

1 Running head: COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

2

3

4 'Let them get on with it': Coaches' perceptions of their roles and coaching
5 practices during Olympic and Paralympic Games

6

7

8

9

10 9th December, 2014

11

12

13

14

15

16

‘Let them get on with it’: Coaches’ perceptions of their roles and coaching
practices during Olympic and Paralympic Games

Abstract

How coaches prepare and perform is critical for athletes’ performances (Gould, Guinan, Greenleaf & Chung, 2002), however, little is known about coaches’ roles and coaching practices during major competitions such as the Olympic or Paralympic Games. To assist coaches in their efforts to improve athletes’ performances in competition environments, greater understanding is needed about the coaching process during major competitions and how coaches prepare and perform. Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to examine track and field coaches’ perceptions of their roles and coaching practices during competition at major events. Eight coaches, seven male and one female, who had coached one or more athletes to an Olympic or Paralympic medal were interviewed. Inductive content analysis indicated that creating an athlete focused supportive environment, detailed preparation and planning, use of effective observation and limited intervention, coach and athlete psychological preparation and managing the process were salient during competition at major events. These findings suggest that during major competition the coach’s role is supportive and facilitative. Actions are largely unobtrusive and in response to athletes’ needs, but remain as detailed as other phases of the coaching process. The findings are discussed in relation to the coach as orchestrator.

Key words: Coaching process, coaching behaviour, performance excellence, orchestration, coaching psychology

Introduction

Coaching is a relational and contextual process that focuses on the guided improvement and long-term development of athletes (International Council for Coaching Excellence, 2013). This process involves the provision of purposeful activities and interventions that focus on improving athletes' performances (Lyle, 2002). Despite a growing body of research examining what coaches do, this research largely focuses on practice or training environments and excludes an important part of the coach's role – coaching during competition (Smith & Cushion, 2006). Furthermore, much of the research has examined coaches working in youth or collegiate environments (e.g., Becker & Wrisberg, 2008; Claxton, 1988; Cushion & Jones, 2001; Gallimore & Tharp, 2004), with much less known about coaching during major competitions such as the Olympic and Paralympic Games. Although the central focus of the coaching process is to facilitate athletes' preparation and performances (Lyle, 2002), coaches are also performing (Giges, Petitpas & Vernacchia, 2004) and how coaches prepare and perform is critical for athletes' performances (Gould, Guinan, Greenleaf & Chung, 2002). However, little is known about coaches' psychological preparation and how their performance can affect athletes. The present study is part of a larger study examining the coaching practices of coaches and their effectiveness in the preparation leading up to and during the Olympics and Paralympics. In the present study we explored successful Olympic and Paralympic track and field coaches' perceptions of their roles and coaching practices during major competitions, including their psychological preparation. In addition, as a means to capture the dynamic and complex nature of coaching we examined the coaches' roles and practices through Jones and Wallace's (2005) concept of coaching as orchestration. There has been only limited empirical examination of this concept (i.e., Santos, Jones, & Mesquita, 2013) and it has not been explored in the competition context. Therefore, a secondary purpose was to examine coaching as orchestration during major competition.

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

1 Coaches' influence on athletes' Olympic performances

2 Coaches and coaching issues have been identified as critical factors in Olympic
3 performances (Gould & Maynard, 2009). The factors perceived to influence athletes'
4 performances were examined in series of studies conducted by Gould and his colleagues
5 (Gould, Greenleaf, Chung, & Guinan, 2002; Gould, Guinan, et al., 2002; Gould, Guinan,
6 Greenleaf, Medbery, & Peterson, 1999; Greenleaf, Gould, & Dieffenbach, 2001). In a
7 survey of 296 Atlanta and 83 Nagano Olympic athletes, Gould, Greenleaf, et al. (2002)
8 found that coaches were perceived to have positive and negative influences on athletes'
9 performances. Athletes perceived trust in the coach, dealing effectively with crisis
10 situations, making decisive but fair decisions, total commitment to helping athletes to
11 succeed, and implementing clear performance plans to have a positive influence on their
12 performances. In contrast, not keeping things simple, over coaching, spending too much
13 time with athletes, unrealistic expectations, and conflict were perceived to have a
14 negative influence on athletes' performances. In a second study (Greenleaf, et al., 2001),
15 interviews with 15 Olympic athletes (N=8 Atlanta, N=7 Nagano) also found that coaches
16 were associated with positive and negative influences on athletes' performances.
17 Coaching related factors that had a positive influence on athletes' performance were
18 contact, trust, friendship, a good plan, well established performance routines and
19 treating the Olympic Games like any other competition. Factors such as conflict, power
20 struggles, and a lack focus by the coach on the team climate were perceived to have a
21 negative influence on athletes' performances. In their study of a female footballer's
22 journey through the preparation for and performance at the Olympics, Pensgaard and
23 Duda (2002) found that it is important for the coach to create positive learning
24 situations that fostered athletes' belief in the possibility of reaching their goal. Gould, et
25 al., (1999) interviewed coaches and athletes from teams that failed to meet expected
26 performance levels and those who exceeded performance expectations about the factors
27 affecting their Olympic performances. Participants of teams that failed to meet

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

performance expectations reported problems associated with coaching such as a negative attitude towards the coach, lack of trust and poor communication between coach and athletes and the coach not being able to deal with distraction and situations at the event. The findings of these studies indicate that coaches are important for athletes' performances and maintaining quality relationships with athletes, having a clear vision and plan for the competition, being prepared for the distractions and situations that may arise, engaging in quality coaching, and not over coaching are important aspects of the coach's role during competition.

Coaches' performances at the Olympics

Giges, et al., (2004) argued that just as athletes are performing so too are coaches and therefore as much attention should be given to coaches' preparation and performance as has been given to athletes. Recent examinations of elite coaches' sources of stress and coping (e.g., Olusoga, Butt, Hays, & Maynard, 2009; Olusoga, Maynard, Hays & Butt, 2012) suggest that researchers are beginning to heed Giges et al.'s call and examine the performance of coaches. However, little is known about how coaches prepare and perform during major competitions. The 'coach as performer' analogy is perhaps most evident when coaching at a major competition such as the Olympic or Paralympic Games. In these situations, coaches are expected to perform their coaching duties in a highly pressurised environment, often where their jobs depend on their athletes' performance successes (Gould, Guinan, et al, 2002). For example, in an interview with legendary Olympic swim coach, James Counsilman, it was revealed that he was often nervous at major competitions but worked hard to hide his own stress responses from his swimmers (Kimiecik & Gould, 1987). Counsilman had learned that athletes model their coaches' anxiety levels and can become more nervous and perform poorly.

In their research with Olympic Games coaches, Gould, Guinan et al. (2002) found that the coaches felt their effectiveness was hindered by marked changes in their

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

coaching behaviours, an inability to establish trust with the athletes, and poor handling of crisis situations. Conversely, keeping things simple, having realistic expectations for their athletes, and following a performance plan facilitated effective coach performance. In a recent examination of coaches' perceptions of the factors that enabled them to coach in a stressful Olympic environment, Olusoga, et al. (2012) found the key factors were psychological attributes (e.g., emotional control and confidence), preparation (e.g., strategic approach), effective communication, an athlete-focus, consistent behaviour, and coping at the event (e.g., team and emotional support). The current literature demonstrates that coaches play a critical role in athletes' performances at major competitions and are performing in their own way. This research also provides valuable insight into a broad range of factors that might be considered and planned for by coaches and support teams to facilitate athletes' performances. However, little is known about coaches' specific roles and coaching practices during major competitions.

