



HAL
open science

Considering perceptual experiences and adaptive actions in performance analysis of elite Formula Kite riders by combining qualitative data and measured key indicators of performance

Eric Terrien, Benoît Huet, Paul Iachkine, Jacques Saury

► To cite this version:

Eric Terrien, Benoît Huet, Paul Iachkine, Jacques Saury. Considering perceptual experiences and adaptive actions in performance analysis of elite Formula Kite riders by combining qualitative data and measured key indicators of performance. *International journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, In press, 10.1177/17479541231153273 . hal-04086534

HAL Id: hal-04086534

<https://nantes-universite.hal.science/hal-04086534v1>

Submitted on 2 May 2023

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

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

1 **Considering perceptual experiences and adaptive actions in performance analysis of elite Formula**
2 **Kite riders by combining qualitative data and measured key indicators of performance**

3

4 **Eric TERRIEN^a, Benoît HUET^a, Paul IACHKINE^b, Jacques SAURY^a**

5 ^aNantes Université, Movement - Interactions – Performance, MIP, EA 4334, F-44000 Nantes,
6 France.

7 ^bEcole Nationale de Voile et des Sports Nautiques, Beg Rohu, 56510 Saint Pierre-Quiberon,
8 France.

9

10 Corresponding author: eric.terrien@univ-nantes.fr

11

12 **Abstract:**

13 Formula Kite is a high-speed sailing sport using hydrofoils, recently included in the Olympic
14 sports list. In Formula Kite, the riders' technical abilities to reach and maintain high speed are
15 key to achieving performance. The aim of the present study was to analyze Formula Kite riders'
16 performance during speed-tests in practice sessions by combining qualitative descriptions of
17 their lived perceptual experiences “from the inside” with measured correlates of performance.
18 The courses of experience of four expert Formula Kite riders' speed-tests were analyzed,
19 compared and discussed in relation to their measured VMG. Results of the qualitative analyses
20 provide original insight into the fine technical adaptations of the riders in their pursuit of
21 performance. Furthermore, the comparison between the evaluated performance using speed
22 measurements and the perceived performance assessed by the qualitative analysis shows
23 interindividual differences as well as inconsistencies between the two modes of analysis. Based
24 on these results, the present study opens practical perspectives for improving training practices,
25 consisting in “calibrating” the sailors' perceived performances with measured performances.

1

2 **Keywords:**

3 Performance, Sailing, Kitesurfing, Hydrofoil, Course of Action, Qualitative analysis,

4 Experience, Enaction

5

6 **1 Introduction**

7 In recent years, Olympic sailing has undergone major changes with the introduction of
8 foiling boats and boards. Hydrofoils are appendages used to produce vertical forces to lift the
9 hull up and out of the water, allowing higher speeds to be reached provided the flight is
10 stabilized.¹ This introduction of foiling boats and boards among Olympic classes has two main
11 consequences. First, boat speed and the sailors' technical adjustments to optimize this speed
12 now appear to be the main key factors of performance, compared to tactical and strategic
13 factors.² Secondly, these technical adjustments to control and maintain high-speed flight require
14 continuous subtle perceptual-motor adaptations, in order to ride a very unstable complex system
15 in interaction with a dynamic and uncertain environment.^{3,4}

16 From the perspective of performance analysis in sailing, these characteristics warrant
17 for researchers, sport scientists and coaches to take a deeper interest in (a) the sailors' fine
18 technical adaptations in speed-test situations, and (b) the perceptual-motor experiences in such
19 situations. The aim of the present study is to present a way of articulating some measured
20 correlates of performance and subjective assessment of performance in elite Formula Kite riders
21 during speed-tests. The challenge is to take into account the sailors' perceptual experiences
22 more fully when their performances are analyzed, in order to improve training practices. This
23 position is based on the general idea that "there can be tremendous value in combining
24 descriptions 'from the inside' and 'from the outside'" (p. 315).⁵

1 Research on sailing in sports science has focused on three main topics: (a) physical
2 characteristics of the sailors, studying the biomechanical, physiological and anthropometric
3 determinants of performance,⁶⁻⁹ (b) psychological aspects of performance, studying the process
4 of decision-making with regard to strategic choices,^{10,11} and (c) statistical analysis of GPS data
5 to compare the speed and distance covered by the sailors.^{2,12-14} For example, in Formula Kite,
6 the speed, distance traveled, number of maneuvers, and time spent on the courses of upwind,
7 downwind, and beam reach of Olympic sailors were analyzed.² To do so, researchers used data
8 collected through the SAP-Sailing® application during Formula Kite-class World Cups. They
9 concluded that speed and time spent sailing upwind and beam reach are the variables that can
10 best distinguish between a “good” and a “bad” sailor. This study emphasized that at the time of
11 the study, the Formula Kite class demonstrates unique performance characteristics, even when
12 compared to other dinghy sports included in the Olympic program.² Indeed, it showed that the
13 variables related to tactics, such as the distance traveled and the maneuvers performed, were
14 not key to differentiating the sailors based on their performance levels in the Formula Kite class.
15 Conversely, the strong influence of the technical variables to optimize speed was underlined.
16 However, although these studies provided insights into key indicators of performance, most of
17 these studies are insufficient to describe and to understand the activity that is actually
18 implemented by the sailors to reach performance. Surprisingly, despite the fact that sailing
19 sports provide relevant situations for analyzing performance of athletes handling complex sport
20 equipment in dynamic environments, the handling techniques have long been a “non-subject”
21 in both the sailing literature¹⁵ and the scientific literature.¹⁶

22 In recent years, a small number of studies have contributed to the understanding of
23 performance in sailing by studying the relations between the perceptions and actions of the
24 sailors with control of the boat, in representative performance environments.^{3,4,16,17} In their
25 study, Pluijms et al.¹⁶ studied the visual search behavior of ILCA (International Laser Class

1 Association) sailors together with their movement behavior, dinghy control and the wind speed
2 during a mark rounding. The findings revealed that all four factors are associated with
3 performance. A further study described the focus of attention of ILCA sailors when sailing
4 upwind.¹⁷ The results showed large interindividual differences in focus of attention, and
5 highlighted that using different foci under the same circumstances can lead to the same
6 performance outcomes, and also that using similar foci under the same circumstances can lead
7 to differences in performance. The authors suggested that the lack of relation between focus of
8 attention and performance can be explained by the diversity of sensory modalities involved in
9 handling a sailboat and the possible overlapping of information obtained from different sensory
10 modalities. We further argue that the analysis of the foci of attention without considering
11 sailors' lived experiences does not allow these foci of attention to be connected precisely to the
12 sailors' performance. Two recent studies^{3,4} have taken these sailors' lived experiences into
13 account. They analyzed the activity of crewmembers on double-handed foiling catamarans. The
14 qualitative analysis of the sailors' experiences of controlling the boat provided insights into the
15 perceptual experiences of the sailors in relation to the boat's movements. Furthermore, by
16 discussing the role of the boat as a "partner" of the collective coordination,⁴ these studies
17 highlighted the interest of a systemic and holistic approach of performance analysis in sailing.

