



**On winning the 'lottery': Psychological preparation for football penalty shootouts**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Sports Sciences</i>
Manuscript ID:	RJSP-2014-0941
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Keywords:	Soccer, Penalty Kicks, Anxiety, Choking, Perceived Control

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**RUNNING HEAD: PREPARING FOR PENALTY SHOOTOUTS**

**On winning the ‘lottery’: Psychological preparation for football penalty  
shootouts**

For Peer Review Only

### Abstract

The outcome of penalty shootouts is often referred to as a 'lottery', with the determining factor being luck rather than the skill level of the player. Throughout this article we hope to show why such attitudes towards physical and psychological preparation can diminish the perceived control of penalty takers and can negatively affect their behaviour and subsequent performance. From the synthesis of this evidence we provide task-specific recommendations that are structured around the dynamic nature of emotions that players are likely to experience during each phase of the shootout and which can be implemented or adapted to suit the individual needs of the player. These recommendations are designed to help applied professionals to optimise the psychological preparation for this scenario with the overall aim of helping players to take back control of the situation.

**Keywords:** Soccer, Perceived Control, Choking, Anxiety, Penalty Kicks

## Introduction

*“Penalties are always a lottery.” Luiz Felipe Scolari (Former Coach of Portugal)*

*“Penalties are a lottery” Fabio Capello (Former England Manager)*

As these quotes testify, the outcome of football penalty shootouts is often referred to as a ‘lottery’ with success dependant on luck rather than the skill of the penalty taker. Consequently, a considerable amount of controversy and scepticism exists – even from individuals charged with the responsibility of preparing players for such situations - surrounding the type, utility and effectiveness of practice and preparation for penalty shootout scenarios. The aim of this paper is not to review the full scientific literature base on football penalty kicks (see Memmert, Hüttermann, Hagemann, Loffing, and Strauss, 2013), but to focus specifically on the role of perceived control. By synthesising this research we hope to provide evidence-based recommendations that applied practitioners can use to aid the psychological preparation for one of the most highly pressurised situations in world sport.

### **Penalty shootouts: Luck or skill?**

As much of the scepticism about the utility of preparing for penalty shootouts is related to an inflated perception of the role of luck in determining outcome success, we will tackle this perception from the outset. If penalty shootout success is predominantly based on luck we would expect success rates between teams to be around chance levels. However, since 1982, the German national team has won all six major shootouts that the country has participated in (1982, 1986, 1990, 1996, and 2006) accumulating a success rate of 85%. In contrast, with one exception (in 1996 against Spain), England has lost all penalty shootouts they have taken part in (in

1  
2  
3 1990, 1996, 1998, 2004, 2006 and 2012) which is a success rate of 14%. Similarly,  
4  
5 with respect to individual players' success rates, players from England score on  
6  
7 significantly fewer of their shots (67%) than Germans (92 %,  $p < .03$ ) (Jordet, 2009).  
8  
9  
10 This disparity between the success rates of these teams suggests that luck is not a  
11  
12 major predetermining factor that underpins outcome success.  
13

14  
15 Second, a kick from the penalty mark is a task that requires the player to take  
16  
17 a free shot at goal from a distance of 11 metres. The goal area measures 24ft (7.32  
18  
19 m) wide by 8ft (2.44 m) high, giving a total target area of approximately 192ft<sup>2</sup> (18  
20  
21 m<sup>2</sup>) for the kicker to hit. Furthermore, a shot struck with typical speed (20 m.s<sup>-1</sup>) to  
22  
23 distal areas of the goal should reach the goal in around 600ms and be physically  
24  
25 impossible for the goalkeeper to save due to constraints on their reaction time (Frank  
26  
27 and Hanvey, 1997). Despite these positive statistics, a surprisingly large number of  
28  
29 penalty kicks are not converted (~25%; McGarry and Franks, 2000) and more are  
30  
31 hit within two metres either side of the goalkeeper (~70%; Bar-Eli and Friedman,  
32  
33 1988). A further study has shown that shots directed toward the upper third of the  
34  
35 goal have a save rate of 0%; yet only 13% of shots are hit to these areas, probably  
36  
37 due to the inflated risk of missing the goal completely (Bar-Eli and Azar, 2009).  
38  
39 Similarly, Miller (1996) examined the penalty kicks taken during the 1994 World  
40  
41 Cup finals and concluded that 59% of penalty kicks landed relatively centrally and  
42  
43 resulted in 26% being saved by the goalkeeper. Conversely only 41% of shots landed  
44  
45 6ft inside each post and of these only one was saved (8%). This evidence again  
46  
47 undermines the role of luck in this scenario and suggests that luck may only be a  
48  
49 significant factor in outcome success during inaccurate shooting. For example, as  
50  
51 shots become less accurate (centralised) some players may get 'lucky' and the  
52  
53 goalkeeper will dive to the wrong side, whereas other players will suffer bad luck  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and the 'keeper will guess correctly. The only way to minimise the role that luck  
4  
5 plays is by optimising shooting accuracy.  
6  
7

