



HAL
open science

Exploring to learn and learning to explore

Guillaume Hacques, John Komar, Matt Dicks, Ludovic Seifert

► **To cite this version:**

Guillaume Hacques, John Komar, Matt Dicks, Ludovic Seifert. Exploring to learn and learning to explore. *Psychological Research*, 2021, 85 (4), pp.1367-1379. 10.1007/s00426-020-01352-x . hal-04064193

HAL Id: hal-04064193

<https://hal.science/hal-04064193>

Submitted on 22 May 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 Running Head: Exploring to Learn and Learning to Explore

2
3
4
5
6 Exploring to Learn and Learning to Explore

7
8
9
10 Guillaume Hacques¹, John Komar², Matt Dicks³ and Ludovic Seifert¹

11 ¹ Center for the Study and the Transformation of Physical Activities (CETAPS
12 EA3832), Faculty of Sport Sciences, University of Rouen Normandy, UNIROUEN, Mont-
13 Saint-Aignan, France.

14 ² National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore,
15 Singapore.

16 ³ School of Sport, Health and Exercise Science, University of Portsmouth, United
17 Kingdom.

18
19 **Corresponding author:**

20 Guillaume Hacques, CETAPS Laboratory (EA3832), University of Rouen Normandy,
21 Boulevard André Siegfried, 76821 Mont-Saint-Aignan cedex, France

22 E-mail: guillaume.hacques@univ-rouen.fr

23
24 **Accepted for publication in Psychological Research** on 27th April 2020

25

2
3 **Abstract**

4 In respect to ecological psychology processes of attunement and calibration, this
5 critical review focusses on how exploratory behaviors may contribute to skilled perception
6 and action, with particular attention to sport. Based on the theoretical insights of Gibson
7 (1966) and Reed (1996), exploratory and performatory actions have been differentiated in
8 numerous experiments to study the perception of opportunities of action. The distinction
9 between exploratory and performatory actions has informed the study of infant behavior in
10 developmental psychology. In the current article, we highlight limitations with this distinction
11 in the study of sports performers. We propose that a dynamic view of exploratory behavior
12 would reveal how individuals develop exploratory activity that generates information about
13 the fit between environmental properties and action capabilities. In this aim, practitioners
14 should: (i) give learners the opportunity to safely develop exploratory behaviors even when
15 they act outside their action boundary; and (ii) guide learners to search for more reliable
16 information to develop exploratory behaviors that would enhance the transfer of skills to
17 various performance contexts.

18
19 **Keywords:** Skill acquisition, Exploration, Ecological psychology, Perception, Action

Introduction

Exploration is the continuous and active process through which individuals reveal and pick up information during the control of action (E. J. Gibson 1988; J. J. Gibson 1979/2015). From an ecological psychology perspective, information resides as patterns in ambient energy arrays (e.g., optical, acoustic, mechanical) that specify the state of the relation between the environment and the individual. From this point of view, exploration underpins the relation between information and movement as the energy arrays are structured by the properties of the environment and the motion of the individual (J. J. Gibson 1979/2015; Mantel, Stoffregen, Campbell, and Bardy 2015; Stoffregen, Mantel, and Bardy 2017). When the information specifies relevant individual-environment relations, individuals perceive opportunities for action, that is, affordances (J. J. Gibson 1979/2015). Said otherwise, through exploratory perceptual-motor activity, individuals reveal energy arrays leading to the pickup of information about affordances that is used to adapt to the environment (E. J. Gibson, 1988).

Authors have tended to differentiate between exploratory and performatory actions (J.J. Gibson, 1966; E. J. Gibson, 1988; Reed, 1996). An underlying proposal has been that exploratory action reveals information that is subsequently utilized in the control of performatory action (e.g., Kretch and Adolph, 2016). Exploration is often considered as a period of information-gathering to satisfy an intention (Adolph, Eppler, Marin, Weise, & Wechsler Clearfield, 2000; E. J. Gibson, 1988; Kretch & Adolph, 2017). In this context, exploratory and performatory actions are often differentiated as the former is thought to precede the latter in development. Whilst such distinction has been meaningful in the developmental psychology literature when applied to other domains of psychology such as expert perceptual-motor control in sport, this has led to the development of methods that separate the reciprocity of perception-action (e.g., McGuckian, Cole, Chalkley, Jordet, and Pepping 2018). Indeed, a contemporary view of perception-action, that builds on James

1 Gibson's (1966) original perspective is that the process of visual perception is context-
2 dependent and relative to the body and action capabilities of the performer (Wagman &
3 Morgan, 2010). Although this view is well-established in ecological psychology, this
4 important proposal is often omitted in the sports skill acquisition literature, particularly during
5 intervention studies aimed at examining the role of exploratory movements in learning.

6 Given that a central tenet of ecological psychology is that perception is embedded in
7 the continuous flow of action and vice-versa, in the current manuscript, we aim to develop a
8 view of exploratory and performatory action that reflects an embodied-embedded approach to
9 skilled behavior (Richardson, Shockley, Fajen, Riley, & Turvey, 2008). We argue that
10 studying the dynamics of changes in exploration during learning could provide valuable
11 information on how perception-action is developed, with specific consideration of how
12 learners become more skilled at perceiving and acting in relation to affordances with respect
13 to sport-specific behaviors (Ludovic Seifert, Komar, Araújo, & Davids, 2016). Central to this
14 view is an affordance-based control framework (Fajen, 2005), which proposes two learning
15 processes in the development of perception and action: (i) attunement and (ii) calibration.
16 First, attunement is characterized by the differentiation of information that supports the
17 pickup of more reliable patterns in the energy arrays to guide action (Fajen & Devaney, 2006;
18 J. J. Gibson, 1966). Second, calibration consists in finding an appropriate scaling between
19 information and action capabilities (Fajen, 2007). Indeed, as individuals' action capabilities
20 change over time (e.g., action capabilities can change with fatigue), recalibration facilitates
21 continuous adaptation that supports the visual control of action (Fajen, 2005, 2007). Despite
22 the large body of literature discussing the importance of exploration to develop perception-
23 action, exploratory activity is rarely studied in sports skill acquisition. To address this gap in
24 the literature, we propose the need to examine the exploratory actions used to generate and

1 scale reliable information for affordances, to better understand “how” individuals become
2 more skilled during learning.

3 In sum, this critical review will focus on how exploratory activity can give rise to
4 perception-action during the acquisition of perceptual-motor skills in sport. We will first
5 consider the methods used in ecological psychology to investigate exploration. Although this
6 distinction appears insightful to understand the development of action systems (Reed, 1996),
7 we propose that these methods cannot be applied to all performance contexts. Indeed, in many
8 complex sporting environments such as climbing (L. Seifert et al., 2018), exploratory and
9 performatory actions can appear tightly linked in tasks where performers need to continuously
10 adjust their relationship with the environment to guide on-going and future activity. Second,
11 we consider the dynamics of exploratory activity during learning. In studies of expert sport
12 populations, it is often implied that the amount of exploration decreases as performers become
13 more attuned to the relevant properties of the environment (Mann, Williams, Ward, & Janelle,
14 2007). We will discuss such assumption and present exploration as a process that, under
15 appropriate practice conditions, supports attunement and calibration, thus, continuously
16 revealing the appropriate fit between the environment and the perceiver’s action capabilities.
17 Finally, we will present some challenges and considerations to design interventions where
18 individuals can learn to explore. Rather than learning a specific movement, we propose that
19 skill acquisition should focus on how performers could develop exploratory behavior: (i) that
20 is useful in various performance contexts; and (ii) that enables maintenance of active
21 prospective control during performatory activity.

