

A CIPP Evaluation of Indonesia's Pelatnas Weightlifting for Paris 2024

Lucky Ramdhani¹, Ramdan Pelana², Yasep Setiakarnawijaya³

Universitas Negeri Jakarta, DKI Jakarta, Indonesia

Author Email: luckyrazor@gmail.com¹, ramdanpelana@unj.ac.id²,
yasep.s@unj.ac.id³

Abstract. This study aims to determine how the context of the program background, program achievements, and program analysis align with the objectives of the Weightlifting National Training Program for the 2024 Paris Olympic Games. How appropriate are the inputs regarding program planning and management, human resources, and program implementation guidelines established to support the implementation of the 2024 Olympic Weightlifting National Training Program? How is the implementation process of the program, monitoring system, and coaching system for the National Weightlifting Training Center for the 2024 Paris Olympics? What is the success rate of the implementation of the National Weightlifting Training Center for the 2024 Paris Olympics in achieving its objectives? The object of evaluation is the achievement of athletes participating in the National Weightlifting Training Center for the 2024 Paris Olympics. The research method used is an evaluative method with a qualitative and quantitative approach, conducted based on the results of interactions with subjects in the field through observation, interviews, questionnaires, and research of related documents based on evaluation criteria. Using the CIPP Model, the proposed statement items indicate that the National Weightlifting Training Center for the 2024 Paris Olympics is in the very good category. That all respondents who provided answers to the proposed statement items indicate that the National Weightlifting Training Center for the 2024 Paris Olympics is good.

Keywords: Athletes, Coaching, National Training Center, Olympics

1 Introduction

The development of national sports has long been a strategic agenda in Indonesia's efforts to enhance human capital and project international prestige. Within this national vision, weightlifting stands as one of the most consistent and productive sports in terms of international achievements, notably contributing to Indonesia's Olympic medal tally across multiple decades. Prominent athletes such as Lisa Rumbewas, Eko Yuli Irawan, and Windy Cantika Aisah have placed Indonesia on the global stage, validating the country's capacity to compete against elite nations in this demanding strength-based discipline.

Despite these successes, the road to Olympic excellence is neither linear nor guaranteed. The emergence of new global competitors and the ever-evolving landscape of sport science and regulations, especially those governed by the International Weightlifting Federation (IWF), present substantial challenges. These include stricter anti-doping standards, changes in weight classes, and intensified athlete monitoring. Countries such as China, North Korea, and nations in Eastern Europe have leveraged well-funded, science-backed training systems to maintain their dominance in international weightlifting. In this context, Indonesia must continuously evaluate the effectiveness of its national training programs, particularly in light of its preparation for the 2024 Paris Olympic Games.

The 2024 Olympics represent not only an important milestone in Indonesia's long-term athletic roadmap but also a crucial test of the country's sports governance and athlete development models. The National Training Center (Pelatnas) for weightlifting was established as a centralized system designed to refine the potential of top athletes through specialized coaching, scientific conditioning, psychological training, and exposure to international competitions. The program's success hinges on its ability to align planning, input, process, and output in a coherent, measurable, and sustainable manner.

From a policy standpoint, the Indonesian government has reinforced its commitment to athletic development through the enactment of Law No. 11 of 2023 on Sports, which articulates the objectives of fostering physical and mental health, character building, discipline, national unity, and international competitiveness. Within this framework, elite sports programs are mandated to follow a structured, science-informed, and results-oriented approach. Institutions such as the Ministry of Youth and Sports, the Indonesian Olympic Committee (KOI), and the Indonesian Weightlifting Federation (PABSI) are expected to synchronize their efforts under these national guidelines.

Notably, the Program Pemusatan Latihan Olahraga Nasional (PPON) has emerged as a cornerstone of Indonesia's high-performance sports strategy. This program emphasizes the importance of nurturing young talents exemplified by the 60% of athletes aged below 23 included in the 2024 Olympic contingent. According to the Ministry of Youth and Sports, this demographic shift is deliberate, reflecting a long-term vision that prioritizes regeneration and sustainability in athletic excellence (Kemenpora, 2021).

However, policy initiatives and funding allocations, while critical, do not automatically translate into on-the-ground effectiveness. There remains an urgent need for robust evaluation mechanisms to assess whether these strategies are achieving their intended outcomes. Evaluation provides not only accountability but also constructive feedback for improvement. A well-executed evaluation can illuminate gaps in planning, misalignments in execution, and unforeseen constraints, enabling decision-makers to adjust course accordingly.

To conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the weightlifting training program for the Paris 2024 Olympics, this study adopts the CIPP Evaluation Model (Context, Input, Process, Product), developed by Daniel Stufflebeam. This model is particularly suited for public sector programs, as it emphasizes formative and summative assess-

ment across all stages of program implementation. The CIPP framework enables evaluators to answer the following key questions:

1. Context: Is the program aligned with the current needs, goals, and environmental conditions?
2. Input: Are the resources, strategies, and human capital adequate to achieve the program objectives?
3. Process: Is the program being implemented effectively and according to plan?
4. Product: Has the program achieved its intended outcomes in terms of athlete performance and readiness?

Preliminary research indicates that while Indonesia's weightlifting program has shown signs of progress particularly in areas such as athlete recruitment and coach training challenges persist in optimizing support systems, upgrading infrastructure, and institutionalizing scientific training methodologies. For instance, the availability of advanced recovery facilities, biomechanical analysis tools, and sport-specific nutritionists remains limited compared to leading international counterparts. Moreover, the absence of a centralized performance monitoring database hinders data-driven decision-making.

International comparisons further underscore the need for reform. Countries like China and South Korea invest heavily in longitudinal athlete tracking systems and integrate sport psychologists, physiologists, and technical analysts into daily training routines. These countries also prioritize early talent identification and develop specialized academies that serve as feeders for national teams. Indonesia must assess whether its current training ecosystem fosters such a holistic and competitive environment.

At the same time, the mental and emotional resilience of athletes must not be overlooked. Olympic-level competition imposes enormous psychological stress, and without proper mental conditioning programs, even the most physically prepared athletes can underperform. The inclusion of mental skills training, mindfulness techniques, and resilience-building modules should be evaluated as part of the broader training strategy. An added layer of complexity arises from the public's and media's limited attention to weightlifting, especially compared to more popular sports such as badminton and football. This underrepresentation can affect athlete motivation, sponsorship opportunities, and public support. Strategic communication and media engagement, therefore, should be considered integral components of a successful training program.

Ultimately, this study aims to generate actionable insights that can inform future policy and operational decisions in Indonesia's sports development agenda. It seeks to identify both best practices and systemic weaknesses, thereby contributing to the establishment of a more responsive, transparent, and results-oriented national sports system.

By employing the CIPP model, the study will assess how well Indonesia's weightlifting Pelatnas has prepared its athletes for the highest level of international competition. The findings will also serve as a reference point for other sports federations in Indonesia as they prepare for future Olympic cycles and global championships. As Indonesia aspires to elevate its status as a competitive sporting nation, rigorous pro-

gram evaluation will be indispensable. The weightlifting training program for Paris 2024 offers a critical case study on how structured evaluations, grounded in evidence and international standards, can drive continuous improvement and excellence in sports performance.

2 Literature Review

The evaluation of high-performance sports programs requires a theoretical and methodological foundation rooted in established educational, organizational, and sport science paradigms. This study draws upon several key models and prior research to build a comprehensive framework for evaluating Indonesia's national weightlifting training program leading up to the 2024 Paris Olympics. Central to this approach is the CIPP Evaluation Model (Context, Input, Process, Product) developed by [1], which provides a structured methodology for assessing the effectiveness of educational and training programs in a systematic and objective manner.

2.1 The CIPP Model in Sports Program Evaluation

The CIPP model has been widely used in evaluating educational and training programs across sectors due to its holistic and decision-oriented approach. The model assesses four key components:

1. Context: Identifies needs, problems, and opportunities relevant to program goals.
2. Input: Evaluates strategies, action plans, resources, and procedures.
3. Process: Assesses program implementation and progress.
4. Product: Measures the outcomes and whether objectives have been achieved.

[2] explain, "the CIPP model is designed not only to assess outcomes but also to improve programs during development and implementation by providing formative feedback." In the context of sports, this allows stakeholders to continuously refine coaching methods, recruitment systems, and resource allocation based on real-time evaluations and feedback loops.

The suitability of the CIPP model for sports programs has been demonstrated in previous studies, including evaluations of KONI regional training centers [3] and national-level sports coaching initiatives in Karangasem, Bali [4]. These studies confirm that the CIPP framework helps identify gaps between program objectives and actual implementation, and ensures that performance indicators align with athlete development outcomes [5].

