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Abstract

Specificity is a key programming principle for optimal transfer of physiological adaptation of training to improved athletic performance. In resistance training, it has long been identified that the closer the mechanical specificity between the training exercise and outcome performance, the greater the transfer of improved capacity. Bilateral resistance exercises are predominately prescribed for the development of maximum strength and are well demonstrated to enhance athletic performance. However, unilateral exercises appear to demonstrate greater specificity to movements such as running and change of direction as these movements are predominantly single leg actions. Nonetheless, the unstable nature and comparatively lower magnitude of external resistance could be theorised to relegate unilateral exercises to be inferior to bilateral exercises and thus of less benefit for enhancing performance.

To investigate the differences in transfer between bilateral and unilateral resistance training to athletic performance of sprint acceleration and change of direction, a series of biomechanical and training intervention studies were implemented. The first study established the reliability of the one repetition maximum (1RM) step-up test (Chapter Three). Ten moderately trained participants completed four familiarisation sessions before two repeated strength testing sessions on separate days. Reliability was estimated as the typical error ±90% confidence limits (CL), expressed as a coefficient of variation (CV%) and the intraclass correlation (ICC). The CV% for all comparisons ranged between 2.0% and 5.3% with average of left and right leg CV% less than the smallest worthwhile change. Importantly, the test was deemed reliable to monitor improvements in lower body unilateral strength.

Second, the validity and reliability of barbell displacement in heavy back squats was established (Chapter Four). Twelve well-trained rugby players (1RM 90° squat = 196.3 ± 29.2kg) completed two sets of two repetitions at 70%, 80% and 90% of 1RM squats. Barbell displacement was derived from three methods across four load categories (120-129kg, 140-149kg, 160-169kg and 180-189kg) including: 1) Linear Position Transducer attached 65cm left of barbell centre, 2) 3D motion analysis tracking of markers attached to either end of the barbell, and 3) cervical marker (C7) (criterion measurement). Validity was calculated using typical error of the estimate as CV% ±90% CL, mean bias as a percentage and Pearson product
moment correlation (r). Intraday reliability was calculated using ICC and the typical error expressed as CV% ±90% CL. Laterality of marker position increased bias between the criterion measure (C7) and predicted measures (LPT bias = 0.9-1.5%; r = 0.96-0.98; barbell ends bias = 4.9-11.2%; r = 0.71-0.97). Moderate reliability was obtained for most measures of barbell displacement (All loads: LPT: CV% = 6.6%, ICC = 0.67; barbell ends: CV% = 5.9-7.2%, ICC = 0.55-0.67; C7: CV% = 6.6%, ICC = 0.62). Due to a combination of heavy external barbell load and the pliant nature of the barbell, overestimation can occur with increasing external load and as the position tracking location moves laterally (barbell ends). The linear position transducer demonstrated high validity to the criterion and high trial-to-trial reliability.

Completing methodological rigour, within-session reliability of kinetic and kinematic variables of the squat and step-up were investigated (Chapters Five to Eight). Fifteen well-trained rugby players completed two testing sessions. Session one involved squat and step-up 1RM strength testing. Session two involved four maximal repetitions of squat and step-up at 70%, 80% and 90% 1RM assessed by three-dimensional motion analysis and in-ground triaxial force plates. Reliability was calculated for each load range using CV% ±90% CL and ICC. Across all load ranges squat and step-up peak and average ground reaction force (GRF) and total concentric impulse were found to have acceptable measures of reliability below 10% and ICC above 0.85. The majority of loads for squat and step-up displacement, concentric duration, and maximum knee flexion angle were reliable (CV% < 10%, ICC > 0.75). For the squat, measures of peak and average velocity were reliable (CV < 10%) whilst step-up velocity measures were less reliable (CV% <13%; ICC >0.60). Reliability findings permitted confident interpretation of key variables of squat and step-up performance and application to training.

A comparison of kinetics and kinematics between squat and step-up were conducted to provide insight for potential training application. In-ground tri-axial force plates and three-dimensional motion analysis were used to capture force output and movement patterns of four maximal efforts of squats and step-ups at 70%, 80% and 90% of 1RM. The concentric phase kinetics and kinematics of each exercise were analysed using effect sizes (ES ± 90% confidence limits). Large to very large differences in peak and average GRF per leg were found for the step-up compared to the squat at all loads (Peak GRF ES: 2.56 ± 0.19 to 2.70 ± 0.37; Average GRF ES: 1.45 ± 0.27 to 1.48 ± 0.29). Additionally, per leg, the squat was inferior to the step-up for impulse at 70% (0.71 ± 0.40) and 80% (0.30 ± 0.41). The difference at 90% 1RM was
unclear. Peak velocity was greater for the squat compared to the step-up across all loads (squat produced large differences in peak velocity at all loads (ES = -1.74 ± 0.48 to -1.33 ± 0.48). The comparable GRF per leg between step-up and squat suggests overload sufficient for strength development in the step-up, despite a lower absolute magnitude of external resistance. Although appearing to provide sufficient overload for strength development, a training study was designed to determine the practical application of resisted step-ups on strength development and measures of speed and change of direction performance.

The final study recruited academy level rugby players (age = 23.1 ± 4.3 years, mean training age = 5.4 ± 2.9 years; 1RM 90° squat = 178 ± 27 kg) assigned to one of two groups – a bilateral (BIL) training group or a unilateral (UNI) training group. Subjects completed a comprehensive 18-week program involving a familiarisation, training and maintenance phases. Back squat and step-up strength testing was analysed for within- and between-group differences using ES ± 90% CL. Both intervention groups showed practically important within group improvements in their primary exercise during the training phase (ES ± 90% CL: BIL = 0.79 ± 0.40; UNI = 0.63 ± 0.17) with transfer to their non-trained resistance exercise (BIL step-up = 0.22 ± 0.37; UNI squat = 0.44 ± 0.39). Between groups, the improvement in squat 1RM was unclear (ES = -0.34 ± 0.55), however unilateral resistance training showed an advantage to step-up 1RM (ES = 0.41 ± 0.36). The bilateral and unilateral training groups improved 20m sprint (ES: BIL = -0.38 ± 0.49; UNI = -0.31 ± 0.31), however the difference between the groups was unclear (ES = 0.07 ± 0.58). Whilst both groups had meaningful improvements in COD (BIL COD average = -0.97 ± 0.32: UNI squat = -0.50 ± 0.54), bilateral resistance training had a greater transfer to COD performance than unilateral (between groups ES = 0.72 ± 0.55). As such, practically important increases in lower body strength can be achieved with bilateral or unilateral resistance training. Whilst increases in strength positively improved sprint acceleration, the BIL group demonstrated superior improvements in COD perhaps due to the limited eccentric training stimulus of the step-up exercise. This demonstrates the importance of targeting the underlying physiological stimulus for adaptation and not purely likeness of movement specificity of the target performance.

The research sought to address specificity and transfer of training as it pertains to bilateral and unilateral lower body resistance training. The results demonstrate that high GRF is produced per leg, comparable between the squat and step-up suggesting sufficient strength
development stimulus of the step-up. Differences in total concentric impulse and velocity may provide variable training applications of either exercise. When incorporated into a resistance training program, unilateral and bilateral exercises can develop maximum strength. Importantly, strength development was demonstrated in the performance of the non-trained bilateral or unilateral exercise, demonstrating a level of transfer. Further, the training study revealed that sprint acceleration over 20m can be developed using either squat or step-up. However, whilst both groups improved COD performance, squat training had a superior transfer to COD than step-up training. This suggests that step-up training may sufficiently improve lower body strength and acceleration, however, the application to COD performance may require additional training stimulus to enhance adaptation potentially due to the lack of eccentric overload in the step-up.
Declaration

I certify that this thesis does not, to the best of my knowledge and belief:

(1) Incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any institution of higher education;

(2) Contain any material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the text; or

(3) Contain any defamatory material.

I also grant permission for the Library at Edith Cowan University to make duplicate copies of my thesis as required

Brendyn B Appleby

Month, Day, Year
Acknowledgements

It has been said, “If you are the smartest person in the room, you are in the wrong room.”

I was not in the wrong room. I could not afford to be. I am still stunned I was let in and have constantly been waiting for the tap on the shoulder and kind escort out the door: “Sorry Mr Appleby, there seems to have been a mistake. You should not be here.”

How someone like me could have supervisors like Rob Newton and Prue Cormie still amazes me? I’m not sure what they were thinking when they said “Yes”, but their belief, support, patience and experience was beyond generous. A blessed combination of amazing academic skills. Rob, your ability to see the big picture and keep me moving contributed more than you know. Prue, your meticulous attention to detail and for entertaining this idea in the first place – thank you. I am constantly inspired by your careers and the important work you do.

To have someone like Stuart Cormack “assist” is amazing and I’m humbled that I could even call him a friend. Stu, thank you for your enthusiasm in my work, your belief in me and your endless patience with my slow growth; I am deeply, deeply indebted. We’ve come a long way from those special whiteboard chats in the weights room.

Mervyn Travers – you have ridden this roller coaster with me and played a significant part as a friend who was always a few steps ahead, wisely pointing out the rabbit holes from the gold mines. “Spearfish, don’t trawl”.

To Greg Haff and Sophia Nimphius: for the greatest baptism of fire an ECU Sport Science Student may have ever had at proposal. I would not want to do again – and I am so very glad that I did. You ignited my pathway of academic rigour.
My colleagues, coaches and athletes of RugbyWA for their support and participation. To the wonderful athletes who put their trust in me, offered their precious time – thank you.

To the students who assisted with the exciting training and testing sessions – thank you; I hope you still look back on those times as fondly as I do.

To the staff at ECU, in particular Nadia, Elisabeth and Helen for their support with laboratory preparation. Nick Hart and Tania Spiteri – colleagues who raced to the finish line, but still graciously had time for a straggler like me. Bernard Liew for his assistance with data techniques.

Finally, more time than I care to admit has come and gone and my daughter cannot recall a time when I was not doing this PhD. To my wife, Jen, and daughter Holly; even though my work took more time than it should (way more!), you still allowed me early mornings and late nights in the study and library to pursue something, that I still cannot believe I actually did.

Brendyn
In Memory

Whilst some time has passed since this investigation, it is still fitting to remember Rob Shugg, Co-owner and Director of Kinetic (GymAware) who was a friend and enthusiastic supporter of this work, who tragically passed before he could see it completed.
List of Abbreviations

General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>Repetition Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RM:BM</td>
<td>ratio of one repetition maximum strength relative to body mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kg</td>
<td>Kilograms, unit of mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Metres, unit of displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cm</td>
<td>centimetre, unit of displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm</td>
<td>millimetre, unit of displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m/s</td>
<td>Meters per second, units of velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m/s/s</td>
<td>Metres per second per second, units of acceleration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ms</td>
<td>milliseconds, unit of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hz</td>
<td>hertz, unit of frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;C</td>
<td>Strength and Conditioning Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>Anterior cruciate ligament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIL</td>
<td>Bilateral training group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>Unilateral training group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>Comparison training group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td>Change of direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Split squat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESS</td>
<td>Rear foot elevated split squat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHS</td>
<td>left hand side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHS</td>
<td>right hand side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>7th cervical vertebra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBT</td>
<td>velocity-based training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMO</td>
<td>Vastus medialis oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL</td>
<td>Vastus lateralis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Confidence limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Effect size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>Intraclass correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV%</td>
<td>Coefficient of variation percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWC</td>
<td>Smallest worthwhile change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Standard error of measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>Technical error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>number of trials/participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Laboratory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Newtons, units of force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFD</td>
<td>Rate of force development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp</td>
<td>Impulse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D</td>
<td>three dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRF</td>
<td>Ground reaction force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMG</td>
<td>Electromyography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT</td>
<td>Linear position transducer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Publications and Presentations

I would like to acknowledge the contribution of reviewers and editors who graciously offered their time to provide constructive feedback to enhance the quality of these papers.

At the time of submission, the following chapters had been submitted/accepted for publication.

**Chapter Four (in 2018, was accepted for publication)**

**Chapter Five (in 2019, was resubmitted for second review)**

**Chapter Nine (in 2018, was accepted for publication)**

**Chapter Ten (in 2019, appeared in print)**

**Chapter Eleven (in 2018, was accepted for publication)**
Appleby BB, Cormack SJ, and Newton RU, Unilateral and bilateral lower body resistance training does not transfer equally to sprint and change of direction performance. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*.

NB. Please note the formatting of text within the following chapters does not coincide 100% with the published manuscripts as listed above. The reference styles and abbreviations may have been modified from the preferred style of the journal to maintain consistency within this thesis. The content has been modified in appearance / formatting only, text, tables, figures and references have not been altered in any way. For example, “Table 1” in Chapter Four now reads as “Table 4.1”.

Statement of Contribution

Chapters 1, 2, 6, 7, 8 and 12. Brendyn B Appleby, Prue Cormie and Robert U Newton contributed to the conception, design, analysis or writing of the chapters.

Chapters 3, 4, 9, 10 and 11. Brendyn B Appleby, Prue Cormie, Stuart J Cormack and Robert U Newton contributed to the conception, design, analysis or writing of the chapters.

Chapter 5. Brendyn B Appleby, Prue Cormie, Stuart J Cormack, Harry Banyard and Robert U Newton contributed to the conception, design, analysis or writing of the chapter.
# Table of Contents

**BILATERAL AND UNILATERAL RESISTANCE TRAINING AND ATHLETIC PERFORMANCE**

- **USE OF THESIS**
- **ABSTRACT**
- **DECLARATION**
- **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**
- **IN MEMORY**
- **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**
- **LIST OF PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**
- **STATEMENT OF CONTRIBUTION**
- **TABLE OF CONTENTS**
- **LIST OF FIGURES**
- **LIST OF TABLES**
- **THESIS SUMMARY**

**PART ONE**

- **CHAPTER ONE**
  - Introduction
- **CHAPTER TWO**
  - **Review of the Literature**
    - 1 - Athletic Performance
    - 2 - Resistance Training: Biological Adaptation and Training Principles – A Brief Review
    - 3 - Lower Body Resistance Training: Bilateral and Unilateral Exercise
    - 4 - Studies Comparing Bilateral and Unilateral Resistance Training
    - 5 - Summary and Thesis Implications

**PART TWO**

- **Preface**
- **CHAPTER THREE**
  - The Lower Body Step-up Exercise: Strength Testing Reliability and Training Application
Appendix A ................................................................................................................................. 238

Human Research Ethics Acknowledgement ................................................................. 238

Appendix B ............................................................................................................................... 239

Information Letter to Participants and Informed Consent Forms ..................... 239

Appendix C ............................................................................................................................... 250

Turnitin Originality Reports ............................................................................................... 250

END ........................................................................................................................................ 253
List of Figures

Figure 1. Schematic representation of thesis .......................................................... XXIII

Figure 2.1 Model of main factors of agility, Young (2002) (585) .............................. 17

Figure 2.3 Common bilateral exercises. A – Back squat; B – Clean pull / clean / front squat; C – Deadlift; D – Snatch / overhead squat. .................................................................. 32

Figure 2.4 Common unilateral exercises. A – Rear foot elevated split squat; B – Lunge / split squat; C – Single leg squat; D – Step-up. ................................................................. 38

Figure 3.1 Experimental design schematic .............................................................. 61

Figure 6.1 Schematic representation of experimental design .................................. 103

Figure 7.2 Representation of temporal phase of the step-up ................................. 115

Figure 8.1 Schematic representation of experimental design ............................... 123

Figure 9.2 Representation of temporal phase of the step-up ............................... 141

Figure 10.1 Schematic representation of study design ........................................... 156

Figure 10.2 The prescribed volume load (VL) and training intensity (TI) as a percentage of 1RM of the Training Intervention (Phase 2 and 3) based on repetitions x sets x %1RM (240). ................................................................................................. 161

Figure 10.3 Mean (±SD) and individual responses for 1RM Squat (A) and 1RM Step-up (B) for each treatment group. Training phase: Base = Baseline testing; Mid = Mid testing; End T. = End training; End M. = End maintenance ............................................... 163

Figure 11.1 Schematic representation of study design ........................................... 175

Figure 11.2 The prescribed volume load (VL) and training intensity (TI) as a percentage of 1RM of the Training Intervention (Phase 2 and 3) based on repetitions x sets x %1RM (240). ................................................................................................. 178

Figure 11.3 Change of Direction course ............................................................... 181

Figure 11.4 Mean (±SD) and individual responses in the Bilateral group (BIL) Unilateral group (UNI) and Comparison group (COM) for average left and right change of
direction (COD) time. Training phase: **Base** = Baseline testing; **Mid** = Mid testing; **End T.** = End training; **End M.** = End maintenance.
List of Tables

Table 2.1 Typical test values and between-session reliability of short sprint distance representative of team sports athletes. ........................................................................................................... 14

Table 2.2 Typical test values and between-session reliability of COD assessments representative of team sports athletes. ...................................................................................................... 16

Table 2.3 Typical test values and between-session reliability of back squat assessments representative of team sports athletes ...................................................................................................... 36

Table 2.4 Typical test values and between-session reliability of back squat assessments representative of team sports athletes ...................................................................................................... 44

Table 2.5 Summary of research investigating bilateral (squat) and unilateral (RESS) lower body resistance training. ................................................................................................................ 53

Table 3.1 The familiarisation protocol. ........................................................................................................... 62

Table 3.2 Reliability of 1RM step-up testing between trial 1 and trial 2 ...................... 64

Table 4.1 Validity of the criterion measure (7th cervical vertebrae marker) in the back squat barbell to the right-hand side, left-hand side and linear position transducer displacement by absolute bar load. ........................................................................................................... 75

Table 4.2 Reliability of the criterion measure (7th cervical vertebrae marker), the right-hand side, left-hand side and linear position transducer displacement in back squat barbell displacement by absolute bar load. ........................................................................................................... 76

Table 6.1 Participant characteristics........................................................................................................... 103

Table 6.2 Reliability of duration phases in the squat .................................................................................. 106

Table 6.3 Reliability of maximum C7 displacement in the squat .......................................................... 106

Table 6.4 Reliability of maximum knee angle in the squat ........................................................................ 107

Table 6.5 Reliability of C7 velocity in the squat ........................................................................................ 107

Table 7.1 Participants characteristics ........................................................................................................... 113

Table 7.2 Reliability of peak concentric phase ground reaction force non-support phase for the drive leg left leg and right leg in the step-up .......................................................... 116

Table 7.3 Reliability of mean concentric phase ground reaction force for the drive leg, left leg and right leg in the step-up through concentric phase. ............................................................................... 116
Table 7.4 Reliability of total concentric impulse for the drive leg in the step-up through the non-support phase. ........................................................................................................... 117

Table 8.1 Participants characteristics ........................................................................................................... 123

Table 8.2 Reliability of maximum knee angle in the step-up ........................................................................... 124

Table 8.3 Reliability of duration phases for the step-up. ................................................................................. 125

Table 8.4 Reliability of maximum C7 displacement in the step-up............................................................... 125

Table 8.5 Reliability of C7 velocity for the step-up.......................................................................................... 126

Table 9.1 Within session reliability of kinetic and kinematic variables of squat and step-up for all load ranges............................................................................................................................. 143

Table 9.2 Kinetic and kinematic differences between squat and step-up per leg performance by relative intensity............................................................................................................................................... 144

Table 10.1 Participant characteristics at the commencement of the training intervention and testing. ..................................................................................................................................................................... 157

Table 10.2 Weekly training schedule. ........................................................................................................... 159

Table 10.3 Example of lower body training program for each four-week mesocycle. ........................................... 159

Table 10.4 The reps, sets and percentage 1RM loading for squats and step-ups for each session. ......................................................................................................................................................................... 160

Table 10.5 The magnitude of within group changes in strength at week 9 and week 12 compared to baseline for Bilateral, Unilateral and Comparison groups. .............................................................. 164

Table 10.6 The magnitude of change in strength, between the groups for each training cycle. ................................................................................................................................................................................. 164

Table 11.1 Subject characteristics at the commencement of the training intervention and testing. ..................................................................................................................................................................... 176

Table 11.2 Weekly training schedule........................................................................................................... 177

Table 11.3 Example of lower body training program for each four-week mesocycle. ........................................... 177

Table 11.4 The reps, sets and percentage 1RM loading for squats and step-ups for each session. ......................................................................................................................................................................... 178
Table 11.5 1RM strength of the Bilateral, Unilateral and Comparison groups for squat and step-up strength at baseline, week 9 and week 12 for Bilateral, Unilateral and Comparison groups.

Table 11.6 The magnitude of within group changes in speed and change of direction at week 9 and week 12 compared to baseline for Bilateral, Unilateral and Comparison groups.

Table 11.7 The magnitude of change in speed and change of direction between the Bilateral and Unilateral groups for each training cycle.

Table 11.8 The magnitude of change in speed and change of direction between the Bilateral and Comparison groups for each training cycle.

Table 11.9 The magnitude of change in speed and change of direction between the Unilateral and Comparison groups for each training cycle.
Thesis Summary

To facilitate reading, this thesis is presented in five parts:

1. Part One: Establishing the position of this research, this part details essential research questions underpinning this thesis (Chapter 1 – Introduction). Chapter Two presents a comprehensive review of the literature pertaining to the application of bilateral and unilateral resistance training for enhancing athletic performance.

2. Part Two: Comprised of three chapters presenting important methodological aspects (validity and reliability) pertinent to sound experimental design.

3. Part Three: Complementing and expanding on Part Two this section presents three technical papers exploring the within-session reliability of squat and step-up biomechanical assessment. Information in this series of technical papers permits confident interpretation of data presented in Part Four.

4. Part Four: Presents the core experimental chapters. First, Chapter Nine compares kinetics and kinematics of the back squat and step-up performed by well-trained participants drawing attention to similarities and differences between the squat and step-up and providing insight regarding potential training application. These findings are explored in a training study comparing development and expression of lower body strength using back squats or step-ups and transfer of strength between the exercises. Ultimately, the success of resistance training is measured by improvement in athletic performance – speed and change of direction. The final experimental chapter presents a training study data detailing improvements and contrasts in athletic performance as a result of bilateral or unilateral resistance training.

5. Part Five: The concluding chapter summarises main findings and provides practical applications addressing the research questions presented, acknowledging thesis limitations and providing future research considerations.
Figure I. Schematic representation of thesis.
PART ONE
Chapter One

INTRODUCTION
A myriad of morphological and neurological adaptations results from resistance training and as such, resistance training is a fundamental component of athletic preparation (182, 183, 205, 503). The nature (i.e. what type of morphological/neurological adaptations) and the magnitude of adaptation are dependent upon the many variables within the resistance training program. Two key variables in resistance training programs include exercise selection and intensity, as they are intimately linked to the principles of overload and specificity (524). These principles are the governing concepts of program design for athlete development (524, 590). In order to achieve an adaptation, the exercise stimulus must exceed normal physiological demands (i.e. principle of overload) (524). Furthermore, the nature and magnitude of adaptation varies with the exercise stimulus and transfer to the desired athletic performance is greater if the training characteristics closely simulate the targeted movement (i.e. principle of specificity) (477). To maximise the transfer of training to performance, these variables must be arranged in a sophisticated manner as part of a periodised resistance training program which elicits desired physiological adaptations (524, 590). Due to their extensive training history, elite athletes have a small window of adaptation and as a consequence, the use of overload and specificity in exercise programming for this population is even more imperative (12, 28, 208, 248, 254, 299, 431).

The mechanical specificity of an exercise refers to the similarity in muscle activation, force development and movement patterns of a training exercise to the athletic action and it is a critical factor in maximising the transfer of training to performance (523, 526). Muscles adapt in a manner specific to the training stimulus (33, 174, 187, 378, 472, 477). Common throughout the literature is evidence linking specificity of resistance training to improved athletic performance (114, 115, 360). The greater the similarity between the kinetics and kinematics of a training stimulus and the athletic demands of the sport, the greater the likelihood and magnitude of transfer of training to improved athletic performance (185, 388, 524). For example, there is strong evidence demonstrating similar kinetic features between weightlifting and the vertical jump, and as such, improvements in weightlifting performance have also resulted in improvements in vertical jump performance (86, 242, 252, 295). Further, Wilson et. al (564) analysed the changes in performance between three groups who performed either squat strength training, drop jumps or ballistic squat jump training (at the load that maximised mechanical power). Despite the similarity in movement patterns between the three groups, the authors discovered that the ballistic training group significantly increased vertical jump, 30m sprint and six second cycle capacity but did not increase isometric force, compared
to the squat group who significantly increased maximum isometric force, but not sprint or cycling performance. This study among many others have clearly demonstrated that selection of mechanically similar resistance training interventions is critical for highly trained athletes to improve the transfer of force production to sporting performance (331, 590).

Bilateral exercises are commonly prescribed in resistance training programs as they allow for significant overload in mechanically specific actions, which in turn, increases strength development and has been demonstrated to transfer to performance (115). For example, bilateral resistance exercises such as weightlifting, squat and deadlifts feature prominently in resistance training for elite athletes due to the mechanical specificity to the performance of common athletic movements such as jumping, sprinting and changing direction. As such, relationships between bilateral lifting performance, and actions such as jumping and short distance sprinting have been well documented (30, 78, 95, 114, 295, 547, 581). In addition to joint angle specificity, these exercises permit substantial neuromuscular overload by the magnitude of external resistance achievable by highly trained performers. The ability to overload mechanically similar actions, improves the neuromuscular mechanisms associated with superior force and power production and is a critically important attribute of these bilateral exercises (115, 132). The highest threshold motor units are only recruited in maximal or near maximal contractions (221, 477). It is theorised that when developed in mechanically specific exercises with similar kinetics, the transfer of increased high threshold motor unit recruitment is more effectively applied to athletic performance (477). Many studies have demonstrated that superior performance in strength, measured by common bilateral resistance exercises, can differentiate sporting level and is associated with superior jumping, sprinting and change of direction performance (25, 27, 66, 209, 227). Therefore, due to the positive neuromuscular changes developed through overload in these mechanically similar exercises, their incorporation in program design for highly trained athletes has long been a strategy for increased physical performance (16, 32, 182, 183, 503).