18 In the present study, we focused on Formula Kite as a newly-added Olympic sailing
19 class. Following the conclusions of Caraballo et al.² about the influence of technical variables
20 on performance in Formula Kite, this study aimed at exploring the perceptual experiences of
21 elite Formula Kite riders when they are involved in speed-tests during training sessions. Speed-
22 tests are used during training sessions to compare the speed performances of sailors. Speed-
23 tests usually take the form of short runs (about one to three minutes) between training partners
24 sailing next to each other on the same leg, in order to compare their speed performance in the
25 same conditions.

1 This study was conducted within the Course of Action framework¹⁸⁻²¹ which has been
2 used for numerous studies focused on the analysis and improvement of sport performance.²²⁻³⁵
3 Furthermore, this framework proposes a systemic approach allowing analysis of the athletes’
4 activity in relation to the sport equipment they use, which is particularly pertinent in sailing^{3,4}
5 and certain other sports.^{25-28, 30-35} In the domain of performance analysis, it was presented as
6 providing a useful qualitative methodology to describe and to analyze athletic performances
7 “from the inside”,⁵ complementary to approaches based on mechanical or biomechanical
8 measurements. This theoretical framework has provided a foundation for various studies using
9 mixed-methods design in sport.^{25,26,28,30-35} For example, joint analysis of phenomenological data
10 and kinematics data in rowing revealed links between the rowers’ perception of their stroke
11 quality and the kinematics of strokes that were previously unsuspected by rowers and
12 coaches.^{25,26,28,33} As a result, coaches could define new training objectives to remedy
13 dysfunctions in crew coordination.²⁸ From a similar perspective in ultra-trail running, Hauw et
14 al.³⁵ examined the relation between typical activity states experienced by the runners during a
15 race, and the runners’ velocities. Their results suggest that the runners’ perception of being in
16 a given activity state is informed by the variation in elevation velocities. Together, the results
17 of these studies have revealed the empirical fruitfulness and the practical interest of combining
18 phenomenological data with measures of relevant features of performance in various sports.

19 The theoretical framework of the Course of Action refers to an enactive approach of
20 human activity.^{18,33} Two main assumptions of this framework guide the analysis of the athletes’
21 activity in the context of sports performance: (a) performance is situated, meaning it cannot be
22 dissociated from the context in which it takes place, and must therefore be studied *in situ*, and
23 (b) the interactions between the athletes and their environment are asymmetrical in that each
24 athlete interacts with their own meaningful world, enacted through the history of a dynamical
25 coupling between the athlete and their environment.^{18,36} These assumptions have one main

1 methodological implication for performance analysis of the Formula Kite riders: to consider
2 both perceptual experiences of riders and relevant measures of the outcomes of their activity in
3 the ecological conditions of real performance situations. Within this framework and in the scope
4 of this paper, we refer to perceptual experience as the meaningful perturbations and salient
5 perceptions of the riders in relation to their pursuit of performance. That is, we approach
6 perceptual experience in terms of sense-making rather than in terms of relevant cue recognition
7 of visual search behavior¹⁶⁻¹⁷.

8

9 **2 Methods**

10 **2.1 Participants and situation**

11 Four Formula Kite riders (two men and two women) volunteered to participate in the
12 study, with an age of 24.75 ± 3.5 yrs (mean \pm SD). They were competing at international level
13 with track records of reaching podiums in European and world championships. The protocol of
14 the study was approved by the Ethical Committee for Non-Interventional Research of the
15 university of affiliation of the authors. All participants provided written informed consent to
16 participate in the study. In order to protect their anonymity, we have used pseudonyms for each
17 participant: KM1 and KM2 for the two men; KW1 and KW2 for the two women.

18

19 **2.2 Data collection**

20 Data were collected during a training session. Four speed-tests were performed for the
21 needs of the study: two speed-tests upwind (one on starboard tack, one on port tack), and two
22 speed-tests downwind (one on starboard tack, one on port tack). The duration of the speed-tests
23 ranged between 1 min 47 s and 3 min 20 s. Speed-tests were performed one after the other with
24 time between each test for the riders to regroup. Wind speed during the speed-tests was

1 measured at 15 to 17 knots. The wind created small waves, and there was no significant ground
2 swell in the sailing area. Riders used kite surfaces ranging between 11 m² to 13 m².

3 Data were collected in two steps. First, the behavior of the riders was video-recorded
4 from the coach's boat during the training session. Each rider was also equipped with an action
5 sport camera (VIRB XE, Garmin) fitted on their helmet, providing a continuous recording of
6 the situation from a "first-person point of view". Furthermore, a 5Hz measurement unit with
7 Global Positioning System (GPS, Yachbot, Igtimi) was installed on each rider's board to record
8 the board speed. Secondly, retrospective verbalizations by the athletes were recorded during
9 individual self-confrontation interviews, which took place two to four hours after the training
10 session. These interviews consisted in confronting each rider with recorded videos of the
11 training to make the rider "re-live" the situation. The researcher and the athlete were installed
12 in front of a computer playing in sync the videos recorded from the action sport camera and
13 from the coach's boat. The researcher used prompts to guide the athletes in a chronological
14 description of the re-lived experience, expressing as precisely as possible what they had aimed
15 for, done, expected, felt, thought, and perceived at every moment. As examples, typical prompts
16 used by the researcher were: "at this moment, what are you doing?", "what are you looking to
17 do?", "what are you thinking?", "what are you focused on?", or "what are you feeling?" The
18 answers of the participants could then be the subject of requests for more details in order to
19 obtain the most accurate description possible of their first-person experience. Moreover, like
20 the researcher, athletes were able to control the video playback by pausing or replaying
21 sequences to take the time to describe their "re-lived" experience of these moments.