Coaching during competition

The limited research that has examined what coaches do during competition suggests that coaches behave differently under practice compared with competition conditions (Cushion, 2010). For example, Smith and Cushion (2006) found that the lower frequency of instruction and higher occurrence of silence during competition was a deliberate coaching strategy to allow time for learning and was not time off-task. It has also been suggested that competition is a time for greater reactive decision making, where coaches observe and evaluate progress on an on-going basis and act when necessary (Cushion, 2010). In addition, coaching during competition at major events also includes the immediate preparation, briefings, and breaks in performance, all of which are opportunities where coaches may influence athletes' performances. Although providing valuable information about the behaviours of coaches in practice and competition conditions, the coaching behaviour research has generally been limited to observations of a discrete range of behaviours such as instruction, feedback, and

1 organisation. With a few notable exceptions (e.g., Potrac, Jones, & Armour, 2002; Smith
2 & Cushion, 2006) this research does not reveal the reasoning behind coaches' actions,
3 nor, does it capture the dynamic and complex nature of coaching process during major
4 events (Potrac, Brewer, Jones, Armour, & Hoff, 2000; Jones & Wallace, 2005).

5 Theoretical framework: Coaching as orchestration

6 To frame our exploration of the dynamic and complex nature of the coaching
7 process during major competitions, we drew upon the concept of coaching as
8 orchestration (Jones & Wallace, 2005; 2006). This was derived from Wallace and
9 Pocklington's (2002) use of orchestration as means to capture complex educational
10 change. Jones and Wallace (2005) argued that the orchestration metaphor could be
11 employed to theorise coaches' contribution to the coaching process. Coaching as
12 orchestration was defined as: "a coordinated activity within set parameters expressed
13 by coaches to instigate, plan, organise, monitor and respond to evolving circumstances
14 in order to bring about improvement in the individual and collective performance of
15 those being coached" (Jones & Wallace, 2005, p. 128). Orchestrator coaches, it was
16 proposed, engage in extensive management of uncertainty, improvisation, and
17 adaptation to evolving situations, whilst "making sure the set course, which is carefully
18 considered in advance, is followed as closely as possible" (p. 131). Orchestration
19 recognises that coaching as a social activity demands appreciation of "the interaction
20 and interconnectivity of events" (Jones, Bailey, & Thompson, 2013, p. 272) and involves
21 both structure and ambiguity.

22 Central features of coaching as orchestration include, steering rather than
23 controlling, structure with flexibility, and close, often unobtrusive, monitoring.
24 Orchestration asserts that coaches steer rather than control the coaching process
25 shaping of the working environment with little overt leadership. This is achieved by
26 unobtrusive monitoring and channelling athletes' agency through encouragement and
27 perceived mutually agreed agendas. The process of steering has been described as

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

1 'behind the scenes string pulling' (Jones & Wallace, 2005; Jones, et al, 2013) and is
2 supported by Santos, Jones, and Mesquita's (2013) findings that elite Portuguese
3 coaches carefully consider their actions generating an illusion of empowerment to
4 ensure compliance with their agenda. Mallett's (2005) reflection on his coaching with
5 the Australian men's Olympic sprint relay teams demonstrates equally careful
6 consideration of his actions and shaping of the coach-athlete working relationship. In
7 contrast, however, he described how he facilitated an autonomy-supportive
8 environment whereby he worked with athletes to genuinely shift responsibility and
9 meaningful decision making back to athletes (Mallett, 2005). Further examination of this
10 feature of the orchestration concept would be valuable to determine a better
11 understanding of the extent to which the process is controlled or guided and who is
12 steering the process and how.

13 Coaching as orchestration suggests that the coaching process is structured,
14 individuals have clear roles, and great attention is given to the detail (Jones & Wallace,
15 2005). For example, the vision and strategy for an athlete is likely to have been
16 developed long before arriving at the Olympic or Paralympic Games. However, the
17 importance of coaches having a clear vision and plans for athletes during the event has
18 also been identified in research with Olympic coaches and athletes (Gould, Greenleaf, et
19 al., 2002; Gould, Guinan et al., 2002; Greenleaf, et al., 2001). However, whilst retaining
20 consistency, coherence, and sight of the overall objective, coaching is also flexible,
21 adaptable, and often unobtrusive (Jones & Wallace, 2005). Flexibility is a necessary
22 component to adapt to the dynamic circumstances ever-present in sport. The flexibility
23 is framed by guidelines that provide a definitive focus and direction without which
24 athletes may become uncertain of what is expected of them. Evidence from research
25 with Olympic athletes suggests that a good plan, being able to adapt tactically, and
26 coping with distractions and situations that may arise are factors that have a positive

1 impact on athletes' performances (Gould, et al., 1999; Gould, Guinan et al., 2002;
2 Olusoga, et al., 2012)

3 According to orchestration, structure with flexibility is achieved through close
4 monitoring of athletes' 'on field' performances and 'off field' interactions, challenges,
5 and emotions. Continual close monitoring has been described as noticing (Jones, et al.,
6 2013) and is viewed as being critical to effective orchestration because coaches must be
7 able to 'see' or notice what is happening and recognise opportunities to act (Jones et al.,
8 2013). The monitoring, and indeed coaches' actions, is often unobtrusive with coaches
9 continually observing and analysing situations in light of the fit with their mental model
10 of expectation (Côté, Salmela, Trudel, Baria, & Russell, 1995). Observing, analysing, and
11 responding to events both on and off the 'field' are direct intervention functions (Lyle,
12 2002) that are critical for the athletes' performances. However, what coaches observe
13 remains a topic of much discussion. Research suggests that one feature that separates
14 expert coaches from other coaches is that they notice more relevant information, often
15 more quickly, and are primed to observe different things (Schempp & McCullick, 2010).
16 Experts notice things that are 'not the norm' and have established repertoires of
17 responses from which to make decisions about how to act (or not act) (Schempp &
18 McCullick, 2010). Much still remains to be discovered about what coaches pay attention
19 to, when and how this is used to inform action.

20 In summary, research examining factors influencing athletes' performances at
21 major competitions indicates that coaches play a critical role and that they are also
22 performers (Gould, Guinan, et al., 2002; Olusoga et al., 2012). Despite suggestions that
23 coaching is likely to be different in competition compared with practice, little is known
24 about coaches' roles and coaching practices during major competitions such as the
25 Olympic or Paralympic Games. In addition, it is argued here that competition at major
26 events as a setting for coaching is indeed dynamic, complex and replete with ambiguity.
27 Coaching as orchestration provides a promising avenue for developing our

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

understanding of the roles and practices of coaches during major events. Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to examine the perceptions of track and field coaches who have produced Olympic and Paralympic medallists to gain a better understanding of their roles and coaching practices during competition at major events. A secondary purpose was to examine coaching as orchestration as a means to capture the coaching roles and practices during major events.

