3-5-2020

Unilateral and bilateral lower-body resistance training does not transfer equally to sprint and change of direction performance

Brendyn B. Appleby
Edith Cowan University

Stuart J. Cormack

Robert U. Newton
Edith Cowan University

10.1519/JSC.0000000000003035
Appleby, B. B., Cormack, S. J., & Newton, R. U. (2020). Unilateral and bilateral lower-body resistance training does not transfer equally to sprint and change of direction performance. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*. 34(1) 54 - 64. Available here

ABSTRACT

Given maximal strength can be developed using bilateral or unilateral resistance training, the purpose of this study was to determine the magnitude of transfer of unilateral or bilateral resistance training to sprint and change of direction (COD) performance. Thirty-three trained participants (average training age = 5.4 ± 2.9 years; one repetition maximum (1RM) 90° squat = 177.6 ± 26.7 kg) completed either a Bilateral group (BIL, n = 13), Unilateral (UNI, n = 10), or Comparison (COM, n = 10) 18-week randomized controlled training design. Training involved two lower body, volume-load matched resistance sessions per week (6-8 sets x 4-8 reps at 45-88% 1RM), differing only in the prescription of a bilateral (squat) or unilateral (step-up) resistance exercise. Strength was assessed via 1RM squat and step-up, in addition to 20m sprint and a customized 50° COD test. The effect size statistic ± 90% confidence limit (ES ± CL) was calculated to examine the magnitude of difference within- and between-groups at each time point. BIL and UNI groups improved their trained and non-trained strength exercise with an unclear difference in adaptation of squat strength (ES = -0.34 + 0.55). Both 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 performance, bilateral resistance training had a greater transfer to COD performance than unilateral (between groups ES = 0.59 ± 0.64). Both bilateral and unilateral training improved maximal lower body strength and sprint acceleration. However, the BIL group demonstrated superior improvements in COD performance. This finding potentially highlights the importance of targeting the underlying physiological stimulus that drives adaptation and not exercise selection based on movement specificity of the target performance.

Keywords: resistance training, unilateral, change of direction, specificity, squat, step-up.

INTRODUCTION

Resistance training is common place for team sport athletes with the ultimate aim being transfer of heightened physical capacity to superior sporting performance (396). Bilateral resistance exercises such as squats, deadlifts and weightlifting derivatives have been demonstrated to improve strength and 5 to 40 meter speed performance, and thus incorporated in resistance training programs for elite athletes (115, 280, 490). However, given that key phases of athletic performance such as sprinting and change of direction (COD) occur on one leg, unilateral resistance training is perceived to offer greater movement specificity than bilateral exercises (389, 511).

Due to a single base of support, unilateral resistance exercises are considered sport specific (311, 388). The unstable nature has demonstrated altered neuromuscular activation levels in gluteal, hamstring and quadricep muscle groups compared to bilateral movements (157, 386). Several lower limb musculotendinous injuries are attributed to neuromuscular deficits which may be rectified by targeted unilateral training (549). Coupled with the resemblance of sporting movements, unilateral exercises are recommended for rehabilitation requiring enhanced neuromuscular coordination (63). However, the unstable base may also reduce the magnitude of external load required for strength development and subsequent improvement in sports performance in trained individuals (49).

Studies investigating the effect of unilateral versus bilateral resistance training, have reported similar strength outcomes, inferring equal benefit using either (389, 511). Investigating bilateral and unilateral resistance training involves several practical limitations making sound methodological design challenging and findings difficult to apply. These include the training age of subjects, inadequate familiarization and training period duration, unadjusted differences in pre-training performance, insufficient resistance training stimulus and supplemental exercise prescription (such as plyometrics) (197, 232, 511). For example, whilst improvements in unilateral basketball performance has been reported the adolescent age of subjects (average age 17yrs) this may have little application to mature athletes (232). Furthermore, isolating transfer of unilateral or bilateral resistance training is problematic where studies have incorporated additional generic lower body resistance training or unilateral and bilateral plyometrics (197, 232). Sufficient overload may also have been compromised by short periods of intervention (511), or magnitude of resistance training intensity via external loading (197, 232). Therefore, such constraints make it difficult to isolate effective resistance training strategies for athlete training programs.

Although inherently unstable on one foot the barbell step-up (step-up) is a unilateral exercise that utilizes considerable external loading capable of driving strength adaptation. Despite the initial bilateral base of support, the majority of the movement is entirely unilateral, unlike other "unilateral" exercises such as lunges, or rear foot elevated split squats, that are asymmetrical rather than purely unilateral. Whilst the step-up appears to exhibit sport specificity as an unstable strength development exercise, little research has examined its application to improvements to sprint acceleration and change of direction (COD) performance.

Therefore, the aim of this study was to examine the changes in sprint acceleration and COD ability as a result of resistance training utilizing bilateral (squat) only or unilateral (step-up) only. Our hypothesis is that unilateral training would be advantageous to COD performance. The outcomes of this investigation may provide insight regarding the role of movement specific, lower body resistance training for enhancing athletic performance.

