Physically active individuals look for more: An eye tracking study of attentional bias

Boris Cheval^{1,2*}, Matthew W. Miller^{3,4}, Dan Orsholits⁵, Tanya Berry⁶, David Sander^{1,2},
Matthieu P. Boisgontier^{5,7}

¹ Swiss Center for Affective Sciences, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

² Laboratory for the Study of Emotion Elicitation and Expression (E3Lab), Department of Psychology, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

³ School of Kinesiology, Auburn University, USA

⁴ Center for Neuroscience, Auburn University, USA

⁵ Swiss NCCR “LIVES – Overcoming Vulnerability: Life Course Perspectives”, University of Geneva, Switzerland

⁶ University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada

⁷ Faculty of Movement and Rehabilitation Sciences, KU Leuven, Belgium

*Corresponding authors: Campus, Biotech, Chemin des mines 9, 1202, Genève, Switzerland; boris.cheval@unige.ch; @ChevalBoris (B. Cheval).

Keywords

Visual dot probe task, attentional capture, eye-tracking, physical activity

DOI

<http://dx.doi.org/10.31236/osf.io/a296j>

Citation

Cheval, B., Miller, M.W., Orsholits, D., Berry, T., Sander, D., & Boisgontier, M.P. (2019). Physically active individuals look for more: an eye tracking study of attentional bias

Co-author agreement

All the authors listed in the by-line have agreed to the by-line order and to the submission of the manuscript in this form

Impact statement

There is increasing behavioral evidence supporting the effect of attentional capture by exercise-related stimuli on physical activity behaviors. Yet, direct evidence of this attentional capture remains largely unexplored. Here, using eye-tracking, we investigate both indirect (reaction times) and more direct (first gaze location and gaze duration) indices of attentional bias toward physical activity. Results reveal that moderately to highly active individuals orient

their attention toward physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli more often and spend more time gazing at these stimuli, whereas these effects were not observed in individuals with a low usual level of physical activity. Active individuals also show a greater decrease in pupil size when gazing at physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli. These findings demonstrate an attentional bias for physical activity stimuli that is especially pronounced in the more active participants, thereby suggesting that these stimuli are relevant to the current concerns of these individuals.

Abstract

Attentional capture by exercise-related stimuli is important for the regulation of physical activity. Attentional processing underlying this capture has been investigated with indirect behavioral measures based on reaction times. To investigate more direct measures of visual spatial attention toward physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli, we used eye tracking and a visual dot probe task in 77 young adults. Reaction times to detect a dot appearing in the area previously occupied by a physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimulus were an indirect measure of attentional bias. The first picture gaze and viewing time were more direct measures of attentional orienting and attentional engagement, respectively. Pupil dilation was an indicator of arousal. Reaction times revealed a two-way interaction between the location of the dot and participants' usual level of physical activity. Only participants with a high level of physical activity more quickly detected a dot when it appeared in the area previously occupied by a physical activity stimulus. Eye-tracking results showed greater odds of first gazing at physical activity stimuli and for a longer time, and a greater decrease in pupil size when viewing physical activity stimuli when usual level of physical activity was moderate or high, but not low. The variance explained in the outcomes ranged from 13.9% (pupil dilation) to 40% (reaction times). Physical activity stimuli biased attention, with a pronounced effect when the level of physical activity was higher. These findings suggested that physical activity stimuli are relevant to the current concerns of moderately and highly active individuals.

1. INTRODUCTION

Most individuals are now aware of the negative health consequences of physical inactivity, with only 6% reporting having no intention to adopt physical activity behaviors (Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute, 2018). Yet, despite their conscious motivation to be active, numerous individuals fail to exercise regularly. Only ~30% of the adult population worldwide regularly exercise (Guthold, Stevens, Riley, & Bull, 2018; WHO, 2010). Physical inactivity is estimated to be responsible of one death every ten seconds worldwide (WHO, 2010a). Until recently, the dominant approaches to exercise behavior were based on motivation theories focusing on how people reflect on their perceptions and attitudes (Brand & Cheval, 2019). Yet, meta-analyses examining the effectiveness of exercise-related interventions based on these reflective approaches have shown small effect sizes and high levels of unexplained variance (Chatzisarantis, Hagger, Biddle, Smith, & Wang, 2003; Hagger & Chatzisarantis, 2009). These results led to the development of theoretical perspectives highlighting the importance of the automatic evaluation of exercise-related stimuli in exercise-related decision making and behavior (Brand & Ekkekakis, 2018; Cheval, Radel, et al., 2018; Conroy & Berry, 2017).

Multiple experimental studies support these perspectives by showing that exercise-related stimuli affect various types of automatic reactions including affective reactions (Bluemke, Brand, Schweizer, & Kahlert, 2010; Chevance, Caudroit, Romain, & Boiché, 2017; Conroy, Hyde, Doerksen, & Ribeiro, 2010; Rebar, Ram, & Conroy, 2015), approach tendencies (Cheval, Sarrazin, Isoard-Gautheur, Radel, & Friese, 2015; Cheval, Sarrazin, Isoard-Gautheur, Radel, & Friese, 2016; Cheval, Sarrazin, & Pelletier, 2014; Cheval, Sarrazin, Pelletier, & Friese, 2016; Hannan, Moffitt, Neumann, & Kemps, 2019), and attentional capture (Berry, 2006; Berry, Spence, & Stolp, 2011; Calitri, Lowe, Eves, & Bennett, 2009). Among these automatic reactions, attentional bias may be particularly important. For instance, a tendency to spontaneously allocate attention toward physical activity opportunities (e.g., a staircase) and to disengage from opportunities to minimize effort (e.g., an escalator) may help individuals effectively regulate their physical activity behaviors.