### 8 **Research evidence**

9  
10  
11 If penalty shootouts were totally determined by luck rather than the skill or  
12  
13 the behaviour of the penalty taker then we would expect no correlation between  
14  
15 player behaviour and performance success. However, a number of observational  
16  
17 studies using video analysis of elite football penalty takers; qualitative studies that  
18  
19 have interviewed elite penalty takers; and lab-based experimental studies have all  
20  
21 shown that there are certain behaviours and psychological variables that are  
22  
23 associated with performance success in football penalty shootouts. What follows is a  
24  
25 review of this literature followed by evidence-based recommendations designed to  
26  
27 minimise the role of luck in this scenario and reduce the impact that this component  
28  
29 has on the perceptions of control in penalty takers.  
30  
31  
32  
33

### 34 **Observational studies**

35  
36  
37 Jordet, Hartman, Visscher, and Lemmink (2007) explored whether poor  
38  
39 performance in penalty shootouts was attributable to stress, skill level, physical  
40  
41 fatigue or chance. Data were collected from 41 penalty shootouts comprising of 409  
42  
43 penalty kicks from major international competitions. Results indicated that the  
44  
45 importance of the kicks (indicative of stress) was negatively related to the outcome,  
46  
47 whereas skill and fatigue had little or no relation to outcome. Jordet and colleagues  
48  
49 have since gone on to explore exactly how this increase in anxiety affects the  
50  
51 behaviours of penalty takers and what affect these behaviours have on subsequent  
52  
53 shooting performance.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 For example, Jordet, Hartman and Sigmundstad (2009) investigated how  
4 anxiety disrupted the timing of the penalty and also negatively influenced players'  
5 pre-shot behaviour. Video analysis of 366 penalty kicks explored the effects of  
6 different time periods typical in penalty shooting (walking to the penalty spot, ball  
7 placement, back-up, waiting for the referee's whistle, responding to the whistle, and  
8 run-up duration) on subsequent performance. Results indicated that longer times to  
9 respond to the referee's whistle were related to more goals and shorter times were  
10 related to fewer goals. Specifically, players who took less than one second to place  
11 the ball on the penalty spot score on about 58% of their penalties whereas those who  
12 took longer score on about 80% of their penalties. Similarly, taking about a second  
13 or more to respond to the referee's whistle to initiate the shot is associated with a  
14 higher probability of scoring than rushing to take the shot. The authors concluded  
15 that extreme levels of pressure cause performers to exhibit escapist thoughts where  
16 they strive to get the situation 'over and done with' as quickly as possible.  
17  
18 Interestingly such behaviour can make goalkeepers form negative impressions of the  
19 penalty taker and in turn, increase their confidence in saving the subsequent shot  
20 (Furley, Dicks, Stendtko, and Memmert, 2012).  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Finally, Moll, Jordet and Pepping (2012) investigated whether post-goal  
42 celebrative behaviours influence team success in a penalty shootout. Interestingly,  
43 82% of those players who substantially celebrated their successful penalty ended up  
44 on the winning team. The authors concluded that such positive displays of emotion  
45 are contagious and are likely to 'infect' a positive attitude on team-mates taking  
46 subsequent kicks. Conversely, such behaviours also seem to have a negative effect  
47 on the opposition. Specifically, when players displayed substantial celebratory  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 behaviours the opposing team were more than twice as likely to miss their next shot  
4  
5 (Moll et al., 2012).  
6  
7