Unilateral resistance training exercises have been more commonly prescribed in strength and conditioning practice recently due to the fact that sporting performance is dominated by the unilateral movements of jumping, sprinting and changing direction (22, 166, 385, 388). The general theory supporting the inclusion of unilateral resistance training exercises is that these may offer greater levels of specificity, and therefore a superior transfer
of training to performance than the more traditional bilateral movements (22, 166, 385, 388). Unilateral resistance training exercises have traditionally been confined to inexperienced athletes or in rehabilitation settings yet have recently become prescribed in advanced strength and conditioning practice based on this general theory and the higher level of specificity required for improvement in already well-trained athletes (232, 511). The advantages of unilateral exercises compared to bilateral exercises may include utilising the bilateral deficit and the specificity of muscle recruitment patterns (421). The bilateral deficit is the phenomenon whereby the summed forces of each unilateral contraction are greater than the total forces of the bilateral contraction (265, 336). This suggests that the magnitude of force development by highly trained athletes may be less in bilateral training compared to unilateral training, and that the appropriate prescription of unilateral exercises may in fact provide greater levels of overload. Additionally, the neuromuscular factors driving movement have been demonstrated to alter based on joint angle/range of motion, contraction/movement velocity, contraction type, external resistance and/or training experience (7, 96, 239, 386). Therefore, there exists a strong theoretical rationale that the specificity of neuromuscular demands in unilateral exercises would differ to bilateral exercises.

Furthermore, bilateral muscle imbalance is well recognised as a precursor to musculoskeletal injury (122, 139, 444, 550, 578). It is possible for an athlete to unintentionally perform a bilateral exercise asymmetrically, contributing to the development and/or exacerbation of musculoskeletal imbalances (313, 432). In rehabilitation or athletic performance training situations, this asymmetry may inhibit appropriate development (478). Insufficient hip neuromuscular function has been associated with lower limb injuries and the importance of synergists to injury prevention has been well documented (302, 550). Furthermore, it has been hypothesized that coordination of synergists is of importance for agonist force production in unsupported exercises (472). The overload of these muscles through unilateral exercises may improve lower body performance compared to bilateral training (139, 148). Differences in muscle activation levels of the rectus femoris, biceps femoris and gluteus medius have been found between single and double leg resistance exercises (157). The biceps femoris and gluteus medius activation levels were significantly higher for the modified single leg squat whilst the rectus femoris was significantly higher in the back squat (386). Despite the theoretical rationale that unilateral resistance training exercises have a high degree of specificity to athletic movements, the scientific research examining the relationship between unilateral resistance training exercises and athletic movements is limited
Unilateral strength training has been demonstrated to improve unilateral vertical jumping ability compared to bilateral training in an eight week study, although participants in this study were untrained male and female college students (389). Additionally, the unilateral training group was performing unilateral plyometrics compared to the bilateral group which performed bilateral plyometrics only. This additional training may have influenced the improvement in single leg jumping ability due to the unfamiliar nature of the task for these untrained participants. A training study incorporating academy rugby players utilised either the modified single leg squat (unilateral) or back squat (bilateral) concluding either training exercise improved lower body strength and 40m speed (511). However, a common limitation of previous unilateral research is either the magnitude of load is low (i.e. the exercise is prescribed for rehabilitation purposes, and therefore does not provide sufficient overload for neuromuscular adaptation that leads to improved athletic performance), the limited training experience of participants, short-term study duration or the exercise selection is asymmetrical in nature but not purely unilateral (i.e. the legs are horizontally off-set and both in contact with the ground during the movement, which is not specific) (22, 63, 75, 384-386, 388, 389). These factors limit the application of current findings to program design for improving elite athletic performance.

Maximising neuromuscular adaptations in athletes requires sophisticated resistance training prescription which involves a high degree of mechanical specificity and overload (amongst other important factors). The challenge for sport scientists is to develop such training programs, as these factors are highly associated with the degree to which resistance training transfers to improved athletic performance. This is even more challenging when working with highly trained/elite athletes given their smaller window for adaptation. While bilateral exercises such as squats and weightlifting have long been recognised for their relationship to athletic performance and capacity for overload, unilateral training may offer equal or superior levels of overload and specificity. Through the use of unilateral training exercises that permit adequate loading (i.e. step-ups), athletes may benefit from greater levels of overload (i.e. not limited by the bilateral deficit) and specificity (i.e. most sporting actions are predominately performed in a unilateral manner). Despite this theoretical rationale, there is a distinct lack of research comparing the mechanical specificity of bilateral and unilateral resistance training exercises on the development of maximal strength and/or the transfer to athletic performance.
PURPOSE AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The primary purpose of this research was to examine the development and transfer of maximal strength developed using the back squat or step-up to athletic performance. Specifically, this thesis was designed to address the following research questions:

One: “A comparison of the force application and movement patterns between bilateral and unilateral resistance training exercises in highly trained athletes”

- What are the force applications and movement patterns during the squat (i.e. bilateral resistance training exercise)?
- What are the force applications and movement patterns during the step-up (i.e. unilateral resistance training exercise)?
- What are the differences and similarities of force applications and movement patterns between bilateral and unilateral resistance training exercises?

Two: “An examination of the efficacy of bilateral and unilateral resistance training for maximum strength development and effect on sprint acceleration and change of direction ability.”

- What is the efficacy of bilateral versus unilateral resistance training exercises for the magnitude of change in strength and athletic performance?
- Does resistance training with bilateral or unilateral movements have a superior transfer of training effect (i.e. is the adaptation of a greater magnitude)?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH

The essential purpose of resistance training is to increase athletic performance such as improved sprint speed, jumping ability or change of direction. Given that athletic performance is generally performed unilaterally, this research will provide valuable insight into the relationships between sprinting, change of direction and unilateral resistance training. Additionally, this research will provide insight into the fundamental principles of training: specificity, transfer and maintenance, and have direct applications for training program design.
Chapter Two

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE
INTRODUCTION

Aspects of resistance training are common place in many sporting populations, with a purpose for the enhanced benefit to subsequent athletic performance (such as sprint acceleration or jumping), and not necessarily for the betterment of resistance exercise performance (394). That is, athletes do not, for example, squat to improve squatting, but squat to improve lower body strength to improve on-field performance (333, 396). Whilst evidence has been frequently presented establishing relationships between measures of lower body strength and athletic performance, resistance training to improve on-field/court performance can be complicated with a range of neuromuscular adaptations greatly influenced by exercise selection. Two guiding principles for physiological adaptation are intensity of training and specificity to maximise transfer of training to the intended performance (332, 524). Thus, exercise selection is a critical underlying consideration of athletic program design in maximising transfer – an exercise requires substantial intensity for overload resulting in adaptation and specific enough to maximise transfer to athletic performance. Superior athletic performance in the form of sprinting and agility are often contest defining attributes and a focus of preparation for many team sport athletes.

The importance of superior athletic performance and the interaction with resistance training is a broad and complex area. As such, the current literature review will broadly examine several overarching themes regarding resistance training and athletic performance, narrowing to specific bilateral and unilateral resistance training applications and their impact on athletic performance. First, the review will explore the value of sprint acceleration and change of direction capacity in team sport athletes, the assessment of such capacities and the role of resistance training in enhancing these on-field qualities. Additionally, the principles of resistance training with particular emphasis on specificity of training, will be explored, leading to a review of prominent lower body bilateral and unilateral strength applications. Finally, examples of training studies comparing bilateral and unilateral interventions on the development of maximal strength and subsequent athletic performance will be presented. The aim is to provide context for the position of this thesis in the current literature and its contribution and practical significance for enhancing athletic development.
ATHLETIC PERFORMANCE

A burst of speed from a striker into space for a scoring opportunity.

A slam dunk from the free throw line.

A defender’s clearing kick.

The centre field throw to home.

Sprinting, jumping, kicking and throwing – decisive physical qualities of team sport performance. Research has demonstrated relationships between neuromuscular strength and athletic performance tasks such as jumping, sprinting or throwing (31, 102, 234, 295, 377, 392, 493, 530, 531). Further, superior performance of these actions have been revealed in various sports delimiting successful competitive levels and playing positions (27, 41, 66, 151, 209, 227, 329, 454, 584, 588). Underpinning power and speed is a foundation of maximal strength; the capacity to apply force (130, 529, 533). Combined with injury risk reduction and rehabilitation (342, 343), resistance training has a long integration in power-based events, such as track and field and team sports, in an effort to improve athletic performance (180, 279, 380, 397, 452). Principles of resistance training – specificity and overload – are critically linked to the development and transfer of favourable neuromuscular adaptations driving improved athletic performance. Whilst bilateral exercises are commonly prescribed due to demonstrated strength, speed and change of direction benefits, the specificity of unilateral training, including enhanced neuromuscular activation strategies, reveal a unique gap in the literature with regard to development and transfer of lower body strength to sprint acceleration and change of direction capacity.

Acceleration in Team Sports

There are three biomechanically differentiated phases of sprinting: acceleration, maximum running speed and deceleration (159, 404, 407, 557). Each phase has distinct kinematic and kinetic differences which require specific testing and training interventions (44, 159, 347). Although maximal speed is an important athletic characteristic and team field sports dimensions may exceed 90m in length, analysis of sprint profiles indicate that players seldom exceed 40m sprint distances (e.g. rugby league, rugby union, Australian Rules football and...
American football) (21, 153, 164, 177, 178, 513). Time motion analysis has shown that a greater percentage of sprints by elite European soccer players are of a short distance (less than 10m) compared to longer sprints (164); that average sprint duration in international field hockey is 1.8s, suggesting short distance (514) and rugby union backs competing at international provincial level average 18m per sprint (21). As such, the sprint acceleration phase is deemed a crucial capacity for performance in such sports (21, 78, 140, 141, 178, 219, 350, 403, 424) and may separate playing and performance levels (217, 218, 450, 508, 588).

Innate differences exist between track sprinting and team sport sprinting. Whilst elite sprinters often achieve maximal velocity at ranges of 50-60m, team sport athletes are limited by time and distance constraints. However, many team sport sprint performances are initiated from a moving start, enabling attainment of velocity in excess of 90% capacity, also demonstrating the importance of acceleration capacity (164, 178, 458). Collectively, time motion analyses and practically implemented testing batteries emphasise the worth of acceleration capacity in team sports.

**Physiological Characteristics of Sprint Acceleration**

*Laboratory Assessment*

Understanding the kinetics and kinematics of sprint acceleration allows recognition of critical characteristics differentiating superior acceleration performance. The importance of training specificity dictates a comprehensive understanding of movement to facilitate training interventions improving performance (350). Laboratory based investigations have incorporated motion analysis (300, 350, 589), force plates (300, 317, 405, 413, 589) and electromyography (EMG) (405, 414) to determine step length and stride frequency (350, 405) joint angles and body posture (300), ground reaction forces (300, 317, 413, 414, 589), muscle activation, muscle and joint forces (405, 406, 414, 589). Combined, this information permits understanding of the neuromuscular characteristics of sprint acceleration performance.

Sprint acceleration is determined by the sum of ground reaction force (GRF) acting on the body (300). Of the three directions (vertical, anterior-posterior and medial-lateral) the vertical and anterior-posterior (henceforth termed “horizontal”) are of most interest (300, 317). Horizontal GRF is comprised of a braking component and an acceleration component (404).
Net horizontal GRF, normalised to body mass, would appear a determining factor in acceleration performance in accordance with Newton’s impulse-momentum relationship (317). Investigations of GRF during sprinting have revealed significant correlations between sprint performance and horizontal and vertical GRF (300, 404). These studies suggest that acceleration performance is a result of an optimal combination of vertical and horizontal GRF. Hunter et al investigating kinetics of sprinters at the 16-metre mark reported faster athletes produced greater magnitudes of propulsive impulse relative to body mass, supporting earlier findings in elite sprinters (300, 405). Investigating male subjects from a variety of field sports, Murphy et al reported faster stride rate and shorter ground contact time as distinguishing kinematic variables between fast and slow team sport athletes over 15m (424). These superior kinematics are the result of more favourable ground reaction force. Kawamori et al reported that faster performance over eight metres was related to horizontal impulse ($r = -0.52$). Although reporting a slightly weaker correlation compared to previous work, the initial starting technique and the heterogeneous team sport nature of the cohort may have influenced the findings. Previous sprint acceleration research has utilised track sprinters which may cluster data points influencing correlation statistics. Collectively these investigations demonstrate the relationship between high force production and superior sprint acceleration performance. Such information guides training interventions to improve the desired traits for superior performance.

**Field Assessment**

Whilst laboratory testing has revealed underlying kinetic and kinematic characteristics of sprint performance, the technical requirements of such testing prohibit the practical implementation in the team sport training environment. Field testing assists coaches to establish sport specific physiological profiles, and guide rehabilitation to monitor individual athlete performance or determine training effectiveness (573). Given the importance of the acceleration phase in many teams sports distances such as 5m, 9.1m (10 yards) 10m and 20m are frequently reported assessments in a multitude of field sports (Australian Rules Football, American Football, rugby league, rugby union, soccer, cricket, basketball, softball) (30, 114, 140, 203, 204, 424, 438, 569, 588).
Central to the interpretation of change is reliability which is the “reproducibility of the observed value when the measurement is repeated” (285). Reliability is maximised by standardising many aspects of testing including participant test familiarisation, consistent environmental conditions including ground surface and ambient temperature, reliable equipment, standard warm-up and fatigue free state of participants (573). Within-session reliability has been reported to be high indicating few testing repetitions are required within a session (146). Of importance is between-session reliability for new or novel tests, or new populations where existing reliability may not exist. Between-session reliability of field tests of acceleration have been performed in numerous sports and with variation in testing surface, timing gate type and configuration (Table 1). Given the array of testing variables, sprint acceleration in team sport athletes is reliable which may be explained by the degree of competence in sprinting as a familiar motor skill (412).
Table 2.1 Typical test values and between-session reliability of short sprint distance representative of team sports athletes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Subject age Ave ± SD (n)</th>
<th>Subject experience &amp; sport</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Gate model</th>
<th>0m Gate</th>
<th>Distance (m)</th>
<th>Time Ave ± SD (s)</th>
<th>CV%</th>
<th>TE</th>
<th>ICC</th>
<th>Trial used in analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byrne</td>
<td>21.2 ± 2.1 (18)</td>
<td>Irish collegiate hurling (M)</td>
<td>Indoors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5m behind</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.06 ± 0.07</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fastest trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cormie</td>
<td>24 ± 4.8 (10)</td>
<td>Recreational (M)</td>
<td>Outdoor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0m</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.07 ± 0.10</td>
<td>6.3-9.1%</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fastest trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr</td>
<td>23.8 ± 3.7 (16)</td>
<td>1st class county cricket (M)</td>
<td>Indoor cricket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5m behind</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.06 ± 0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fastest trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>19 ± 1.7 (11)</td>
<td>Snr Provincial RU (M)</td>
<td>Indoor track</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.70m behind</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.04 ± 0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean of 3 trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabbett</td>
<td>23.6 ± 5.3 (42)</td>
<td>Snr RL (M)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0m</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.20 ±0.10</td>
<td>1.3%-3.2%</td>
<td>0.84-0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fastest trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockie</td>
<td>23.8 ± 7.0 (18)</td>
<td>Amateur ARF (M)</td>
<td>Grass outdoor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3m behind</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.09 (0.7*)</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>0.04s</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>Average of 3 best trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard</td>
<td>21.8 ± 3.2 (32)</td>
<td>State level ARF (M)</td>
<td>Indoor wooden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.89 ± 0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>Mean of two trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moir</td>
<td>25.3 ± 6.6 (10)</td>
<td>Physical education students (M)</td>
<td>Indoor running track</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5m behind</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Graphed</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>Fastest trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann</td>
<td>20.5 ± 1.2 (64)</td>
<td>Div I American Football (M)</td>
<td>Indoor artificial turf</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ground hand touch pad</td>
<td>9.1 (10yd)</td>
<td>1.81 ± 0.14</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>Fastest trial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ave = average, SD = standard deviation; n = number; s = seconds; CV% = coefficient of variation; TE = technical error of measurement; ICC = intraclass correlation coefficient; M = male, Recreational: “a wide variety of sports”; Snr = senior, ARF = Australian Rules Football, RU = Rugby union; RL = Rugby league; Div I = Division one; * denotes 90% CL reported instead of SD; 0m Gate = position of first timing gate; Distance = distance of timing gate split, m = metres, yd = yards.

Gate model: (1) Brower Timing Systems, Draper, UT, USA; (2) KMS, Fitness Technologies, Adelaide, AUS; (3) Speedlight, Swift Sports, Lismore, AUS; (4) STT = Sprint Timer Telemetry, Cranlea and Company, ENG; (5) Fusion Sport Smart Speed, Brisbane, AUS; (6) Microgate, Bolzano, ITA.
Superior acceleration capacity has been identified as a discriminator between playing levels and playing positions in many sports (214, 215, 218, 227, 308, 310, 544, 546, 588). At the elite level, starters in a professional Australian Rules Football team were significantly faster over 10m and Flying 30m (40m time minus 10m time) than their non-starting teammates (588). Further importance of acceleration capacity was demonstrated by a comparison between elite rugby union and rugby league players. Whilst rugby union players were faster at 20m (ES = 0.76), the greatest difference between backs from both codes was greatest at 2m (ES = 0.95). Estimated to 0.44m after two seconds of sprinting, the authors suggested this practical difference alluded to short-distance acceleration as important for match success (147). Linking field and laboratory analysis, the authors suggested that the more combative body orientation requirements of rugby union (greater forward lean) (159, 580) favoured horizontal force production required for superior acceleration.

Change of Direction in Team Sports

Whilst sprinting and acceleration are desired physical traits in many team sports, there are frequent events where athletic movement is characterised more by changes of direction than straight line running (153, 586). As such, agility or change of direction (COD) is an important physical requirement for team sport athletes (498). Generally defined as encompassing deceleration, a change to the direction of initial motion and then acceleration, agility is frequently assessed in a multitude of sports (204, 220, 274, 416, 438, 518). The importance and complexity of agility in sport is highlighted by the scope of research, array of available agility tests (Table 2) and the breadth of sport science sub-disciplines that investigate and enhance performance (e.g. biomechanics, physiology, motor control, psychology) (193, 237, 274, 353, 356, 495, 498, 515, 518, 579). Investigations of agility and COD performance have ranged from studies exploring biomechanical factors of injury risk and prevention (61, 161, 348, 561), various timed courses of sport specific demands (204, 238, 262, 438, 465, 500), distinction of planned versus reactive tests (193, 216, 416, 443, 497, 517, 555, 585), isolated investigations of specific neuromuscular demands of COD (170, 435, 515) and relationships between agility/COD performance to other physical capacities (such as jumping and muscular strength) (92, 95, 204, 270, 312, 354, 356, 367, 543).
Table 2.2 Typical test values and between-session reliability of COD assessments representative of team sports athletes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Subject Age Ave ± SD (n)</th>
<th>Subject experience &amp; sport</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Time Ave ± SD (s)</th>
<th>CV%</th>
<th>TE</th>
<th>ICC</th>
<th>Trial used in analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nimphius (439)</td>
<td>18.1 ± 1.6 (10)</td>
<td>Provincial softball (F)</td>
<td>Grass outdoor</td>
<td>505D</td>
<td>2.70 + 0.14</td>
<td>≥ 1.9%</td>
<td>≥ 0.93</td>
<td>Fastest trial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber (40)</td>
<td>23.9 ± 5.4 (52)</td>
<td>Netball (F)</td>
<td>Netball court</td>
<td>F505</td>
<td>2.84 + 0.22</td>
<td>SEM = 0.97</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronin (145)</td>
<td>23.1 ± 4.8 (40)</td>
<td>Recreational (M &amp; F)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Modified T-Test</td>
<td>3.77 + 0.37</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>Fastest trial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockie (355)</td>
<td>23.8 ± 7.0 (18)</td>
<td>Amateur ARF (M)</td>
<td>Grass outdoor</td>
<td>Illinois Agility Run CODAT</td>
<td>14.08 ± 6.10 (13.8-14.4*)</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.29s</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>Average of 3 best trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabbett (220)</td>
<td>23.6 ± 5.3 (42)</td>
<td>Senior RL (M)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>505 test Modified 505 L Run (m)</td>
<td>2.39 + 0.17 2.73 + 0.17 5.77 + 0.69</td>
<td>1.9 2.5 2.8</td>
<td>0.90 0.92 0.95</td>
<td>Fastest trial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann (365)</td>
<td>20.5 ± 1.2 (64)</td>
<td>Div I American Football (M)</td>
<td>Indoor artificial turf</td>
<td>L Run (yd) Pro Agility</td>
<td>7.41 + 0.43 4.47 + 0.29</td>
<td>1.2% 1.9%</td>
<td>0.12 0.13</td>
<td>0.96 0.91</td>
<td>Fastest trial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ave = average, SD = standard deviation; n = number; s = seconds; CV% = coefficient of variation; TE = technical error of measurement; ICC = intraclass correlation coefficient; M = male, F = female; Recreational: “a wide variety of sports”, no specifics presented; ARF = Australian Rules Football; Senior RL = Senior rugby league; Div I = Division one; D = dominant as determined by batting stance; F505 = Flying 505 with 10m lead in to 5m out and back 180° turn; S505 = 5m out and back 180° turn; CODAT = Change-of-Direction and Acceleration Test; L-run (m) = L-run performed at 5 metres; L-run (yd) = L-run performed at 5 yards * = denotes 90% CL reported instead of SD.
The model of agility presented by Young et al (Figure 2.1) recognises two major sub-categories of perception and change of direction speed (586). While the decision-making aspect of team sport remains a critical capacity (585), the central focus of this review and subsequent thesis shall be concerned with the physical characteristics of COD.

![Figure 2.1 Model of main factors of agility, Young (2002) (586)](image)

**Physiological Characteristics of Change of Direction Laboratory Assessment**

As with faster sprint ability, superior COD is vital in the sport setting, however, also associated with injury. Early laboratory studies of COD incorporated EMG, force plates and motion analysis, predominantly in an endeavour to understand injury risk during cutting (60, 61, 111, 162, 339, 398, 425, 429, 554, 561). Focussed predominantly on anterior cruciate ligament injury, many reported aspects such as the differences in eccentric muscle actions of quadriceps and hamstrings during foot strike (111, 429), coactivation differences between planned and reactive COD (61), the role of hip abductors and adductors in pelvic stabilisation (429) and specific joint angles at foot-strike (60, 398, 554). This research direction cultivated specific injury reduction training strategies (110, 161, 272, 348, 364, 425, 427). Common to these programs was the attention to single leg function in terms of maximal strength, proprioception, muscle imbalance and performance in physical tasks with attention to hip control (186). Neuromuscular control of the hip has been recommended as a factor to reduce the risk of knee injury during COD (398). As well as focussed interest at the knee, full body kinematics have revealed important upper body contribution to lower body moments, impulse and cutting performance (98, 162, 167, 481). Collectively, these studies portray the complexity of injury risk and demands of COD performance. The broad array of program considerations
for performance enhancement and injury prevention begin to demonstrate the multifaceted nature of COD.

Whilst reducing injury risk remains important for athlete welfare, laboratory studies have also examined characteristics of superior COD performance (169, 368, 515). Although identified as a risk factor to injury, pelvic control during the single limb support phase was also determined as a key factor in superior COD performance (368). Incorporating motion analysis and force plates during a 75° cut performed by elite Gaelic hurlers, Marshall et al concluded that control during deceleration by the plant leg contributed to faster COD times. The researchers suggested prescription of frontal plane exercises in single limb stance such as single leg squats and single leg landings to enhance pelvic control. The combination of strength (the ability to produce force) and optimal mechanics is recommended for safe and effective COD (162, 171).

In a series of studies utilising force plates and EMG, Spiteri et al investigated the relationships of lower body strength to performance (515). Creating two groups based on relative isometric back squat force, it was observed that during the 45° COD test, the stronger group produced significantly higher ground reaction forces and significantly faster COD times compared to the weaker group (515). It was concluded that greater levels of relative lower body strength produced superior COD performance. This study was expanded to include eccentric, isometric and concentric strength measures and two COD tests (505 and T-Test) (518) (Figure 2.2). Many correlations between strength and superior COD performance were reported, supporting maximal dynamic strength as a crucial base for COD performance (295). Importantly, many subtle observations were made regarding the specificity and relationships of capacity testing. First, isometric strength was slightly more related to the T-Test than 505 task. The authors considered the body position and direction changes of the T-Test required greater isometric strength compared to the 505. This implies the nature of the COD task may demand different strength capacities demonstrating the specificity of the COD task to strength assessment (516, 518, 543). This is particularly important for subsequent training interventions when considering the array of testing options available. Finally, a relationship between concentric strength and COD performance was identified, in contrast to previous studies (42, 586). The authors considered the conflict between the concentric strength tests in the current
study (a multi-joint box squat) to previous isokinetic testing (single joint knee extension) (42, 586) and the specificity to COD tasks.

The importance of comprehensive lower limb strength to superior COD performance was supported by Dos Santos et al testing 40 sub-elite and collegiate team sport athletes utilising the modified 505 (169). The researchers dissected COD performance analysing ground contact time and ground reaction forces of the final and penultimate step in a 180° COD task. Ground contact time, horizontal braking force and horizontal propulsive force were discriminating factors between fast and slow performers, reinforcing the importance of comprehensive lower limb strength (516). Given the complexity of mechanical demands involved in rapid direction change, the research suggested development of lower body strength is a comprehensive strategy.