22

23 **2.3 Data analysis**

24 The self-confrontation interviews were fully transcribed. The data analysis was then
25 conducted in three steps: (a) identification of meaningful episodes of the riders' courses of

1 experience and categorization into episodes of good or bad perceived performance; (b)
2 evaluation of the riders' performance based on their Velocity Made Good (VMG) for each
3 meaningful episode of the riders' courses of experience; and (c) comparison of the evaluated
4 performance with the perceived performance of the meaningful episodes of the riders' courses
5 of experience.

6

7 **2.3.1 Identification of meaningful episodes of the riders' courses of experience and** 8 **categorization into episodes of good or bad perceived performance**

9 The qualitative analysis of the data consisted of reconstructing the participants' courses
10 of experience on each speed-test. We carried out a back and forth progressive/regressive
11 analysis of the data¹⁸ to identify (a) meaningful units of the riders' courses of experience, and
12 (b) the meaningful episodes of the riders' courses of experience.

13 The meaningful units were identified through chronologically progressive analysis of
14 the data. Following the Course of Action's methods, one meaningful unit of the course of
15 experience can be documented as an hexadic sign, involving and articulating six components
16 at a given moment^{18,19}: the *involvement in the situation* (i.e., concerns opened at the instant t),
17 the *anticipation structure* (i.e., expectations that are delimited by the *involvement in the*
18 *situation*), the *referential* (i.e., mobilized knowledge belonging to the actor's own culture), the
19 *representamen* (i.e., meaningful elements of the situation considered by the actor at each
20 moment), the *unit of the course of experience* (i.e., the meaningful accomplished action from
21 the actor's viewpoint), and the *interpretant* (i.e., constructed or reinforced knowledge at this
22 given moment).¹⁸ We particularly focused on describing the riders' perceptual experiences,
23 examining two main components of the hexadic signs: the meaningful elements of the situation
24 (*representamen*), and the meaningful adaptive actions (*units of the course of experience*), from
25 the riders' viewpoints.

1 The meaningful episodes of the riders' courses of experiences were broader significant
2 structures of their courses of experiences. They were identified through chronologically
3 regressive analysis of the data.¹⁸ In this step, we identified the opening and closing of sets of
4 concerns delimiting the beginning and the end of each episode respectively. A total of 57
5 episodes of riders' courses of experience were identified (14 episodes for KM1, 18 episodes for
6 KM2, 15 episodes for KW1 and 10 episodes for KW2).

7 The episodes of the courses of experience were then categorized by answering the
8 following question: Was the rider's experience of their own performance good or bad during
9 this episode? The perceived perturbations and salient perceptions documented were used to
10 answer this question. For example, episodes with recurrent perceptions of the board touching
11 the water, or episodes with the rider describing the sensation of feeling the kite pulling in the
12 wrong direction, were categorized as bad perceived performance. In contrast, when the rider
13 described sensations of feeling fast, or feeling settled, the episodes were categorized as episodes
14 of good perceived performance. When no sufficient description of the perceived perturbation
15 and salient perceptions was available to categorize the episode as good or bad perceived
16 performance, the episodes remained uncategorized.

17 The analysis was conducted by the first author with two of the co-authors acting as
18 "critical friends".³⁷ This involved reading transcripts and watching videos, and discussing and
19 asking provocative questions about the labeling of the episodes. Three of the co-authors were
20 experienced in conducting qualitative research within the Course of Action framework. In
21 addition, all co-authors had extensive knowledge of high-performance sailing.

22 **2.3.2 Evaluation of the riders' performance based on their VMG**

23 Each episode of the riders' courses of experience was categorized in relation to an
24 objective measurement of the riders' performance during the speed-test: the VMG. VMG is the
25 technical term used in sailing to indicate the measured speed of a sailboat towards (or from) the

1 direction of the wind. The use of the VMG to evaluate objective performance is relevant
2 because in Formula Kite, as in all sailboats, it is impossible to sail directly upwind and it is not
3 efficient to sail directly downwind. The VMG is calculated by considering both the board speed
4 over ground and the angle between the wind direction and the point of sail of the board. The
5 VMG is considered as the most important variable for evaluating the performance of the
6 sailor.^{16,17,38,39}

7 VMG in Formula Kite is highly dependent on wind and sea conditions, and the latter
8 can vary at the scale of a speed-test. Therefore, we used two complementary measures to
9 evaluate the riders' performances during each episode: (a) for each speed-test, we compared the
10 mean VMG of each episode with the mean VMG of the entire speed-test; (b) the mean VMG
11 of each episode of a rider was compared to the mean VMG of their same-gender training mate
12 over the same period of time. When the mean VMG of an episode of a rider was both higher
13 than the mean VMG of the speed-test and higher than the mean VMG of their same-gender
14 training mate over the same period of time, this episode was categorized as an episode of "better
15 VMG". In the opposite situation, the episode was categorized as an episode of "worse VMG".
16 The remaining episodes were categorized as episodes of "mixed VMG".

17

18 **2.3.3 Comparison of the evaluated performance with the perceived performance of the** 19 **meaningful episodes of the riders' courses of experience**

20 We compared the evaluated performance with the perceived performance by looking at
21 the quantity of meaningful episodes of the riders' courses of experience that were evaluated as
22 better VMG, bad VMG or mixed VMG within the categories of good and bad perceived
23 performance. The episodes with uncategorized perceived performance were excluded from this
24 step of the analysis.

25

1 **3 Results**

2 The results are presented in two parts relating respectively to: (a) the qualitative
3 characteristics of the riders' perceptual experiences with regard to their perceived
4 performances, and (b) the relations between perceived performances by the riders and VMG.

5

6 **3.1 Qualitative characteristics of the riders' perceptual experiences with regard to their**
7 **perceived performances**

8 Twenty-one episodes were categorized as good perceived performance from the riders'
9 viewpoints, 29 episodes were categorized as bad perceived performance, and seven episodes
10 remained uncategorized. The distribution of these episodes for each rider is presented in Table
11 1.