### 8 **Qualitative studies** 9

10  
11 As well as studies that have linked non-verbal behaviours with performance  
12 success, a few studies have gained access to elite players that have experience of  
13 taking penalty kicks in intentional tournament shootouts. These studies give a unique  
14 insight and a first-hand account of the psychological demands experienced by elite  
15 players in shootout scenarios and highlight that the subjective feelings of anxiety that  
16 players experience during penalty kicks is influenced by their perceived control over  
17 the situation.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 Perceived control can be defined as the perception of one's capacities to be  
29 able to cope and attain goals under stress (Skinner, 1996) and is related to more  
30 favourable interpretations of anxiety symptoms (Hanton, O'Brien and Mellalieu,  
31 2003) and superior performance under pressure (Cheng, Hardy, and Markland, 2011;  
32 Otten, 2009). In order to measure and conceptualize perceived control it has been  
33 argued that separate assessments of the perceived outcome contingency and personal  
34 competence is crucial (Skinner, 1996). Contingency expectations relate to beliefs  
35 regarding the relationship between actions and outcomes ("do my behaviours affect  
36 the result?") and competence ("can I perform at the required level?") relates to  
37 perceptions of ability (Skinner, 1996).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 In an attempt to apply this to football penalty shootouts, Jordet, Elferink-  
52 Gemser, Lemmink, and Visscher (2006) interviewed ten international football  
53 players regarding their perceptions of contingency (the belief that the outcome was  
54 attributable to luck or skill) competence (their perceived ability at penalty taking)  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 and control (their perceived ability to cope with the anxiety experienced) whilst  
4 watching video footage of an international penalty shootout in which they had  
5 previously competed. Results indicated that participants with low perceived  
6 competence and contingency (who attributed outcome to be determined by luck  
7 rather than skill) before the penalty shootout experienced significantly higher or  
8 more debilitating anxiety symptoms than those who perceived their competence and  
9 contingency to be high.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 More recently Jordet and Elferink-Gemser (2012) interviewed eight elite  
20 professional football players who had taken penalty kicks in a UEFA European  
21 Championship penalty shootout. Players were interviewed regarding their  
22 experiences of stress, coping and emotions during each of four temporal phases of  
23 the penalty shootout (the break after extra-time prior to the shootout beginning;  
24 standing in the centre circle during the shootout waiting for their turn to shoot; the  
25 walk to the penalty mark; and the shot itself). Results indicated the dynamic nature  
26 of stress, coping and emotions during each of these phases. The most stressful phases  
27 reported were the break after extra time that preceded the start of the shootout and  
28 the time interval between the shootout beginning and the player's turn to shoot.  
29 During these periods players experienced higher levels of anxiety due to (a)  
30 contingency beliefs about penalty shootouts being a lottery, (b) lack of control  
31 regarding penalty taker selection and shooting order, and (c) lack of control  
32 experienced by having to passively wait and watch teammates perform. During the  
33 walk to the penalty spot to take their kick, players reported feelings of loneliness and  
34 concentration disruption. Finally at the penalty mark players reported relatively few  
35 stressors in comparison to earlier phases of the shootout, but common stressors  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 reported were the fear of failure and worry about the goalkeeper's performance or  
4  
5 behaviour.  
6

### 7 8 **Experimental studies** 9

10  
11 A further body of experimental research has explored anxiety's effect on  
12  
13 cognitive mechanisms that underpin successful performance in this task. When  
14  
15 taking a penalty, players generally have the option to (a) try to watch for which  
16  
17 direction the goalkeeper dives during their run-up to the ball and shoot to the  
18  
19 opposite side of the goal at the last moment, or (b) to use a more traditional aiming  
20  
21 approach and look where they intend to shoot (see Wood and Wilson, 2010a). The  
22  
23 consensus of studies that have explored the effectiveness of such strategies has  
24  
25 repeatedly shown that aligning gaze with aiming intention promotes more accurate  
26  
27 shooting (Binsch, Oudejans, Bakker, and Savelsbergh, 2010; van der Kamp, 2011;  
28  
29 Wilson, Wood and Vine, 2009; Wood and Wilson, 2010a, 2010b, 2011, 2012).  
30  
31 Indeed, researchers have also suggested that the neural mechanisms that regulate  
32  
33 goal-directed movements benefit from the availability of accurate and timely spatial  
34  
35 information of the foveated target (Land, 2009). Quite simply, in order to aim  
36  
37 accurately performers need to look where they are shooting so that the information  
38  
39 regarding the target (i.e., velocity, force, direction) can be processed and accurate  
40  
41 responses programmed. Denying this information by not focusing on the target or by  
42  
43 focusing on the goalkeeper impairs accuracy.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 Interestingly, anxiety has been shown to negatively impact the aiming  
51  
52 behaviour of players in precisely this way (i.e., by predisposing players to focus on  
53  
54 the goalkeeper rather than looking to where they wish to aim). In a study by Wilson,  
55  
56 Wood and Vine (2009), players took kicks under high and low threat conditions in  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 an effort to explore how anxiety would alter their aiming behaviour. When anxious,  
4  
5 players were quicker to focus on the centralised goalkeeper and spent significantly  
6  
7 longer looking in this location compared to the low threat condition. Furthermore,  
8  
9 this disruption is increased if the goalkeeper actively attempts to attract the kicker's  
10  
11 attention by using distracting behaviours (waving the arms; Wood and Wilson,  
12  
13 2010b). This centralisation of aiming behaviour caused a corresponding tendency to  
14  
15 shoot centrally at the goalkeeper - an effect that resonates with the findings discussed  
16  
17 earlier from penalty shootouts (Bar-Eli and Azar, 2009; Miller, 1996).  
18  
19