**Field Assessment**

Although COD performance can be divided into discrete biomechanical capacities, similar to the phases of sprinting, it remains a complicated technical synchronisation of many body parts which is difficult to capture in a single test (448). As a result, there is a great diversity of tests which are problematic for distinguishing capacity (typical performance and reliability are presented in Table 2). The nature of the COD task alters the contribution of running speed and technique and the subsequent ability for investigators to isolate and interpret
mechanisms for change (495). Task issues include total test time, number of direction changes, type of change (entry and exit angles), composition of linear sprinting, entry and exit speeds, and total distance of test selection (436). For example, the 5-0-5 test requires a single 180° redirection whereas the Illinois has curvilinear components and 11 direction changes. The AFL agility test requires footballers to perform two right-side turns and three left-side turns, disadvantaging left leg dominant (right-turn) athletes (262). Additionally, tests can range from 1.5s for a simple 5-0-5 test to up to 16s in duration for the Illinois Agility Test (Figure 2), the long duration potentially assessing anaerobic ability and not COD factors (436, 483).

Whilst linear speed and COD speed are considered somewhat related (120, 306, 312, 355, 371, 497), they are deemed separate qualities with unique neuromuscular requirements (83, 120, 347, 371, 435, 436, 475, 586, 587). Confusion regarding the relationships between linear speed and COD can be attributed to test design featuring few direction changes, obtuse angle and large proportions of linear speed involvement. A large proportion of straight-line sprinting can mask inferior COD capacity, a concept incorporated in new analysis protocols (435, 437). Exit speed from a direction change has discriminated faster and slower performers (515) however, it is difficult to measure in the field. The COD deficit has been applied to extract COD capacity from linear sprint speed (435, 437). Young et al demonstrated the specificity of straight-line sprint training only or COD training only (587). The researchers utilised seven variations of a 30m course increasing the number and degree of angle of direction change from straight line to five 100° changes. The straight-line sprint group improved the most in straight sprinting speed with little transfer to the 7th course with most COD, whilst the COD group improved the most in the 7th course and the least in the straight sprint test. This highlighted the specificity of training with speed and COD, distinguishing straight line speed and COD as distinct qualities (83, 371).

Test selection is critical to assess COD. Appropriate tests should be short in duration and distance minimising the influence of energy system and linear speed capacity, possess a single COD to isolate unilateral performance and have context to the athlete’s sport and coaching perspective (436). Thus, whilst variation in testing protocols and sports have proved problematic for widespread conclusions, particular methodologies have identified areas of physical development for COD. When the total course distance is short and the number of
direction changes few, relationships between performance and strength capacities are observed, highlighting the importance of lower body strength in COD performance (312, 518).

**RELATIONSHIPS OF STRENGTH AND ATHLETIC PERFORMANCE IN TEAM SPORTS**

Laboratory and field studies have shown that to accelerate from a stationary or moving start, an athlete needs to produce high levels of force to overcome the body’s inertia (317, 351). Compared to maximum velocity sprinting, ground contact time is relatively high and stride rate is typically slower to maximise the development of ground reaction force (44, 347, 404, 407). Muscle contraction is characteristically concentric in nature with superior sprint acceleration related to concentric force development (507), whereas maximum velocity running has a higher elastic energy contribution (159). The postural alignment depicts a forward trunk lean positioning the centre of mass in front of the grounded foot and aligns horizontal acceleration in the direction of intended travel (159, 580). Knee extension through quadriceps activation is the primary generation of force in this posture (304, 407). Collectively, these kinetic and kinematic characteristics of acceleration are targeted variables in the prescription of maximal strength training to improve sprint capacity.

Relationships have been reported between measures of short-sprint performance and measures of lower body strength, particularly when expressed relative to bodyweight (30, 78, 100, 114, 118, 140, 159, 258, 260, 295, 375, 430, 462, 569, 581). Due to these relationships, lower body resistance training has been recommended to improve sprint acceleration. Similarly, whilst identified as a distinct capacity comprehensive lower body strength has been demonstrated important for COD performance (158, 171, 273, 542). Though studies have demonstrated variance between the performance of sprint phases and change of direction capacity (120, 347, 581), both share elements of lower body strength reinforcing the relevance of comprehensive lower body strength to sprint and COD performance in athletes (169, 515, 516, 537).
Influence of Strength Improvement on Acceleration and Change of Direction

As lower body strength underpins performance of sprint acceleration and COD performance, improvements in strength facilitate improvements in athletic performance. The role of resistance training for improving speed has long been recognised (160) with improvements in lower body strength shown to increase sprint speed in a variety of subjects (115, 278, 351, 468, 479, 532, 547, 577). However, consideration should be afforded to contextual elements of research design, that influence adaptation and transfer, and interpretation and application of training merit, such as subject training age, length of intervention and the appropriateness of the intervention. For example, less trained subjects respond more favourably to training than experienced subjects (43, 522, 566), whilst short-term training interventions may not reflect long-term adaptation (29). However, well-trained athletes (e.g. elite or professional team sport) are often difficult to access for long-training interventions and whilst untrained participants (e.g. students) may be available for longer periods, their untrained status may exaggerate the training adaptation and program merit. The appropriateness of the training intervention can also render misleading conclusions. For example, a twice per week, eight-week resistance training program returned unclear sprint (0-10m) and COD results in under-19 soccer players, however, the squat training program intensity peaked at 60% one repetition maximum (1RM), a low intensity for strength development (154, 332).

Several studies in team sport athletes have illustrated improvements in strength can transfer to sprint performance. A 15-week training program in college football players demonstrated improvements in lower body strength with reductions in sprint time (278). Two separate studies with professional soccer players demonstrated improvements in 1RM squat was associated with improvements in sprint performance over 5m, 10m, 20m and 40m (468, 532). Of similar duration, professional rugby league players have been reported to improve back squat 1RM (17.7%) and 5m (7.6%), 10m (7.3%), and 20m (5.9%) sprint times after an 8-week resistance training phase (115). A systematic review of 15 studies demonstrated the transfer of improved strength to sprinting is of practical importance to coaches (490).

Training interventions have also demonstrated concurrent improvements in strength and COD performance. Positive changes in 3RM squat and 505 COD performance have been
noted in softball players during a 20-week preparation phase (439). Additionally, strength training has been demonstrated to improve COD in young soccer players, however, the adaptations were expected given the long duration of the study and young age of the cohort (320). Finally, improvements in lower body strength (measured by 1RM squat) were associated with significant improvements in pro-agility performance during a 5-week training program with Academy rugby players (511).

**SUMMARY**

Sprint acceleration and COD are critical capacities in many team sports. Laboratory and field analyses have revealed fundamental biomechanical characteristics of successful performance and established relationships to physical capacity for training interventions, particularly maximal strength. Whilst commonality exists in strength qualities between capacities for sprint and COD, they remain independent qualities, requiring a degree of specific training application. Due to the limited transfer, training prescription is a critical consideration for the transfer of lower body strength to sprint performance. The principle of specificity dictates that the training exercise should be highly specific to the performance outcome (524, 565). Transfer of resistance training adaptations to enhanced sprint performance is limited due to complexities in aligning movement patterns and contraction type (565, 583). Whilst lower body maximal strength was related to COD performance, the nature of direction change required altered the determinant strength capacity (isometric, eccentric or concentric) demonstrating the importance of all components of maximal strength as an important base for performance (516). It has been suggested that unilateral lower body strength may identify, particularly COD exit performance (471, 586) and COD performance may potentially be enhanced by correcting lower limb imbalance (495). Research from training studies has demonstrated the beneficial application of resistance training to enhance the physiological qualities contributing to enhanced sprint and COD performance (490). To maximise athletic performance, the method for development and transfer of enhanced neuromuscular force generating capacity is of utmost importance. An understanding of resistance training principles is required.
Resistance Training: Biological Adaptation and Training Principles – A Brief Review

Measures of lower body strength have been related to sprint acceleration and COD performance, and improvements in strength enhance sprint and COD (490). Ground reaction force profiles during movements such as jumps (127), maximal isometric tasks (e.g. mid-thigh pull or squat (47, 245)) and track sprint starts (35, 47, 246, 318) distinguish components such as explosive strength (rate of force development) (245), reactive strength (the contraction of a muscle preceded immediately by a stretch load, typical of a drop jump (202)) low- and high-load speed strength (431) and maximum strength (590). Maximum strength is considered a foundation capacity that supports the development of the abovementioned strength capacities and other sport specific conditioning (244, 529, 539). It is commonly measured in isometric tasks or isoinertial field-based strength tests (i.e. one repetition maximum strength tests – e.g. 1RM squat) (4, 175, 331, 402). The purpose of resistance training in many athletic settings is to increase maximum strength.

Strength enhancements can be attributed to neural and morphological adaptations resulting from resistance training interventions (205, 251, 477). Neural improvements refer to a variety of intra- and inter-muscular responses such as, firing frequency, onset of activation, motor unit synchronisation and antagonist coactivation, improving coordination of involved muscles during a specific task (52, 205, 231, 472). Morphological adaptations include increase in cross sectional area, muscle fibre pennation angle and structural improvement of tendon and connective tissue (11, 194, 205). The neuromuscular adaptations are dependent upon the manipulation of many acute variables including exercise selection, magnitude of external load (intensity), sets and repetitions (volume), lifting cadence (or time under tension), and intra- and inter-set recovery (23, 332, 333, 539). Given the recognition of strength as a motor skill, exercise selection would seem an essential consideration for the development of appropriate coordination (472, 476, 477). Exercise selection dictates the muscles recruited, contraction profile (eccentric and concentric), range of motion and magnitude of external resistance utilised which stimulate the specific neuromuscular activation and physiological adaptation. The principle of specificity is a driving factor in resistance training design (523, 565); the more
similar a training exercise is to the target performance, the greater the likelihood of transfer. Specificity includes the joint angles used, the contraction type (concentric, eccentric, isometric) and the movement velocity.

**NEUROMUSCULAR ADAPTATIONS TO RESISTANCE TRAINING**

**Neural Adaptations**

Hypertrophy and cross-sectional area are critical for strength, however early adaptations to resistance training are predominantly neural unaccompanied by detectable increases in muscle size (251, 275, 415, 428, 476, 477, 520). Neural adaptations can be categorised as intra-muscular or inter-muscular. Neural response can be the number and size of muscle fibres recruited (52, 91). Neural adaptations can also be improvements in coordination resulting in enhanced muscular activation specific to the nature of the trained task (96, 205). For example, specifics of neural adaptation have been long known with research utilising isometric training demonstrating the greatest improvements in force capacity were at the angle trained during the intervention (225, 560). Isoinertial training has also demonstrated similar adaptation whereby the more similar the mechanics of training and testing, the greater the transfer of adaptation (565). The neuromuscular system adapts according to the muscular contraction task performed during training, indicating the importance of exercise prescription for performance improvement (36, 82, 174, 228, 231).

Higher force production resulting from resistance training is made possible by several intra-muscular neural adaptations which can include an increase in the number of motor units recruited, consistent activation of higher threshold motor units or an increase in the firing frequency (1, 205, 477, 552). Motor unit synchronisation has been demonstrated to improve with resistance training and synchronisation capability is different between trained and untrained individuals (410). Importantly, there are specific motor unit patterns during resistance training that can only be recruited at maximal or near-maximal loads, indicating the importance of exercise intensity for adaptation. Resistance training can positively impact neural adaptations that increase the rate of force development and peak force production (1, 476).
The significance of strength as a motor skill is emphasised by the enhancements in inter-muscular coordination for improved strength performance. Neural specificity dictates that the more disparate the training exercises and target movement (joint angle, contraction type and velocity etc.) the less the transfer of training adaptation due to dissimilar neural activation and coordination (52, 175). Effective movement requires increased agonist activity complemented by synergistic activity with coordinated antagonistic co-contraction (477, 553). Antagonist co-contraction is a vital strategy to control motion and joint stability (2, 39, 150). For example, closed kinetic chain rehabilitation exercises are preferred to open chain as the coactivation of antagonists involved limits harmful shear force and ligament strain in anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) rehabilitation (338). Whilst a degree of antagonist contraction facilitates joint stability, excessive contraction opposes the prime mover and diminishes net joint torque for movement (91). Improvements in movement with training can be attributed to refined co-contraction and decreased activation of antagonists (88, 150). When considering the complex synchronicity of the coordination of lower limb muscles involved in a vertical jump, inter-muscular coordination is paramount to force transferred efficiently into ground reaction impulse (131). As a skill, resistance training may enhance performance by decreasing activation of pathways contrary to the intended movement, increasing task efficiency (88, 91). This demonstrates resistance training as motor training, the ability to improve force generating coordination.

A unique central nervous system adaptation to resistance training is observed with cross-education or contra-lateral strength training (64, 196, 415, 559). This phenomenon explains strength increases without hypertrophy in the untrained limb following periods of unilateral resistance training. There is great variance reported in the magnitude of strength gains in the untrained limb likely due to differences in application of intensity of resistance training (196, 422). Despite variation, the positive effect promotes the prescription of unilateral exercise during rehabilitation of temporarily incapacitated limbs (149, 268).

**Morphological Adaptation**

Though early and continual adaptations for strength have neural components, physiological cross-sectional area (PCSA) is directly related to the force production capacity of muscle (7, 247, 296, 399, 419). Whilst structural adaptation includes enhancements in
tendon and connective tissue (205), the morphological adaptation from resistance training is greater PCSA (207). Muscle hypertrophy due to resistance training predominantly involves increases in muscle fibre size (361) whilst muscle fibre angle, pennation angle or fascicle length and fibre type shifts (Type IIB to Type IIA) also change in response to resistance training (68, 69, 85, 253). The relationship between PCSA and maximal strength supports the inclusion of hypertrophy resistance training in a multitude of sports dependent upon strength (34, 155, 182, 223, 280, 503). Typical guidelines for resistance training inducing muscle hypertrophy include large resistance training volume (4-6 days per week, multiple sets of 6-12 repetitions), intermediate intensity (70-85% 1RM) with a focus on large, multi-joint exercises (85, 332). However, athlete development programs orientated towards maximal strength (high intensity (70-100% 1RM), low volume multiple sets of 1-6 repetitions) also produce a comparatively smaller degree of hypertrophy. Further, training experience does affect the adaptation response with more experienced athletes requiring greater exposure than less trained (32, 254). Both single- and multi-joint exercises have been demonstrated effective at increasing PCSA, however, multi-joint exercises (squats, deadlifts, etc) are considered superior for athletic populations due to the larger muscle mass and coordination requirements (332).

**Resistance Training Variables**

The success of a strength training program depends on the prescription of stimulus via arrangement of resistance training variables (332). The importance of neural and morphological adaptations of resistance training to heightened athletic performance influences the arrangement of training variables. There are many acute training variables for consideration of resistance training design for strength enhancement: muscles to be trained, training intensity, training volume (reps and sets and load), exercise choice and arrangement, intra- and inter-set recovery, repetition speed and session frequency (144, 332, 539). The higher neural activation experienced during high intensity training serves as a stimulus for the adaptation of improved neural recruitment. Therefore, intra-muscular neural adaptations for strength are dependent on the magnitude of intensity. Additionally, if neuromuscular adaptation can be considered as motor learning, then exercise selection is a critical consideration as it can dictate the muscles to be trained, the magnitude of intensity (external resistance for overload), movement speed and transfer to subsequent performance (221, 231).
Overload and Intensity

As a fundamental training principle, overload is concerned with the delivery of a stimulus above normal level and is most commonly targeted in training programs by intensity and volume (332, 524). Intensity is often achieved by the magnitude of external load, but can also include the speed of movement and is essential for the development of strength (332, 524). Athletic performance is a result of force produced by motor unit activation and high levels of force require high levels of motor unit recruitment. The size principle of motor unit recruitment dictates that to recruit high threshold fibres heavy resistance is required, thus high intensity in training (269). The intensity of exercise prescription influences the intra-muscular neural responses to training. Training loads must constantly be of a high magnitude in order to target high threshold motor units (451), a minimum of 80% 1RM are recommended to produce neural adaptations critical for maximum strength (175, 249, 332). It has been demonstrated that joint moment or muscle activation are load dependant in lower body resistance exercises (135, 325, 447, 575). Therefore, high training intensity is a critical variable of resistance training prescription for the magnitude of strength adaptation (3, 211, 332, 487). Exercises such as squats, deadlifts and weightlifting variations are frequently incorporated into programs for athletic development due to the ability to utilise large external loads targeting high threshold motor units (5, 32, 101, 115, 257, 468)

Specificity and Transfer

The transfer of training is the degree of response in the non-trained performance from adaptation in the trained task and is a result of the interaction of neuromuscular adaptions of training (52, 91, 303, 524). Expression of strength adaptation has long been demonstrated to be closely linked to the manner in which the strength was developed and includes contraction speed and joint angles (59, 109, 206, 247, 250, 276, 418, 440, 459, 565). Whilst isometric and isokinetic investigations have clearly demonstrated joint angle or muscle length and contraction velocity specific adaptations (8, 174, 316, 346, 411, 541), isoinertial training applicable to athletic training has demonstrated improvement in force production is higher when the training exercise and test are similar (33, 565). The multifaceted nature of team sport preparation depends extensively on positive transfer of sport-specific drills from training (physiological, technical and tactical) to superior competitive performance (303). With regards to resistance training, the purpose of increasing maximum strength is the transfer to performance dependant on force expression such as sprint acceleration and COD. Given neuromuscular adaptation can
be defined as a skill (the coordination of agonists, antagonists, synergists and stabilisers) exercise selection would appear critical for transfer (476).

An important consideration of transfer to performance is the “dynamic correspondence” of the exercise to final task. Specificity, as defined by Zatsiorsky and Kraemer (2006), refers to the “similarity between adaptation induced by a training drill and adaptation required by a main sport movement” (590). Stone, Stone and Sands (2007) further specificity by the degree of association of exercise variables (528). That is, the basic mechanics of the trained and target tasks and not simply external resemblance (501). The body posture of training has been demonstrated instrumental in facilitating transfer to subsequent performance. For example, squat training has been demonstrated superior to leg press training in improving vertical jump performance (568). Similarly, squat strength has been demonstrated to transfer more to vertical jumping than sprint acceleration (565). In addition to posture, the manipulation of resistance training variables alters the adaptation and subsequent expression of force and velocity in dynamic performance. Comparing weightlifters, powerlifters and sprinters, McBride et al reported specific expression of force or velocity reflective of training nuances between the three disciplines (377). However, despite limited resemblance, a positive transfer to sprinting exists and as such the squat is still regularly incorporated in a multitude of sports for enhancing sprint performance. Short-term training studies in soccer and rugby league have reported corresponding improvements in squat strength and sprint performance from resistance training incorporating the squat exercise (101, 115). In male youth soccer players, two years of resistance training improved squat strength and 30m sprint times (479). Given the relationship between ground reaction force and propulsion in sprinting, it is logical that improved force production capacity would improve sprint capacity. However, whilst there is general agreement that improvements in strength assessed by squat testing or the integration of squat training transfer favourably to enhanced sprint performance (490), the transfer is not guaranteed. Despite adhering to appropriate programming principles, studies have demonstrated measurable squat enhancement with limited sprint improvement (257, 378).

**SUMMARY**

The development of maximum strength involves neural and morphological adaptations. The expression of strength can be defined as improved intra- and inter-muscular coordination
of agonists, antagonists and synergists, whilst increased cross sectional area of a muscle also contributes to force development capacity. Improvements in strength are dependent on a sophisticated arrangement of resistance training variables in program design. Resistance training variables such as intensity facilitate intra-muscular adaptations of motor unit synchronisation and firing frequency. The significance of inter-muscular coordination, the summation and transference of force to the ground (or an implement), highlights the importance of exercise selection that can optimise intensity to achieve intra-muscular adaptation into a coordinated system. Exercise selection is a critical factor influencing the arrangement of crucial resistance training variables of intensity and overload, defining muscles involved and the transfer of strength improvement to the final athletic performance. This underscores the importance of exercise selection and optimal application of resistance training principles as more than a means to target neuromuscular adaptation, but as an opportunity to focus specific training benefiting future athletic performance.
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**LOWER BODY RESISTANCE TRAINING: BILATERAL AND UNILATERAL EXERCISE**

The needs analysis of critical athletic performance, sprint acceleration and COD capacity, demonstrate the association to maximal lower body strength and that improvements in lower body strength can be realised in improvements in acceleration and COD ability. However, the transfer of strength is an essential consideration influencing exercise selection which in turn, targets appropriate muscle recruitment patterns for future performance. Therefore, movement patterns are considered when selecting appropriate lower body exercises to maximise the development and efficient transfer of strength gains underpinning athletic performance. An exercise selection challenge appears to be balancing the ability to maximize strength development and transfer to performance. Whilst bilateral exercises have been extensively researched and linked to maximal strength development and performance, these exercises appear limited in movement specificity to sprinting and COD, predominantly unilateral performances. Thus, unilateral resistance training appears an appropriate exercise selection. However, unilateral exercises typically prohibit large external resistance, and perhaps insufficient capacity to provide satisfactory neuromuscular stimulus which drives
strength development. Therefore, coaches are faced with the dichotomy of specificity (strength) and transfer (performance).

If the goal of resistance training in sport was solely increased strength, the choice of exercise would be governed by selection of those most capable of improving maximal strength. However, sport specificity is a critical consideration for the transfer of strength to performance (583). Additionally, resistance training is perceived important for decreasing injury risk, a multifactorial process involving muscular strength, muscle symmetry and stabilisation (369). Thus, comprehensive athletic exercise prescription endeavours to achieve many performance enhancing objectives. Comprehensive training demands of athletes requires efficient prescription of resistance training encompassing multiple physiological adaptations, influencing exercise choice. A biomechanical understanding of lower body resistance training exercises provides important external and internal loading conditions guiding selection (9, 18, 22, 80, 93, 106, 108, 116, 157, 181, 189, 191, 198, 229, 323, 352, 386, 400, 504, 591). The following will attempt to present features that are contemplated for bilateral and unilateral resistance training selection and provide context for the current investigation. (References to bilateral or unilateral resistance training henceforth will refer purely to lower body).

**Features of Bilateral Resistance Training**

Bilateral exercises are generally described are those with bodyweight evenly distributed in parallel stance and include the squat, deadlift and weightlifting variants such as cleans (Figure 2.3). Whilst movements such as lunges, split squats or rear foot elevated split squats also require a two-point base of support, these movements are often classified as unilateral due to their asymmetrical muscle activation (223, 434). Parallel bilateral exercises are well prescribed due to closed kinetic chain force development and demonstrated relationships and positive influence on lower body strength and athletic performance (101, 115, 192, 292, 375, 532, 569). The squat (which shall be the focus of this review) is commonly incorporated in resistance training and rehabilitation in an array of sports (16, 32, 107, 180, 277, 496, 532). A benefit of the squat is the ability to utilise large magnitudes of external mass to facilitate neuromuscular overload and adaptation. Superior squat performance has demonstrated relationships to vertical jump performance (493, 569), sprint time (acceleration and maximal
velocity; (30, 78, 95, 350, 569)), COD (449)), athlete playing level (227) and superior rate of recovery from team sport competition (309, 446).

![Figure 2.3 Common bilateral exercises. A – Back squat; B – Clean pull / clean / front squat; C – Deadlift; D – Snatch / overhead squat.](image)

**Characteristics of the Squat**

Considered an important exercise of widespread application, the squat requires recruitment of multiple muscle groups using several joints in a single action (94, 188, 212, 488). Performed as a back squat, overhead squat or front squat there exist several technical variations modifying bar placement, squat depth, stance width and stability requirements (18, 108, 189, 229, 240, 379). As the depth of back squat and thus range of motion increases, the capacity for external load decreases (121, 173). Biomechanical analysis and review of the squat has provided critical understanding of muscle activation, joint loading and force profiles in a variety of subjects, performance intensities and training applications (e.g. rehabilitation to athletic performance) (18, 80, 94, 121, 190, 191, 198, 374, 379, 488, 506, 536, 576). The prime movers during the squat are the quadricep, hamstring and gluteal groups, requiring stabilisation through the trunk, hips and ankles (108, 121, 442, 488). Studies have demonstrated a tendency for greater knee extensor moments than hip during squat performance, although technical execution can vary the emphasis (80, 106, 201). For example, in a small sub-study utilising the 90° squat, net joint moment analysis indicated the hip as the limiting joint in 3RM back squat performance in three of the five subjects (200). This may have been due to the shallower
90° squat and reinforces the influence of depth on muscular contributions to the squat. As barbell load or squat depth increases, so does knee flexor moment (135). Furthermore, compared to shallow squats, deep squat training produced superior increases in quadricep cross-sectional area (70).

The performance of maximal effort isometric squats registers higher EMG activity for vastus lateralis (VL) (90 ± 40% MVIC) and vastus medialis oblique (VMO) (90 ± 70% MVIC) compared to the hamstrings (10 ± 10% MVIC), gluteus maximus (GMax) (20 ± 10% MVIC) and gastrocnemius (30 ± 20% MVIC) (484). Using parallel squats at 80% 1RM, Signorille reported no significant effect of foot position (toes in, neutral or outward rotation) between the VL, VMO or rectus femoris (502), however, variations in stance width and externally rotated foot alignment does increase the involvement of adductors (379, 447). A wider squat stance has also shown greater hip moments compared to narrow stance in elite male powerlifters and GMax EMG activity (188, 447). Although deeper squats have been reported to involve greater GMax activation than shallow squats (93), the involvement of hamstrings has been reported as unchanged with depth during the concentric phase of back squats (307). Whilst squat technique may influence the pattern of activation, the magnitude of external load is the major determinant (379, 447). Performance of moderate intensity back squats (75% 1RM) involves considerable VMO and VL muscle activation, compared to biceps femoris (99).