METHODS

Experimental Approach to the Problem. This investigation involved a three-phase, three-arm, randomized controlled design training intervention incorporating a six-week familiarization phase, an eight-week training intervention and a three-week maintenance phase (Figure 11.1). Although trained, an extended familiarization phase was deemed necessary to eradicate potential learning effects from the unfamiliar unilateral strength exercise (67). This period also enabled all subjects to regularly practice the COD test. Baseline testing occurred at the conclusion of this familiarization period prior to the training intervention. The purpose of the maintenance phase was to observe changes as per an in-season phase common in competitive sporting environments. In addition to lower body maximal strength testing (evaluated by one repetition maximum (1RM) squat and step-up), subjects were assessed for 20m sprint acceleration and COD. Training was equated between experimental groups, with the only distinction being the volume-load prescription of squats (bilateral resistance training group

(BIL)) or step-ups (unilateral resistance training group (UNI)) during two lower body resistance training sessions per week. Training was conducted during a development academy rugby pre-season phase.



Figure 11.1 Schematic representation of study design.

*Subjects***.** A total of 49 male subjects were recruited from a state rugby union academy program and grade club competition for the three groups, of which 33 (age = 22.4 ± 4.1 yrs, height = 185.3 ± 5.5 cm, mass = 102.9 ± 12.0 kg) completed all required aspects of the testing and training for inclusion in the final analysis (one rugby related injury and 15 failed to complete sufficient training or testing sessions) (Table 11.1). Following baseline testing, balanced randomization procedures were used to stratify the subjects into the experimental arms at a ratio of 1:1, by resistance training experience (≤4 vs. >4 years) and relative maximal strength (≤1.5 vs. >1.5 squat 1RM to body mass ratio). Another group was allocated to a comparison group and was permitted to maintain normal activity and present for testing only. Resistance training compliance was set at 80% completion for the intervention phase (weeks 1-8 of training), and 66% for the maintenance phase (being two out of the three sessions). All subjects 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 subjects commenced free of injury or previous injury history which may have inhibited performance.

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

Group	Age years	Height cm	Mass kg	Squat 1RM:BM
Bilateral (n=13)	21.8 (3.3)	184.3 (5.9)	101.3 (12.8)	1.74 (0.24)
Unilateral (n=10)	23.1 (4.1)	186.3 (5.1)	104.6 (11.5)	1.80 (0.15)
Comparison (n=10)	24.6 (5.3)	183.2 (7.4)	93.1 (10.4)	1.71 (0.09)

Data presented as mean (SD) for all variables. **Age** = chronological age, **squat 1RM:BM** = 1 repetition maximum 90° back squat divided by participant body mass.

Training Programs. Training was performed during a typical sub-elite rugby pre-season phase (Table 11.2) (509). Skill sessions generally involved rugby specific training including physical contact. Upper body resistance training was individually prescribed for strength or hypertrophy, whilst all lower body resistance training sessions were volume-load matched for squats (BIL group) or step-ups (UNI group), following the format presented in Table 11.3. As the investigation was embedded in a preparation phase, speed and agility sessions were incorporated as part of a standard rugby preparation phase and was common to all subjects. The only training aspect to differ between the two groups was the allocation of lower body bilateral or unilateral resistance training, at individually prescribed loads as a percentage of 1RM obtained at baseline, mid-testing and post-testing (Table 11.4). The training stimulus was matched according to the following volume-load equation: *Volume load = number of sets x* *total number of repetitions x %1RM* (241) (Figure 11.2). All lower body sets were performed under the guidance of at least one coach to assist with load prescription, performance monitoring and technical execution. A linear position transducer (LPT) (GymAware PowerTool Version 5, Kinetic, Canberra) was used to record barbell velocity and provide feedback for every repetition during training only.

Table 11.2 Weekly training schedule

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday and Sunday
Strength (upper) Speed Skills	Skills Strength (lower)	Rest day	Strength (lower) Speed Skills	Conditioning Strength (upper)	Rest day

Strength = gym-based resistance training session; **Speed** = acceleration and change of direction; **Skills** = team rugby training, technical and tactical skill development; **Rest day** = no structured training; **Conditioning** = bike fitness sessions.

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

Exercise		Phase 2 Sets and Reps range	Phase 3 Sets and Reps range
Warm-up exercises	Split squat / lunge type movement (body weight)	3 x 5	3 x 5
	Landing (hops, jumps, in multiple directions etc.).	3 x 3	3 x 3
Intervention exercise	Squat or Step-up	(As per Table 11.4)	
Specific injury prevention exercises	Hamstring: Nordics (day 1); Glute-ham raises and Romanian Deadlift (day 2)	Day 1: 3 x 6-10; Day 2: 2 x 6-10	Day 1: 4 x 4-10; Day 2: 3 x 4-8
	Calf Raises	Double leg: 3 x 10-25	Single leg: 3 x 10-25

Table 11.4 The reps, sets and percentage 1RM loading for squats and step-ups for each session.

Phase	Week	Session	Reps per set	% 1RM							
				Set 1	Set 2	Set 3	Set 4	Set 5	Set 6	Set 7	Set 8
Phase 2	1	1	8	45	55	64	64	64	64	64	64
		2	8	45	55	64	64	68	68	55	55
	2	3	6	45	55	64	68	72	72	72	72
		4	6	45	55	64	68	72	72	60	60
	3	5	6	45	55	64	64	68	68	72	76
		6	6	45	55	64	67	70	70	60	60
	4	7	6	45	55	64	68	68	72	76	80
		8	6	45	55	68	72	62	62	-	-
Phase 3	5	9	4	45	55	65	72	76	76	Rest sets	
		10	4	45	55	65	72	76	81	72	72
	6	11	4	45	55	65	76	81	81	85	85
		12	4	45	55	65	72	72	72	67	67
	7	13	4	45	55	65	76	81	83	85	85
		14	4	45	55	65	76	81	85	67	67
	8	15	4	45	55	65	76	81	83	85	88
		16	No Training – Recovery for final testing session								
Phase 4	10	17	4	45	55	65	76	83	88	67	67
	11	18	4	45	55	65	76	83	88	67	67
	12	19	4	45	55	65	76	83	88	67	67

Note: for the Step-up, the reps are the total for the set, (i.e. 4 reps indicate 2 on each leg for a total of 4). Session 8 and 9 had two less sets, either side of the Mid-test session.