Methods

Participants

Eight track and field coaches, seven male and one female, who ranged in age from 46 to 72 years volunteered to participate in the study. The events coached included Heptathlon (Multi-events), Long Jump, Triple Jump, High Jump, 100m, 400m hurdles and 100m hurdles. To be considered for inclusion in the study, and to ensure the credibility of the data emerging from the interviews, coaches were required to have coached one or more athletes to an Olympic or Paralympic medal. In total, the coach participants had coached athletes to 19 Olympic or Paralympic medals: 11 gold; 4 silver; and 4 bronze. The coaches had between 21 and 51 years of coaching experience ($M = 30.25$ years). All were employed full-time as coaches and six were employed by their National Governing Body. They had attended between one and ten Olympic or Paralympic Games and between them amassed over 30 Olympic and Paralympic coaching appearances. At the time of the interviews, the coaches were at the end of a four-year Olympic cycle (i.e. just after the London 2012 Olympic/Paralympic Games).

Procedure

Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the authors' institution. Subsequently, fifteen coaches were invited to discuss their perceptions of their roles and practices during Olympic or Paralympic events. Initial contact was made through email or a telephone call to each of the participants explaining the aims of the study and the expected commitment. Ten coaches replied stating they would like to be involved and

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

eight coaches fully committed to the study. Once coaches agreed to participate in the study, they were emailed a formal letter, informing them of the nature and purpose of the study. Participants were assured that their comments would remain anonymous and that data would be treated confidentially. Convenient dates and times for the interviews were then agreed upon and informed consent was obtained before data collection. In keeping with the tertiary institution's ethical procedures regarding confidentiality, all participants were given a code (e.g., Coach 1).

Data Collection

Based on existing coach development literature (e.g., Gilbert, Cote', & Mallett, 2006), a semi-structured interview guide was developed (Appendix A). This ensured that all participants were asked the same set of major questions. However, as participants were encouraged to elaborate, the natural flow of conversation directed the discussion and explored the coaches' unique experiences in greater depth as they arose (Patton, 2002). The interview guide was divided into two main sections and the coaches were reminded to focus on their Olympic and Paralympic experiences throughout. The first section involved introductory questions about the coaches' experience and background, and encouraged participants to talk descriptively (Patton, 2002). The second part of the interview guide focused on the coaches' perceptions of their roles and coaching practices during competition which occurred over several days at the event. This section was further divided into 3 sub-sections. The first sub-section discussed the coaches' beliefs about their role and involvement. The second sub-section discussed what the coaches' do for the athlete such as coaching behaviours, how their actions affect the athlete, considerations taken into account when acting or not. The third sub-section discussed what the coaches do for themselves to improve their ability to assist the athlete. The questions initially focused on the day of competition (e.g., what is your role on the day of competition? However, because track and field events in the Olympics and Paralympics typically take place over several days, the coaches were encouraged to

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

1 discuss their roles and practices during the wider 'Olympic competition' (e.g., what is
2 your involvement during competition? What do you do/not do?). Additional follow-up,
3 probing, elaboration, clarification questions were used throughout the interviews to
4 elicit in-depth information and to ensure that the coaches had discussed everything they
5 felt relevant. Coaches were also given the opportunity to add anything relevant that was
6 not discussed during the interview. All the interviews were conducted by the first
7 author. They were carried out either face to face, through Skype or over the telephone.
8 Each interview lasted approximately 60 minutes and was audio recorded.

9 Data analysis

10 The recorded interviews were transcribed verbatim and analysed. To ensure
11 trustworthiness and in keeping with procedures recommended and used within
12 coaching research, (e.g., Côté, Samela, Baria, & Russell, 1993; Olusoga et al., 2012) the
13 transcripts of each interview were content analysed by both authors independently. The
14 analysis was both deductive and inductive using axial and open coding (Patton, 2002).
15 The analysis was deductive in that the overall areas of the study were delineated by the
16 literature and interview guide (e.g., role, actions for the athlete, actions for oneself) and
17 axial coding was used to find evidence of the coaches' roles and practices. However, in
18 keeping with the exploratory nature of the study inductive analysis and open coding
19 was used to analyse features of the complex and dynamic coaching practice. Following
20 initial coding of the data, preliminary lower order themes were developed. At this stage
21 the authors discussed and reached agreement on the themes emerging from data and
22 their meaning in relation to the purpose of the study. These themes were then analysed
23 further through an iterative process which involved organising the lower-order themes
24 into groups, then discussing and providing rationales for the groupings. This process
25 continued until both authors were satisfied that no further groupings were needed to
26 adequately represent the data (i.e., consensus was reached). These final groupings
27 became the higher-order themes.

Results

Overall, the coaching process during major events was athlete-led with the coaches adopting a supportive and facilitative role including managing the wider performance environment. Through detailed preparation and planning most of the coaches' work had been completed prior to the event and the coaches expressed a desire to let athletes get on with their performances. However, they closely observed and monitored the athletes' preparation and performances, assisting when asked by the athlete or if they felt some input was needed. Facilitating the psychological preparation of the athletes was an important part of their coaching practice on the day of competition. The coaches were also performing in their own way and ensuring that their performance was effective required mental preparation and planning.

Six higher order themes emerged from the data representing the coaches' perceptions of their roles and coaching practices during major competitions. These themes were: athlete focused supportive environment, preparation and planning, observation, analysis and intervention, athlete psychological preparation, coach psychological preparation, and management. Each of the themes comprised a number of lower order themes. These are summarised in Figure 1. The number of coaches whose responses fit with each theme is cited next to each higher and lower-order theme. In the following sections each higher-order theme is described, and lower-order themes explored in detail.

Athlete-focused supportive environment

How coaches interpret their roles has implications for what they are likely to do (Gilbert & Trudel, 2004). The athlete-focused supportive environment higher order theme reflected the coaches' perceptions that their roles and actions during competition centred on the athlete and his/her needs. This theme comprised four lower-order themes: athlete-led process, athlete empowerment, support for athlete's performance, and coach behaviour.

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

1 *Athlete-led process.* During competition at the event the coaches believed the
2 coaching process should be, and was, led by the athlete rather than directed by the
3 coach. The coaches described the process as athlete-focused and largely athlete-led. The
4 comments of Coach 6 clearly illustrate this focus: “I am there for support but not there to
5 lead. It is all about the athlete... It is not just athlete centred, it is athlete led.” Their focus
6 included facilitating athlete’s ownership and avoiding ego-involvement. Coach 2 stated
7 that his “philosophy is that they [coaches] should be there for the athlete, focused on the
8 athlete, not on themselves.” Several coaches described how earlier in their careers they
9 had been too involved but had learnt to step back and allow the athletes to lead the
10 process. For example:

11 When I first started in professional coaching, I interfered a bit too much ... I
12 got over that and all I do now is I am with them. I am there and let them
13 bounce off me. Otherwise, I just let them get on with it because they don’t need
14 anyone fussing around them at an important competition. (Coach 3)

15 *Athlete empowerment.* All the coaches expressed a desire to let the athletes
16 perform, but to be there if they were needed. Coach 4 focused on “creating the
17 environment where the athlete is in control.” Coach 5 questioned the athletes to ensure
18 they knew their plan for the competition: “I get them to tell me what their game plan is.”
19 Coach 6 explained his view in this way:

20 ...it is up to athlete... it is their competition, it is their life and what happens is
21 for them it is not about the coach... There is, not a handing over of
22 responsibility because it’s a team effort, it’s a pairing. There is a case of “we
23 have got here together, that’s great, now you take it on. This is your glory,
24 not the coach’s...”

