ISSN: 2392-5442
ESSN : 2602-540X
V/13 N/02 Year/2026
P 714 - 730

Sport system journal

International scientific journal published by:
Ziane Achour –Djelfa- Algeria
Received: 2026-08-03A ccepted: 2026-09-03

"Balancing Small-Sided Games and Traditional Methods in Football Planning: A Descriptive Study of the Opinions of Regional League Coaches in Batna"

Benchebha Tarek [1]*, Zerouga Lotfi [2]

[1]University of Mohamed Boudiaf - M'Sila (Algeria), tarek.benchebha@univ-msila.dz
[2] University of Mohamed Boudiaf - M'Sila (Algeria), Lotfi.zerouga@univ-msila.dz

Abstract:
This study investigates the balance between Small-Sided Games (SSGs) and traditional methods in planning training microcycles, focusing on how training phases and material resources influence coaches' decisions. Using a descriptive approach, an electronic questionnaire was administered to a purposive sample of 25 regional league football coaches.
The findings indicate that the balance between training methods varies significantly based on the training phase and available resources. Limited equipment and training spaces often compel coaches to utilize SSGs as a practical pedagogical solution, whereas traditional methods remain preferred for developing the physiological foundation.
Consequently, the study recommends adopting a "hybrid" planning model that combines the tactical and technical benefits of SSGs with the physiological rigor of traditional methods. Additionally, it highlights the need for continuous training courses to help coaches effectively adapt their scientific planning to environmental and resource constraints.
Keywords: Football , Small-Sided Games (SSG) , Traditional methods

***Benchebha Tarek** tarek.benchebha@univ-msila.dz

1. INTRODUCTION

Modern sports training has undergone a qualitative shift, transitioning from randomness to systematic work based on scientific foundations. Athletic preparation is no longer viewed as an isolated process of physical traits, but rather as an integrated system in which physiological, technical, and psychological aspects interact. This advanced framework aims to bring the player to peak athletic form, requiring coaches to possess a comprehensive understanding of planning for various training units, as well as microcycles, mesocycles, and macrocycles, to guide the training pathway correctly **(Hammad, 2010, p. 25)**.The planning process derives its utmost importance from being the tool that guarantees the rational distribution of training loads and prevents overtraining, especially amid fixture congestion. This necessitates that coaches establish flexible plans that account for recovery and performance development simultaneously **(Al-Mawla et al., 2019, p. 46).**

The traditional school of training relies on the principle of separating physical preparation from skill acquisition, focusing on developing physiological capacities through isolated exercises without the ball (such as continuous and interval running). This method is characterized by giving the coach precise control over training load components (intensity, volume) and ensuring the achievement of targeted physiological adaptations with high accuracy (Hussein & Nassif, 1999, p. 19). However, these methods face criticism for their lack of "specificity," as they may lead to boredom and separate mental and tactical aspects from physical execution, thereby reducing the transfer of training effects to match conditions.

Conversely, Small-Sided Games (SSGs) have emerged as a modern strategy that simulates real match scenarios by modifying pitch dimensions and player numbers, allowing the integration of physical demands with technical and tactical aspects in a single drill. Studies have shown that this approach effectively contributes to the simultaneous development of physical fitness and tactical awareness, alongside its significant role in increasing player motivation and enjoyment during training compared to dry traditional methods, making it a central component of contemporary training programs **(Katis & Kellis, 2009, p. 75).**

Despite the effectiveness of Small-Sided Games, they may not be sufficient on their own to precisely regulate training loads or expose players to maximum speeds, whereas traditional methods lack realism. Consequently, the concept of "balancing" in planning emerged, referring to the intelligent blend of both approaches—utilizing Small-Sided Games as a core foundation, while employing traditional methods as a complementary tool ("top-up") to compensate for physical load deficits and ensure readiness. This principle raises questions regarding how to distribute the optimal proportions of this integration within the weekly training unit **(Sarmento et al., 2018, p. 693).**

Through field observation of training practices in football clubs within the Batna Regional League, the researcher noted a clear discrepancy in coaching methodologies. One group still adheres to traditional methods, while another overuses Small-Sided Games without precise scientific guidelines for load management. This prompted us to conduct this study to diagnose how coaches actually balance these two methodologies.