20  
21 To summarise; if players hit optimal areas of the goal their chances of  
22  
23 success increase dramatically and that in order to shoot with such accuracy they need  
24  
25 to aim effectively. Anxiety has a negative impact on the aiming behaviour of the  
26  
27 player creating an attentional bias towards looking at the goalkeeper. Therefore there  
28  
29 may be utility in training players to optimise their aiming behaviour to perform well  
30  
31 under pressure.  
32  
33

34  
35 Two recent studies by Wood and Wilson, (2011, 2012) taught players to  
36  
37 focus on optimal target areas of the goal (top-corners) for a sufficient amount of time  
38  
39 in order to process the aiming information needed for accurate shooting (Quiet-eye  
40  
41 training see Vickers, 2007). Compared to a practice group who just received  
42  
43 uninstructed practice time, the quiet-eye trained players hit more accurate shots  
44  
45 during training and maintained this performance advantage under the pressure of a  
46  
47 'live' penalty shootout Wood and Wilson (2011). Wood and Wilson (2012) also  
48  
49 explored the impact this training regime had on the control beliefs of the penalty  
50  
51 takers. Quiet eye trained participants significantly reduced their perceptions of  
52  
53 outcome uncertainty (contingency) and increased their perceptions of shooting  
54  
55 ability (competence) and ability to score and cope with the pressure (control),  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 compared to players who received uninstructed practice. Furthermore, there was an  
4  
5 overall and significant relationship between high perceptions of control beliefs and  
6  
7 aiming behaviour. Specifically, those participants with high control beliefs were  
8  
9 more likely to aim optimally and further from the goalkeeper, whereas participants  
10  
11 with low control beliefs experienced suboptimal and more centralized aiming  
12  
13 behaviour (Wood and Wilson, 2012).  
14  
15

### 16 17 **So what can be done? Applying research to practice**

#### 18 19 **In training**

20  
21  
22 *Education:* Jordet (2010) proposed a three-point strategy that is designed to  
23  
24 help athletes to prepare to perform in highly-pressurised competitions. This strategy  
25  
26 suggests that any psychological intervention designed to elevate the negative effects of  
27  
28 anxiety on performance should focus on reducing ego-threat, normalising emotional  
29  
30 distress and optimising self-regulation. In order to help football players to cope with  
31  
32 the level of ego threat inherent in penalty shootouts, we suggest that coaches should  
33  
34 communicate with their players that mistakes under pressure *will* occur and rather  
35  
36 than focusing solely on reducing individual errors, the coach should focus on having  
37  
38 individual and team coping strategies in place in the event of personal and team  
39  
40 failure. Being proactive in recognising, accounting for, and supporting mistakes has  
41  
42 the potential to reduce ego-threat and the possibility of ‘choking’ under pressure  
43  
44 (Jordet, 2010).  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 A natural consequence of admitting that mistakes may happen is an  
51  
52 acceptance of the emotional distress that might occur as a result (Jordet, 2010). To  
53  
54 facilitate this process players and coaching staff need to be educated regarding the  
55  
56 typical stressors and emotions experienced by penalty takers in shootouts scenarios.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Such information will not only help to normalise the emotional distress players are  
4 likely to experience, but it can also be used to create more realistic training regimes  
5 that will help to prepare players to cope with the thoughts and emotions that they are  
6 likely to experience during the shootout (Jordet and Elferink-Gemser, 2012). To  
7 supplement this, players should be made aware of behaviours linked to outcome  
8 success in penalty shootouts and taught how to incorporate these behaviours into a  
9 pre-performance routine (see below). These considerations are likely to make players  
10 feel more mentally prepared to deal with potential sources of stress and increase their  
11 beliefs that outcome success is within their control (contingency) rather than being  
12 attributable to luck. Both aspects are likely to enhance perception of control and  
13 reduce potential anxiety symptoms.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 *Organisation:* Not knowing who is going to take the penalties and the  
29 kicking order of these takers is a major stressor for players immediately prior to  
30 taking part in the shootout (Jordet and Elferink-Gemser, 2012). Therefore coaches  
31 should have a predetermined list of each penalty taker together with a specific  
32 running order for all 11 players. Obviously, injury, substitution or a red card may  
33 have an influence on how closely this order is followed but such changes to a  
34 running order would be minimal considering a maximum of three substitutions are  
35 allowed. Alleviating uncertainty from the outset is likely to have two benefits. First it  
36 is likely that all players will take every aspect of any psychological intervention  
37 more seriously when given the responsibility of a kick number. This has obvious  
38 motivational benefits for their application and dedication to various aspects of a  
39 training programme (the educational and practice aspects particularly). Second, by  
40 predetermining the kicking order players will be given more time to mentally prepare  
41 themselves for competing in the shootout and greater opportunity to seek help from  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 applied professionals who can tailor interventions to suit their needs. The cumulative  
4  
5 effect of both aspects should be that if a match goes to penalty kicks then each player  
6  
7 will know what is expected of them and will understand their role in the team. This  
8  
9 will allow for more time to be spent on problem-focused or emotional-focused  
10  
11 coping strategies and help to maximise perceptions of control (Jordet and Elferink-  
12  
13 Gemser, 2012).