22 **Explore to Reach a Task-Goal: Exploration and Performance**

23 **Exploratory Actions: Explore to Perform**

24 James Gibson (1966) proposed that perception is an active process that does not rely
25 on passive sensory units, but on the activity of perceptual systems. Gibson differentiated

1 exploratory (or investigative) activity achieved by these perceptual systems from the
2 performatory (or executive) activity achieved by the action systems. Following Gibson's
3 initial work, Reed (1996) further differentiated exploratory and performatory activities to
4 understand the development of functional systems, which are the systems that enable
5 individuals to use resources in their environment to achieve their goal. Reed (1996) proposed
6 that exploratory actions are those that are aimed at scanning the environment for information
7 whereas performatory actions are those that alter the substances and surfaces of the
8 environment. This distinction is useful as animals, especially those like humans, with a head
9 differentiated from the rest of the body, are able to scan their environment for information
10 while acting in their environment. For example, during bipedal locomotion, humans have the
11 capacity to maintain a prospective control in locomotion or to initiate other activity (Reed,
12 1996).

13 The differentiation between performatory and exploratory activity is in line with
14 perspectives in developmental psychology (E. J. Gibson, 1988). Eleanor Gibson differentiated
15 performatory actions from exploratory actions that are information-gathering, to understand
16 how infants discover opportunities for action. For instance, E. J. Gibson et al. (1987)
17 measured the visual and haptic exploration of infants in a task where they had to traverse
18 different surfaces. Exploratory activity was defined as the period before initiation of
19 locomotion on the manipulated surface (i.e., when the infants were leaving a starting
20 platform). This study showed that the duration of haptic and visual exploration depended on
21 the properties of the surfaces (whether they were rigid or not) and on the mode of locomotion
22 that was characteristic of the infants' developmental stage. Thus, this distinction of
23 performatory and exploratory activities appears valuable to understand how infants developed
24 their action systems and perceive new affordances. For example, in a series of experiments,
25 the exploratory activity of children of different ages and abilities were studied in a task

1 requiring them to approach a slope to study whether they perceived the slope as “crossable” or
2 not (Adolph, 1995; Adolph, Bertenthal, Boker, Goldfield, & Gibson, 1997; Adolph, Eppler, &
3 Gibson, 1993; Adolph et al., 2000; Adolph & Eppler, 1998). In these studies, all actions
4 (whether visual or haptic) that occurred before each child passed the edge of the slope were
5 considered as exploratory actions. The possibilities of performatory actions are minimal in
6 young infants as their action systems are not well developed (E. J. Gibson, 1988). Therefore,
7 the distinction between exploratory and performatory action enables description of the links
8 between infants’ activity and the attunement of their perceptual-motor system (Adolph et al.,
9 1993; Eppler, Adolph, & Weiner, 1996; E. J. Gibson et al., 1987).

10 The distinction between exploratory and performatory actions in developmental
11 psychology has motivated studies in the sport of climbing that have investigated the effects of
12 anxiety on affordance perception (Nieuwenhuys, Pijpers, Oudejans, & Bakker, 2008; Pijpers,
13 Oudejans, & Bakker, 2005; Pijpers, Oudejans, Bakker, & Beek, 2006). In these works, the
14 visual fixations and hand movements of climbers have been categorized as being either
15 exploratory or performatory based on the actions utilized to complete the climb. If the action
16 led to a displacement of the climber on the route, it was deemed performatory, otherwise the
17 action was deemed exploratory. Results showed that both exploratory and performatory visual
18 (eye) and haptic (hand) movements increased in high anxiety conditions, suggesting that the
19 climbers performed at a level equivalent to novice performance (Pijpers, 2006). Further to
20 climbing studies, researchers have also differentiated between exploratory and performatory
21 actions in soccer. Specifically, in these works, studies have measured visual exploratory
22 activity (VEA), separate from performatory actions (Jordet, 2005; Pocock, Dicks, Thelwell,
23 Chapman, & Barker, 2019), with VEA defined as head and body movements that are used to
24 scan the environment (pitch, teammates, and opponents) prior to receiving the ball, whereas
25 performatory actions are those observed once a player is in possession of the ball. The

1 differentiation between VEA and performatory action has led to the development of
2 experimental methods that have studied VEA in response to video images presented across
3 multiple screens, without any game-specific performatory action (McGuckian et al., 2019;
4 van Andel, McGuckian, Chalkley, Cole, & Pepping, 2019). Thus, a methodological
5 consequence of creating a dichotomy between exploratory and performatory actions is that
6 researchers have studied perception and action as two separate processes, which compromises
7 the theoretical view of Gibson (1966). Similarly, in climbing, the differentiation of
8 exploratory and performatory hand movements has been questioned as in many instances, it is
9 possible that movements categorized as being exploratory may actually be “failed”
10 performatory movements (Orth, Button, Davids, & Seifert, 2016). For instance, a climber may
11 have tried to use a handhold, but because the handhold depth was not as expected, he/she may
12 have only touched the handhold, released it, and then used another hold. Thus, even “failed”
13 performatory actions may have temporary performance consequences, they remain important
14 in the process of learning to differentiate information (van Dijk & Bongers, 2014). Thus,
15 during practice, the entire activity (i.e., both exploratory and performatory actions) contributes
16 to their perceptual learning.

17 In summary, actions have tended to be categorized according to their outcomes: if they
18 enable the performer to reach the task-goal they are performatory actions, otherwise, if they
19 lead to the discovery of available information and preparing the performatory actions, they are
20 related to exploratory activity. Thus, exploratory activity relates to actions that aim at
21 gathering or scanning information before the initiation of a performatory action. Considering
22 the reciprocity of perception and action, the study of prospective control with the distinction
23 between “action to perceive” (exploratory activity) and “action to realize the intention”
24 (performatory action) appears to be in contradiction to the unity of perception-action.

25 **Exploration is Continuous and Multimodal: Exploring is Performing**

1 **Exploration Never Ceases**

2 As considered in the previous section, the differentiation between exploratory and
3 performatory actions has contributed important understanding in developmental studies
4 (Adolph, 1995; Adolph et al., 1997, 2000; Adolph & Eppler, 1998), where infants face the
5 task of perceiving whether to act or not (e.g., walking down slopes or walking over an
6 unexpected surface). However, in numerous sports activities, performers are in continual need
7 of adapting their ongoing activity and are, therefore, unable to necessarily stop and “explore”
8 their environment. For example, performance in pole vaulting necessitates that athletes adjust
9 the pole position whilst running at high-speed to accurately point the tip of the pole to the
10 vault box, and then prospectively control when and how to move relative to the pole to
11 convert maximal kinetic energy into gravitational potential energy while avoiding the bar.
12 Indeed, performance environments are often dynamic and require to continuously perceive the
13 opportunities for action relative to ongoing events (Fajen, 2005; Fajen, Riley, & Turvey,
14 2008).

15 The ability to anticipate future states of the individual-environment relation is a
16 characteristic of all animals, especially skilled performers in sport (Araújo, Hristovski, Seifert,
17 Carvalho, & Davids, 2017). For instance, in a series of recent climbing studies, Seifert and
18 colleagues have found that performers do not appear to perceive the actions enabled by each
19 separate hold during an ascent, but rather, they perceive a chain of movements offered by the
20 properties of the holds and layout on the wall (L. Seifert et al., 2018; Ludovic Seifert, Cordier,
21 Orth, Courtine, & Croft, 2017). Moreover, in dynamic environments such as soccer games,
22 players may act by anticipating a chain of actions to score or defend, but they continuously
23 need to probe for potential changes in the ball, teammates, and opponents’ movements that
24 could affect the viability of their chain of actions (Dicks, Araújo, & van Der Kamp, 2019).
25 The concept of nested affordances, which emphasizes that seemingly discrete behaviors are

1 better understood as a continuous flow of actions distributed across different temporal and
2 spatial scales, may, therefore, help to understand how individuals efficiently chain their
3 actions to achieve a task-goal.