Attentional bias is typically assessed using a modified version of the Stroop color-naming task (Field & Cox, 2008; Stroop, 1935) or the visual dot probe task (MacLeod, Mathews, & Tata, 1986). For example, in the modified version of the Stroop color-naming task, participants are asked to name the font color of words that related to the construct of interest (e.g., active or inactive-related words) and to neutral words. Slower reaction time in naming the font color of affectively laden words (e.g., physical activity) than neutral words indicates an attentional bias toward the affective words. In the modified version of the visual dot probe task, two words or images are presented simultaneously on a screen. Then, one is replaced by a dot. The participant is instructed to indicate as quickly as possible where the dot appears by

pressing the left or right response key. Some of the stimuli are related to the construct of interest and others are “neutral”. A shorter reaction time to detect the dot when it appears in the area previously occupied by the affectively laden stimulus is thought to reflect an attentional bias toward this type of stimulus. It has been suggested that such paradigms typically reveal that attention is biased towards stimuli that are particularly relevant to the current concerns of the participants (Pool, Brosch, Delplanque, & Sander, 2016).

However, few studies have assessed attentional bias toward physical activity and sedentary behaviors (Berry, 2006; Berry et al., 2011; Calitri et al., 2009). Using a Stroop color-naming task with words related to physical activity (e.g., energetic, vigorous, muscle), control (e.g., synthetic, suburban, varied), or sedentary behavior (e.g., unmotivated, lethargic, unfit), Berry (2006) showed that exerciser schematics (i.e., people who identify strongly as exercisers) are biased toward physical activity stimuli, whereas non-exerciser schematics are biased toward sedentary stimuli. Using a visual dot probe task based on pairs of words (physical activity vs. neutral words), Calitri et al. (2009) showed that self-reported physical activity during the past 7 days was positively correlated with attentional bias toward physical activity. A second study using a visual dot probe task based on pairs of pictures (physical activity vs. neutral images) showed that men demonstrated an attentional bias toward physical activity, regardless of their usual physical activity level, whereas only active women showed this attentional bias toward physical activity (Berry et al., 2011). Although this visual dot probe task is thought to reflect a more direct measure of the attentional bias toward a specific type of stimulus than the Stroop color-naming task, attentional bias is still inferred from difference in reaction times and not directly assessed. Moreover, it has been suggested that more direct measures of attentional bias may be more reliable than the indirect ones that suffer from low internal and test-retest reliability (Pennington, Qureshi, Monk, Greenwood, & Heim, 2019).

To the best of our knowledge, only one study has directly investigated attentional bias toward physical activity using eye-tracking (Giel et al., 2013). This study used a passive picture viewing task in which participants were asked to freely explore pairs of pictures presented on the screen, one related to physically activity (e.g., a young female athlete exercising) and the other one related to physically inactivity (e.g., a young female athlete in a passive situation). Anorexia nervosa patients and athletes showed higher attentional engagement (i.e., longer gaze) toward physical activity pictures than non-athletes. These findings suggest that physical activity behaviors are particularly relevant to the current concerns of active and hyper-active (i.e., anorexia nervosa patients) individuals. However, the group of athletes had competitively practiced endurance sports for at least 5 hours per week, which far exceeds the 150 min per week of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity recommended by the WHO (2010b) guidelines. As such, it is not possible to know whether individuals with a moderate level of physical activity also demonstrate such attentional bias. In addition, this study only included

female participants. Thus, whether the effects observed could emerge in men remains unclear. This may be problematic as other results suggested that attentional bias toward active stimuli differs between genders (Berry et al., 2011). Moreover, Giel et al. (2013) study used a task in which participants only passively explored picture pairs, thereby preventing the assessment of reaction time performances. Therefore, this paradigm did not permit comparisons between behavioral indices of attentional biases commonly used by previous studies with a more direct and objective measures of attentional processing. Finally, the sample size of each group ($n=15$) may have led to an underpowered study producing biased effect sizes (Lohse, Buchanan, & Miller, 2016).

Here, the objective was to extend current insights in the associations between the usual level of physical activity and attentional bias toward physical activity versus inactivity stimuli. To this end, we combined indirect and more direct indicators of attentional bias to examine how the usual level of physical activity influences visual processing. We used an eye tracker and a visual dot probe task depicting physical activity versus inactivity stimuli to assess attentional processing in individuals with low to high levels of usual physical activity. We used differences in reaction times to detect the dot when it appeared in the area previously occupied by a physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimulus as a behavioral indicator of an attentional bias toward physical activity. We used first gaze location (attentional orienting) and gaze duration (attentional engagement) as indicators of visual spatial attention. Additionally, we recorded pupil responses when participants looked at physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli. Pupil dilatation was used as an indicator of the value representation of the stimulus as pupil dilatation is influenced by value and arousal (Pauli et al., 2015; Pool, Pauli, Kress, & O'Doherty, 2019; Prévost, McNamee, Jessup, Bossaerts, & O'Doherty, 2013; Seymour, Daw, Dayan, Singer, & Dolan, 2007).

We hypothesized that individuals with higher levels of usual physical activity demonstrate both indirect (behavioral outcome) and more direct (eye-tracking outcomes) evidence of higher attentional capture by physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli, when compared to individuals with lower levels of usual physical activity. Therefore, we expected that the more active participants, as compared to the less active participants, are faster to detect the dot when appearing in the area previously occupied by a physical activity stimulus (H1), initially direct their gaze toward physical activity stimuli (H2), gaze at physical activity stimuli for a longer time (H3), and demonstrate greater pupil dilatation when looking at physical activity stimuli (H4). As previous studies suggested that attentional processing toward physical activity stimuli may differ between gender (Berry et al., 2011), we explored whether gender moderated the observed effects. Finally, to examine the associations between indirect and direct measures of attentional processing, we explored whether the more direct indicators of attentional processing (i.e., first gaze and gaze duration) and arousal (i.e., pupil

dilation) could predict the behavioral performance (reaction times) in the visual dot probe task.