12 **Table 1**

13 *Distribution of the episodes of Good perceived performance, Bad perceived performance and*
14 *Uncategorized for each rider*

| Riders | Good perceived performance | Bad perceived performance | Uncategorized | Total |
|--------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------|
| KM1 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 14 |
| KM2 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 18 |
| KW1 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 15 |
| KW2 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 10 |
| Total | 21 | 29 | 7 | 57 |

15

16 In the following two subsections, we successively present the meaningful elements of
17 the situation considered by the riders and the meaningful adaptive actions of the riders, related
18 to their perceived performances.

1 **3.1.1 Meaningful elements of the situation considered by the riders related to their**
2 **perceived performances**

3 Three main categories of meaningful elements of the situation were considered by the
4 riders and associated with the episodes of perceived performances (either good or bad). Those
5 depended on the nature of perceived perturbations and salient perceptions, which were related
6 to features of: (a) one or some particular elements inside the rider/equipment system; (b) the
7 functioning of the rider/equipment system considered as a whole; and (c) one or some
8 environmental elements outside the rider/equipment system. Meaningful elements of the
9 situation included in those three categories were considered by the riders in episodes of bad
10 perceived performances as well as in episodes of good perceived performances.

11

12 *Perceived perturbations and salient perceptions related to the features of particular*
13 *elements inside the rider/equipment system.* These meaningful elements typically included
14 perceptions of the foil, kite or body positioning.

15 In episodes categorized as good perceived performance, the riders described their
16 perceptual experiences as being related to the perception of fewer perturbations of the foil, and
17 to good quality of power transmission between kite, body and board. For example, referring to
18 the second episode of his speed-test downwind on starboard tack, KM2 described the feeling
19 of the kite pulling in the right direction (i.e., in the direction he wants to go): “You feel that the
20 kite... you’re being pulled forward, you feel it pulling you in the right direction”.

21 In contrast, in episodes categorized as bad perceived performances, they described their
22 perceptual experiences as being related to the perception of perturbation of the foil, and to bad
23 quality of power transmission between kite, body and board. For example, referring to the fifth
24 episode of his speed-test upwind on starboard tack, KM1 expressed the feeling of losing lift on

1 the foil associated with an uncomfortable position of his legs: “I extend my front leg and damn,
2 I’m [with my weight] on the back [leg] with the foil losing lift”.

3

4 *Perceived perturbations and salient perceptions related to the features of the*
5 *functioning of the rider/equipment system considered as a whole.* These meaningful elements
6 included perceptions of the quality of control or flight stability without referring precisely to
7 specific elements of the rider/equipment system.

8 In episodes categorized as good experiences of performance, the riders described their
9 perceptual experiences as being related to the perception of the system’s overall stability. For
10 example, referring to the first episode of her speed-test upwind on port tack, KW1 described
11 her perception of a stable flight: “[The flight] is more stable, I feel settled, and so I have fewer
12 small adjustments to make [to maintain a good VMG]”.

13 In contrast, in episodes categorized as bad perceived performance, they described their
14 perceptual experiences as being related to the perception of the system’s overall instability. For
15 example, referring to the first episode of her speed-test downwind on port tack, KW2 expressed
16 an overall sensation of struggle: “I felt like I was fighting against my equipment all the time to
17 hold on course, and at the same time, have speed”.

18

19 *Perceived perturbations and salient perceptions related to the features of one or some*
20 *environmental elements outside the rider/equipment system.* These meaningful elements
21 typically included perception of the sea’s surface movements and incoming gusts of wind, as
22 well as perception of the training mates.

23 In episodes categorized as good perceived performances, the riders described their
24 perceptual experiences as being related to the perception of flat-water sections, waves or gusts
25 of wind offering opportunities to accelerate, and the perception of being faster than the training

1 mates. For example, referring to the second episode of his speed-test downwind on starboard
2 tack, KM2 described the way he perceived the waves as opportunities to accelerate: “You really
3 try to read the chop, to be at the top of the wave to accelerate, and you feel that it accelerates
4 when you go down [the slope of the wave]”.

5 In contrast, in episodes categorized as bad perceived performances, they described their
6 perceptual experiences as being related to the perception of waves that hinder speed or balance,
7 strong gusts or big lulls of wind, and the perception of being behind or slower than the training
8 mates. For example, referring to the first episode of her speed-test downwind on port tack, KW2
9 described the perception of sailing at a worse angle to the wind than her training mate, and
10 feeling bad about being behind her: “I kept bearing away, but less [than KW1]. I was a bit
11 behind, I didn’t like that.”

12

13 **3.1.2 Meaningful adaptive actions of the riders related to their perceived performance**

14 We identified three categories of meaningful adaptive actions of the riders, in relation
15 to their perceived performances: (a) adaptive actions to “let the equipment do its thing”, (b)
16 adaptive actions to reach a maximal speed over a limited period of time, and (c) adaptive actions
17 on specific elements of the system in response to perturbing events. The first and second
18 categories are typical of episodes of good perceived performances and the third category is
19 typical of episodes of bad perceived performances.

20 *Adaptive actions to “let the equipment do its thing”.* Episodes of good perceived
21 performances were characterized by lesser efforts experienced by the riders than in episodes of
22 bad perceived performance, and by an attitude of “letting the equipment do its thing”. For
23 example, referring to the second episode of his speed-test downwind on starboard tack, KM2
24 expressed that he was not doing anything while going where he wanted to go: “There, the board
25 is levelled, it’s very easy... there’s no action required... apart from heel adjustments there’s no

1 need to do anything, it's just driving, you go where you want to go... frankly, it's so instinctive
2 (...) levelled board, you let it glide”.

3 ***Adaptive actions to reach a maximal speed over a limited period of time.*** This type of
4 adaptive action was, as for the previous category, typical of episodes of good perceived
5 performances. Indeed, intense efforts could be made during this kind of episode. But, in contrast
6 to episodes of bad perceived performances with efforts to react to disrupting events, during the
7 episodes of good perceived performances, intense efforts were controlled and at chosen times.
8 In this kind of episode, the riders had the possibility to choose between engaging more in the
9 action to increase the speed or reducing their effort in order to recover. For example, in the third
10 episode of his speed-test upwind on starboard tack, KM1 took the decision to accelerate and
11 made an intense effort during a short period of time to pass a training mate before recovering
12 his initial speed and position: “ok, now I make the decision to switch to speed mode, to forget
13 my angle [to the wind] a little, and to pass him leeward, forcing him to raise his kite, and by
14 doing so I get some clear wind (...) I tell myself that... I'm going for an explosive 20-second
15 effort where I have to sheet more, and it requires more concentration and sheathing in case the
16 foil ventilates or whatever, and... once I've passed [him] well, yeah, I feel my legs are starting
17 to tremble a little (...) and I try to get back on an angle (...) to preserve myself and continue
18 afterwards”.

