Ijfans International Journal Of Food And Nutritional Sciences
ISSN PRINT 2319 1775 Online 2320 7876
Research Paper , Journal UGC CARE Listed (Group-I) Volume 10 , Issue 06, May 2021

Wearable Technology and Real-Time Monitoring of Training Load in Competitive Sports: A Study with Special Reference to Visakhapatnam

Dr. Bhaskar Ankem
Assistant Professor
Dr. B. R. Ambedkar University, Srikakulam, Andhra Pradesh, India
E-mail: bhaskar.ankem@gmail.com

Abstract

The integration of wearable sensing devices into the daily routines of competitive athletes has changed the way training is planned, delivered and reviewed. This paper examines the role of wearable technology in the real-time monitoring of training load among competitive athletes in Visakhapatnam, a fast-growing sporting centre on the eastern coast of Andhra Pradesh. A descriptive survey design was adopted and primary data were gathered from one hundred and fifty respondents, comprising one hundred and twenty competitive athletes and thirty coaches drawn from athletics, cricket, football, hockey, swimming and indigenous combat disciplines. A structured questionnaire built around a five-point Likert scale was used to capture patterns of device adoption and the perceived effectiveness of these devices in managing training load. Percentage analysis, mean, standard deviation and the chi-square test were employed to analyse the data. The findings reveal that the adoption of wearable devices among athletes in Visakhapatnam is moderate but rising, with heart-rate monitors, fitness bands and smartwatches being the most widely used. Respondents reported that real-time feedback helped them regulate intensity, recognise early signs of fatigue and reduce the risk of avoidable injury. High device cost, limited technical guidance and concerns about data accuracy emerged as the principal barriers. The study concludes that wearable technology holds considerable promise for evidence-based load management in regional sport and recommends greater institutional investment, structured coach education and locally relevant data interpretation support.

Keywords: Wearable technology, training load, real-time monitoring, competitive sports, athlete monitoring, Visakhapatnam, sports performance.

1. Introduction

Competitive sport has become increasingly dependent on accurate, timely and individualised information about the athlete. The margin separating success from failure at the elite level is often very small, and coaches today are expected to make decisions that are grounded in objective evidence rather than intuition alone. One of the most important areas in which such evidence is required is the management of training load, that is, the total physical and physiological stress placed on an athlete during practice and competition. When training load is managed well, the athlete adapts, improves and performs at the right moment. When it is managed poorly, the athlete may either fail to reach the required level of fitness or, more dangerously, fall into a state of accumulated fatigue, illness and injury.

Wearable technology has emerged as a practical and powerful tool for addressing this challenge. The term refers to a broad family of electronic devices worn on the body that continuously record physiological and movement-related information. These include heart-rate monitors, global positioning system units, accelerometers, fitness bands, smartwatches and specialised sensor garments. By collecting data on heart rate, distance covered, running speed, acceleration, sleep quality and recovery status, these devices allow both the athlete and the coach to observe what is happening to the body in real time and to respond before small problems become serious ones.

Training load is usually understood through two complementary perspectives. External load describes the physical work that the athlete performs, such as the distance run, the number of sprints completed or the number of high-intensity efforts. Internal load describes the biological response of the athlete to that work, captured through measures such as heart rate, heart-rate variability and the subjective rating of perceived exertion. The real value of wearable technology lies in its ability to record both kinds of information at the same time, thereby giving a complete picture of how hard the athlete is working and how the body is coping with that work.

In India, the conversation around athlete monitoring has gained momentum over the past decade. National institutes, professional leagues and private academies have begun to adopt sensor-based tools, and the price of consumer-grade devices has fallen to a point where individual athletes can afford them. Yet much of the published discussion remains centred on elite national programmes and metropolitan centres. The experience of athletes in regional sporting hubs, where resources are more limited but ambition is no less strong, has received far less attention. This gap is significant because the majority of competitive athletes in the country train and compete in precisely such settings.

Visakhapatnam, the largest city in Andhra Pradesh, offers a particularly suitable setting for this enquiry. The city has a strong and diverse sporting tradition, supported by university grounds, state-run stadia, swimming facilities and a growing number of private academies in cricket, football and athletics. Athletes from the city and its surrounding districts regularly compete at state and national level. As awareness of sports science spreads, a steadily increasing number of these athletes and their coaches have begun to experiment with wearable devices. Understanding how these tools are actually being used, and how useful the users believe them to be, is essential for guiding future investment and policy in the region.

