ACADEMY OF STRENGTH

EVIDENCE WHITE PAPERS

01 The Gospel of Strength

02 The Myth of Muscle Angles

03 The Fallacy of Sport-Specific Training

04 Why Strength Is the Foundation of Health

05 The True Science of Hypertrophy

06 Why Compound Movements Are All You Need

07 Strength and Cardio

08 The Myth of the Great Workout

Prepared by Kirtus Hunsaker
Academy of Strength LLC

Evidence reviewed through July 2026

EVIDENCE & EDITORIAL NOTE

How to Read This Collection

A position paper can be forceful without asking the evidence to say more than it does.

These papers preserve the Academy of Strength's central philosophy: strength deserves a primary place in physical preparation. They also distinguish direct scientific findings from interpretation and from Academy programming choices. That distinction makes the argument more durable, not less decisive.

The review prioritizes peer-reviewed position stands, randomized trials, prospective research, and foundational motor-control studies. It is a focused narrative review rather than a systematic review or clinical practice guideline. Citation numbers restart in each paper so every paper can be published independently.

Material Fact-Check Decisions

Foundation, not totality. Strength is foundational, but not every physical quality is reducible to strength. Power, endurance, balance, skill, and body composition each have additional determinants and require specific practice.

A framework, not a law. Seven weeks is an Academy framework, not a uniquely validated biological duration. The defensible claims are planned progression, adequate stimulus, fatigue management, and repeated evaluation.

Angles matter. Joint angle can change leverage, muscle length, force capacity, and regional adaptation. The myth is that arbitrary angle changes precisely isolate fibers or make progression secondary.

Motor units are not whole muscles. The all-or-none principle applies to action potentials and fibers within a recruited motor unit. Whole-muscle force is graded through recruitment, firing rate, and mechanics.

Transfer is conditional. Strength gained in the gym can transfer, but its expression remains specific to movement, velocity, range of motion, coordination, and context. Loaded sport-like drills may help or harm depending on design and dose; they are not automatically corruptive.

> USE AND SCOPE
> This material is educational and does not replace individualized medical, rehabilitation, or coaching judgment. Claims about trademarks, legal status, and specific Academy program rules should be reviewed separately from the exercise-science fact-check.

WHITE PAPER 01 / ACADEMY OF STRENGTH

The Gospel of Strength

A White Paper on the Foundational Truths of Training, Movement, and Human Potential

> *“Strength is everything—not because it is the only quality, but because force capacity raises the ceiling for so many others.”*

Executive Thesis

Modern fitness offers almost unlimited information and almost no shortage of novelty. Yet a substantial share of adults still fails to meet basic activity recommendations: a 2024 global analysis estimated that 31.3% of adults—about 1.8 billion people—were insufficiently active in 2022.[1] The Academy of Strength uses the phrase “weakness epidemic” to name the practical result: too many people possess less physical reserve than ordinary life, aging, work, and sport may demand.

That phrase is a call to action, not a clinical diagnosis. The scientific claim underneath it is narrower and stronger: muscular strength is a trainable capacity with broad relevance to health and performance, and progressive resistance training is one of the most direct ways to build it.[2]

Strength Defined

In applied terms, strength is the capacity of the neuromuscular system to produce force against resistance under specified conditions. Every purposeful movement requires force. Standing from a chair, arresting a fall, accelerating a sprint, carrying a child, and controlling a heavy bar all depend on the nervous system organizing muscular force.

But force is expressed through a task. Strength measured in a squat is not identical to strength expressed in a pull-up, a jump, or a change of direction. The pattern, joint positions, velocity, stability demands, and skill of the test matter. Strength is therefore foundational without being formless.

The same boundary applies to the other capacities commonly placed beneath strength. Power combines force with time. Muscular endurance depends on repeated or sustained force and fatigue resistance. Balance integrates sensory information, rapid corrections, and task-specific practice. Body composition is influenced by resistance training but also by nutrition, total energy balance, sleep, medication, and other biological factors. Adding strength expands what the system can do; it does not erase the need to train the quality one wants to express.

How the System Becomes Stronger

Voluntary force is graded partly through motor-unit recruitment and firing behavior. Henneman’s size principle describes an orderly tendency: as force demand rises, lower-threshold motor units are recruited before progressively higher-threshold units.[3] This is one reason demanding resistance exercise can expose the nervous system and muscle to high levels of force.

The principle is often reduced to the claim that only a very heavy external load can recruit high-threshold motor units. That is too simple. Heavy loads create high force demands immediately, but high intent and accumulating fatigue can also increase recruitment during lighter-load work. Load matters, yet it works through force demand, effort, duration, and the task—not by percentage alone.[2,5]

Repeated resistance training changes both control and tissue. Neural drive, rate of force development, coordination within the trained task, and the muscle's force-producing capacity can improve.[4] Over longer periods, muscle hypertrophy and connective-tissue and skeletal adaptations may contribute. These are not caused primarily by a dramatic post-workout hormone surge. Studies in trained adults have found that transient systemic hormone responses do not explain individual gains in strength or hypertrophy.[5,6]

Progressive Overload Without the Folklore

Progressive overload means that training must continue to present a sufficient challenge as the athlete adapts. It does not mean adding weight at every session forever. The challenge can progress through load, repetitions, sets, range of motion, exercise difficulty, intent, density, or improved execution at the same external load. The correct variable depends on the outcome being trained.

For maximal strength, current evidence favors regular exposure to relatively heavy loads, full or task-relevant ranges of motion, multiple working sets, and repeated weekly practice. The 2026 American College of Sports Medicine position stand also makes a useful larger point: many resistance-training prescriptions work, and consistent participation is more important than optimizing every small programming variable.[2]

Recovery is part of overload because adaptation requires repeated high-quality exposure. A plan that creates fatigue faster than it creates capacity cannot be rescued by motivational language. Performance trends, technique, sleep, soreness, pain, and willingness to train all inform whether the next productive step is more work, the same work, or less.

How the Seven-Week Framework Fits the Evidence

The Academy's seven-week cycle is best presented as an applied progression model: accumulate productive work, increase intensity while reducing repetition demand, then evaluate performance. The model is coherent because it organizes overload and fatigue. It is not supported because seven weeks has been shown to be the universal or uniquely optimal biological duration.

Phase	Programming emphasis	Scientific purpose
1	Volume foundation	Build repeatable exposure, technique, and tolerance to productive work.
2	Load progression	Raise force demand while managing total repetition volume.
3	Specific preparation	Practice heavier, lower-repetition outputs without carrying unnecessary fatigue.
4	Evaluation and reset	Test the planned outcome, then use performance and recovery to set the next cycle.

PROGRAMMING BOUNDARY

Every published percentage must identify its denominator. Repeated triples at 95–100% of a current, true one-repetition maximum are ordinarily not repeatable. If the Academy retains very high percentage bands for repeated work, the manual should state that they refer to a deliberately conservative training max and should include a clear load-reduction rule.

The Five Books of Lifting

The Academy organizes practice around five scalable compound-lift families: Squat, Press, Pull, Bench, and Deadlift. They are not literally the only human movement patterns, nor are their barbell versions mandatory for every body. Their value is practical: together they train large amounts of muscle, provide clear external resistance, reward technical repetition, and permit small, measurable progressions over time.

A movement family is more useful than a rigid exercise idol. A squat may be performed with a barbell, safety bar, belt squat, or another appropriate variation. A pull may be vertical or horizontal. The criterion is whether the exercise can be performed safely, repeated consistently, loaded progressively, and matched to the trainee's anatomy, equipment, experience, and goal.

The Academy's compound-first philosophy is an efficiency decision. Compound lifts can provide a large return per exercise for general strength. Single-joint training can still be useful for hypertrophy, rehabilitation, tolerance, or a clearly identified weak link. Rejecting random accessory clutter does not require pretending that every isolation exercise is biologically useless.

Evidence in Human Outcomes

The breadth of resistance training's usefulness is clearest at the edges of human capacity. In a randomized trial of frail nursing-home residents with a mean age of 87 years, high-intensity resistance training produced large gains in strength and meaningful improvements in gait and stair-climbing power.[7] In postmenopausal women, a year of high-intensity strength training improved or preserved bone mineral density while improving strength, muscle mass, and balance.[8]

Prospective observational research has also linked greater muscular strength with lower mortality risk in men, although that design cannot prove that strength itself caused the difference.[9] The honest conclusion is not that lifting is a cure-all. It is that strength is modifiable, consequential, and unusually useful across a wide range of starting points.