2. METHODS

2.1. Participants and procedures

Participants were recruited through posters, directly at the university library, or from the Psychology Department Research Subject Pool, which offers course credit to participants. To be included in the study, participants had to be willing to participate in a one-hour laboratory session on the topic of physical activity. Participants with a history of psychiatric, neurological, or severe mental disorders, or taking psychotropic medication or illicit drugs at the time of the study were excluded. Eighty-four students were recruited.

All participants were seated in an experimental cubicle in front of a computer and provided written informed consent prior to participation. They were asked to complete a questionnaire assessing their usual level of physical activity and their intention to be active [2 items: “I intend to (I am determined to) partake in at least 30 min of moderate-to-intense physical activity per day, most days of the week during my free time or as a way to get from one place to another”. They also provided demographics information (age, sex, height, weight). Before doing the visual dot probe task, participants completed a first reaction-time task (either a decision lexical task or a go-no go task), which lasted 8–10 min (These data are not used in the current study). Immediately afterwards, participants filled out a short questionnaire assessing some potential confounding variables (e.g., hunger, thirst, physical activity during the previous day and the current day, sleep pattern, caffeine and cigarette consumption). The University of Geneva Ethics committee approved this research and informed consent process.

2.2. Measures

2.2.1. Visual Dot Probe Task

A visual dot probe task was used to measure the attentional bias toward physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli using eye-tracking (MacLeod et al., 1986). Each trial began with a fixation cross in the center of the screen with a white background. Trials initiated when the participants looked at this fixation cross randomly for between 800 and 1100 ms. Two pictures (one related to physical activity and one related physical inactivity) were subsequently presented on the left and right side of the screen randomly for 4000 to 4500 ms. A black dot was then presented either on the left or right side of the fixation cross. Participants were requested to press the “S” key when the dot was displayed on the left and the “L” key when it was displayed on the right, with the left and right hand respectively. The dot remained on the screen until the participant’s answer. Then, the next trial started (Figure 1).

The task consisted of 6 training trials and 80 experimental trials in which the dot appeared with an equal frequency in the area previously occupied by an active and inactive

stimulus, and the position of the dot and the type of stimulus were counterbalanced with respect to appearing on the left and right side of the screen. Consistent with previous studies, reaction times (i.e., the time elapsed between the appearance of the dot on the screen and the participant's response) to detect a dot when it replaced a physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimulus was used as an indirect indicator of attentional bias. First gaze location (i.e., attentional orienting), gaze duration (i.e., attentional engagement) were used more direct indicators of attentional processing, and pupil dilatation as an indicator of arousal.

We used the same stimuli as in Kullmann et al. (2014). Specifically, five pairs of images displaying a physically active vs. physically inactive individual were selected. The advantage of these stimuli is that images are closely matched for color, brightness, visual complexity, valence, and arousal. The only element that critically varies is the level of energy expenditure of the displayed individual. The visual dot probe task is available on the Zenodo open-access repository (10.5281/zenodo.3371190).

2.2.2. Usual level of physical activity

The usual level of physical activity was measured using an adapted version of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ; Craig et al., 2003) assessing moderate-to-vigorous intensity activities undertaken during leisure time during a usual week.

2.3. Statistical analysis

Reaction times, gaze location, gaze duration, and pupil dilation were analyzed using mixed effects models to account for the cross-random effects (participants and stimuli) and to decrease the risk of type-I error (Boisgontier & Cheval, 2016; Judd, Westfall, & Kenny, 2012). We built a linear mixed effects model using the lme4 and lmerTest packages in R and specified both participants and stimuli as random factors (Bates, Mächler, Bolker, & Walker, 2014; Kuznetsova, 2016; R Core Team, 2017). To reduce convergence error, each model was first optimized using the default BOBYQA optimizer (Powell, 2009), the Nelder-Mead optimizer (Nelder & Mead, 1965), the nlmb optimizer from the optimx package (Nash & Varadhan, 2011), and then, the L-BFGS-B optimizer (See Frossard & Renaud, 2019, for similar procedure). If all optimizers failed, we step-by-step reduced the complexity of the random structure until we obtained a solution without convergence issues (see Table 2 for the final random structure). An estimate of the effect size was reported using the conditional pseudo R^2 computed using the MuMin package (Barton, 2018). Statistical assumptions associated with MEM (normality of the residuals, linearity, multicollinearity, and undue influence) were checked and met for all the models.

2.4. Behavioral outcome

Incorrect responses (0.9%), responses below 200 ms (0.0%), and responses above 1500 ms (0.4%) were excluded. Reaction times were log-transformed to normalize their distribution (models using reaction times in their raw metric revealed the same results as

presented below). Faster reaction times to detect a dot when it appeared in the area previously occupied by an active (vs. inactive) stimulus was used as a behavioral indicator of attentional bias toward physical activity stimuli. The within factor dot (2 modalities: appeared in the area previously occupied by a physical activity vs. inactivity stimulus), the usual level of physical activity, and their interaction were included as fixed effects.

2.5. Eye-tracking outcomes

2.5.1. First gaze

The association between the usual level of physical activity and the odds of first gazing at physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli was analyzed using a logistic mixed effects model. For each trial, a first gaze toward physical activity stimuli was coded 1, whereas a first gaze toward physical inactivity stimuli was coded 0. Usual level of physical activity was included as a fixed effect.

2.5.2. Gaze duration

The association between the usual level of physical activity and the relative viewing time toward physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli was analyzed using a linear mixed effects model.