The present study therefore sets out to document the adoption of wearable technology for real-time monitoring of training load among competitive athletes in Visakhapatnam and to assess how effective the users believe this technology to be in optimising training, preventing injury and enhancing performance. In doing so, the paper aims to contribute regionally grounded evidence to a field that has so far been dominated by studies of elite and metropolitan populations.

2. Review of Literature

The scientific monitoring of training load has a well-established foundation in the sports-science literature. Foster (1998) drew early attention to the relationship between training load and the overtraining syndrome and later proposed the session rating of perceived exertion as a simple yet robust method of quantifying internal load. This approach, which multiplies the perceived intensity of a session by its duration, remains widely used today precisely because it is inexpensive and easy to apply across many athletes at once.

Borresen and Lambert (2009) reviewed the quantification of training load and its relationship to the training response, emphasising that no single measure captures the full complexity of the athlete's adaptation. They argued that both internal and external indicators are necessary for a meaningful interpretation of load. This argument was later refined by Impellizzeri, Marcora and Coutts (2019), who revisited the internal–external load framework and stressed that external load is the stimulus while internal load is the response, with individual characteristics shaping the relationship between the two.

Halson (2014) provided an influential synthesis of methods for monitoring training load in order to understand fatigue, concluding that practical, athlete-friendly tools are more likely to be used consistently than complex laboratory procedures. The relevance of this observation for wearable technology is clear, since the appeal of such devices lies precisely in their convenience and their capacity to gather data without interrupting training.

The growth of satellite-based tracking has been documented extensively. Aughey (2011) reviewed the application of global positioning system technology to field sports and noted its value in quantifying movement demands, while Scott, Scott and Kelly (2016) examined the validity and reliability of such systems in team sport, cautioning that accuracy varies with sampling rate and the type of movement being measured. These studies underline an important theme in the literature, namely that the usefulness of any wearable device depends heavily on the quality and interpretation of the data it produces.

With regard to consumer technology, Düking and colleagues (2016) compared a range of commercially available wearables and observed wide variation in their accuracy, advising users to treat individual readings with appropriate caution while still recognising their value for tracking trends over time. Cardinale and Varley (2017) reviewed wearable training-monitoring technology and highlighted both its promise and its practical limitations, including data overload and the need for skilled interpretation.

Perhaps the most influential contribution to applied practice has come from Gabbett (2016), whose work on the training–injury prevention paradox demonstrated that appropriately high and well-managed training loads can actually protect athletes from injury, whereas sudden spikes in load increase the risk. This finding has done much to shift the purpose of monitoring from simple record-keeping towards active load management. Akenhead and Nassis (2016) explored how training load and player monitoring are implemented in high-level football and found a gap between the data that practitioners collect and the use they actually make of it. The international consensus statement coordinated by Bourdon and colleagues (2017) brought these threads together, offering practical guidance on the selection, application and interpretation of monitoring tools.

Taken together, the literature establishes that wearable technology can provide valuable insight into training load, that internal and external measures must be combined for sound interpretation, and that the human capacity to interpret and act on the data is as important as the data itself. What is less well represented in the literature is the experience of athletes in regional Indian settings, and it is this gap that the present study seeks to address.

3. Significance of the Study

The significance of this study rests on three considerations. First, it brings empirical attention to a regional sporting centre that has rarely been examined in the athlete-monitoring literature, thereby broadening the evidence base beyond elite and metropolitan populations. Second, it focuses on the lived experience of athletes and coaches rather than on laboratory validation alone, offering insight into how wearable devices are actually adopted and valued in everyday training. Third, the findings carry practical value for universities, state sports authorities, academies and individual athletes in Andhra Pradesh, since they identify both the perceived benefits of the technology and the obstacles that prevent its wider and more effective use. In this way the study aims to inform decisions about investment, training and policy that can improve the quality of athlete preparation in the region.

4. Objectives of the Study

In keeping with the focused scope of the enquiry, the study is built around the following two objectives:

1. To examine the extent and pattern of adoption of wearable technology for the real-time monitoring of training load among competitive athletes and coaches in Visakhapatnam.
2. To assess the perceived effectiveness of wearable technology in optimising training load, preventing injury and enhancing performance among competitive athletes in Visakhapatnam.

5. Hypotheses of the Study

To support the second objective, the following null hypotheses were formulated and tested:

H1: There is no significant association between the type of sport practised and the level of adoption of wearable technology among competitive athletes in Visakhapatnam.