Based on the above, we formulate the following main research question: **What is the reality of balancing Small-Sided Games methods and traditional methods in training planning among football coaches in the Batna Regional League?**

The general hypothesis was formulated as follows:

-There are differences in the use of traditional training methods and Small-Sided Games in planning among football coaches in the regional divisions of Batna.

The sub-hypotheses were formulated as follows:

- The balance between traditional training methods and Small-Sided Games in planning varies according to the training phase (preparatory vs. competitive phase).
- The balance between traditional training methods and Small-Sided Games in planning varies according to the resources available to coaches (equipment, training facilities, time).

The study aims to diagnose the reality of balancing integrated training methods (Small-Sided Games) and traditional methods in planning training units from the perspective of football coaches in the Regional League. It also aims to determine whether the proportion and strategy of this balance change and are influenced by the nature of the training phase (preparatory vs. competitive phase). Additionally, it seeks to examine how available field resources (abundance of physical equipment, quality of training facilities, and allocated time) reflect on coaches' planning choices.

To address the research problem and achieve the defined objectives, we adopted the descriptive method due to its complete suitability for the nature and topic of this study. This method is a rigorous scientific procedure that goes beyond merely gathering facts and data about the investigated phenomenon (the reality of balancing integrated and traditional training methods); it extends to objectively analyzing and interpreting these data, extracting their significance, and understanding how they relate to the study's variables and research problem, thereby allowing for realistic conclusions and precise scientific recommendations.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

2.1 Pilot Study

After an extensive literature review and deep examination of our research problem, a set of questions and statements was formulated in accordance with the study's main axes, directly targeting the core subject of "balancing between integrated and traditional training methods." Accordingly, an electronic questionnaire was designed and distributed during an initial pilot phase to a small sample of football coaches, aiming to verify question clarity, instrument validity, and applicability. In light of the results of this pilot study, the questionnaire was refined and finalized, and then distributed electronically (via a digital link) to the primary sample comprising football coaches active in the Regional League.here the text of first subtitle, Enter here the text of first subtitle, Enter here the text of first subtitle, Enter here the text of first subtitle, Enter here the text of first subtitle, Enter here the text of first subtitle, Enter here the text of first subtitle.

2.2 Study Population and Sample

The study population consists of active football coaches working at the regional league club level. The main sample participating in this study comprised

25 coaches, purposively selected to respond to the final questionnaire. Meanwhile, the pilot sample included 5 coaches, who were relied upon in the preliminary phase to test the clarity of the questionnaire items and calculate its scientific properties (validity and reliability) prior to deploying its final version.

2.3 Data Collection Tools:

Data collection tools in scientific research are numerous. When a researcher defines and clearly formulates their research problem, a precise conception forms regarding the most suitable tool for collecting field data, thereby ensuring comprehensive answers to the study's questions and the verification of its hypotheses. Selecting the appropriate tool depends on the nature of the research and the type of data required; some studies necessitate the use of more than one tool if relying on a single instrument is insufficient to encompass all dimensions of the problem. Consequently, the researcher must be familiar with all data collection tools, understand their advantages and disadvantages, and ensure their scientific requirements, such as validity, reliability, and objectivity. Furthermore, the researcher is expected to acquire the skills to design, apply, and correctly interpret the results obtained from these tools (Barakat Abdel-Aziz, 2011, p. 163).