19 ***Adaptive actions on specific elements of the system to react to perturbing events.*** This
20 type of adaptive action is typical of episodes of bad perceived performances. For example,
21 during the fifth episode of her speed-test upwind on starboard tack, KW1 hit a wave with the
22 board and got carried away by a gust. In this situation, recovering balance involved a sequence
23 of specific actions to control the board and the kite: “I got totally swept away, so to get back in
24 control, well, I went back to riding [the board] flat (...), I raised my kite and then I reengaged
25 the movement by lowering my kite again and sitting down again in the harness”.

1

2 **3.2 Relations between perceived performance by the riders and VMG**

3 Concerning the perceived performance, of the 57 episodes of riders' courses of
4 experience that were identified, a total of 50 episodes were categorized as good or bad perceived
5 performance (seven episodes remained uncategorized and have not been analyzed). Twenty-
6 one episodes were categorized as good perceived performance (respectively seven episodes for
7 KM1 and KM2, four episodes for KW1 and three episodes for KW2); 29 episodes were
8 categorized as bad perceived performance (six episodes for KM1, seven episodes for KM2,
9 nine episodes for KW1, and seven episodes for KW2).

10 Concerning the evaluation of the riders' VMG, among the 50 episodes that were
11 analyzed, a total of 20 episodes were categorized as better VMG (respectively three episodes,
12 seven episodes, five episodes and five episodes for KM1, KM2, KW1 and KW2); 11 episodes
13 were categorized as worse VMG (respectively two episodes, four episodes, one episode and
14 four episodes for KM1, KM2, KW1 and KW2); and 19 episodes were categorized as mixed
15 VMG (respectively eight episodes, three episodes, seven episodes and one episode for KM1,
16 KM2, KW1 and KW2).

17

18 **3.2.1 Distribution of the episodes of better, worse or mixed VMG within the categories** 19 **of good and bad perceived performances**

20 Within the category of good perceived performances (21 episodes), 13 episodes (62%)
21 were categorized as better VMG, 2 episodes (9.5%) were categorized as worse VMG and 6
22 episodes (28.5%) were categorized as mixed VMG. Within the category of bad perceived
23 performances (29 episodes), 7 episodes (24%) were categorized as better VMG, 9 episodes
24 (31%) were categorized as worse VMG and 13 episodes (45%) were categorized as mixed
25 VMG (Figure 1). Therefore, the episodes of good perceived performances were more likely to

1 be episodes of better VMG (62%) than episodes of worse VMG (9.5%) or mixed VMG (28.5%).
 2 In contrast, episodes of bad perceived performance were more likely to be episodes of worse
 3 VMG (31%) or mixed VMG (45%) than episodes of better VMG (24%). Taken together, these
 4 results show a better correspondence between perceived performance and the VMG-based
 5 evaluation in the cases of good perceived performances than in the cases of bad perceived
 6 performances. However, we observe significant interindividual differences between riders
 7 (Table 2).

8 **Table 2**

9 *Distribution of the episodes of Better, Worse and Mixed VMG for each rider within the*
 10 *categories of Good perceived performance and Bad perceived performance*

| | Better | Worse | Mixed |
|----------------------------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Riders | VMG | VMG | VMG |
| Good perceived performance | | | |
| KM1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| KM2 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| KW1 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| KW2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| total (%) | 13 (62%) | 2 (9.5%) | 6 (28.5%) |
| Bad perceived performance | | | |
| KM1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| KM2 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| KW1 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| KW2 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| total (%) | 7 (24%) | 9 (31%) | 13 (45%) |

11

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

[insert Figure 1.]

3.2.2 Interindividual differences and inconsistencies between perceived performance and VMG

Regarding interindividual differences, a different profile for each rider appears (Figure 2). The specificities of KM1's profile is that all the episodes of better VMG were also categorized as good perceived performances, most of the episodes of mixed VMG were categorized as bad perceived performances (five episodes), and the episodes of worse VMG were equally perceived as good performance (one episode) and bad performance (one episode). For KM1, therefore, an episode of good perceived performance is not necessarily an episode of better VMG. However, an episode of bad perceived performance is likely to be an episode of mixed, or worse VMG. The specificities of KM2's profile are the high number of episodes of good perceived performance associated with better VMG (six episodes), and the low association of episodes of good perceived performance associated with worse, or mixed VMG (one and zero episodes respectively). Therefore, for KM2, an episode of good perceived performance is very likely to be an episode of better VMG, whereas an episode of bad perceived performance is very likely to be an episode of worse or mixed VMG. The specificities of KW2's profile is that while every episode of worse VMG is associated with bad perceived performance (four episodes), the episodes of better VMG are distributed among the categories of good perceived performance (three episodes) and bad perceived performance (two episodes). Therefore, in KW2's case, episodes of better VMG were almost as likely to be perceived as good performance, as to be perceived as bad performance. KW1's profile differs from all the other profiles as in her case, most of the episodes of better VMG were associated with bad perceived performance (four episodes), and only one episode of better VMG was associated

1 with good perceived performance. Therefore, in KW1's case, the perception of good
2 performance was clearly inconsistent with her VMG during that training session's speed-test.

3

4 [insert Figure 2.]

5

6 Regarding inconsistencies between perceived performance and VMG, a total of nine
7 episodes (18% of all episodes analyzed) fell into opposite categories of perceived performance
8 and VMG. For example, during the speed-test port tack going downwind, KW1 experienced an
9 episode of bad perceived performance that was actually categorized as better VMG. Referring
10 to this episode, she expressed perceiving vibrations of the foil through her ankles and the need
11 to "lock" her body to overcome the vibrations. Interestingly, it was during this episode that she
12 reached her best speed of the speed-test, sailing at an average speed of 25.94 ± 1.15 knots during
13 this episode compared to an average speed of 24.36 ± 1.33 during her speed-test and an average
14 speed of 25.26 ± 1.12 knots for KW2 during that same period of time. In contrast, during the
15 speed-test port tack going upwind, KM2 experienced an episode of good perceived performance
16 that was actually categorized as a worse VMG. Referring to this episode, he expressed feeling
17 fewer ventilations of the foil, good glide and a stabilized speed. However, during this episode
18 KM2 was sailing at a lower speed than in other episodes of the speed-test and at a lower speed
19 than his training mate, with an average speed of 16.29 ± 1.06 knots during this episode compared
20 to an average speed of 17.05 ± 1.11 knots during his speed-test and an average speed of 18.10
21 ± 0.98 for KM1 during the same period of time.

