American Journal of Alternative Education
ISSN: 2997-3953 (Online)
Vol. 2, No. 12, Dec 2025,
Available online at: https://scientificbulletin.com/index.php/AJAE

Small-Sided Games in Youth Football: How Pitch Size and Player Numbers Shape Physical Load and Tactical Behaviors

Alimov Tojiddin Yaxshibayevich
Senior Lecturer, Acting Associate Professor, Department of Sports Activities and Pre-Conscription Military Education, Termiz State Pedagogical Institute
tojiddinalimov1970@gmail.com

Article information:
Manuscript received: 02 Oct 2025; **Accepted:** 02 Nov 2025; **Published:** 30 Dec 2025

Abstract: Small-sided games are a cornerstone of contemporary football training because they blend conditioning with decision-making under realistic constraints. Yet coaches still argue about a deceptively simple question: Should we change the pitch or change the number of players when we want a specific training stimulus? This rapid evidence synthesis summarizes how two major task constraints pitch size (relative area per player) and player numbers/game format influence internal load, external load, and collective tactical behavior in youth football. Evidence from systematic reviews and meta-analyses shows that SSG intensity is sensitive to manipulated constraints, with general trends of higher physiological and running demands when relative area per player increases and when fewer players are involved, although time-motion profiles and technical outputs do not always move in parallel.

Keys words: youth football; small-sided games; pitch size; relative area per player; internal load; external load; tactical behavior; constraints-led approach.

INTRODUCTION

Small-sided games are widely used in youth football because they compress match-like perception-action couplings into shorter, repeatable training bouts. Unlike isolated running drills, SSGs expose players to contextual interference: scanning, pressing cues, passing lanes, and constant re-organization under opponents' actions. This is precisely why coaches love them and precisely why they are tricky to control. The same drill name ("5v5") can produce very different training loads depending on pitch dimensions, player numbers, scoring method, coach encouragement, and rule constraints [1]. From an ecological dynamics viewpoint, SSGs act as "designed environments" in which task constraints guide the emergence of coordination patterns and decision-making tendencies [3]. In other words: you are not just conditioning players; you are shaping how they see and solve the game.

Two constraints are especially powerful and commonly manipulated in youth settings: pitch size (often expressed as relative area per player) and player numbers/game format. Systematic evidence indicates that SSG intensity generally increases when the relative area per player increases and when fewer players are involved, although the relationship is not perfectly linear and can be moderated by rules and tactical intent[6]. A practical problem emerges for youth coaches: increasing intensity may be beneficial for aerobic development, but poorly chosen constraints can reduce meaningful ball contacts, distort tactical behaviors, or increase injury risk through uncontrolled high-speed actions. Recent syntheses suggest that SSGs can improve aerobic capacity and football-specific behaviors, but evidence quality across reviews is uneven and methodological variability is high [7]. Therefore, coaches need clear,

evidence-informed heuristics rather than one-size-fits-all recipes.

This article aims to synthesize available review-level evidence and key experimental findings on how pitch size and player numbers shape internal load, external load, and tactical behaviors in youth football SSGs, and to translate these insights into actionable design principles.

METHODS.

A rapid evidence synthesis approach was used to prioritize higher-level evidence and representative experimental studies relevant to youth football SSG design. Core sources included foundational systematic reviews on SSG physiology and training variables [1], broad narrative and systematic syntheses of SSG effects, an umbrella review evaluating review-level evidence quality across team sports, and a recent pitch-size meta-analysis directly comparing smaller versus larger SSG pitches. To anchor practical interpretation, two frequently cited primary studies examining pitch-size effects and game-format/player-number manipulations were included as exemplars of controlled SSG comparisons. Conceptual grounding was supported by an ecological dynamics/constraints-led framework describing how SSG constraints shape learning and decision-making [3].