Furthermore, the use of external load also requires heightened trunk stabilisation (442). Highly mobile, vertebral bodies are supported by facet articulations, ligaments and muscles to resist vertebral shear (222). Technical instruction of the squat highlights the importance that a slight lordotic spinal curve should be maintained and the trunk as upright as possible to minimise vertebral shear and injury risk (210, 488). Externally loaded squats have been demonstrated to recruit trunk muscles to a greater extent than isolated trunk exercises and increase activation levels with increasing load (79, 372, 376, 442). However, given the ability to lift considerably large loads during half and quarter squats, research has indicated an increased risk of shear and compression spinal injury (263).

Although simple in execution, squat performance requires coordinated muscular control for extension at the hip, knee and ankle. The knee joint is composed of the tibiofemoral
joint and patellofemoral joint and supported by dynamic structures (hamstrings, quadriceps, adductor group (491)) many static ligaments: medial and lateral collateral ligaments, and ACL and posterior cruciate ligament (PCL). The ACL is considered the most important knee stabiliser and an ACL injury is debilitating and frequent in many sports requiring extensive rehabilitation (6, 236, 314, 545). The co-contraction of the hamstrings, quadriceps and gastrocnemius during closed kinetic chain exercises enhance knee stability and is a rationale for the inclusion of such exercises for prevention and rehabilitation of knee injuries (267, 338, 463).

Investigations regarding stability demands have been furthered by analysing squat performance in unstable environments to enhance neural adaptations, particularly stabiliser and trunk muscles. Efforts during unstable squats have shown maintained or decreased agonist activation accompanied by decreases in isometric force or strength, due to the reduced magnitude of load capacity (9, 49, 474). These results indicate the interaction between stability, force production and muscle activation during unaltered free weight squat performance with external load and the lower force production may be disadvantageous to strength development (53).

Field Assessment of the Squat and Relationship to Athletic Performance
The back squat has been identified as a reliable test and frequently used to assess lower body strength in a variety of athletes and levels (20, 37, 117, 493, 558) (Table 2.3). Strong relationships exist between squat strength (absolute or relative to body mass) and sprint, jump and COD (87, 95, 114, 375, 441, 468, 537, 569). More importantly, the transfer of developed strength is paramount for enhanced athletic performance and evidence is compelling for resistance training programs incorporating the squat positively impacting sprint, jump and COD performance (5, 101, 115, 271, 280, 490, 511, 565, 571). Given the ability for untrained participants to respond favourably to resistance training, particular importance is given to research demonstrating improvements in trained participants. In professional handball players, a seven-week program incorporating half squats, twice a week at 4-6RM significantly improved strength, jump and acceleration performance (468). Similarly, 1RM squat increases of well-trained rugby league players was associated with improvements in 20m acceleration following an eight-week strength and power program (115). Elite, well-trained national
handball players performed an eight-week resistance training program involving half-squats at 80-95% 1RM also demonstrating improvements in acceleration performance and jump height (271). Collectively, these investigations support strength improvements, utilising heavy squat variations positively impacting athletic performance.
Table 2.3 Typical test values and between-session reliability of back squat assessments representative of team sports athletes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject average ±SD (n)</th>
<th>Subject experience &amp; sport</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Average ± SD (kgs)</th>
<th>CV% / %TE</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>ICC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard (493)</td>
<td>20.8 ± 3.9 (21)</td>
<td>National indoor volleyball (M)</td>
<td>1 RM Parallel back squat</td>
<td>Absolute unreported</td>
<td>TE = 3.5%</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakley (558)</td>
<td>17.3 ± 0.4 (14)</td>
<td>Adolescent rugby union (M)</td>
<td>3 RM Front Squat</td>
<td>103.0 ± 17.4</td>
<td>CV = 2.90</td>
<td>TE = 2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustsson (20)</td>
<td>24 ± 1.3 (20)</td>
<td>University students (F)</td>
<td>1 RM Parallel back squat</td>
<td>60.5 ± 18</td>
<td>6.9kg</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyard (37)</td>
<td>25.4 ± 3.3 (17)</td>
<td>Resistance trained (M)</td>
<td>1RM Full back squat</td>
<td>140.3 ± 27.2</td>
<td>CV = 2.1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort (117)</td>
<td>21.5 ± 2.0 (32)</td>
<td>Inexperienced college athletes (M)</td>
<td>1RM 90° back squat</td>
<td>140.0 ± 21.2</td>
<td>2.7kg</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.0 ± 1.9 (12)</td>
<td>Inexperienced college athletes (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>94.6 ± 14.1</td>
<td>2.0kg</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: M = male, F = female; CV% = coefficient of variation, %TE = percentage technical error of measurement; SEM = Standard error of measurement; ICC = intraclass correlation coefficient.
FEATURES OF UNILATERAL RESISTANCE TRAINING

Lower body unilateral exercise has been defined as “a weight bearing movement supported on one leg (388)”. Commonly prescribed unilateral exercises include single leg squats, rear foot elevated split squats (RESS), lunges, step-ups and split squats (Figure 2.4) (75, 181, 301, 322, 330). Many exercises termed unilateral derive varying levels of support from the non-drive leg with few closed kinetic chain resistance exercises truly unilateral. Unilateral exercises have been labelled supplementary or auxiliary to the prescription of bilateral exercises, their placement in programs typically less emphasised (often following major bilateral exercises), intended to vary stimulus, assist prime movers and increase fatigue (223, 298, 388). The narrower base of support contributes to the additional coordination requirements, subsequently decreasing the magnitude of external load comparable to bilateral exercises. Given a purpose of resistance training is the increase in maximal strength, the lower magnitude of load incorporated in unilateral exercises is somewhat discouraging (266). However, the uneven emphasis of load distribution in asymmetrical performance (ie. system mass is not evenly distributed between legs) does result in the dominant/lead leg being activated at intensity sufficient for strength development (267, 311, 382). Despite the assertion that single leg exercises may not sufficiently develop strength, they are simultaneously classified “sport specific”, mimicking the single leg biased movements of many sporting actions (266, 388, 480). The asymmetrical loading provide further rationale for the inclusion of these exercises as a primary exercise at all stages of athletic development: increased muscle activation of stabilisers, injury risk reduction benefits, potential benefits of trunk control and perceived sports transfer resemblance (232, 266, 340, 382, 511, 534). Although not typically prescribed for hypertrophy, unilateral resistance training has been demonstrated to have comparable improvements in CSA as bilateral training (276, 562).
Characteristics of Unilateral Resistance Exercises

Given the asymmetrical muscle activation patterns, resemblance to activities of daily living, practical implementation and typically no or little external resistance requirement, unilateral resistance exercises feature abundantly in research regarding actions of daily activity or lower body rehabilitation literature (22, 58, 63, 73, 75, 112, 116, 179, 185, 264, 282, 334, 338, 491). As a result, methodological constraints detailing prime mover muscle activation is often characterised by low intensity performance, atypical of elite athlete training requirements. Peak quadriceps (VMO, VL, rectus femoris) activation during bodyweight only step-ups was approximately twice the maximum voluntary contraction of isometric leg extension whereas biceps femoris was only 59% of isometric flexion (63). Lower hamstring surface EMG was reported in forward, lateral and retro step-ups (backward step-up), compared to single leg wall squats during unweighted performance (22). Critically, the step height in this investigation was quite low, only 15cm high; typical of daily activity yet substantially lower than athletic training application. Increasing step height has been shown to increase quadricep and hamstring activity, similar to increased squat depth (77). Additionally, comparisons between muscle activity of bilateral and unilateral exercises often fail to equate loading parameters. For
example, Schellenburg et al assessed split squats at 125% bodyweight barbell load and deadlifts at 150% bodyweight barbell load reporting gluteal activation was highest for the lead leg in the split squat compared with gluteal activation in deadlifts (485). The load in the deadlift is spread across two legs whilst the split squat load distribution asymmetrically overloads the lead leg, thus two different loading conditions were assessed. Bellon et al reported no difference in mean EMG in erector spinae, GMax, biceps femoris or VL and VMO between back squat at 75% 1RM and RESS at 37.5% of back squat 1RM (58). Although half the squat load was used to compare to the RESS, more than 50% of the load can be directed through the lead leg (267). Another study assigned loads as a percentage of 1RM back squat: back squat were performed at 85% 1RM and split squat and RESS at 50% 1RM (157). Biceps femoris EMG was greater in RESS than back squats despite the lower magnitude load. However, methodological differences in relative intensity of the exercises may influence EMG activity and confound interpretation as differences in load contribute to muscle activation discrepancies and conclusions (370). Where relative intensity has been equated, quadriceps activity was high for squat performance at 75% 1RM and biceps femoris activation was significantly higher for split squats at 75% 1RM compared to squats at 75% 1RM (99). Mausehund et al compared RESS, single leg squats and splits squats at relative 6RM (370). This investigation reported no significant differences in GMax and VL peak EMG. However, gluteus medius (GMed) activation was significantly different in the single leg squat compared to the RESS and split squat. This may be due to the single leg squats one-foot base of support compared to the asymmetrical two-feet base of support. As with alterations in squat technique, technical variations in step length and front shin angle have been found to significantly alter EMG and joint moments (485, 489). Trunk position has also been demonstrated to influence lower limb mechanics in single leg squats whereby hamstring forces are significantly higher with moderate trunk lean compared to a more upright posture, which in turn, reduced ACL forces (335). The favourable quadriceps:hamstring coactivation in single leg exercises compared to bilateral squats supports the integration of unilateral exercises in ACL rehabilitation and prevention programs (156, 370). These studies demonstrate limitations in previous research comparing bilateral and unilateral application whilst highlighting the diversity of unilateral exercise and influence of external load on muscle activation levels.
Stability

The narrow base of support is a critical distinction between bilateral and unilateral resistance exercise and creates a “disruptive torque” to the body (56). The greater medial-lateral forces demand altered neural strategies at the hip, knee and ankle to maintain balance (9, 386, 460). During performance there may be an additional challenge due to the shifting centre of mass which heightens frontal plane neuromuscular instability (9, 49, 344, 382, 386, 388). The higher EMG values of hip stabiliser muscles recorded during single leg performance compared to bilateral has been suggested to develop neuromuscular adaptations that may reduce the risk of injury (22, 166, 334, 461). The GMed, a hip stabiliser in the frontal and transverse planes abducting and externally rotating the femur, is frequently targeted by the prescription of unilateral exercise (334). Internal rotation of the femur results in excessive knee valgus forces, a contributing factor in lower limb injuries such as patellofemoral pain / anterior knee pain, iliotibial band syndrome and ACL tears. Early phase rehabilitation exercise prescription often entails exercise atypical of athletic resistance programming, conducted in lying or isolated fashion (184). Integration in unilateral exercises provide a practical benefit to athletes, loading in similar movement patterns to athletic performance. Unilateral training is often prescribed for rehabilitation and injury prevention due to heightened hip stability requirements (357, 453, 473). Lower hip abduction strength was statistically significant (p=0.02) to injury in a two-year study of collegiate athletes (345). Krause and colleagues suggested that “exercise be performed unilaterally if the intent is to provide a challenge to the GMed muscle” (334). The beneficial neuromuscular adaptations of unilateral exercise in rehabilitation settings seem a logical integration in enhancing athletic performance. Likened to the stance phase during running and COD tasks, the incorporation of unilateral resistance training has been suggested for optimum athletic performance and injury prevention (388). Furthermore, unique to unilateral movements is medial-lateral co-contraction. As with bilateral exercises, co-contraction of antagonists is crucial for joint stability and is influenced by the magnitude of force involved, the velocity of movement, movement precision, type of contraction and duration of acceleration or deceleration (49, 52, 54). Due to the narrow base of support, medial-lateral co-contraction forces may be a further benefit of unilateral exercise prescription for injury risk reduction (63). It has been proposed that the hip moment of the support leg during COD contributes to the body’s stabilisation, indicating the importance of strength training of hip adductors and abductors (535). With specific regard to knee alignment and injury risk during COD performance, unilateral lower limb resistance training appears to provide benefit beyond enhanced strength development to include critical hip stabilisation.
The one-legged execution of sporting movements suggests the specificity of resistance training occur on one leg to maximise transfer (53, 266). Free weight resistance training is utilised for the inherent joint stabilisation requirements, and to provide a resemblance of force transfer during athletic movement skill execution occurring amidst postural stability challenges (243, 525). The position of load has a significant influence on the magnitude of GMed and VL activation (521). Additionally, studies have extended the application of instability by having participants perform exercises on unstable supports to increase balance demands (9, 49, 50, 137, 372). Multiple investigations have demonstrated decreased ability to utilise external mass and/or decreased motor activation of prime movers when requiring subjects to perform resistance exercise in an unstable environment (9, 49, 372). For example, addition of a foam cushion pad under the feet decreased 6RM Bulgarian squat (or RESS) by 10% and significantly decreased biceps femoris and erector spinae EMG amplitude (9). When performed in a stable environment, the EMG amplitude in the 6RM Bulgarian squat versus 6RM back squat was comparable for the VL and VMO, indicating similar motor unit activation between the unilateral and bilateral exercises at relative intensity (9). Attempting to decrease stability to replicate sport specificity beyond unilateral performance to an unstable base decreases the strength development capacity of the training exercise. Whilst sporting actions may occur on one leg, the surface is stable permitting high force production/application (137). Therefore, unilateral resistance training exercises, performed on a stable surface, may provide an optimum combination of force production and stability demands in a sport specific context, a position supported by a systematic review on unstable surface training (57).

Rehabilitation and Corrective Application

Unilateral resistance training has been incorporated in rehabilitation practice to benefit from the phenomenon of cross-education, the process where enhanced force output of the contra-lateral untrained limb is observed with unilateral training (149, 196, 268, 499). Contralateral strength improvements have been reported in many studies suggesting enhanced central neural drive (64, 149, 196, 422, 560). The practical implementation of unilateral exercises have involved training the uninjured limb to reduce substantial strength loss in the injured limb (149, 268). Additionally, lower limb contralateral strength balance may affect performance and predispose an athlete to an increased risk of injury (313, 432). As such, unilateral assessment is used as a screening tool for injury.
A further rationale for the inclusion of unilateral exercises is the unintentional imbalance of bilateral performance – the assumption that both legs contribute evenly to bilateral performance. Research has indicated that performance of the squat can be performed asymmetrically and athletes experienced with bilateral resistance training can exhibit bilateral asymmetry (48, 198, 328, 432, 482). It has been suggested that supplementary unilateral training may be required in such instances to correct imbalance that may increase injury risk or limit performance (432). Comparison of unilateral performance is an essential feature of lower body rehabilitation, particularly from ACL injury (314). Whilst the origins of bilateral asymmetry are multifaceted, discrepancy exceeding 15% has been suggested as an injury risk factor (326, 391). The prescription of unilateral exercises is suggested to assist within-subject detection and correction of imbalance (289, 432).

The bilateral deficit phenomenon has been suggested as a rationale for the incorporation of unilateral exercises in resistance training (298, 421, 511). Bilateral deficit is defined as the force produced by both limbs working simultaneously being less than the sum of both limbs working independently (305, 420). It has been demonstrated more difficult to “achieve full motor unit activation in bilateral than unilateral contractions” (476). Neural activation patterns have been speculated as the mechanisms for bilateral deficit (297, 305, 337). As such, unilateral training may be a strategy to optimize strength development. In untrained subjects, whilst bilateral and unilateral exercises improved lower body strength expression, unilateral training optimized individual lower limb force production (74). However, this finding is based on untrained subjects and whether this occurs in well-trained athletic populations requires investigation. Yet, given the expression of strength as a skill, the coordination of synergists, agonists and antagonists and the advantages of the bilateral deficit, unilateral exercises appear to maximise strength specificity for athletic performance (476).

Whilst unilateral exercises utilise lower external loading compared to bilateral exercises a potential benefit that reduction may provide is to supportive structures (such as the spine) which may promote athlete health. As the external loading in unilateral lower body exercise is markedly lower than bilateral exercises it has been suggested that the lower load decreases the compressive load on the spine and may reduce injury risk during training (157, 263).
Technical instruction for squat performance recommends vertebral alignment to minimise lumbar injury risk (168, 210, 235, 488). The spinal orientation during unilateral performance of RESS, step-ups or split squats may facilitate a more favourable vertical alignment. Trunk muscle activation has been demonstrated to increase greatly when the strengthening exercises were performed in a more unstable environment (56) and whilst trunk activation has been demonstrated during back squats, the asymmetry of unilateral exercises increases contralateral trunk stabiliser activation (10, 84). The trunk section is responsible for transferring force generated in the lower limbs to the upper limbs and inefficiency in transfer can result in force loss or injury risk due to overcompensation. Training that integrates trunk strength in the kinetic chain is favourable for athletic preparation (55, 56). Additionally, the trunk section is seen as providing a solid foundation for force transfer between upper and lower limbs (56). Furthermore, trunk control also identified in COD performance may be assisted by unilateral resistance training which has differentiated trunk demands to bilateral training (481).
Table 2.4 Typical test values and between-session reliability of back squat assessments representative of team sports athletes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Subject average ±SD (n)</th>
<th>Subject experience &amp; sport</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Average ± SD (kgs)</th>
<th>CV% / %TE</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>ICC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speirs</td>
<td>18.1 ± 0.5 (18)</td>
<td>Academy RU (M)</td>
<td>3RM RESS</td>
<td>U: 76 ± 6.1</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B: 75 ± 4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urquhart</td>
<td>23 ± 1.2 (14)</td>
<td>Untrained (M)</td>
<td>1RM Split squat</td>
<td>68.8 ± 9.2</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCurdy</td>
<td>21.0 ± 0.8 (8)</td>
<td>Untrained (M)</td>
<td>1RM RESS</td>
<td>88.6 ± 18.5</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3RM RESS</td>
<td>80.4 ± 16.0</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.9 ± 6.5 (22)</td>
<td>Untrained (F)</td>
<td>1RM RESS</td>
<td>45.8 ± 10.7</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3RM RESS</td>
<td>39.8 ± 10.4</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.6 ± 1.9 (10)</td>
<td>Trained (M)</td>
<td>1RM RESS</td>
<td>121.6 ± 17.7</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3RM RESS</td>
<td>103.0 ± 21.5</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.0 ± 0.8 (12)</td>
<td>Trained (F)</td>
<td>1RM RESS</td>
<td>55.3 ± 11.6</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3RM RESS</td>
<td>47.5 ± 8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  M = male, F = female; CV% = coefficient of variation, %TE = percentage technical error of measurement; SEM = Standard error of measurement; ICC = intraclass correlation coefficient.
Field Assessment of Unilateral Exercises and Relationship to Athletic Performance

The infrequency of unilateral resistance training as a prime strength development tool in athletic populations has limited the availability of strength testing reliability of unilateral resistance exercises typical of athletic training (Table 2.4) (385, 511, 551). Relationships between unilateral assessment and athletic performance have ranged from stability/balance tests, hops or jumps to unilateral resistance exercise (103, 313, 352, 390, 423). For example, superior dynamic stability as assessed by the Star Excursion Balance Test has been related to faster COD performance (354), leading authors to suggest that unilateral training may benefit lower body strength development and stability for sprint and COD performance. Leg stiffness measured by hopping has been correlated to sprint acceleration over 40m (103) whilst unilateral jump performance has a strong correlation to sprint performance in collegiate athletes (390). Compared to bilateral resistance training, the relationship of unilateral resistance measures to athletic performance is limited. Relationships to performance have been constrained to comparisons with seated unilateral leg press and RESS to differentiate dominant and non-dominant deficit (313, 352). Detectable strength asymmetry was unrelated to deficits in sprint performance with the inability to identify relationships to field performance attributed to the complex movements and muscle qualities (contraction speed, range of motion) of field testing than strength testing. Furthermore, in each investigation imbalances were within clinically defined parameters of imbalance (under 15%), highlighting the complexity of determining relationships between “asymptomatic” imbalance and performance limitations.

A resistance program consisting of only unilateral exercises (single leg squats, lunges, step-ups and single leg power cleans) was implemented in seven NCAA Division II female volleyball players (341). This small investigation utilised a RESS 3RM strength test and volleyball specific jump tests, pre and post a 3 session per week, 10-week intervention. Despite resistance training being performed primarily unilaterally, the small cohort demonstrated some improvement in double leg vertical jump suggesting a positive effect of unilateral resistance training on bilateral performance. This investigation demonstrates the potential of unilateral resistance training on performance, yet comparisons between bilateral and unilateral effectiveness require further investigation.
**SUMMARY**

Given the importance of exercise selection in determining the manipulation of training variables driving neuromuscular adaptation and expression of strength, bilateral and unilateral exercises offer unique benefits blending overload and specificity for enhanced performance. The benefits of bilateral exercise for strength development and athletic application are well established. Given the importance of task-specific resistance training (472), and the positive neuromuscular benefits of unilateral resistance training in rehabilitation settings, unilateral resistance exercises are recommended to be incorporated in programs designed to improve an athlete’s strength and power (388). Despite the resemblance to one-legged athletic performance and comprehensive neuromuscular benefit, unilateral exercises lack the extent of applied research relative to bilateral exercises to athletic performance and unilateral exercises are predominantly investigated in rehabilitation application. Furthermore, a review of resistance training interventions in sprinters concluded that no clear modality of resistance training was optimal for speed development with different regimes improving performance (72). The authors concluded that resistance training at 60-100% RM be utilised and programs include unilateral movement.
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**STUDIES COMPARING BILATERAL AND UNILATERAL RESISTANCE TRAINING**

**TRAINING STUDIES**

Given the positive benefits of unilateral resistance training and the resemblance of specificity to athletic movements, it is surprising few studies have compared unilateral and bilateral resistance interventions. McCurdy and colleagues considered the prescription of unilateral resistance exercises to be secondary to bilateral exercises and attributed to a lack of evidence demonstrating strength and power benefits from unilateral training (389). They compared changes in strength and power in untrained male and female participants aged between 18 and 24 randomly assigned to a bilateral or unilateral group training twice per week for 8-weeks. Participants had not resistance trained within the previous 12 months. The 90° back squat was the bilateral resistance test and the RESS with a 90° front knee flexion angle
was the unilateral test. A 5RM protocol was used for assessment and to estimate a 1RM to determine training loads. Force plates were utilised for bilateral and unilateral countermovement tests and contact time was used for the Margaria-Kalamen stair climb test. Only the dominant leg was tested in unilateral conditions. The study design incorporated a two-week familiarisation period and two-week testing period. Whilst a complete program was not documented detailed indicated prescribed back and front squats for bilateral training and RESS, lunges and split squats for unilateral training progressing from 3 sets of 15 repetitions at 50% predicted 1RM to 6 sets of 5 repetitions at 87%. The training load was balanced between groups by sets and repetitions and individualised by predicted 1RM. Further, between weeks three and eight of the training program each condition was supplemented with bilateral or unilateral plyometrics, progressing from 3 sets of 5 repetitions to 3 sets of 15. No program was published.

This study reported similar improvements in unilateral and bilateral strength using bilateral or unilateral resistance training. The unilateral group improved single leg countermovement jump performance more than the bilateral group. The authors included the Margaria-Kalamen stair climb test as a coordinated unilateral power test involving alternating foot contact. Both bilateral and unilateral groups improved suggesting a similar neuromuscular adaptation. However, demonstrating the complexity of research design in applied training studies comparing unilateral and bilateral resistance training, there are methodological considerations. Importantly, the authors adjusted pre-test differences and the interaction of gender and group was an acknowledged limitation of the study. Additionally, the incorporation of bilateral or unilateral plyometrics further confounds interpretation with studies demonstrating different adaptations from bilateral or unilateral plyometric training (71, 362). A further compounding variable is the addition of other resistance exercises that were not included in the strength testing battery (front squats, split squats and lunges). Additional bilateral (front squats) and unilateral (split squat, lunges) exercises may have affected the study through fluctuations in training intensity as these exercises were not tested and able to be accurately prescribed. Furthermore, exercises such as the lunge require contribution from the rear leg. The authors acknowledged the interaction of gender and group however, incorporation of unilateral plyometrics on unilateral jumping performance may also have confounded strength development. The authors noted the untrained nature of the training groups as a potential limitation in application of the findings to more experienced participants.
Despite methodological constraints, this study provided initial indications of benefit of unilateral or bilateral resistance training for lower body strength.

Differences in hip muscle activation between bilateral and unilateral lower body resistance exercises was the basis of a six-week training intervention assessing speed and COD performance (197). Collegiate rugby players experienced with resistance training were randomly assigned to a bilateral or unilateral training group. The primary bilateral exercise was the barbell back squat (parallel depth) and the primary unilateral exercise was the RESS squat with dumbbells (parallel depth). It is questionable if training loads with dumbbells could be accurately equated from barbell strength testing, and if dumbbell training volume and intensity could be adequately matched to barbell back squat training. A substantial plyometric program of 10 to 15 sets of group matched bilateral or unilateral exercises was incorporated, confounding interpretation of the strength training intervention. During the training period volume and intensity of the primary exercise remained at 3x6 at 80% of baseline 1RM. Unfortunately, Fisher and Wallin did not report any post-training strength results rendering interpretation of the influence of the resistance training problematic. Further, the intervention was heavily weighted towards plyometric training compared to resistance training. For example, in the final two weeks of training subjects completed three sets of resistance training compared to 15 sets of plyometrics. When assessing 10m sprint time, Fisher and Wallin reported a statistically significant difference in favour of the bilateral group. However, there existed a large unadjusted difference at baseline between the two groups (bilateral group average of 2.12s and the unilateral group 2.04s). Fisher and Wallin reported significant changes in performance for the unilateral group compared to the bilateral group (both the bilateral and unilateral groups were evenly matched at baseline for both tests). Both the T-test and Illinois Agility test involve multiple accelerations and decelerations (Figure 1-1a,c) and the superior performance of the unilateral group may have been attributed more to the unilateral reactive strength qualities developed from the supplementary single leg plyometric training (409, 586). This study demonstrates the complexity in ascertaining the impact of training between bilateral and unilateral resistance exercise interventions with considerations of balancing training load and supplementary training as part of a comprehensive training program.
Removing confounding plyometric training, Speirs et al trained young male rugby players (18.1 ± 0.5 years) suggesting that both bilateral and unilateral resistance interventions would develop lower body strength, and unilateral training would exhibit superior transfer to sprint and COD performance (511). Similar to previous research, this study utilised the back squat and RESS although to a higher 100° knee flexion angle. Despite familiarity with the back squat, RESS exercise and sprint and COD tests, the research design included a 3-week, 6-session familiarisation phase. The researchers utilised a 3RM strength test, and tested both legs in the RESS, although only used the dominant leg in the statistical analysis. The research designed included RESS reliability testing (ICC = 0.98) reporting similar to previous work (385). The 3RM testing result was converted to a predicted 1RM to determine training loads.