Conclusion

Strength does not replace skill, conditioning, mobility, nutrition, or recovery. It gives each of them a larger physical reserve from which to operate. A stronger person can use a smaller fraction of maximal capacity for the same submaximal task. A stronger athlete can potentially express more force, provided the sport's technical and velocity demands are also trained.

The Gospel of Strength is therefore not a claim that one barbell quality explains the whole human being. It is a programming priority: build force capacity deliberately, expose it to progressive demands, recover well enough to repeat the process, and measure whether the system is becoming more capable.

> *"Strength is the root. Everything else is fruit—but every fruit still needs its own conditions to grow."*

References

1. Strain T, Flaxman S, Guthold R, et al. National, regional, and global trends in insufficient physical activity among adults from 2000 to 2022: a pooled analysis of 507 population-based surveys with 5.7 million participants. Lancet Glob Health. 2024;12(8):e1232–e1243. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(24)00150-5
2. Currier BS, et al. Resistance Training Prescription for Muscle Function, Hypertrophy, and Physical Performance in Healthy Adults: An Overview of Reviews. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2026;58(4):851–872. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000003897
3. Henneman E, Somjen G, Carpenter DO. Functional significance of cell size in spinal motoneurons. J Neurophysiol. 1965;28:560–580. doi:10.1152/jn.1965.28.3.560
4. Aagaard P, Simonsen EB, Andersen JL, Magnusson P, Dyhre-Poulsen P. Increased rate of force development and neural drive of human skeletal muscle following resistance training. J Appl Physiol. 2002;93(4):1318–1326. doi:10.1152/japplphysiol.00283.2002
5. Morton RW, Oikawa SY, Wavell CG, et al. Neither load nor systemic hormones determine resistance training-mediated hypertrophy or strength gains in resistance-trained young men. J Appl Physiol. 2016;121(1):129–138. doi:10.1152/japplphysiol.00154.2016
6. West DWD, Phillips SM. Associations of exercise-induced hormone profiles and gains in strength and hypertrophy in a large cohort after weight training. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2012;112:2693–2702. doi:10.1007/s00421-011-2246-z
7. Fiatarone MA, O'Neill EF, Ryan ND, et al. Exercise training and nutritional supplementation for physical frailty in very elderly people. N Engl J Med. 1994;330(25):1769–1775. doi:10.1056/NEJM199406233302501
8. Nelson ME, Fiatarone MA, Morganti CM, Trice I, Greenberg RA, Evans WJ. Effects of high-intensity strength training on multiple risk factors for osteoporotic fractures: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA. 1994;272(24):1909–1914. doi:10.1001/jama.1994.03520240037038
9. Ruiz JR, Sui X, Lobelo F, et al. Association between muscular strength and mortality in men: prospective cohort study. BMJ. 2008;337:a439. doi:10.1136/bmj.a439

WHITE PAPER 02 / ACADEMY OF STRENGTH

The Myth of Muscle Angles

Why Angle Matters—but Progression Matters More

> *“Force demand calls motor units into action; joint position determines how that demand is distributed.”*

Executive Thesis

Fitness marketing often treats tiny changes in bench angle, cable height, stance, or hand position as if each reveals a new muscle. That story is exaggerated. Muscles are not a collection of independent laser beams waiting for the perfect angle.

The opposite slogan—“muscles do not care about angles; they care about load”—is also inaccurate. Joint angle changes external leverage, muscle length, internal moment arms, stability requirements, and the distribution of force across a movement. Training at different lengths and ranges can produce different strength and hypertrophy outcomes.[2,5–9] The useful message is more disciplined: angle is a programming variable, not a substitute for progression.

What All-or-None Actually Means

The all-or-none principle applies to the action potential and the fibers belonging to a recruited motor unit. Once that motor unit reaches threshold, its fibers respond; the nervous system does not send a “half signal” to those fibers. The principle does not mean that an entire muscle is either completely on or completely off.

Whole-muscle force is graded. The nervous system can recruit additional motor units, alter their firing rates, coordinate them differently, and change activation across synergists and antagonists. Meanwhile, joint position changes the mechanical result of that activation. Henneman’s size principle remains central: increasing force demand generally brings progressively higher-threshold motor units into the task.[1]

> **FACT-CHECK**
> “Every fiber fires fully or not at all” is only defensible when it refers to fibers within an activated motor unit. It is not a rule that every region of a whole muscle contributes equally in every exercise or at every joint angle.

Load Is Important, but Load Is Not Acting Alone

A heavy external load creates a high force requirement from the first repetition and is highly useful for improving maximal strength. That does not make the number on the bar the sole determinant of recruitment. With a lighter load, sustained effort and fatigue can increase the demand placed on available motor units. In a controlled study of resistance-trained men, low-load and high-load training taken to volitional failure produced similar muscle hypertrophy, while heavier loading retained advantages for some strength outcomes.[3]

This is why “load” must be interpreted through effort, repetitions, tempo, range, leverage, intent, and technique. A 25-kilogram dumbbell can be easy in one exercise and maximal in another. The muscle responds to the internal demands created by the task, not to the label printed on the plate.

What Joint Angle Changes

Changing an angle can change where a movement is hardest, how long a muscle is under load, which muscles have the best leverage, and how much stable range of motion can be used. These are real mechanical differences. They do not create perfect isolation, but they can create a bias.

Long-muscle-length training provides a clear example. In a controlled hamstring study, seated leg curls produced greater whole-hamstring hypertrophy than prone leg curls, despite both exercises training knee flexion; the seated position placed biarticular hamstrings at longer lengths.[5] In squat research, deep and shallow ranges produced different strength and muscle adaptations.[6] Other studies show that partial-range training at long muscle lengths can outperform short-length partials for some adaptations.[7]

Regional hypertrophy also exists. Strength and power training have produced nonuniform changes within the quadriceps,[8] and isometric training can produce joint-angle-specific strength gains.[9] These findings do not prove that every five-degree adjustment deserves its own exercise. They demonstrate that muscle length, joint position, and range are biologically meaningful.

Why the “Feel” of an Exercise Can Mislead

Sensation may reflect local fatigue, stretch, novelty, metabolites, technique, or attention. It can help an experienced lifter notice whether an exercise is being performed as intended, but it cannot reveal the complete pattern of motor-unit recruitment or predict long-term growth.

Surface electromyography is useful for carefully framed questions about electrical activity near the recording site. It is not a direct measure of muscle force, mechanical tension, or future hypertrophy. Electrode placement, anatomy, normalization, cross-talk, movement, and signal processing all affect the amplitude. Interpreting a larger acute EMG signal as proof that one exercise will build more muscle is therefore a category error.[4]

Bench-angle studies illustrate the distinction. Acute EMG patterns can change across horizontal and inclined pressing,[10] but that finding alone does not establish a superior long-term hypertrophy program. An acute signal can suggest a hypothesis; longitudinal training must test the adaptation.

A Better Exercise-Selection Standard

The Academy’s answer to angle chasing is not to deny mechanics. It is to demand a reason for variation. Keep an exercise when it is safe for the trainee, trains the intended movement or tissue through a productive range, can be loaded and repeated consistently, and improves an outcome that matters.

Change the angle when the change solves a problem: it improves tolerance, exposes a useful muscle length, matches a target range, addresses an identified limitation, or creates a progression that the current exercise cannot. Do not change it merely because the previous version stopped feeling novel.

This approach supports a compound-first system. The squat, press, pull, bench, and deadlift families can cover a large share of general strength training efficiently. A variation or single-joint exercise earns a place when it produces a specific benefit that justifies its time and recovery cost. That is a programming filter, not a claim that anatomy disappears outside the five lifts.

Conclusion

The industry's mistake is not recognizing that angles matter. Its mistake is selling angle novelty as anatomical precision and treating sensation as proof. Load remains essential, especially when maximal strength is the target. Yet load, effort, range of motion, muscle length, and joint mechanics operate together.

