



2008 Super Clinic Eugene, OR

Combined Event Training Theory
Cliff Revelto
Head Track & Field Coach
Kansas State University

Introduction

1. Reaching one's potential in the combined events is a long term process (six to eight years).
Top 10 in World Rankings in 2004
Decathlon – 27.2 years old
Heptathlon – 25.7 years old
2. The athlete has relatively few opportunities to compete in a year.
3. In each competition, the athlete has 7/10 opportunities to do something special and an equal number of opportunities to fail.
4. Coach and athlete have no control over weather, head winds, facilities and officiating.
5. Coach and athlete do have control over training plan. There is no excuse for failure to develop strategic/tactical periodized plan with respect to:
 - A. Biomotor Development
 - B. Motor Development
 - C. Psycho – Motor Development

Foundational Beliefs

1. Successful combined event athletes are more than average, versatile athletes competing in heptathlons and decathlons.
2. Emphasize strengths and work over time to eliminate weaknesses.
3. Good athletes are motor geniuses; they will "get it" if biomotor areas are adequately developed.
4. Making efficient use of training time is critical due to rules, education, jobs, families, etc.
5. The heptathlon/decathlon is one event. Successful combined event athletes have "a" plan. The successful combined event coach works to become knowledgeable in all events/sciences involved in the heptathlon/decathlon.

Point Derivation Analysis

1. Origin (1950)
2. Rationale
 - A. Template for direction of training program
 - B. Assist in goal setting process
3. Heptathlon
 - 2001 World Championships, Edmonton (Top 6 Average)

Average	Yelena Prokhorova, 8894
Sprints 31.2%	30.1%
Jumps 29.9%	31.7%
Throws 25.4%	28.1%
Endurance 13.6%	14.1%

 - 2006 NCAA Heptathlon (Top 8 Average)

Average	Johnson, NCAA Champion, 8583
Sprints 32.6%	33.9%
Jumps 30.1%	31.6%
Throws 29.0%	21.7%
Endurance 14.3%	13.6%

4. Decathlon

1997 World Championships, Athens (Top 10 Average)

Average	Tomás Dvorak, 8837
Sprints 32.5%	32.9%
Jumps 31.3%	30.6%
Throws 29.1%	28.7%
Endurance 8.1%	8.0%

2006 NCAA Decathlon (Top 8 Average)

Average	Arnold, NCAA Champion, 7870
Sprints 32.6%	32.5%
Jumps 31.6%	31.4%
Throws 29.0%	27.1%
Endurance 9.2%	9.0%

Average of Past Four World Record Holders

Sprints	32.1%	(31.5-32.6)
Jumps	31.6%	(30.7-32.3)
Throws	28.9%	(27.7-29.6)
Endurance	8.1%	(7.7-8.6)

Sum of Decathlon / Heptathlon Individual Event PR's vs PR Score

1. Open vs Combined Event PR's
2. Training age influenced

Decathlon Differentials

Daly Thompson	422
Dan O'Brien	534
Tomás Dvorak	147
Roman Sobrie	278
Average	345

Bryan Clay (8820)	555
Tom Pappas (8784)	347

Heptathlon Differentials

Jackie Joyner-Kersey WR 7291

Differential 363

Top 4 at 2004 Athens Olympic Games

			<u>Differentials</u>
Carolina Klüft	(83)	6952	62 (203)
Austra Skujyte	(79)	6435	164
Kelly Sotherton	(79)	6424	255
Shelia Burrell	(72)	6296	258
Average			185 (220)

Combined Event Training Theory Considerations

1. Macrocycle Considerations

A. Biomotor Development

- i. The development of biomotor abilities at sub-elite and elite levels cannot adequately be developed simultaneously.
- ii. Over the course of the macrocycle it is necessary to divide the training year into periods and/or phases of certain biomotor emphasis.
- iii. Progression should be logical; i.e. training emphasis preceded by their prerequisites, e.g. extensive to intensive as well as speed prior to speed endurance.
- iv. Training progresses from general to specific.
 - a. Prerequisites to specific training, with respect to technical, tactical, psychological, neuromuscular or metabolic demand should be scheduled accordingly.
 - b. Bleeding periods allow for gradual change in training focus.
- v. Relationships between volume and intensity.

2. Mesocycle Considerations

- A. Theme or block training by biomotor ability(ies) or technical commonality.
- B. Recovery mesocycles.
- C. Vary practice tasks to enhance task transfer.

3. Microcycle Considerations

A. Compatible Training

Describe the combination of training activities that enhance each other when combined in a session, increasing the effectiveness of the session.

Examples of compatible grouping considerations:

- i. Grouping by similar neuromuscular demands.
- ii. Grouping by similar metabolic demands.
- iii. Grouping by technical commonality.
- iv. Grouping by duration of power output.
- v. Grouping by force application time frames.
- vi. Grouping by static/dynamic nature of the activity.
- vii. Grouping by rhythm of the activity.

B. Complementary Training

Describe training sessions which, when sequenced in a certain way, enhance the training effect. Rest, recovery and contrast which distinguishes more effectively the individual training stimulus will enhance adaptation.

Examples of complementary grouping considerations:

- i. A day of rest.
- ii. A prescription of restoration activities.
- iii. A training session featuring restorative units.
- iv. A training session of the same theme, training these qualities deeper.
- v. A training session of the same theme, training these qualities shallower.
- vi. A training session of the same theme, training these qualities in an alternate manner.
- vii. A training session of a differing theme with some contrasting qualities.

C. Commonalities of Events

Technical features we see in common when we examine the various events and skills of athletes. Developing a commonality based philosophy of teaching makes teaching and learning simpler. Fundamental skills can be taught and brought to various events in appropriate ways, rather than approaching each event as a separate entity.

Examples:

- i. High Jump – Javelin
- ii. Long Jump – High Jump
- iii. Long Jump – Hurdles
- iv. Power positions in throws
- v. Initiation of throws