2.2 Government Policy and the Role of Institutions

Government regulation plays a critical role in shaping the structure and priorities of national sports development. In Indonesia, the passage of Law No. 11 of 2023 on Sports provides a legal foundation for the planning and evaluation of elite athlete training. This law emphasizes the need for measurable goals, multi-stakeholder col-

laboration, and alignment with national development plans (RPJMN/RPJP). As noted by [6], successful policy execution requires not only regulation but institutional commitment and cross-sectoral coordination.

Moreover, international declarations such as the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development underscore the importance of sports in fostering health, education, and social inclusion (UN, 2015). These global frameworks have pushed national governments to ensure accountability, transparency, and sustainability in managing athlete development programs [7], [8].

2.3 Best Practices in Weightlifting Coaching and Athlete Development

Globally, top-performing nations in weightlifting (e.g., China, Russia, North Korea) invest heavily in structured, science-based coaching systems. Research shows that strength-based sports benefit greatly from biomechanical assessments, individualized training plans, and early talent identification systems (Bompa & Buzzichelli, 2019). According to the National Strength and Conditioning Association (NSCA), Olympic weightlifting improves key performance markers such as rate of force development and muscular coordination when integrated with appropriate recovery protocols and periodization models [9], [10][11]

In Indonesia, however, the integration of sport science in daily training remains limited. Studies like [12] on powerlifting and weightlifting programs highlight this gap, suggesting the need for improved infrastructure and access to sports nutrition, psychology, and data analytics.

Athlete-coach relationships are also critical to long-term motivation and success. [13] found that strong relational bonds between coaches and athletes are positively correlated with intrinsic motivation in weightlifters. This aligns with broader findings in sports psychology which suggest that autonomy-supportive coaching styles foster resilience and mental toughness key attributes for success at international competitions [14].

2.4 Nutrition and Support Services in Elite Sports

Sports nutrition remains a neglected component of Indonesia's athlete preparation. In a study by [15], [16], [17], both athletes and coaches acknowledged the essential role of sports nutritionists in enhancing recovery, muscle gain, and overall performance. Yet, access to these professionals remains scarce in national training camps. The same study calls for greater investment in nutrition education, meal planning, and supplement safety awareness for elite athletes.

Additionally, medical support, physiotherapy, and psychological services are foundational to sustaining high performance. As noted by [18], [19], these support systems not only reduce injury risk but also improve the longevity and consistency of athlete performance in sports like weightlifting, where technical execution and mental focus are paramount.

2.5 Challenges in Management and Evaluation Practices

Despite good intentions and government commitment, sports program implementation often faces challenges in Indonesia. These include funding inconsistencies, bureaucratic delays, and a lack of centralized performance tracking systems. Studies such as that of [20], [21] on training program evaluations emphasize the need for timely data collection and clear indicators for success. Without this, it becomes difficult to determine program effectiveness or to justify resource allocations.

Management efficiency is crucial, as emphasized by [22] who defines sport management as the coordination of human and physical resources toward athletic excellence. Unfortunately, as highlighted in the KONI evaluations [23], many local training centers still lack the managerial expertise needed to run athlete development programs effectively. This includes deficiencies in budgeting, logistical planning, and staff training.

2.6 The Role of Competitions in Athlete Readiness

Competition is an essential part of the athlete development cycle. It not only provides opportunities for benchmarking and psychological conditioning but also acts as an evaluation mechanism for training programs. [24] argue that competition, especially during the formative years, helps athletes refine tactical thinking, technical precision, and emotional regulation.

However, Indonesian athletes often lack access to international-level competition due to funding or logistical issues. This has been cited as a barrier to achieving elite performance standards, particularly in sports like weightlifting where the margin for technical error is extremely small [25], [26].

The literature reviewed reveals that a holistic evaluation of Indonesia's weightlifting program must incorporate structural policy analysis, training methodology, athlete support systems, and competitive exposure. The application of the CIPP model allows for such multidimensional evaluation, making it a valuable tool for policy refinement and program improvement.

