
519 spontaneity or fluency of their decision making. They also revealed that they perceived
520 training sessions in the days leading up to a match to be critical for providing a match
521 specific context that facilitated effective decision making in the match itself.

522 It is important to remain cognisant that this study merely sought to explore and
523 identify the broad array of contextual factors that influence soccer players' decision making.
524 The broad scope of the study meant that it was impossible to establish the specific way that
525 such factors combine to influence decisions, but we suggest this should be addressed in future
526 studies. Likewise the study sample contained only male soccer players from one academy, so
527 it is possible that players from a different demographic (e.g., age group, gender, culture) will
528 identify additional contextual factors. Furthermore, it is likely that both the contextual factors
529 and their influence on decision making changes during skill development. Large-scale cohort
530 designs and longitudinal research will further develop knowledge in this area. A further
531 limitation of the study is that it relied on the accuracy of the participants' recall, together with
532 their ability and willingness to articulate their experiences. Whilst the quality and depth of the
533 responses provided would suggest these were not serious problems, they must be considered
534 in evaluating the findings of the study.

535 The present findings highlight the importance of considering the context in which
536 decisions are made, and reveal how confident, effective decision making is subject to both
537 dynamic and static contextual influences. More detailed examination of each of these

538 contexts is warranted and there is also a clear need to determine the extent to which the same
539 contextual influences are common across different sports and other domains. Variability in
540 regard to the perceived impact of situational pressure highlights the importance of identifying
541 and measuring key individual difference variables in empirical research on decision making.
542 While challenging, this will lead to a more comprehensive understanding of decision making
543 in sport that should yield theoretical as well as practical advances.

544 Funding Sources

545 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,
546 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

547 References

- 548 Abernethy, B., Gill, D. P., Parks, S. L., & Packer, S. T. (2001). Expertise and the perception
549 of kinematic and situational probability information. *Perception, 30*(2), 233-252.
550 doi:10.1068/p2872
- 551 Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change.
552 *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215. doi:10.1016/0146-6402(78)90002-4
- 553 Bar-Eli, M., & Raab, M. (2009). Judgment and decision making in sport and exercise: A
554 concise history and present and future perspectives. In D. Araujo, H. Ripoll & M. Raab
555 (Eds.), *Perspectives on Cognition and Action in Sport* (pp. 149-156). Portland, OR:
556 Nova Science Publishers.
- 557 Barton, H., Jackson, R. C., & Bishop, D. (2013). Knowledge of player tendencies: The effect
558 on anticipation skill and susceptibility to deception. *Journal of Sport & Exercise*
559 *Psychology, 35*, S18.
- 560 Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research*
561 *in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

- 562 Buszard, T., Farrow, D., & Kemp, J. (2013). Examining the influence of acute instructional
563 approaches on the decision-making performance of experienced team field sport players.
564 *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 31(3), 238-247. doi:10.1080/02640414.2012.731516
- 565 Byrne, K. A., Silasi-Mansat, C. D., & Worthy, D. A. (2015). Who chokes under pressure? the
566 big five personality traits and decision-making under pressure. *Personality and*
567 *Individual Differences*, 74, 22-28. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.10.009
- 568 Carron, A. V., Colman, M. M., Wheeler, J., & Stevens, D. (2002). Cohesion and performance
569 in sport: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 24, 168-188.
- 570 Chase, W. G., & Simon, H. A. (1973). The mind's eye in chess. In W. Chase (Ed.), *Visual*
571 *Information Processing* (pp. 215-281). London, England: Academic Press.
- 572 Davids, K., & Araújo, D. (2010). The concept of 'Organismic Asymmetry' in sport science.
573 *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 13(6), 633-640.
574 doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2010.05.002
- 575 Ericsson, K. A., & Ward, P. (2007). Capturing the naturally occurring superior performance
576 of experts in the laboratory toward a science of expert and exceptional performance.
577 *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16(6), 346-350. doi:10.1111/j.1467-
578 8721.2007.00533.x
- 579 Eysenck, M. W., Derakshan, N., Santos, R., & Calvo, M. G. (2007). Anxiety and cognitive
580 performance: attentional control theory. *Emotion*, 7(2), 336-353. doi:10.1037/1528-
581 3542.7.2.336
- 582 Gray, R. (2002a). Behavior of college baseball players in a virtual batting task. *Journal of*
583 *Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 28(5), 1131-1148.
584 doi:10.1037/0096-1523.28.5.1131
- 585 Gray, R. (2002b). "Markov at the bat": a model of cognitive processing in baseball batters.
586 *Psychological Science*, 13(6), 542-547. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00495