> *"Stop chasing novelty. Chase progressively greater force through repeatable, productive ranges."*

References

1. Henneman E, Somjen G, Carpenter DO. Functional significance of cell size in spinal motoneurons. J Neurophysiol. 1965;28:560–580. doi:10.1152/jn.1965.28.3.560
2. Currier BS, et al. Resistance Training Prescription for Muscle Function, Hypertrophy, and Physical Performance in Healthy Adults: An Overview of Reviews. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2026;58(4):851–872. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000003897
3. Morton RW, Oikawa SY, Wavell CG, et al. Neither load nor systemic hormones determine resistance training-mediated hypertrophy or strength gains in resistance-trained young men. J Appl Physiol. 2016;121(1):129–138. doi:10.1152/japplphysiol.00154.2016
4. Vigotsky AD, Halperin I, Lehman GJ, Trajano GS, Vieira TM. Interpreting signal amplitudes in surface electromyography studies in sport and rehabilitation sciences. Front Physiol. 2018;8:985. doi:10.3389/fphys.2017.00985
5. Maeo S, et al. Greater hamstrings muscle hypertrophy but similar damage protection after training at long versus short muscle lengths. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2021;53(4):825–837. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000002523
6. Bloomquist K, Langberg H, Karlsen S, Madsgaard S, Boesen M, Raastad T. Effect of range of motion in heavy load squatting on muscle and tendon adaptations. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2013;113(8):2133–2142. doi:10.1007/s00421-013-2642-7
7. Pedrosa GF, Maeo S, Lemos TMAM, et al. Partial range of motion training elicits favorable improvements in muscular adaptations when carried out at long muscle lengths. Eur J Sport Sci. 2022;22(8):1250–1260. doi:10.1080/17461391.2021.1927199
8. Earp JE, Newton RU, Cormie P, Blazevich AJ. Inhomogeneous quadriceps femoris hypertrophy in response to strength and power training. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2015;47(11):2389–2397. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000000669
9. Noorkõiv M, Nosaka K, Blazevich AJ. Neuromuscular adaptations associated with knee joint angle-specific force change. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2014;46(8):1525–1537. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000000269
10. Lauver JD, Cayot TE, Scheuermann BW. Influence of bench angle on upper extremity muscular activation during bench press exercise. Eur J Sport Sci. 2016;16(3):309–316. doi:10.1080/17461391.2015.1022605

WHITE PAPER 03 / ACADEMY OF STRENGTH

The Fallacy of Sport-Specific Training

Why Strength Builds Capacity and Skill Must Be Practiced in Context

> *“You get stronger in the gym. You get better at your sport by practicing it.”*

Executive Thesis

The phrase “sport-specific training” is used so broadly that it can mean almost anything: playing the sport, lifting weights, sprinting with a sled, swinging a heavy implement, standing on an unstable surface, or copying a game movement with a cable. When every exercise is called specific, the term stops helping coaches make decisions.

A clearer model separates capacity from expression. Resistance training builds physical capacities such as maximal force, rate of force development, tissue tolerance, and power. Sport practice teaches the athlete to organize those capacities under the sport’s exact perceptual, coordinative, tactical, and timing constraints. The two interact, but they are not interchangeable.

Skill Is Highly Specific

Motor skill improves through repeated attempts in which the athlete perceives relevant information, produces an action, receives feedback, and adjusts. Research on specificity of practice shows that the sensory information and conditions available during practice shape what is learned.[1] A hitter must read an actual pitch; a defender must respond to an opponent; a lifter must practice the lift or test in which performance will be judged.

This specificity is visible even inside strength training. In one study, repeatedly practicing a one-repetition-maximum test produced gains on that test comparable to much higher-volume training, while the higher-volume group gained more muscle.[2] The result is a warning against treating every rise in a test score as a purely general increase in muscular capacity. Testing is also a skill.

Velocity and joint angle matter as well. Resistance training performed with maximal intended velocity can produce velocity-specific adaptations even when the implement moves slowly under heavy load,[3] and isometric strength gains are greatest near the trained joint angles.[4] Strength is transferable, but it is never entirely free of the task through which it was acquired.

What General Strength Contributes

The fact that strength is task-specific does not make the weight room irrelevant. A larger force reserve can reduce the relative effort required for submaximal actions and can support higher outputs when the athlete has the skill and time to express it. Heavy resistance training can improve neural drive and rate of force development,[5] while appropriately designed strength programs have improved sprint, jump, change-of-direction, and strength outcomes in trained young soccer players.[6]

The responsible claim is probabilistic: becoming stronger increases an athlete's potential to produce force, and that potential often supports sport performance. It does not guarantee that a stronger squat will automatically appear as a faster first step, a more accurate throw, or a better tackle. Transfer depends on the athlete's limiting factor and on the similarity of force direction, contraction time, velocity, range of motion, coordination, and energy-system demands.

> **FACT-CHECK**
> "Strength is general" is useful coaching shorthand, but scientifically incomplete. Strength adaptations are partly specific to the trained movement, range, joint angle, contraction type, and velocity intention. The transferable element is increased force-producing capacity—not a universal motor program.

Why Loaded Imitation Is Not Automatically Specific

An exercise can resemble a sport movement and still train the wrong problem. Adding load may alter timing, release mechanics, posture, contact time, or the information that guides the action. A cable punch may look like punching while removing the opponent, the target, the footwork, and the rapid impact. Visual resemblance is not proof of transfer.

That does not mean every loaded sport-like drill corrupts skill. Some "bridge" exercises deliberately retain an important feature while overloading it. Sled-resisted sprinting, medicine-ball throws, assisted or resisted jumps, and weighted implements can be useful when the target and dose are clear.

The evidence illustrates both possibility and risk. In a randomized six-week weighted-baseball study, trained high-school pitchers increased throwing velocity, but 24% of the weighted-ball group sustained an injury and none occurred in the control group.[7] In resisted sprint research, individualized heavy sled loading produced small group improvements in sprint outcomes, with meaningful variation among athletes.[8] Neither result supports a blanket rule. Overload can transfer; it can also impose costs.

A Hierarchy for Physical Preparation

Build the base. First, build general capacity with simple, measurable training. Squat, press, pull, bench, and deadlift families can raise force capacity efficiently when they are appropriate for the athlete. Conditioning, mobility, and tissue preparation should be added according to the demands of the sport and the athlete's current limitations.

Train the output. Second, convert capacity when the sport requires it. Jumps, throws, sprints, and ballistic resistance work can train rapid force expression. The exercise should have a defensible relationship to the desired output without needing to be a visual copy of competition.

Practice the skill. Third, practice the sport in the environment where perception and action are coupled. Technical and tactical decisions are learned through representative repetition, feedback, and competition-like constraints.

Earn specificity. Finally, add a bridge exercise only when it has a job. The coach should be able to identify the target quality, explain why the drill overloads it, measure whether the intended output changes, and control the fatigue or injury cost. If those questions have no clear answer, the drill is theater.

The Gym's Proper Role

The weight room should make the athlete more capable and more available to practice. It should not compete with the sport for identity. A strong program is often less theatrical than a highlight reel: a small number of lifts, clear loading, repeatable technique, adequate recovery, and outcome tracking.

This division of labor protects both sides. The gym can pursue force and power without pretending to reproduce an open, chaotic sport. Sport practice can pursue perception, timing, tactics, and technique without being overloaded simply to look difficult. The coach then evaluates the bridge between them instead of assuming it.

Conclusion

The fallacy is not that special exercises can never transfer. It is that resemblance alone makes an exercise specific, or that a physical capacity automatically becomes competitive skill. Strength prepares the system. Practice organizes that strength into the exact action the sport rewards.

> *"Strength supports skill. It does not replace practice."*

References

1. Proteau L, Marteniuk RG, Lévesque L. A sensorimotor basis for motor learning: evidence indicating specificity of practice. Q J Exp Psychol A. 1992;44(3):557–575. doi:10.1080/14640749208401298
2. Mattocks KT, Buckner SL, Jessee MB, Dankel SJ, Mouser JG, Loenneke JP. Practicing the test produces strength equivalent to higher volume training. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2017;49(9):1945–1954. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000001300
3. Behm DG, Sale DG. Intended rather than actual movement velocity determines velocity-specific training response. J Appl Physiol. 1993;74(1):359–368. doi:10.1152/jappl.1993.74.1.359
4. Noorkõiv M, Nosaka K, Blazevich AJ. Neuromuscular adaptations associated with knee joint angle-specific force change. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2014;46(8):1525–1537. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000000269
5. Aagaard P, Simonsen EB, Andersen JL, Magnusson P, Dyhre-Poulsen P. Increased rate of force development and neural drive of human skeletal muscle following resistance training. J Appl Physiol. 2002;93(4):1318–1326. doi:10.1152/japplphysiol.00283.2002
6. Keiner M, Kadlubowski B, Sander A, Hartmann H, Wirth K. Effects of 10 months of speed, functional, and traditional strength training on strength, linear sprint, change of direction, and jump performance in trained adolescent soccer players. J Strength Cond Res. 2022;36(8):2236–2246. doi:10.1519/JSC.0000000000003807
7. Reinold MM, Macrina LC, Fleisig GS, et al. Effect of a 6-week weighted baseball throwing program on pitch velocity, pitching arm biomechanics, passive range of motion, and injury rates. Sports Health. 2018;10(4):327–333. doi:10.1177/1941738118779909
8. Cross MR, Lahti J, Brown SR, et al. Training at maximal power in resisted sprinting: optimal load determination methodology and pilot results in team sport athletes. PLoS One. 2018;13(4):e0195477. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0195477
9. Currier BS, et al. Resistance Training Prescription for Muscle Function, Hypertrophy, and Physical Performance in Healthy Adults: An Overview of Reviews. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2026;58(4):851–872. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000003897

WHITE PAPER 04 / ACADEMY OF STRENGTH

Why Strength Is the Foundation of Health

Why Muscle Function Belongs at the Center of Healthy Aging

> *"Health is not only the absence of disease. It is the capacity to meet the demands of life."*

Executive Thesis

Health is often discussed through laboratory values, diagnoses, and the absence of symptoms. Those measures matter, but they do not fully describe whether a person can rise from the floor, climb stairs, carry a load, arrest a fall, or remain independent. Strength is the physical reserve that helps make those actions possible.

