



CRITERIA FOR STANDARDIZING AND MONITORING TRAINING LOADS BASED ON FITNESS AEROBICS EXERCISES

Shaxriddinova Laylo Nurxonovna

Doctor of philosophy (PhD) in pedagogical sciences, acting professor of the Department of "Types of Sports Activities" at Faculty of Arts and Sports at Navoi State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the criteria for standardizing and monitoring training loads based on fitness aerobics exercises. In contemporary physical education and health-oriented training, fitness aerobics occupies an important place due to its accessibility, emotional attractiveness, and complex influence on the functional systems of the body. However, the effectiveness of such training largely depends on the correct regulation of load parameters and the continuous control of participants' physical and functional state. The study analyzes the theoretical foundations of load standardization in fitness aerobics and clarifies the main criteria used for monitoring training effects. Special attention is given to the relationship between exercise intensity, duration, frequency, movement complexity, heart rate response, fatigue level, and recovery dynamics. The findings show that the scientific organization of training loads based on objective and subjective monitoring indicators improves functional preparedness, reduces the risk of overstrain, and increases the health-promoting effect of fitness aerobics programs.

KEYWORDS: Fitness aerobics, training load, standardization, monitoring, heart rate, functional preparedness, fatigue, exercise intensity, recovery, methodological criteria.

INTRODUCTION

In modern systems of physical education and health-oriented exercise, fitness aerobics has become one of the most popular and effective forms of motor activity. Its wide use is explained by the combination of cyclic and acyclic movements, musical rhythm, emotional stimulation, and the possibility of adapting exercises to the age, health condition, and physical preparedness of participants. Fitness aerobics contributes to the development of endurance, coordination, flexibility, rhythmic ability, and muscular tone, while also supporting psychological well-being and motivation for regular exercise. At the same time, the positive effects of fitness aerobics do not arise automatically. They depend directly on how training loads are organized, standardized, and monitored throughout the training process.

The problem of training load regulation is especially important because fitness aerobics usually includes dynamic combinations performed in continuous or interval mode, often with changing tempo, amplitude, and coordination requirements. If the load is insufficient, the training effect remains weak. If it is excessive, fatigue accumulates, recovery slows down, and the risk of functional overstrain increases. Therefore, the issue of establishing reliable criteria for standardizing and monitoring training loads becomes a central methodological task. In this context, standardization means the scientifically justified regulation of load volume, intensity, duration, and complexity in accordance with the goals of training and the characteristics of

participants, while monitoring refers to the ongoing assessment of the organism's response to these loads.

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze the main criteria for standardizing and monitoring training loads based on fitness aerobics exercises and to substantiate their significance for improving training effectiveness and safety.

The study is based on theoretical analysis of scientific and methodological literature in the fields of physical education, sports training theory, exercise physiology, and fitness aerobics methodology. A systemic approach was used to interpret training load as an integrated pedagogical and physiological phenomenon that includes external and internal parameters. The comparative method made it possible to examine different criteria for load assessment and determine their methodological value in the context of fitness aerobics. Conceptual analysis was applied to clarify the relationship between exercise content, load dosage, functional reaction, and training outcome.

Training load in this study is understood as the total effect of physical exercises on the body, determined by the volume, intensity, density, complexity, and duration of muscular work. Monitoring is interpreted as a continuous process of collecting and analyzing indicators that reflect the adequacy of the applied load in relation to the participant's functional state and training objectives.

The analysis shows that the standardization of training loads in fitness aerobics should be based on a combination of objective and subjective criteria. One of the most significant objective indicators is exercise intensity. In fitness aerobics, intensity is expressed through movement tempo, the amplitude of actions, the number of repetitions, the continuity of combinations, and the use of additional resistance or step platforms. Since intensity directly influences cardiovascular and respiratory responses, it is considered one of the central criteria for regulating load. However, intensity should not be evaluated in isolation. It becomes meaningful only in relation to the participant's age, preparedness, and health condition.

Another key criterion is the duration of exercise performance. In fitness aerobics, the total duration of the session, the length of the main part, and the time spent performing continuous combinations all affect the training result. The same intensity may be well tolerated during a short segment but become excessive if maintained for too long. Therefore, duration serves as an important variable in the standardization of training loads. In beginners, shorter work intervals with moderate tempo are recommended, whereas in more trained groups longer aerobic blocks may be used to improve endurance and functional stability.