H2: There is no significant difference in the perceived effectiveness of wearable technology between athletes who use such devices regularly and those who use them only occasionally.

6. Research Methodology

6.1 Research Design

The study adopted a descriptive survey design, which is appropriate for documenting existing patterns of behaviour, attitude and opinion within a defined population. Since the aim was to describe adoption and to assess perceived effectiveness rather than to manipulate variables under controlled conditions, the survey method was considered the most suitable approach.

6.2 Study Area

The study was conducted in Visakhapatnam, the largest city of Andhra Pradesh and an important centre of education and sport on the eastern coast of India. The city accommodates university sporting facilities, state-run stadia, swimming complexes and a number of private academies, and it draws competitive athletes from the surrounding districts. This concentration of sporting activity made it a fitting location for examining the adoption of wearable technology.

6.3 Population and Sample

The population of the study comprised competitive athletes and coaches active in Visakhapatnam at the time of data collection. A sample of one hundred and fifty respondents was selected, consisting of one hundred and twenty athletes and thirty coaches. The athletes represented a range of disciplines including athletics, cricket, football, hockey, swimming and indigenous combat sports, so that the sample reflected the diversity of sport in the city.

6.4 Sampling Technique

A stratified purposive sampling technique was employed. The population was first divided into strata on the basis of sport, and respondents were then purposively selected from each stratum on the condition that they competed at district level or above and had at least some exposure to wearable devices. This approach ensured that the sample was both varied and relevant to the research questions.

6.5 Tools for Data Collection

Primary data were gathered through a structured questionnaire developed by the researcher after a review of the relevant literature. The questionnaire was organised into three parts: the first recorded the demographic profile of the respondent, the second captured patterns of device ownership and use, and the third measured perceived effectiveness through a series of statements rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The instrument was reviewed by subject experts to establish content validity, and a pilot test was conducted to confirm clarity and internal consistency before full administration.

6.6 Statistical Techniques

The collected data were tabulated and analysed using percentage analysis to describe adoption patterns, mean and standard deviation to summarise perceived effectiveness, and the chi-square test to examine associations and differences in line with the stated hypotheses. A significance level of five per cent was adopted throughout.

7. Results and Discussion

7.1 Demographic Profile of Respondents

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the respondents. The sample was dominated by younger athletes, reflecting the age structure of competitive sport, and contained a healthy representation of both men and women as well as a meaningful share of experienced coaches.

Table 1 Demographic Profile of the Respondents (N = 150)

Variable	Category	No. (%)
Role	Athletes	120 (80.0)
	Coaches	30 (20.0)
Gender	Male	92 (61.3)

	Female	58 (38.7)
Age (years)	18 – 24	78 (52.0)
	25 – 30	46 (30.7)
	Above 30	26 (17.3)
Level of competition	District	64 (42.7)
	State	61 (40.7)
	National	25 (16.6)

As shown in the table, more than half of the respondents fell within the eighteen to twenty-four age group, and a substantial proportion competed at state and national level. This profile indicates that the sample was well suited to a study of competitive sport, since the respondents were both serious about performance and at a stage of their careers in which careful load management is particularly important.

7.2 Adoption and Usage of Wearable Technology (Objective 1)

The first objective concerned the extent and pattern of adoption of wearable technology. Table 2 summarises ownership and the frequency of use among the respondents.

Table 2 Ownership and Frequency of Use of Wearable Devices (N = 150)

Pattern of Use	No.	%
Own and use a wearable device regularly	69	46.0
Use a device occasionally	48	32.0
Aware of devices but do not use them	24	16.0
Unaware of such devices	9	6.0
Total	**150**	**100.0**

The data show that nearly half of the respondents used a wearable device regularly, while a further third used one occasionally. Taken together, this means that around four out of five respondents had practical experience of wearable technology, which represents a moderate but encouraging level of adoption for a regional centre. Only a very small minority were entirely unaware of such devices, suggesting that awareness is no longer the principal barrier; the challenge now lies in converting occasional users into consistent ones.

Table 3 sets out the specific types of devices used by the respondents who reported some experience with the technology.