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 (241).

Testing Protocol. Subjects had a minimum of three days recovery between their last lower body strength session and physical assessment. Testing occurred at the same time of day on each occasion. Subjects commenced with a standardized 20-minute warm-up procedure that 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 and concluded with prescribed countermovement jumps. At the conclusion of the warm-up, all subjects completed field tests of 20m speed and COD capability followed by a 30-minute rest period prior to maximal dynamic strength testing (1RM squat and 1RM step-up tests) with a 20-minute rest between. To minimize the effects of fatigue and potentiation, subjects were randomly assigned to a speed first or COD first group of even numbers. Similarly, squat and step-up groups were randomly assigned to two even groups. Where a test could be performed on the left or right leg, the order was randomized. The testing order remained consistent for each subject at all test sessions. Verbal encouragement was provided by testers and subjects.

Data Acquisition and Analysis Procedures. Box height allocation. During the familiarization period, all subjects were assigned a box step-up height and barbell back squat depth. On each subject, a permanent marker was used to draw lines joining the greater trochanter to lateral tibial condyle, and lateral tibial condyle to the lateral malleolus of the right leg. Subjects were videoed from a lateral perspective performing barbell step-ups on a series of seven wooden boxes from 300mm to 420mm and analyzed via computer software (Kinovea, version 0.8.15). The subject was allocated the box height that resulted in a 90º knee angle at foot contact. Subjects were also filmed from a lateral perspective performing light barbell back squats in a power cage (York Fitness, Rocklea, Queensland, Australia) where a light elastic band was looped around the right-hand side of the frame, marked with centimeter graduations. Subjects performed a series of squats to the band, where their knee angle was measured with a goniometer and confirmed on video analysis. Subjects were allocated a squat depth via the rack centimeter markings that represented a knee angle flexion depth of 90º.

One Repetition Maximum Testing. Subjects performed a series of warm-up sets, four repetitions at 50% of 1RM, three repetitions at 70%, two repetitions at 80% and one repetition at 90%, each separated by three minutes rest (376). Following the warm-up, a series of maximal attempts were performed until a 1RM was obtained. All testing occurred inside a power rack with the safety bars raised to chest height for step-up testing. The step-up was deemed a fail if the subject could not extend the leg fully on the box without assistance from the uninvolved limb. A squat was deemed a fail if the subject did not descend to their target depth or achieve full extension without assistance. All repetitions were observed by an accredited strength coach (Australian Strength and Conditioning Association, Level 3) and at least one other coach for spotting and encouragement. The order of squat or step-up was randomized.

Change of Direction Testing. A customized single 50° COD test (586) was used which involved a 2.5m approach, a 50° COD and a 2.5m exit sprint, for a total distance of 5 meters (Figure 11.3). This test was designed to limit total sprint distance which can influence COD assessment; isolate performance of a single leg COD, a limitation of tests involving multiple changes of direction (e.g. Illinois, 1 more) (495); and replicate rugby movement patterns for implementation with the current cohort, as opposed to an out and back test (eg. 505, T-test). The 50° angle was selected based on previous research demonstrating reductions in sprint speed with a direction change of 40° or greater (586). Test-re-test reliability was established during familiarization testing (n=10, pooled left and right CV = 3.6%, ICC = 0.78). On an indoor surface, electronic timing gates formed a channel approximately 1.4m wide placed at the 0 and 5m marks with dual beam photo cells (Speedlight, Swift Performance Equipment, QLD, Australia) and an accuracy of 0.01s (the middle of the dual beam gate approximately 83cm from the ground). A minimum of three trials of each condition: a left foot COD and a right foot COD, with a two-minute rest was allowed. The choice of lead foot in the starting posture was self-selected by the subject to maximize their performance. Subjects self-initiated the run and were required to change direction by placing the correct pivot foot within a 50 x 50cm target square which was marked on the floor, the center of the box being 2.5m from each gate. A trial was invalid if the subject touched the perimeter of the taped box. A maximum of five trials were permitted in each direction with the fastest time used in the analysis. The use of the fastest trial for analysis is a process that has been previously used extensively (118, 349, 509)



Figure 11.3 Change of Direction course.

20m Sprint Acceleration Testing. The 20m test has been used extensively as a field and laboratory based assessment to measure sprint acceleration in a variety of team sports (378, 573). Sprint acceleration (20m) was assessed using dual-beam electronic timing gates (Speedlight, Swift Performance Equipment, QLD, Australia), on the same indoor surface as the COD testing. Gates were positioned at 0m, 5m, 10m and 20m with the splits from the fastest 20m used in the analysis. Subjects used a two-point, staggered start with the front foot placed at the zero line and started the sprint at their volition. Flying 15m time was calculated as the time to sprint from the 5m gate to the 20m gate (130). The 5m, 10m, 20m and Flying 15m sprint reliability has been previously established in our laboratory (CV%, ICC: 5m = 6.3%, 0.90; 10m = 5.2%, 0.98; 20m = 5.4%, 0.99; Flying 15m = 4.7%, 0.99) (132). As per COD testing the fastest trial was used for analysis (118, 349)