4 The concept of nested affordances was further developed by Wagman (2012), who
5 demonstrated the effect of practice on the estimation of reachability, revealing that affordance
6 perception depends on the future states by which a behavior will occur. Specifically,
7 Wagman, Cialdella and Stoffregen (2018) proposed that affordances can be nested in a
8 hierarchy that consists of three levels: the “Why” level, which represents the task goal; the
9 “What” level, which represents the specific behaviors needed to achieve the task goal; and the
10 “How” level, which represents the various means available to achieve the task goal (Wagman
11 et al., 2018; Wagman & Morgan, 2010). For illustration, Wagman (2012) showed that
12 individuals could estimate their maximum touching height (the “Why” level) when they were
13 asked to reach a suspended object (the “What?” level) by (i) standing on toes or standing with
14 heels touching the ground, (a first “How?” level), and/or by (ii) using (or not using) a tool (a
15 second “How?” level). These results indicate that individuals are able to perceive the future
16 state of their action capabilities even when they are about to perform a series of nested
17 actions. Therefore, there is not an exploratory action that dictates what and how to do the next
18 performatory action, but exploration enables performers to keep on accurately perceiving and
19 acting.

20 In accordance with the nested affordances perspective, we propose that exploration
21 could also be considered as an aspect of performatory activity. For instance, in a team sport
22 such as soccer, the player in possession is not the only sportsperson on the field “performing”.
23 All the other players are also acting in such a way that they seek to probe future actions, and
24 at the same time, they move to create opportunities for passes or to restrict opportunities
25 (depending on whether their team is in possession of the ball or not). Thus, performers in

1 team sports are constantly scanning, probing and acting in their environment in such a way
2 that the differentiation between exploration and performatory periods is ambiguous.
3 Moreover, when a performer tries to dribble past his/her opponent, he/she may use deception
4 to influence his/her opponent and guide future actions. That is, as the player is revealing and
5 picking up information, he/she is also generating information. Thus, expertise may reside in
6 the continuous exploratory activity of performers that enables them to maintain an active
7 prospection of the available information to act effectively (Pocock et al., 2019). In sum, the
8 prospective control of action occurs through the information-movement coupling, which
9 enables to continuously adjust the relation between individual and environment to achieve the
10 task-goal (Araújo et al., 2017). On-going actions reveal information that contribute to
11 perception of affordances related to this action (Franchak, van der Zalm, & Adolph, 2010).

12 **Exploration is multimodal**

13 The continuity of exploratory activity is also dependent on multimodal perception. An
14 important emphasis of James Gibson (1966) was that the environment is not perceived
15 passively in which our actions are responses to stimuli, but that we actively perceive the
16 world through the actions of the different perceptual systems. However, a multimodal account
17 of exploration is lacking in the study of sport skill acquisition. Notably, visual exploration has
18 largely been studied using video-based laboratory tasks where the opportunities for action are
19 severely compromised and not representative of complex sport environments (Mann et al.,
20 2007; McGuckian, Cole, & Pepping, 2018). Indeed, results have revealed that the gaze
21 behaviors utilized by soccer goalkeepers when attempting to save penalty kicks change as a
22 consequence of both the environment (i.e., video presentation vs. real-time opponent) and the
23 response requirements (e.g., simulated movement vs. diving to save the kick) (Dicks, Button,
24 & Davids, 2010).

1 Comparable to the study of sport performers, the role of exploration in the perception
2 of affordances has also been studied in laboratory tasks, with restrictions placed on participant
3 behavior. For instance, Pepping and Li (2008) investigated the role of visual and haptic
4 exploration on the perception of maximum jumping height from different surfaces. One group
5 of participants was allowed to explore visually and haptically (i.e., they were invited to jump
6 on the different surfaces) whereas another group was limited to visual exploration. Although
7 the haptic exploration group could access more information, they did not improve perception
8 of their jumping capabilities. Rather, they overestimated their capabilities, whereas the
9 participants in the visual exploration group underestimated them. Thus, the results indicate
10 that limiting the perceptual systems during exploration, does not appear to support accurate
11 attunement or calibration. Indeed, methods that have constrained the modes of exploration,
12 have also been used to study the perception of “sit-ability” under different leg lengths (Mark,
13 Balliett, Craver, Douglas, & Fox, 1990), gap “cross-ability” (Mark, Jiang, King, & Paasche,
14 1999), the “catchableness” of fly balls (Oudejans, Michaels, Bakker, & Dolné, 1996) and the
15 minimum passing height of a barrier when using a wheelchair (Yu, Bardy, & Stoffregen,
16 2011; Yu & Stoffregen, 2012). In these studies, the limitations on the permitted actions with
17 the different perceptual systems (e.g., notably the haptic system and visual system) has been
18 shown to negatively affect the perceptual judgements of participants in comparison to
19 conditions where they are able to freely explore. Such findings support a multimodal account
20 of exploration and as such, examination of the temporal organization of different exploratory
21 actions provides the opportunity to better understand how multimodal exploration can give
22 rise to skilled perception-action.

23 Research conducted in the developmental psychology literature has highlighted the
24 necessity of multimodal exploration by showing that the information picked-up through the
25 different perceptual systems is used to support accurate affordance perception. For example,

1 in the “walk on slope” experiment, Adolph and Eppler (1998) revealed that infants can obtain
2 visual information about depth and slant, whilst haptic exploration is required to get
3 information about friction. Furthermore, Adolph, Eppler, Marin, Weise, and Wechsler
4 Clearfield (2000) described the exploratory activity of infants during the “walk on slope” task
5 as a sequential process composed of three modes of exploration: exploration from a distance
6 (e.g., looking at the slope); exploration via direct contact (e.g., touching the slope surface);
7 and exploration of alternative means (e.g., crawling instead of walking). Following this idea
8 of a sequential organization of exploration, Kretch and Adolph (2017) proposed that the mode
9 and organization of exploration in space and time is relative to its cost in terms of effort, time,
10 and injury risk. According to this hypothesis, individuals use the exploration modes following
11 a ramping-up organization process. For instance, haptic exploration is a risky form of
12 exploration because it involves direct contact with an unknown surface, thus, it is only used to
13 obtain new information following less exposed forms of exploration such as visual
14 exploration that can be achieved from a distance and, therefore, with limited risks. Thus,
15 exploratory activity appears to be organized in space and time when individuals search for
16 opportunities for actions. A closer look at how haptic, motor, and visual exploration are linked
17 during tasks is required to reveal the organization and changes in organization of exploration
18 to maintain prospective control during action.

19 Stoffregen, Mantel, and Bardy (2017) reinforced the importance of multimodal
20 exploration by proposing that perception should be considered as emerging from a single
21 perceptual system rather than from different perceptual systems. This idea follows the global
22 array hypothesis, which proposes that the senses function as a single unit during (active)
23 perception (Stoffregen & Bardy, 2001). Studies have shown that exploratory activity can
24 reveal higher order information to perceive the absolute distance from a target object, which is
25 composed of optic flow patterns and haptic/gravito-inertial stimulation (Mantel, Bardy, &

1 Stoffregen, 2010; Mantel et al., 2015). These results argue in favor of looking for organization
2 in the different dimensions of exploratory activity rather than in isolated perceptual systems.
3 For instance, affordance perception depends on information exploited by the eyes, head and
4 whole-body in motion, as studies have shown that eye-height information is important for
5 calibration of the perceptual system to perceive whether one can sit on a seat or fit through a
6 doorway (Franchak et al., 2010; Mark, 1987; Mark et al., 1990). The information-movement
7 couplings utilized during exploration may, therefore, provide individuals with the ability to
8 act purposefully to reveal information. Subsequently, the usefulness of the revealed
9 information depends on the organization of individuals' exploratory actions. Thus,
10 exploratory activity is not only an information-gathering activity that occurs before the start of
11 performatory actions, but it is embedded throughout the entirety of a performer's activity.
12 Exploration is multimodal as individuals do not perceive the environment through isolated
13 perceptual systems, but as a whole. From this whole, individuals must find functional patterns
14 to discover affordances, which is made possible through attunement and calibration of the
15 perceptual-motor system. But how can performers become sensitive to properties of their
16 performance environment? How does exploration evolve with practice and experience in a
17 task?