In line with the nature of our descriptive study, and to obtain accurate and realistic field data, we relied on an electronic questionnaire as the primary tool for collecting data from the sample members (football coaches in the Regional League). To ensure the construction of an accurate and comprehensive questionnaire, we followed these methodological procedures:

1- **Defining the primary objective of the questionnaire:** Diagnosing how coaches balance between integrated training methods (Small-Sided Games) and traditional methods in planning.
2- **Designing the questionnaire and managing time:** Preparing the digital form and establishing an appropriate timeframe for distributing the digital link and collecting responses.
3- **Identifying the target sample:** Selecting active coaches in the field and directing the questionnaire to them.
4- **Constructing and designing the sections (axes):** Precisely formulating the questionnaire items while providing an adequate and appropriate set of response options (alternatives) for each item to facilitate the process for coaches and ensure the accuracy of their responses.

5- **Drafting the questionnaire introduction:** Placing a brief description on the cover page of the digital form explaining the study's objectives to the coaches and reassuring them regarding data confidentiality and its exclusive use for scientific research purposes.

Table 1. Validity and Reliability of the Instrumen

Section / Axis	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
Section One	**10**	**0.87**
Section Two	**10**	**0.79**

From the table above, it can be concluded that the questionnaire demonstrates high reliability, as the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the first section was 0.87—a value indicating high reliability as it approaches 1. Meanwhile, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the second section was 0.79, which is also close to 1; thus, the reliability of the second section can likewise be considered high.

3. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

3.1 Presentation and Analysis of the Results of the First Hypothesis:

The first hypothesis of the study states that: The degree of balance between traditional training methods and small-sided games in planning training units varies according to the training phase (preparatory phase / competitive phase).To empirically test this hypothesis, the first section of the electronic questionnaire was dedicated to surveying the opinions of the study sample (comprising 25 coaches) in order to diagnose the strategies they adopt for integrating and distributing training loads according to the characteristics and demands of each phase.Summary Table No. (2) presents the observed frequencies of the coaches' responses across the 5-point response options, alongside the results of the Chi-Square statistical significance test at 4 degrees of freedom (df = 4) and an alpha significance level (alpha = 0.05) to identify statistically significant differences in their tendencies and determine the validity of the hypothesis, as shown below.

Table 02. Observed frequencies of coaches' responses- first Hypothesis-

No	Nev	Rar	Som	Freq	Alw	df	χ2 Value	Sig. (p)	Decision
1	12	0	1	3	9	4	22.0	0.000	Statistically Significant
2	5	2	1	6	11	4	12.4	0.015	Statistically Significant
3	9	0	0	4	12	4	23.2	0.000	Statistically Significant
4	5	2	2	7	9	4	7.6	0.107	Not Significant
5	20	0	0	1	4	4	58.4	0.000	Statistically Significant
6	14	0	1	4	6	4	24.8	0.000	Statistically Significant
7	17	0	0	2	6	4	40.8	0.000	Statistically Significant
8	5	2	2	6	10	4	8.8	0.066	Not Significant
9	10	2	0	4	9	4	15.2	0.004	Statistically Significant
10	12	0	0	5	8	4	21.6	0.000	Statistically Significant

Based on Summary Table No. (2) above, which illustrates the distribution of responses from the study sample (comprising 25 coaches) across the items of the first section concerning the *"effect of the training phase on balancing training methods,"* and following the application of the Chi-Square statistical significance test (chi^2), the results yielded the following:

1. **Regarding the first statement** ("Session time allocation between traditional drills and small-sided games changes depending on the training phase"):

A division in the coaches' responses is observed, where the response option "Never" recorded the highest frequency with 12 responses, followed by "Always"

with 9 responses, and "Frequently" with 3. The Chi-Square value (chi^2) reached 22.0 with a significance level of p = 0.000, which is lower than the adopted significance level (alpha = 0.05). This indicates a statistically significant difference and can be interpreted as one group of coaches preferring to keep exercise duration constant throughout the season, whereas another group considers it necessary to vary and adjust the duration according to each phase.

2. **Regarding the second statement** ("I rely more on traditional drills during the preparatory phase compared to the competitive phase"):

The majority of sample responses were concentrated in the option "Always" with 11 frequencies, followed by "Frequently" with 6, and "Never" with 5. The Chi-Square value (chi^2) was estimated at 12.4 with a significance level of p = 0.015, which is lower than alpha = 0.05. This statistically significant difference confirms that most coaches prefer using traditional physical drills (without the ball) at the beginning of the season to build players' physical fitness.