22 **4 Discussion**

23 The discussion focuses on two aspects: (a) the relationship between perceived
24 performance and the maintenance and exploitation of possibilities for action by the rider, and

1 (b) the relevance of calibrating the riders' perceived performances with objective measures of
2 performance to improve training sessions.

3 **4.1 Relationship between perceived performance and the maintenance and exploitation** 4 **of possibilities for action by the rider**

5 Results from the analysis of the riders' courses of experience show that the structure
6 of the perceptual experiences is similar in both categories of episodes: we found the three main
7 categories of meaningful elements of the situation considered by the riders in the episodes of
8 good perceived performance as well as in those of bad perceived performance: (a) features of
9 one or some particular elements of the rider/equipment system; (b) features of the functioning
10 of the rider/equipment system considered as a whole; and (c) features of some environmental
11 elements outside the rider/equipment system. The omnipresence of these three dimensions of
12 perceptual experiences is consistent with the results of Pluijms et al.,¹⁷ suggesting that
13 performance in sailing may not be predictable by analyzing a single sensory modality but results
14 rather from the constant integration of information obtained from overlapping sensory
15 modalities.

16 However, our results show that the characteristics of the meaningful elements of the
17 situation considered by the riders and the adaptive actions associated with episodes of good
18 perceived performance differ qualitatively from those associated with episodes of bad perceived
19 performance, in that they provide the riders with greater or fewer opportunities for actions to
20 optimize their performance. Indeed, regardless of the category of the perceived perturbations
21 and salient perceptions of the riders (i.e., related to a particular element of the rider/equipment
22 system, to the rider/equipment system considered as a whole, or to an outside environmental
23 element), two typical cases can be contrasted. On the one hand, in episodes categorized as good
24 experiences of performance, the riders described their perceptual experiences as of their being
25 little constrained and disrupted by their equipment and/or by the environmental conditions,

1 providing a wide range of possible relevant actions to optimize or preserve their functioning.
2 On the other hand, in episodes categorized as bad experiences of performance, the riders
3 described their perceptual experiences as of their “fighting against” their equipment, the wind
4 gusts or the waves. In this kind of case, riders are highly constrained by their equipment and/or
5 by the environmental conditions, which force them to react in a certain way to preserve flight
6 stability and the viability of their functioning..

7 Moreover, adaptive actions associated with episodes of good perceived performance are
8 characterized by less effort or more controlled effort than adaptive actions associated with
9 episodes of bad perceived performance. We argue that the reduction of the riders’ effort by
10 letting the equipment do its thing and the controlled effort to reach maximal speed over a limited
11 period of time, characterizing episodes of good perceived performance, can also be associated
12 with a wide range of possibilities for action. As the riders let the equipment “do its thing”, they
13 remain in an unconstrained action-readiness state,⁴⁰ allowing them to adapt to the situation
14 flexibly, as expressed by KM2: “you go where you want to go”. Regarding the effort to reach
15 maximal speed over a limited period of time, it is characterized by the capacity of the rider to
16 control the effort and return to the previous state, therefore not exhausting the potential of the
17 situation by preserving possibilities for action. Management of the possibilities for action on
18 sailing boats has previously been described by Terrien et al.⁴ on double-crew foiling
19 catamarans. These authors showed that crew members regulate their activity in order to
20 maintain action possibilities for themselves and for their partners, as well as possibilities of
21 movement for the boat. In the present study our results suggest that from a Formula Kite rider’s
22 perspective, good perceived performance is associated with a wider range of possibilities for
23 action than bad perceived performance. This is in line with recent developments in ecological
24 dynamic frameworks on the notion of metastable zones,^{40, 41} as states allowing the rapid and

1 flexible adoption of a vast number of different action-readiness states and subsequent actions⁴⁰
2 to achieve optimal performance.

3 This understanding of the assessment of performance from the riders' perspective can
4 explain some of the inconsistencies between perceived performance and measured VMG.
5 Indeed, in Formula Kite, riders travel at high speed in a precarious equilibrium resulting from
6 the combination of hydrodynamical, biomechanical and aerodynamical forces. Maintaining this
7 balance presupposes a resilience of the rider/Formula Kite equipment system. When a rider
8 loses possibilities for action, they become more vulnerable to the environmental variations
9 generating movements of the equipment, thus constraining the rider's action even more. The
10 example presented in the Results section, of KW1 reaching her top speed during an episode of
11 bad perceived performance, illustrates this situation: as she felt vibrations in the foil and locked
12 her body in position, she reduced her possibilities of acting on the system. At such a moment,
13 an unexpected environmental variation could have dramatic consequences on her speed, and
14 therefore is not experienced as a situation of good performance.

15

16 **4.2 “Calibrate” riders’ perceived performances with objective measures of** 17 **performance to improve training sessions**

18 Our results show that for three of the four participants, the riders' perceived performance
19 was in line with the performance as evaluated by the VMG. Previous studies have shown that
20 athletes are able to accurately assess their performance and the efficiency of their functioning,^{35,}
21 ⁴² sometimes more accurately than their coaches.⁴² Our results suggest that during speed-tests,
22 the preservation of possibilities for action seems to be a determinant factor in the perception of
23 performance, and not only speed variations. Indeed, while “objectively” the rider with the best
24 VMG can win a regatta, maintaining a high VMG throughout a regatta presupposes avoiding
25 either technical mistakes or being surprised by unexpected changes in environmental

1 conditions. The main originality of the present study is to propose an approach of performance
2 analysis from the rider's perspective. Understanding performance "from the inside" offers an
3 opportunity to enrich reflection on performance variables commonly used by coaches and sport
4 scientist to analyze performance. Hence, approaching performance analysis through the riders'
5 perspective is complementary with statistical approaches of performance analysis.^{2,14} However,
6 while technological developments now provide a wide range of tools to measure performance
7 "from the outside" (e.g., wearable GPS, compact waterproof and shockproof IMU), little has
8 been done to measure performance "from the inside" in an appropriate way that takes into
9 account the constraints of the actual practice sessions.