14  
15  
16  
17 *Pre-performance routines:* The ability to hit optimal areas of the goal under  
18  
19 pressure is one of the best predictors of performance success in penalty shootouts.  
20  
21 Therefore players not only need help in developing strategies to regulate their  
22  
23 physiological arousal but in order to maximise shooting accuracy they need help in  
24  
25 developing strategies to regulate and control their aiming behaviour. This can be  
26  
27 achieved by developing individualised pre-performance routines (PPRs). While the  
28  
29 structure and content of such routines is best tailored to the individual, we suggest  
30  
31 that PPRs should incorporate a gaze-control element in order to optimise aiming  
32  
33 behaviour and prevent anxiety-induced disruptions in attentional control (see Wilson  
34  
35 and Richards, 2011). Specifically, players should be encouraged to look where they  
36  
37 are aiming. An intuitive concern for players when presented with such instruction  
38  
39 may be to worry about what predictive information this gives to the goalkeeper. To  
40  
41 alleviate these concerns players should be made aware that goalkeepers generally use  
42  
43 information from lower limb kinematics of the kicker to aid their anticipation rather  
44  
45 than the kickers gaze (Dicks, Button and Davids, 2010) and that an accurately struck  
46  
47 shot to the corners of the goal should be almost impossible for the goalkeeper to save  
48  
49 regardless; unless they dive really early which then leaves enough time for the kicker  
50  
51 to change kick direction (van der Kamp, 2006). Not only will a structured PPR  
52  
53 routine help players to optimise their aiming behaviour, it is also a useful way to  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 guide the timing of their shot, preventing players from rushing; a tendency which has  
4  
5 been linked to poor performance in this task (Jordet et al, 2009).  
6  
7

8 *Practice:* One of the common criticisms of the utility of practice is that it is  
9  
10 virtually impossible to recreate the anxiety experienced in real competition. This  
11  
12 widely held view draws a dichotomy between physical and mental preparation and  
13  
14 suggest the two concepts are unrelated. However this is not the case, as physical  
15  
16 practice has psychological benefits for the performer. For example, practicing  
17  
18 penalty kicks increases perceived competence (Wood and Wilson, 2012), perceived  
19  
20 competence is positively related to perceived contingency and perceived control  
21  
22 (Jordet et al 2006; Wood and Wilson, 2012) and perceived control is related to the  
23  
24 intensity of anxiety symptoms experienced (Jordet et al 2006) and subsequent  
25  
26 performance under pressure (Wood and Wilson, 2012). Therefore it is imperative  
27  
28 that players are afforded time to practice prior to competing in games where a  
29  
30 shootout is a possibility. Specifically, practice that promotes target-focused shooting  
31  
32 drills to each corner of the goal would be particularly appropriate (e.g., Wood and  
33  
34 Wilson 2011, 2012). Such practice would help players to rehearse their PPR so that  
35  
36 it is robust under pressure; would help players to strengthen eye-shot coordination so  
37  
38 that they hit where they were aiming; and would increase competency and  
39  
40 contingency expectations that will aid overall perceptions of control.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 While it is true that it is impossible to recreate the anxiety felt in real  
48  
49 competition, that is no excuse for not attempting to manipulate the training  
50  
51 environment in order to be as representative of a real shootout as possible. In fact  
52  
53 research suggests that practicing under relatively low levels of anxiety can help to  
54  
55 alleviate feeling of anxiety in competition and help to insulate performance from  
56  
57 disruption (Oudejans and Pijpers, 2009; 2010). Therefore, coaches need to be  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 innovative in relation to how they design penalty kick practice in order to try to  
4  
5 manipulate levels of anxiety, distraction and perceptions of control. For example,  
6  
7 coaches may manipulate anxiety through introducing competition between players or  
8  
9 by inviting audiences (press and supporters) to watch penalty shootout practice prior  
10  
11 to competition. They can mimic a distracting goalkeeper to test the durability of  
12  
13 players' aiming behaviour; a practice that will have the added benefit of helping to  
14  
15 desensitise players from such antics. Finally, players could be forced to tell the  
16  
17 goalkeeper which way they will shoot. Such practice will provide a live  
18  
19 demonstration of the constraints on the goalkeeper, thus helping players to realise  
20  
21 that if they hit the optimal areas of the goal (particularly the top-corners) then it is  
22  
23 extremely unlikely that the goalkeeper can stop it – even when pre-warned.  
24  
25  
26  
27