Statistical Analysis. Descriptive statistics (mean ± SD) for strength, speed and COD were calculated for each testing occasion. The difference within the Bilateral, Unilateral and Comparison groups compared to baseline, at End-training and End Maintenance phases was calculated using a customized Excel spreadsheet (287). Data were log transformed to reduce bias due to non-uniformity of error and analyzed using the effect size statistic (ES) ± 90% confidence limits (CL) (287). In addition, the difference in the change from baseline to week 9 and 12 between the treatment groups was also calculated. In all analyses, the outcome was adjusted to the mean of the stronger or faster group in each performance task (287). The magnitude of the effect in both analyses was classified according to the following scale: 0.2-0.6 as small; 0.6-1.2 as moderate; and 1.2-2.0 as large (38). In addition, the likelihood of the effect exceeding the smallest practically important difference (0.2) was represented using the following scale: >75% as "likely"; >95% as "very likely; and >99.5% as "almost certainly" (45). Effects less than 75% likely to exceed an ES of 0.2 were considered "trivial" and where there was a > 5% chance of the effect being simultaneously positive and negative, the effect was considered "unclear".

RESULTS

Descriptive strength information is presented in Table 11.5. The BIL and UNI groups exhibited meaningful improvements in 1RM strength (BIL 1RM squat ES = 0.79 ± 0.40, 99% very likely; UNI 1RM average step-up ES = 0.63 ± 0.17, 99.9% almost certainly). The difference in squat strength between the groups after the 8-week training intervention were unclear (-0.34 ± 0.55) with a small difference in 1RM step-up strength favoring the UNI group (ES = 0.41 ± 0.36, 84% likely). The changes in speed and COD within each group at week 9 and 12 compared to baseline are presented in Table 11.6. Both the BIL and UNI groups showed meaningful improvements in speed (BIL 5m ES = -0.60 ± 0.78; UNI 5m ES = -0.37 ± 0.41; BIL 20m = -0.38 ± 0.49; UNI 20m = -0.31 ± 0.31) and average COD (BIL ES = -0.97 ± 0.32; UNI ES = -0.50 ± 0.54) during the training period. The difference in the change from baseline to week 9 and week 12 between the BIL, UNI and COM groups is displayed in Tables 11.6-11.8. Whilst both the BIL and UNI exhibited small to moderate changes in 5m and 20m, the difference between the BIL and UNI groups was "unclear" (5m = 0.11 ± 0.88; 20m = 0.07 ± 0.58) (Table 6). When comparing the adaptation between the BIL and UNI groups, the BIL showed moderate improvement in COD capacity (ES = 0.72 ± 0.55, 94% likely) (Table 11.6). The changes in speed and change of direction are presented in Figure 11.4.

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.

	Bilateral (Squat treatment)		Unilateral (Step-up treatment)		Comparison	
	Squat (kg)	Step-up (kg)	Squat (kg)	Step-up (kg)	Squat (kg)	Step-up (kg)
Baseline	181 ± 26	122 ± 18	193 ± 28	135 ± 20	158 ± 14	104 ± 16
End Training (Week 9)	205 ± 30	132 ± 15	203 ± 28	148 ± 17	170 ± 22	105 ± 20
End Maintenance (Week 12)	198 ± 25	132 ± 14	205 ± 34	150 ± 22	171 ± 21	106 ± 17

1RM = one repetition maximum. **Step-up** = average of right and left leg 1RM strength.

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.

		Bilateral (Squat treatment) *[ES + 90%CI]*	Unilateral (Step-up treatment) *[ES + 90%CI]*	Comparison *[ES + 90%CI]*
5m Sprint	Weeks 1-8 (Training)	-0.60 ± 0.78 [a] (Moderate)	-0.37 ± 0.41 [a] (Small)	0.49 ± 0.53 [a] (Small
	Weeks 10-12 (Maintenance)	0.57 ± 0.68 [a] (Small)	-0.12 ± 0.63 (Unclear)	-0.62 ± 0.67 [a] (Moderate)
	Weeks 1-12	-0.13 ± 0.65 (Trivial)	-0.47 ± 0.51 [a] (Small)	-0.13 ± 0.51 (Unclear)
20m Sprint	Weeks 1-8 (Training)	-0.38 ± 0.49 (Small)	-0.31 ± 0.31 (Small)	0.54 ± 0.30 [b] (Small)
	Weeks 10-12 (Maintenance)	0.04 ± 0.48 (Unclear)	0.11 ± 0.48 (Unclear)	-0.06 ± 0.39 (Unclear)
	Weeks 1-12	-0.19 ± 0.34 (Trivial)	-0.23 ± 0.51 (Unclear)	0.48 ± 0.28 [a] (Small)
COD (average of left and right legs)	Weeks 1-8 (Training)	-0.97 ± 0.32 [c] (Moderate)	-0.50 ± 0.54 [a] (Small)	-0.22 ± 0.38 (Small)
	Weeks 10-12 (Maintenance)	0.30 ± 0.40 (Small)	-0.14 ± 0.68 (Unclear)	0.04 ± 0.30 (Unclear)
	Weeks 1-12	-0.90 ± 0.40 [b] (Moderate)	-0.54 ± 0.61 [a] (Small)	-0.18 ± 0.19 (Trivial)

ES ± 90% CI = effect size ± 90% confidence interval. ES classified according to: <0.2 as trivial; 0.2-0.59 as small; 0.6-1.19 as moderate; and 1.2-2.0 as large. Results were classified as "Unclear" when the 90% CI crossed substantially positive and negative values (0.20 and -0.20). %Likelihood of exceeding the smallest important ES of 0.2 and qualitative descriptor: a>75% as "likely"; b >95% as "very likely; and c>99.5% as "almost certainly". Baseline adjustments: comparisons were adjusted due to the Step-up being the stronger or faster group at baseline.