Table 3 Types of Wearable Devices Used (multiple responses, n = 117)

Type of Device	Responses	%
Heart-rate monitor (chest / wrist)	88	75.2
Fitness band	81	69.2
Smartwatch with GPS	73	62.4
GPS / accelerometer vest	29	24.8
Sleep / recovery tracker	34	29.1

The pattern is clear. Heart-rate monitors, fitness bands and smartwatches, all of which are relatively affordable and easy to use, dominated the responses. Specialised sensor vests, which are costly and usually require institutional support, were used by only about a quarter of respondents. This distribution mirrors the economic reality of regional sport, where individual athletes gravitate towards consumer-grade devices that they can purchase and operate without external assistance.

7.3 Purposes for Which Devices Are Used

Respondents reported using wearable devices for several connected purposes. The most common were the monitoring of heart rate during training, the tracking of distance and speed, the observation of recovery and sleep, and the regulation of session intensity. A smaller group also used the data to maintain a structured training diary. These purposes correspond closely to the internal and external dimensions of training load discussed in the literature, indicating that, even at the regional level, athletes are intuitively engaging with the same concepts that underpin formal load-management theory.

7.4 Perceived Effectiveness of Wearable Technology (Objective 2)

The second objective concerned the perceived effectiveness of wearable technology. Respondents who had used such devices rated a series of statements on a five-point scale, where a higher mean score indicates stronger agreement. Table 4 reports the results.

Table 4 Perceived Effectiveness of Wearable Technology (n = 117)

Statement	Mean	SD
Real-time feedback helps me regulate training intensity	4.21	0.68
The device helps me recognise early signs of fatigue	4.08	0.74
Monitoring has helped me avoid overtraining and injury	3.94	0.81
The data have improved my training planning	3.97	0.77
Using the device has improved my competitive performance	3.79	0.86
I trust the accuracy of the data the device provides	3.41	0.95

The results are revealing. The highest mean scores related to the regulation of intensity and the early recognition of fatigue, which suggests that the immediate, in-session value of the technology is what athletes appreciate most. Statements concerning injury prevention, planning and performance also attracted clear agreement, confirming that users perceive a broad range of benefits. The lowest mean score, by a noticeable margin, concerned trust in the accuracy of the data, accompanied by the highest standard deviation. This indicates that while athletes value the feedback their devices provide, a meaningful number remain uncertain about how precise that feedback really is, a reservation that echoes the cautions expressed in the validation literature.

7.5 Testing of Hypotheses

The first null hypothesis stated that there is no significant association between the type of sport practised and the level of adoption of wearable technology. A chi-square test was applied to the cross-classification of sport and adoption level. Table 5 summarises the result.

Table 5 Chi-Square Results for the Stated Hypotheses

Relationship Tested	χ^2	df	p	Result
Sport practised × level of adoption	18.46	8	0.018	Rejected

Frequency of use × perceived effectiveness	21.07	4	0.000	Rejected

In the first case the calculated value exceeded the critical value at the five per cent level, so the null hypothesis was rejected. This means that the type of sport does influence the level of adoption: disciplines that involve sustained running and intermittent high-intensity effort, such as football, athletics and field hockey, showed higher adoption than sports in which continuous physical output is less central. The second null hypothesis, which proposed no difference in perceived effectiveness between regular and occasional users, was also rejected. Regular users rated the technology as significantly more effective than occasional users, suggesting that the benefits of wearable monitoring become more apparent the more consistently the devices are used and the more familiar the athlete becomes with interpreting the feedback.

7.6 Barriers to Adoption

Respondents were asked to identify the principal obstacles preventing wider or more effective use of wearable technology. Their responses are summarised in Table 6.

Table 6 Perceived Barriers to the Use of Wearable Technology (multiple responses)

Barrier	Responses	%
High cost of devices and subscriptions	104	69.3
Lack of guidance on interpreting the data	89	59.3
Doubts about data accuracy	67	44.7
Limited institutional / coaching support	61	40.7
Concerns about battery life and durability	38	25.3

Cost was identified as the leading barrier, followed closely by the absence of guidance on how to interpret the data. These two obstacles are connected: a device that is expensive to purchase is of limited value if the athlete does not know how to translate its readings into better training decisions. The concerns about accuracy and the limited institutional support reinforce the conclusion that technology alone is not sufficient; it must be accompanied by education and informed coaching if its potential is to be realised.

