

## Current Periodization, Testing, and Monitoring Practices of Strength and Conditioning Coaches

Jad Adrian Washif,<sup>1</sup> Carl James,<sup>2</sup> Jeffrey Pagaduan,<sup>3</sup> Julian Lim,<sup>4</sup> Danny Lum,<sup>5,6</sup>  
Raja Mohammed Firhad Raja Azidin,<sup>7</sup> Iñigo Mujika,<sup>8,9</sup> and Christopher Martyn Beaven<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup>High-Performance Centre, Sports Performance Division, National Sports Institute of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia; <sup>2</sup>Department of Sport, Physical Education and Health, Academy of Wellness and Human Development, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong, Hong Kong; <sup>3</sup>Brain and Mental Health Hub, Melbourne School of Psychological Sciences, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia; <sup>4</sup>Athletic Collective, Singapore, Singapore; <sup>5</sup>Sport Science and Sport Medicine, Singapore Sport Institute, Singapore, Singapore; <sup>6</sup>Sport Performance and Nutrition Research Group, La Trobe University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia; <sup>7</sup>Faculty of Sports Science and Recreation, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia; <sup>8</sup>Department of Physiology, Faculty of Medicine and Nursing, University of the Basque Country, Leioa, Basque Country, Spain; <sup>9</sup>Exercise Science Laboratory, School of Kinesiology, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Finis Terrae, Santiago, Chile; <sup>10</sup>Division of Health, Te Huataki Waiora School of Health, University of Waikato, Tauranga, New Zealand

**Purpose:** This study investigated the periodization, testing, and monitoring practices of strength and conditioning practitioners across different levels of coaching experience and sports. **Methods:** An online survey was completed by 58 practitioners (25 sports/events) from 9 Southeast and East Asian countries. The survey focused on periodization models, programming frameworks, unloading strategies, fitness assessments, and pretraining readiness monitoring. Frequency analysis and chi-square tests were used to assess data distribution and differences. **Results:** Hybrid (multiple) periodization was favored over a single model for different training objectives (39%–45%), including very short-term training ( $\leq 4$  wk). Emerging approaches, including flexible programming, were similarly adopted (43%). Program adjustment was primarily driven by athlete feedback (90%), self-observation (78%), and technical execution (74%). Major programming challenges identified were managing fatigue (72%), optimizing training stimuli (53%), specificity (50%), and adherence (47%). **Deloading** practices (95%) and **tapering** applications (91%) were common. Physical performance changes were primarily identified from testing (90%) but also athlete/coach feedback (76%), monitoring (71%), training data (67%), and performance data/statistics (62%). Strength assessments were conducted 2 to 4 times yearly (67%) using 1 to 4 exercises (76%). Pretraining readiness was monitored via conversations (71%), wellness tools (46%), and performance devices (31%). Practitioners also utilized monitoring technology, force plates (21%), and velocity-tracking devices (23%). Training load was commonly quantified using volume load (81%) and session RPE (72%). None of the comparisons differed across experience levels and sports types ( $P > .05$ ). **Conclusion:** Practitioners adopted multiple periodization models, incorporating flexible approaches. Unloading strategies were commonly applied alongside various assessment methods. Technologies were used for monitoring, but conversational/subjective methods remained more widespread.

**Keywords:** assessment, high performance, planning, resistance training, tapering, unloading training