25 *Support for athlete’s performance.* The coaches viewed their role during major
26 competition as supporting the athlete to perform to his/her best. Coach 2 indicated that

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

1 “on the day, my job really is to ensure the athlete competes to their potential. Whatever
2 that takes, within reason.” Coach 6 expressed it this way:

3 I honestly see myself as, not a crutch, but a supporter who’s at a distance...

4 At that stage, it is all about the athlete... However, if you see the wheels
5 coming off you need to intervene.

6 *Coach behaviour.* The coaches treated the competition as a normal day. Coach 1
7 referred to it as “just another day in the office.” For many of the coaches this involved
8 providing consistency and stability for the athletes, particularly not changing their
9 behaviour. The importance of consistent behaviour from the coach was highlighted by
10 Coach 7 who reflected on the consequences of a time when she had mistakenly changed
11 her behaviour:

12 When moving the hurdles (trying to help her), she bit my head off... ‘just leave
13 me to it.’ You see I don’t normally help her with these, but because of the
14 stressful environment, I thought I would help her... I’ve just got to let her go
15 with the flow and let her manage her own warm up.

16 Treating the competition as everything as usual was facilitated by the strong
17 relationships the coaches had established with the athletes over time prior to the Games
18 and knowing how to work with and support them. Coach 6 described his approach in
19 this way:

20 Different athletes act differently at different times and a coach comes to know
21 this... I tailor my communications, body language, around what the athlete is
22 expecting... What does not change for me is having a positive attitude... I’m
23 very controlled and constructive in my thinking, nothing should change... I
24 act... the way the athlete expects me to behave... I have an understanding of
25 the athlete... everything is based on how well you know your athlete... the
26 relationship.

27 *Preparation and planning*

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

1 The preparation and planning higher-order theme reflected the work done before
2 arriving at the Games and during the Games to ensure that athletes were appropriately
3 prepared to compete to the best of their ability. This theme comprised three lower-
4 order themes: high quality work prior to event, rehearsal and simulation, and joint
5 process.

6 *High quality work prior to event.* Many of the coaches indicated that the coach's
7 work had been done prior to the competition and the event was the time for the athlete
8 to perform. The coaches believed that detailed preparation and planning prior to the
9 competition was critical for optimal athletic performance on the day. Coach 8 commented
10 that "all the hard work should have been done in advance." The following quotes illustrate
11 the coaches' views:

12 My role is in the weeks and months prior, I go over everything for the day of
13 competition with the athlete ... I speak to the athletes in the weeks before and
14 put on paper, you know, wake up at this time etc... exactly what to do and
15 when. I keep my mouth shut on the day. (Coach 1)

16 For developed athletes,... people overestimate the role of the coach... if
17 coaches need to coach their athletes whilst competing... what are they doing
18 when coaching before the competition?... They should sit back and enjoy the
19 competition... In training, the whole reason is to teach athletes to compete
20 well and out there let them get on with it... I have come to understand I have
21 done my job prior to competition. (Coach 3)

22 Coach 1 went on to describe an experience which demonstrated the value of pre-
23 competition preparation when an athlete needed to refocus after a poor performance:

24 ...she messed up in [event]... she came back to the warm up track and I said
25 'do you remember what to do in these circumstances, 'she said 'yes'... [I]
26 knocked on her door 2 hours later... she had left [the event] behind her and
27 was in control of the situation and could make a joke at difficult moment in

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

1 her career... This was because we went over this scenario so many times
2 before... 'What will you do? What do you need to do and feel, thought
3 process?'... I did not have to say anything... all I had to say was 'do you know
4 what you now have to do'.

5 *Rehearsal and simulation.* Preparation included rehearsing elements of the
6 plan and performance, including travel, pre-performance routines, and simulating
7 'big event' conditions. The coaches made comments such as "this would all have
8 been rehearsed beforehand. It is a ritual that they have gone through several times"
9 and "keep to routines the importance of which has been explained previously."
10 Coach 5 described rehearsing their travel plans:

11 We always have a defined time when we go to the track. We've run that
12 system 3 or 4 times, we never leave it to chance, taking the bus and organising
13 that trip 3 or 4 times before the competition. (Coach 5)

14 This coach also described how at an appropriate time during their preparation he
15 would simulate the noise and distractions of a major competition so the athlete could
16 experience the conditions and learn to cope:

17 ...the athlete must be in a good place technically for you to do this. If the
18 athlete is struggling with their training technically, you wouldn't carry out
19 this exercise. I would have a ghetto blaster at training to create as much noise
20 as I can, and then I try to communicate with the athlete in the session, and try
21 to talk over it. I would try to create noise and distraction. I would get people
22 to walk in front of the athlete. I would move their mark. I would put a cone in
23 their way. So that the athletes can develop skills for the big stage. (Coach 5)

24 *Joint process.* Competition plans were developed jointly between coach and
25 athlete and generally worked back from the time of competition. Coach 6 indicated
26 that he and the athlete "agree sensible things and processes beforehand." Coach 7
27 explained their joint process:

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

1 We created a run sheet for the day... a run of tasks... we work out what time
2 the event is, what time the call room is, what time we have to start warm up,
3 what time we need to be at the warm up track, what time the bus is etc... all of
4 those things.

5 *Observation, analysis and intervention*

6 The observation, analysis, and intervention higher-order theme reflected the
7 coaches' actions during the competition directly related to athletes' performances. This
8 theme comprised four lower-order themes: monitor preparation, input and feedback,
9 observe performance, and decide to intervene.

10 *Monitor preparation.* The coaches monitored athletes over the course of the day
11 and during preparation. Prior to competition, they monitored the athlete's state of
12 readiness and ensured plans and routines were being followed. The monitoring was
13 often unobtrusive:

14 ...out of the corner of my eye I am keeping an eye on my athletes to make sure
15 that they are doing what they should be doing... whilst keeping an eye on
16 reporting times and once they report... I give them time checks as they go.
17 (Coach 2)

18 *Input and feedback.* On the day of competition the coaches engaged in
19 limited direct coaching, providing only minimal input and feedback. As Coach 8
20 explained, the preparation and planning prior to the competition supported the
21 coaching process at the Games, enabling the process to be athlete-led and require
22 only limited coaching intervention: "you don't want to do much... if you are doing a
23 lot on the day then you are patching things up... all the hard work should have been
24 done in advance... [just] remind them of the usual things." The performance
25 process was led by the athlete with the coaches responding to athletes' questions:

26 Biggest competition... [the athlete says] 'just let me know where I am on the
27 board, I can do the rest'. I just answered the questions he asked... There are

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

1 some things a coach wants to say but that is not what the athlete wants to
2 hear... you need to understand what athlete requires. (Coach 6)

3 I normally don't say too much unless she talks to me. Sometimes we chat
4 about silly things like where her boyfriend is sitting, or look at that guy's
5 jacket. Sometimes it is specific questions... So then you are giving feedback, at
6 this point it's about how she feels, rather than technical. (Coach 7)

7 If the coaches were providing information or feedback it was "concise and
8 accurate", "very simple" and reinforced key messages and readiness:

9 ...when giving the athlete feedback during the competition, I try to keep it
10 simple, positive and general in nature, and don't say too much technically.