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

	5m sprint	20m sprint	COD (Average of left and right)
Weeks 1-8 (Training)	0.11 ± 0.88 Unclear	0.07 ± 0.58 Unclear	0.72 ± 0.55 [a] Moderate [B]
Weeks 10-12 (Maintenance)	-0.67 ± 0.94 [a] Moderate [U]	0.07 ± 0.65 Unclear	-0.46 ± 0.67 Unclear
Weeks 1-12	-0.45 ± 0.83 Unclear	-0.04 ± 0.59 Unclear	0.59 ± 0.64 [a] Small [B]

1RM = one repetition maximum. ES ± 90% CI = effect size ± 90% confidence interval. ES classified according to: <0.2 as trivial; 0.2-0.59 as small; 0.6-1.19 as moderate; and 1.2-2.0 as large. Results were classified as "Unclear" when the 90% CI crossed substantially positive and negative values (0.20 and -0.20). %Likelihood of exceeding the smallest important ES of 0.2 and qualitative descriptor: [a]>75% as "likely"; [b] >95% as "very likely; and [c]>99.5% as "almost certainly". Baseline adjustments: comparisons were adjusted due to the Step-up being the stronger or faster group at baseline. [B] = performance adaptation benefits Bilateral group; [U] = performance adaptation benefits Unilateral group.

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

	5m sprint	20m sprint	COD (Average of left and right)
Weeks 1-8 (Training)	0.91 ± 1.22 [a] Moderate [B]	1.04 ± 0.62 [b] Moderate [B]	-0.92 ± 0.99 [a] Moderate [B]
Weeks 10-12 (Maintenance)	-0.91 ± 1.14 [a] Moderate [B]	-0.06 ± 0.66 Unclear	0.81 ± 0.93 [a] Moderate [B]
Weeks 1-12	-0.05 ± 1.04 Unclear	0.78 ± 0.47 [b] Moderate [B]	-1.14 ± 0.80 [b] Moderate [B]

1RM = one repetition maximum. ES ± 90% CI = effect size ± 90% confidence interval. ES classified according to: <0.2 as trivial; 0.2-0.59 as small; 0.6-1.19 as moderate; and 1.2-2.0 as large. Results were classified as "Unclear" when the 90% CI crossed substantially positive and negative values (0.20 and -0.20). %Likelihood of exceeding the smallest important ES of 0.2 and qualitative descriptor: [a]>75% as "likely"; [b] >95% as "very likely; and [c]>99.5% as "almost certainly". Baseline adjustments: comparisons were adjusted due to the Step-up being the stronger or faster group at baseline. [B] = performance adaptation benefits Bilateral group; [U] = performance adaptation benefits Unilateral group.

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

	5m sprint	20m sprint	COD (Average of left and right)
Weeks 1-8 (Training)	0.95 ± 0.63 [b] Moderate [U]	0.96 ± 0.43 [c] Moderate [U]	0.57 ± 0.1.34 Small [U]
Weeks 10-12 (Maintenance)	-0.36 ± 0.90 Unclear	-0.17 ± 0.60 Unclear	-0.57 ± 1.53 Small [U]
Weeks 1-12	0.54 ± 0.71 [a] Small [U]	0.79 ± 0.55 [b] Moderate [U]	0.00 ± 1.36 Unclear

1RM = one repetition maximum. ES ± 90% CI = effect size ± 90% confidence interval. ES classified according to: <0.2 as trivial; 0.2-0.59 as small; 0.6-1.19 as moderate; and 1.2-2.0 as large. Results were classified as "Unclear" when the 90% CI crossed substantially positive and negative values (0.20 and -0.20). %Likelihood of exceeding the smallest important ES of 0.2 and qualitative descriptor: [a]>75% as "likely"; [b] >95% as "very likely; and [c]>99.5% as "almost certainly". Baseline adjustments: comparisons were adjusted due to the Step-up being the stronger or faster group at baseline. [B] = performance adaptation benefits Bilateral group; [U] = performance adaptation benefits Unilateral group.



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.

DISCUSSION

This investigation revealed that whilst lower body strength can be developed using unilateral or bilateral resistance exercise, a similar magnitude of adaptation transfers differently to acceleration and COD performance. Both groups displayed similar magnitudes of strength improvement as a result of bilateral or unilateral training and exhibited small improvements in 20m sprint time indicating the influence of maximal strength development to sprint acceleration capacity. However, a different mechanistic adaptation occurred in the BIL training group with superior transfer to COD performance.

Although strongly correlated (490), gains in lower body maximal strength do not guarantee improvements in sprint performance (160), and critical to improved performance is the transfer of newly gained strength (583). Both the BIL and UNI groups made small to moderate improvements in 5m and 20m sprint time during the eight-week training phase, coinciding with improvements in lower body strength. This finding is in support of previous short-term and meta-analysis studies that have demonstrated improvements in strength positively influencing short distance sprint performance (115, 490). Interestingly the difference between the two training groups in 5 and 20m speed was unclear due to the wide confidence interval that appears to be the function of varied individual adaptation. Initial sprint acceleration is greatly influenced by the production of peak ground reaction force and impulse for overcoming inertia (300, 317). In the current study, it may be that the underlying physiological stimulus of the squat and the step-up targeted adaptations essential for improved sprint acceleration capacity. It is likely that prescribed strength stimulus and subsequent improvements in lower body strength of each group enhanced force generation capacity required for sprint acceleration (319).