- 587 Hays, K., Maynard, I., Thomas, O., & Bawden, M. (2007). Sources and types of confidence
588 identified by world class sport performers. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *19*(4),
589 434-456. doi:10.1080/10413200701599173
- 590 Hepler, T. J., & Feltz, D. L. (2012). Take the first heuristic, self-efficacy, and decision-
591 making in sport. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, *18*(2), 154-161.
592 doi:10.1037/a0027807
- 593 Hoffman, R. R., Shadbolt, N. R., Burton, A. M., & Klein, G. (1995). Eliciting knowledge
594 from experts: A methodological analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision*
595 *Processes*, *62*(2), 129-158. doi:10.1006/obhd.1995.1039
- 596 Jackson, R. C., Kinrade, N. P., Hicks, T., & Wills, R. (2013). Individual propensity for
597 reinvestment: Field-based evidence for the predictive validity of three scales.
598 *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, *44*, 331-350. DOI: 10.7352/IJSP2013.44.331
- 599 Johnson, J. G., & Raab, M. (2003). Take the first: Option-generation and resulting choices.
600 *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *91*(2), 215-229.
601 doi:10.1016/S0749-5978(03)00027-X
- 602 Jones, G., Swain, A., & Cale, A. (1991). Gender differences in precompetition temporal
603 patterning and antecedents of anxiety and self-confidence. *Journal of Sport & Exercise*
604 *Psychology*, *13*(1), 1-15. doi:10.1123/jsep.13.1.1
- 605 Kinrade, N. P., Jackson, R. C., & Ashford, K. J. (2015). Reinvestment, task complexity and
606 decision making under pressure in basketball. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *20*, 11-
607 19. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.03.007
- 608 Lausic, D., Tenebaum, G., Eccles, D., Jeong, A., & Johnson, T. (2009). Intrateam
609 communication and performance in doubles tennis. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and*
610 *Sport*, *80*(2), 281-290. doi:10.5641/027013609X13087704028598

- 611 LeCouteur, A., & Feo, R. (2011). Real-time communication during play: Analysis of team-
612 mates' talk and interaction. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *12*(2), 124-134.
613 doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2010.07.003
- 614 Lenzen, B., Theunissen, C., & Cloes, M. (2009). Situated analysis of team handball players'
615 decisions: An exploratory study. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *28*(1), 54-
616 74. doi:10.1123/jtpe.28.1.54
- 617 Loffing, F., Stern, R., & Hagemann, N. (2015). Pattern-induced expectation bias in visual
618 anticipation of action outcomes. *Acta Psychologica*, *161*, 45-53.
619 doi:10.1016/j.actpsy.2015.08.007
- 620 Macquet, A. (2009). Recognition within the decision-making process: A case study of expert
621 volleyball players. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *21*(1), 64-79.
622 doi:10.1080/10413200802575759
- 623 Macquet, A., & Fleurance, P. (2007). Naturalistic decision-making in expert badminton
624 players. *Ergonomics*, *50*(9), 1433-1450. doi:10.1080/00140130701393452
- 625 Macquet, A., & Kragba, K. (2015). What makes basketball players continue with the planned
626 play or change it? A case study of the relationships between sense-making and decision-
627 making. *Cognition, Technology & Work*, *17*(3), 345-353. doi:10.1007/s10111-015-0332-
628 4
- 629 McRobert, A. P., Ward, P., Eccles, D. W., & Williams, A. M. (2011). The effect of
630 manipulating context-specific information on perceptual-cognitive processes during a
631 simulated anticipation task. *British Journal of Psychology*, *102*(3), 519-534.
632 doi:10.1111/j.2044-8295.2010.02013.x
- 633 Murphy, C. P., Jackson, R. C., Cooke, K., Roca, A. Benguigui, N. & Williams, A. M. (2016).
634 Contextual information and perceptual-cognitive expertise in a dynamic, temporally-