### 28 **In Match**

29  
30  
31 *Prior to the shootout commencing:* The interval between when extra time  
32  
33 ends and the shootout begins is a critical period when players report the highest  
34  
35 amount of stressors (often linked to feelings of uncertainty); report a lack of  
36  
37 perceived psychological support; and an absence of communication (Jordet and  
38  
39 Elferink-Gemser, 2012). Hopefully, by having a predetermined kicking order that  
40  
41 staff and players are familiar with will help to decrease the uncertainty that is often  
42  
43 rife during this period, which may then have positive effect on the anxiety symptoms  
44  
45 experienced. This should leave more time for coaching staff – and also other  
46  
47 members of the team - to remind players of appropriate and personalised coping  
48  
49 strategies and provide generalised psychological support. Finally, players are likely  
50  
51 to benefit from positive affirmations that seek to enhance their perceptions of  
52  
53 competence, contingency and control. Specifically, a reiteration of the points stated  
54  
55 in the education section above should reinforce the belief that an accurate shot is  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 almost impossible to save (contingency), that their preparation, practice and ability  
4  
5 has equipped them to shoot accurately (competence) and that both of these factors  
6  
7 will help them to deal with the pressure and perform to their maximum (control).  
8

9  
10 The adoption of these suggestions will help players to feel supported, enable them to  
11  
12 optimise their arousal for their upcoming performance and enhance their overall  
13  
14 perceptions of control.  
15

16  
17 *The walk to the penalty spot:* During this period players generally report an  
18  
19 increase in intrusive thoughts and consequent disruptions in concentration (Jordet  
20  
21 and Elferink-Gemser, 2012). Therefore it is important that players remain focused on  
22  
23 their performance and do not allow themselves to be distracted by worrying thoughts  
24  
25 or negative emotions. Some psychological techniques that will help to facilitate such  
26  
27 a focus could include relaxation exercises such as deep breathing, positive self-talk  
28  
29 that focuses on control beliefs (e.g., “If I shoot accurately the goalkeeper has no  
30  
31 chance”), mental rehearsal of their PPR (imaging themselves executing a successful  
32  
33 penalty kick) or players could start to plan how they are going to celebrate with their  
34  
35 teammates. Finally, players may use this period to commence the early initiation of  
36  
37 the aiming phase of the shot by focusing on where they intend to shoot by picking a  
38  
39 location or object behind the goal that could act as a target. Such methods will help  
40  
41 players to remain focused on the processes behind accurate shooting and need to be  
42  
43 practiced during representative training exercises that simulate competitive situations  
44  
45 as closely as possible.  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 *At the penalty mark:* During this final stage the biggest source of stress for  
52  
53 the penalty taker is worry about the performance of the goalkeeper and how this may  
54  
55 negatively affect their chances of success (Jordet and Elferink-Gemser, 2012).  
56

57  
58 However, players that have utilised our interventions, that actively attempt to  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 enhance perceptions of contingency and competence, should feel less outcome  
4 uncertainty and more confidence in their ability to hit the optimal areas of the goal.  
5

6  
7 This should help players to take their time in following their PPR, trust their  
8 preparation and focus solely on the process behind hitting an accurate shot.  
9