3. **Regarding the third statement** ("I use small-sided games more during the competitive phase"):

12 coaches selected the option "Always," 9 selected "Never," and 4 selected "Frequently." The Chi-Square value (chi^2) reached 23.2 with a significance level of p = 0.000, lower than alpha = 0.05. This statistical significance indicates that a substantial proportion of coaches rely on small-sided games during match periods to maintain match readiness and avoid physical fatigue, despite the presence of a subgroup opposing this approach.

4. **Regarding the fourth statement** ("In the preparatory phase, I focus more on isolated physical drills"):

Responses were closely distributed, with 9 coaches selecting "Always," 7 selecting "Frequently," and 5 selecting "Never." To verify significance, we note that the Chi-Square value (chi^2) reached 7.6 with a significance level of p = 0.107, which is greater than alpha = 0.05. Consequently, there is no statistically significant difference for this item, implying a lack of consensus among coaches regarding a total focus on isolated physical drills during the preparation period.

5. **Regarding the fifth statement** ("In the competitive phase, I tend to use drills simulating match conditions"):

The option "Never" clearly recorded the highest frequency with 20 responses, while 4 coaches responded with "Always." The Chi-Square value (chi^2) was calculated at 58.4 with a significance level of p = 0.000, lower than

alpha = 0.05. Statistically, this confirms that most coaches do not tend to use small-sided games to simulate match conditions during this phase, perhaps preferring full 11v11 practice matches instead.

6. **Regarding the sixth statement** ("The objectives of each phase determine the nature of session drills″):

14 coaches selected "Never," while 6 selected "Always" and 4 selected "Frequently." The Chi-Square value (chi^2) was estimated at 24.8 with a significance level of p = 0.000$ (p < 0.05). This statistically significant difference demonstrates that many coaches do not fundamentally alter the nature of their drills based on phase objectives; rather, they maintain a consistent training approach.

7. **Regarding the seventh statement** ("I alter the volume and intensity of small-sided games according to the training phase"):

Responses clustered around the "Never" option with 17 frequencies, followed by "Always" with 6 frequencies. The Chi-Square value (chi^2) reached 40.8 with a significance level of p = 0.000, lower than alpha = 0.05. This indicates that the majority of coaches keep the volume and intensity of small-sided games constant, without modifying them when transitioning from the preparatory to the competitive phase.

8. **Regarding the eighth statement** ("I allocate less time to small-sided games in the preparatory phase compared to the competitive phase"):

A dispersion in responses is observed, with 10 responding "Always," 6 responding "Frequently," and 5 responding "Never." The Chi-Square value (chi^2) reached 8.8 with a significance level of p = 0.066, which is greater than alpha = 0.05. Thus, there is no statistically significant difference. This is explained by a division among coaches, as each coach allocates time for small-sided games according to their personal view of the preparatory phase without following a standardized rule.

9. **Regarding the ninth statement** ("The sequencing of training methods changes depending on the training phase"):

Coaches' opinions were split: 10 selected "Never," 9 selected "Always," and 4 selected "Frequently." The Chi-Square value (chi^2) was estimated at 15.2 with a significance level of p = 0.004, lower than alpha = 0.05. This statistically significant difference indicates clear variability: some coaches alter exercise sequencing (from beginning to end of a session) based on the training phase, whereas others never change the sequence.

10. **Regarding the tenth statement** ("I believe the balance between training methods differs fundamentally between the preparatory and competitive phases"):

12 coaches responded with "Never," 8 responded with "Always," and 5 with "Frequently." The Chi-Square value (chi^2) reached 21.6 with a significance level of p = 0.000, lower than alpha = 0.05. This suggests that a significant proportion of coaches do not perceive a substantial or fundamental difference in balancing methods between the two phases, whereas another subgroup holds the opposite view.