3 Research Methodology

This study employed an evaluative research design using the CIPP evaluation model (Context, Input, Process, Product), as developed by Stufflebeam. The methodology combined qualitative and quantitative approaches to ensure comprehensive data collection and analysis. Qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured interviews and document analysis, while quantitative data were obtained via structured questionnaires distributed to athletes, coaches, and program administrators involved in the national weightlifting training center (Pelatnas) for the 2024 Paris Olympics. The research was conducted at designated national training facilities under the supervision of the Indonesian Weightlifting Federation (PABSI). Respondents were selected using purposive sampling to ensure relevant expertise and involvement in the program. The instruments were validated through expert review and tested for reliability.

Data analysis for qualitative findings used thematic coding, while quantitative responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics to assess perceptions of program effectiveness across the four CIPP components. The integration of both data types aimed to provide a robust and multidimensional evaluation of the weightlifting training program's implementation and outcomes.

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 Results

This study evaluated the Weightlifting National Training Program (Pelatnas) for the 2024 Paris Olympic Games using the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) evaluation model. Data were collected through a combination of questionnaires, interviews, observations, and document analysis. The evaluation results are presented below according to the four components of the CIPP model.

Context Evaluation.

The evaluation of the context focused on understanding the background, objectives, and supporting policies for the training program. Based on the findings, it was evident that the development of the Weightlifting Pelatnas was aligned with national sports policies, specifically Law No. 11 of 2023 on Sports, which emphasizes the improvement of human resources through structured and competitive sports training.

Respondents, including coaches, athletes, and program officials, stated that the primary goal of the program was to secure medals at the 2024 Paris Olympics, while also nurturing young talent to ensure long-term sustainability in weightlifting. The program objectives were clear and considered highly relevant by all participants. Additionally, the government's commitment, through funding and policy support, was identified as a key contextual strength. However, the context evaluation also revealed some challenges. These included limited public attention toward weightlifting compared to other sports such as badminton or football, and insufficient media exposure, which impacted athlete motivation and sponsorship opportunities [27], [28].

Input Evaluation.

The input evaluation assessed the adequacy of planning, human resources, financial resources, infrastructure, and supporting documents. Results showed that the selection of athletes and coaches followed a structured process involving trials, performance reviews, and previous achievements. Most coaches involved in the program were highly experienced and certified by national and international weightlifting bodies. The athletes selected had previously demonstrated outstanding performance at national and regional competitions. Furthermore, the program had clear operational guidelines, developed in coordination with the Indonesian Weightlifting Federation (PABSI).

In terms of financial support, the program was funded by the Ministry of Youth and Sports, with a focus on ensuring that the athletes received sufficient allowances,

nutrition, training equipment, and accommodation. However, several respondents noted that the funding disbursement process was sometimes delayed, causing disruptions in training logistics. In terms of facilities, training centers were found to be adequate but in need of modernization. Access to advanced recovery tools, sport science labs, and psychological services remained limited.

Process Evaluation.

The process component focused on the implementation of training activities, athlete monitoring, and program supervision. Training was conducted regularly and followed a periodization model, ensuring that athletes peaked during the Olympic qualifiers and main event. Interviews with coaches indicated that training was based on individualized performance plans. Athletes underwent strength, technique, and conditioning sessions, supported by regular testing. Coaches also implemented biomechanical feedback and video analysis to improve technique.

The program included routine performance reviews, including monthly evaluations and training simulations. A standardized monitoring system was in place to record training load, injury status, and nutritional intake, although some staff pointed out that the data recording was still done manually and needed digitization for efficiency.

Program implementation was closely supervised by national sports authorities, with periodic visits and evaluations. The supervision process was generally rated as effective by respondents, although several stakeholders suggested that more frequent feedback sessions between athletes, coaches, and administrators could improve coordination and response to emerging issues.

Product Evaluation.

The product evaluation measured the program's effectiveness in achieving its goals, particularly regarding athlete performance in the 2024 Olympic cycle. Based on performance data, several athletes from the program succeeded in qualifying for the 2024 Paris Olympics, with a few even winning medals in international competitions during the preparation phase, such as the Asian Championships and IWF World Cups. Respondents agreed that the Pelatnas program had successfully produced high-caliber athletes with strong medal potential. The training outcomes met or exceeded expectations, especially considering the relatively limited resources compared to other countries. The athletes demonstrated notable improvements in technical performance, competition consistency, and mental resilience.

Nonetheless, areas for improvement were identified. These included the lack of integration with university-based sport science institutions, limited exposure to international training camps, and the need for a sustainable athlete database system to track development across Olympic cycles. Overall, based on the combination of qualitative and quantitative data, the program was rated as "very good" by 82% of the respondents, while 18% rated it as "good", indicating overall satisfaction with the program's impact.