That does not make strength the whole of health. Cardiorespiratory fitness, metabolic health, balance, mobility, nutrition, sleep, and medical care remain distinct. The World Health Organization recommends both aerobic activity and muscle-strengthening work because the two serve overlapping but nonidentical purposes.[1] The Academy claim is therefore a priority claim: strength belongs near the center of health preparation because losing it narrows nearly every physical option.

Strength Is Functional Reserve

Daily tasks require an absolute amount of force. A flight of stairs does not become lighter because someone is tired, older, or detrained. When maximal force capacity falls, an ordinary task consumes a larger percentage of what the person can produce. Eventually the task crosses from easy, to difficult, to impossible.

This is why health cannot be reduced to body weight or muscle size. In the Health, Aging and Body Composition Study, older adults lost leg strength roughly three times faster than leg lean mass over three years.[2] Muscle mass matters, but neural drive, coordination, tissue quality, pain, disease, and the ability to use available muscle also influence force. A person can preserve some mass and still lose meaningful capability.

Prospective research reinforces the reserve model. In initially healthy middle-aged men, lower grip strength predicted more functional limitation and disability 25 years later.[3] This does not establish that grip training prevents disability. Grip strength may also reflect prior activity, illness, nutrition, and general vitality. What it establishes is that strength is not a cosmetic side note; it is a useful marker of future function.

What Mortality Research Can—and Cannot—Prove

Large cohort studies consistently associate lower strength with higher risk. In the PURE study, which followed nearly 140,000 adults across multiple countries, every 5-kilogram decrement in grip strength was associated with a 16% higher risk of all-cause mortality during follow-up.[4] The association remained after statistical adjustment and was also present for cardiovascular outcomes.

> **CAUSALITY BOUNDARY**
> Grip strength is a prognostic marker, not proof that adding 5 kilograms to a grip test directly reduces mortality by a corresponding percentage. Observational research cannot fully separate strength from disease burden, activity history, socioeconomic conditions, nutrition, and other causes. Training recommendations must rest on intervention evidence as well as association.

What Resistance Training Changes Directly

The intervention evidence is less dramatic than a mortality headline and more useful for coaching. The 2026 American College of Sports Medicine position stand synthesized 137 reviews and concluded that resistance training improves strength, hypertrophy, power, muscular endurance, gait speed, balance, chair-rise performance, and other measures of physical function compared with no training.[5] Many forms worked. The common requirement was progressive, sufficiently demanding muscular work performed consistently.

The effect is visible even in advanced age. In frail nursing-home residents with a mean age of 87, high-intensity resistance training produced large strength gains and improved gait and stair-climbing power.[6] The lesson is not that every older adult should begin with the same load. It is that age does not erase trainability and that carefully supervised loading can restore capacity even after substantial decline.

Bone, Metabolism, and Physical Independence

Strength training also loads tissues that health depends on. In the LIFTMOR randomized trial, screened postmenopausal women with low bone mass completed eight months of supervised high-intensity resistance and impact training. Compared with a low-intensity home program, the intervention improved lumbar-spine bone mineral density and multiple physical-function measures.[7] That result supports appropriately prescribed loading; it does not justify unsupervised maximal lifting for every person with osteoporosis.

In older adults with type 2 diabetes, progressive resistance training added to a moderate weight-loss program improved glycated hemoglobin more than weight loss plus a control program, while better preserving lean mass.[8] Resistance training is therefore a legitimate component of metabolic care. It is not a replacement for medication, nutrition, aerobic exercise, or clinical monitoring when those are indicated.

The Academy Standard

The Academy of Strength organizes this work around the Squat, Press, Pull, Bench, and Deadlift families. These movements are not magical and their barbell versions are not mandatory. They are useful because they train large amounts of muscle, can be scaled to the person, and permit small, measurable increases in work and force over time.

The health prescription is not to chase exhaustion. It is to retain or increase physical reserve. Train the major muscle groups at least twice weekly, use loads and ranges that can be performed safely, progress as adaptation occurs, and preserve enough recovery to repeat the process. Add aerobic conditioning, balance practice, sport, and rehabilitation according to the outcome—not because strength failed, but because health is larger than one quality.

Conclusion

Strength is foundational to health because health must eventually be expressed through action. Bloodwork cannot lift a suitcase. A diagnosis cannot rise from a chair. The human system must still produce and control force.

The honest claim is not that strength prevents every disease or guarantees longevity. It is that strength is trainable, strongly associated with future function, and directly improves the physical capacities that protect independence. Weakness reduces the margin for error. Strength restores it.

> *"Build enough strength that ordinary life remains ordinary."*

References

1. Bull FC, Al-Ansari SS, Biddle S, et al. World Health Organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. Br J Sports Med. 2020;54(24):1451–1462. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2020-102955
2. Goodpaster BH, Park SW, Harris TB, et al. The loss of skeletal muscle strength, mass, and quality in older adults: the Health, Aging and Body Composition Study. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2006;61(10):1059–1064. doi:10.1093/gerona/61.10.1059
3. Rantanen T, Guralnik JM, Foley D, et al. Midlife hand grip strength as a predictor of old age disability. JAMA. 1999;281(6):558–560. doi:10.1001/jama.281.6.558
4. Leong DP, Teo KK, Rangarajan S, et al. Prognostic value of grip strength: findings from the Prospective Urban Rural Epidemiology (PURE) study. Lancet. 2015;386(9990):266–273. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(14)62000-6
5. Currier BS, D'Souza AC, Fiatarone Singh MA, et al. American College of Sports Medicine position stand. Resistance training prescription for muscle function, hypertrophy, and physical performance in healthy adults: an overview of reviews. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2026;58(4):851–872. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000003897
6. Fiatarone MA, O'Neill EF, Ryan ND, et al. Exercise training and nutritional supplementation for physical frailty in very elderly people. N Engl J Med. 1994;330(25):1769–1775. doi:10.1056/NEJM199406233302501
7. Watson SL, Weeks BK, Weis LJ, Harding AT, Horan SA, Beck BR. High-intensity resistance and impact training improves bone mineral density and physical function in postmenopausal women with osteopenia and osteoporosis: the LIFTMOR randomized controlled trial. J Bone Miner Res. 2018;33(2):211–220. doi:10.1002/jbmr.3284
8. Dunstan DW, Daly RM, Owen N, et al. High-intensity resistance training improves glycemic control in older patients with type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Care. 2002;25(10):1729–1736. doi:10.2337/diacare.25.10.1729

WHITE PAPER 05 / ACADEMY OF STRENGTH

The True Science of Hypertrophy

What Builds Muscle—and What Merely Feels Like It Does

> *“Muscle grows from repeated, recoverable loading—not from chasing a sensation.”*

Executive Thesis

Muscle growth has been buried beneath a vocabulary of pumps, burns, shocks, angles, hormone spikes, microtears, and secret repetition ranges. Most of that language confuses an acute experience with a long-term adaptation. A muscle can burn without growing. It can become sore without growing. It can grow without either sensation being dramatic.

Hypertrophy is the enlargement of muscle tissue over time. Resistance training produces it when training repeatedly creates a sufficient muscular demand, the dose can be recovered from, and nutrition supplies the material required to remodel tissue. No single rep range, exercise angle, or post-workout feeling owns that process.[1]

What Muscle Growth Actually Is

Long-term hypertrophy is assessed through changes such as muscle-fiber cross-sectional area, ultrasound-measured thickness, or magnetic-resonance-imaging muscle volume. Each method has limitations, but all attempt to separate durable tissue change from the temporary swelling, fluid shift, glycogen storage, and inflammation that can follow a workout.