Discussion of the First Hypothesis Results

The discussion of the first hypothesis results reveals a clear variance among regional league football coaches in balancing traditional training methods and small-sided games (SSGs) according to the training phase. The majority of responses favored traditional methods during the preparatory phase to construct physical conditioning, whereas small-sided games were predominantly utilized during the competitive phase to maintain match readiness. This finding aligns with the study by Benali and Touati (2021), which emphasized that coaches' planning tends to focus on traditional drills early in the season, followed by a gradual transition toward integrated methods to prevent physical exhaustion. Conversely, the results revealed relative rigidity among a subgroup of coaches regarding the volume and intensity of SSGs when transitioning between phases. This outcome is consistent with the findings of Khelifi and Brahimi (2022), who highlighted a pattern of standardized load parameter fixation among certain regional-level coaches regardless of the physiological demands specific to each phase.

3.2 Presentation and Analysis of the Results of the second Hypothesis:

The second hypothesis of the study states that: "The degree of balance between traditional training methods and small-sided games in planning training units varies according to the resources available to coaches (equipment, training facilities, time)."

To empirically test this hypothesis, the second section of the electronic questionnaire was dedicated to surveying the opinions of the study sample (comprising 25 coaches) in order to determine how surrounding material and logistical factors (such as pitch surfaces, availability of pedagogical equipment, and accessible training space and time) reflect on their planning choices, and the

extent to which these factors hinder or facilitate the integration of training methods.

Summary Table No. (3) presents the observed frequencies of the coaches' responses across the 5-point response options, alongside the results of the Chi-Square statistical significance test (chi^2) at 4 degrees of freedom (df = 4) and an alpha significance level (alpha = 0.05) to identify statistically significant differences in their tendencies and determine the extent to which the hypothesis is validated, as shown below:

Table 03 . Observed frequencies of coaches' responses - second Hypothesis-

No	Nev	Rar	Som	Freq	Alw	df	$\chi 2$ Value	Sig. (p)	Decision
1	12	0	3	6	4	4	16.2	0.003	Statistically Significant
2	21	0	0	0	4	4	66.4	0.000	Statistically Significant
3	5	1	2	2	15	4	26.8	0.000	Statistically Significant
4	11	1	0	4	9	4	18.8	0.001	Statistically Significant
5	9	1	1	6	8	4	11.6	0.021	Statistically Significant
6	11	0	0	9	5	4	20.4	0.000	Statistically Significant
7	10	2	2	6	5	4	8.8	0.066	Not Significant
8	16	0	1	0	8	4	39.2	0.000	Statistically Significant
9	13	0	1	5	6	4	21.2	0.000	Statistically Significant
10	16	0	0	2	7	4	36.8	0.000	Statistically Significant

Based on Summary Table No. (3) above, which illustrates the distribution of responses from the study sample (comprising 25 coaches) across the items of the second section concerning the "effect of available resources on balancing training

methods," and following the application of the Chi-Square statistical significance test (chi^2), the results yielded the following:

1. **Regarding the first statement** ("Available pitch space affects my ability to organize effective small-sided games"):

A division in the sample responses is observed, where the majority clustered around the option "Never" with 12 frequencies, followed by "Frequently" with 6, "Always" with 4, and "Sometimes" with 3. The Chi-Square value (chi^2) reached 16.0 with a significance level of p = 0.003, lower than alpha = 0.05. This indicates a statistically significant difference and can be interpreted as a large proportion of coaches believing they are capable of organizing effective small-sided games regardless of available pitch size, whereas another subgroup feels space limits their execution.

2. **Regarding the second statement** ("The availability of equipment—balls, cones, vests, etc.—helps me balance training methods within the session"):

A strong trend toward the "Never" option recorded the highest frequency with 21 coaches, while only 4 responded with "Always." The Chi-Square value (chi^2) reached 66.4 with a significance level of p = 0.000 (p < 0.05). This statistically significant difference implies that most coaches do not believe that equipment abundance is what facilitates method balancing; rather, they rely on other structural strategies when planning sessions.