18 **Exploration During Practice: Learning to Reveal Information**

19 **Dynamics of Exploration: Toward Less Exploration with Practice?**

20 When exploration is investigated as a sequence of information-gathering actions,
21 research has shown that exploratory activity tends to decrease with practice, and performatory
22 activity also decreases as individuals attune to more reliable information and become more
23 skilled in the task (e.g., Seifert, Boulanger, Orth, and Davids 2015). Quantification of
24 exploratory actions has been studied during climbing, within which participants were
25 instructed to climb three different routes - with different orientations of handholds – as

1 fluently as possible (Orth, Davids, & Seifert, 2018; L. Seifert et al., 2015). In these studies,
2 the handhold orientation in the climbing route and experience of participants in the task
3 impacted the amount of exploration of climbers. Specifically, the number of exploratory
4 actions decreased with practice and increased with the complexity of behavior specified by
5 the climbing routes. Similar findings have been observed in the development of tool creation
6 (van Dijk & Bongers, 2014). In this study, van Dijk and Bongers differentiated between
7 distinct periods during task completion: (i) a visual phase; (ii) a manual and visual exploration
8 phase; and (iii) a construction phase. The first two phases were considered as exploratory
9 activity while the construction phase was related to performatory activity. The distinction
10 between the exploratory and performatory periods was defined relative to the initiation of a
11 movement that was aimed at achieving the task (i.e., to create and use a tool with the pieces
12 provided). The duration of the two exploratory periods decreased with practice, whilst actions
13 during these phases were found to be more goal-directed, as the actions were oriented towards
14 constructing the final tool. The authors concluded that actions became more goal-directed
15 with the attunement of the participants to their environment and the discovery of new
16 possibilities for action. In sum, these findings suggest that the amount of exploration
17 decreases as the performers become better attuned to relevant information about affordances.

18 However, focusing analysis solely on the amount of exploration may be misleading.
19 For example, Wagman, Shockley, Riley and Turvey (2001) examined how the accuracy of
20 participants' estimations of the width and height of different objects differed following
21 periods of haptic exploration completed under different modes of practice (i.e., with or
22 without knowledge of results). Results revealed that irrespective of the feedback received,
23 exploration time and exploration complexity (e.g., randomness in hand movements)
24 decreased, which suggests that exploration decreased and gained in goal-directedness (cf. van
25 Dijk and Bongers 2014). Nevertheless, attunement did not occur for the groups without

1 knowledge of results; in this case, the decrease in exploration time was not associated with
2 improved performance in the size estimation of objects. This finding is in line with infant
3 locomotion studies, which have reported that neither the amount nor the type of exploration
4 predicts motor decisions (Adolph et al., 2000; Joh & Adolph, 2006; Kretch & Adolph, 2017).
5 Therefore, an increase in the effectiveness of exploration cannot be explained solely through
6 the measurement of the quantity of exploration; a measure that accounts for the accuracy of
7 perception is required.

8 The literature considered in this section suggests that individuals who become
9 successful in a task do not necessarily decrease the quantity of exploration over time. Rather,
10 it appears that successful exploration reveals the opportunities for action that fit both an
11 individual's action capabilities and properties of the environment. Thus, successful
12 exploration guides the pick-up of reliable information for task accomplishment; that is,
13 successful exploration is a consequence of increasing accuracy rather than decreasing
14 quantity. Thus, we argue in the following sections that when studying the perceptual learning
15 processes of attunement and of calibration, it is more insightful to investigate changes in
16 performers' exploration during practice rather than the volume of exploration.

17 **Explore to Reveal Reliable Information: Differentiation of Information**

18 Perceptual learning studies have demonstrated that, with practice, novices can learn to
19 exploit more reliable informational variables through the attunement of the perceptual systems
20 (Jacobs & Michaels, 2006; Smith, Flach, Dittman, & Stanard, 2001; van der Kamp,
21 Savelsbergh, & Smeets, 1997). To better understand the relation between exploration during
22 learning and task achievement, an important question is whether the changes in the pick-up of
23 information are a consequence of changes in the mode of exploration. For instance, van Dijk
24 and Bongers (2014) observed the functional reorganization of gaze behavior with practice in
25 their tool making task. This reorganization had both an exploratory role, which led to the

1 pick-up of information about affordances, and a performatory role, which led to alterations of
2 the environment that led to the discovery of new affordances. Given the mutuality of
3 perception-action, changes in the information exploited may be assessed by the changes in the
4 way individual interacts with the environment. For example, Withagen, Kappers, Vervloed,
5 Knoors and Verhoeven (2013) investigated if sighted, and blind children and adults were
6 using the same exploratory actions to differentiate between dimensions of an object including
7 the shape, weight, volume and texture. The experimenters defined five exploratory procedures
8 that they used to code the participants' hand movements. They measured the percentage of
9 time spent using each exploratory pattern and the quality of exploration (i.e., the time needed
10 before an estimation). Results showed that specific exploratory patterns were necessary to
11 estimate some dimensions of the objects and that the difference between sighted and blind
12 participants was not a result of the specific exploratory pattern utilized but in the quality of
13 exploration (i.e., blind participants needed less time to respond). With practice, participants
14 learnt to differentiate three out of four object dimensions (i.e., their shape, texture and volume
15 but not their weight), which illustrated that practice led to the detection of more reliable
16 information. Thus, the novice participants needed to find an adequate means of exploration to
17 interact with the objects to achieve the task and, as such, they learnt how to explore.

18 Wagman (2012) pointed out that changes in exploratory actions can be obvious (e.g.,
19 like touching a surface to estimate its walk-ability after a fall, Joh and Adolph, 2006) or more
20 subtle (e.g., changes in head and torso motion are sufficient to judge maximum sitting height
21 when action capabilities are changed: Stoffregen, Yang, and Bardy, 2005). In accordance with
22 different contemporary learning perspectives in ecological psychology (Fajen, 2005; Jacobs &
23 Michaels, 2007), it would be important to understand whether differences exist in the modes
24 of exploration associated with changes in perceptual attunement and the calibration of action.
25 An example of an obvious change in exploratory activity was observed in a study by Joh and

1 Adolph (2006) during which, children had to walk on a path with a hidden foam pit. Results
2 showed that after falling in a trial, children increased the amount of exploration on subsequent
3 trials: they took more time before walking on the path, they changed their locomotor
4 behavior, and they increased the use of exploratory touching near the foam pit. Task
5 achievement was due to the differentiation of reliable visual information (i.e., the delineation
6 of the new ground surface), which was motivated by a fall in an earlier trial that guided
7 changes in the exploratory and locomotor activity. Exploration may lead to misperception and
8 failure in the task if the exploited information is not reliable, irrespective of the time spent
9 exploring the environment (Adolph, Marin, & Fraise, 2001). Therefore, the quantity of
10 exploration during learning should be investigated alongside the mode of exploration (i.e.,
11 how do individuals reveal information to achieve the task?) and the dynamics of exploration
12 during practice (i.e., what were the previously observed outcomes and behaviors?).

13 A recent climbing study proposed an innovative method to study the dynamics of
14 exploration during the acquisition of a complex motor skill. To describe the temporal
15 organization of exploration of climbers during practice, Seifert, Orth, Mantel, Boulanger,
16 Hérault, and Dicks (2018) defined five different climbing states: (i) looking at the route; (ii)
17 adjusting the center of mass; (iii) determining which hold to use (i.e., modifying the position
18 or orientation of the hand or foot); (iv) hold changing (i.e., grasping another hold while the
19 hip stays stationary before motion); and (v) moving the hip and at least one limb. The number
20 of times each mode was used, and their relative duration was measured for each trial during
21 practice. The authors presented the dynamics of exploration across multiple temporal levels,
22 which enabled improved understanding on the relations between exploration during learning
23 and task achievement. Their results revealed that climbers decreased the number of stationary
24 states while their climbing fluency increased, suggesting an improvement in “route finding”
25 skill, encompassing the ability to perceive a chain of movements (i.e., nested affordances) on

1 the climbing route. Such association between the dynamics of exploration and the dynamics
2 of performance highlights changes in the efficiency of an individual's exploration. The
3 analysis of the dynamics of the efficiency of the exploratory activity would also reveal if the
4 learning protocol enabled individuals to learn to explore effectively, that is by guiding
5 performers toward information about affordances relevant for the task achievement.