2.5.3. Pupil dilation

For each trial, the difference in the maximum pupil size when viewing physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli was used as an outcome. Based on the data distribution, pupil size below 2 mm and above 4.5 mm were excluded. Pupil size differences larger than 1 mm between physical activity and inactivity stimuli were also excluded. We used the same fixed and random structure as the one used for first gaze and gaze duration.

2.6. Predicting behavioral performance with eye-tracking outcomes

We used a series of mixed effects models to examine whether the eye-tracking outcomes predicted reaction times to detect the dot when it appeared in the area previously occupied by a physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimulus, separately. The models included one eye-tracking index at a time to predict the reaction times. We explored whether gender and the usual level of physical activity influenced these associations by adding interaction terms in the models.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Descriptive results

Table 1 shows the characteristics of the participants by usual level of physical activity. For descriptive purposes, participants were categorized as either reaching the 150 min per week of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity guidelines vs. not reaching this threshold. A total of 84 students were recruited, but 7 did not complete the physical activity questionnaire. The final sample size included 77 participants (52 women and 25 men; 34 active and 43 inactive participants; mean age 21.7 ± 3.8 years; mean body mass index 21.5 ± 3.1 kg/m²), with

a moderately high intention to be active (mean intention, 7.6 ± 2.0 , on a scale ranging from 1 to 10). The more active participants had a higher intention to be active, a higher number of first look toward physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli, and a longer relative viewing time to physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli than less active participants. Age, gender, and body mass index were similar across more and less active participants. Overall, the usual level of moderate to vigorous physical activity was 199.3 min per week (± 261.4 min).

3.2. Reaction times

Results revealed a two-way interaction between the location of the dot (appeared in the area previously occupied by a physical activity vs. inactivity stimulus) and participants' usual level of physical activity, suggesting that the effect of dot location on reaction time varied as a function of the usual level of physical activity ($b = -.02$, 95% Confidence Interval [95CI] = $-.03$ to $-.01$, $p = .002$) (Table 2). As expected, simple effect tests showed that when the usual level of physical activity was low ($-1SD$) or moderate (mean), participants were not faster to detect a dot appearing in the area previously occupied by a physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimulus ($b = .01$, 95CI = $-.01$ to $.03$, $p = .167$ and $b = -.06$, 95CI = $-.04$ to $.03$, $p = .224$, for low and moderate usual levels of physical activity, respectively). By contrast, when the usual level of physical activity was high ($+1SD$), participants were faster to detect a dot when it appeared in the area previously occupied by a physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimulus ($b = -.025$, 95CI = $-.04$ to $-.01$, $p = .003$) (Figure 2). The variables under consideration explained 40% of the variance in the reaction times. Gender did not influence the effects ($p = .235$).

3.3. Eye-tracking

3.3.1. First gaze

Results showed an effect of the usual level of physical activity on the spatial location of the first gaze that followed the location of the fixation cross (Table 2). As expected, the odds of gazing first at the physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli increased as the usual level of physical activity increased (odds ratio [OR] = 1.14, 95CI = 1.03 to 1.26, $p = .012$). Simple effect tests showed that when the usual level of physical activity was high ($+1SD$) or moderate (mean), the odds of gazing first at physical activity stimuli were higher than the odds of gazing first at physical inactivity stimuli (OR = 1.61, 95CI = 1.27 to 2.03, $p < .001$ and OR = 1.42, 95CI = 1.15 to 1.74, $p = .001$, for high and moderate usual levels of physical activity, respectively). By contrast, when the usual level of physical activity was low ($-1SD$) only a trend was observed (OR = 1.24, 95CI = .99 to 1.58, $p = .065$) (Figure 3A). The variables under consideration explained 28.1% of the variance in the attentional orienting. Gender did not influence the effects ($p = .532$).

3.3.2. Gaze duration

Results showed an effect of the usual level of physical activity on the time spent looking at the physically active stimuli (Table 2). As expected, the viewing time of physical activity (vs.

inactivity) stimuli increased as the usual level of physical activity increased ($b=7.8$, $95\text{CI}=4.8$ to 10.9 , $p<.001$). Specifically, when the usual level of physical activity was high (+1SD) or moderate (mean), participants stared at the physical activity stimuli 20.2% ($95\text{CI}=12.7$ to 27.7 , $p<.001$) and 12.4% ($95\text{CI}=5.5$ to 19.2 , $p=.004$) longer than at the physical inactivity stimuli, respectively. By contrast, when the usual level of physical activity was low (-1SD), no differences were observed ($b=4.6\%$, $95\text{CI}=-3.0$ to 12.1 , $p=.253$) (Figure 3B). The variables under consideration explained 28.8% of the variance in the attentional processing. Gender did not influence the effects ($p=.427$).

3.3.3. Pupil dilation

Results showed an effect of the usual level of physical activity on pupil dilatation when viewing physical activity stimuli (Table 2). The pupil size decrease observed when participants viewed physically active (vs. inactive) stimuli was more pronounced as the usual level of physical activity increased ($b=-.1$, $95\text{CI}=-.01$ to $-.002$, $p=.008$). Specifically, when the usual level of physical activity was high (+1SD) or moderate (mean), pupil size decreased by $-.024$ mm ($95\text{CI}=-.033$ to $-.015$, $p<.001$) and $-.016$ mm ($95\text{CI}=-.024$ to $-.008$, $p=.001$) when viewing physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli, respectively. By contrast, when the usual level of physical activity was low (-1SD), we only observed a trend ($b=-.009$, $95\text{CI}=-.018$ to $.001$, $p=.090$) (Figure 3C). The variables under consideration explained 13.9% of the variance in pupil dilation. Gender did not influence the effects ($p=.267$).