- 635 constrained task. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 22(4), 455-470.
636 doi:10.1037/xap0000094
- 637 Oxford English Dictionary. Retrieved February 12th 2018, from
638 <http://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/context>
- 639 Paull, G., & Glencross, D. (1997). Expert perception and decision making in baseball.
640 *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 28(1), 35-36.
- 641 Raab, M., & Laborde, S. (2011). When to blink and when to think: Preference for intuitive
642 decisions results in faster and better tactical choices. *Research Quarterly for Exercise*
643 *and Science*, 82(1), 89-98. doi:10.1080/02701367.2011.10599725
- 644 Roca, A., Ford, P. R., McRobert, A. P., & Williams, A. M. (2013). Perceptual-cognitive skills
645 and their interaction as a function of task constraints in soccer. *Journal of Sport and*
646 *Exercise Psychology*, 35(2), 144-155. doi:10.1123/jsep.35.2.144
- 647 Rushall, B., & Sherman, C. (1987). A definition and measurement of pressure in sport.
648 *Journal of Applied Research in Coaching and Athletics*, 2, 1-23.
- 649 Schläppi-Lienhard, O., & Hossner, E. (2015). Decision making in beach volleyball defense:
650 Crucial factors derived from interviews with top-level experts. *Psychology of Sport and*
651 *Exercise*, 16(1), 60-73. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.07.005
- 652 Smith, J. A. (1995). Semi-structured interviewing and qualitative analysis. In J. Smith, R.
653 Harré & L. Van Langenhove (Eds.), *Rethinking Methods in Psychology* (pp. 8-26).
654 London, England: SAGE publications.
- 655 Starkes, J., & Deakin, J. (1984). Perception in sport: A cognitive approach to skilled
656 performance. In W. F. Straub & J. M. Williams (Eds.), *Cognitive Sport Psychology* (pp.
657 115-128). Lansing, MI: Sport Science Association.

- 658 Tett, R. P., & Guterman, H. A. (2000). Situation trait relevance, trait expression, and cross-
659 situational consistency: Testing a principle of trait activation. *Journal of Research in*
660 *Personality, 34*(4), 397-423. doi:10.1006/jrpe.2000.2292
- 661 Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative
662 research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 16*(10), 837-851. doi:10.1177/1077800410383121
- 663 Travassos, B., Araújo, D., Davids, K., O'Hara, K., Leitão, J., & Cortinhas, A. (2013).
664 Expertise effects on decision-making in sport are constrained by requisite response
665 behaviours – A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 14*(2), 211-219.
666 doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2012.11.002
- 667 Vaeyens, R., Lenoir, M., Williams, A. M., & Philippaerts, R. M. (2007). Mechanisms
668 underpinning successful decision making in skilled youth soccer players: An analysis of
669 visual search behaviors. *Journal of Motor Behavior, 39*(5), 395-408.
670 doi:10.3200/JMBR.39.5.395-408
- 671 Vealey, R. S., Hayashi, S. W., Garner-Holman, M., & Giacobbi, P. (1998). Sources of sport-
672 confidence: Conceptualization and instrument development. *Journal of Sport and*
673 *Exercise Psychology, 20*(1), 54-80. doi:10.1123/jsep.20.1.54
- 674 Verkoeijen, P. P., Rikers, R. M., Schmidt, H. G., Van De Wiel, M. W. J., & Kooman, J. P.
675 (2004). Case representation by medical experts, intermediates and novices for laboratory
676 data presented with or without a clinical context. *Medical Education, 38*(6), 617-627.
677 doi:10.1046/j.1365-2923.2004.01797.x
- 678 Williams, A. M. (2009). Perceiving the intentions of others: How do skilled performers make
679 anticipation judgments? *Progress in Brain Research, 174*, 73-83. doi:10.1016/S0079-
680 6123(09)01307-7

- 681 Zardo, P., Collie, A., & Livingstone, C. (2014). External factors affecting decision-making
682 and use of evidence in an Australian public health policy environment. *Social Science &*
683 *Medicine, 108*, 120-127. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.02.046

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Contextual Factors Influencing Decision Making: Perceptions of Professional Soccer Players

Highlights

- Semi-structured interviews were conducted with eight professional soccer players
- Static and dynamic contextual themes were perceived to influence decision making
- Dynamic themes related to performance, score status, momentum, and communication
- Static themes related to match importance, perceived pressure, and preparation