Due to the competition schedule of the subjects, a shorter training period of only five weeks was conducted. Whilst a longer training duration was preferred by researchers, this reflects the applied nature of the current protocol. Unlike Fisher and Wallin who maintained a constant loading intensity for their study duration, training progressed from high volume and low intensity (4 sets of 6 repetitions at 75% 1RM) to low volume and high intensity (4 sets of 3 repetitions at 92% 1RM). Both the barbell back squat or barbell RESS exercises were the only lower body resistance training prescribed. As members of a rugby academy, all participants completed an additional four rugby specific sessions and one match per week. The bilateral training group improved back squat 1RM by 5.0 ± 3.7% and RESS 1RM by 10.5 ± 3.2% whilst the unilateral group improved back squat 1RM by 5.7 ± 3.8% and RESS 1RM by 9.2 ± 2.1%. The authors concluded that both unilateral and bilateral resistance training were equally effective in improving lower body strength, supporting the earlier work of McCurdy and colleagues, importantly in trained subjects. The authors acknowledged that the strength improvements may have been typical of immediate response to training in short-term interventions and suggested longer training interventions to assess chronic adaptation.

Although the training intervention improved lower body strength, only a small effect size improvement was observed in 10m time. This is despite positive relationships between improvements in lower body strength and sprint acceleration (490). The authors suggested that the five-week training period may have been too short for effective transfer of strength to improved sprinting performance. Additionally, it was also suggested that an absence of
specific sprint training may have contributed to the lack of transfer. Sprint training was purposely withheld in the current study due to the periodisation model and to isolate the influence of resistance training on performance. The authors suggest that lag time – the period of time between the development of an adaptation (strength) and its performance realisation (improved speed) may have been a factor in the short five-week study. However, despite the lack of improvement in the 10m time, a moderate improvement in 40m time was observed with no difference between the bilateral or unilateral groups. Based on this result the authors concluded “that improvements in lower limb strength transfers to enhanced sprinting performance”. Another important component of the research design was the inclusion of COD assessment via the Pro-Agility test (Figure 2.2). Although small in magnitude, both groups demonstrated positive improvements of 1.7 ± 1.0% and 1.9 ± 0.8% for the unilateral and bilateral groups providing some insight regarding the potential for strength transfer from unilateral or bilateral resistance training to COD capacity. Whilst the study was unable to determine performance changes in 10m sprint time, the Pro-Agility task, which involves two 180° direction changes and contains a single 10m sprint within 20m of sprinting, did show positive improvement.

Sharing similar considerations regarding unilateral specificity in sprinting and COD, plus injury risk and muscular asymmetry, Gonzalo-Skok and colleagues sought to determine the effect of unilateral or bilateral training (232). Although familiarised with the exercise procedures and a resistance training age of two years, the 22 basketball participants in this study design were young with an average age of 16.9 ± 2.1 years. The extensive testing battery included a V-cut COD test (a 25-m sprint with four, 5m 45° cuts), a 180° COD test (7.5m out and back sprint), incremental bilateral and unilateral tests to determine maximal power output, 25m sprint speed and countermovement jump performance. The maximal power output test involved bilateral and unilateral Smith Machine jump squat testing with incremental load until the attainment of maximum power. During the training intervention, the number of repetitions were post-determined; that is the set stopped when power output decreased below 10% of the target power output. The mean number of repetitions between groups was not substantially different during the course of the intervention. For the first five weeks, the squat load was increased from 80% to 100% of maximum power load, dropping to 80% in the final week. Subjects in this study performed two intervention resistance sessions in addition to their normal strength training. Four sets of unilateral or bilateral matched drop and countermovement
jumps. After the six-week period, the authors reported greater improvements in unilateral maximum power output by the unilateral training group compared to the bilateral training group in the incremental unilateral squat test. Both groups improved sprint and jumping performance. The unilateral training group improved in three COD tests (V-cut, 180° right leg and 180° left leg COD tasks) compared to the bilateral group improving in just one (180° right leg). The authors suggest the combined resistance training + plyometrics as opposed to isolated resistance training contributed to the enhanced sprint performance. Limitations in the study acknowledged by the authors include the uncertainty whether improved capacity was the effect of the inclusion or combination of maximal power training, strength training, and plyometrics. The inclusion of a control group in this design may have provided further insight regarding improvements due to training as opposed to maturation in such a young population.

**BILATERAL VERSUS UNILATERAL RESEARCH DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS**

There are methodological considerations for all research designs, and some specific to bilateral and unilateral resistance training investigations that require consideration. Common to all research, the chronological and training age of the subjects influences the response to training and subsequent practical application to experienced and elite settings. Subjects who are chronologically young, or have a low training age, are demonstrated to respond differently to well-trained athletes (32, 254). Thus, interpretation of training effects cannot be generalised between populations of differing training ages. Studies investigating unilateral and bilateral resistance training have been limited by subject cohort training experience ((232, 389). The effects of maturation on adolescent subjects may contribute to enhanced physical progress. The inclusion of a control group may assist interpretation of the magnitude of change due to the interventions (46). Furthermore, familiarisation to the testing and training protocols is an important requirement, particularly with unilateral exercises (67). Research on unfamiliar unilateral resistance testing has highlighted the importance of establishing specific familiarisation to ensure high test reliability.

An important consideration in evaluating the effectiveness of resistance training interventions is the equitable delivery of load (volume and intensity). Common to all featured research (197, 232, 389, 511) is the equal prescription of sets and reps between the unilateral and bilateral intervention exercise. Additionally, further unilateral or bilateral resistance
exercise was prescribed as well as unilateral or bilateral plyometric exercise. Whilst all studies utilised baseline strength testing and prescribed training loads from testing, the inclusion of additional resistance training makes equating training load between unilateral and bilateral exercises difficult and interpretation of the efficacy of unilateral or bilateral resistance training somewhat problematic. Fisher and Wallin pre-tested both the squat and Bulgarian with a barbell, but dumbbells were used in training for the Bulgarian squat (197).

Compounding interpretation in much of the previous work of unilateral or bilateral resistance training on sprinting and COD was the addition of unilateral or bilateral matched plyometric training (Table 2.5). Differing responses have been shown in untrained populations with either unilateral or bilateral resistance training (363). The influence of bodyweight in plyometrics using either one leg at a time or two results in vastly different magnitudes of stimulus. Matching volume-intensity between bilateral and unilateral training was a consideration of the previous studies, many equally prescribing training repetitions. However, Gonzalo-Skok et al managed the repetitions of the intervention exercise based on the decline in power output during each set. At the conclusion of the intervention, no substantial differences in the number of repetitions performed were found between groups (232). This can be further confounded by additional training. Speirs et al used one training exercise (back squat or RESS) and no supplemental plyometrics. Conversely, McCurdy et al and Fisher and Wallin supplemented training with additional unilateral or bilateral resistance exercises which provide different, unmatched stimulus between groups. Interestingly, the complexity of athletic performance is reflected in the variation of speed and COD assessments previously utilised. Sprint testing has been performed over 10m (197, 511), 25m (232) and 40m (511). Change of direction has been assessed using the Pro-agility (511), Illinois and T-Test (197), and customised V-cut and 180° (232). The complexity of these tests – the number and acuteness of direction changes, the proportion of direction changes to straight line sprinting components and the duration of the test, confound dissection of the impact of unilateral or bilateral resistance training interventions on COD performance.
Table 2.5 Summary of research investigating bilateral (squat) and unilateral (RESS) lower body resistance training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Study length</th>
<th>Resistance intervention</th>
<th>Additional training</th>
<th>Strength test</th>
<th>Sprint test</th>
<th>COD tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McCurdy (389)</td>
<td>38 untrained men and women (ave 21yrs)</td>
<td>2/wk for 8 weeks</td>
<td>Squat</td>
<td>RESS</td>
<td>Bil / Uni matched plyometrics</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher and Wallin (197)</td>
<td>15 collegiate male rugby (ave 20yrs)</td>
<td>2/wk for 6 weeks</td>
<td>Squat</td>
<td>RESS</td>
<td>Bil / Uni matched plyometrics</td>
<td>10m sprint</td>
<td>Illinois and T-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speirs et al (511)</td>
<td>18 academy male rugby (ave 18yrs)</td>
<td>2/wk for 5 weeks</td>
<td>Squat</td>
<td>RESS</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>10m and 40m sprint</td>
<td>Pro-agility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzalo-Skok et al (232)</td>
<td>22 youth male basketball (ave 17yrs)</td>
<td>2/wk for 6 weeks</td>
<td>Smith machine squat</td>
<td>Smith machine RESS</td>
<td>Incremental Bil and Uni squat power test</td>
<td>25m</td>
<td>V-cut and 180° test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ave = average; /wk = per week; RESS = rear foot elevated split squat; Bil = Bilateral; Uni = Unilateral; RM = repetition maximum; wk = week
Summary and Thesis Implications

This review has demonstrated the importance of sprint acceleration and COD capacity in team sport performance and the relationship to lower body strength. The influence of increased strength on improvements in speed and COD are well supported, with training interventions and analysis of bilateral exercises well documented. Specificity and transfer are fundamental principles of resistance training design guiding exercise selection. Despite the apparent synergy between unilateral resistance training and athletic performance, the literature regarding unilateral integration is sparse. Research limitations include biomechanical comparison of bilateral and unilateral performance in well-trained participants. Additionally, practical implementation could be attributed to research design complexity which has rendered applied investigation problematic. Collectively, practitioners have limited empirical information from which to design programs for trained and well-trained athletes. It is acknowledged that adaptations to training in untrained, or relatively untrained individuals are easier to obtain and may not necessarily reflect the likely adaptation of trained individuals.

Furthermore, practical resistance training design comparing bilateral and unilateral intervention of previous studies have confounded the assessment with supplemental resistance exercises and/or plyometric activity. Reactive strength is a component of COD performance, therefore inclusion of bilateral or unilateral plyometric activities in previous research may have influenced COD performance changes obscuring interpretation regarding the resistance training intervention. The assessment of COD performance is also an important consideration. The number and magnitude of direction changes or the distance of the test alters the contribution of running speed and technique and the subsequent ability for investigators to isolate and interpret mechanisms for change (495). Previous comparison studies (197, 232, 389, 511) have focussed on the back squat and RESS, potentially overlooking other beneficial unilateral exercises with capacity for higher external loads capable of sufficient overload. The inclusion of a control group would provide further methodological rigour to extract the effects of training from natural development. Finally, practical training environments are characterised by periods of strength development and strength maintenance. The effect of unilateral resistance training prescribed according to typical maintenance volume-load
characteristics may provide information currently unavailable concerning the influence of unilateral resistance training on strength maintenance.
PART TWO
**PREFACE**

A primary research question was to determine the force application and movement patterns of the squat and step-up. The experimental design developed to answer this specific research question required determination of validity and reliability of particular methodology. Thus, Part Two presents three papers establishing the rigour of methodology utilised in this thesis. Comparing the step-up to squat required establishing reliability of the 1RM Step-up maximal strength assessment (Chapter Three). A reliable unilateral test was essential to success of the thesis. Additional constraints in laboratory set-up were overcome comparing methods of determining barbell displacement in heavily loaded back squats performed by well-trained athletes presented in Chapter Four. Accurate determination of barbell displacement underpins barbell velocity calculation, an important performance variable for comparing movements in subsequent analysis. Finally, despite extensive investigation, reliability of kinetic variables in heavy back squat performance of well-trained participants has been seldom reported. Chapter Five presents information critical to interpretation of kinetic performance of the squat.

**Chapter Three**
The lower body step-up exercise: Strength testing reliability and training application.

**Chapter Four**
Validity and reliability of methods to determine barbell displacement in heavy back squats: Implications for velocity-based training (as accepted for publication: Appleby BB, Banyard HG, Cormack SJ, and Newton RU, PAP 2018 JSCR).

**Chapter Five**
Reliability of squat kinetics in well-trained rugby players: Implications for monitoring training (as reviewed for publication to the Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research).
Chapter Three

**THE LOWER BODY STEP-UP EXERCISE:**

**STRENGTH TESTING RELIABILITY AND TRAINING APPLICATION**
ABSTRACT

Unilateral exercises are perceived as sport specific, yet coaches have comparatively fewer reliable testing options for single leg strength compared to bilateral exercises. Accurate single leg assessment may provide practical benefit to coaches in the daily training environment for single leg strength and asymmetry and injury risk identification. The purpose of this study was to determine the reliability of the maximal barbell step-up test in moderately trained athletes and determining the smallest worthwhile change in performance likely to be important for this population. Ten participants completed four familiarisation resistance training sessions prior to two repeated one repetition maximum (1RM) barbell step-up tests on separate days. Reliability was estimated as the typical error ± 90% confidence limits (CL), expressed as a coefficient of variation (CV%) and the intraclass correlation (ICC). The smallest worthwhile change (SWC), calculated as 0.2 x between-participant standard deviation was used to determine the smallest important change in performance. Despite the relatively low CV% of many variables (maximum of left or right leg CV% = 3.3%; only the right leg CV% = 5.3%) only the left leg (CV = 2.0%, SWC = 3.3%, ICC = 0.98) and average of the left and right leg (CV = 2.7%, SWC = 3.1%, ICC = 0.95) are able to detect the SWC. The CV% ranged from 0.6 – 1.8 times the smallest worthwhile change. The 1RM step-up test is a reliable test for coaches to monitor improvements in unilateral strength. Coaches using the 1RM step-up can confidently detect important changes in performance of approximately 5%. Regular programming of the step-up in the daily training environment may assist coaches monitor unilateral lower body strength.
INTRODUCTION

Unilateral lower body strength exercises are prescribed as a sport specific training strategy. Such exercises are utilised due to the heightened recruitment of secondary stabilizer muscles, the higher potential for force development per limb due to the bilateral strength deficit and the identification and potential correction of asymmetry (298, 480). Compared to unilateral resistance exercises, the reliability of bilateral exercises is widely available and movements such as the squat can be seamlessly integrated into training plans and sessions for both training and testing (37, 117). Given the importance of single leg training for sport specificity and injury rehabilitation (386), a reliable unilateral test would provide coaches with a tool that can be incorporated in the routine training environment.

It is well accepted that interpretation of testing results requires confidence in their accuracy (285) and new methodologies should quantify “error” or “noise” from both biological and technical sources, such as depths or angles of displacement and population training age and familiarity (259). With regards to familiarisation, it is suggested that three to four sessions are required for inexperienced lifters, or unfamiliar testing protocols to ensure a true maximal assessment (20, 67, 510). For example, Augustsson and Svantesson (20) found a significant 11% difference between two testing sessions of one repetition maximum (1RM) squat performance in female university students (intraclass correlation [ICC] = 0.85), and suggested a familiarisation test session for inexperienced participants. However, familiarity with technical execution may not be sufficient, and experience with the testing intensity may be of greater importance (385). Several studies have demonstrated high ICC’s and low coefficients of variation (CV%) can be achieved with trained participants within three trials (37, 385, 464).

Regarding unilateral lower body strength testing, the step-up exercise is an example of a lower body training and testing exercise yet to be examined for reliability. Additionally, it is also critical that the level of detectable improvement be established to inform program practice and decision making (288). Therefore, the aim of this study was to establish the reliability and smallest worthwhile change of the 1RM barbell step-up in moderately trained participants.
METHODS

Experimental Approach to the Problem. To establish the reliability and smallest worthwhile change of a free-weight barbell box step-up (step-up) 1RM test, a group of 10 well trained, yet unfamiliar participants were selected. In a two-week period (four training sessions), participants completed four sets of 2 to 4 repetitions of increasing moderate, to moderate-high intensity (Figure 3.1). In the third week participants attended two sessions separated by four days to determine 1RM reliability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>Step-up height assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarisation</td>
<td>Step-up training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 weeks / 4 sessions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Day 1: Step-up 1RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day 4: repeat step-up 1RM testing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.1 Experimental design schematic.

Subjects. Ten academy level rugby union players were recruited (age = 21.4 ± 2.9 yrs; mass = 99.7 ± 13.4 kg; height: 184.7 ± 6.0; training age = 5.2 ± 2.3 yrs). All participants were notified of the potential risks involved and gave informed consent. This study was approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee. All participants were free of injury or previous injury history which may have affected performance. All participants identified themselves as right foot dominant in reference to their preferred leg to kick a ball (261, 385).

Procedures. Step-up Height Assessment. The exercise required the participant to achieve a knee angle of 90° at the commencement of the concentric phase of the movement. A 90° knee angle has been frequently used in studies that assessed barbell back squats and other lower body resistance exercises such as split squats or rear foot elevated split squats (385, 551). A line joining the greater trochanter to lateral tibial condyle, and lateral tibial condyle to the lateral malleolus of the right leg was used to determine a 90° knee angle during the step-up. Participants were filmed from a right, lateral view performing a 40kg barbell step-up on a series of boxes of incremental step height of 20mm from 300mm to 420mm high. A video camera (Sony Handycam HDR-HC3 HDV 1080i) was placed on a tripod 0.95 metres high and
approximately four metres perpendicular from the centre position of the first box for lateral filming. Participants were filmed performing a minimum of two step-ups with their right leg on each step. Computer software (Kinovea, version 0.8.15) was used to measure knee angle. The 90° knee angle was defined as the minimum angle of the knee at contact of the lead foot on the step. All repetitions were analysed and the closest step-up box to that which resulted in a 90° knee angle was allocated to the participant.

**Familiarisation training.** Over four training sessions, participants completed four sets of two to four repetitions (Table 3.1). Loads were refined each session as participants improved with confidence in the exercise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Repetitions</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,4,4,4</td>
<td>6-8 RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,4,3,3</td>
<td>5-7 RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,3,3,3</td>
<td>4-5 RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,3,2,2</td>
<td>3-4 RM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**One Repetition Maximum Testing.** Participants were tested after a rest day on both occasions. Upon arrival at the testing facility, participants followed the 20-minute standard testing warm-up protocol which consisted of stationary bike riding (seven minutes of steady state intensity plus three minutes of short interval efforts of increasing intensity), followed by lower body mobility exercises (bodyweight squats and lunges) and concluded with five sub-maximal countermovement jumps and five depth jumps. Participants completed a series of warm-up sets (four repetitions at 50% of estimated 1RM, three repetitions at 70%, two repetitions at 80% and one repetition at 90%) each separated by three minutes recovery. Following the warm-up, a series of maximal attempts were performed until a 1RM was obtained. Verbal encouragement was provided throughout the testing. This protocol was modified for single leg testing, based on a previous protocol for assessment of maximal strength (377). To execute the step-up, the participant was located within a power cage with the safety racks raised to approximately chest height (Figure 3.2). From this position, the participant un-racked the barbell across their upper back and performed the step-up inside the rack. The step-up was deemed a fail if the participant could not extend the leg fully on the box without support from the uninvolved limb. The order of step-up leg was randomised amongst participants and a 1RM was obtained for each leg.
The inter-day reliability of 1RM step-up strength testing was calculated using the intraclass correlation coefficient and the typical error expressed as a percentage (coefficient of variation (CV%)), ±90% confidence limits using a customised Excel spreadsheet (283). A measure was deemed reliable if the CV% was less than 10%, a threshold reported in many human performance reliability studies (19, 124, 143). The smallest worthwhile change, representing the smallest practically important change, was calculated as 0.2 x the between-participant pure SD (283). A test was considered capable of detecting the smallest worthwhile change if the CV% was less than the SWC (455).

**RESULTS**

Across all participants and trials, the average ± standard deviation 1RM step-up of the left leg and right leg was 129.1kg ± 19.2kg. The CV for all comparisons ranged between 2.0% and 5.3% with the left leg and average (left and right leg) CV% less than the smallest worthwhile change.
Table 3.2 Reliability of 1RM step-up testing between trial 1 and trial 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trial 1 1RM mean (kg)</th>
<th>Trial 2 1RM mean (kg)</th>
<th>CV% (CL)</th>
<th>ICC (CL)</th>
<th>SWC%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left leg</td>
<td>125.0 (20.4)</td>
<td>132.5 (20.7)</td>
<td>2.0 (1.5-3.3)</td>
<td>0.98 (0.97-1.00)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right leg</td>
<td>127.5 (16.2)</td>
<td>131.5 (21.2)</td>
<td>5.3 (3.8-8.8)</td>
<td>0.82 (0.75-0.97)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>128.5 (17.6)</td>
<td>134.5 (20.3)</td>
<td>3.3 (2.4-5.5)</td>
<td>0.92 (0.89-0.99)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of left and right</td>
<td>126.3 (18.2)</td>
<td>132.0 (20.7)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.0-4.5)</td>
<td>0.95 (0.93-0.99)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as mean (SD), CV (90% CL), ICC (90% CL) and SWC%. 1RM: one repetition maximum; Left leg: value of left leg step-up; Right leg: value of right leg step-up; Maximum: the maximum value at session 1 to session 2; Average of left and right: average of left leg and right leg; CV%: coefficient of variation; ICC: intraclass correlation; CL: 90% confidence limits; SWC%: Smallest worthwhile change from pure SD.

DISCUSSION

In this paper we present a single leg lower body exercise with practical application as both a sport specific training exercise and unilateral assessment for athletes. The primary result of this study is the high reliability within four sessions in moderately trained athletes. Furthermore, some variables were sufficiently sensitive to measure the smallest important change. This is a vital finding, as the ability of a test to detect a small but important change in performance at an individual level is critical for strength and conditioning coaches who wish to assess unilateral lower body performance using the step-up exercise.

Whilst the incorporation of unilateral lower body resistance training attempts to address sport specificity, (232, 511) objective assessment of unilateral training is limited compared to the range of proven reliable bilateral testing options (e.g. squat, power clean, clean pull) (117, 119, 256, 291). The reliability of 1RM step-up on both legs is considered acceptable (CV% < 5.3) with ICC values > 0.82 (Table 3.2) and compares favourably to those previously reported for back squats and power cleans across a range of athlete training experience and sport (117, 493). The results of the current study are particularly interesting compared to bilateral testing, as the reduced base of support introduces more technical variation (67), yet despite more degrees of freedom, the unilateral test can be highly reliable in trained athletes when they have been sufficiently familiarised with the task.

Previous reliability investigations of lower body unilateral strength have involved the barbell split squat (SS) (551) and rear-foot elevated split squat (RESS) (385) reporting excellent
inter-trial reliability (SS: %CV\textsubscript{TE} = 1.57\%, ICC = 0.99; RESS: ICC = 0.98). Although these studies recognised the importance of unilateral training and testing to assess lower leg function, unfortunately both only tested the dominant leg, potentially limiting practical application. In the current study, participants were required to perform the test on both sides, as per normal training practices, providing a more complete practical analysis. Although the majority of load is directed through the front leg in both SS and RESS (70-85\% (267, 386)), in comparison the step-up movement contains a purely unilateral component.

An important methodological reliability component of this study is the homogenous participant group. Achieving high levels of reliability can be difficult in homogenous groups where the bounds of performance are clustered (285). Despite the homogenous and trained nature of this population, and their prior unfamiliarity with the exercise, they were able to demonstrate reliable performance within four sessions. Importantly, the combination of reliability (CV\% and ICC) and SWC presented in the current study, enables coaches to accurately assess the impact of training interventions utilising the step-up.

An essential rationale for unilateral training and testing is identifying and addressing lower limb asymmetry. During lower body rehabilitation, it is common practice to utilise unilateral performance to assess progress by making comparisons to the non-injured side (385). In team sports such as soccer, rugby, Australian Rules Football and netball, it is common for athletes to suffer a lower body injury (62, 445, 563, 572). By incorporating the step-up in a periodised annual plan, with routine 1RM assessment, coaches can have historical unilateral data which may provide critical “return to training/play” data points in the event of lower body injury that requires rehabilitation. Knowledge of the CV\% and smallest worthwhile change permit objective assessment regarding progress between current and previous performance. Such information may provide training targets to inform rehabilitation programming to return asymmetry to pre-injury levels (63, 393, 426).

