THE ROLE OF PEDAGOGICAL MONITORING IN MANAGING THE COMPREHENSIVE PREPARATION OF YOUNG TRACK AND FIELD ATHLETES IN HOT CLIMATES

Nuriddinov Axrorjon Bahodir o‘g‘li
Asia International University
Lecturer at the Department of Physical Education
E-mail: nuriddinovaxrorjonbahodirugli@oxu.uz

Abstract. This paper examines pedagogical monitoring as a means of connecting observation, assessment and coaching decisions in the comprehensive preparation of young track and field athletes in hot climates. A conceptual framework is proposed for integrating physical performance, technical execution, perceived effort, recovery and environmental information. The discussion draws on published consensus statements and training monitoring research. Particular attention is given to individual reference values, athlete feedback and the interpretation of performance under changing weather conditions. The proposed framework requires prospective evaluation; its contribution is a practical structure for educationally meaningful monitoring rather than an experimentally demonstrated improvement in performance.

Keywords: pedagogical monitoring, youth athletics, comprehensive preparation, hot climate, coaching decisions, training load, athlete feedback.

Introduction

Comprehensive preparation in youth athletics involves physical development, technical learning, psychological readiness and the acquisition of practical knowledge about training. These components should be considered together when evaluating progress. A faster running time alone does not show whether an athlete has improved movement control, understood pacing or recovered adequately. Youth development guidance emphasises the importance of maturation, appropriate training experiences and the broader context of the young athlete’s life [1].

Hot conditions add another interpretive challenge. The same session may impose different demands on different days, so performance comparisons require environmental context [3]. Pedagogical monitoring can help coaches explain such differences and select the next teaching task. The aim of this paper is to propose a monitoring structure that links individual observations to decisions about comprehensive preparation. The approach is a narrative synthesis and methodological proposal; no original participant data are reported.

Pedagogical monitoring as a management process

For this framework, pedagogical monitoring is defined as repeated, purposeful collection and interpretation of information used to adjust teaching and training. It extends beyond recording results because every observation should answer a coaching question. For example, a technical assessment asks which movement component needs attention, while a recovery check asks whether the planned learning task is appropriate that day.

The proposed management cycle comprises setting an objective, selecting relevant indicators, collecting observations, interpreting them and reviewing the resulting decision. A session record should therefore include both the observation and the action taken. Writing that an athlete appeared unusually fatigued is less useful than recording how the task was modified and whether technical execution subsequently improved. This makes monitoring part of the educational process rather than a separate administrative exercise.

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

Selecting indicators for comprehensive preparation

The distinction between external work and the athlete's internal response provides a useful starting point [2]. In the proposed record, running distance, repetitions and practice duration describe the work completed. Perceived effort and appropriately measured heart rate provide complementary information about the response. Neither category should replace direct observation of technical performance.

Technical monitoring can use a short, consistent checklist adapted to the event. A sprint coach might observe starting position and acceleration mechanics; a jumps coach might assess approach consistency and take-off organisation. The same observation criteria should be retained across comparable sessions. Psychological and educational observations can include willingness to participate, understanding of instructions and the ability to explain an agreed pacing strategy.

Environmental information should accompany the session record. Temperature alone does not fully describe heat exposure; humidity, solar radiation and airflow also matter [3]. Where suitable equipment is available, on-site wet-bulb globe temperature can support environmental assessment. Such measurements should inform established local safety procedures and should not be treated as a direct measurement of an individual athlete's body temperature.

Organisation of monitoring within training

A practical proposal is to organise observation at three points. Before training, the coach records the planned objective, relevant environmental conditions and a brief athlete report. During training, attention focuses on task execution, effort and any unexpected difficulty. After training, the coach records the completed work and the athlete's response, then notes what should be reconsidered at the next session.

Session rating of perceived exertion offers a simple way to summarise perceived session difficulty. In the established session-RPE approach, the session rating is multiplied by duration in minutes to express load in arbitrary units [4]. Young athletes need understandable instructions and familiarisation before such ratings can be interpreted consistently. The resulting number is a monitoring aid, not a clinical assessment or a universal safety threshold.

For example, an athlete may complete the planned repetitions but report greater difficulty and show less consistent technique than in comparable sessions. The proposed response is to discuss the experience, check contextual factors and reconsider the next task. The coach should avoid concluding from one observation that fitness has declined. Repeated observations under documented conditions provide a more defensible basis for interpretation.

Feedback and individual interpretation

The educational value of monitoring depends on how feedback is delivered. Athletes should learn to describe effort, identify technical difficulties and communicate concerns without fear of punishment. A brief discussion can connect the recorded information to a specific learning goal, such as maintaining approach rhythm or recognising when concentration deteriorates.

Individual records should be compared primarily with the athlete's own comparable observations. Group averages may describe the training group but should not dictate identical expectations. The proposed record also separates missing information from normal findings: an absent heart-rate reading is not evidence of an ordinary response. Coaches should retain uncertainty instead of filling gaps with assumptions.

Monitoring supports, but does not replace, appropriate health supervision. Guidance for exercising children stresses preparation, modification and observation in hot conditions [5]. Concerning symptoms

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

require cessation of activity and appropriate assessment according to the setting's emergency procedures. A satisfactory training score must never override an athlete's report of illness or distress.

Conclusion

Pedagogical monitoring can be organised as a continuous connection between assessment and coaching decisions. The proposed framework combines event-specific learning objectives with individual responses and environmental context. Its practical value lies in making decisions traceable and feedback understandable to young athletes. Future evaluation should examine feasibility, record completeness, coaching decisions and athlete outcomes before claims about effectiveness are made.

References

1. Bergeron, M. F., Mountjoy, M., Armstrong, N., et al. (2015). International Olympic Committee consensus statement on youth athletic development. British Journal of Sports Medicine, 49(13), 843–851.
2. Bourdon, P. C., Cardinale, M., Murray, A., et al. (2017). Monitoring athlete training loads: Consensus statement. International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance, 12(Suppl. 2), S2-161–S2-170.
3. Racinais, S., Alonso, J. M., Coutts, A. J., et al. (2015). Consensus recommendations on training and competing in the heat. British Journal of Sports Medicine, 49(18), 1164–1173.
4. Foster, C., Florhaug, J. A., Franklin, J., et al. (2001). A new approach to monitoring exercise training. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 15(1), 109–115.
5. American Academy of Pediatrics, Council on Sports Medicine and Fitness and Council on School Health. (2011). Climatic heat stress and exercising children and adolescents. Pediatrics, 128(3), e741–e747.

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.