10  
11  
12 *After the shot:* After scoring, players should demonstrate celebratory  
13 behaviours in the direction of their teammates (Moll et al., 2012). Such behaviours  
14 are likely to elicit positive emotions that may help other teammates or they may elicit  
15 negative emotions that may hinder the opposition. Practical ways to achieve this  
16 would be to ask successful takers to display overt celebratory behaviours towards  
17 their goalkeeper (who is to face the next kick) or with the other penalty takers on  
18 their team – particularly with the player who is next in line to shoot.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## 29 **Conclusion**

30  
31  
32 Throughout this article we have synthesised research evidence that shows  
33 that anxiety influences the non-verbal behaviour of penalty takers and that this  
34 negatively affects performance. We have outlined research that shows that anxiety  
35 creates an attentional bias towards the goalkeeper, disrupting aiming behaviour and  
36 negatively affecting shooting accuracy. Finally, we have discussed findings which  
37 state that the intensity of anxiety experienced during shootout competition is  
38 dynamic in nature and changes as the situation unfolds. As a result we have provided  
39 a list of task-specific recommendations that are structured around the dynamic nature  
40 of emotions that players are likely to experience during each phase of the shootout  
41 and which can be implemented or adapted to suit the individual needs of the player.  
42  
43 These recommendations are designed to help applied professionals to optimise the  
44 psychological preparation for this scenario with the overall aim of helping players to  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 take back control of the situation. We believe that structured, and representative,  
4  
5 practice is the key to helping players to prepare for one of the most highly anxious  
6  
7 situations in world sport. It is only in the absence of such preparation that the  
8  
9 'lottery' truly begins.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review Only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Acknowledgements**

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

For Peer Review Only

## References

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Bar-Eli, M., & Azar, O. H. (2009). Penalty kicks in soccer: An empirical analysis of  
7  
8 shooting strategies and goalkeepers' preferences. *Soccer & Society, 10*, 183-  
9  
10 191. doi: 10.1080/14660970802601654  
11
- 12  
13 Bar-Eli, M., & Friedman, Z. (1988). Psychological stress in soccer: The case of  
14  
15 penalty kicks. *Soccer Journal, 33*, 49-52  
16  
17
- 18  
19 Binsch, O., Oudejans, R. R. D., Bakker, F. C., & Savelsbergh, G. J. P. (2010). Ironic  
20  
21 effects and final target fixation in a penalty shooting task. *Human Movement*  
22  
23 *Science, 29*, 277-288. doi: 10.1016/j.humov.2009.12.002  
24  
25
- 26  
27 Cheng, W. N. K., Hardy, L., & Woodman, T. (2011). Predictive validity of a three-  
28  
29 dimensional model of performance anxiety in the context of tae-kwon-do.  
30  
31 *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 33*(1) 40-53.  
32  
33
- 34  
35 Dicks, M., Button, C., & Davids, K. W. (2010). Availability of advance visual  
36  
37 information constrains association-football goalkeeping performance during  
38  
39 penalty kicks. *Perception, 39*(8), 1111-1124.  
40  
41
- 42  
43 Franks, I. M., & Hanvey, T. (1997). Cues for goalkeepers: High-tech methods used  
44  
45 to measure penalty shot response. *Soccer Journal, 30*-38.  
46  
47
- 48  
49 Furley, P., Dicks, M., Stendtko, F., & Memmert, D. (2012). "Get it out the way. The  
50  
51 wait's killing me." hastening and hiding during soccer penalty kicks.  
52  
53 *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 13*(4), 454-465.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Hanton, S., O'Brien, M., & Mellalieu, S. D. (2003). Individual differences, perceived  
4 control and competitive trait anxiety. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 26(1). 39-  
5 55.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Jordet, G. (2009). Why do English players fail in soccer penalty shootouts? A study  
11 of team status, self-regulation, and choking under pressure. *Journal of Sports*  
12 *Sciences*, 27, 97-106.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 Jordet, G. (2010). Choking under pressure as self-destructive behaviour. In A.  
19 Nicholls (Ed), *Coping in Sport: Theory, Methods, and Related Constructs* (pp  
20 239-259). New York: Nova Science Publishers  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 Jordet, G. & Elferink-Gemser, M.T. (2012). Stress, coping, and emotions on the  
27 world stage: The experience of participating in a major soccer tournament  
28 penalty shootout. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 24, 73-91.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34 Jordet, G., Elferink-Gemser, M. T., Lemmink, K. A. P. M., & Visscher, C. (2006).  
35 The "Russian roulette" of soccer?: Perceived control and anxiety in a major  
36 tournament penalty shootout. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 37,  
37 281-298.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 Jordet, G., Hartman, E., & Sigmundstad, E. (2009). Temporal links to performing  
44 under pressure in international soccer penalty shootouts. *Psychology of Sport*  
45 *and Exercise*, 10, 621–627. McGarry, T., & Franks, I.M. (2000). On winning  
46 a penalty shootout in soccer. *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 18, 401-409.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53 Jordet, G., Hartman, E., Visscher, C., & Lemmink, K. A. P. M. (2007). Kicks from  
54 the penalty mark in soccer: The roles of stress, skill, and fatigue for kick  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 outcomes. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 25, 121-129. doi:  
4  
5 10.1080/02640410600624020  
6  
7