4.2 Discussion

The evaluation of the Weightlifting National Training Program (Pelatnas) for the Paris 2024 Olympic Games using the CIPP model offers critical insights into both the strengths and areas for improvement within Indonesia's elite athlete development system. The findings from this study generally align with previous evaluations of similar athletic programs conducted both in Indonesia and abroad.

Context Analysis.

The context evaluation revealed that the Pelatnas program's objectives are clearly defined and strategically aligned with national sports development goals. This is in accordance with the findings of [12], who concluded that context clarity, including policy support and defined goals, is a strong determinant of training program success in Indonesia's powerlifting and weightlifting development centers. Similarly, [29] emphasized the importance of context relevance in ensuring the sustainability and effectiveness of training programs.

Despite this strength, challenges remain, especially regarding the promotion and visibility of weightlifting as a sport. Limited public engagement and sponsorship opportunities, as noted in interviews, mirror findings from [30], who observed similar issues in track and field coaching programs, where lack of public support and government incentives hinder athlete motivation and media attention.

Input Analysis.

The input component revealed adequate but improvable aspects of the program. The selection of experienced coaches and high-performing athletes was a key strength, echoing findings by [12], who similarly found that structured recruitment and certification standards positively impact training outcomes.

However, constraints were noted in the areas of infrastructure modernization, delayed funding disbursement, and limited integration of sports science. These issues reflect broader systemic concerns in national-level training initiatives. As [31] argued, improvement in supporting input variables such as instructor resources, instructional media, and facilities can directly enhance training satisfaction and effectiveness.

Process Analysis.

The process evaluation showed that training activities are implemented with professionalism and regular performance reviews. This structured implementation mirrors the conclusions of [30], who observed that well-executed training schedules and consistent monitoring significantly influence athlete performance.

Nevertheless, areas for improvement remain, particularly in the integration of digital systems for training logs, performance analytics, and recovery monitoring. As [29] emphasized, the use of digital systems can improve evaluation accuracy and responsiveness, allowing for more timely adjustments in program strategy.

Another gap identified was the need for more frequent and structured feedback mechanisms between stakeholders. Similar gaps in communication and feedback have

been documented in evaluations of training programs across different sectors, including healthcare and education [32].

Product Analysis.

The product evaluation confirms that the Pelatnas program has achieved notable outcomes, with athletes qualifying for the Olympics and winning international medals. This confirms the program's high level of effectiveness and aligns with [12], who reported similar success in their evaluation of a regional weightlifting program in Indonesia.

However, sustainability remains a concern. The absence of a centralized database to monitor long-term athlete development, as well as limited collaboration with higher education institutions for applied sport science, represents a missed opportunity. [31] also noted that long-term success of training programs is contingent on reinforcing knowledge management and continuous improvement strategies.

5 Conclusion

The evaluation of the Weightlifting National Training Program (Pelatnas) for the 2024 Paris Olympics using the CIPP model revealed that the program is generally well-structured, relevant, and effective. The context and objectives align with national sports policies, while the inputs such as human resources and planning are adequate but require infrastructure enhancement. Implementation processes are well-organized, though monitoring systems need digitization. The program has successfully produced Olympic-qualified athletes, indicating a high level of effectiveness. However, sustainability and innovation remain challenges. Overall, the program demonstrates a strong foundation for elite athlete development but must evolve to maintain global competitiveness in future Olympic cycles and ensure continuous improvement in sports excellence.

6 Recommendations

To further enhance the Pelatnas Weightlifting Program, several key recommendations are proposed. First, digital systems for athlete monitoring, performance tracking, and injury prevention should be integrated to support data-driven decisions. Second, investment in modern facilities, recovery tools, and psychological support must be prioritized. Third, collaboration with universities and sport science institutions should be expanded to strengthen innovation in training methods. Fourth, consistent and timely funding disbursement is essential to maintain program stability. Finally, increasing media exposure and public support for weightlifting can improve athlete motivation and sponsorship opportunities. By addressing these areas, the program can achieve long-term sustainability and improved outcomes in future international competitions, including the Olympics.