6 **Explore to (Re)Calibrate the Perceptual-motor System: Scaling Action to the** 7 **Information**

8 Although the previous section stressed that the exploration of performers may change
9 as they increase their sensitivity to their environment, it shouldn't be forgotten that the
10 accurate perception of affordances is grounded in the individuals' sensitivity to their action
11 capabilities (Fajen, 2007). For example, Oudejans, Michaels, Bakker, and Dolné (1996) used
12 an interception task to study the "catchableness" of a fly ball. To be perceived, this kind of
13 affordance requires that participants scale information to their body size (e.g., eye height and
14 leg length) and to their running and catching capabilities. Results revealed that participants
15 were more efficient in judging the ball "catchability" when they could move than when they
16 stood before giving their judgement. This difference was explained by the availability of
17 information about the boundaries of the participants action capabilities when they are moving,
18 which supports the view that exploration is continuous.

19 Given that action capabilities are liable to change due to motor development on a
20 longer timescale, and on a shorter timescale, due to fatigue, calibration and recalibration must
21 be continuous to accurately perceive opportunities for action (Franchak & Somoano, 2018).
22 More specifically, a change in action capabilities modifies the mapping between information
23 and action which requires recalibration, that is, to adapt the scaling of action to information
24 (van Andel, Cole, & Pepping, 2017). Moreover, Brand and de Oliveira (2017) proposed that
25 the exploration required for recalibration depends on the availability of reliable information

1 and on the magnitude of the disturbance of the action system. The authors subsequently
2 suggested that expert performers may better adapt to disturbances in their action capabilities
3 as they may have developed exploratory actions that support recalibration over a relatively
4 short timescale (Brand & de Oliveira, 2017). For example, Mantel, Stoffregen, Campbell, and
5 Bardy (2015) demonstrated that individuals could generate sufficient information about the
6 distance between themselves and an object with only a combination of eye, head and torso
7 movements. Such adaptive exploratory actions could reflect the subtle changes in exploration
8 that we previously discussed that are used to adapt perception and action to the context
9 (Wagman, 2012).

10 During development, children adopt different locomotion patterns including crawling
11 and walking due to postural milestones (e.g., learning to crawl, to walk...), which requires
12 calibration of an infant's action capabilities and contributes to the process of differentiation of
13 information (Adolph et al., 1997; Adolph & Eppler, 1998). Indeed, experiments on the slope
14 crossing task have revealed that infants in their first weeks are unable to judge risky slopes.
15 Rather, they needed weeks of locomotor experience to develop exploratory activity to
16 generate information that reveals the fit between environmental properties and their
17 capabilities (Adolph, 2008). In fact, the emergence of new coordination modes can increase
18 individual action capabilities and extend the field of possibilities that the environment offers
19 to individuals. During learning, changes in patterns of coordination used to achieve task
20 outcomes have been observed during practice (Chow, Davids, Button, & Rein, 2008; Komar,
21 Potdevin, Chollet, & Seifert, 2019; Nourrit, Delignières, Caillou, Deschamps, & Lauriot,
22 2003). These behavioral dynamics may induce the need for learners to modify their
23 exploratory activity to control their movements accurately, but it also gives to the learners the
24 chance to discover new opportunities for interaction with the environment.

1 It has been suggested that the discovery of original and functional possibilities for
2 action (i.e., individuals' creativity) may be enhanced when individuals act close to their
3 maximal action capabilities (Orth, van der Kamp, Memmert, & Savelsbergh, 2017).
4 Conversely, it has been proposed that in everyday tasks, individuals tend to stay in a safe
5 region in-between the boundaries of their action capabilities to preserve the possibility to
6 adapt their behavior (Fajen, 2005). For instance, studies show that children playing in a
7 climbing playscape stay within a safe region of their action boundaries and keep a security
8 margin when they climb (Croft, Pepping, Button, & Chow, 2018; Prieske, Withagen, Smith,
9 & Zaal, 2015). This protective behavior has also been observed in a virtual car braking task
10 where participants anticipated braking even if they could stop later (Fajen, 2005; Fajen &
11 Devaney, 2006). However, in competitive sport contexts, performers are pushed toward their
12 action boundaries. In such instances, exploratory movements (i.e., like touching a hold in a
13 climbing task to estimate its grasp-ability) may be limited so that performers are targeted in
14 their exploration to maintain a prospective control and to perceive the limits of their action
15 capabilities. For example, when attempting to save penalty kicks, soccer goalkeepers tend to
16 initiate movements to intercept the ball outside of their action boundaries (Dicks, Davids, &
17 Button, 2010). Although this late dive may not enable goalkeeper to reach for the ball if the
18 shot is highly accurate, this timing of action allowed goalkeepers to rely on more useful
19 spatial information to anticipate kick direction. Thus, methods that investigate affordance-
20 based control of action should assess the maximal action capabilities of the performers to
21 examine whether they are sensitive to their action boundaries. Also, it seems that performers
22 should explore a large range of their action capabilities during practice to develop efficient
23 exploratory activity, and acting close to their action boundaries may encourage performers to
24 find new movement solutions that would extend their maximal action capabilities and their
25 possibility of exploration.

Learning to Explore

1
2 A key emphasis of this critical review is that skill learning conditions in sports should
3 encourage the development of modes of exploration that reveal the fit between environmental
4 properties and performers' action capabilities to perceive affordances relevant for task
5 achievement. Practice conditions should: (i) lead performers to develop exploratory activity
6 that reveals more reliable information; and (ii) encompass safe environments where
7 performers can learn to explore even when they behave close to – and beyond - their current
8 maximal action boundaries. When applied to climbing, a safe environment refers to situations
9 from which the learner can escape, fallback or adapt and use a back-up plan. To test this
10 hypothesis, Seifert, Boulanger, Orth, and Davids (2015) designed three climbing routes by
11 manipulating the hold orientation and the number of available edges for grasping during
12 learning. A horizontal-edge route was designed to allow horizontal holds in which the trunk
13 faced the wall. A vertical-edge route was designed to allow vertical holds, which experienced
14 climbers were able to grasp with the side of their body toward the wall. Finally, a double-edge
15 route was designed to invite both horizontal and vertical holds. Because a route with only
16 vertical-edge holds was challenging for novice climbers, the double-edge route allowed safe
17 and functional exploration because climbers could both exploit their preexisting behavioral
18 repertoire (i.e., horizontal-hold grasping pattern with their trunk toward the wall) and explore
19 new behaviors (i.e., vertical-hold grasping with their side toward the wall). The results
20 indicate that this safe environment of practice can be useful because perceptual-motor
21 exploration appears less risky, with possible back-up and the learner is more inclined to
22 experiment in these regions (L. Seifert et al., 2015). Thus, this learning design guided the
23 exploration of learners to search for reliable information to perform the vertical-hold grasping.

24 However, research has also demonstrated that if there is insufficient variation in the
25 practice environment, learners can sometimes exploit information that does not support

1 accurate perception when they are exposed to a broader range of situations (Fajen & Devaney,
2 2006; Smith et al., 2001). To address this issue, Smeeton, Huys and Jacobs (2013), proposed a
3 novel type of intervention to guide learners' exploration to pick-up more reliable information
4 by neutralizing less useful information. More specifically, they reduced the usefulness of the
5 informational variables that were potentially used by novice tennis players to anticipate the
6 direction of their opponent's stroke by keeping constant this potential information while the
7 strike outcomes were varied. Two important findings revealed that: (i) learners exploited new
8 information if the usefulness of the initial information is reduced; and (ii) learners could
9 attune to higher order information that supported accurate perceptual-motor skill in both a
10 post-test and transfer test (in this study, the higher-order information was distributed across
11 different body parts of the opponent).