11 As a principle I think every time you say something, it creates inhibition for
12 the athlete because they have to digest the information, so normally I would
13 say, 'yeah it looks great'... I like to restrict myself to only the most necessary
14 information. (Coach 1)

15 *Observe performance.* Observation and analysis of athletes' performances was a
16 very important activity for the coaches during the competition. For example coaches
17 reported getting the "best seat that they possibly can to observe their athlete" and that
18 they "concentrate very hard on the competition and focus on who I am coaching... seeing
19 everything they are doing". The observation and analyses was critical to enable the
20 coaches to provide specific feedback to the athlete if required:

21 ...athlete comes out and misses by a mark... I sit there and work out why they
22 missed the board by a mark... you evaluate and then you give feedback.
23 (Coach 2)

24 ...athlete is going down the runway... video... discuss this is what I saw, this is
25 what I think you ought to do to improve it, ask the athlete what they did, what
26 do they think they saw... give them one or two bits of information... They can't
27 take in any more... everything should be simple. (Coach 8)

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

1 *Decide to intervene.* The coaches only intervened if they felt something was
2 not right or the athlete requested it. The coaches would shape the actions of the
3 athlete if they felt it was necessary. Coach 4 suggested that, “the athlete is central
4 to everything... but at times you have to steer the athlete to where they need to be
5 to perform even if they don’t realise it themselves.” Coach 5 made an analogy of a
6 curling stone and brush. The coach being the brush: “you know when you have a
7 curling stone, and you have a brush on the ice and you control the direction of the
8 stone with a brush.” The coaches would also intervene if they felt the athlete’s
9 preparation or performance was not progressing well. Coach 3 explained how he
10 approached direct coaching on the day in this way: “if they ask me technical
11 questions I will give them an answer and if they are making a terrible mistake, I will
12 put them right. But my interference now in major competitions is very few and far
13 between.” Coach 6 described a more subtle but no less direct intervention: “if I see a
14 problem that needs some thought process I will draw their attention [to it].”

15 The decision to intervene, however, was not always straightforward. Coach 8
16 discussed a challenge he faced and his decision making process:

17 In the competition the decision to intervene is very much a judgement call, and can
18 almost be seen as a gamble. In the Olympics, I noticed that the athlete was taking
19 two more strides than they normally take, but she looked good coming in and
20 comfortable at the board. So do I potentially throw petrol on the situation and light
21 a match by telling the athlete ‘your run up is all wrong’, or do I say nothing?
22 Sometimes as a coach, you need to have the confidence to say nothing. That’s when
23 you, as a coach, become a bit of artist, where the situation is quite thick and it’s
24 layered, and you’re comfortable enough to go “let it be”. Inside you might be going
25 “f*** hell, f*** hell, f*** hell”, but you look at it and you go, ‘nah just let it go’, let it sit.
26 It’s a gamble.

27 *Athletes’ psychological preparation*

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

1 The athletes' psychological preparation higher-order theme reflected the roles
2 and practices the coaches' engaged in to assist athletes to be in an appropriate mental
3 state during the competition. This theme comprised three lower-order themes: manage
4 emotional state, instil confidence, and maintain task focus.

5 *Manage emotional state.* All the coaches identified that part of their role was to
6 ensure the athlete was mentally ready to compete and assist this process if necessary.
7 The coaches commented "my job as a coach is getting the athlete settled into being in the
8 right place for that competition" and it is "very much creating a focused, confident not
9 arrogant, relaxed, supported athlete." Coach 8 discussed minimising the pressure the
10 athlete felt: "our job is to take off all pressure... our job to unload her [athlete]." Coach 1
11 described the need to help the athlete manage their emotions: "In general as a coach... it's
12 about emotions... when they are too great you pull them down... when they are
13 depressed... you pull them up... always focused on this is where you have to be." Coach 6
14 explained his approach in this way:

15 Athletes are grown people and should be sensible, however, their minds are
16 on fire, especially on the day of competition... [The coach should] be
17 supportive, positive, be aware of what the athlete needs, not what you think
18 the athlete needs and or/wants, which can be slightly different...

19 The coaches often monitored athletes' psychological states, unobtrusively, and
20 managed it by assisting athletes to cope with anxiety, remain relaxed, or energised. Coach
21 2's description of the way he facilitated athletes' psychological preparation reinforces his
22 monitoring, confidence building and also his flexibility to adapt to the circumstances
23 facing him:

24 basically... monitoring the state of the athlete all the time ... if they are
25 agitated or confident,... and I try not to make it obvious, just looking and
26 feeling the right vibes. If things don't feel or seem right my job is to try and
27 settle [the athlete] as much as I can and if there is a bit of self-doubt there, I

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

1 can try to instil confidence back... I make it up as I go... I have a number of
2 tools in my bag of what to say and how to say it and it depends on the
3 scenario that faces me which tool I pull out.

4 *Instil confidence.* The coaches focused on supporting and building the athletes'
5 confidence. For example coaches talked about "giving confidence" and "making them feel
6 like a million dollars". They also modelled confidence no matter how they felt "I try to
7 almost show confidence and transfer it from me to them."

8 *Maintain task focus.* Ensuring the athletes are focused on the task of performing and
9 were not distracted was also an important role for the coaches. Coach 5 explained his role
10 was do whatever was needed, this might be to assist the athlete with refocusing, smooth
11 out any minor issues, take care of the small things so that the athlete could focus on
12 performing: "my role is I don't let them get distracted... If needed, I am the re-focuser. I'm
13 a smoother outer... the 'don't worry about the small stuff'."

14 *Coaches' psychological preparation*

15 The coaches' psychological preparation higher-order theme reflected the actions of
16 the coaches to optimise their own performance. Coach 5 compared himself with the
17 athlete: "I need to focus and prepare my mind just as the [athlete] does." This theme
18 comprised four lower-order themes: manage emotions, show confidence, maintain task
19 focus, and strategies.

20 *Manage emotions.* The coaches recognised that their emotions could affect their own
21 performance as well as that of their athletes. Coach 8 stated: "if I look anxious, stressed, all
22 I am going to do is transfer that to the athletes and that is of no value at all... you deal with
23 your own anxiety so as not to worry [the athlete]." They discussed "suppressing their
24 emotions", "feeling in control", being "as relaxed as possible", and "appearing clam." Coach
25 6 explained:

26 ...stability comes from the coach. I don't think a nervous coach or an over anxious
27 coach helps the athlete perform. The idea is to appear calm and I think that is what

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

1 the athlete wants. Everything is matter of fact. There is enough tension without the
2 coach being stressed as well. Therefore, I aim to act as normal as possible, no matter
3 how I feel. Even if I'm feeling insecure, or having bad day, the coach needs to
4 supress their emotions.