Given the large percentage of maximal speed that can be attained by team sport athletes over short distances, studies have reported “Flying” times to remove the initial acceleration phase (132, 582). Whilst 20m time decreased, the majority of improvement in both intervention groups was realized in the first 5m as demonstrated by the trivial change in flying 15 m time (Figure 5c). Sprinting in team sport athletes has been characterized by two phases – acceleration and maximal velocity (580), and maximum strength has a greater impact on the acceleration phase (160). Whilst 20m is classified as an acceleration phase, the results indicate that the current training program had a greater impact on the initial 5m acceleration component. However, the unclear results make it difficult to determine if bilateral training or unilateral training is a superior stimulus.

Whilst acceleration and COD have been demonstrated to be distinct qualities, both have also been shown to be positively related to maximal strength (114, 518). It could be postulated that the transfer of newly acquired maximal lower body strength to single leg athletic performance would be heightened by developing that strength unilaterally (381, 511). Both groups improved strength, speed, and COD ability. However, unilateral training was less effective than bilateral training for improving COD performance (COD average, Weeks 1-8, between groups ES: 0.72 ± 0.55, 94% very likely). The difference in COD capacity between the two groups is an important finding that requires explanation. The ability to change direction first requires the athlete to arrest momentum in the original direction, before applying impulse in a new direction (273, 518). As initial steps in a sprint start are primarily concentric in nature, this may explain the similar benefit of the squat and the step-up training (404). However, the ability of an athlete to tolerate eccentric load is an essential neuromuscular capacity for COD performance (515, 518).

Although speculative given the role of eccentric strength in COD performance (515, 518), the presence of an eccentric phase in the squat may have provided stimulus to this group that the step-up group did not. Both the back squat and step-up were performed with rapid and forceful triple extension (concentric phase). However, the step-up is essentially performed as a concentric-dominant action onto the box, with a controlled eccentric descent and a recovery between repetitions. By contrast, the squat is performed with an eccentric action immediately prior to the concentric extension. Given eccentric training specifically improves eccentric strength, it may be that it is the contraction specificity, and not the unilateral or bilateral nature of the exercise (i.e. joint angle, unilateral stability) that explains the difference in enhanced COD performance (418). Previous research has demonstrated relationships between eccentric or reactive strength, to COD performance (518, 586). Further biomechanical investigation comparing the squat and step-up and their relationship to COD may provide additional insight. The results of this study support training based on targeting the underlying neuromuscular demands and not the similarity in appearance to the target performance.

An important aspect of the training program design was the inclusion of a three-week maintenance phase typical of decreased training volume experienced by team sport athletes during periods of travel or frequent competition. It is known that strength and speed adaptations developed during a pre-season cannot be maintained without specific in-season maintenance (26, 279). A resistance training frequency of one session per week has been demonstrated sufficient to maintain lower body strength and 40m speed (224, 467). Within the current training study, the 20m speed results proved unclear for each group during this maintenance phase with both groups appearing to demonstrate individual variation in adaptation. The individual variation to one session per week over three weeks suggests coaches should monitor meaningful sprint performance changes in their athletes to determine the necessary individual dose for speed maintenance during periods of interrupted training. An additional speed training stimulus may be warranted for identified athletes.

It is important to consider the following limitations when interpreting the results. Complexity exists in equating strength training workloads between the BIL and UNI groups, an issue recognized in previous research in bilateral and unilateral resistance training, which may result in unequal training stimulus between the groups, especially given the lack of eccentric phase in the step-up which may have been beneficial for squat change of direction improvement (363, 511). A training complication may exist in the practical implications of the relative distribution of sprint training. During sprint acceleration training in a team sport setting, even a sprint focused on 20m, inherently contains a 0-5m acceleration component. Therefore, the 0-5m distance is trained with every sprint acceleration and training for 0-5m sprint acceleration may have been biased. Training studies with actively competitive subjects are also potentially confounded by the concurrent skill-based training. The current cohort were actively engaged in a pre-season period of high training load where variations in position specific training content may have influenced individual adaptations, particularly in rugby union with distinct position specific skill sets that were not accounted for within the allocation or analysis of the groups. This may have affected fatigue levels for training or the application of speed and agility distribution. Finally, as this program was prescribed to a training squad, it was impractical to blind subjects and coaches from the treatment intervention.

PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

The results of this study provide further insight regarding specificity when selecting resistance exercises and the transfer of improved capacity to performance. This study demonstrates that maximal force capacity developed in resistance training – regardless of bilateral or unilateral training parameters – may be transferred to sprint acceleration where the common requirement is the ability to produce initial high levels of force with greater reliance on concentric strength. However, for COD performance, coaches should select exercises that address the underlying neuromuscular requirements of the task and not just similarity in appearance to the target performance. In this regard increasing eccentric strength is a necessary strategy. This study has demonstrated that strength developed unilaterally (step-up) or bilaterally (squat) can transfer to sprint acceleration performance. Coaches may be confident incorporating unilateral or bilateral resistance exercises for strength development with positive implications for sprint acceleration. However, sprint acceleration and COD are distinct qualities and may require specific development and transfer strategies. Whilst the step-up exercise resulted in strength and speed benefits additional eccentric stimulus may be required to enhance training for COD ability. Resistance training program design for improved athletic performance should consider the underlying neuromuscular physiology of contraction type and overload as critical elements of exercise selection.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the subjects of the investigation for their commitment and dedication to the training program. Further gratitude is extended to the intern coaches who assisted with coaching supervision of training and field testing. Finally, to RugbyWA, and in particular Academy Coach, Dwayne Nestor, for supporting the training plan. Kinetic Australia kindly loaned (without compensation) four GymAware PowerTool units for the duration of the study. The Centre for Exercise and Sports Science Research (CESSR) at Edith Cowan University provided financial assistance and access to testing equipment. No further additional funding was sourced.