12 Variable practice has been proposed to guide learners' perceptual attunement and to
13 enhance transfer of learning (Fajen, 2005; Fajen & Devaney, 2006; Huet et al., 2011). In this
14 form of practice, less useful informational variables are varied across practice trials so that
15 learners are forced to search for new and more consistent information to guide their action.
16 Smith, Flach, Dittman, and Stanard (2001) proposed the concept of flexible attunement to
17 describe the ability of learners to rely on different informational variables according to the
18 performance context. Fajen and Devaney (2006) observed such flexible attunement while
19 comparing the effects of different variable practice conditions to perform a braking task in a
20 virtual environment. They manipulated either (or both) the stop sign radius and/or the initial
21 speed of the virtual vehicle so that the less reliable informational variables, like the expansion
22 rate of the sign would no longer be useful. Results showed that these interventions led to
23 perceptual attunement: participants learnt to rely on high order informational variables to
24 guide their actions. Similarly, Huet, Jacobs, Camachon, Missenard, Gray, and Montagne
25 (2011) created a flight simulator where the less reliable informational variables initially used

1 by novice participants were varied so that exploiting this information no longer supported
2 accurate action. Results showed that participants in the variable practice group outperformed a
3 constant practice group in a transfer test due to changes in the informational variables used to
4 guide action. Developing interventions that support flexible attunement (i.e., transfer in the
5 use of a variable to guide action) is important in sports given the variable and complex nature
6 of sport environments (Fajen et al., 2008). Dicks, Pocock, Thelwell, and van der Kamp (2017)
7 proposed a form of on-field variable practice to train goalkeepers in a penalty task. The
8 goalkeepers faced three players that started their run-up together but only one of them executed
9 the penalty on each trial. This intervention was aimed at directing the goalkeeper's attention
10 to information that emerged around the time of when the penalty taker's foot contacted the
11 ball. Compared to constant practice (i.e., facing penalty kicks from one player executing the
12 run-up and penalty), the intervention enhanced performances of goalkeeper on non-deceptive
13 penalty kicks, which may be due to a better perceptual attunement. Such intervention must be
14 developed to help learners to pick-up more reliable information about affordances, and so that
15 the exploration developed during practice can be transferred and used to achieve high
16 performances outside the training context.

17 Linking perspectives from ecological psychology to existing findings on the dynamics
18 of learning may help to better understand the transfer of perceptual-motor skills to multiple
19 contexts of performance and to inform interventions that both develop a performer's motor
20 repertoire and guide learners toward more reliable information. Indeed, a large volume of the
21 literature focusing on interventions in performance contexts is rooted in the dynamical
22 systems approach to learning (Schöner, Zanone, & Kelso, 1992). This framework has focused
23 on the effect of the interventions on coordination dynamics (i.e., the motor repertoire of the
24 learners) rather than on perceptual attunement (Chow et al., 2008, 2007; Lee, Chow, Komar,
25 Tan, & Button, 2014). Based on Bernstein's (1967) observation that practice is a form of

1 “repetition without repetition”, interventions have focused on the role of movement variability
2 to develop the adaptability of learners. For instance, training interventions such as
3 “differential learning” have proposed to add random noise to task constraints (i.e., irrelevant
4 movement components) to increase the performance of learners by discovering multiple
5 movement solutions (Schöllhorn et al., 2006; Schöllhorn, Hegen, & Davids, 2012;
6 Schöllhorn, Mayer-Kress, Newell, & Michelbrink, 2009). A question remains about the
7 qualitative nature and actual relevance of the induced variability (i.e., the random noise in the
8 task constraints). Indeed, variations in the learning contexts may encourage attunement only if
9 reliable information is available in the different learning conditions (Smeeton et al., 2013).
10 Cardis, Casadio, and Ranganathan (2018) have also pointed out that such variability may
11 increase exploration of new solutions but may adversely affect the ability to retain the learned
12 solution, thus, they questioned the threshold of variability after which variable practice
13 impairs learning.

14 In summary, learning interventions may promote the discovery of exploratory actions
15 that enhance the transfer of perceptual-motor skills. Learners should be given the opportunity
16 to safely explore and to be guided toward more reliable information for action. Reducing the
17 usefulness of the less reliable information seem to be effective in enhancing transfer of
18 learning. In this aim, the less reliable information can be neutralized or varied across practice
19 trials so that learners search for new and more reliable information for action. However, care
20 must be given to the context of practice that may limit the opportunity to interact with the
21 environment. Thus, as learning is not about accumulating information across trials but rather
22 generating and exploiting useful information for action, interventions must lead performers to
23 learn to explore rather than learning a model of skill.

24 **Conclusion**

- 1 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 21(4), 734–
2 750. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0096-1523.21.4.734>
- 3 Adolph, K. E. (2008). Learning to Move. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17(3),
4 213–218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2008.00577.x>
- 5 Adolph, K. E., Bertenthal, B. I., Boker, S. M., Goldfield, E. C., & Gibson, E. J. (1997).
6 Learning in the Development of Infant Locomotion. *Monographs of the Society for*
7 *Research in Child Development*, 62(3), i–162. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1166199>
- 8 Adolph, K. E., & Eppler, M. A. (1998). Development of Visually Guided Locomotion.
9 *Ecological Psychology*, 10(3), 303–321.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10407413.1998.9652687>
- 11 Adolph, K. E., Eppler, M. A., & Gibson, E. J. (1993). Crawling versus Walking Infants’
12 Perception of Affordances for Locomotion over Sloping Surfaces. *Child Development*,
13 64(4), 1158–1174. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1993.tb04193.x>
- 14 Adolph, K. E., Eppler, M. A., Marin, L., Weise, I. B., & Wechsler Clearfield, M. (2000).
15 Exploration in the service of prospective control. *Infant Behavior and Development*,
16 23(3–4), 441–460. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383\(01\)00052-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383(01)00052-2)
- 17 Adolph, K. E., Marin, L. M., & Fraise, F. F. (2001). Learning and exploration: Lessons from
18 infants. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 24(2), 213–214.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X01223942>
- 20 Araújo, D., Hristovski, R., Seifert, L., Carvalho, J., & Davids, K. (2017). Ecological
21 cognition: expert decision-making behaviour in sport. *International Review of Sport and*
22 *Exercise Psychology*, 12(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2017.1349826>
- 23 Bernstein, N. A. (1967). *The co-ordination and regulation of movements*. London: Pergamon
24 Press.
- 25 Brand, M. T., & de Oliveira, R. F. (2017). Recalibration in functional perceptual-motor tasks:

1 A systematic review. *Human Movement Science*, 56(November 2017), 54–70.
2 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2017.10.020>

3 Cardis, M., Casadio, M., & Ranganathan, R. (2018). High variability impairs motor learning
4 regardless of whether it affects task performance. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 119(1),
5 39–48. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00158.2017>

6 Chow, J. Y., Davids, K., Button, C., & Rein, R. (2008). Dynamics of movement patterning in
7 learning a discrete multiarticular action. *Motor Control*, 12(3), 219–240.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1123/mcj.12.3.219>

9 Chow, J. Y., Davids, K., Button, C., Shuttleworth, R., Renshaw, I., & Araújo, D. (2007). The
10 Role of Nonlinear Pedagogy in Physical Education. *Review of Educational Research*,
11 77(3), 251–278. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430305615>

12 Croft, J. L., Pepping, G.-J., Button, C., & Chow, J.-Y. (2018). Children’s perception of action
13 boundaries and how it affects their climbing behavior. *Journal of Experimental Child
14 Psychology*, 166, 134–146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2017.07.012>

15 Dicks, M., Araújo, D., & van Der Kamp, J. (2019). Perception-action for the study of
16 anticipation and decision making. In A. M. Williams & R. C. Jackson (Eds.),
17 *Anticipation and Decision Making in Sport* (pp. 181–199). Routledge.
18 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315146270-10>