5 *Show confidence.* The coaches described "looking confident" no matter how they
6 were actually feeling. Coach 2 explained "I am pretty good at supressing my emotions and
7 looking confident even when feeling very insecure." This was often described as being
8 relaxed. Coach 5 said "I try to be as unnervous and relaxed as possible." Coach 4
9 commented being "relaxed, chilled out, very free and easy."

10 *Maintain task focus.* Staying focused was also important to enable the coaches
11 to perform their roles during the competition to support the athlete. Coach 4
12 described being nervous but remaining focused "observing everything and not
13 necessarily communicating a lot... In the call room I can be very nervous but I'm
14 very controlled, knowing exactly where we are all the time... and what is going on.
15 Coach 1 indicated the need to "be aware of it [nerves]" but to remain "focussed on
16 the job and fully aware of things that are not right."

17 *Coping strategies.* The coaches reported using a range of methods to help them
18 manage their emotions and stay focused during the competition. These included "normal
19 breathing techniques to keep calm", "talking to other coaches", "walking a lap" to gather
20 their thoughts, "stopping negative thoughts", "talking to themselves", taking time out for
21 themselves when possible and having a plan for their own performance. Coach 4
22 described his approach in this way:

23 ...on the day of competition... my day is equally as planned out as the
24 athletes... I don't have any interference from what is going on... I will phone
25 home in the morning... there is no further interference... [I try to be] in
26 control not showing any nerves... being as confident as I can and that is part
27 of the plan... and that is also part of training.

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

1 *Management*

2 The management higher-order theme reflected the coaches' involvement in
3 managing the wider performance environment. This theme comprised two lower-order
4 themes: manage competition process, and manage support staff.

5 *Manage competition process.* The coaches ensured athletes followed established
6 plans and routines and were not disrupted. Their actions to manage the process were
7 often relatively unobtrusive. The following quotes illustrate how two of the coaches
8 approached this management role.

9 On the day of competition the athlete would have his plan. I stay very much in
10 the background, and only make decisions on what was needed. I would
11 ensure the athlete had his space. So on the day I would keep the media and all
12 the support staff away, giving him space and keeping everything normal, or as
13 normal and as structured as possible. During the warm up there would be
14 very little communication, with any communication very much guided by the
15 athlete (Coach 4).

16 *Managing support staff.* The coaches also recognised the importance of managing
17 the support staff including establishing clear roles and managing their anxiety levels.
18 Coach 8 explained his views on managing support staff:

19 As coach you have to manage the team as well as yourself... It's an element of
20 being in charge of the whole team and manage them... She [athlete] is on the
21 track and I am there to support her and you [management team] are there to
22 support me.

23 Discussion

24 The purpose of the present study was to examine the coaches' perceptions of their
25 roles and coaching practices during major competitions. We found that the coaches
26 worked to create an athlete-focused supportive environment focussing on managing the
27 wider performance environment and overseeing the performance process. The coaches

expressed a desire to let athletes get on with their performances. This was possible due to the detailed preparation and planning prior to the competition and the experience level of the athletes. The coaches still had important roles. They engaged in detailed, often unobtrusive, observation and analysis of the athletes' psychological and physical preparation and performances. This enabled them to provide feedback and intervene if requested by the athlete or if something was not right. The coaches also recognised and actively worked to control their emotions and portray themselves as confident and relaxed. The findings from the present study provide valuable insight into how the coaching process is implemented in highly pressurised sporting environments such as the Olympic and Paralympic Games. These findings can assist those working in these environments to develop a greater understanding of the influences on athletes' performances and the implementation of coaching practice to facilitate improvements in performance.

Previous research has examined factors influencing athletes' performances at the Olympic Games and factors associated with successful coaching in this environment (e.g., Gould, et al, 1999; Gould et al, 2002; Gould & Maynard, 2009; Greenleaf et al, 2001; Olusoga et al, 2012; Pensgaard & Duda, 2002). Our findings are consistent with this research, specifically, the coaches in the present study emphasised preparation and planning, not over-coaching, managing the athletes' emotional states, and helping the athlete maintain focus. The findings also reinforce the notion that coaches are performing (Giges, et al, 2004) and therefore managing their own emotions and maintaining consistency in their behaviour is essential to their effectiveness (Gould & Maynard, 2009).

Examining the coaches' roles and coaching practices in greater detail allowed us to explore how coaches operate in these complex and dynamic settings. Using Jones and Wallace's (2005) concept of coaching as orchestration it was clear that the coaches could be described as orchestrators and their coaching during competition as

1 orchestration. The concept of orchestration suggests that coaches steer rather than
2 control the coaching process. One coach's use of the curling stone and brush analogy to
3 describe his role and practice captures this unobtrusive steering of the process and
4 supports the concept of coaching as orchestration. Unobtrusively steering the coaching
5 process could be interpreted as manipulative on the part of the coach. Where the coach
6 shapes the athletes' experience to serve the coaches' own interests and there may only
7 be a *perception* that the agenda is mutually agreed between coach and athlete (Jones &
8 Wallace, 2005). Some support for this notion comes from a study of five elite Portuguese
9 coaches which found that the coaches carefully considered their actions to engender an
10 illusion of empowerment to ensure compliance with their agendas (Santos et al, 2013).
11 This might suggest a hierarchical coach-athlete relationship. Such an interpretation
12 appears somewhat at odds with more humanistic, athlete-centred views on coaching
13 (e.g., Kidman, 2005; Mallett, 2005) where coaches support athletes' autonomy, show
14 genuine care for athletes' perspectives, and involve athletes in meaningful decision
15 making to facilitate responsibility and ownership of the overall objective. The coaches in
16 the present study did appear to steer the coaching process, however, they also described
17 a process whereby the athlete was the central focus and they worked to empower the
18 athlete to lead the process. From the coaches' perspectives this 'agenda' was mutually
19 agreed between athlete and coach, rather than the result of a hierarchical relationship
20 where the coach set the agenda. Examples such as coaches limiting communication with
21 athletes unless requested by the athlete (e.g., answering their questions) or an athlete
22 berating the coach for behaviour that was not 'normal' (e.g., 'helping' with hurdles)
23 suggest the coaches were perhaps not as 'in control' of the process as even the
24 orchestration concept seems to suggest. In fact, athletes, particularly experienced
25 athletes, actually determined the process during competition at the event. Rather than
26 resist this situation or see it as cause for concern, the coaches embraced, encouraged,
27 and actively supported the athletes' autonomy. Their approach appeared to be a genuine

1 expression of empowerment that let the athletes 'get on with it.' It is important to note
2 that the coaches in the present study were working with experienced elite athletes.
3 Future research should continue to explore how the coaching process is steered and
4 determine whether coaches working with less experienced development athletes also
5 adopt an empowering approach.

