David Papineau has argued for a distinction between two ways of theorizing about expert action: habitualism and intellectualism. Habitualists about expert action claim that awareness (in Chalmers' sense, see Chalmers 1996) is detrimental to expert performance. Intellectualists, on the other hand, argue that awareness is often crucial for expert performance. There is an abundance of evidence from the sports psychology literature to support the habitualist account. Research on choking under pressure has generated two (unexclusive) hypotheses: being aware of what one is doing (the explicit monitoring hypothesis) and/or being aware of anything else (the distraction hypothesis) typically has detrimental effects on expert action. As a result of these findings from experimental psychology and persuasive habitualist arguments, there seems to be a tension between being absorbed in action and any sort of awareness or reflection. The purpose of this paper is to dispel the notion that this tension applies to all instances of expert performance by arguing for a pluralist account of everyday and esoteric expert action in which awareness and absorption may co-occur (although not always). Arguing against strong forms of habitualism, I will also supplement existing intellectualist perspectives by arguing for non-bodily forms of awareness that contribute to successful expert action. In particular, I will focus on instances of mind-wandering in everyday expert action as well as the functional role of mind wandering in creative expert action. The ultimate aim of the paper is to suggest that an expert actor can be fully engrossed in a task while simultaneously keeping in mind non-immediate mental contents and that it is possible for such mental contents to have a non-detrimental and even beneficial influence on expert action.