3.4. Predicting behavioral performance with eye-tracking outcomes

3.4.1. Dot appearing in the area previously occupied by a physical activity stimulus

In the models including a single eye-tracking index at a time, results showed that a higher percentage of viewing time of physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli predicted shorter reaction times to detect the dot ($b=-2.4\times 10^{-4}$, $95\text{CI}=-3.8\times 10^{-4}$ to -1.1×10^{-4} , $p<.001$), whereas neither first gaze ($b=1.7\times 10^{-3}$, $95\text{CI}=-.013$ to $.017$, $p=.819$), nor pupil dilation did ($b=1.9\times 10^{-2}$, $95\text{CI}=-.05$ to $.09$, $p=.584$). The variables under consideration explained 36.3% of the variance in the reaction times. These effects did not vary as a function of the usual level of physical activity or gender.

3.4.2. Dot appearing in the area previously occupied by an inactive stimulus

In the models including a single eye-tracking index at a time, results showed that pupil dilatation when staring at physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli predicted longer reaction times (although $p=.067$; $b=6.2\times 10^{-2}$, $95\text{CI}=-.004$ to $.130$), whereas neither viewing time ($b=-5\times 10^{-5}$, $95\text{CI}=-1.8\times 10^{-4}$ to 8.9×10^{-5} , $p=.442$) nor attentional orienting did ($b=9.9\times 10^{-4}$, $95\text{CI}=-.014$ to $.016$, $p=.896$). Gender modified the effect of pupil dilation ($b=-.15$, 95CI from $-.30$ to $-.004$, $p=.044$), with an effect found in women ($b=.12$, $95\text{CI}=.04$ to $.20$, $p=.005$), but

not in men ($b = -.03$, $95\text{CI} = -.15$ to $.08$, $p = .604$). The variables under consideration explained 36.3% of the variance in the reaction times.

4. DISCUSSION

This study examined attentional processing toward physical activity and inactivity stimuli in individuals with low to high usual levels of physical activity. To the best of our knowledge, our results provide the first eye-tracking-based empirical evidence that physical activity stimuli bias attention, especially in individuals with higher levels of physical activity. Hence, our study lends support to recent theories in exercise psychology stressing that automatic reactions toward exercise-related stimuli are involved in the regulation of physical activity behaviors (Brand & Ekkekakis, 2018; Cheval, Radel, et al., 2018; Conroy & Berry, 2017).

As hypothesized (H1), behavioral results revealed an interaction effect between dot location and the usual level of physical activity. Participants were faster at detecting a dot when it appeared in the area previously occupied by a physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimulus but only when the usual level of physical activity was high, thereby suggesting that the more active participants, but not the less active ones, demonstrated an attentional bias toward physical activity. Overall, these findings are in line with previous results showing evidence of an attentional bias toward active stimuli in active individuals using differences in reaction times (Berry, 2006; Berry et al., 2011; Calitri et al., 2009), although some differences can be noted. For example, Berry et al. (2011) showed that all men, regardless of their usual physical activity level, demonstrated such bias toward active stimuli, while only active women showed evidence of this bias. One possible explanation of this discrepancy lies in the characteristics of the visual dot probe task. Specifically, the control-related images used in Berry et al. (2011) included objects that could be associated with specific affective contents (e.g., remote control, baby, vacuum cleaner, beer bottle), which may be gender dependent. By contrast, our pairs of physical activity and inactivity images were selected to only differ in terms of energy expenditure suggested by the pictures, with the person represented being the same in all the images (see [10.5281/zenodo.3371190](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3371190)). Yet, our results are consistent with other studies showing an association between attentional bias toward physical activity, irrespective of gender (Berry, 2006; Calitri et al., 2009).

As expected (H2 and H3), participants showed greater odds of gazing first at physical activity stimuli and to stare longer at them when the usual level of physical activity was higher. When the usual level of physical activity was high or moderate, participants showed greater odds of gazing first at and to view longer physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli, whereas these effects were not significant when the usual level of physical activity was low. These findings showed that active participants are biased toward physical activity, thereby suggesting that

indices associated with physical activity could be particularly relevant to the current concerns of active individuals (Pool et al., 2016).

To the best of our knowledge, only one study used eye-tracking to assess attentional processing of physical activity stimuli (Giel et al., 2013). In this study, results showed that people with anorexia nervosa and athletes who competitively practiced endurance sports for at least 5 hours per week, as well as non-athletes, first orient their attention to physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli. Although this study did not find group differences in attentional orienting, both anorexia nervosa patients and athletes demonstrated higher attentional engagement (i.e., longer gaze) toward physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli, when compared with non-athletes. Overall, our findings are consistent with this study but showed a difference in the direct measure of attentional processing in a healthy population.

Contrary to our hypothesis (H4), participants showed a greater decrease in pupil size when viewing physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli when the usual level of physical activity was higher. As for the other eye tracking outcomes, results showed that this effect was only observed when the usual level of physical activity was high or moderate, but not low. These results suggest that physical activity stimuli are associated with less arousal than physical inactivity stimuli, especially in physically active individuals. Yet, it should be noted that the association between the level of physical activity and change in pupil size was very small (0.02 mm) and could hardly be distinguished from simple measurement error. Therefore, it seems reasonable to avoid over-interpreting this result.

Results showed that greater attentional engagement toward physical activity stimuli was associated with a faster detection of a dot when it appeared in the area previously occupied by an active stimulus. This result confirms that the indirect measure of attentional bias in the visual dot probe task (i.e., difference in reaction times) reflects differences in attentional engagement. This finding suggests that attentional bias as measured by a visual dot probe task with a relatively long presentation of the stimuli may accurately reflect attentional engagement (or difficulty of disengagement) but not attentional orienting. Regarding the reaction time to detect the dot when it appeared in the area previously occupied by a physical inactivity stimulus, higher pupil dilation was associated with slower reaction times in women. This result suggests that higher arousal to physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli disrupted the behavioral performance when women had to detect the dot appearing after a physical inactivity stimulus.