6 The coaches' desire to let the athletes get on with performing and their
7 willingness to 'stay in the background' was largely possible due to the established
8 coach-athlete relationships and detailed planning and preparation prior to the event
9 and day of competition. Establishing a strong relationship between the coach and
10 athlete enables the coach to understand the psychological needs of the athlete and
11 respond accordingly (Gould & Maynard, 2009). Preparation and planning has been
12 identified as an important factor influencing athletes' performances (Gould et al, 2002)
13 and part of successful coaching in the Olympic environment (Olusoga, et al, 2012). In
14 addition, sport psychology researchers have suggested that preparing athletes for
15 dealing with disruptions and helping them to avoid distractions is one of the most
16 important things coaches can do to assist athletes in their Olympic performance (Gould
17 et al, 2002; Orlick & Partington, 1988). Structure and attention to detail are central
18 features of orchestration (Jones & Wallace, 2005). The detailed plans and routines
19 provided structure, clear direction, and a strong foundation from which the athlete then
20 had the freedom to perform. They were developed prior to competition, sometimes over
21 years, and reduced the ambiguity in the setting for athletes and coaches. This provided a
22 sense of control where complete control is not possible.

23 Another key finding was the extensive use of observation by the coaches, whereby
24 they were constantly monitoring and assessing the athletes' preparation and
25 performance. From an observer's perspective, the coaches may appear to be 'off-task',
26 however, the coaches were very much 'on task'. They were actively, but silently,
27 observing the athlete's preparation and performance. The use of silence by the coaches

provides support for Rupert and Buschner's (1989) notion of silently monitoring as a coaching strategy, where the coach reflects on appropriate interventions. Silent observation by the coach was also found by Smith and Cushion (2006) to be a deliberate coaching strategy, with coaches silently monitoring individual performance, and reflecting upon timely and appropriate intervention. The extensive use of observation and analysis and limited direct intervention is another central feature of orchestration (Jones & Wallace, 2005; Jones, et al., 2013). Borrowing from Mason's (2002) work, Jones et al (2013) argued that noticing was the foundation for orchestration in that before a coach can act he/she needs to recognise an opportunity to do so. The coaches in the present study were clearly noticing. Of interest is what they were noticing. The coaches described looking for things that were 'not right'. Although the coaches did not directly mention it, this suggests they had a representation in their mind or mental model of what they expected to see (Côté, et al, 1995). This extended beyond the athletes' sport-specific technical and tactical performances. At major events the coaches attended to the athletes' psychological states, the actions and psychological states of support staff, potential for distractions and the possible impact of their own actions and psychological state on athletes' performances. These findings support the importance observation and analysis play in coaching and as perhaps one of the distinguishing features of expert coaches (Schempp & McCullick, 2010). Investigations into what, when, and why coaches notice and how this is used to impact performance holds promise to further our understanding of the coaching process and influences on coaches' performance.

Another important finding from the present study was that the coaches provided only limited input and feedback to athletes during major events. This finding is in contrast, to research examining coaching behaviours in training situations. For example, Potrac, Jones and Armour (2002) finding that the football coach in their study used frequent instruction. The high frequency of instruction was explained by the coach's desire for control over the team's and players' improvement and the coach's conscious

1 efforts to portray his knowledge of the game and thereby gain the players' respect. Our
2 finding is consistent with the limited research examining coaching during competition,
3 which suggests a greater emphasis on silent observation and 'on-task' monitoring and a
4 lower frequency of instruction (e.g., Smith & Cushion, 2006). In the present study, the
5 coaches used simple and concise input and feedback to provide a definitive focus,
6 thereby reducing ambiguity for athlete, and maintain momentum towards their
7 objectives. This allowed the athlete to continue their preparation or performance with
8 only minimal disruption. However, the decision to intervene could be a complex
9 decision making process, with the coaches considering a wide range of information to
10 decide whether or not to intervene and, if so, what to do and when. The cognitive ability
11 to make repeated rapid assessments of circumstances, compare them with mental
12 models, and make an appropriate intervention has been suggested to be a cornerstone
13 of coaches' expertise (Schempp & McCullick, 2010).

14 Coaching as orchestration focuses on the social activity of coaching, the
15 interactions amongst various stakeholders in complex and dynamic contexts. It
16 considers the management of coaches, themselves, largely in the context of how they
17 steer others. The findings from the present study indicate that although the focus of the
18 coaching process is on the athletes and their performances, coaches are performing in
19 their own way. The coaches were consciously managing their own performance, albeit
20 for the betterment of the athletes' performances. This finding supports the growing
21 recognition that coaches are performers (e.g., Giges et al, 2004; Olusoga et al, 2012) and
22 that personal preparation is important for the facilitation of a successful coaching
23 performance (Gould, Guinan et al. (2002). To date, only a small number of studies have
24 examined how coaches prepare for their performance during competition at major
25 events or how they perform at these events. In addition to managing their own
26 emotions, the coaches in the present study indicated that it was important for them to
27 take time out to relax away from the stresses of the environment, so that they could

function to the best of their ability, both physically and mentally. Recognising the value of leaders' personal well-being (physical, spiritual, emotional and mental) to their performance is gaining recognition (e.g., Giges, et al, 2005; Loehr & Schwartz, 2001; Olusoga et al., 2012). Greater understanding of coaches' own preparation and performance will enable developments in education and support to ensure coaches are appropriately prepared for the pressurised environment of major events such as the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

Limitations and future directions

Our findings provide valuable insight into the process of coaching during track and field competition at major events, however, it is not our intention that these findings be generalised to other sports, or contexts. This is for several reasons. First, due to the small number of participants it would be inappropriate to generalize the findings beyond this sample. Second, coaching is a contextualised process and the present study focused on coaches working with experienced athletes from one sport, track and field, in a very specific context, the Olympic and Paralympic Games. How coaches in different sports, with different athletes, and in different contexts, interpret their roles and coach is might not be the same as that of the coaches in our study. However, our findings do provide some interesting directions for future research. To further our understanding of the coaching process during competition researchers might examine coaches working with athletes in different contexts (e.g., other sports or working with developing athletes). For example, one of the coaches in our sample stated that you cannot stop an athlete in the middle of the 800m, therefore, coaching during the actual performance is limited. However, a basketball coach, for example, can call a timeout, make substitutions, use quarter- and half-time breaks as opportunities to influence athletes' performances. Questions might focus on the extent to which coaches' recognise the ambiguity in sports settings, what attempts, if any, are made to retain control, and how they manage uncertainty for the athlete but equally for themselves. Furthermore, the present study

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

only gained the insight of the coaches. Gould and colleagues (Gould, et al, 1999; 2002; Greenleaf et al, 2001) found that athletes' also had views on their coaches' effectiveness leading up to and during the Olympics. Future research should include more in-depth analysis of athletes' perceptions, specifically about the coaches' roles and the process of coaching during competition. This could include consideration of athletes' perceptions of coaching as orchestration.