Eligible evidence was prioritized if it (a) examined football/soccer SSGs, (b) reported outcomes related to internal load (e.g., heart rate, perceived exertion), external load (e.g., distance, high-speed running, accelerations), technical actions, or tactical/collective organization metrics, and (c) explicitly manipulated pitch dimensions, relative area per player, or player numbers/game format. Data were extracted narratively into three outcome domains: (1) internal physiological load, (2) external physical demands, and (3) tactical/technical behaviors. Because the synthesis focused on integrating existing quantitative summaries (rather than re-estimating pooled effects), no de novo meta-analysis was conducted. Methodological caveats were considered using conclusions reported in umbrella and systematic reviews particularly the high heterogeneity in SSG protocols and the frequently low methodological quality ratings across reviews [7]. Findings were then translated into applied design recommendations structured around the controllability of constraints (pitch → players → rules) to support safe and purposeful youth training planning.

RESULTS

Across reviews, pitch size and player numbers consistently emerge as primary drivers of SSG intensity, but they influence different components of performance in partly dissociable ways. Evidence indicates that larger relative area per player generally increases internal load and running demands. In youth players, increasing individual playing area within a constant player format led to higher effective playing time, greater total and high-intensity running, higher time spent above high heart-rate thresholds, and higher perceived exertion; meanwhile, certain ball-related motor behaviors occurred less frequently on larger areas. This suggests a trade-off: more space promotes running and dispersion, but may reduce density-driven technical repetitions.

Meta-analytic evidence strengthens this pattern. When comparing smaller versus larger pitch sizes across SSG studies, larger pitches produced higher heart rate, higher perceived exertion, greater total distance, and greater high-speed running, alongside increased dispersion-related tactical metrics such as surface area and stretch index. In contrast, many technical variables showed minimal or non-significant differences between pitch sizes, indicating that “bigger pitch” is a reliable lever for load, but not a guaranteed lever for technical output [8].

Manipulating player numbers and game format also changes demands. In monitored SSG conditions, possession-based formats tended to impose greater physiological and physical demands, and reducing player numbers increased physiological load, though physical outputs did not always scale identically. Systematic reviews note that fewer-player formats can approach or exceed match-like intensity, but variability is high and depends on encouragement and rules. Umbrella-level evidence concludes that task constraints strongly modulate acute responses, while long-term adaptations are generally positive for aerobic capacity but heterogeneous for neuromuscular outcomes.

DISCUSSION

The synthesis supports a practical principle: pitch size is the "volume knob" for running load and team dispersion, while player numbers/game format are finer "tuning knobs" that can shift interaction density, decision frequency, and constraint pressure. This aligns with the constraints-led view that learning and performance emerge from how players interact with space, opponents, and goals under specific task rules. If a youth coach wants higher cardiovascular strain and more high-speed running exposure, increasing relative area per player is a direct and evidence-supported method. However, technical outcomes do not reliably rise with pitch size, and in some cases the opposite may occur because larger spaces reduce contest density and compress fewer actions per minute. Therefore, "bigger pitch = better technique" is not supported; "bigger pitch = bigger load" is.

Player number manipulations add complexity. Smaller formats often increase physiological load, but physical time-motion responses can diverge, partly because fewer players create more frequent involvement but also more stoppages and higher variability [1]. The choice of scoring method (possession vs goals, goalkeepers vs small goals) further modifies demands, with possession formats often raising load likely through sustained engagement and fewer rest-like phases. For youth development, this means constraints must be selected to match the session's primary goal: aerobic exposure, repeated high-speed actions, compactness/pressing behaviors, or technical repetition under pressure.

A key caution is evidence quality. The umbrella review highlights that many SSG systematic reviews and meta-analyses have low methodological quality, and heterogeneity in protocols limits confident "exact prescriptions". Coaches should therefore use evidence as directionally strong guidance (what tends to increase/decrease) rather than as rigid formulas. The safest applied approach is progressive: start with a target relative area per player to control load, then adjust player numbers and rules to shape tactical learning without overshooting intensity.