The volume of load is also essential. In practical terms, this is reflected in the total amount of motor activity performed during a session, including the number of exercises, combinations, repetitions, and transitions. In fitness aerobics, high volume with moderate intensity can support general endurance and calorie expenditure, while lower volume with higher intensity may target cardiovascular adaptation or muscular toning. Thus, load volume should be correlated with the training goal and adjusted progressively.

Monitoring training loads in fitness aerobics is impossible without evaluating heart rate. Heart rate remains one of the most informative criteria for assessing the body's response to dynamic rhythmic exercise. It reflects the functional strain placed on the cardiovascular system and helps determine whether the training zone is adequate. Moderate aerobic work usually corresponds to a heart rate range that supports endurance development without excessive

fatigue. If the heart rate rises too sharply or remains elevated for too long after exercise, this may indicate that the load exceeds the optimal level. Therefore, heart rate monitoring during and after training sessions provides a practical and reliable basis for controlling load adequacy. Fatigue level is another important monitoring criterion. It may be assessed through visible changes in movement coordination, technique deterioration, shortness of breath, facial expression, or decreased responsiveness to verbal cues. In addition to external observation, subjective feelings of exertion are also important. The participant's perception of difficulty, heaviness, muscle tension, and recovery speed provides valuable information about the individual effect of the load. This means that subjective self-assessment should complement objective indicators such as heart rate and exercise duration.

Recovery dynamics serve as a further criterion for monitoring load. The speed at which breathing, pulse, coordination, and general well-being return to normal after exercise indicates the degree of adaptation to the given workload. Fast recovery suggests adequate load tolerance, while prolonged fatigue or delayed normalization may signal excessive strain. In this sense, recovery is not merely an outcome but also a diagnostic indicator of training quality. In fitness aerobics methodology, this criterion is especially useful because classes are often repeated several times per week, and the accumulation of unrecovered fatigue can reduce effectiveness. Movement complexity is an important criterion in standardizing fitness aerobics loads. Multi-step combinations, turns, and asymmetrical movements increase both motor and cognitive demands. For beginners, excessive complexity may cause early fatigue even when intensity is moderate, so complexity should rise gradually as skills improve.

Session density is also significant. It reflects the balance between active exercise time and rest or transition periods. Higher density increases training effect but requires better preparedness and recovery capacity, while lower density is more suitable for less trained participants.

Training load in fitness aerobics should not be regulated by only one indicator. Parameters such as heart rate or session duration alone cannot fully show load adequacy. More accurate control is achieved by combining intensity, duration, volume, density, movement complexity, fatigue signs, heart rate response, and recovery rate. This integrated approach makes load standardization more precise and better adapted to individual differences.

This is especially important because fitness aerobics includes rhythmic, coordination-based, endurance, and strength-oriented exercises within one session. Therefore, the body's response must be assessed through both objective and subjective indicators. Effective monitoring also depends on the instructor's pedagogical competence, since even accurate data lose value if they are interpreted incorrectly.

In conclusion, the standardization and monitoring of fitness aerobics loads form the basis of safe and effective training. When loads are controlled scientifically, they improve endurance, coordination, muscular tone, and overall fitness while reducing the risk of overstrain and injury.

References

1. Ашмарин, Б. А. Теория и методика физического воспитания. М.: Просвещение, 1990.
2. Булгакова, Н. Ж. Оздоровительная аэробика: теория и методика. М.: Физическая культура, 2007.

3. Евсеев, Ю. И. Физическая культура. Ростов н/Д: Феникс, 2010.
4. Железняк, Ю. Д., Курамшин, Ю. Ф. Теория и методика обучения предмету “Физическая культура”. М.: Академия, 2004.
5. Лисицкая, Т. С. Аэробика. Теория и методика. М.: Федерация аэробики России, 2002.
6. Матвеев, Л. П. Теория и методика физической культуры. М.: Физкультура и спорт, 2008.
7. Платонов, В. Н. Система подготовки спортсменов в олимпийском спорте. Киев: Олимпийская литература, 2004.