At the tissue level, growth requires accumulated periods in which muscle-protein synthesis exceeds breakdown. Even this statement needs care. Early in a new program, a large protein-synthesis response may support repair of unfamiliar damage rather than new contractile tissue. In a longitudinal study, integrated myofibrillar protein synthesis related to hypertrophy only after training reduced the initial muscle-damage response.[2] One impressive acute laboratory signal is not the same thing as measured growth.

Force Demand Recruits the System

The nervous system grades force by recruiting motor units and altering their firing behavior. Henneman's size principle describes the general order: lower-threshold units are recruited before progressively higher-threshold units as force demand rises.[3] Heavy loads create high force demands immediately. Lighter loads can also require high-threshold recruitment as sustained effort and fatigue make the remaining repetitions increasingly demanding.

This is why external load cannot be treated as a complete measure of the stimulus. Muscle length, moment arms, range of motion, repetitions, effort, velocity intention, stability, and fatigue all change the internal force requirement. Mechanical tension is useful shorthand for that loading environment; it is not a number printed on a plate.

There Is No Exclusive Hypertrophy Rep Range

In resistance-trained men, 12 weeks of whole-body training with roughly 30–50% of one-repetition maximum for 20–25 repetitions per set produced muscle growth similar to training at roughly 75–90% for 8–12 repetitions when sets were taken to volitional failure.[4] Heavier training retained an advantage for bench-press one-repetition-maximum improvement. The distinction is crucial: many loads can build muscle, but the best way to build a specific strength test still includes practicing heavy work related to that test.

Effort becomes especially important at low loads. In an eight-week unilateral knee-extension study, training at 30% of one-repetition maximum produced clear quadriceps growth when sets reached failure but not when the low-load sets stopped much earlier. At 80%, reaching failure added no hypertrophy advantage over stopping short in that protocol.[5] Failure is therefore a tool, not a commandment. The lighter the load, the more repetitions may be required to create a comparable recruitment demand.

> **PROGRAMMING BOUNDARY**
> A set does not become productive merely because the lifter adds unplanned repetitions to chase a burn. Follow the prescribed sets, repetitions, load, range, and progression. If performance exceeds the plan, record it and advance the next programmed exposure rather than turning every session into an improvised failure test.

Volume Matters, but More Is Not Infinite

Hypertrophy responds to accumulated hard training. In untrained men, six months of training with five sets per exercise produced greater upper-arm muscle-thickness gains than lower-set conditions in several comparisons.[6] The 2026 ACSM synthesis likewise found that higher weekly volumes can enhance hypertrophy on average.[1]

That does not mean every added set is productive. Volume has a recovery cost, studies report group averages, and the useful dose depends on training status, exercise selection, effort, sleep, nutrition, and the muscle being measured. The correct dose is enough work to force adaptation without degrading technique, performance, or the next exposure.

The Academy's seven-week progression moves from higher-repetition work toward heavier, lower-repetition work. That is a coherent way to expose the body to different loading demands while keeping progression measurable. It should be defended as an applied framework—not as proof that one seven-week sequence is the only or universally optimal hypertrophy prescription.

Range and Muscle Length Matter

The rejection of angle chasing must not become denial of anatomy. Joint position changes muscle length, leverage, and force distribution. In a 12-week within-person study, seated leg curls produced greater whole-hamstring hypertrophy than prone leg curls, particularly in the biarticular hamstrings placed at longer lengths.[7] That is a meaningful programming difference, not proof that every minor angle change deserves another exercise.

The correct question is not, “Can this angle feel different?” It is, “Does this position create a repeatable, tolerable loading exposure that improves the outcome we actually care about?” Angles are tools. Progression remains the system.

What the Pump, Soreness, EMG, and Hormones Do Not Prove

A pump shows that fluid has shifted into working tissue. Soreness shows that an exercise created an unfamiliar or damaging stress. Surface electromyography estimates electrical activity near an electrode. None of those observations, alone, establishes future hypertrophy.

The same is true of acute systemic hormone elevations. In a cohort of 56 young men, post-exercise changes in growth hormone, free testosterone, and insulin-like growth factor 1 did not explain gains in lean mass or leg-press strength.[8] The Morton training study reached the same practical conclusion.[4] Local cellular signaling and normal endocrine function matter; a temporary bloodstream spike is simply not a scoreboard for muscle growth.

Nutrition and Recovery Supply the Adaptation

Training provides the demand. Food and recovery determine whether the body can repeatedly answer it. A large meta-analysis found that protein supplementation modestly enhanced resistance-training gains in lean mass and strength, with average benefits plateauing around a total daily intake of approximately 1.6 grams per kilogram of body mass in the studied healthy adults.[9] That number is an estimate, not a universal ceiling or a requirement to buy supplements.

Total energy intake, protein quality and distribution, sleep, illness, medication, age, and training history all affect the result. No advanced method can compensate indefinitely for inadequate nutrition or recovery.

The Academy Standard

Build hypertrophy through exercises that can be loaded, repeated, and progressed. Use compound lifts to train large amounts of muscle efficiently. Keep technique and range consistent enough that an increase in performance means something. Add a variation only when it solves a defined problem—not because novelty created a new sensation.

Muscle growth is the accumulated result of productive exposures. The session is a signal. The program is the dose. The months and years are the adaptation.

Conclusion

The true science of hypertrophy is less theatrical than the marketing. Muscles grow when sufficiently demanding resistance training is performed often enough, progressed over time, and supported by food and recovery. Load matters, but it is not acting alone. Volume matters, but it is not unlimited. Failure can matter, but it is not mandatory. Angles matter, but they do not replace progression.

> *“Do not chase the feeling of growth. Build the conditions that make growth unavoidable.”*

References

1. Currier BS, D'Souza AC, Fiatarone Singh MA, et al. American College of Sports Medicine position stand. Resistance training prescription for muscle function, hypertrophy, and physical performance in healthy adults: an overview of reviews. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2026;58(4):851–872. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000003897
2. Damas F, Phillips SM, Libardi CA, et al. Resistance training-induced changes in integrated myofibrillar protein synthesis are related to hypertrophy only after attenuation of muscle damage. J Physiol. 2016;594(18):5209–5222. doi:10.1113/JP272472
3. Henneman E, Somjen G, Carpenter DO. Functional significance of cell size in spinal motoneurons. J Neurophysiol. 1965;28:560–580. doi:10.1152/jn.1965.28.3.560
4. Morton RW, Oikawa SY, Wavell CG, et al. Neither load nor systemic hormones determine resistance training-mediated hypertrophy or strength gains in resistance-trained young men. J Appl Physiol. 2016;121(1):129–138. doi:10.1152/japplphysiol.00154.2016
5. Lasevicius T, Schoenfeld BJ, Silva-Batista C, et al. Muscle failure promotes greater muscle hypertrophy in low-load but not in high-load resistance training. J Strength Cond Res. 2022;36(2):346–351. doi:10.1519/JSC.0000000000003454
6. Radaelli R, Fleck SJ, Leite T, et al. Dose-response of 1, 3, and 5 sets of resistance exercise on strength, local muscular endurance, and hypertrophy. J Strength Cond Res. 2015;29(5):1349–1358. doi:10.1519/JSC.0000000000000758
7. Maeo S, Huang M, Wu Y, et al. Greater hamstrings muscle hypertrophy but similar damage protection after training at long versus short muscle lengths. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2021;53(4):825–837. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000002523
8. West DWD, Phillips SM. Associations of exercise-induced hormone profiles and gains in strength and hypertrophy in a large cohort after weight training. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2012;112:2693–2702. doi:10.1007/s00421-011-2246-z
9. Morton RW, Murphy KT, McKellar SR, et al. A systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-regression of the effect of protein supplementation on resistance training-induced gains in muscle mass and strength in healthy adults. Br J Sports Med. 2018;52(6):376–384. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2017-097608

WHITE PAPER 06 / ACADEMY OF STRENGTH

Why Compound Movements Are All You Need

Foundational Lifts for General Strength—and the Exceptions That Earn Their Place

> *"A movement earns its place by what it builds, not by how many exercises fit on the page."*

Executive Thesis

Most training programs become complicated for the wrong reason. Exercises accumulate because variety looks sophisticated, muscles are divided into ever-smaller targets, and fatigue is mistaken for completeness. The result is often more time, more soreness, and less measurable progress.

Compound movements reverse that equation. A squat, press, pull, bench, or deadlift asks multiple joints and muscle groups to produce and control force together. One well-chosen lift can train more tissue, more coordination, and more usable force than a circuit of disconnected movements. For general strength, that efficiency makes compound lifts the default.