CONCLUSION

Small-sided games remain one of the most efficient tools in youth football because they train fitness and football intelligence simultaneously when constraints are chosen deliberately. The evidence converges on a clear takeaway: increasing relative area per player reliably increases internal load and external running demands and expands collective dispersion, while player number and format changes alter interaction density and can raise physiological stress but with higher variability[4]. Coaches who want "more intensity" should first consider adjusting pitch size, since larger pitches consistently raise heart rate, perceived exertion, total distance, and high-speed running. If the session goal is more technical repetition under pressure, smaller spaces may be preferable, but should be paired with appropriate rules and work-rest structure to prevent chaotic overload and degraded decision quality [1].

Set relative area per player to match the desired running and cardiovascular dose;

Select player numbers to manage involvement and perceptual load;

Choose game format/rules (possession vs goals, touch limits, scoring conditions, coach encouragement) to target tactical themes without unintentionally changing intensity beyond tolerance [1].

Because review-level evidence quality is mixed, practitioners should treat these as robust tendencies, not universal laws, and they should monitor players using feasible internal/external metrics (RPE, heart rate when available, GPS-derived distance bands) to individualize exposure [7]. In youth populations, constraint choices must also respect maturation, skill level, and injury risk especially when expanding space increases high-speed actions. In short: SSGs are not "small" just because the pitch is small. They are small only in dimensions; their training consequences are very large. Used intelligently, they can build fitter, smarter players. Used lazily, they can build tired players who learn the wrong game.

REFERENCES

1. Hill-Haas S.V., Dawson B., Impellizzeri F.M., Coutts A.J. Physiology of small-sided games training in football: a systematic review // Sports Medicine. 2011. Vol. 41, No. 3. P. 199-220. DOI: 10.2165/11539740-000000000-00000.
2. Aguiar M., Botelho G., Lago C., Maças V., Sampaio J. A review on the effects of soccer small-sided games // Journal of Human Kinetics. 2012. No. 33. P. 103-113. DOI: 10.2478/v10078-012-0049-x.
3. Davids K., Araújo D., Correia V., Vilar L. How small-sided and conditioned games enhance acquisition of movement and decision-making skills // Exercise and Sport Sciences Reviews. 2013. Vol. 41, No. 3. P. 154-161. DOI: 10.1097/JES.0b013e318292f3ec.
4. Casamichana D., Castellano J. Time-motion, heart rate, perceptual and motor behaviour demands in small-sides soccer games: effects of pitch size // Journal of Sports Sciences. 2010. Vol. 28, No. 14. P. 1615-1623. DOI: 10.1080/02640414.2010.521168.
5. Castellano J., Casamichana D., Dellal A. Influence of game format and number of players on heart rate responses and physical demands in small-sided soccer games // Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research. 2013. Vol. 27, No. 5. P. 1295-1303. DOI: 10.1519/JSC.0b013e318267a5d1.
6. Bujalance-Moreno P., Latorre-Román P.Á., García-Pinillos F. A systematic review on small-sided games in football players: Acute and chronic adaptations // Journal of Sports Sciences. 2019. Vol. 37, No. 8. P. 921-949. DOI: 10.1080/02640414.2018.1535821.
7. Clemente F.M., Afonso J., Sarmento H. Small-sided games: An umbrella review of systematic reviews and meta-analyses // PLOS ONE. 2021. Vol. 16, No. 2. e0247067. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0247067.
8. Clemente F.M., Praça G.M., Aquino R., et al. Effects of pitch size on soccer players' physiological, physical, technical, and tactical responses during small-sided games: a meta-analytical comparison // Biology of Sport. 2023. Vol. 40, No. 1. P. 111-147. DOI: 10.5114/biolsport.2023.110748.
9. Nuriddinov, K. J. (2025). Psycho-pedagogical determinants in the formationof academicculture among students in pedagogical universities. Educational ResearchinUniversalSciences, 4(5), 96-100.