REFERENCES

26. Baker D. The Effects of an in-Season of Concurrent Training on the Maintenance of Maximal Strength and Power in Professional and College-Aged Rugby League Football Players. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 15: 172-177, 2001.

45. Batterham AM and Hopkins WG. Making Meaningful Inferences About Magnitudes. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance* 1: 50-57, 2006.

49. Behm D, Anderson, K and Curnew, RS. Muscle Force and Activation under Stable and Unstable Conditions. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 16: 416-422, 2002.

63. Beutler A, Cooper, LW, Kirkendall, DT and Garrett, WE. Electromyographic Analysis of Single-Leg Closed Chain Exercises: Implications for Rehabilitation after Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction. *Journal of Athletic Training* 37: 13-18, 2002.

67. Blazevich A, and Gill, ND. Reliability of Unfamiliar, Multijoint, Uni- and Bilateral Strength Tests: Effects of Load and Laterality. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 20: 226-230, 2006.

114. Comfort P, Bullock, N, and Pearson, S.J. A Comparison of Maximal Squat Strength and 5-, 10- and 20-Meter Sprint Times in Athletes and Recreationally Trained Men. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 26: 937-940, 2012.

115. Comfort P, Haigh, A, and Matthews, M.J. Are Changes in Maximal Squat Strength During Preseason Training Reflected in Changes in Sprint Performance in Rugby League Players? *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 26: 772-776, 2012.

118. Comfort P, Stewart A, Bloom L, and Clarkson B. Relationships between Strength, Sprint and Jump Performance in Well Trained Youth Soccer Players. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 2014.

130. Cormie P, McGuigan MR, and Newton RU. Influence of Strength on Magnitude and Mechanisms of Adaptation to Power Training. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 42: 1566-1581, 2010.

132. Cormie P MM, and Newton R.U. Adaptations in Athletic Performance after Ballistic Power Versus Strength Training. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 42: 1582-1598, 2010.

157. DeForest BA, Cantrell GS, and Schilling BK. Muscle Activity in Single-Vs. Double-Leg Squats. *International Journal of Exercise Science* 7: 302, 2014.

160. Delecluse C, Van Coppenolle, H., Willems, E., Van Leemputte, M., Diels, R. and Goris, M. . Influence of High-Resistance and High-Velocity Training on Sprint Performance. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 27: 1203-1209, 1995.

197. Fisher J and Wallin M. Unilateral Versus Bilateral Lower-Body Resistance and Plyometric Training for Change of Direction Speed. *Journal of Athletic Enhancement* 6: 2, 2014.

224. Gannon EA, Stokes KA, and Trewartha G. Strength and Power Development in Professional Rugby Union Players over a Training and Playing Season. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance* 11: 381-387, 2016.

232. Gonzalo-Skok O, Tous-Fajardo J, Suarez-Arrones L, Arjol-Serrano JL, Casajús JA, and Mendez-Villanueva A. Single-Leg Power Output and between-Limb Imbalances in Team-Sports Players: Unilateral Vs. Bilateral Combined Resistance Training. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance* 12: 106-114, 2016.

241. Haff G. Quantifying Workloads in Resistance Training: A Brief Review. *UK Strength and Conditioning Association* 19: 31-40, 2010.

273. Hewit J, Cronin J, Button C, and Hume P. Understanding Deceleration in Sport. *Strength and Conditioning Journal* 33: 47-52, 2011.

279. Hoffman JR, Fry, A.C., Howard, R., Maresh, C.M., and Kraemer, W.J. Strength, Speed and Endurance Changes During the Course of a Division I Basketball Season. *Journal of Applied Sport Science Research* 5: 144-149, 1991.

280. Hoffman JR, Ratamess, N.A., Klatt, M., Faigenbaum, A.D., Ross, R.E., Transhina, N.M., McCurley, R.C., Kang, J. and Kraemer, W.J. Comparison between Different Off-Season Resistance Training Programs in Division Iii American College Football Players. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 23: 11-19, 2009.

287. Hopkins WG. Spreadsheets for Analysis of Controlled Trials, with Adjustment for a Subject Characteristic. *Sportscience* 10: 46-50, 2006.

300. Hunter JP, Marshall, R.N., and McNair, P.J. Relationships between Ground Reaction Force Impulse and Kinematics of Sprint-Running Acceleration. *Journal of Applied Biomechanics* 21: 31-43, 2005.

311. Jones MT, Ambegaonkar JP, Nindl BC, Smith JA, and Headley SA. Effects of Unilateral and Bilateral Lower-Body Heavy Resistance Exercise on Muscle Activity and Testosterone Responses. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 26: 1094-1100, 2012.

317. Kawamori N, Nosaka K, and Newton RU. Relationships between Ground Reaction Impulse and Sprint Acceleration Performance in Team Sport Athletes. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 27: 568-573, 2013.