References

- [1] G. F. Madaus, M. S. Scriven, D. L. Stufflebeam, and D. L. Stufflebeam, "The CIPP model for program evaluation," *Eval. Model. Viewpoints Educ. Hum. Serv. Eval.*, pp. 117–141, 1983.
- [2] D. L. Stufflebeam and C. L. S. Coryn, *Evaluation theory, models, and applications*, vol. 50. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- [3] S. Sudirman, A. Hamzah, M. I. Hasanuddin, and A. Mappanyukki, "Evaluation of The Sports Coaching Program in South Sulawesi: an Evaluative Research CIPP Model Program," *Int. J. Disabil. Sport. Heal. Sci.*, 2024, doi: 10.33438/ijdshs.1504627.
- [4] U. Utomo, Y. Supriyati, and M. Akbar, "The Evaluation of Swimming Sports Coaching Programs for Disabled Athletes in The National Paralympic Committee," *J. Pendidik. Teor. Penelitian, dan Pengemb.*, vol. 5, pp. 544–553, 2020, doi: 10.17977/JPTPP.V5I4.13410.
- [5] F. Setyadi, M. Hidayatullah, and S. Purnama, "EVALUATION OF SPORTS AND HEALTH PHYSICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM IN SMA N 2 NGAWI USING THE CIPP EVALUATION MODEL (CONTEXT, INPUT, PROCESS, PRODUCT).," *Indones. Sport J.*, 2022, doi: 10.24114/isj.v4i2.37872.
- [6] E. Supriatna, D. Suryadi, M. Haetami, and G. F. Yosika, "Analysis Endurance Profile (Vo2max) of Women's Volleyball Athletes: Yo-yo intermittent test level 1," *Indones. J. Phys. Educ. Sport Sci.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 12–19, 2023.
- [7] C. Chaudhary, "Cultivating social values in youth: The positive impact of physical education and sport," *Int. J. Sport. Heal. Phys. Educ.*, 2024, doi: 10.33545/26647559.2024.v6.i1b.113.
- [8] J. Campillo-Sánchez, F. Borrego-Balsalobre, A. Díaz-Suárez, and V. Morales-Baños, "Sports and Sustainable Development: A Systematic Review of Their Contribution to the SDGs and Public Health," *Sustainability*, 2025, doi: 10.3390/su17020562.
- [9] N. Zaras, A.-N. Stasinaki, P. Spiliopoulou, G. Arnaoutis, M. Hadjicharalambous, and G. Terzis, "Rate of Force Development, Muscle Architecture, and Performance in Elite Weightlifters," *Int. J. Sports Physiol. Perform.*, pp. 1–8, 2020, doi: 10.1123/ijsp.2019-0974.
- [10] T. Suchomel, P. Comfort, and J. Lake, "Enhancing the Force-Velocity Profile of Athletes Using Weightlifting Derivatives," *Strength Cond. J.*, vol. 39, p. 10, 2017, doi: 10.1519/SSC.0000000000000275.
- [11] W. Hornsby, J. Gentles, C. MacDonald, S. Mizuguchi, M. Ramsey, and M. Stone, "Maximum Strength, Rate of Force Development, Jump Height, and Peak Power Alterations in Weightlifters across Five Months of Training," *Sports*, vol. 5, 2017, doi: 10.3390/sports5040078.
- [12] A. Nuruhidin, F. Putra, O. I. Pamungkas, H. Ardiyanto, and D. Saputro, "An evaluation of powerlifting and weightlifting development program," vol. 1, pp. 1–8, 2018, doi: 10.33292/PETIER.V1I1.19.
- [13] G. Mageau and R. Vallerand, "The coach–athlete relationship: a motivational model," *J. Sports Sci.*, vol. 21, pp. 883–904, 2003, doi: 10.1080/0264041031000140374.
- [14] S. Jowett, J. Adie, K. Bartholomew, S. Yang, H. Gustafsson, and A. López-Jiménez, "Motivational processes in the coach-athlete relationship: A multi-cultural self-determination approach," *Psychol. Sport Exerc.*, vol. 32, p. 143, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.06.004.