10 Nevertheless, this study has some limitations, and opens up new points of debate. First,
11 the limited number of participants in the study encourages us to be cautious and not to over-
12 generalize our conclusions. Second, the observed convergences and divergences between the
13 riders' perceptual experiences and their "objective" performances must be interpreted with
14 caution. Indeed, while the self-confrontation interview is a well-considered method for
15 collecting phenomenological data, the descriptions made by the athletes of their lived
16 experience always remain incomplete. Furthermore, regarding the quantitative data, VMG is
17 undeniably the most relevant performance measurement in sailing. However, in the natural
18 conditions of this study, VMG was calculated using an average wind direction. Yet even if
19 riders stay close to each other during speed tests, on some occasions very local wind shifts can
20 affect the VMG of one rider more than the other for a short period of time, causing a risk of
21 bias in the assessment of relative performance between the riders at these moments. Despite
22 these limitations, divergences and convergences between first-person and third-person points
23 of view are possible and coherent with the ontological definition of the course of
24 experience.^{18,20,21} Indeed, these points of view are irreducible by nature, even if their joint
25 analysis remains very fruitful and useful for performance analysis in sport.^{25, 28, 35} Thus, these

1 limitations highlight a challenge for coaches and sport scientists in sports such as sailing, in
2 which performance must be considered in conjunction with varied and constantly varying
3 environmental conditions, and should be analyzed jointly “from the outside” and “from the
4 inside”.

5 Based on the results of the present study, we advocate two complementary practical
6 perspectives to improve training and coaching practices, to be developed in collaboration with
7 athletes and coaches in Formula Kite and sailing sports in general. The first perspective is to
8 implement a specific debriefing methodology after a training session, thus allowing the
9 inconsistencies between measured performance and perceived performance to be reduced. The
10 core principle of this methodology is to systematically and thoroughly confront the athlete’s
11 perceptual experiences with in-depth recorded traces of their behavior (e.g., video recordings)
12 and performances (e.g., measures of VMG). This methodology, similar to self-confrontation
13 interviews,⁵ is likely to enable athletes to become aware of the moments of coherence and
14 inconsistency between their actual and perceived performances. The second perspective is to
15 develop a self-report instrument, as a cost-effective method, specifically designed to allow
16 athletes to systematically report their perceived performances after each training session. This
17 instrument could be based on specific scales to assess performance “from the inside”, to be
18 compared to relevant measures of actual performance. These perspectives, combining
19 qualitative data about athletes’ experiences and quantitative measures of relevant correlates of
20 performances, are promising directions in the field of performance in sailing, and more
21 generally in all other sports.⁵

22

23 **Aknowledgements:**

24 The authors are grateful to the ENVSN’s technical staff, and to the coaches of the Formula Kite
25 French team, for their help in the experiments.

1 **Funding details:**

2 This work was supported by France's Agence nationale de la recherche (ANR), under grant
3 n°ANR-19-STHP-0002 "Du carbone à l'or Olympique" (CtoOr).

4 **Disclosure statement:**

5 The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

6

1 **References**

- 2 1. Püschl W. High-speed sailing. *Euro J Phys* 2018;39(4): 044002.
- 3 2. Caraballo I, González-Montesinos J, Casado-Rodríguez F, et al. Performance Analysis in
4 Olympic Sailors of the Formula Kite Class Using GPS. *Sensors*. 2021;21(2): 574.
- 5 3. Terrien E, Huet B, Iachkine P, et al. Coordination between crew members on flying
6 multihulls: a case study on a Nacra 17. *J Sports Sci Med* 2020;19(2): 298-308.
- 7 4. Terrien E, Huet B and Saury J. Controlling the flight on double-handed foiling catamarans:
8 The role of shared equipment on the crew members' mutual modes of regulation. *Psychol*
9 *Sport Exerc* 2022;61: 102204.
- 10 5. Poizat G, Sève C and Saury J. Qualitative aspects in performance analysis. In: McGarry T,
11 O'Donoghue P and Sampaio J (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Sports Performance*
12 *Analysis*. London: Routledge, 2013, pp.309-320.
- 13 6. Bojsen-Møller J, Larsson B and Aagaard P. Physical requirements in Olympic sailing. *Euro*
14 *J Sport Sci* 2014;15(3): 220-227.
- 15 7. Bourgois J, Callewaert M, Celie B, et al. Isometric quadriceps strength determines sailing
16 performance and neuromuscular fatigue during an upwind sailing emulation. *J Sports Sci*
17 2015;34(10): 973-979.
- 18 8. Philippe K, Paillard T, Dubois R, et al. Key performance indicators in Tour de France sailing.
19 *J Sports Sci* 2020;39(8): 944-954.
- 20 9. Vogiatzis I and De Vito G. Physiological assessment of Olympic windsurfers. *Euro J Sport*
21 *Sci* 2014;15(3): 228-234.
- 22 10. Araújo D, Davids K and Serpa S. An ecological approach to expertise effects in decision-
23 making in a simulated sailing regatta. *Psychol Sport Exerc* 2005;6(6): 671-692.
- 24 11. Araújo D, Davids K, Diniz A, et al. Ecological dynamics of continuous and categorical
25 decision-making: The regatta start in sailing. *Euro J Sport Sci* 2014;15(3): 195-202.