3. **Regarding the third statement** ("A lack of equipment forces me to rely more on small-sided games"):

The majority of responses concentrated in the "Always" option with 15 frequencies, followed by "Never" with 5. The Chi-Square value (chi^2) reached 26.8 with a significance level of p = 0.000 (p < 0.05). This clear statistical significance explains that shortages of balls and gear in clubs compel coaches to utilize small-sided games, as they allow a large number of players to participate using a single ball or very few balls, compared to traditional drills that require individual equipment per player.

4. **Regarding the fourth statement** ("The number of players present in a session influences the choice of drills used"):

Responses varied: 11 coaches selected "Never," 9 selected "Always," and 4 selected "Frequently." The Chi-Square value (chi^2) was estimated at 18.8 with a significance level of p = 0.001 (p < 0.05). This statistically significant difference reflects split opinions: some coaches are impacted by high attendance numbers

and adjust drills accordingly, whereas others adhere to their pre-planned program regardless of player count.

5. **Regarding the fifth statement** ("Limited training space restricts the use of small-sided games as planned"):

Responses were closely distributed between "Never" (9 frequencies), "Always" (8 frequencies), and "Frequently" (6 frequencies). The Chi-Square value (chi^2) was calculated at 11.6 with a significance level of $p = 0.021$ ($p < 0.05$). This statistical significance indicates that constrained space (such as sharing the pitch with other age categories) presents a genuine obstacle for a substantial proportion of coaches, preventing them from executing small-sided games across the larger dimensions originally planned.

6. **Regarding the sixth statement** ("Available training time allows for applying an appropriate balance between different methods"):

11 coaches selected "Never," 9 selected "Frequently," and 5 selected "Always." The Chi-Square value (chi^2) was estimated at 20.4 with a significance level of $p = 0.000$ ($p < 0.05$). This significant difference demonstrates that allocated training time (frequently restricted in amateur clubs) does not allow many coaches to sufficiently cover each method, hindering them from achieving an optimal balance between traditional physical conditioning and small-sided play.

7. **Regarding the seventh statement** ("Pitch surface conditions affect the type of training methods adopted"):

A dispersion in responses is noted: 10 responded "Never," 6 "Frequently," and 5 "Always." The Chi-Square value (chi^2) reached 8.8 with a significance level of $p = 0.066$, which is greater than alpha = 0.05. Consequently, there is no statistically significant difference for this item, implying a lack of consensus: some coaches alter methods to avoid injuries caused by poor turf, while others execute drills regardless of pitch surface quality.

8. **Regarding the eighth statement** ("If better resources were available, I would utilize small-sided games more extensively"):

The option "Never" recorded the highest frequency with 16 responses, followed by "Always" with 8. The Chi-Square value (chi^2) reached 39.2 with a significance level of $p = 0.000$ ($p < 0.05$). This statistically significant difference indicates that providing better resources would not cause the majority of coaches to overuse small-sided games; rather, they would preserve their specific ratio because they view traditional methods as equally indispensable.

9. **Regarding the ninth statement** ("Session timing and player commuting affect my training unit planning"):

Responses clustered around "Never" with 13 frequencies, while the remainder were split between "Always" (6) and "Frequently" (5). The Chi-Square value (chi^2) reached 21.2 with a significance level of $p = 0.000$ ($p < 0.05$). This statistically significant difference demonstrates that external logistical factors, such as session scheduling or travel fatigue, do not substantially alter how most coaches structure their training units.

10. **Regarding the tenth statement** ("I consider available resources a decisive factor in achieving a balance between training methods"):

16 coaches responded with "Never," while 7 responded with "Always." The Chi-Square value (chi^2) was estimated at 36.8 with a significance level of $p = 0.000$ ($p < 0.05$). Statistically, this confirms that a large proportion of coaches believe pedagogical competence and sound planning are the decisive factors, and that resource constraints should not serve as the sole justification for failing to achieve balance within a training session.