319. Kawamori NaN, R.U. Velocity Specificity of Resistance Training: Actual Movement Velocity Versus Intention to Move Explosively. *Strength and Conditioning Journal* 28: 86-91, 2006.

349. Lockie RG, Callaghan SJ, Berry SP, Cooke ER, Jordan CA, Luczo TM, and Jeffriess MD. Relationship between Unilateral Jumping Ability and Asymmetry on Multidirectional Speed in Team Sport Athletes. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 2014.

363. Makaruk H, Winchester, JB, Sadowski, J, Czaplicki, A and Sacewicz, T. Effects of Unilateral and Bilateral Plyometric Training on Power and Jumping Ability in Women. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 25: 3311-3318, 2011.

376. McBride JM LT, Dayne AM, and Haines TL, and Kirby TJ. Effect of Absolute and Relative Loading on Muscle Activity During Stable and Unstable Squatting. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance* 5: 177-183, 2010.

378. McBride JM, Triplett-McBride, T., Davie, A. and Newton, R.U. The Effect of Heavy- Vs Light-Load Jump Squats on the Development of Strength, Power and Speed. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 16: 75-82, 2002.

381. McCormick BT, Hannon JC, Newton M, Shultz B, Detling N, and Young WB. The Effects of Frontal- and Sagittal-Plane Plyometrics on Change-of-Direction Speed and Power in Adolescent Female Basketball Players. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance* 11, 2015.

386. McCurdy K, O'Kelley, E., Kutz, M., Langford, G., Ernest, J. and Torres, M. Comparison of Lower Extremity Emg between the 2-Leg Squat and Modified Single Leg Squat in Female Athletes. *Journal of Sport Rehabilitation* 19: 57-70, 2010.

388. McCurdy KaC, C. Unilateral Support Resistance Training Incorporating the Hip and Knee. *Strength and Conditioning Journal* 25: 45-51, 2003.

389. McCurdy KW, Langford, G.A., Doscher, M.W., Wiley, L.P. and Mallard, K.G. The Effects of Short-Term Unilateral and Bilateral Lower-Body Resistance Training on Measures of Strength and Power. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 19: 9-15, 2005.

396. McGuigan MR, Wright GA, and Fleck SJ. Strength Training for Athletes: Does It Really Help Sports Performance? *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance* 7: 2-5, 2012.

404. Mero A. Force-Time Characteristics and Running Velocity of Male Sprinters During the Acceleration Phase of Sprinting. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport* 59: 94-98, 1988.

418. Morrissey MC, Harman EA, and Johnson MJ. Resistance Training Modes: Specificity and Effectiveness. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 27: 648-660, 1995.

467. Ronnestad B, Nymark, BS and Raastad, T. Effects of in-Season Strength Maintenance Training Frequency in Professional Soccer Players. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 25: 2653-2660, 2011.

490. Seitz LB, Reyes A, Tran TT, de Villarreal ES, and Haff GG. Increases in Lower-Body Strength Transfer Positively to Sprint Performance: A Systematic Review with Meta-Analysis. *Sports Medicine* 44: 1693-1702, 2014.

495. Sheppard JM, Dawes JJ, Jeffreys I, Spiteri T, and Nimphius S. Broadening the View of Agility: A Scientific Review of the Literature. *Journal of Australian Strength and Conditioning* 22: 6-25, 2014.

509. Smart DJ and Gill ND. Effects of an Off-Season Conditioning Program on the Physical Characteristics of Adolescent Rugby Union Players. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 27: 708-717, 2013.

511. Speirs DE, Bennett M, Finn CV, and Turner AP. Unilateral Vs Bilateral Squat Training for Strength, Sprints and Agility in Academy Rugby Players. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 30: 386-392, 2015.

515. Spiteri T, Cochrane JL, Hart NH, Haff GG, and Nimphius S. Effect of Strength on Plant Foot Kinetics and Kinematics During a Change of Direction Task. *European Journal of Sport Science* 13: 646-652, 2013.

518. Spiteri T, Nimphius S, Hart NH, Specos C, Sheppard JM, and Newton RU. Contribution of Strength Characteristics to Change of Direction and Agility Performance in Female Basketball Athletes. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 28: 2415-2423, 2014.

549. Tyler TF, Nicholas SJ, Mullaney MJ, and McHugh MP. The Role of Hip Muscle Function in the Treatment of Patellofemoral Pain Syndrome. *American Journal of Sports Medicine* 34: 630-636, 2006.

573. Woolford SM, Polglaze, T., Rowsell, G. and Spencer, M. Field Testing Principles and Protocols, in: *Physiological Tests for Elite Athletes, 2e*. R Tanner, C Gore, eds.: Human Kinetics, 2000.

580. Young W, Benton, D., Duthie, G., and Pryor, J. Resistance Training for Short Sprints and Maximum-Speed Sprints. *Strength and Conditioning Journal* 23: 7-13, 2001.

582. Young W, Russell A, Burge P, Clarke A, Cormack S, and Stewart G. The Use of Sprint Tests for Assessment of Speed Qualities of Elite Australian Rules Footballers. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance* 3: 199-206, 2008.

583. Young WB. Transfer of Strength and Power Training to Sports Performance. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance* 1: 74-83, 2006.

586. Young WB, James, R. and Montgomery, I. Is Muscle Power Related to Running Speed with Changes of Direction? *Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness* 42: 282-288, 2002.