- 1 12. Anastasiou A, Jones T, Mullan P, et al. Descriptive analysis of Olympic class windsurfing
2 competition during the 2017-2018 regatta season. *Int J Perform Anal Sport* 2019;19(4):
3 517-529.
- 4 13. Caraballo I, Lara-Bocanegra A and Bohórquez M. Factors Related to the Performance of
5 Elite Young Sailors in a Regatta: Spatial Orientation, Age and Experience. *Int J Environ*
6 *Res Public Health*. 2021;18(6): 2913.
- 7 14. Chun S, Park J, Kim T, et al. Performance analysis based on GPS data of Olympic class
8 windsurfing. *Int J Perform Anal Sport*. 2022;22(3): 332-342.
- 9 15. Bethwaite F. *Higher Performance Sailing*. London: Adlard Coles, 2013.
- 10 16. Pluijms J, Cañal-Bruland R, Hoozemans M, et al. Visual search, movement behaviour and
11 boat control during the windward mark rounding in sailing. *J Sports Sci* 2015;33(4): 398-
12 410.
- 13 17. Pluijms J, Cañal-Bruland R, Hoozemans M, et al. Quantifying external focus of attention in
14 sailing by means of action sport cameras. *J Sports Sci* 2016;34(16): 1588-1595.
- 15 18. Poizat G, Flandin S and Theureau J. A micro-phenomenological and semiotic approach to
16 cognition in practice: a path toward an integrative approach to studying cognition-in-the-
17 world and from within. *Adapt Behav*. Epub ahead of print 15 April 2022. DOI:
18 10.1177/105971232110723.
- 19 19. Theureau J. Course-of-action analysis and course-of-action centered design. In: Hollnagel
20 E (ed) *Handbook of cognitive task design*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003,
21 pp.55-81.
- 22 20. Theureau J. *Le cours d'action : Méthode développée*. Toulouse: Octarès, 2006.
- 23 21. Theureau J. *Le cours d'action. L'enaction et l'expérience*. Toulouse: Octarès, 2015.
- 24 22. Antonini Philippe R, Rochat N, Crettaz von Roten F, et al. The Relationship between Trail
25 Running Withdrawals and Race Topography. *Sports* 2017;5(4): 91.

- 1 23. Hauw D, Berthelot C and Durand M. Enhancing performance in elite athletes through
2 situated-cognition analysis: Trampolinists' course of action during competition activity.
3 *Int J Sport Psychol* 2003;34(4): 299-321.
- 4 24. Hauw D and Durand M. The meaningful time of acrobatic athletes' activity during
5 performance. *J Sports Sci Med* 2008;7: 8-14.
- 6 25. R'Kiouak M, Saury J, Durand M, et al. Joint Action of a Pair of Rowers in a Race: Shared
7 Experiences of Effectiveness Are Shaped by Interpersonal Mechanical States. *Front*
8 *Psychol* 2016;7: 720.
- 9 26. R'Kiouak M, Saury J, Durand M, et al. Joint action in an elite rowing pair crew after
10 intensive team training: The reinforcement of extra-personal processes. *Hum Mov Sci*
11 2018;57: 303-313.
- 12 27. Rochat N, Gesbert V, Seifert L, et al. Enacting Phenomenological Gestalts in Ultra-Trail
13 Running: An Inductive Analysis of Trail Runners' Courses of Experience. *Front Psychol*
14 2018;9 : 2038
- 15 28. Sève C, Nordez A, Poizat G, et al. Performance analysis in sport: Contributions from a joint
16 analysis of athletes' experience and biomechanical indicators. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*
17 2013;23(5): 576-584.
- 18 29. Sève C, Ria L, Poizat G, et al. Performance-induced emotions experienced during high-
19 stakes table tennis matches. *Psychol Sport Exerc* 2007;8(1): 25-46.
- 20 30. Poizat G, Adé D, Seifert L, et al. Evaluation of the Measuring Active Drag system usability:
21 An important step for its integration into training sessions. *Int J Perform Anal Sport*
22 2010;10(2): 170-186.
- 23 31. Adé D, Seifert L, Gal-Petitfaux N and Poizat G. Artefacts and expertise in sport: an
24 empirical study of ice climbing. *Int J Sport Psychol* 2017;48: 82-98

- 1 32. Rochat N, Seifert L, Guignard B, et al. An enactive approach to appropriation in the
2 instrumented activity of trail running. *Cogn Process* 2019;20(4): 459-477.
- 3 33. Seifert L, Adé D and Saury J. Mix of phenomenological and behavioural data to explore
4 interpersonal coordination in outdoor activities: examples in rowing and orienteering. In:
5 Passos P, Davids K and Chow JY (eds) *Interpersonal coordination and performance in*
6 *social systems*. London: Routledge, 2016, pp. 127-143.
- 7 34. Gal-Petitfaux N, Adé D, Poizat G, et al. L'intégration de données biomécaniques et
8 d'expérience pour comprendre l'activité de nageurs élites et concevoir un dispositif
9 d'évaluation. *Trav Hum* 2013; 76: 257-282.
- 10 35. Hauw D, Rochat N, Gesbert, V, et al. Putting together first- and third-person approaches
11 for sport activity analysis: The case of ultra-trail runners' performance analysis. In:
12 Salmon P and Macquet AC (Eds) *Advances in Human Factors in Sports and Outdoor*
13 *Recreation*. Cham: Springer International Publishing Switzerland, 2016, pp. 49-59.
- 14 36. Varela F, Thompson E and Rosch E. *The embodied mind*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991.
- 15 37. Marshall C and Rossman GB. *Designing qualitative research*. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage
16 publications, 2014.
- 17 38. Caraballo I, Conde-Caveda J, Pezelj L, et al. GNSS Applications to Assess Performance in
18 Olympic Sailors: Laser Class. *Appl Sci* 2020;11(1): 264.
- 19 39. Caraballo I, Cruz-Leon C, Pérez-Bey A, et al. Performance analysis of Paralympic 2.4mR
20 class sailing. *J Sports Sci* 2021;39(sup1): 109-115.
- 21 40. Luecke S. Freediving neurophenomenology and skilled action: an investigation of brain,
22 body, and behavior through breath. *Phenom Cogn Sci* 2022; 1-37.
- 23 41. Rietveld E, Denys D and Van Westen M. Ecological-Enactive Cognition as engaging with
24 a field of relevant affordances: The Skilled Intentionality Framework (SIF). In: Newen

1 A, De Bruin L and Gallagher S (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of 4E Cognition*. Oxford:
2 Oxford University Press, 2018, pp. 41-70.

3 42. Millar SK, Oldham AR, Renshaw I, et al. Athlete and coach agreement: Identifying
4 successful performance. *Int J Sports Sci Coach* 2017;12(6): 807–813.

5

6

7

8

1 **Figure captions:**

2 Figure 1- Overall distribution of the episodes of better, worse or mixed VMG within the
3 categories of good and bad perceived performance.

4 Figure 2- Distribution of the episodes of better, worse or mixed VMG within the categories of
5 good and bad perceived performance for each rider.

6