**Practical Applications**

We present a highly sport specific application for coaches wishing to assess single leg lower body performance. The results are that 1RM step-up is a reliable test in trained participants after four familiarisation sessions. Importantly, coaches can confidently detect
changes in step-up 1RM when there is a change in performance of approximately 5%. This test may be utilised to provide coaches with an insight into unilateral training adaptations, symmetry performance and requirements of athletes. Routine incorporation of the exercise in the daily training environment may assist coaches to monitor unilateral lower body performance.
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**SUMMARY**

Part Two presented three papers establishing methodological rigor central to the primary research question of this thesis:

- The 1RM step-up test is a reliable test (CV% = 2.0 – 5.3; ICC = 0.82 – 0.98) capable of detecting important changes in performance of approximately 5%.
- Well-trained participants are capable of familiarising to the 1RM step-up testing protocol within four sessions.
- The location of tracking barbell displacement should be centralised as much as practically possible as the combination of laterality, the pliant nature of a weightlifting barbell and magnitude of external load can influence the validity of displacement (LPT: CV% = 2.1 – 3.0; Overall mean bias % = 0.9 – 1.5; RHS: CV% = 3.3 – 7.5; Overall mean bias % = 7.3 – 11.2; LHS: CV% = 2.7 – 3.4; Overall mean bias % = 4.9 – 7.3).
- Peak and mean ground reaction force from the left, right or sum of left and right legs during heavy back squats is highly reliable. (CV% = 2.3 – 4.8; ICC = 0.87 – 0.96).
PART THREE
PREFACE

Part Three comprises three technical papers pertaining to reliability of key biomechanical variables of squat and step-up performance. Importantly, these papers provide confidence when interpreting biomechanical variables of interest when examining a primary thesis purpose: a comparison of the force application and movement patterns of bilateral and unilateral resistance training. Complementing Chapter Five, these papers combine to form an assessment of the reliability of key variables currently unreported in the literature in well-trained participants in heavy squat and step-up performance. The following chapters include:

Chapter Six
Reliability of back squat kinematics.

Chapter Seven
Reliability of step-up kinetics.

Chapter Eight
Reliability of step-up kinematics.
Chapter Six

*TECHNICAL PAPER:*

*RELIABILITY OF BACK SQUAT KINEMATICS*
INTRODUCTION

The squat is arguably the most widely prescribed and researched resistance exercise with applications ranging from activities of daily life, to injury rehabilitation and elite athlete training (18, 198, 321, 359, 374, 466, 478, 591). Laboratory measured variables of angle and velocity of movement are reported in numerous studies to describe characteristics of the squat (165, 188, 190, 191, 488) or compare the squat to other exercises (189, 240, 512, 536, 576). Despite the abundance of squat analyses, the documentation of reliability pertaining to key characteristic variables for the back squat are infrequent. Whilst studies have commonly reported knee flexion angles, bar displacement and velocity and temporal phase information, the reliability of these measures is often unpublished. Therefore, the purpose of this technical paper is to identify and report the reliability of kinematic variables of squat performance in highly trained rugby union players, to permit subsequent analysis and characterisation.

METHODS

Experimental Design. A cross-sectional research design was utilised to determine the kinematics during the squat in trained participants (Figure 6.1). Fifteen participants attended two testing sessions, separated by seven to ten days. The first session established one repetition maximum (1RM) strength of the squat and the second session involved assessment of the squat under the following experimental conditions. Participants performed two sets of two repetitions of the back squat at 70, 80 and 90% of 1RM. Force application and movement patterns were assessed using tri-axial force plates and three-dimensional motion measurement. The focus of this paper is the kinematic reliability of the squat (the kinetic results having been presented in a previous chapter) and the use of the force plate for this paper is solely for temporal phase identification.
Participants. A combination of 15 academy and professional rugby union players were recruited to participate in this investigation (Table 6.1). All participants were notified of the potential risks involved and gave their written informed consent. This study was approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee. All participants were cleared by medical staff to be free of injury or injury history which may have inhibited performance.

Table 6.1 Participant characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Body mass (kg)</th>
<th>90° Squat 1RM (kg)</th>
<th>Relative squat (1RM:BW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.1 ± 3.0</td>
<td>103.0 ± 9.5</td>
<td>194.7 ± 26.9</td>
<td>1.88 ± 0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as mean ± SD for all variables

Data Acquisition and Analysis Procedures One Repetition Maximum Testing. The 1RM protocol was applied for assessment of maximal strength (377). This protocol involved participants completing a series of warm-up sets (four repetitions at 50% of estimated 1RM, three repetitions at 70%, two repetitions at 80% and one repetition at 90%) each separated by three minutes recovery. Following the warm-up, maximal single repetition attempts separated by a minimum of five minutes recovery were performed until a 1RM was obtained. Verbal encouragement was provided throughout the testing. The 90° knee flexion depth was assessed by goniometer and verified via video analysis during the familiarisation phase. During maximal testing, the knee angle was monitored by each participant squatting with a 20kg Olympic barbell (Australian Barbell Company, Victoria, Australia) and Olympic weight plates (Eleiko, Halmstad, Sweden) to an elastic band attached horizontally across a power rack (York Fitness, Rocklea, Queensland, Australia.) at their individually determined depth. An accredited
strength and conditioning coach and at least one assistant observed each test for spotting, technique and depth monitoring. The repetition was deemed a fail if the participant could not achieve the required depth or could not return to the upright position.

Resistance Exercise Assessment. Session two involved performance of submaximal squats at three loads with measurement of force and movement kinematics (Figure 6.2). A standardised general body warm-up consisted of moderate intensity stationary cycling, self-directed stretching and mobility exercises, followed by the performance of a specific warm-up progression. Tested exercise technique was monitored according to the 1RM protocols and trials not meeting these criteria were repeated. During all resistance assessments, ground reaction force and movement patterns were assessed using tri-axial force plates and three-dimensional motion analysis.

![Flow chart representation of participant testing session two.](image)

Three-Dimensional Motion Analysis. During all resistance exercise assessments, a 10-camera digital optical motion analysis system (Vicon MX, Vicon, Oxford, UK) was used to record whole body three-dimensional movement patterns at 250Hz. A previously validated, whole-body model was used to capture and analyse movement patterns using Nexus software (Nexus 1.0) (152). The model was a defined, 37 retro-reflective marker set and series of subject
measurements to examine the three-dimensional joint kinematics. A control space of approximately 25 square meters to a height of approximately three meters, surrounding two in-ground force plates, was calibrated using the manufacturers recommended technique of wand calibration (538). Force and motion analysis data were captured simultaneously and aligned using a fifth-order spline interpolation to up-sample the motion analysis data to 1,000Hz. All trials were processed according to previous standards in Vicon Nexus 2.3 using a customised pipeline incorporating a zero-lag fourth order 18Hz low pass Butterworth filter (515). All data was analysed using customised calculations in Microsoft Excel 2013.

**Temporal Phase Definitions.** The commencement of the squat eccentric phase was defined by a 5% reduction in bilateral GRF (494), concluding at minimum marker displacement of the 7th cervical vertebra (C7). The concentric phase was defined, from the end of the eccentric phase to maximum C7 displacement. The use of C7 as a reliable marker of displacement has been previously established (Chapter Four).

**Statistical Analysis.** The inter-trial reliability was calculated using intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) and typical error expressed as a percentage of coefficient of variation (CV%), including ±90% confidence limits calculated using a customised Excel spreadsheet (286). The smallest worthwhile change (SWC) was calculated at 0.2 times between-participant pure standard deviation (SD). For CV%, values below a threshold of 10% were deemed acceptable (19, 124, 143). A test was considered capable of detecting the SWC if the CV% was less than the SWC (455).

**RESULTS**

Reliability assessments of kinematic derived variables are presented in Tables 6.2-6.5. High intra-subject reliability was observed in several variables across all intensities, including maximum knee angle, concentric displacement and peak velocity. The CV% for the squat concentric phase length was also under 10% whilst the ICC improved as bar mass increased (ICC = 0.38-0.78). The eccentric phase of the squat was observed to have the greatest variability (CV% = 13.2-15.2) (Table 6.2). Both the eccentric and concentric measures of displacement for the squat were acceptable (CV% = 4.3-8.6; ICC = 0.55-0.81) (Table 6.3). The typical error for maximum knee flexion during the squat was less than 5.2% with large or very
large ICC values (Table 6.4). The typical error for squat average or peak velocity was 7.4% or less, whilst ICC values ranged from moderate to very large (ICC = 0.78-0.89) (Table 6.5). None of the variables could be used to detect the SWC.

Table 6.2 Reliability of duration phases in the squat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Load (%1RM)</th>
<th>Mean duration (ms)</th>
<th>CV% (CL)</th>
<th>ICC (CL)</th>
<th>SWC%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eccentric time</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>1,185 (238)</td>
<td>13.8 (11.0-19.2)</td>
<td>0.52 (0.22-0.77)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1,274 (9294)</td>
<td>13.3 (10.6-17.9)</td>
<td>0.66 (0.41-0.85)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>1,426 (310)</td>
<td>15.2 (12.1-21.3)</td>
<td>0.54 (0.25-0.79)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentric time</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>861 (84)</td>
<td>8.2 (6.5-11.3)</td>
<td>0.38 (0.07-0.68)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>984 (110)</td>
<td>6.8 (5.4-9.0)</td>
<td>0.66 (0.41-0.85)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>1,229 (252)</td>
<td>9.9 (8.0-13.8)</td>
<td>0.77 (0.56-0.91)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as mean (SD), CV (90% CL), ICC (90% CL) and SWC%. CV%: coefficient of variation; CL: confidence limit; ICC: intraclass correlation coefficient; SWC%: 0.2 times the between-subject pure SD. Eccentric time: duration of the eccentric phase from 5% reduction in bilateral GRF to minimal C7 displacement. Concentric time: duration from minimum C7 displacement to maximal C7 displacement; %1RM: percentage of one repetition maximum.

Table 6.3 Reliability of maximum C7 displacement in the squat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Load (%1RM)</th>
<th>Mean displacement (mm)</th>
<th>CV% (CL)</th>
<th>ICC (CL)</th>
<th>SWC%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eccentric displacement</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>452 (48)</td>
<td>7.2 (5.8-10.0)</td>
<td>0.60 (0.31-0.82)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>438 (35)</td>
<td>4.3 (3.5-5.8)</td>
<td>0.75 (0.54-0.89)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>432 (40)</td>
<td>4.5 (3.6-6.1)</td>
<td>0.81 (0.62-0.92)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentric displacement</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>527 (62)</td>
<td>8.6 (6.9-11.9)</td>
<td>0.55 (0.26-0.79)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>522 (51)</td>
<td>4.6 (3.7-6.1)</td>
<td>0.81 (0.64-0.92)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>514 (49)</td>
<td>4.3 (3.5-6.0)</td>
<td>0.83 (0.65-0.93)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as mean (SD), CV (90% CL), ICC (90% CL) and SWC%. CV%: coefficient of variation; CL: confidence limit; ICC: intraclass correlation coefficient; SWC%: 0.2 times the between-subject pure SD. Concentric displacement: relative displacement from minimum displacement to the completion of the concentric phase. Eccentric displacement: relative displacement from commencement of the eccentric phase to minimum displacement.
Table 6.4 Reliability of maximum knee angle in the squat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load (%1RM)</th>
<th>Leg</th>
<th>Mean of knee flexion (degrees)</th>
<th>CV% (CL)</th>
<th>ICC (CL)</th>
<th>SWC%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>94.4 (6.7)</td>
<td>4.2 (3.4-5.9)</td>
<td>0.69 (0.43-0.87)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>95.8 (6.9)</td>
<td>5.2 (4.2-7.2)</td>
<td>0.53 (0.23-0.78)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>92.5 (6.0)</td>
<td>2.3 (1.8-3.1)</td>
<td>0.90 (0.78-0.96)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>93.9 (5.4)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.2-3.6)</td>
<td>0.80 (0.62-0.92)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>91.7 (5.8)</td>
<td>2.9 (2.3-3.9)</td>
<td>0.83 (0.65-0.93)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>93.6 (5.6)</td>
<td>3.0 (2.4-4.1)</td>
<td>0.78 (0.58-0.91)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as mean (SD), CV (90% CL), ICC (90% CL) and SWC%. CV%: coefficient of variation; CL: confidence limit; ICC: intraclass correlation coefficient; SWC%: 0.2 times the between-subject pure SD.

Table 6.5 Reliability of C7 velocity in the squat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Velocity (m/s)</th>
<th>CV% (CL)</th>
<th>ICC (CL)</th>
<th>SWC%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average velocity - concentric</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>0.61 (0.07)</td>
<td>5.5 (4.5-7.6)</td>
<td>0.78 (0.60-0.91)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phase</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0.54 (0.06)</td>
<td>5.3 (4.3-7.2)</td>
<td>0.85 (0.70-0.94)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0.43 (0.07)</td>
<td>7.4 (5.9-10.2)</td>
<td>0.86 (0.72-0.95)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak velocity - concentric</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>1.28 (0.16)</td>
<td>6.1 (4.9-8.4)</td>
<td>0.83 (0.66-0.93)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phase</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1.21 (0.15)</td>
<td>5.9 (4.7-7.8)</td>
<td>0.83 (0.67-0.93)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>1.12 (0.11)</td>
<td>3.7 (2.9-5.1)</td>
<td>0.89 (0.76-0.96)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as mean (SD), CV (90% CL), ICC (90% CL) and SWC%. CV%: coefficient of variation; CL: confidence limit; ICC: intraclass correlation coefficient; SWC%: 0.2 times the between-subject pure SD. Average velocity: concentric phase: average velocity derived from C7 displacement during the concentric phase. Peak Velocity: maximum value of instantaneous velocity, derived from C7 displacement.

**DISCUSSION**

In this chapter we report acceptable levels of kinematic reliability for back squat concentric phase duration, maximum knee flexion angle, eccentric and concentric displacement and velocity. An important aspect of this study design is the well-trained nature of the participants and the magnitude of load used (absolute and relative), a theme central to Part Three of this thesis and providing critical context for further analysis.

The temporal phases of the squat, without the intra-trial reliability have been reported in a variety of populations and loading parameters (189, 417, 512). In the current investigation, the eccentric phase duration was of high variability in performance, whilst the concentric phase was shorter in duration and more reliable, suggesting individual variation in strategy during squat descent (Table 6.2). In contrast to this study, previous research investigating maximal or
near maximal back squats in powerlifters (compared to rugby union athletes in the current study) have shown shorter eccentric phases compared to concentric. Whilst reliability values have not been reported, there exists inconsistency in the literature regarding temporal phase durations, potentially attributed to methodology of participants and technique, or phase detection definitions (e.g. squat descent indicated by bar descent (512), knee flexion (417) or ground reaction force (current study). This suggests future research should strive to ensure consistency in the definition of temporal marks and establish clear temporal phase assessment.

Based on previous research, the use of C7 motion as a measure of barbell displacement has been demonstrated to be reliable across a range of barbell loads (Chapter Four). Both the eccentric and concentric displacement in the squat were found to have good reliability (Table 6.2) and this is supported in the literature in less trained participants performing free weight full or Smith Machine squat variants (CV = 5% (76); ICC = 0.92 (377)). Similarly, the reliability for knee angle in the current study was 5.2% or less, comparable to previous research assessing full squats in trained participants (76) (Table 6.3).

Derived from displacement data, the peak and average velocity during the concentric phase of the squat were found to have excellent reliability (CV% = 3.7-7.3; ICC = 0.78-0.90) with consistency of performance of peak velocity improving with increasing bar load (Table 6.5). This is similar to previous studies using a position transducer or optical encoder in weighted Smith Machine jumps (ICC: 0.775 – 0.90; SEM% < 4%) (377, 456).

CONCLUSION AND PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

Although kinematic variables are frequently reported, reliability of these measures for heavy back squats in well-trained participants has not been well documented. A strength of the current research is the magnitude of external load, and high training experience of the participants. In this biomechanical study we confirm that although not capable of determining the SWC, kinematic derived peak and average velocity, knee flexion angle and C7 displacement are reliable variables. This suggests that coaches and researchers can confidently interpret these variables in heavily loaded squats.
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Chapter Seven

**TECHNICAL PAPER:**

**RELIABILITY OF STEP-UP KINETICS**
**INTRODUCTION**

Historically, kinetics of lower body unilateral exercises such as the step-up, lunge or rear foot elevated split squat, have been investigated predominantly for application to rehabilitation or activities of daily living (e.g. stair ascent (473)), seldom in the execution of high-intensity performance in well-trained athletes (116, 324). Muscular activation levels, centre of pressure, joint kinetics and ground reaction forces being commonly investigated. Unilateral exercises are becoming increasingly considered in the sports performance setting for advantages of load prescription and secondary muscle activation (232, 421, 511). Given the increasing prescription of unilateral exercise in elite athlete programs, a greater understanding of the underlying kinetics assists with training program design, providing coaches with knowledge regarding likely targeted physiological and performance criteria. While a sparse number of publications have documented kinetics of the step-up (eccentric and concentric GRF and RFD) none have addressed the reliability associated with reported variables, leaving doubt regarding variability of interpreted measures (195, 574). Further, little is known regarding reliability of kinetic variables associated with the step-up performed by well-trained athletes.

Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to present reliability data of kinetics of the step-up in well-trained rugby union players. The discovery of robust kinetic variables for the step-up may assist with describing the key characteristics of performance. Additionally, given the growing capacity to measure kinetic information in the training environment, determining the reliability of variables may assist coaches to better interpret meaningful information to guide training interventions in the step-up exercise.

**METHODS**

*Experimental Design.* In a cross-sectional research design to determine the kinetics of the step-up, fifteen participants attended two testing sessions separated by seven to 10 days. The first session involved assessment of one repetition maximum (1RM) strength in the step-up and the second session involved biomechanical analysis of the step-up. Participants performed two sets of two repetitions of back squat at 70, 80 and 90% of 1RM. Force application and movement patterns were assessed using tri-axial force plates and three-dimensional motion measurement.
Participants. A combination of 15 academy and professional rugby union players were recruited to participate in this investigation (Table 7.1). All participants were notified of the potential risks involved and gave their written informed consent. This study was approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee. All participants were cleared by medical staff to be free of injury or injury history which may have inhibited performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.1 Participants characteristics.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.1 ± 3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as mean ± SD for all variables

Data Acquisition and Analysis Procedures. Step-up Assessments. The protocol for the allocation of step height and 1RM strength assessment for the step-up has been previously detailed (Chapter Three – Reliability of the One Repetition Maximum Step-up in Academy Level Rugby Union Players).

Step-up Assessment. Upon arrival, participants completed a standardised warm-up consisting of stationary bike riding and lower body mobility exercises. Participants performed two warm-up sets at 50% and 60% 1RM for three and two repetitions respectively. Laboratory testing consisted of two sets of two repetitions at 70%, 80% and 90% of 1RM (left and right leg step-ups). During the step-up, participants stood on one force plate facing the step-up box which was isolated on the second force plate. As well-trained participants, they were requested to...
perform the concentric phase as “explosively” as possible. Technique was monitored according to the strength testing and was observed by the same accredited strength coach. The step-up was treated as a concentric only movement, starting from foot contact on the box, indicated by an increase of 5N, in line with the threshold detection for commencement of the squat (255).

**Ground Reaction Force.** Two in-ground tri-axial force plates (9290AD, Kistler Instruments, Winterthur, Switzerland) recording at 1,000Hz captured the kinetics of performance and filtered using a fourth order, low-pass Butterworth digital filter with a cut off frequency of 50 Hz. Calculations were made for each leg with the best trial (mean force) being used in the analysis. The integration of force-time data (trapezoid method) was used to determine total concentric impulse (176, 294). Impulse (Newton seconds (Ns) was calculated for each leg independently during the concentric phase.

**Temporal Phase Definitions.** The start was determined as foot contact on the box (initiated by the detection of ≥5N of force) to maximum C7 vertical displacement (as determined by motion analysis; 250Hz, Vicon MX, Vicon, Oxford, UK) (Figure 1). The C7 marker has been found reliable for measuring barbell displacement in the squat (Chapter Four – Reliability and Validity of Methods to Determine Barbell Displacement in Heavy Back Squats: Implications for Velocity Based Training). Movement was further divided into a support phase and non-support phase, determined by the presence of ground reaction force through the support leg force plate (the uninvolved step-up leg).
Statistical Analysis. Inter-trial reliability was calculated using intraclass correlation of coefficient (ICC) and the typical error expressed as a percentage of coefficient of variation (CV%), including ±90% confidence limits (286). The smallest worthwhile change (SWC%) was calculated at 0.2 times the between-participant pure SD. For CV%, values below a threshold of 10% were deemed acceptable (19, 124, 143). A test was considered capable of detecting SWC% if the CV% was less than the SWC% (455).

RESULTS

Reliability assessments of kinetic derived variables are presented in Tables 7.2 to 7.4. High intra-subject reliability was observed in several variables across all intensities. The coefficient of variation for ground reaction force (GRF) was very low (less than 6.0%) with very large to nearly perfect correlations across all loads (Tables 7.2 and 7.3). GRF was reliable for all loads for the step-up (left leg and right leg).
Table 7.2 Reliability of peak concentric phase ground reaction force non-support phase for the drive leg left leg and right leg in the step-up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load (%)1RM</th>
<th>Leg</th>
<th>Mean of Peak concentric ground reaction force (SD)</th>
<th>CV%</th>
<th>ICC</th>
<th>SWC%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>2,248 (297)</td>
<td>4.1 (3.4 – 5.3)</td>
<td>0.92 (0.85 – 0.97)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>2,212 (238)</td>
<td>4.0 (3.3 – 5.1)</td>
<td>0.89 (0.80 – 0.95)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>2,444 (286)</td>
<td>3.3 (2.7 – 4.2)</td>
<td>0.94 (0.88 – 0.97)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>2,441 (251)</td>
<td>2.8 (2.3 – 3.6)</td>
<td>0.94 (0.88 – 0.97)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>2,636 (347)</td>
<td>5.5 (4.5 – 7.2)</td>
<td>0.85 (0.73 – 0.93)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>2,631 (282)</td>
<td>3.9 (3.3 – 5.1)</td>
<td>0.89 (0.79 – 0.95)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as mean ± SD for all variables, SD: standard deviation; CV%: coefficient of variation; CL: 90% confidence limits; ICC: intraclass correlation; SWC%: 0.2 times the between-subject pure SD. %1RM = percentage of one repetition maximum.

Table 7.3 Reliability of mean concentric phase ground reaction force for the drive leg, left leg and right leg in the step-up through concentric phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load (%)1RM</th>
<th>Leg</th>
<th>Mean of average concentric ground reaction force (SD)</th>
<th>CV%</th>
<th>ICC</th>
<th>SWC%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>1,356 (170)</td>
<td>3.8 (3.0-5.2)</td>
<td>0.92 (0.83-0.97)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>1,381 (140)</td>
<td>3.8 (3.0-5.2)</td>
<td>0.88 (0.75-0.95)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>1,495 (182)</td>
<td>2.8 (2.3-3.6)</td>
<td>0.95 (0.90-0.98)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>1,501 (142)</td>
<td>2.7 (2.2-3.7)</td>
<td>0.93 (0.85-0.97)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>1,628 (219)</td>
<td>3.2 (2.6-4.4)</td>
<td>0.95 (0.88-0.98)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>1,634 (170)</td>
<td>2.8 (2.3-3.8)</td>
<td>0.94 (0.87-0.98)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as mean ± SD for all variables, SD: standard deviation; CV%: coefficient of variation; CL: 90% confidence limits; ICC: intraclass correlation; SWC%: 0.2 times the between-subject pure SD. %1RM = percentage of one repetition maximum.
Table 7.4 Reliability of total concentric impulse for the drive leg in the step-up through the non-support phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load (%1RM)</th>
<th>Leg</th>
<th>Mean total concentric impulse (SD)</th>
<th>CV% (90% CL)</th>
<th>ICC (90% CL)</th>
<th>SWC%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-support phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>738 (139)</td>
<td>8.6 (7.1-11.2)</td>
<td>0.83 (0.69-0.92)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>733 (127)</td>
<td>7.9 (6.5-10.3)</td>
<td>0.82 (0.68-0.92)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>912 (185)</td>
<td>7.1 (5.6-9.1)</td>
<td>0.90 (0.82-0.96)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>892 (176)</td>
<td>7.7 (6.5-10.0)</td>
<td>0.86 (0.74-0.93)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>1,207 (324)</td>
<td>9.0 (7.3-11.9)</td>
<td>0.90 (0.80-0.96)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>1,161 (274)</td>
<td>10.4 (8.6-13.5)</td>
<td>0.83 (0.69-0.92)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support and non-support phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>1,057 (168)</td>
<td>6.3 (5.3-8.3)</td>
<td>0.87 (0.75-0.94)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>1,063 (165)</td>
<td>6.2 (5.1-8.1)</td>
<td>0.86 (0.74-0.94)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>1,276 (262)</td>
<td>7.0 (5.8-9.0)</td>
<td>0.89 (0.80-0.95)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>1,254 (211)</td>
<td>5.3 (4.4-6.8)</td>
<td>0.91 (0.83-0.96)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>1,597 (358)</td>
<td>6.9 (5.6-9.0)</td>
<td>0.92 (0.84-0.96)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>1,587 (316)</td>
<td>7.4 (6.1-9.5)</td>
<td>0.88 (0.78-0.95)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as mean ± SD for all variables, SD: standard deviation; CV%: coefficient of variation; CL: 90% confidence limits; ICC: intraclass correlation; SWC%: 0.2 times the between-subject pure SD. Total concentric impulse (Ns): integration of force-time data (trapezoid method); Non-support phase: period of concentric phase with GRF detected solely under the step-up box; CV Support and non-support phase: GRF from foot contact on box to maximum concentric displacement; %1RM = percentage of one repetition maximum.

**DISCUSSION**

The results confirm that measures of GRF in the concentric phase of the step-up are highly reliable, indicated by low CV% and high ICC. Total concentric impulse during the step-up also demonstrated acceptable measures of reliability. Despite the reliability, none of the reported measures were capable of detecting the SWC. However, this acceptable reliability permits confident interpretation of these variables contributing to neuromuscular performance in the step-up.