Among the strengths of the study are the use of eye-tracking technology in a visual dot probe task allowing the measurement of both direct and indirect indicators of attentional processing toward physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli, and offering a broad perspective on attentional bias (first gaze and gaze duration) and arousal (pupil dilation); the first comparison of a normal, non-pathological, sample of physically active and inactive individuals; and the use of statistical analyses suited to examine repeated measures data

involving cross-random factors (i.e., participants and stimuli). However, this study also has some limitations. First, physical activity was measured using self-report. Other assessment techniques (e.g., accelerometry) could more accurately assess participants' usual level of physical activity. Second, our study was cross-sectional. Future studies could investigate whether indirect and more indirect measures of attentional processing can prospectively predict physical activity behaviors. Third, the visual dot probe task did not involve neutral stimuli. As such, the faster reaction time to detect a dot when it appeared in the area previously occupied by a physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimulus could also reflect a slower reaction to detect inactive stimuli. Moreover, as previous studies showed that physically inactive opportunities act as temptations threatening the achievement of physical activity goals (Cheval, Sarrazin, Boisgontier, & Radel, 2017; Cheval, Tipura, et al., 2018), these opportunities could also bias attention. As such, difference between physical activity and inactivity stimuli could be smaller than the difference with stimuli irrelevant to the current participants concerns. Future studies could examine whether both active and inactive stimuli attract attention, when compared with non-relevant stimuli. Finally, our study assessed attentional bias toward physical activity while participants had remained seated for a non-negligible amount of time (~20 min). This may have artificially biased the results toward a lower attraction toward physical inactivity in line with the outcome devaluation phenomenon (Pool et al., 2019). Future studies should experimentally manipulate the situational factors likely to change the attractive value of physical activity and inactivity behaviors (Cheval, Boisgontier, Bacelar, Feiss, & Miller, 2019; Cheval, Radel, et al., 2018).

In conclusion, our results show that physical activity stimuli biases attention, especially in individuals with high levels of physical activity. This bias suggests that stimuli associated with physical activity are relevant to the current concerns of moderately and highly active individuals. Therefore, our study supports recent evidence suggesting that automatic reactions toward exercise-related stimuli, including attentional capture, are involved in the regulation of physical activity.

Contributors

B.C. designed the analyses. B.C. analyzed the data. D.O., M.P.B. prepared the figures. B.C., M.M., M.P.B. drafted the manuscript. All authors critically appraised and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

Ethical approval

This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Geneva Canton, Switzerland (CCER2019-00065).

Data sharing

The dataset is available the Zenodo open-access repository (10.5281/zenodo.3371190)

Acknowledgements

B.C. is supported by an Ambizione grant (PZ00P1_180040) from the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF). We thank Sabina Pedrazzini and Anouché Canellini for helping with data acquisition. With great sadness, we want to acknowledge the death of Rémi Radel, who contributed to the design of this study. He was a much-appreciated colleague and friend.

Table captions

Table 1. Participant's characteristics by usual level of physical activity.

First look is the probability to first gaze at physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli. Relative viewing is the difference in the time spent gazing at physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli, expressed as a percentage. Relative pupil size is the difference in pupil size when viewing physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli. A higher score indicated a larger pupil size when looking at physical activity stimuli. BMI = body mass index; SD = standard deviation; ms = milliseconds.

Table 2. Results of the linear mixed models predicting the reaction times (log) required to go toward physical activity and inactivity stimuli. CI = 95% confidence interval, OR = odds ratio, Corr. = correlation

Figure captions

Figure 1. Visual dot probe task. A. Stimuli. B. Procedure. Trials started with an 800 to 1100 ms fixation of the cross. Then, stimuli depicting physical activity and inactivity appeared for 4000 to 4500 ms. Then, a black dot replaced either the physical activity or inactivity stimulus. The experiment consisted of one block of 80 trials. Participants were instructed to detect the side where the dot appeared, as quickly as possible. In half of the trials, the dot appeared on the side of the active stimuli. In the other half, the dot appeared on the side of the inactive stimuli.

Figure 2. Reaction times. Reaction times to detect the dot when it appeared in the areas previously occupied by physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli as a function of participants' usual level of physical activity. Reaction times in log were back transformed into milliseconds.

Figure 3. Eye-tracking outcomes. A. Attentional orienting. The odds ratio of first gazing at physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli. **B. Attentional engagement.** The relative percentage of time spent gazing at physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli. **C. Pupil dilation.** The relative pupil size when gazing at physical activity (vs. inactivity) stimuli. Grey area = 95% confidence interval.

