

INTENTIONAL PERFORMANCE CERTIFICATION · EXPERT REVIEW

Research Foundations

Annotated bibliography of all primary sources cited across the six-week IPCC curriculum. Each entry identifies the core finding and where it appears in the course.

ACT & PSYCHOLOGICAL FLEXIBILITY

Hayes, S. C., Strosahl, K. D., & Wilson, K. G. (2012). *Acceptance and Commitment Therapy: The process and practice of mindful change* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

Curriculum location: Week 1 — Core Framework

The foundational ACT text. The six Hexaflex processes (acceptance, defusion, present-moment awareness, self-as-context, values, committed action) form the primary framework for the coach's own psychological development and the conceptualization of athlete functioning. The Week 1 Hexaflex deep dive draws directly from Hayes et al.'s model of psychological inflexibility and its consequences for committed action.

Wegner, D. M. (1994). *Ironic processes of mental control*. *Psychological Review*, 101(1), 34–52.

Curriculum location: Week 3 — Self-Talk & Defusion

The White Bear Problem. Wegner demonstrated that attempting to suppress a thought requires monitoring for that thought to confirm suppression — which keeps the thought continuously active. This is the mechanistic explanation for why "don't think about the error" is functionally counterproductive, and why ACT defusion (changing your relationship to the thought rather than its content) is the evidence-based alternative. Used in Week 3 to explain the defusion vs. restructuring distinction.

MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING

Miller, W. R., & Rollnick, S. (2023). *Motivational Interviewing: Helping people change and grow* (4th ed.). Guilford Press.

Curriculum location: Weeks 1 & 2 — MI Foundation & Advanced

The canonical MI text. OARS (Open questions, Affirmations, Reflective listening, Summaries), MI Spirit (partnership, evocation, autonomy support, compassion), and the distinction between righting reflex and evocation are all drawn from Miller & Rollnick. The Week 1 foundation covers Spirit and OARS; Week 2 advances to complex reflections, change talk recognition, and rolling with resistance. The 4th edition (2023) reflects current evidence including expanded sustain talk and discord framing.

SELF-DETERMINATION THEORY

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.

Curriculum location: Weeks 2 & 5 — SDT Foundation & 3Cs

The core SDT paper establishing autonomy, competence, and relatedness as universal psychological needs. Week 2's motivational architecture framework is built on this foundation. The parallel crises framing (autonomy frustrated by external pressure; competence frustrated by technique overload) is drawn from SDT's distinction between controlling and autonomy-supportive environments. The 3Cs framework in Week 5 is the practitioner translation: Choice = Autonomy, Connection = Relatedness, Confidence = Competence.

Mageau, G. A., & Vallerand, R. J. (2003). The coach–athlete relationship: A motivational model. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 21(11), 883–904.

Curriculum location: Week 2 — SDT in Coaching Contexts

Applies SDT specifically to the coach-athlete relationship, identifying six coaching behaviors that support autonomy and three that undermine it. The Week 2 SDT environment audit tool draws directly from Mageau & Vallerand's behavioral indicators of autonomy-supportive coaching, translated into language accessible to coaching staff.

MENTAL TOUGHNESS & ATTENTION

Gucciardi, D. F., Hanton, S., & Fleming, S. (2017). Are mental toughness and mental health contradictory concepts in elite sport? A narrative review of theory and evidence. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 20(3), 307–311.

Curriculum location: Weeks 3 & 6 — Gucciardi Framework & Examination

Gucciardi's operational definition of mental toughness — the ability to pay attention to the right thing, at the right time, regardless of circumstances — is the conceptual anchor for the entire attention training sequence. The three-part definition provides the diagnostic framework for Week 3 (what fails: right thing, right time, or regardless?) and appears in the Week 6 examination. This definition is used over competing definitions because it is operational (identifies what to train) rather than dispositional (describes a personality trait).

MOTOR LEARNING & CUEING

Wulf, G., Shea, C., & Lewthwaite, R. (2010). *Motor skill learning and performance: A review of influential factors*. *Medical Education*, 44(1), 75–84.

Curriculum location: Week 4 — Wulf OPTIMAL Theory

Wulf's OPTIMAL (Optimizing Performance Through Intrinsic Motivation and Attention for Learning) Theory establishes that external focus cues — directing attention to the effect of movement or the environment — consistently outperform internal focus cues for both skill acquisition and performance. The Constrained Action Hypothesis explains the mechanism: internal focus invokes conscious motor control that interferes with automated programs. Week 4 translates this into practical cueing guidelines for coaches.