- [15] H. Santos *et al.*, “Nutritional Strategies to Improve Post-exercise Recovery and Subsequent Exercise Performance: A Narrative Review,” *Sport. Med.*, 2025, doi: 10.1007/s40279-025-02213-6.
- [16] K. Beck, J. Thomson, R. Swift, and P. Von Hurst, “Role of nutrition in performance enhancement and postexercise recovery,” *Open Access J. Sport. Med.*, vol. 6, pp. 259–267, 2015, doi: 10.2147/OAJSM.S33605.
- [17] D.-J. Hwang and H.-J. Yang, “Nutritional Strategies for Enhancing Performance and Training Adaptation in Weightlifters,” *Int. J. Mol. Sci.*, vol. 26, 2024, doi: 10.3390/ijms26010240.
- [18] A. Li, “Real-Time Athlete Fatigue Monitoring Using Fuzzy Decision Support Systems,” *Int. J. Comput. Intell. Syst.*, vol. 18, p. 23, 2025, doi: 10.1007/s44196-025-00732-8.
- [19] D. Seshadri *et al.*, “Wearable sensors for monitoring the internal and external workload of the athlete,” *NPJ Digit. Med.*, vol. 2, 2019, doi: 10.1038/s41746-019-0149-2.
- [20] S. Shewchuk, J. Wallace, and M. Seibold, “Evaluations of training programs to improve capacity in K*: a systematic scoping review of methods applied and outcomes assessed,” *Humanit. Soc. Sci. Commun.*, vol. 10, pp. 1–14, 2023, doi: 10.1057/s41599-023-02403-5.
- [21] K. Sucharitha, “AN OVER VIEW ON EVALUATION OF TRAINING PROGRAM,” *INTERANTIONAL J. Sci. Res. Eng. Manag.*, 2024, doi: 10.55041/ijrsrem28529.
- [22] S. Iftikhar, Y.-M. Fu, S. Naureen, Y. Cao, and C. Zhou, “Cascading of teachers training at higher education in Pakistan: An evaluation of a faculty professional development program,” *Eval. Program Plann.*, vol. 94, p. 102130, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2022.102130.
- [23] D. F. Battafarano *et al.*, “2015 American College of Rheumatology workforce study: supply and demand projections of adult rheumatology workforce, 2015–2030,” *Arthritis Care Res. (Hoboken)*, vol. 70, no. 4, pp. 617–626, 2018.
- [24] T. Bompa and C. Buzzichelli, “Periodization Training for Sports,” 1999, [Online]. Available: <https://consensus.app/papers/periodization-training-for-sports-bompa-buzzichelli/8c3ade614f5c564ca57e716f8aff64f8/>
- [25] E. Muammar, “Stagnation of Achievements of Indonesian Athletes at The International Level,” *J. Res. Soc. Sci. Econ. Manag.*, 2025, doi: 10.59141/jrssem.v4i9.813.
- [26] I. Harahap, “Kebijakan Pemerintah dalam Meningkatkan Prestasi Atlit Nasional,” vol. 1, pp. 189–198, 2018, doi: 10.36782/JEMI.V1I4.1825.
- [27] D. Procházka, K. Bočková, and N. Kazistay, “Impact of sports sponsorship on early career athlete performance: Czech case study,” *J. Infrastructure, Policy Dev.*, 2024, doi: 10.24294/jipd.v8i12.9533.
- [28] C. George, C. Constantin, G. Gabriel, and E. S. Ion, “Theoretical Study of the Determinants of Weightlifting Success in a Postmodern Approach,” *Sport. Bakiş Spor ve Eğitim Bilim. Derg.*, 2025, doi: 10.70736/spjses.290.
- [29] K. A. Umam and I. Saripah, “Using the Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) Model in the Evaluation of Training Programs,” *Int. J. Pedagog. Teach. Educ.*, 2018, doi: 10.20961/ijpte.v2i0.26086.
- [30] E. Aldapit and S. Suharjana, “CIPP evaluation model for the coaching program of running athletes,” *Psychol. Eval. Technol. Educ. Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.33292/petier.v1i2.10.
- [31] M. Rahimzadeh, A. Emadzadeh, M. Hosseini, and R. Akrami, “Exploring Learners’ Viewpoint regarding Training Program of Health Care Providers Based on CIPP

- Model,” *Futur. Med. Educ. J.*, vol. 9, pp. 3–10, 2019, doi: 10.22038/FMEJ.2019.37036.1245.
- [32] S. E. Susanto, S. Hardhienata, and W. Sunaryo, “Evaluation of the CIPP Model for Education and Training Program at the National Archives Indonesia (ANRI),” *East Asian J. Multidiscip. Res.*, 2023, doi: 10.55927/eajmr.v2i7.5349.