> **TITLE BOUNDARY**
> "All you need" is an Academy programming standard for general strength and broad muscular development. It is not an anatomical claim that every compound exercise maximizes every muscle, nor a claim that single-joint exercise has no biological effect. An absolute version of either statement would be false.

Why Compound-First Programming Works

Compound lifts offer a large return on training time. They can expose several major muscle groups to meaningful force in the same set, accept progressive external loading, and produce objective performance records. They also allow the trainee to practice bracing, balance, and force transfer across joints under a stable, repeatable task.

Their value is not that a heavier bar automatically creates more growth. A larger external load is distributed across several joints and muscles. Their value is coverage: a small menu can improve broad force capacity without requiring a separate exercise for every anatomical structure. The 2026 ACSM position stand found that many resistance-training modes improve strength and muscle function and that exercise complexity itself did not consistently determine outcomes.[1] Consistency, effort, progression, and matching the exercise to the goal remain more important than the label attached to the equipment.

What Addition Studies Actually Show

In one 10-week trial of untrained young men, a program built from lat pulldowns and bench presses increased elbow-flexor muscle thickness and peak torque. Adding curls and elbow extensions produced no statistically significant additional improvement in those measured outcomes.[2] In resistance-trained men, eight weeks of multi-joint training likewise produced changes in upper-arm size and single-joint strength similar to the same program with added arm isolation work.[3]

Those trials support a time-efficiency argument, not a universal law. The samples were small, the interventions were short, and the measurements did not capture every muscle or every region. “No significant additional benefit in this study” does not mean “no possible benefit for any person or goal.” It means that more exercises should not receive the benefit of the doubt.

The Newer Evidence Shows Both the Strength and the Limit

A 2026 within-person trial directly compared leg press training in one leg with knee-extension training in the other. Both produced comparable growth in the three vasti muscles and in the quadriceps as a whole. The leg press also increased gluteus maximus and adductor magnus volume, demonstrating the broad coverage that makes a multi-joint exercise efficient.[4]

But the same trial found that knee extension produced far greater rectus femoris growth than leg press. A separate eight-week study found greater elbow-flexor hypertrophy from a biceps curl than from a dumbbell row, although it involved only 10 untrained men.[5] These findings are not an argument for filling every program with isolation work. They are evidence that exercise selection is specific and that indirect involvement may not maximize every muscle.

Squat research makes the same point. Ten weeks of full- or half-squat training increased knee-extensor, gluteus maximus, and adductor muscle volume, with deeper squatting producing greater gluteal and adductor growth. Hamstring and rectus femoris volume did not significantly increase in either condition.[6] A compound lift can be extraordinarily productive without being anatomically complete.

General Strength Is Not Maximum Regional Hypertrophy

The apparent conflict disappears when the goal is stated honestly. Academy of Strength is not a bodybuilding system designed to maximize the size of every muscle region. It is a general strength system designed to make people more capable through a small number of scalable, measurable lifts.

For that mission, failing to maximize rectus femoris or biceps hypertrophy in isolation does not invalidate the squat or pull. The question is whether the person is becoming stronger across the major movement families and whether that strength supports the demands of life, work, or sport. If the answer is yes, adding exercises merely to make the program look complete is wasted complexity.

The Five Books as a Coverage System

Squat trains the coordinated production of force through the hips, knees, trunk, and feet. Press trains vertical force through the shoulder girdle, arms, and trunk. Pull trains vertical or horizontal pulling through the back, arms, grip, and trunk. Bench trains horizontal pressing with stable, measurable loading. Deadlift trains force production from the floor through the posterior chain, trunk, and grip.

These are movement families, not sacred equipment choices. Anatomy, injury history, tolerance, access, and the intended test determine the variation. A person may use a barbell, dumbbells, a machine, or body weight when that version is safe, repeatable, and progressively loadable. The family preserves the purpose while the variation serves the person.

When an Additional Exercise Earns Its Place

An additional movement earns a place when a specific need has been identified: rehabilitation after injury, restoring tolerance in a tissue that cannot yet participate fully, or correcting a documented gap that limits the primary lifts. In those cases, the exercise is not filler. It has a defined target, a measurable outcome, and an exit or progression criterion.

If someone's goal is maximum development of a particular muscle, the evidence does not support claiming that compound lifts always maximize that outcome. That is a different goal and should be programmed honestly. The Academy does not need to adopt bodybuilding priorities in order to acknowledge the biology.

Strength improvements are also specific to the practiced task. Repeated practice of a one-repetition maximum can raise that test even without the greater muscle growth produced by higher-volume training. [7] Compound lifts should therefore be selected because they are the capacities the program wants to build and measure—not because every barbell exercise automatically transfers everywhere.

The Academy Filter

Before adding an exercise, ask four questions. What exact problem does it solve? What outcome will show that it worked? Does a primary lift already provide enough stimulus? Is the benefit worth the time and recovery cost? If those questions cannot be answered, the exercise has not earned its place.

This filter protects the program from both extremes. It rejects random accessory clutter, and it also prevents doctrine from overruling evidence when rehabilitation or a clearly defined limitation requires a more specific tool.

Conclusion

Compound movements are all most people need to build broad, measurable general strength. They cover large amounts of muscle, train force across coordinated movement, and make progression difficult to fake. That is a powerful programming advantage.

They are not all that human anatomy can respond to, and they do not maximize every possible adaptation. The honest Academy position is stronger than the absolute slogan: begin with the foundational lifts, progress them for long enough to judge the result, and add nothing until a real need earns the space.

> *“Master the movements that build the system. Add only what the system proves it needs.”*

References

1. Currier BS, D'Souza AC, Fiatarone Singh MA, et al. American College of Sports Medicine position stand. Resistance training prescription for muscle function, hypertrophy, and physical performance in healthy adults: an overview of reviews. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2026;58(4):851–872. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000003897
2. Gentil P, Soares SRS, Pereira MC, et al. Effect of adding single-joint exercises to a multi-joint exercise resistance-training program on strength and hypertrophy in untrained subjects. Appl Physiol Nutr Metab. 2013;38(3):341–344. doi:10.1139/apnm-2012-0176
3. de França HS, Branco PAN, Guedes Junior DP, Gentil P, Steele J, Teixeira CVLS. The effects of adding single-joint exercises to a multi-joint exercise resistance training program on upper body muscle strength and size in trained men. Appl Physiol Nutr Metab. 2015;40(8):822–826. doi:10.1139/apnm-2015-0109
4. Kinoshita M, Maeo S, Kobayashi Y, et al. Hypertrophic effects of single- versus multi-joint exercise: a direct comparison between knee extension and leg press. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2026;58(7):1566–1580. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000003957
5. Mannarino P, Matta T, Lima J, Simão R, Freitas de Salles B. Single-joint exercise results in higher hypertrophy of elbow flexors than multijoint exercise. J Strength Cond Res. 2021;35(10):2677–2681. doi:10.1519/JSC.0000000000003234
6. Kubo K, Ikebukuro T, Yata H. Effects of squat training with different depths on lower limb muscle volumes. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2019;119(9):1933–1942. doi:10.1007/s00421-019-04181-y
7. Mattocks KT, Buckner SL, Jessee MB, Dankel SJ, Mouser JG, Loenneke JP. Practicing the test produces strength equivalent to higher volume training. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2017;49(9):1945–1954. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000001300

WHITE PAPER 07 / ACADEMY OF STRENGTH

Strength and Cardio

Why Different Adaptations Should Work Together—not Compete

> *“Strength builds force. Cardio builds the capacity to sustain work. Neither can impersonate the other.”*

Executive Thesis

The fitness industry often frames strength and cardio as rival camps. One side treats every mile as a threat to muscle. The other treats lifting as optional because the heart rate did not remain high enough. Both positions confuse a training method with the adaptation it is best designed to produce.

Strength training raises the capacity to produce and control force. Aerobic training raises the capacity to transport and use oxygen, sustain repeated work, and recover between efforts. Those adaptations overlap, but they are not interchangeable. This is why the World Health Organization recommends both aerobic activity and muscle-strengthening work rather than asking one mode to do every job.[1]

The Academy position is therefore not strength instead of conditioning. It is strength first as the foundation of force, with conditioning prescribed for the demands strength alone does not fully solve. A complete program assigns each tool a job and manages the fatigue created when both are trained together.