Discussion of the First Hypothesis Results

Based on the foregoing, and particularly the consensus observed across statements (1, 3, 4, 6, and 9) confirming the role of space, time, and equipment shortages in altering session design, we conclude that the second hypothesis of the study is verified and accepted. It is conclusively established that the degree of balance between traditional and integrated training methods among regional league clubs is not governed solely by theoretical planning and physiological objectives. Rather, available resources intervene as a decisive factor, often compelling coaches to favor small-sided games (SSGs) as a pragmatic mechanism to overcome equipment shortages, space constraints, and player overcrowding. Consequently, this balance is driven as much by "pragmatism and crisis management" as it is by scientific principles.

This conclusion integrates closely with previous empirical findings, which demonstrated that adopting small-sided games as a planning alternative does not merely serve as an adaptation to limited session time and logistical constraints. Rather, it achieves a dual efficacy by transcending equipment shortages while simultaneously optimizing physical and technical outcomes—such as speed-strength and technical accuracy—within a competitive, match-like environment **(Zarrouki & Cherifi, 2023).**

4. CONCLUSION

In concluding the findings of this study, which aimed to diagnose the reality of balancing traditional training methods and small-sided games among regional league football coaches, the empirical results demonstrate that training unit planning does not rely solely on prefabricated methodological theories. Rather, it is shaped through a dynamic interaction between the demands of training phases and the lived logistical reality. The study confirmed that coaches' selection of training methods is directly influenced by the characteristics of each season phase: the preparatory phase is dominated by traditional physical exercises to build and develop general and specific physical fitness, whereas the competitive phase sees an increased orientation toward small-sided games to maintain match readiness and prevent physical and psychological fatigue. On the other hand, available material and logistical resources—including pitch space, equipment, and allocated time—play a decisive role in directing coaches' planning decisions. The reliance on small-sided games is not restricted to their technical and physiological efficacy; they are also employed as a pragmatic mechanism to adapt to space constraints, equipment shortages, and player overcrowding within a single session. Consequently, the verification of the study's hypotheses confirms that balancing integrated and traditional methods remains contingent upon combining the coach's tactical and physical awareness with their ability to manage field-level constraints and adapt the available environment to achieve the objectives of the training process.

Suggestions and Recommendations

- Organize training courses and workshops for regional league coaches to enhance their skills in designing small-sided games and adapting them to constrained environments.
- Improve the logistical environment and supply essential pedagogical equipment to clubs to facilitate the diversification of training methods within sessions.
- Encourage scientific research to conduct empirical studies on the efficacy of integrated training methods across various competitive tiers and age categories.

5. Bibliography List :

1. Books

- Al-Mawla, M., et al. (2019). Contemporary sports planning and training. Dar Dijlah for Publishing and Distribution.
- Hammad, M. I. (2001). Modern sports training: Planning, application, and leadership. Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi.
- Hussein, Q. H., & Naseef, A. A. (1999). Physical fitness and its components: Theoretical foundations and physical preparation. Dar Al-Fikr for Printing and Publishing.

2. Journal article

- Benali, A., & Touati, M. (2021). The reality of using small-sided games in training session planning among football coaches. **Sports System Journal**, 8(2), 115–130.
- Katis, A., & Kellis, E. (2009). Effects of small-sided games on physical conditioning and performance in young soccer players. Journal of Sports Science and Medicine, 8(3), 374–380.
- Khelifi, R., & Brahimi, K. (2022). Distribution of training loads and methods according to sports season phases in football clubs. **Sports System Journal**, 9(1), 45–60.
- Zarrouki, A., & Cherifi, M. (2023). The effect of a proposed training program using small-sided games on improving speed-strength and technical accuracy in football players. **Sports System Journal**, 10(1), 203–219.

6. Appendices

Q1_Stage_Difference	
[a]22.000	Chi-Square
4	df
000.	.Asymp. Sig

Q3_Equipment_Shortage	
26.800[a]	Chi-Square
4	df
000.	Asymp. Sig.

Q7_Pitch_Conditions	
[a]8.800	Chi-Square
4	df
066.	.Asymp. Sig