Wulf, G., & Lewthwaite, R. (2016). *Optimizing performance through intrinsic motivation and attention for learning: The OPTIMAL theory of motor learning*. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 23(5), 1382–1414.

Curriculum location: Week 4 — External Focus Application

The full OPTIMAL theory paper. Extends the external focus advantage to include autonomy support and enhanced expectancies as additional performance-enhancing variables — directly reinforcing the SDT framework from Week 2 with motor learning research. The practical implication: external focus, autonomy support, and competence feedback are mutually reinforcing, not independent variables.

AROUSAL REGULATION

Evans, L. (practitioner framework — not peer-reviewed)

Curriculum location: Week 3 — Evans Red Head / Blue Head Model

The Red Head / Blue Head model is a practitioner framework developed in professional sport that translates Yerkes-Dodson arousal theory into an immediately applicable coaching tool. Red Head = fight-or-flight activation, prefrontal cortex offline, reactive and narrow. Blue Head = composure under optimal arousal, prefrontal cortex online. The Evans 1–10 check-in scale appears throughout the course as the primary between-moment arousal monitoring tool. The underlying science (Yerkes-Dodson inverted-U, prefrontal cortex suppression under high arousal) is well-established. The Evans framing is a pedagogical tool, not a theoretical claim.

A NOTE ON THE EVANS FRAMEWORK

The Red Head / Blue Head model is a practitioner framework, not a peer-reviewed construct. It is included because it provides an immediately applicable, field-tested translation of arousal theory that coaches and athletes can use in real time. Veters are asked to evaluate whether the underlying science is accurately represented, not whether the Evans model itself should carry the weight of a peer-reviewed construct.

IMAGERY & MOTOR REHEARSAL

Holmes, P. S., & Collins, D. J. (2001). *The PETLEP approach to motor imagery: A functional equivalence model for sport psychologists*. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 13(1), 60–83.

Curriculum location: Week 3 — PETLEP Imagery

The PETLEP framework (Physical, Environment, Task, Timing, Learning, Emotion, Perspective) establishes that imagery produces better results when it is functionally equivalent to actual performance — same physical state, same environment, same timing, same emotional activation. The Week 3 imagery module is built directly on PETLEP principles, with sport-specific application protocols for each element. Plan B imagery (rehearsing the reset after mistake) is a Baker-developed application of the PETLEP framework.

MINDFULNESS & ATTENTION TRAINING

Jha, A. P., Morrison, A. B., Dainer-Best, J., Parker, S., Rostrup, N., & Stanley, E. A. (2015). *Minds "at attention": Mindfulness training curbs attentional lapses in military cohorts*. *PLOS ONE*, 10(2), e0116889.

Curriculum location: All MBAT Modules — Research Foundation

The primary research foundation for the MBAT program. Jha's work with military cohorts established the minimum effective dose: 12 minutes per day, five days per week, for four or more weeks, producing significant improvements in attentional stability and working memory capacity. The 15-minute daily × 28-day MBAT protocol in the course is built on this evidence base, with each week's practice targeting a specific Nideffer attentional quadrant.

Jha, A. P., Krompinger, J., & Baime, M. J. (2007). *Mindfulness training modifies subsystems of attention*. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 7(2), 109–119.

Curriculum location: Weeks 1–4 — MBAT Specificity

Jha's earlier work demonstrating that different types of mindfulness practice produce different attentional effects — specifically, that focused attention (FA) and open monitoring (OM) practices train distinct attentional subsystems. This is the scientific basis for the MBAT program using four different practices (rather than one repeated) — each week trains a different subsystem, following the Nideffer quadrant map.

LONG-TERM ATHLETE DEVELOPMENT

Côté, J., Baker, J., & Abernethy, B. (2007). *Practice and play in the development of sport expertise*. In G. Tenenbaum & R. C. Eklund (Eds.), *Handbook of Sport Psychology* (3rd ed.). Wiley.

Curriculum location: Week 5 — Developmental Frame

The foundational LTAD research establishing the sampling, specializing, and investing stages of athletic development. The finding that early sport sampling (not early specialization) predicts elite performance in most sports underpins the Week 5 developmental frame and the explicit warning against importing professional performance frameworks into youth developmental contexts.

Côté, J., & Vierimaa, M. (2014). *The developmental model of sport participation: 15 years after its first conceptualization*. *Science & Sports*, 29, S63–S69.

Curriculum location: Week 5 — Under-13 Research

The updated LTAD research confirming that fun and enjoyment at practice are the strongest predictors of continued participation and eventual elite performance in athletes under 13. This finding is stated directly and without hedging in Week 5 because it contradicts most youth sport practice and has significant implications for how certified IP coaches calibrate their approach to developmental populations.