5. REFERENCES

- Barton, K. (2018). MuMIn: Multi-model inference. R package version 1.42.1. .
<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn>.
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2014). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.5823*.
- Berry, T. R. (2006). Who's even interested in the exercise message? Attentional bias for exercise and sedentary-lifestyle related words. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 28, 4-17.
- Berry, T. R., Spence, J. C., & Stolp, S. M. (2011). Attentional bias for exercise-related images. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 82, 302-309.
- Bluemke, M., Brand, R., Schweizer, G., & Kahlert, D. (2010). Exercise might be good for me, but I don't feel good about it: do automatic associations predict exercise behavior? *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 32, 137-153.
- Boisgontier, M. P., & Cheval, B. (2016). The anova to mixed model transition. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*.
- Brand, R., & Cheval, B. (2019). Theories to explain exercise motivation and physical inactivity: Ways of expanding our current theoretical perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1147.
- Brand, R., & Ekkekakis, P. (2018). Affective–Reflective Theory of physical inactivity and exercise. *German Journal of Exercise and Sport Research*, 48, 48-58.
- Calitri, R., Lowe, R., Eves, F. F., & Bennett, P. (2009). Associations between visual attention, implicit and explicit attitude and behaviour for physical activity. *Psychology & Health*, 24, 1105-1123.
- CFLRI (2018). Canadian Fitness and Lifestyle Research Institute. Physical activity monitor: facts and figures.
http://www.cflri.ca/sites/default/files/node/95/files/PAM2008FactsFigures_Bulletin14_Intention_to_be_activeEN.pdf.
- Chatzisarantis, N. L., Hagger, M. S., Biddle, S. J., Smith, B., & Wang, J. C. (2003). A meta-analysis of perceived locus of causality in exercise, sport, and physical education contexts. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 25, 284-306.
- Cheval, B., Boisgontier, M. P., Bacelar, M. F., Feiss, R., & Miller, M. W. (2019). Opportunities to sit and stand trigger equivalent reward-related brain activity. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 141, 9-17.
- Cheval, B., Radel, R., Neva, J. L., Boyd, L. A., Swinnen, S. P., Sander, D., & Boisgontier, M. P. (2018). Behavioral and neural evidence of the rewarding value of exercise behaviors: a systematic review. *Sports Medicine*, 48, 1389-1404.

- Cheval, B., Sarrazin, P., Boisgontier, M. P., & Radel, R. (2017). Temptations toward behaviors minimizing energetic costs (BMEC) automatically activate physical activity goals in successful exercisers. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 30, 110-117.
- Cheval, B., Sarrazin, P., Isoard-Gautheur, S., Radel, R., & Friese, M. (2015). Reflective and impulsive processes explain (in)effectiveness of messages promoting physical activity: a randomized controlled trial. *Health Psychology*, 34, 10-19.
- Cheval, B., Sarrazin, P., Isoard-Gautheur, S., Radel, R., & Friese, M. (2016). How impulsivity shapes the interplay of impulsive and reflective processes involved in objective physical activity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 96, 132-137.
- Cheval, B., Sarrazin, P., & Pelletier, L. (2014). Impulsive approach tendencies towards physical activity and sedentary behaviors, but not reflective intentions, prospectively predict non-exercise activity thermogenesis. *Plos One*, 9, e115238.
- Cheval, B., Sarrazin, P., Pelletier, L., & Friese, M. (2016). Effect of retraining approach-avoidance tendencies on an exercise task: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Physical Activity & Health*, 13, 1396-1403.
- Cheval, B., Tipura, E., Burra, N., Frossard, J., Chanal, J., Orsholits, D., . . . Boisgontier, M. (2018). Avoiding sedentary behaviors requires more cortical resources than avoiding physical activity: An EEG study. *Neuropsychologia*, 119, 68-80.
- Chevance, G., Caudroit, J., Romain, A. J., & Boiché, J. (2017). The adoption of physical activity and eating behaviors among persons with obesity and in the general population: the role of implicit attitudes within the Theory of Planned Behavior. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, 22, 319-324.
- Conroy, D. E., & Berry, T. R. (2017). Automatic Affective Evaluations of Physical Activity. *Exercise and Sport Sciences Reviews*, 45, 230-237.
- Conroy, D. E., Hyde, A. L., Doerksen, S. E., & Ribeiro, N. F. (2010). Implicit attitudes and explicit motivation prospectively predict physical activity. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 39, 112-118.
- Craig, C. L., Marshall, A. L., Sjostrom, M., Bauman, A. E., Booth, M. L., Ainsworth, B. E., . . . Oja, P. (2003). International physical activity questionnaire: 12-country reliability and validity. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 35, 1381-1395.
- Field, M., & Cox, W. M. (2008). Attentional bias in addictive behaviors: a review of its development, causes, and consequences. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 97, 1-20.
- Frossard, J., & Renaud, O. (2019). The correlation structure of mixed effects models with crossed random effects in controlled experiments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.10766*.
- Giel, K. E., Kullmann, S., Preißl, H., Bischoff, S. C., Thiel, A., Schmidt, U., . . . Teufel, M. (2013). Understanding the reward system functioning in anorexia nervosa: crucial role of physical activity. *Biological Psychology*, 94, 575-581.

- Guthold, R., Stevens, G. A., Riley, L. M., & Bull, F. C. (2018). Worldwide trends in insufficient physical activity from 2001 to 2016: a pooled analysis of 358 population-based surveys with 1·9 million participants. *The Lancet Global Health*, 6, e1077-e1086.
- Hagger, M. S., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. (2009). Integrating the theory of planned behaviour and self-determination theory in health behaviour: a meta-analysis. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 14, 275-302.
- Hannan, T. E., Moffitt, R. L., Neumann, D. L., & Kemps, E. (2019). Implicit approach–avoidance associations predict leisure-time exercise independently of explicit exercise motivation. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, 8, 210-222.
- Judd, C. M., Westfall, J., & Kenny, D. A. (2012). Treating stimuli as a random factor in social psychology: A new and comprehensive solution to a pervasive but largely ignored problem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103, 54-69.
- Kullmann, S., Giel, K. E., Hu, X., Bischoff, S. C., Teufel, M., Thiel, A., . . . Preissl, H. (2014). Impaired inhibitory control in anorexia nervosa elicited by physical activity stimuli. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 9, 917-923.
- Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P.B., Christensen, R.H.B. (2016). ImerTest: Tests in Linear Mixed Effects Models. R package version 2.0-33. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lmerTest>
- Lohse, K., Buchanan, T., & Miller, M. (2016). Underpowered and overworked: Problems with data analysis in motor learning studies. *Journal of Motor Learning and Development*, 4, 37-58.
- MacLeod, C., Mathews, A., & Tata, P. (1986). Attentional bias in emotional disorders. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 95, 15-20.
- Nash, J. C., & Varadhan, R. (2011). Unifying optimization algorithms to aid software system users: optimx for R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 43, 1-14.
- Nelder, J. A., & Mead, R. (1965). A simplex method for function minimization. *The Computer Journal*, 7, 308-313.
- Pauli, W. M., Larsen, T., Collette, S., Tyszka, J. M., Seymour, B., & O'Doherty, J. P. (2015). Distinct contributions of ventromedial and dorsolateral subregions of the human substantia nigra to appetitive and aversive learning. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 35, 14220-14233.
- Pennington, C. R., Qureshi, A. W., Monk, R. L., Greenwood, K., & Heim, D. (2019). Beer? Over here! Examining attentional bias towards alcoholic and appetitive stimuli in a visual search eye-tracking task. *Psychopharmacology*, 1-12.
- Pool, E., Brosch, T., Delplanque, S., & Sander, D. (2016). Attentional bias for positive emotional stimuli: a meta-analytic investigation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142, 79-106.