Conclusion

The present study provides detailed insight into eight coaches' perceptions of their roles and coaching practices during competition at major events. The coaches emphasised that competition was a time to 'let the athletes get on with it', noting that all the work was done prior to the competition, and only minimal input, if any, was needed. This is not to say that the coaches had no part to play, rather that much of their role was unobtrusive. They supported and facilitated athletes' performances, closely monitoring athletes, and intervening only if needed. This involved the use of psychological strategies to manage the emotions and focus of the athlete, the support team, and themselves. The findings provide preliminary support for coaching during competition as orchestration, and the coaches appeared to be the orchestrators. However, further research is warranted to examine who steers the process and how, and whether this changes as athletes gain more experience. In addition, the coaches were engaged in detailed noticing and some insight has been gained about what coaches notice. This is a promising area for future research to identify what coaches notice and how this informs coaching practice. Finally, the findings indicate that coaches are performing in their own way and a greater understanding of the coaches' performance process is needed to ensure coaches can be adequately prepared to perform effectively in highly pressurised environment such as the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

References

- Becker, A. J., & Wrisberg, C. A. (2008). Effective coaching in action: Observations of legendary collegiate basketball coach Pat Summitt. *The Sport Psychologist*, 22, 197-211.
- Claxton, D. B. (1988). A systematic observation of more and less successful high school tennis coaches. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 7, 302-310.
- Côté, J., Salmela, J. H., Baria, A., & Russell, S. (1993). Organising and interpreting unstructured qualitative data. *The Sport Psychologist*, 7, 127 – 137.
- Côté, J., Salmela, J., Trudel, P., Baria, A., & Russell, S. (1995). The coaching model: A grounded assessment of expert gymnastic coaches' knowledge. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 17, 1-17.
- Cushion, C. J. (2010). Coach behaviour. In J. Lyle, & C. J. Cushion, (Eds.), *Coaching professionalism and practice* (pp. 43-62). Elsevier: London
- Cushion, C. J., & Jones, R. L. (2001). A systematic observation of professional top-level youth soccer coaches. *Journal of Sport Behaviour*, 24, 1 – 23.
- Gallimore, R., & Tharp, R. (2004). What a coach can teach a teacher, 1975-2004: Reflections and reanalysis of John Wooden's teaching practices. *The Sport Psychologist*, 18, 119-137.
- Giges, B., Petitpas A. J., & Vernacchia R. A. (2004). Helping coaches meet their own needs: Challenges for the sport psychology consultant. *The Sport Psychologist*, 18, 430-444.
- Gilbert, W., & Trudel, P. (2004). Role of the coach: how model youth team sport coaches frame their roles, *The Sport Psychologist*, 18, 21-43.
- Gilbert, W., Côté, J., & Mallett, C. (2006). Developmental paths and activities of successful sport coaches. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 1, 69–76.

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

- 1 Gould, D., Greenleaf, C., Chung, Y., & Guinan, D. (2002). A survey of U.S. Atlanta and
2 Nagano Olympians: Factors influencing performance. *Research Quarterly for*
3 *Exercise and Sport*, 73, 175-186.
- 4 Gould, D., Guinan, D., Greenleaf, C., & Chung, Y. (2002). A survey of U.S. Olympic coaches:
5 Variables perceived to have influenced athlete performances and coach
6 effectiveness. *The Sport Psychologist*, 16, 229–250.
- 7 Gould, D., Guinan, D., Greenleaf, C., Medbery, R., & Peterson, K. (1999). Factors affecting
8 Olympic performance: Perceptions of athletes and coaches from more and less
9 successful teams. *The Sport Psychologist*, 13, 371-394.
- 10 Gould, D., & Maynard, I. W. (2009). Psychological preparation for the Olympic Games.
11 *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 27, 1393–1408.
- 12 Greenleaf, C. A., Gould, D., & Dieffenbach, K. (2001). Factors influencing Olympic
13 performance: Interviews with Atlanta and Nagano U.S. Olympians. *Journal of*
14 *Applied Sport Psychology*, 13, 179-209.
- 15 International Council for Coaching Excellence. (2013). *International Sport Coaching*
16 *Framework 1.2*. Human Kinetics, Champaign, IL.
- 17 Jones, R. L., & Wallace, M. (2005). Another bad day at the training ground: Coping with
18 the ambiguity in the coaching context. *Sport, Education and Society*, 10, 119-134.
- 19 Kidman, L. (2005). *Athlete-centred coaching*. Innovative Print, Christchurch, NZ.
- 20 Kimiecik, J., & Gould, D. (1987). Coaching psychology: The case of James ‘Doc’
21 Counsilman. *The Sport Psychologist*, 1, 350–58.
- 22 Loehr, J., & Schwartz, T. (2001). The making of a corporate athlete. *Harvard Business*
23 *Review*, January, 120–128.
- 24 Lyle, J. (2002). *Sports coaching concepts: A framework for coaches’ behaviour*. Routledge:
25 London.
- 26 Olusoga, P., Butt, J., Hays, K., & Maynard, I. W. (2009). Stress in elite sports coaching:
27 Identifying stressors. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 21, 442–459.

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

- 1 Olusoga, P., Maynard, I., Hays, K., & Butt, J. (2012): Coaching under pressure: A study of
2 Olympic coaches. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 30, 229-239.
- 3 Orlick, T., & Partington, J. (1988). Mental links to excellence. *The Sport Psychologist*, 2,
4 105-130.
- 5 Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd Ed.). Thousand
6 Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 7 Potrac, P., Jones, R., & Armour, K. (2002). 'It's all about getting respect': The coaching
8 behaviours of an expert English soccer coach. *Sport, Education, and Society*, 7, 183-
9 202.
- 10 Potrac, P., Brewer, C., Jones, R., Armour, K., & Hoff, J. (2000). Towards a holistic
11 understanding of the coaching process. *Quest*, 52, 186-199.
- 12 Rupert, T., & Buschner, C. (1989). Teaching and coaching: A comparison of instructional
13 behaviors. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 9, 49 – 57.
- 14 Schempp, P. G., & McCullick, B. (2010). Coaches' expertise. In Lyle, J. & Cushion, C. (Eds.)
15 *Sports coaching: Professionalisation and practice* (pp. 221-232). Elsevier, London.
- 16 Smith, M., & Cushion, C. J. (2006). An investigation of the in-game behaviours of
17 professional, top-level youth soccer coaches, *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 24, 355-
18 366.
- 19

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

- 1 Figure 1. Olympic and Paralympic track and field coaches' roles and coaching
- 2 practices during major events.
- 3

4

5

6

7

COACHING DURING OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

- 1 Appendix A. Interview Guide
- 2 Can you tell me about your coaching background?
- 3 What do you see your role during competition?
- 4 As the coach, what are you doing for the athlete?
- 5 As the coach, what are you doing for yourself?
- 6 What is your philosophy on what your role should be on the day and why is this?
- 7 Why do you take a particular approach, and how did it develop?
- 8 Can you tell me of a critical incident (moment) on competition day where you had to
- 9 make a decision that affected the athletes performance?
- 10 Can you give me an example of a successful outcome?
- 11 • Why did you make that decision?
- 12 Can you give me an example an unsuccessful outcome?
- 13 • Why did you make that decision?
- 14 How have you, the successful coach, developed your ability to coach successfully in an
- 15 Olympic environment?
- 16