The reporting of kinetic variables and reliability, in heavy step-ups has escaped rigorous assessment. Fauth et al (195) reported the GRF for the eccentric and concentric phases of step-ups performed by NCAA Division I female athletes. Similarly, Wurm (2010) reported step-up GRF from a population of recreationally trained men (574). Neither study reported the reliability of the GRF, nor distinguished unilateral characteristics. However, reliability measures in unilateral lower body performance has been detailed.
Recently, testing a combination of predominantly professional male rugby league players, Dos’Santos et al (171) reported excellent within session ICC (0.89-0.96) and %CV (4.3-5.9) in peak force using a unilateral isometric mid-thigh pull. Similarly, Comfort et al. reported highly reliable ICC’s (0.991) for GRF during the concentric phase of bodyweight single leg squats in recreationally trained males (116). These findings are similar to the current investigation where the ICC ranged from 0.85-0.95 with all CV’s under 5.5%.

Unilateral exercises and tests have been reported beneficial for detection of asymmetry, with reporting of reliability confined to single leg jumping tasks. Impulse is the product of force and time and explains, rather than describes, movement (327). Unilateral impulse has been reported in vertical jump with mixed reliability (123, 519). This is the first paper to report the reliability of impulse in a weighted step-up in highly trained individuals. The reliability for the total concentric impulse during phases of the step-up was reliable at all loads (6.2 – 10.4%) with the ICC range between 0.82 to 0.92.

**CONCLUSION AND PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS**

In conclusion, the high reliability of kinetic variables presented in this investigation demonstrate consistency of performance by these well-trained participants. Of importance, from the highly reliable GRF data it can be concluded that well-trained participants are capable of consistent performance of maximal efforts in heavily loaded unilateral strength exercises. Given the increasing prescription of unilateral resistance exercises for elite athletes, high reliability permits subsequent comparison and interpretation of meaningful differences in the underlying neuromuscular capacities reflected in kinetic outcomes involving the step-up. Additionally, the ability to consistently perform heavy unilateral exercises can provide practitioners with confidence that well-trained participants can achieve a repeatable training stimulus.
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Chapter Eight

TECHNICAL PAPER:

RELIABILITY OF STEP-UP KINEMATICS
INTRODUCTION

The step-up exercise is commonly associated with stair ascent and rehabilitation settings. In these environments, biomechanical information such as knee angle and temporal phases have been documented (63, 134, 163, 281). Additionally, the movements are generally performed with low, if any, external mass, atypical of an athletic resistance training program. Recent training investigations have demonstrated comparative improvements in strength with either bilateral or unilateral resistance training (232, 511). However, with growing interest in unilateral exercise prescription (65, 74, 298, 421), much is unknown regarding key kinematic variables important to understanding of unilateral performance, specifically the step-up.

Therefore, the purpose of this investigation was to determine the reliability of the kinematic variables of resisted step-up performance in well-trained athletes. Given the growing application of kinematic assessment in the training environment, information regarding reliability of variables associated performance, may be of assistance to coaches working with athletes.

METHODS

Experimental Design. Fifteen participants attended two testing sessions, separated by seven to ten days. The first testing session involved assessment of one repetition maximum (1RM) strength in the step-up exercise. The second testing session involved the biomechanical assessment of the step-up movement in the laboratory (Figure 8.1). Participants performed two sets of two repetitions of step-up at 70, 80 and 90% of 1RM. Force application and movement pattern were assessed using tri-axial force plates and three-dimensional motion measurement.
Participants. A combination of 15 academy and professional rugby union players were recruited to participate in this investigation (Table 8.1). All participants were notified of the potential risks involved and gave their written informed consent. This study was approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee. All participants were cleared by medical staff to be free of serious lower limb injury in the previous six months or injury history which may have inhibited performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.1 Participants characteristics.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (years)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.1 ± 3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as mean ± SD for all variables

Data Acquisition and Analysis Procedures.

The assessment of step-up height (Chapter 3), the laboratory testing protocol (Chapter 7), the three-dimensional motion analysis (Chapter 6) and temporal phase definitions (Chapter 7) pertinent to this study have been previously detailed in this thesis.

Statistical Analysis. The inter-trial reliability was calculated using intraclass correlation of coefficient (ICC) and typical error expressed as a percentage of coefficient of variation (CV%), including ±90% confidence limits (286). The SWC% was calculated at 0.2 times the between-participant pure SD. For CV%, values below a threshold of 10% were deemed acceptable (19,
A test was considered capable of detecting the SWC% if CV% was less than SWC% (455).

### RESULTS

Reliability assessments of kinematic derived variables are presented in Tables 8.1-8.5. High intra-subject reliability was observed in several variables across all intensities, including maximum knee angle, concentric displacement and peak velocity. The typical error for maximum knee flexion during the step-up was less than 5.2% with large or very large ICC values (Table 8.1). With regards to temporal phase analyses, CV% remained under 10% for all step-up variables and ICC values fluctuated between large and very large (ICC = 0.60-0.90). There was excellent reliability for concentric displacement (CV% = 4.3-8.6; ICC = 0.55-0.81; Table 8.5), and both peak velocity from foot contact (CV% = 6.2-10.4; ICC = 0.56-0.85) and average velocity from toe-off (CV% = 5.5-13.2; ICC = 0.53-0.83).

#### Table 8.2 Reliability of maximum knee angle in the step-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Load (%1RM)</th>
<th>Leg</th>
<th>Mean of knee flexion in degrees (SD)</th>
<th>CV% (CL)</th>
<th>ICC (CL)</th>
<th>SWC%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knee angle at step contact</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>95.8 (7.0)</td>
<td>2.8 (2.2-3.9)</td>
<td>0.89 (0.77-0.95)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>97.1 (6.9)</td>
<td>3.0 (2.5-3.9)</td>
<td>0.85 (0.72-0.93)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>96.0 (7.1)</td>
<td>2.8 (2.3-3.5)</td>
<td>0.88 (0.79-0.95)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>97.2 (5.9)</td>
<td>2.9 (2.4-3.7)</td>
<td>0.80 (0.64-0.90)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>96.1 (8.4)</td>
<td>3.3 (2.7-4.2)</td>
<td>0.89 (0.77-0.95)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>98.0 (6.5)</td>
<td>2.5 (2.1-3.2)</td>
<td>0.88 (0.78-0.95)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Knee Angle</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>101.1 (6.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (2.6-4.1)</td>
<td>0.77 (0.60-0.89)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>100.1 (5.5)</td>
<td>2.9 (2.4-3.7)</td>
<td>0.76 (0.58-0.88)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>100.3 (5.8)</td>
<td>2.3 (1.9-2.9)</td>
<td>0.87 (0.76-0.94)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>99.9 (4.9)</td>
<td>3.0 (2.5-3.8)</td>
<td>0.67 (0.46-0.83)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>101.3 (6.2)</td>
<td>2.4 (2.0-3.0)</td>
<td>0.87 (0.76-0.94)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>100.7 (5.6)</td>
<td>2.3 (2.0-3.0)</td>
<td>0.85 (0.72-0.93)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as mean ± SD for all variables, SD: standard deviation; CV%: coefficient of variation; CL: 90% confidence limits; ICC: intraclass correlation; SWC%: 0.2 times the between-subject pure SD; **Knee angle at step contact**: knee angle of leg on step at the moment of GRF measurement under step. **Maximum knee angle**: the greatest knee angle from the time of foot contact until maximal C7 displacement; %1RM = percentage of one repetition maximum.
Table 8.3 Reliability of duration phases for the step-up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Load (%1RM)</th>
<th>Limb</th>
<th>Mean of duration (SD)</th>
<th>CV% (CL)</th>
<th>ICC (CL)</th>
<th>SWC%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of stance phase (%time of rep)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>40% (5%)</td>
<td>6.5 (5.4-8.4)</td>
<td>0.75 (0.56-0.88)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>40% (4%)</td>
<td>7.4 (6.1-9.5)</td>
<td>0.63 (0.41-0.82)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>38% (5%)</td>
<td>6.5 (5.4-8.3)</td>
<td>0.80 (0.65-0.91)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>39% (5%)</td>
<td>7.7 (6.4-10.0)</td>
<td>0.68 (0.47-0.84)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>37% (6%)</td>
<td>9.7 (8.0-12.7)</td>
<td>0.74 (0.54-0.87)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>38% (5%)</td>
<td>6.5 (5.4-8.4)</td>
<td>0.82 (0.67-0.92)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of toe off (ms)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>315 (51)</td>
<td>7.6 (6.3-9.9)</td>
<td>0.82 (0.67-0.92)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>309 (38)</td>
<td>6.9 (5.7-8.8)</td>
<td>0.75 (0.57-0.88)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>324 (41)</td>
<td>4.7 (3.9-6.0)</td>
<td>0.89 (0.79-0.95)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>325 (40)</td>
<td>5.6 (4.6-7.2)</td>
<td>0.85 (0.73-0.93)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>365 (53)</td>
<td>5.1 (4.2-6.7)</td>
<td>0.90 (0.81-0.95)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>367 (51)</td>
<td>6.7 (5.6-8.6)</td>
<td>0.84 (0.70-0.92)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total time (ms)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>778 (70)</td>
<td>6.1 (5.0-7.9)</td>
<td>0.60 (0.37-0.80)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>780 (96)</td>
<td>6.9 (5.7-9.0)</td>
<td>0.69 (0.48-0.85)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>848 (98)</td>
<td>5.6 (4.7-7.2)</td>
<td>0.77 (0.60-0.89)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>832 (85)</td>
<td>3.7 (3.1-4.7)</td>
<td>0.88 (0.78-0.95)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>997 (142)</td>
<td>8.4 (6.9-10.9)</td>
<td>0.68 (0.47-0.84)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>965 (120)</td>
<td>5.4 (4.5-6.9)</td>
<td>0.83 (0.70-0.92)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as mean ± SD for all variables, SD: standard deviation; CV%: coefficient of variation; CL: 90% confidence limits; ICC: intraclass correlation; SWC%: 0.2 times the between-subject pure SD. **Duration of stance phase**: the time of contact of support leg from lead foot contact on step, until GRF of support leg not detected. **Time of toe off**: the time at which the support leg was removed from force plate during drive phase. **Total time**: duration from lead foot contact on step to maximum C7 displacement; %1RM = percentage of one repetition maximum.

Table 8.4 Reliability of maximum C7 displacement in the step-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Load (%1RM)</th>
<th>Leg</th>
<th>Mean displacement in mm (SD)</th>
<th>CV% (CL)</th>
<th>ICC (CL)</th>
<th>SWC%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concentric displacement</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>504 (33)</td>
<td>2.6 (2.2-3.4)</td>
<td>0.86 (0.75-0.94)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>493 (38)</td>
<td>3.9 (3.2-5.0)</td>
<td>0.78 (0.62-0.90)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>498 (36)</td>
<td>2.4 (2.0-3.1)</td>
<td>0.91 (0.83-0.96)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>488 (36)</td>
<td>2.1 (1.8-2.8)</td>
<td>0.93 (0.86-0.97)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>491 (36)</td>
<td>2.1 (1.7-2.7)</td>
<td>0.93 (0.87-0.97)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>487 (36)</td>
<td>2.6 (2.2-3.3)</td>
<td>0.90 (0.81-0.95)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as mean ± SD for all variables, SD: standard deviation; CV%: coefficient of variation; CL: 90% confidence limits; ICC: intraclass correlation; SWC%: 0.2 times the between-subject pure SD. **Concentric displacement**: displacement from minimum C7 displacement to the maximum C7.
Table 8.5 Reliability of C7 velocity for the step-up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Load (%1RM)</th>
<th>Limb</th>
<th>Mean Velocity in m/s (SD)</th>
<th>CV% (CL)</th>
<th>ICC (CL)</th>
<th>SWC%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average velocity – from toe off to maximum displacement</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>0.72 (0.09)</td>
<td>9.2 (7.6-12.0)</td>
<td>0.53 (0.27-0.75)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>0.70 (0.11)</td>
<td>12.1 (10.0-15.8)</td>
<td>0.61 (0.37-0.80)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>0.63 (0.10)</td>
<td>8.0 (6.7-10.4)</td>
<td>0.83 (0.69-0.92)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>0.64 (0.08)</td>
<td>5.5 (4.4-7.5)</td>
<td>0.85 (0.72-0.93)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>0.51 (0.10)</td>
<td>13.2 (10.9-17.4)</td>
<td>0.70 (0.50-0.85)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>0.54 (0.09)</td>
<td>10.1 (8.4-13.1)</td>
<td>0.70 (0.50-0.85)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Velocity – pre-toe off</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>1.07 (0.14)</td>
<td>5.2 (4.3-6.7)</td>
<td>0.88 (0.78-0.95)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>1.04 (0.12)</td>
<td>5.6 (4.7-7.2)</td>
<td>0.81 (0.66-0.91)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>1.01 (0.13)</td>
<td>4.1 (3.5-5.3)</td>
<td>0.92 (0.86-0.97)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>0.98 (0.13)</td>
<td>3.6 (3.0-4.7)</td>
<td>0.94 (0.89-0.98)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>0.95 (0.13)</td>
<td>5.4 (4.4-7.0)</td>
<td>0.89 (0.80-0.95)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>0.92 (0.14)</td>
<td>4.7 (3.9-6.0)</td>
<td>0.93 (0.864-0.97)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Velocity – post-toe off</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>0.91 (0.13)</td>
<td>10.0 (8.3-13.3)</td>
<td>0.58 (0.33-0.78)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>0.90 (0.14)</td>
<td>7.8 (6.5-10.2)</td>
<td>0.80 (0.64-0.91)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>0.84 (0.12)</td>
<td>6.3 (5.3-8.1)</td>
<td>0.85 (0.72-0.93)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>0.86 (0.12)</td>
<td>6.2 (5.2-8.0)</td>
<td>0.82 (0.68-0.92)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>0.73 (0.14)</td>
<td>9.5 (7.9-12.6)</td>
<td>0.82 (0.67-0.92)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>0.76 (0.11)</td>
<td>10.4 (8.6-13.5)</td>
<td>0.56 (0.31-0.77)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as mean ± SD for all variables, SD: standard deviation; CV%: coefficient of variation; CL: 90% confidence limits; ICC: intraclass correlation; SWC%: 0.2 times the between-subject pure SD. %1RM = percentage of one repetition maximum. Average velocity – from toe off to maximum displacement: the average velocity of the concentric phase from the toe-off to maximum C7 displacement. Peak velocity – pre-toe off: peak velocity during ground contact support phase of step-up. Peak velocity – post-toe off: peak velocity during concentric phase after support leg removed from ground contact.

**DISCUSSION**

There were high levels of reliability during step-up for measures of step-leg knee flexion angle, vertical displacement during the concentric phase and temporal phase durations. This acceptable reliability permits confident interpretation of these variables contributing to neuromuscular performance in the step-up. Further, these findings present insight into repeatable aspects of the motion, despite the unstable nature of the unilateral exercise.

During the preparation phase of the research design, each participant was allocated a step-up box height that permitted a 90° knee angle at foot contact. However, in the experimental data capture session, the magnitude of the bar load was substantially greater than
during familiarisation, resulting in average knee angles at foot contact between 95-101°. Despite the increased knee angle, there was a high within-session reliability at foot contact, and maximum knee angle achieved during the step-up motion (CV% = 2.3-3.3%; ICC = 0.67-0.89; Table 8.2), regardless of the magnitude of external load, demonstrating comparable reliability with squat knee flexion angles (CV% 2.3-5.2; ICC 0.53-0.90; Chapter Six, Table 6.4). The reliability of resisted step-ups have so far escaped scrutiny, with investigations reporting knee angle in sub-maximal unilateral movements such as single leg squats (within-session ICC of 0.97) (116) and/or single leg landings (ICC 0.83-0.97) (387).

Our analysis of the step-up, similar to a deadlift analysis, observed only the upward, or ascent phase for analysis (255). Further, as per Flanagan et al. (199) who investigated joint torque contributions in lightly weighted step-ups, the concentric phase was defined as initiating with one foot on the box, the other on the floor and concluding with both feet on the box. Additionally, it is also important to acknowledge the contribution of the support, or non-propulsive leg, to the movement. The concentric portion of the step-up can be characterised by two sub-phases, representing the contact phase of the support foot during step ascent. Good measures of reliability were observed for the time of toe off (when the support foot was removed from the floor – CV% = 4.7-7.6%; ICC = 0.75-0.90; Table 8.4), the duration of the support phase as a percentage of the total concentric phase time (CV% = 6.5-9.7%; ICC = 0.63-0.82; Table 8.4), and total time of the movement (CV% = 3.7-8.4%; ICC = 0.60-0.88; Table 8.4). These results further can be interpreted as demonstrated consistency of execution of heavy resisted step-up in this group and ability to characterise temporal phase performance of the step-up. Whilst Flanagan et al (199) did not further dissect the propulsion phase, the authors did note contribution of the uninvolved limb to the step-up movement and recommended this phase be considered in future step-up investigations.

The C7 marker was selected as a valid and reliable representation of barbell displacement based on previous research (Chapter Four). Reliability for concentric phase of the step-up was favourable (CV% = 2.1-3.9%; ICC = 0.78-0.93; Table 8.4). To the authors knowledge, this is the first study investigating reliability of step-ups tracking the C7 marker using motion analysis. Traditionally, barbell displacement has been found to be very reliable via linear position transducers in variations of squats and weightlifting derivatives (38, 293, 492). The reliability of bar displacement in unilateral exercises has not been previously...
analysed, as such, results of this study are an insight of the capacity to reliably measure concentric displacement in step-up performance.

Velocity in unilateral resistance exercises has seldom been reported and reliability analysis limited to single leg jumping variants (408). In the current study, velocity measures were derived from integration of C7 displacement-time data. A range of reliability was found in average velocity (CV% = 5.5-13.2%; ICC = 0.53-0.94; Table 8.5) and peak velocity post-toe-off (CV% = 6.2-10.4%; ICC = 0.56-0.85; Table 8.5). However, peak velocity pre-toe-off was quite reliable (CV% = 3.6-5.6%; ICC = 0.81-0.94; Table 8.5). Perhaps given the reliable displacement and temporal phases within the step-up, the less reliable post-toe-off velocity measures may be an indication of subtle technical variability in the unstable unilateral exercise.

**CONCLUSION AND PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS**

Several kinematic variables of the step-up are highly reliable permitting confident interpretation and comparison of key characteristics. Knee angle, temporal phases and concentric displacement were very reliable demonstrating consistency of performance. Velocity measures post-toe-off were of lesser reliability. It may be speculated that the unstable nature of the unilateral performance influenced repeatability of the step-up motion during the single leg drive phase. However, confidence can be gained from the consistent knee angle and displacement values permitting confident interpretation of step-up performance characteristics.


SUMMARY

Concluding the methodology for this thesis, Part Three comprised three technical papers outlining reliable kinetic and kinematics of the squat and step-up confirming:

- Kinematic derived peak velocity (CV% = 3.7 – 6.1; ICC = 0.83 – 0.89) and mean velocity (CV% = 5.3 – 7.4; ICC = 0.78 – 0.86), knee flexion angle (CV% = 2.3 – 5.2; ICC = 0.53 – 0.90) and C7 concentric displacement (CV% = 4.3 – 8.6; ICC = 0.55 – 0.83) are reliable variables in heavily loaded back squat performance in well-trained participants.

- Peak and mean ground reaction force of the left or right legs in the step-up is highly reliable (Peak: CV% = 2.8 – 5.5; ICC = 0.85 – 0.94; Mean: CV% = 2.7 – 3.8; ICC = 0.88 – 0.95).

- Several kinematic variables in the step-up demonstrated high reliability indicating consistent performance. Knee angle at step contact (CV% = 2.5 – 3.3; ICC = 0.80 – 0.89), temporal phases and duration (CV% = 3.7 – 9.7; ICC = 0.63 – 0.90) and concentric displacement (CV% = 2.1 – 3.9; ICC = 0.86 – 0.93).

- Peak velocity in the non-support phase of the step-up was reliable (CV% = 6.2 – 10.4; ICC = 0.56 – 0.85). Average velocity in the step-up was less reliable (CV% = 5.5 – 13.2; ICC = 0.53 – 0.85).

As a complement, Parts Two and Three substantiate the methodology, confirming reliable variables of performance for confident interpretation of a central thesis question – a comparison of the force application and movement patterns between bilateral and unilateral resistance training exercises in highly trained athletes.
PART FOUR
**PREFACE**

Having established sound methodological practices, Part Four specifically addresses the research questions: a comparison of the force application and movement patterns between the squat and step-up; and an examination of the efficacy of squat or step-up training for maximum strength and performance improvements in sprint and change of direction ability. Chapter Nine specifically addresses the primary research question with a biomechanical comparison of squat and step-up performance in well-trained athletes. Chapters Ten and Eleven target the secondary research question and present a comprehensive three-arm randomised controlled design training study. Incorporated in a rugby academy pre-season, two intervention groups were distinguished by the volume-load matched prescription of squats (bilateral training) or step-ups (unilateral training). Groups were assessed for maximum strength (both bilateral and unilateral), sprint speed and change of direction. The following chapters include:

**Chapter Nine**
Kinetics and kinematics of the squat and step-up in well-trained rugby players (as accepted for publication: Appleby BB, Newton RU, and Cormack SJ, 2018 *JSCR)*.

**Chapter Ten**
Specificity and transfer of lower body strength – The influence of bilateral and unilateral lower body resistance training (as accepted for publication: Appleby BB, Cormack SJ, and Newton RU; *JSCR*, 2019, 33 (2), 318-326).

**Chapter Eleven**
Unilateral and bilateral lower body resistance training does not transfer equally to sprint and change of direction performance (as accepted for publication: Appleby BB, Cormack SJ, and Newton RU, 2018 *JSCR)*.
Chapter Nine

KINETICS AND KINEMATICS OF THE SQUAT AND STEP-UP IN WELL-TRAINED RUGBY PLAYERS

As accepted for publication in the Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 2018.

Pages 135-151 are not available in this version of the thesis.

To view this publications record in Research Online, please go here:

https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworkspost2013/6469/
Chapter Ten

SPECIFICITY AND TRANSFER OF LOWER BODY STRENGTH – THE INFLUENCE OF BILATERAL AND UNILATERAL LOWER BODY RESISTANCE TRAINING

As accepted for publication in the
Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research,

Pages 153-170 are not not available in this version of the thesis.

To view this publications record in Research Online, please go here:
https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworkspost2013/5881/
Chapter Eleven

*Unilateral and Bilateral Lower Body Resistance Training Does Not Transfer Equally to Sprint and Change of Direction Performance.*

As accepted for publication in the *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 2018.

Pages 172-192 are not available in this version of the thesis.

To view this publications record in Research Online, please go here: https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworkspost2013/6530/
**SUMMARY**

Part Four specifically addressed the research questions:

1 – a comparison of the force application and movement patterns between bilateral (squat) and unilateral resistance training (step-up) in highly-trained athletes.

- Peak and average GRF was higher for the step-up than squat during the concentric phase at all relative intensities.
- The squat demonstrated superior peak velocity at all intensities compared to the step-up suggesting the squat may have a wider application for coaches utilising velocity-based training.

2 – An examination of the efficacy of bilateral (squat) and unilateral (step-up) resistance training for maximum strength and power development in sprinting and change of direction:

- Lower body strength can be developed using unilateral or bilateral resistance training and expressed in improved performance of the non-trained variation.
- Both unilateral and bilateral strength was shown to transfer to improved sprint acceleration performance, supporting research demonstrating increases in strength facilitating short distance sprint improvements.
- Yet, despite similar strength improvements the bilateral group demonstrated superior COD ability. However, this may be attributed to the contraction specificity between the two exercises and not the unilateral or bilateral nature.
- The results of the training study support training based on targeting the underlying neuromuscular demands of the target performance, and not the similarity in appearance to the target performance.
PART FIVE
Chapter Twelve

GENERAL THESIS SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS
An important consideration in resistance training program design is the transfer of adaptation to subsequent athletic performance, such as sprint acceleration or COD (396, 583). Historically, lower body strength had been primarily developed using bilateral exercise with unilateral training included as supplementary exercises often for specific rehabilitation purposes or targeting athlete performance development based on the rationale of more sport specific movement (389, 511). However, the absence of biomechanical comparison of bilateral and unilateral exercise utilised by well-trained athletes, and rigorous training intervention research, is a gap in our current understanding of sport specific resistance training applications. As such, a series of studies forming this thesis sought to explore biomechanics and training efficacy and efficiency of bilateral or unilateral resistance training in relatively well-developed athletes. This chapter shall summarise key thesis components, practical applications and suggestions for future research.

Attention to meticulous methodological rigour underpinning this thesis was first presented in Chapter Three. Maximal strength testing is an important field-based athlete assessment protocol (402). Whilst reliability of the rear foot elevated split squat has been reported (385, 511) it was critical to determine reliability of the step-up test, central to the thesis research direction. Ten trained participants were familiarised to the 1RM step-up over four sessions, prior to a test-retest assessment. It was found that the 1RM step-up was highly reliable for the assessment of unilateral strength. This was essential for subsequent investigations. Furthermore, it was concluded that the 1RM step-up test could confidently detect meaningful strength changes of approximately 5%, a finding of practical relevance to coaches who may confidently incorporate the test to measure single leg strength, asymmetry and rehabilitation progression in athletes.

Methodology was further substantiated with a novel investigation of the validity and reliability of measures of barbell displacement. Barbell velocity is a variable of practical importance when comparing resistance training exercises, the calculation of which is dependent upon accurate displacement data (38, 138, 226, 293). The next project was a validation of kinematic methods of tracking barbell displacement in heavily loaded back squats. Using the 7th cervical vertebra (C7) as a representation of barbell centre, the displacement of this marker was compared to the displacement of barbell ends and a linear position transducer attached to the barbell. This investigation offered unique insight regarding the influence of
barbell load, the attachment site of barbell displacement tracking and the deformation characteristics of a heavily loaded barbell during squat performance. It was determined that calculations of barbell displacement can be overestimated as the barbell tracking position moves laterally. Further, increases in barbell load can exacerbate displacement due to the bar whip present in flexible barbell design. It is recommended that coaches incorporating barbell velocity as a means of monitoring resistance training chose the centre of the barbell for measurement of displacement to maximise reliability. This methodology was incorporated in the determination of barbell displacement in subsequent laboratory analyses.