8. Major Findings

1. Adoption of wearable technology among competitive athletes in Visakhapatnam is moderate but rising, with about four-fifths of respondents having practical experience of such devices and nearly half using them regularly.
2. Affordable consumer-grade devices, namely heart-rate monitors, fitness bands and smartwatches, dominate use, while costly sensor vests remain confined to a small minority.
3. Athletes use the devices mainly to regulate intensity, monitor recovery and track distance and speed, engaging in practice with both the internal and external dimensions of training load.
4. Perceived effectiveness is high, especially for regulating intensity and detecting early fatigue, although trust in data accuracy is the weakest area.
5. The type of sport practised is significantly associated with the level of adoption, and regular users perceive the technology as significantly more effective than occasional users.

6. High cost and a lack of guidance on data interpretation are the leading barriers to wider and more effective use.

9. Conclusion

This study set out to examine the adoption of wearable technology for the real-time monitoring of training load among competitive athletes in Visakhapatnam and to assess how effective the users believe that technology to be. The evidence gathered indicates that wearable devices have established a meaningful presence in the city's competitive sporting community and that the athletes who use them perceive clear and varied benefits, particularly in managing intensity, recognising fatigue and reducing the risk of avoidable injury. At the same time, the study makes plain that the technology is not yet being used to its full potential. Cost places good devices beyond the reach of many athletes, and even those who own them often lack the guidance needed to convert raw data into sound training decisions.

The broader message of the study is that wearable technology is best understood not as a substitute for skilled coaching but as a tool that becomes valuable in skilled hands. Its benefits grow with consistent use and informed interpretation, as the significantly higher effectiveness ratings of regular users demonstrate. For a regional sporting centre such as Visakhapatnam, the opportunity is considerable. With modest investment, structured education and a culture that treats data as a guide to better decisions, the city's athletes stand to gain access to the same evidence-based approach to load management that has transformed elite sport elsewhere.

10. Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

As with any survey-based enquiry, this study has limitations that should be acknowledged. The findings rest on self-reported perceptions rather than on direct physiological measurement, and the sample, while diverse, was confined to a single city. The results should therefore be interpreted as indicative of the regional situation rather than as definitive for the country as a whole. Future research could complement the present approach by combining survey data with objective device readings, by extending the enquiry across several regional centres for comparison, and by following athletes over a season to assess the longer-term relationship between wearable-guided load management and outcomes such as injury rates and competitive performance. Studies of this kind would deepen the understanding of how wearable technology can best serve athletes beyond the elite metropolitan setting.

References

1. Akenhead, R., & Nassis, G. P. (2016). Training load and player monitoring in high-level football: Current practice and perceptions. International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance, 11(5), 587–593.
2. Aughey, R. J. (2011). Applications of GPS technologies to field sports. International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance, 6(3), 295–310.
3. Borresen, J., & Lambert, M. I. (2009). The quantification of training load, the training response and the effect on performance. Sports Medicine, 39(9), 779–795.
4. Bourdon, P. C., Cardinale, M., Murray, A., Gastin, P., Kellmann, M., Varley, M. C., … Cable, N. T. (2017). Monitoring athlete training loads: Consensus statement. International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance, 12(s2), S2-161–S2-170.

 Journal UGC CARE Listed (Group-I) Volume 10 , Issue 06, May 2021

5. Cardinale, M., & Varley, M. C. (2017). Wearable training-monitoring technology: Applications, challenges, and opportunities. International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance, 12(s2), S2-55–S2-62.
6. Düking, P., Hotho, A., Holmberg, H.-C., Fuss, F. K., & Sperlich, B. (2016). Comparison of non-invasive individual monitoring of the training and health of athletes with commercially available wearable technologies. Frontiers in Physiology, 7, 71.
7. Foster, C. (1998). Monitoring training in athletes with reference to overtraining syndrome. Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise, 30(7), 1164–1168.
8. Foster, C., Florhaug, J. A., Franklin, J., Gottschall, L., Hrovatin, L. A., Parker, S., … Dodge, C. (2001). A new approach to monitoring exercise training. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 15(1), 109–115.
9. Gabbett, T. J. (2016). The training–injury prevention paradox: Should athletes be training smarter and harder? British Journal of Sports Medicine, 50(5), 273–280.
10. Halson, S. L. (2014). Monitoring training load to understand fatigue in athletes. Sports Medicine, 44(Suppl. 2), 139–147.
11. Impellizzeri, F. M., Marcora, S. M., & Coutts, A. J. (2019). Internal and external training load: 15 years on. International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance, 14(2), 270–273.
12. Scott, M. T. U., Scott, T. J., & Kelly, V. G. (2016). The validity and reliability of global positioning systems in team sport: A brief review. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 30(5), 1470–1490.