Different Demands Produce Different Adaptations

A heavy squat and a sustained run can both feel difficult, but difficulty does not make them the same stimulus. Progressive resistance training improves maximal strength, power, muscle size, muscular endurance, and multiple measures of physical function.[8] Aerobic training places a larger and more continuous demand on oxygen delivery and utilization. Cardiorespiratory fitness is important enough that the American Heart Association has argued for treating it as a clinical vital sign.[2]

Specificity still governs the result. Lifting can raise work capacity, especially in someone who is untrained, and endurance exercise can strengthen tissues relative to their starting point. But a person does not build maximal force merely by extending the duration of a low-force task, and a strong deadlift does not guarantee the aerobic capacity required for a long race, shift, hike, or repeated field effort.

The Original Interference Effect

The fear that cardio destroys strength is usually traced to Robert Hickson's 1980 experiment. The strength group trained five days per week, the endurance group trained six, and the combined group performed both regimens. The combined group improved strength at first, then leveled off and declined late in the ten-week study, while its gains in maximal oxygen uptake were preserved.[3]

That study demonstrated that interference can occur. It did not establish that any amount of aerobic work cancels strength adaptation. The combined condition imposed an unusually dense schedule, and the result was specific: endurance development survived while late strength development was reduced. The correct lesson is that adaptation has a recovery cost—not that the human body can select only one quality.

What the Updated Evidence Shows

A 2022 meta-analysis of 43 studies compared concurrent aerobic-plus-strength training with the same strength training performed alone. On average, concurrent training did not significantly compromise maximal strength or muscle hypertrophy. Explosive-strength gains showed a small attenuation, most clearly when aerobic and strength work occurred in the same session.[4]

This is a more useful model than the slogan that cardio either kills gains or never matters. Training volume, modality, session order, proximity, nutrition, sleep, tissue stress, and the athlete's primary goal can all change the outcome.[5] Interference is not an automatic reaction to elevated heart rate. It is a programming risk that rises when competing demands and unresolved fatigue accumulate.

> **INTERFERENCE BOUNDARY**
> Concurrent training is generally compatible with maximal-strength and hypertrophy development, but that does not make every schedule equally effective. Power-focused athletes, high-volume endurance athletes, and anyone stacking hard lower-body sessions should manage order, spacing, and recovery with greater care.[4,5]

Why Strength Helps Endurance

Endurance performance is not determined by maximal oxygen uptake alone. It also depends on how much energy an athlete spends at a given pace, how much force each stride or stroke can produce, and how well tissues tolerate repeated loading. Strength training can improve those factors without turning the weight room into an imitation of the endurance event.

A 2024 meta-analysis found that high-load and combined strength methods improved running economy in middle- and long-distance runners.[6] A 2025 umbrella review likewise reported improvements in running economy and endurance performance, while the included meta-analyses did not show significant changes in maximal oxygen uptake. The authors also rated confidence in much of the review literature as low or critically low.[7]

The boundary matters. Strength may allow an endurance athlete to use less relative force per stride and improve economy, but it does not replace the aerobic work that develops event-specific oxygen transport, pace tolerance, and duration. Strength supports endurance. It does not impersonate it.

Why Cardio Still Has Its Own Job

Cardiorespiratory fitness is strongly associated with cardiovascular health and all-cause mortality, even after accounting for traditional risk factors.[2] Association is not proof that a single test causes a specific outcome, but the evidence is more than sufficient to reject the idea that aerobic capacity is decorative.

For general health, the public-health target is not endless punishment. WHO guidance recommends 150–300 minutes of moderate-intensity aerobic activity, 75–150 minutes of vigorous activity, or an equivalent combination each week, alongside regular muscle-strengthening activity.[1] That is a population guideline, not an individualized sports program, but it makes the scientific boundary plain: health preparation includes both.

Program the Relationship

The primary goal determines the hierarchy. If maximal strength or power is the priority, perform the highest-quality strength or power work before fatigue-producing conditioning, and separate demanding sessions when the schedule permits. If endurance performance is the priority, protect the key endurance sessions and use strength work to improve force, economy, and durability without stealing recovery from the event-specific training.

Manage local fatigue, not just the calendar. Hard intervals, hills, and long runs can be heavy lower-body stress even when no barbell is present. Pairing them carelessly with high-volume squats or deadlifts may reduce the quality of both. Easy walking, cycling, or other low-intensity work creates a different recovery demand and should not be treated as equivalent to a maximal conditioning test.

Progress the qualities separately. Strength should be judged by force, load, repetitions, technique, and the ability to repeat quality work. Conditioning should be judged by pace, power, duration, heart-rate response, recovery, or the specific demand being trained. A single exhausted feeling cannot verify that both systems improved.

The Academy Standard

The Squat, Press, Pull, Bench, and Deadlift families remain the center of the Academy strength system because they make force production measurable and progressively trainable. Conditioning is then added with a defined purpose: health, work capacity, recovery between efforts, or preparation for a sport or event.

Do not turn conditioning into a tax paid for eating, and do not turn the weight room into a breathless circuit merely to make it feel cardiovascular. Train force as force. Train aerobic capacity as aerobic capacity. When a session intentionally blends them, judge it by the blended goal—not by how completely it empties the athlete.

Conclusion

Strength and cardio are not enemies. They are distinct capacities drawing from one recoverable human system. Most people can improve both at the same time, and many athletes perform better when they do. Problems begin when volume, order, and recovery are ignored.

Strength remains the foundation of force. Cardio develops the machinery and tolerance to sustain work. Build each on purpose, protect the quality that matters most, and stop asking one adaptation to perform the other's job.

“Strength is the base. Conditioning extends what the base can do.”

References

1. Bull FC, Al-Ansari SS, Biddle S, et al. World Health Organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. Br J Sports Med. 2020;54(24):1451–1462. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2020-102955
2. Ross R, Blair SN, Arena R, et al. Importance of assessing cardiorespiratory fitness in clinical practice: a case for fitness as a clinical vital sign. Circulation. 2016;134(24):e653–e699. doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000000461
3. Hickson RC. Interference of strength development by simultaneously training for strength and endurance. Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol. 1980;45(2–3):255–263. doi:10.1007/BF00421333
4. Schumann M, Feuerbacher JF, Sünkeler M, et al. Compatibility of concurrent aerobic and strength training for skeletal muscle size and function: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. Sports Med. 2022;52(3):601–612. doi:10.1007/s40279-021-01587-7
5. Fyfe JJ, Bishop DJ, Stepto NK. Interference between concurrent resistance and endurance exercise: molecular bases and the role of individual training variables. Sports Med. 2014;44(6):743–762. doi:10.1007/s40279-014-0162-1
6. Llanos-Lagos C, Ramirez-Campillo R, Moran J, Sáez de Villarreal E. Effect of strength training programs in middle- and long-distance runners' economy at different running speeds: a systematic review with meta-analysis. Sports Med. 2024;54(4):895–932. doi:10.1007/s40279-023-01978-y
7. Ramos-Campo DJ, Andreu-Caravaca L, Clemente-Suárez VJ, Rubio-Arias JÁ. The effect of strength training on endurance performance determinants in middle- and long-distance endurance athletes: an umbrella review of systematic reviews and meta-analysis. J Strength Cond Res. 2025;39(4):492–506. doi:10.1519/JSC.0000000000005056
8. Currier BS, D'Souza AC, Fiatarone Singh MA, et al. American College of Sports Medicine position stand. Resistance training prescription for muscle function, hypertrophy, and physical performance in healthy adults: an overview of reviews. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2026;58(4):851–872. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000003897

WHITE PAPER 08 / ACADEMY OF STRENGTH

The Myth of the Great Workout

Why Sweat, Soreness, Burn, and Exhaustion Do Not Prove Adaptation

> *"Fatigue is what a workout costs. Adaptation is what the program builds."*

Executive Thesis

A workout can leave a shirt soaked, a muscle burning, a body sore, and an athlete flattened on the floor. None of those outcomes proves that the session built strength, muscle, endurance, or skill. They prove that the session produced an acute response.

That distinction separates training from entertainment. Training applies a specific, progressive, recoverable stimulus and repeats it long enough for adaptation to become measurable. Sensation can provide useful information, but it cannot replace the program, the performance record, or the trend across weeks.

Sweat Measures Heat Management

Sweating is primarily a thermoregulatory response. Its job is to support heat loss through evaporation. Sweat rate and sweat sodium concentration vary substantially between people and within the same person according to exercise intensity, environmental conditions, heat acclimation, body size, clothing, and the measurement method.[1]

This makes sweat useful for judging fluid loss and heat-management demands. It does not make sweat a direct measure of training quality. A hard strength session in a cool room may produce little visible sweat while delivering a large force stimulus. A light circuit in a hot, humid room may soak a shirt without producing the load, range of motion, or progression required for a particular adaptation.