An essential thesis intention was to determine the force applications and movement patterns of the squat and step-up. In order to compare and contrast the underlying mechanics it was important to determine key kinetic and kinematic variables. Despite long practical implementation and research investigation, seldom has reliability of kinetics and kinematics been reported for heavy back squats, particularly in well-trained participants (38, 230). Therefore, it was important to first establish the rigor of the laboratory testing protocol assessing biomechanical variables in the squat and step-up. This was presented in Chapters Five to Eight and provided an indication of stable performance of multiple maximal effort squat and step-up repetitions, providing confidence in future key comparisons. Utilising inground force plates and three-dimensional motion analysis, well-trained, participants highly familiar with the movements, performed a series of squats and step-ups at 70 to 90% of 1RM. Concentric variables such as barbell displacement, knee flexion angle at the commencement of the concentric phase and peak and mean GRF were found reliable. These variables were incorporated in subsequent discussion comparing the two exercises. Particular practical importance was the reliability in left and right GRF in both the squat and the step-up. With increasing access to field based bilateral force plates, routine assessment of bilateral asymmetry may be interpreted with confidence.

With methodological approaches established, the kinetic and kinematic variables underlying performance of the squat and step-up were compared. Critically, Chapter Nine demonstrated higher peak and average concentric GRF per leg for the step-up compared to the squat. Total concentric impulse was also higher for the step-up, however the comparison was unclear at 90% 1RM. This may have been attributed to the longer concentric duration of the squat allowing a greater duration of maximal force. Barbell velocity is a result of the propulsive
force. The squat was faster than the step-up with large differences between exercises at all loads. At a comparable relative intensity, the squat was performed substantially faster. Furthermore, across the 70% to 90% 1RM load range, the squat demonstrated a larger spread in velocity which may present practical implications for coaches utilising velocity-based training. The differences in average concentric velocity were unclear. Underlying the importance of these findings were the well-trained capacity of the participants and magnitude of external load. How these differences in fundamental kinetic and kinematic variables manifest in an applied training environment were subsequently investigated.

Concluding the analysis of the effect of unilateral or bilateral resistance training on the development of lower body strength, and the resulting transfer to athletic performance, a training study was implemented. Critical insight regarding the development of lower body strength using either squat or step-up and the transfer of strength to sprint acceleration and COD capacity was presented. There were several key methodological components of this study: a 6-week pre-study phase incorporating familiarisation, reliability and baseline testing; an 8-week training intervention with two groups stratified by training age and relative 1RM squat; a parallel comparison group; mature subjects with an average five-year training experience; no supplementary lower body strength training or plyometric training; and a 3-week maintenance phase. Presented in Chapter Ten, meaningful improvements in lower body strength were achieved using either step-up or squat, and importantly, the strength developed could be expressed in the 1RM strength testing of the non-trained variant (ie, step-up training improved 1RM squat and vice versa). This has substantial practical application as coaches may be confident in incorporating unilateral resistance training for the development or maintenance of lower body strength using the step-up where the incorporation of the squat may be prohibitive (such as through injury, the training environment or training variation).

The investigation was expanded to assess the influence on sprint acceleration and change of direction (COD) performance. It was revealed that whilst both the squat and step-up groups demonstrated a small ES improvement in 20m sprint acceleration neither was superior in transfer to speed. This finding supported the importance of strength on sprint acceleration performance. However, of interest was the difference between the two groups with respect to COD. Whilst both groups improved COD, the magnitude of adaptation was less for the unilateral group than the bilateral group. Given the similar improvements in
strength and sprint acceleration, it was speculated that different COD adaptations were influenced by concentric and eccentric differences between the two resistance exercises, rather than the unilateral or bilateral nature of each. The first component of COD is a breaking force to arrest momentum in the initial direction (353, 518). This breaking force requires eccentric contractions, a stimulus that was absent in the performance of the step-up exercise but present in the squat. It was perhaps this stimulus that was the source of difference between the adaptation in COD between the groups, a theory that requires further investigation. This study highlights the importance of training targeting the underlying physiological stimulus for adaptation and not the exercise selected on the appearance of the target performance. Whilst the step-up exercise produced strength and sprint improvements, practitioners using the step-up may need to consider additional eccentric exercise to facilitate improvements in COD.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Based on the results of this thesis, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Maximal unilateral strength can be reliably assessed with the 1RM step-up exercise after four familiarisation sessions in trained, yet unfamiliar, athletes (Chapter Three).
2. Barbell load and location of barbell displacement measurement systems can influence displacement values. Attachment points should be centralised as much as practically possible, particularly with respect to heavy barbell loads which can exaggerate displacement due to barbell whip (Chapter Four).
3. High single leg GRF is generated during the step-up. These forces are moderately higher than GRF through each leg in the squat. This demonstrates a comparable level of strength stimulus of the step-up to squat and its capacity for strength development (Chapter Nine).
4. The development and transfer of maximal strength can be achieved using the squat or step-up. This strength can be exhibited in the non-trained variation (Chapter Ten).
5. Adaptations from maximal strength training using bilateral or unilateral resistance training positively transfer to sprint acceleration (Chapter Eleven).
6. Despite similar transfer of lower body strength, the underlying neuromuscular mechanism of the strength training stimulus is critical. This was realised in different magnitudes of COD improvement between the squat and step-up groups. These findings further highlight that the adaptation and transfer of strength is dependent upon
the underlying physiological stimulus (e.g. eccentric versus concentric) and not the outward appearance of the exercise (Chapter Eleven).

**PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS**

A number of practical applications from this thesis include:

1. The 1RM step-up exercise is a reliable testing tool, capable of detecting change in performance. Coaches working with athletes can incorporate this exercise as part of their periodised resistance training plan, utilising the exercise for both training and assessment. The unilateral nature of the test permits detection of lower limb asymmetry. Regular incorporation may assist coaches monitor asymmetry and regulate lower limb rehabilitation plans.

2. Practitioners of velocity-based training or researchers assessing barbell kinematics in heavily loaded back squats are encouraged to centralise the marker tracking position to minimise the influence of barbell whip and load which can lead to overestimations of barbell displacement, and subsequent velocity.

3. Coaches using force as a measure of performance can be confident in the reliability of individual leg peak and mean concentric GRF captured bilaterally in both squats and step-ups.

4. Stable performance and measurement of kinetic variables in multiple sets of maximal effort squat and step-up can be reliably obtained. In the practical training environment, provided adequate rest (minimum three minutes) coaches with high athlete to force plate ratios can rotate athletes through a testing station capturing ground reaction force effectively with minimal disruption to training.

5. The step-up exercise can be effectively used to improve lower body strength and maintain strength during periods where bilateral resistance training may be problematic, such as through injury or environmental constraints.

6. Both squat and step-up resistance training transfer to improved maximal lower body strength and sprint acceleration.

7. A three-week period of one strength session per week is sufficient to maintain strength, using squat or step-up. However, the effects on the magnitude of change in speed was unclear due to individual variation in responses. Practitioners are encouraged to monitor strength and speed for meaningful differences in adaptation to determine the minimum required dose for identified athletes.
8. Coaches are encouraged to program based on the underlying physiological stimulus that drives adaptation and not the outward appearance of the target performance.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

Findings of this thesis have provided insight into specificity of resistance training and the transfer of adaptation to athletic performance. However, the literature review and thesis results suggest further research opportunities:

**EMG analysis between unilateral and bilateral resistance training:** In Chapter Nine, the kinetics and kinematics of the squat and step-up were compared. Whilst EMG investigations of the squat have been performed (93, 108, 358, 576), information regarding contraction patterns of the step-up as utilised in athletic resistance training is limited (504), particularly in well-trained participants using heavy loads. Unilateral exercises such as forward step, lateral step and lunge or split squat variations have been investigated from a rehabilitation perspective performed with no or very low external resistance (22, 179, 185, 236). Knowledge of the motor unit recruitment patterns of unilateral resistance exercise during heavy load may benefit rehabilitation progressions and sport specific training. This may be addressed using a similar research design to Chapter Nine incorporating electromyography of prime movers and stabilisers, such as adductor longus.

**EMG analysis of change of direction performance and relationship to single leg training:** Differences in the magnitude of improvement in COD between squat and step-up training were observed. It was speculated that the difference in transfer was due to the eccentric component of the squat rather than the differences in bilateral or unilateral resistance training. The magnitude of breaking force in COD has been detailed (515, 516, 518), and little has been reported regarding contraction mechanisms of COD (517), in particular their resemblance to resistance training. Contraction specificity is an important principle of resistance training. Future studies may examine the transfer of contraction type between resistance training and the athletic task to facilitate the design of more effective resistance training programs. Research design could utilise force plate and EMG capture during a series of pre-planned COD movements and compare to unilateral resistance training EMG and force plate information as well as individual muscle actions.
Unilateral and bilateral resistance training and the transfer to jumping: Sprinting and COD were the selected performance tasks in this thesis due to their familiarity to the participants. Unilateral jumping is a prominent athletic task and whilst research has shown strong relationships between bilateral resistance training and counter movement jumps (373, 568, 569), comparison of unilateral resistance training has been seldom performed, particularly in well-trained participants. Future research may investigate the relationship between unilateral resistance training and unilateral jump performance. Research design could incorporate two groups, familiarised in both unilateral and bilateral resistance training and bilateral and unilateral jump performance. Each group could be stratified according to jump performance and training age to minimise the confounding influences of jumping ability and principle of diminished returns.

The effect of unilateral resistance training on muscle hypertrophy: An important adaptation of resistance training in athletic populations is the increase or maintenance of muscle mass (15, 223). Bilateral resistance training exercises have a well-documented benefit in muscle hypertrophy and maintenance (85, 254). Unilateral exercise has predominantly investigated with an emphasis on cross-education and is thus less well researched from a hypertrophy perspective (64, 562). Furthermore, study design often utilises single joint exercises foreign to elite training programs or untrained participants (64, 562). Whilst the results of this thesis demonstrated positive improvements in muscle strength, differences in lean tissue changes during the training study were not reported. Future research may incorporate a similar design to Chapter 10 and incorporate lower body lean tissue assessments (DEXA scan).
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INFORMATION LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS AND INFORMED CONSENT FORMS
This study has been approved by the Edith Cowan University Human Research Ethics Committee.

Project Title

The relationship between bilateral and unilateral resistance training exercises to measures of functional athletic performance.

Purpose

Resistance training is a fundamental component of rugby union player development. Strength and conditioning coaches need to implement programs based on sound scientific practice. The relationships between bilateral and unilateral resistance training and athletic tasks such as jumping, sprinting and changing direction requires in-depth analysis. The purpose of this research is to discover the relationships and between bilateral and unilateral resistance training exercises and athletic movements such as jumping, sprinting and changing direction capability.

Testing Procedures

As a participant in this investigation, all assessments will be conducted at Edith Cowan University Joondalup campus. It is important to note that all of these tests are no more strenuous than a typical training session. You will be thoroughly instructed on the correct technique and procedure prior to testing, complete adequate warm-up and cool down procedures, be provided adequate hydration and nutrition and be supervised by certified professionals during all testing sessions.

• Body Composition
  o Height will be determined with a wall-mounted stadiometer to the nearest millimetre.
  o Body mass will be measured on electronic scales to the nearest 100 grams.
  o Body composition will be assessed by a dual energy x-ray absorptiometry (DEXA), a test that involves lying still on a platform for approximately seven minutes.

• Power
  o Jumping Exercises: You will be required to perform double and single leg countermovement jumps (CMJ) and drop jumps (DJ). A CMJ requires an athlete to perform a rapid lower movement to a self-selected depth (usually 70-120 degrees of knee angle) and then jump, explosively, upwards as fast as possible with the feet leaving the floor. The DJ requires an athlete to step off a 40 cm box (double leg trials) or a 20cm box (single leg version), perform a rapid countermovement on contact with the ground and then jump, explosively, upwards as fast as possible with the feet leaving the floor. During these jump assessments, subjects will be required to hold a light (400g) fibreglass pole across their upper back, similar to a squat bar position.

• Strength:
One Repetition Maximum (1RM): this is a dynamic measure of maximal force production that determines the maximum amount of weight an individual can move in one effort. The exercises to be used here include the back squat and step-up.

Resistance assessment: you will be required to perform the back squat and step-up at sub-maximal loads under laboratory conditions.

- **Speed:**
  - Maximal speed: involves accelerating in a straight line as fast as possible over 10 metres or 30 metres.

- **Change of Direction:**
  - 50 Degree cut: subjects will accelerate as fast as possible over 2.5 metres and then change direction (50 degrees) to continue running an additional 2.5 metres. Tests need to be performed to the right and left and are pre-planned.

During jump, strength, sprint and change of direction tests, you will have markers placed on your upper and lower body to film your movements and detect muscle signals. These markers are external and stuck on your skin with double sided tape.

**Risks**

There are no inherent risks involved with this investigation. However, as with all physical testing, there is the risk of muscle pulls or strains. With lower body resistance exercises, there is a risk of injury to the lower back. Typically, an injury occurs as a result of poor movement technique. As such, all participants will be thoroughly instructed and familiarised with the correct technique by trained professionals. Furthermore, with any exercise test, there is the risk of delayed onset muscle soreness. This will be minimised by adequate warm-up and cool down procedures supervised by qualified strength and conditioning personnel. In addition, qualified personnel with first aid and CPR certification will be monitoring testing.

Because some of this testing involves exercise at your maximum ability, it is our duty of care to inform participants of the possible risks associated with such activity. Although very unusual in young or well trained individuals, there exists the possibility of certain physical changes during the test, which include: abnormal blood pressure, fainting, fast or slow heart rhythm, and in extremely rare instances, heart attack, stroke or death. Every effort to will be made to minimise these risks by

a) have the participant complete a medical questionnaire, and if deemed necessary, cleared by the participants local medical practitioner prior to reporting to testing, and

b) through careful observations of the participant during the exercise test.

Personnel trained in cardiopulmonary resuscitation will be present during the testing. It should be pointed out that although it is extremely unlikely that any of these ‘rare instances’ will occur during training, it is our duty of care to each participant to inform of all possible eventualities.

DXA scans are routine clinical tests but carry a small risk to the patient. DXA involves an exceedingly small dose of radiation (10-30µSv). A person on a return airline flight from Perth to
Sydney (of 8 hours duration) would be exposed to approximately 80 µSv. A typical chest–ray is 30 to 40 µSv. The number of scheduled scans in this study is well within the guidelines provided by the DXA manufacturer.

**Benefits**

Involvement in this investigation will provide you with multiple detailed body composition, speed, change of direction and lower body power assessment. This is highly valuable process that will allow for future training interventions specific to your needs. All study activities are free of charge to the participant.

**Confidentiality**

It is a critical aspect of this research that your results are kept confidential. A report will be provided to your employer regarding the outcomes of the study. You will be anonymous in this report, unless you indicate otherwise. If the results are published in a scientific journal, your identity will not be revealed. All records will be help in a locked filing cabinet in a private office, or on password protected computer hard drives for a period of 10 years. Video recording of the sessions will be conducted for exercise technique verification.

**Contacting the Investigators**

We are happy to answer any questions you may have at this time. If you have queries late, you can contact:

Brendyn Appleby: ( ), Brendyn.appleby@rugbywa.com.au
Professor Rob Newton: (6304 5106), r.newton@ecu.edu.au
Dr Prue Cormie: (6304 3418), p.cormie@ecu.edu.au

If you have concerns or complaints about the research project and wish to talk to an independent person, you may contact:

Research Ethics Officer
Human Research Ethics Officer
Edith Cowan University
270 Joondalup Drive
JOONDALUP WA, 6027
Phone: (08) 6304 2170
research.ethics@ecu.edu.au
Feedback

All participants will be provided with the test results as soon as they are available. A summary of the study results will be made available to all interested participants as soon as possible upon completion of the trial.

Voluntary Participation

Whether you decide to participate in this study or not is your decision and will not prejudice you in any way. If you do not decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue your involvement at any time.

Privacy Statement

The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and or use of your identified personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to a third party without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will be safeguarded at all times.
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

This study has been approved by the Edith Cowan University Human Research Ethics Committee.

Project Title: The relationship between bilateral and unilateral resistance training exercises to measures of functional athletic performance.

Researchers: Brendyn Appleby (Chief investigator):
/ brendy.appleby@rugbywa.com.au
Prof. Rob Newton (Supervisor)
6304 5106 / r.newton@ecu.edu.au
Dr Prue Cormie (Co-supervisor)
6304 3418 / p.cormie@ecu.edu.au

I confirm that (please tick):

☐ I have been provided with a copy of the INFORMATION LETTER explaining the research study,
☐ I have read and understood the information provided,
☐ I have been given the opportunity to ask questions and have had my questions answered satisfactorily,
☐ I am aware that if I have any additional questions, I can contact the research team,
☐ I understand that participation in the project will involve:
  ☐ The measurement of height and weight,
  ☐ An assessment of body composition by a DEXA scan,
  ☐ The performance of maximal effort in familiar field tests (vertical and drop jumps, 10m sprint accelerations and change of direction testing),
  ☐ The performance of maximal effort back squats and step-ups at 70-90% of 1RM.
☐ I understand that the information from all testing will be kept confidential and that my identity will not be disclosed without my consent,
☐ I understand that the information provided by me will only be used for the purposes of this research project and I understand how the information is to be used,
☐ I understand that I am free to withdraw from further participation at any time, without explanation or penalty,
☐ I am aware that the session will be video recorded for exercise technique verification,
☐ I freely agree to participate in the project.

Participant:

Name __________ Signature __________________ Date ____________

Researcher

Name __________ Signature __________________ Date ____________
INFORMATION LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

Project Title

An examination of the efficacy of bilateral and unilateral resistance training on maximum strength and power development and improvements in functional athletic performance.

Purpose

Resistance training is a fundamental component of rugby union player development. Strength and conditioning coaches need to implement programs based on sound scientific practice. The relationship of lower body resistance training to performance has long been established, yet the little research regarding transfer effect of double or single leg training to jumping, sprinting and change of direction performance. The purpose of this research is to determine the effect of a short-term concurrent resistance and speed/change of direction training program on the performance of jumping, sprinting and changing direction capability.

Testing Procedures

As a participant in this investigation, you will be required to perform the following assessments at Edith Cowan University. It is important to note that all of these tests are no more strenuous that a typical training session. You will be thoroughly instructed on the correct technique and procedure prior to testing, complete adequate warm-up and cool down procedures, be provided adequate hydration and nutrition and be supervised by certified professionals during all testing sessions.

• Body Composition
  o Height will be determined with a wall-mounted stadiometer to the nearest millimetre.
  o Body mass will be measures on electronic scales to the nearest 100 grams.
  o Body composition will be assessed by a dual energy x-ray absorptiometry (DEXA), a test that involves lying still on a platform for approximately seven minutes.

• Power
  o Jumping Exercises: You will be required to perform double and single leg countermovement jumps (CMJ) and drop jumps (DJ). A CMJ requires an athlete to perform a rapid lower movement to a self-selected depth (usually 70-120 degrees of knee angle) and then jump, explosively, upwards as fast as possible with the feet leaving the floor. The DJ requires an athlete to step off a 40 cm box (double leg trials) or a 20cm box (single leg version), perform a rapid countermovement on contact with the ground and then jump, explosively, upwards as fast as possible with the feet leaving the floor. During these jump assessments, subjects will be required to hold a light (400g) fibreglass pole across their upper back, similar to a squat bar position.

• Strength:
- One Repetition Maximum (1RM): this is a dynamic measure of maximal force production that determines the maximum amount of weight an individual can move in one effort. The exercises to be used here include the back squat and step-up.

- Speed:
  - Maximal speed: involves accelerating in a straight line as fast as possible over 10 metres or 30 metres.

- Change of Direction:
  - 50 Degree cut: subjects will accelerate as fast as possible over 2.5 metres and then change direction (50 degrees) to continue running an additional 2.5 metres. Tests need to be performed to the right and left and are pre-planned.

Training Procedures

As a participant in this investigation, you will be involved in a 16-week, fully supervised strength and conditioning program at RugbyWA, Mt Claremont. The purpose of this training program will be to improve your strength, power and speed through specific resistance and field training interventions. It is important to note that this training period will involve the periods of intense exercise, but no more strenuous than a typical training session. You will be thoroughly instructed on the correct technique of all exercises and procedures throughout each session. You will be provided adequate warm-up and cool down procedures, adequate hydration and be supervised by certified professionals during all sessions.

Risks

There are no inherent risks involved with this investigation. However, as with all physical training, there is the risk of muscle pulls or strains. As with lower body resistance exercises, there is a risk to the lower back. Typically, an injury occurs as a result of poor movement technique. As such, all participants will be thoroughly instructed and familiarised with the correct technique by trained professionals. Furthermore, with any exercise intervention, there is the risk of delayed onset muscle soreness. This will be minimised by adequate warm-up and cool down procedures supervised by qualified strength and conditioning personnel. In addition, qualified personnel with first aid and CPR certification will be monitoring testing. Standardised procedures for physical activity testing will be followed as previously performed in the RugbyWA training facility.

Because some of this training involves exercise at your maximum ability, it is our duty of care to inform participants of the possible risks associated with such activity. Although very unusual in young of well trained individuals, there exists the possibility of certain physical changes during the test, which include: abnormal blood pressure, fainting, fast or slow heart rhythm, and in extremely rare instances, heart attack, stroke or death. Every effort to will be made to minimise these risks by

a) have the participant complete a medical questionnaire, and if deemed necessary, cleared by the participants local medical practioner prior to reporting to testing, and

b) through careful observations of the participant during the exercise test.
Personnel trained in cardiopulmonary resuscitation will be present during the testing. It should be pointed out that although it is extremely unlikely that any of these ‘rare instances’ will occur during training, it is our duty of care to each participant to inform of all possible eventualities.

DXA scans are routine clinical tests but carry a small risk to the patient. DXA involves an exceedingly small dose of radiation (10-30µSv). A person on a return airline flight from Perth to Sydney (of 8 hours duration) would be exposed to approximately 80 µSv. A typical chest –ray is 30 to 40 µSv. The number of scheduled scans in this study is well within the guidelines provided by the DXA manufacturer.

**Benefits**

Involvement in this investigation will provide you with multiple detailed body composition, speed, change of direction and lower body power assessment. Additionally, your involvement in a structure training program in an elite training facility will improve your physical condition for the following season. This is highly valuable process that will allow for future training interventions specific to your needs. All study activities are free of charge to the participant.

**Confidentiality**

It is a critical aspect of this research that your results are kept confidential. A report will be provided to your employer regarding the outcomes of the study. You will be anonymous in this report, unless you indicate otherwise. If the results are published in a scientific journal, your identity will not be revealed. All records will be held in a locked filing cabinet in a private office, or on password protected computer hard drives for a period of 10 years.

**Contacting the Investigators**

We are happy to answer any questions you may have at this time. If you have queries late, you can contact:

Brendyn Appleby: ( ), Brendyn.appleby@rugbywa.com.au
Professor Rob Newton: (6304 5106), r.newton@ecu.edu.au
Dr Prue Cormie: (6304 3418), p.cormie@ecu.edu.au

If you have concerns or complaints about the research project and wish to talk to an independent person, you may contact:

Research Ethics Officer
Human Research Ethics Officer
Edith Cowan University
270 Joondalup Drive
JOONDALUP WA, 6027
Phone: (08) 6304 2170
research.ethics@ecu.edu.au
Feedback

All participants will be provided with the test results as soon as they are available. A summary of the study results will be made available to all interested participants as soon as possible upon completion of the trial.

Voluntary Participation

Whether you decide to participate in this study or not is your decision and will not prejudice you in any way. If you do not decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue your involvement at any time.

Privacy Statement

The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and or use of your identified personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to a third party without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will be safeguarded at all times.
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Project Title: An examination of the efficacy of bilateral and unilateral resistance training on maximum strength and power development and improvements in functional athletic performance.

Researchers: Brendyn Appleby (Chief investigator):
/ brendy.appleby@rugbywa.com.au

Prof. Rob Newton (Supervisor)
6304 5106 / r.newton@ecu.edu.au

Dr Prue Cormie (Co-supervisor)
6304 3418 / p.cormie@ecu.edu.au

I confirm that (please tick):

☐ I have been provided with a copy of the INFORMATION LETTER explaining the research study,
☒ I have read and understood the information provided,
☐ I have been given the opportunity to ask questions and have had my questions answered satisfactorily,
☐ I am aware that if I have any additional questions, I can contact the research team,
☐ I understand that participation in the project will involve:
  ▪ The measurement of height and weight,
  ▪ An assessment of body composition by a DEXA scan,
  ▪ The performance of maximal effort in familiar field tests (vertical and drop jumps, 10m sprint accelerations and change of direction testing),
  ▪ The performance of maximal effort back squats and step-ups at 70-90% of 1RM,
  ▪ Involvement in a 16-week training resistance and sprint training study, supervised by the primary investigator, performed at RugbyWA. During this phase, I will be required to attend to training sessions each week where I will be asked to perform a variety of sub-maximal and maximal physical exertions, as would be performed in any resistance and fitness program.

☐ I understand that the information from all testing will be kept confidential and that my identity will not be disclosed without my consent,
☐ I understand that the information provided by me will only be used for the purposes of this research project and I understand how the information is to be used,
☐ I understand that I am free to withdraw from further participation at any time, without explanation or penalty,
☐ I freely agree to participate in the project.

Participant:

Name __________ Signature ____________________ Date ____________

Researcher

Name __________ Signature ____________________ Date ____________
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