19 Dicks, M., Button, C., & Davids, K. (2010). Examination of gaze behaviors under in situ and
20 video simulation task constraints reveals differences in information pickup for perception
21 and action. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 72(3), 706–720.
22 <https://doi.org/10.3758/APP.72.3.706>

23 Dicks, M., Davids, K., & Button, C. (2010). Individual differences in the visual control of
24 intercepting a penalty kick in association football. *Human Movement Science*, 29(3),
25 401–411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2010.02.008>

- 1 Dicks, M., Pocock, C., Thelwell, R., & van der Kamp, J. (2017). A Novel On-Field Training
2 Intervention Improves Novice Goalkeeper Penalty Kick Performance. *The Sport*
3 *Psychologist*, 31(2), 129–133. <https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.2015-0148>
- 4 Eppler, M. A., Adolph, K. E., & Weiner, T. (1996). The developmental relationship between
5 infants' exploration and action on slanted surfaces. *Infant Behavior and Development*,
6 19(2), 259–264. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383\(96\)90025-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383(96)90025-9)
- 7 Fajen, B. R. (2005). Perceiving Possibilities for Action: On the Necessity of Calibration and
8 Perceptual Learning for the Visual Guidance of Action. *Perception*, 34(6), 717–740.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1068/p5405>
- 10 Fajen, B. R. (2007). Affordance-based control of visually guided action. *Ecological*
11 *Psychology*, 19(4), 383–410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10407410701557877>
- 12 Fajen, B. R., & Devaney, M. C. (2006). Learning to control collisions: The role of perceptual
13 attunement and action boundaries. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human*
14 *Perception and Performance*, 32(2), 300–313. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.32.2.300)
15 1523.32.2.300
- 16 Fajen, B. R., Riley, M. A., & Turvey, M. T. (2008). Information, affordances, and the control
17 of action in sport. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 40(1), 79–107.
- 18 Franchak, J. M., & Somoano, F. A. (2018). Rate of recalibration to changing affordances for
19 squeezing through doorways reveals the role of feedback. *Experimental Brain Research*,
20 236(6), 1699–1711. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-018-5252-0>
- 21 Franchak, J. M., van der Zalm, D. J., & Adolph, K. E. (2010). Learning by doing: Action
22 performance facilitates affordance perception. *Vision Research*, 50(24), 2758–2765.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2010.09.019>
- 24 Gibson, E. J. (1988). Exploratory Behavior In The Development Of Perceiving, Acting, And
25 The Acquiring Of Knowledge. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 39(1), 1–41.

1 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.39.1.1>

2 Gibson, E. J., Riccio, G., Schmuckler, M. A., Stoffregen, T. A., Rosenberg, D., & Taormina,
3 J. (1987). Detection of the Traversability of Surfaces by Crawling and Walking Infants.
4 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 13(4), 533–
5 544. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.13.4.533>

6 Gibson, J. J. (1966). *The senses considered as perceptual systems*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

7 Gibson, J. J. (2015). *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception* (Classic ed). New York,
8 NY: Psychology Press (Original work published in 1979).

9 Huet, M., Jacobs, D. M., Camachon, C., Missenard, O., Gray, R., & Montagne, G. (2011).
10 The education of attention as explanation of variability of practice effects: Learning the
11 final approach phase in a flight simulator. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human*
12 *Perception and Performance*, 37(6), 1841–1854. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024386>

13 Jacobs, D. M., & Michaels, C. F. (2006). Lateral interception I: Operative optical variables,
14 attunement, and calibration. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception*
15 *and Performance*, 32(2), 443–458. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.32.2.443>

16 Jacobs, D. M., & Michaels, C. F. (2007). Direct Learning. *Ecological Psychology*, 19(4),
17 321–349. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10407410701432337>

18 Joh, A. S., & Adolph, K. E. (2006). Learning From Falling. *Child Development*, 77(1), 89–
19 102. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00858.x>

20 Jordet, G. (2005). Perceptual training in Soccer: An imagery intervention study with elite
21 players. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 17(2), 140–156.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200590932452>

23 Komar, J., Potdevin, F., Chollet, D., & Seifert, L. (2019). Between exploitation and
24 exploration of motor behaviours: unpacking the constraints-led approach to foster
25 nonlinear learning in physical education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 24(2),

1 133–145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2018.1557133>

2 Kretch, K. S., & Adolph, K. E. (2017). The organization of exploratory behaviors in infant
3 locomotor planning. *Developmental Science*, *20*(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12421>

4 Lee, M. C., Chow, J. Y., Komar, J., Tan, C. W., & Butten, C. (2014). Nonlinear pedagogy: an
5 effective approach to cater for individual differences in learning a sports skill. *Plos One*,
6 *9*(8), e104744. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0104744>

7 Mann, D. T. Y., Williams, A. M., Ward, P., & Janelle, C. M. (2007). Perceptual-Cognitive
8 Expertise in Sport: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *29*(4),
9 457–478. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.29.4.457>

10 Mantel, B., Bardy, B. G., & Stoffregen, T. A. (2010). Multimodal Perception of Reachability
11 Expressed Through Locomotion. *Ecological Psychology*, *22*(3), 192–211.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10407413.2010.496665>

13 Mantel, B., Stoffregen, T. A., Campbell, A., & Bardy, B. G. (2015). Exploratory movement
14 generates higher-order information that is sufficient for accurate perception of scaled
15 egocentric distance. *PLoS ONE*, *10*(4), 1–26.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0120025>

17 Mark, L. S. (1987). Eyeheight-Scaled Information About Affordances: A Study of Sitting and
18 Stair Climbing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and*
19 *Performance*, *13*(3), 361–370. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.13.3.361>

20 Mark, L. S., Balliett, J. A., Craver, K. D., Douglas, S. D., & Fox, T. (1990). What an Actor
21 Must Do in Order to Perceive the Affordance for Sitting. *Ecological Psychology*, *2*(4),
22 325–366. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326969eco0204_2

23 Mark, L. S., Jiang, Y., King, S. S., & Paasche, J. (1999). The impact of visual exploration on
24 judgments of whether a gap is crossable. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human*
25 *Perception and Performance*, *25*(1), 287–295.

1 1523.25.1.287

2 McGuckian, T. B., Cole, M. H., Chalkley, D., Jordet, G., & Pepping, G.-J. (2019). Visual
3 Exploration When Surrounded by Affordances: Frequency of Head Movements Is
4 Predictive of Response Speed. *Ecological Psychology*, 31(1), 30–48.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10407413.2018.1495548>

6 McGuckian, T. B., Cole, M. H., & Pepping, G. J. (2018). A systematic review of the
7 technology-based assessment of visual perception and exploration behaviour in
8 association football. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 36(8), 861–880.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2017.1344780>

10 Nieuwenhuys, A., Pijpers, J. R., Oudejans, R. R. D., & Bakker, F. C. (2008). The Influence of
11 Anxiety on Visual Attention in Climbing. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*,
12 30(2), 171–185. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.30.2.171>

13 Nourrit, D., Delignières, D., Caillou, N., Deschamps, T., & Lauriot, B. (2003). On
14 Discontinuities in Motor Learning: A Longitudinal Study of Complex Skill Acquisition
15 on a Ski-Simulator. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, 35(2), 151–170.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222890309602130>

17 Orth, D., Button, C., Davids, K., & Seifert, L. (2016). What current research tells us about
18 skill acquisition in climbing? In L. Seifert, P. Wolf, & A. Schweizer (Eds.), *Science of*
19 *Climbing and Mountaineering* (pp. 196–209). New York: Routledge.

20 Orth, D., Davids, K., & Seifert, L. (2018). Constraints representing a meta-stable régime
21 facilitate exploration during practice and transfer of learning in a complex multi-articular
22 task. *Human Movement Science*, 57, 291–302.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2017.09.007>

24 Orth, D., van der Kamp, J., Memmert, D., & Savelsbergh, G. J. P. (2017). Creative Motor
25 Actions As Emerging from Movement Variability. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1–8.