8 Land, M. F. (2009). Vision, eye movements, and natural behavior. *Visual*  
9  
10 *Neuroscience*, 26, 51–62.  
11

12  
13 McGarry, T., & Franks, I.M. (2000). On winning a penalty shootout in soccer.  
14  
15 *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 18, 401-409.  
16  
17

18 Miller, R. (1996). Shooter vs. keeper: A tense battle. Games are won and lost by  
19  
20 penalty kicks and PK tiebreakers. *Soccer Journal*, 41, 59–62.  
21  
22

23  
24 Memmert, D., Hüttermann, S., Hagemann, N., Loffing, F., & Strauss, B. (2013).  
25  
26 Dueling in the penalty box: evidence-based recommendations on how  
27  
28 shooters and goalkeepers can win penalty shootouts in soccer. *International*  
29  
30 *Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 6(1), 209-229.  
31  
32

33  
34 Moll, T., Jordet, G., & Pepping, G. J. (2010). Emotional contagion in soccer penalty  
35  
36 shootouts: Celebration of individual success is associated with ultimate team  
37  
38 success. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 28(9), 983-992.  
39  
40 doi:10.1080/02640414.2010.484068  
41  
42

43  
44 Otten, M. (2009). Choking vs. clutch: A study of sport performance under pressure.  
45  
46 *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 31, 583–601.  
47  
48

49 Oudejans, R. R., & Pijpers, J. R. (2009). Training with anxiety has a positive effect  
50  
51 on expert perceptual–motor performance under pressure. *The Quarterly*  
52  
53 *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 62(8), 1631-1647.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Oudejans, R. R., & Pijpers, J. R. (2010). Training with mild anxiety may prevent  
4 choking under higher levels of anxiety. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*,  
5 *11*(1), 44-50.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 Skinner, E. A. (1996). A guide to constructs of control. *Journal of Personality &*  
12 *Social Psychology*, *71*, 549–570. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.71.3.549  
13  
14  
15  
16 Van Der Kamp, J. (2006). A field simulation study of the effectiveness of penalty  
17 kick strategies in soccer: late alterations of kick direction increase errors and  
18 reduce accuracy. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *24*(5), 467-477.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 Van der Kamp, J. (2011). Exploring the merits of perceptual anticipation in the  
25 soccer penalty kick. *Motor Control*, *15*, 342-358.  
26  
27  
28  
29 Vickers, J. N. (2007). *Perception, cognition and decision training: The quiet eye in*  
30 *action*. Champaign IL: Human Kinetics.  
31  
32  
33  
34 Wilson, M. R., & Richards, H. (2011). Putting it together: skills for pressure  
35 performance. In D. Collins, A. Button, & H. Richards (Eds), *Performance*  
36 *psychology* (pp. 337-360). Edinburgh, UK: Elsevier.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42 Wilson, M. R., Wood, G., & Vine, S. J. (2009). Anxiety, attentional control and  
43 performance impairment in penalty kicks. *Journal of Sport & Exercise*  
44 *Psychology*, *31*, 761-775.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 Wood, G., & Wilson, M. R. (2010a). Gaze behaviour and shooting strategies in  
50 football penalty kicks: Implication of a ‘keeper-dependent approach.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Wood, G., & Wilson, M. R. (2010b) A moving goalkeeper distracts penalty takers  
4  
5 and impairs shooting accuracy. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 29, 937-946. doi:  
6  
7 10.1080/02640414.2010.495995  
8  
9

10  
11 Wood, G., & Wilson, M. R. (2011). Quiet-eye training for soccer penalty kicks.  
12  
13 *Cognitive Processing*, 12, 257-266. doi: 10.1007/s10339-011-0393-0  
14  
15

16 Wood, G., & Wilson, M. R. (2012). Quiet-eye training, perceived control and  
17  
18 performing under pressure. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 13, 721–728.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60