Sweat is therefore real but nonspecific. It says the body is managing heat. It does not say which motor units were challenged, whether technique improved, whether the planned dose was completed, or whether the athlete will be better after recovery.

Soreness Is a Symptom, Not a Score

Delayed-onset muscle soreness usually emerges after unfamiliar or strenuous work, especially exercise with a large eccentric component. It develops after the session rather than during it and can be accompanied by temporary reductions in force and range of motion.[2] Soreness can therefore inform a coach that an exposure was novel or damaging. It cannot quantify the amount of useful adaptation.

Lactate is not the explanation for next-day soreness. In a classic experiment, level running elevated blood lactate without producing significant soreness, while downhill running produced soreness without elevated lactate.[3] The immediate burn and delayed soreness are different phenomena on different timelines.

Most importantly, detectable damage is not required for strength or hypertrophy. In one training study, a gradual ramp-up minimized early damage while a naïve group experienced substantially more damage and soreness. Both groups achieved similar increases in strength and muscle size.[5] Another study found that the relationship between postexercise myofibrillar protein synthesis and hypertrophy became clear only after the early muscle-damage response had attenuated.[6]

The body also becomes less sore after it learns an exposure. This repeated-bout effect can reduce damage and soreness when similar eccentric work is performed again.[7] If diminishing soreness meant diminishing value, successful adaptation would look like program failure. In reality, it often means the person has become more tolerant of the work.

> **SIGNAL BOUNDARY**
> Sweat can guide hydration and heat management. Soreness can guide readiness, exercise tolerance, and recovery decisions. Neither one can certify that the intended adaptation occurred. A signal becomes misleading only when it is asked to answer a question it does not measure.

The Burn Is an Acute Signal

The burning sensation during repeated contractions often accompanies rapid nonmitochondrial ATP turnover, changing pH, metabolite accumulation, and sensory feedback from working tissue. Lactate rises in that environment, but lactate production is not the biochemical cause of exercise-induced acidosis; it coincides with and helps buffer the conditions in which acidosis develops.[4]

A burn can confirm that a local task became metabolically demanding. It still cannot rank the quality of the stimulus. A heavy set of three may produce enormous force with little burn. A light, short-rest set may burn intensely while training a different quality. The correct question is not how much the muscle burned. It is whether the set imposed the force, effort, volume, range, and technique required by the program.

Exhaustion Is Not the Objective

The hardest possible session is not automatically the most productive session. A systematic review and meta-analysis of 15 studies in young adults found no significant overall advantage for training to repetition failure over nonfailure training for strength or hypertrophy.[8] The 2026 American College of Sports Medicine evidence synthesis similarly concluded that training to momentary muscle fatigue did not consistently affect training outcomes.[11]

This does not mean effort is irrelevant. Sets must be sufficiently demanding for the chosen load and goal, and very light-load hypertrophy work generally needs to approach failure more closely than heavy strength work.[9] It means that the final involuntary repetition is not magic and that failure is a tool, not a moral standard.

The cost of failure is measurable. In resistance-trained adults, sets performed to failure produced larger immediate losses in lifting velocity, greater discomfort, and worse perceived recovery than sets stopped with one or three repetitions in reserve.[10] Sometimes that cost is justified. Repeating it indiscriminately can reduce the quality of later sets, later exercises, and later sessions.

> **PAIN BOUNDARY**
> Delayed, diffuse muscular tenderness after unfamiliar work is not the same as sharp or focal pain, joint pain, altered sensation, or a sudden loss of function during a lift. Those symptoms should not be glorified as proof of effort. Stop the exposure and use appropriate clinical or coaching judgment.

Novelty Can Manufacture Sensation

It is easy to make a person sore: choose an unfamiliar movement, emphasize eccentric loading, add volume, shorten rest, and repeat until fatigue changes the task. It is easy to make a person sweat: raise the temperature, extend the session, and limit rest. It is easy to create burn and exhaustion. None of those methods requires a coherent progression.

This is why random variation can feel more effective than disciplined training. Novelty renews sensation, while repeated practice often reduces it. But repeated practice is what makes technique stable, loading comparable, progression visible, and adaptation testable. Constantly changing the workout to recover soreness can erase the very evidence needed to know whether it works.

What a Productive Workout Looks Like

A productive workout completes the planned work with the intended load, range of motion, effort, and technical standard. It creates enough stress to stimulate change without consuming so much recovery that the next important exposure deteriorates. It also generates a record that can be compared with prior and future sessions.

The useful scorecard lives across time: more load lifted with the same technique, more repetitions at a fixed load, better bar speed, improved work capacity, better event performance, measurable muscle growth, or the same work completed at a lower relative cost. Not every metric belongs in every program. The metric must match the stated adaptation.

Session sensations can then be interpreted in context. Unexpected soreness may justify modifying the next exposure. An unusual sweat rate may change hydration planning. A dramatic loss of repetitions or technique may reveal excessive fatigue. These observations help manage training; they do not define success by themselves.

The Academy Standard

The Academy trains the Squat, Press, Pull, Bench, and Deadlift families through planned progression. The objective is not to decorate those lifts with enough circuits, finishers, and forced repetitions to guarantee collapse. The objective is to make the athlete more capable while preserving the ability to train again.

Follow the prescribed work. Stop a set when the program's repetition, effort, or technical criterion is reached. Add load or volume because performance and recovery justify it—not because the session failed to produce a pump. Extra work that cannot be tied to a defined adaptation is not commitment. It is unpriced fatigue.

Conclusion

Sweat, soreness, burn, and exhaustion are experiences. They may accompany productive training, and each can provide limited information. None is a universal receipt proving that the body received the right dose or built the desired result.

A great workout is not the session that creates the most evidence of suffering. It is the session that fits the plan, advances the target, and leaves enough recovery for the next step. Reward adaptation, not exhaustion.

> *“Do not grade the workout by how destroyed you feel. Grade the program by what you become.”*

References

1. Baker LB. Sweating rate and sweat sodium concentration in athletes: a review of methodology and intra/interindividual variability. Sports Med. 2017;47(Suppl 1):111–128. doi:10.1007/s40279-017-0691-5
2. Cheung K, Hume P, Maxwell L. Delayed onset muscle soreness: treatment strategies and performance factors. Sports Med. 2003;33(2):145–164. doi:10.2165/00007256-200333020-00005
3. Schwane JA, Watrous BG, Johnson SR, Armstrong RB. Is lactic acid related to delayed-onset muscle soreness? Phys Sportsmed. 1983;11(3):124–131. doi:10.1080/00913847.1983.11708485
4. Robergs RA, Ghiasvand F, Parker D. Biochemistry of exercise-induced metabolic acidosis. Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol. 2004;287(3):R502–R516. doi:10.1152/ajpregu.00114.2004
5. Flann KL, LaStayo PC, McClain DA, Hazel M, Lindstedt SL. Muscle damage and muscle remodeling: no pain, no gain? J Exp Biol. 2011;214(Pt 4):674–679. doi:10.1242/jeb.050112
6. Damas F, Phillips SM, Libardi CA, et al. Resistance training-induced changes in integrated myofibrillar protein synthesis are related to hypertrophy only after attenuation of muscle damage. J Physiol. 2016;594(18):5209–5222. doi:10.1113/JP272472
7. McHugh MP. Recent advances in the understanding of the repeated bout effect: the protective effect against muscle damage from a single bout of eccentric exercise. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2003;13(2):88–97. doi:10.1034/j.1600-0838.2003.02477.x
8. Grgic J, Schoenfeld BJ, Orazem J, Sabol F. Effects of resistance training performed to repetition failure or non-failure on muscular strength and hypertrophy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Sport Health Sci. 2022;11(2):202–211. doi:10.1016/j.jshs.2021.01.007
9. Lasevicius T, Schoenfeld BJ, Silva-Batista C, et al. Muscle failure promotes greater muscle hypertrophy in low-load but not in high-load resistance training. J Strength Cond Res. 2022;36(2):346–351. doi:10.1519/JSC.0000000000003454
10. Refalo MC, Helms ER, Hamilton DL, Fyfe JJ. Influence of resistance training proximity-to-failure, determined by repetitions-in-reserve, on neuromuscular fatigue in resistance-trained males and females. Sports Med Open. 2023;9(1):10. doi:10.1186/s40798-023-00554-y
11. Currier BS, D'Souza AC, Fiatarone Singh MA, et al. American College of Sports Medicine position stand. Resistance training prescription for muscle function, hypertrophy, and physical performance in healthy adults: an overview of reviews. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2026;58(4):851–872. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000003897