- 1 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01903>
- 2 Oudejans, R. R. D., Michaels, C. F., Bakker, F. C., & Dolné, M. A. (1996). The Relevance of
3 Action in Perceiving Affordances: Perception of Catchableness of Fly Balls. *Journal of*
4 *Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 22(4), 879–891.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.22.4.879>
- 6 Pepping, G.-J., & Li, F.-X. (2008). The role of haptic exploration of ground surface
7 information in perception of overhead reachability. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, 40(6),
8 491–498. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JMBR.40.6.491-498>
- 9 Pijpers, J. R. (2006). *The impact of anxiety on perceptual-motor behaviour*. Enschede:
10 Febodruk B.V.
- 11 Pijpers, J. R., Oudejans, R. R. D., & Bakker, F. C. (2005). Anxiety-induced changes in
12 movement behaviour during the execution of a complex whole-body task. *The Quarterly*
13 *Journal of Experimental Psychology Section A*, 58(3), 421–445.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02724980343000945>
- 15 Pijpers, J. R., Oudejans, R. R. D., Bakker, F. C., & Beek, P. J. (2006). The Role of Anxiety in
16 Perceiving and Realizing Affordances. *Ecological Psychology*, 18(3), 131–161.
17 https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326969eco1803_1
- 18 Pocock, C., Dicks, M., Thelwell, R. C., Chapman, M., & Barker, J. B. (2019). Using an
19 Imagery Intervention to Train Visual Exploratory Activity in Elite Academy Football
20 Players. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 31(2), 218–234.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2017.1395929>
- 22 Prieske, B., Withagen, R., Smith, J., & Zaal, F. T. J. M. (2015). Affordances in a simple
23 playscape: Are children attracted to challenging affordances? *Journal of Environmental*
24 *Psychology*, 41, 101–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2014.11.011>
- 25 Reed, E. (1996). *Encountering the world : toward an ecological psychology*. Oxford: Oxford

- 1 University Press.
- 2 Richardson, M. J., Shockley, K., Fajen, B. R., Riley, M. A., & Turvey, M. T. (2008).
3 Ecological psychology: Six principles for an embodied – embedded approach to
4 behavior. In P. Calvo & T. Gomila (Eds.), *Handbook of cognitive science: An embodied*
5 *approach* (pp. 161–187). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- 6 Schöllhorn, W. I., Beckmann, H., Michelbrink, M., Sechelmann, M., Trockel, M., & Davids,
7 K. (2006). Does noise provide a basis for the unification of motor learning theories?
8 *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 37(2–3), 186–206.
- 9 Schöllhorn, W. I., Hegen, P., & Davids, K. (2012). The Nonlinear Nature of Learning - A
10 Differential Learning Approach. *The Open Sports Sciences Journal*, 5(1), 100–112.
11 <https://doi.org/10.2174/1875399X01205010100>
- 12 Schöllhorn, W. I., Mayer-Kress, G., Newell, K. M., & Michelbrink, M. (2009). Time scales of
13 adaptive behavior and motor learning in the presence of stochastic perturbations. *Human*
14 *Movement Science*, 28(3), 319–333. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2008.10.005>
- 15 Schöner, G., Zanone, P. G., & Kelso, J. a. (1992). Learning as change of coordination
16 dynamics: theory and experiment. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, 24(1), 29–48.
17 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222895.1992.9941599>
- 18 Seifert, L., Boulanger, J., Orth, D., & Davids, K. (2015). Environmental Design Shapes
19 Perceptual-motor Exploration, Learning, and Transfer in Climbing. *Frontiers in*
20 *Psychology*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01819>
- 21 Seifert, L., Orth, D., Mantel, B., Boulanger, J., Hérault, R., & Dicks, M. (2018). Affordance
22 Realization in Climbing: Learning and Transfer. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1–14.
23 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00820>
- 24 Seifert, Ludovic, Cordier, R., Orth, D., Courtine, Y., & Croft, J. L. (2017). Role of route
25 previewing strategies on climbing fluency and exploratory movements. *PloSone*, 12(4).

1 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0176306>

2 Seifert, Ludovic, Komar, J., Araújo, D., & Davids, K. (2016). Neurobiological degeneracy: A
3 key property for functional adaptations of perception and action to constraints.
4 *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *69*, 159–165.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.08.006>

6 Smeeton, N. J., Huys, R., & Jacobs, D. M. (2013). When less is more: Reduced usefulness
7 training for the learning of anticipation skill in tennis. *PLoS ONE*, *8*(11).
8 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0079811>

9 Smith, M. R. H., Flach, J. M., Dittman, S. M., & Stanard, T. (2001). Monocular optical
10 constraints on collision control. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception*
11 *and Performance*, *27*(2), 395–410. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.27.2.395>

12 Stoffregen, T. A., & Bardy, B. G. (2001). On specification and the senses. *Behavioral and*
13 *Brain Sciences*, *24*(2), 195–213. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X01003946>

14 Stoffregen, T. A., Mantel, B., & Bardy, B. G. (2017). The Senses Considered as One
15 Perceptual System. *Ecological Psychology*, *29*(3), 165–197.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10407413.2017.1331116>

17 Stoffregen, T. A., Yang, C. M., & Bardy, B. G. (2005). Affordance judgments and
18 nonlocomotor body movement. *Ecological Psychology*, *17*(2), 75–104.
19 https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326969eco1702_2

20 van Andel, S., Cole, M. H., & Pepping, G. J. (2017). A systematic review on perceptual-
21 motor calibration to changes in action capabilities. *Human Movement Science*, *51*, 59–
22 71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2016.11.004>

23 van Andel, S., McGuckian, T. B., Chalkley, D., Cole, M. H., & Pepping, G. J. (2019).
24 Principles of the Guidance of Exploration for Orientation and Specification of Action.
25 *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, *13*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2019.00231>

- 1 van der Kamp, J., Savelsbergh, G., & Smeets, J. (1997). Multiple information sources in
2 interceptive timing. *Human Movement Science*, *16*(6), 787–821.
3 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-9457\(97\)00017-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-9457(97)00017-1)
- 4 van Dijk, L., & Bongers, R. M. (2014). The Emergence of an Action System: The
5 Organization of Gaze in Creating Novel Tools. *Ecological Psychology*, *26*(3), 177–197.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10407413.2014.929476>
- 7 Wagman, J. B. (2012). Perception of maximum reaching height reflects impending changes in
8 reaching ability and improvements transfer to unpracticed reaching tasks. *Experimental*
9 *Brain Research*, *219*(4), 467–476. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-012-3104-x>
- 10 Wagman, J. B., Cialdella, V. T., & Stoffregen, T. A. (2018). Higher order affordances for
11 reaching: Perception and performance. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*,
12 *72*(5), 1200–1211. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1747021818784403>
- 13 Wagman, J. B., & Morgan, L. L. (2010). Nested prospectivity in perception: perceived
14 maximum reaching height reflects anticipated changes in reaching ability. *Psychonomic*
15 *Bulletin & Review*, *17*(6), 905–909. <https://doi.org/10.3758/PBR.17.6.905>
- 16 Wagman, J. B., Shockley, K., Riley, M. A., & Turvey, M. T. (2001). Attunement, Calibration,
17 and Exploration in Fast Haptic Perceptual Learning. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, *33*(4),
18 323–327. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222890109601917>
- 19 Withagen, A., Kappers, A. M. L., Vervloed, M. P. J., Knoors, H., & Verhoeven, L. (2013).
20 The use of exploratory procedures by blind and sighted adults and children. *Attention,*
21 *Perception, & Psychophysics*, *75*(7), 1451–1464. [https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-013-](https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-013-0479-0)
22 [0479-0](https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-013-0479-0)
- 23 Yu, Y., Bardy, B. G., & Stoffregen, T. A. (2011). Influences of head and torso movement
24 before and during affordance perception. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, *43*(1), 45–54.
25 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222895.2010.533213>

1 Yu, Y., & Stoffregen, T. A. (2012). Postural and locomotor contributions to affordance
2 perception. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, 44(5), 305–311.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222895.2012.706659>

4