- Pool, E. R., Pauli, W. M., Kress, C. S., & O'Doherty, J. P. (2019). Behavioural evidence for parallel outcome-sensitive and outcome-insensitive Pavlovian learning systems in humans. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 3, 284-296.
- Powell, M. J. (2009). The BOBYQA algorithm for bound constrained optimization without derivatives. *Cambridge NA Report NA2009/06*, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, 26-46.
- Prévost, C., McNamee, D., Jessup, R. K., Bossaerts, P., & O'Doherty, J. P. (2013). Evidence for model-based computations in the human amygdala during Pavlovian conditioning. *Plos Computational Biology*, 9, e1002918.
- R Core Team. (2017). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Retrieved from <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Rebar, A. L., Ram, N., & Conroy, D. E. (2015). Using the EZ-diffusion model to score a single-category implicit association test of physical activity. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*, 16, 96-105.
- Seymour, B., Daw, N., Dayan, P., Singer, T., & Dolan, R. (2007). Differential encoding of losses and gains in the human striatum. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 27, 4826-4831.
- Stroop, J. R. (1935). Studies of interference in serial verbal reactions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 18, 643-662.
- WHO. (2010a). Global Strategy on diet, physical activity and health. <https://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/pa/en/>. World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.
- WHO. (2010b). Global recommendations on physical activity for health. World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland. <https://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/global-PA-recs-2010.pdf>

1 **Table 1.**

	Physically inactive (n = 43)		Physically active (n = 34)		
	Mean	SD	mean	SD	P-value
Age (years)	21.6	3.2	21.9	3.0	.776
Gender (% women)	29	67	23	68	.999
BMI (kg/m ²)	21.3	2.5	21.8	3.8	.550
Intention to be active	7.1	2.1	8.3	1.7	.006
Mean reaction time (ms)					
to detect a dot on the physically active stimuli side	458.9	88.1	443.6	59.0	.367
to detect a dot on the inactive stimuli side	453.5	80.7	455.3	64.2	.913
Eye-tracker outcomes					
Viewing time of physically inactive stimuli	851.8	503.7	902.2	501.8	.664
Viewing time of physically active stimuli	1041.8	650.6	1346.9	793.5	.075
Viewing time of the fixation cross	1871.0	1262.7	1790.4	1344.2	.789
Pupil size when viewing physically active stimuli	2.88	0.28	2.77	0.24	.071
Pupil size when viewing physically inactive stimuli	2.89	0.28	2.79	0.25	.104
Pupil size when viewing the fixation cross	2.91	0.27	2.82	0.24	.129
Toward active rather than inactive stimuli					
First look (%)	54	7	59	9	.020
Relative gazing time (%)	7	13	18	19	.005
Relative pupil size (mm)	-0.02	0.03	-0.04	0.10	.263

ATTENTIONAL BIAS TOWARD PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

3 **Table 2.**
4

	Model: Response time (log) to detect the dot		Model: Probability to first gaze at active vs. inactive stimuli		Model: Relative viewing time toward active vs. inactive stimuli		Model: Relative pupil size toward active vs. inactive stimuli	
	b (CI)	<i>t</i> value; <i>df</i> ; <i>p</i>	OR (CI)	<i>Z</i> value; <i>p</i>	b (CI)	<i>t</i> value; <i>df</i> ; <i>p</i>	b (CI)	<i>t</i> value; <i>df</i> ; <i>p</i>
Response time (log) to detect the dot								
Fixed Effects								
Intercept	6.09 (6.06;6.12)	360.9;75.4; <.001	1.42 (1.03;1.63)	3.28; .001	12.4 (5.5;19.2)	3.5;10.6; .004	-.016 (-.02;.01)	-4.28;10.38; .001
Dot side (ref. on inactive stimuli)	-.01 (-.02;.01)	1.3;74.6; .224						
Usual level of PA	-.01 (-.04;.03)	-0.9;74.94; .732	1.14 (1.03;1.26)	2.51; .012	7.8 (4.7;10.9)	5.0;63.5; .01	-.01 (-.01;-0.002)	-2.73;63.3; .008
Dot side*Usual level of PA	-.02 (-.03;-.01)	3.2;74.0; .002						
Random Effects								
Participants								
Intercept	2.1×10 ⁻²				70.7		9.4×10 ⁻⁵	
Dot side	7.5×10 ⁻⁴							
Stimuli								
Intercept	1.5×10 ⁻⁵		0.85		96.4		5.9×10 ⁻⁵	
Corr. (Intercept, Dot side)	-0.01							
Participants by dot side								
Intercept			1.18		725.5		1.9×10 ⁻³	
Residual	3.3×10 ⁻²				2373.7		1.3×10 ⁻²	
R ²	.400		.281		.29		.139	

5

6 **Figure 1.**

7
8

9 **Figure 2.**

10

11 **Figure 3.**

12