



ISSN: 2456-0057

IJPNPE 2024; 9(1): 158-160

© 2024 IJPNPE

www.journalofsports.com

Received: 03-01-2024

Accepted: 09-01-2024

Dr. Vishaw GauravAssistant Professor,
Department of Physical
Education, Post Graduate Govt.
College, Sector-46, Chandigarh,
India**Dr. Amandeep Singh**Dean and Head,
Department of Physical
Education (T), Guru Nanak Dev
University, Amritsar, Punjab,
India**Dr. Sandeep**Assistant Professor,
Department of Physical
Education, N.J.S.A. Govt.
College, Kapurthala, Punjab,
India**Corresponding Author:****Dr. Vishaw Gaurav**Assistant Professor,
Department of Physical
Education, Post Graduate Govt.
College, Sector-46, Chandigarh,
India

Comparison of somatotype of inter-university and inter-college volleyball players

Dr. Vishaw Gaurav, Dr. Amandeep Singh and Dr. Sandeep

Abstract

This study aimed to explore somatotype differences between inter-university and inter-college volleyball players. A total of 240 male volleyball players were examined, comprising 120 inter-university players (mean \pm standard deviation, body mass 73.3 ± 9.1 kg, stature 184.4 ± 8.8 cm) and 120 inter-college players (mean \pm standard deviation, body mass 70.1 ± 8.5 kg, stature 180.8 ± 6.3 cm), aged between 18-25 years, drawn from various universities in northern India. Somatotypes were assessed using the Heath & Carter method. The findings indicate that inter-university volleyball players exhibited significantly lower endomorphic component ($p < 0.05$) and significantly higher mesomorphic component ($p < 0.05$) compared to their inter-college counterparts. However, no significant difference was observed in the ectomorphic component between the two groups. In conclusion, inter-university players demonstrated superior somatotype characteristics compared to inter-college volleyball players.

Keywords: Somatotype, inter-university, inter-college, volleyball players

Introduction

The anthropometric and somatotype characteristics of players have long been a focal point for athletes, sports coaches, physical education teachers, and sports professionals, deemed crucial parameters contributing to volleyball team success (Gualdi-Russo & Zaccagni, 2001; Duncan *et al.*, 2006; Gaurav *et al.*, 2010; Gaurav *et al.*, 2011) ^[13, 4, 9, 11]. Success in volleyball is believed to be significantly influenced by players' anthropometric characteristics (Gaurav *et al.*, 2010) ^[9]. Performance in volleyball hinges on tactical maneuvers and players' proficiency in fundamental skills such as serving, spiking, digging, and blocking, as well as more position-specific skills. The key attributes of top-level volleyball players encompass age, size, somatotype, technique, and tactical skills (Gjinovci *et al.*, 2014; Sterkowicz-Przybycien *et al.*, 2008) ^[12, 26]. Young volleyball players are typically described as ecto-mesomorphic in somatotype (Duncan *et al.*, 2006; Teixeira *et al.*, 2016) ^[4, 27]. Understanding body characteristics is essential for assessing their significance in achieving success in today's competitive sports (Viswanathan & Chandrasekaran, 2011) ^[30]. Volleyball, being a sport where somatic features significantly influence performance levels during matches, has been shown to exhibit significant somatic characteristics compared to age-matched control groups (Gaurav *et al.*, 2011) ^[11]. In essence, in addition to high levels of technical and tactical skills, optimal body characteristics in each player are imperative for high-level sports performance in volleyball (Palao *et al.*, 2004) ^[20]. Gualdi-Russo and Zaccagni (2001) ^[13] examined the significance of somatometric components among elite volleyball players of both genders, finding somatotype values to vary according to players' roles in the game. Duncan *et al.* (2006) ^[4] utilized the Heath-Carter method to assess the somatotype of junior elite volleyball players, revealing that setters tended to be more ectomorphic and less mesomorphic than centers. There is substantial evidence supporting a positive relationship between somatotype and success in sport and physical performance. Existing somatotype data on athletes serve as valuable guidelines for talent identification and training program selection to enhance performance (Pastuszak *et al.*, 2016) ^[21]. Palao *et al.* (2014) ^[19] discovered that players from the highest-ranked teams exhibited greater body height and weight compared to those from lower-ranked teams.

Consequently, numerous previous studies have evaluated the anthropometric profiles of volleyball players (Bandyopadhyaya, 2007; Bayios *et al.*, 2006; Gabbett & Georgieff, 2007; Gaurav *et al.*, 2010; Gaurav *et al.*, 2011; Petroski *et al.*, 2013) ^[1, 2, 7, 9, 11, 22]. Thus, the aim of this study was to compare somatotype characteristics between inter-university and inter-college volleyball players.

Materials and Methods

Participants: The study included 120 inter-university male volleyball players (mean \pm standard deviation: body mass 73.3 \pm 9.1 kg, stature 184.4 \pm 8.8 cm) and 120 inter-college male volleyball players (mean \pm standard deviation: body mass 70.1 \pm 8.5 kg, stature 180.8 \pm 6.3 cm) aged between 18-25 years. Participants were purposively sampled from various colleges and universities across northern states of India.

Anthropometric Measurements: Ten anthropometric variables were assessed, including height measured with an anthropometric rod and body mass with a weighing machine, triceps, subscapular, suprascapular, and calf skinfolds using a skinfold caliper, and flexed arm and calf girth measured with a steel tape. Humerus and femur breadth were measured with a sliding caliper. Somatotype was determined using the equations provided by Heath & Carter (1990) ^[3]:

1. Endomorphy: $-0.7182 + 0.1451(X) - 0.00068 (X)^2 + 0.0000014 (X)^3$, where X is the sum of supra-spinal, subscapular, and triceps skinfold, corrected for stature by multiplying the sum of skinfolds by 170.18 divided by body height in cm.
2. Mesomorphy: $(0.858 \times \text{humerus width}) + (0.601 \times \text{femur width}) + (0.188 \times \text{corrected arm girth}) + (0.161 \times \text{corrected calf girth}) - (\text{body height} \times 0.131) + 4.5$. Corrected arm girth = arm girth - biceps skinfold, and corrected calf girth = calf girth - calf skinfold.
3. Ectomorphy: $(\text{HWR} \times 0.732) - 28.58$, where $\text{HWR} = (\text{body height in cm}) / (\text{weight in kg})^{1/3}$.

Statistical Analysis

Mean values and standard deviations were calculated. An independent samples t-test was conducted, with significance set at 0.05. Data analysis was performed using SPSS.

Results

Table 1: Comparison of Somatotype between Inter-University and Inter-College Volleyball Players.

Variable	Group	N	Mean	S.D	t-value
Endomorphy	Inter-university	120	2.57	0.86	2.17
	Inter-college	120	2.79	0.70	
Mesomorphy	Inter-university	120	3.74	1.20	2.08
	Inter-college	120	3.37	1.49	
Ectomorphy	Inter-university	120	3.74	1.21	0.88
	Inter-college	120	3.60	1.15	

The somatotype characteristics of inter-university and inter-college volleyball players are presented in Table 1. The mean values of the endomorphic component for inter-university and inter-college volleyball players were 2.57 and 2.79, respectively. Notably, inter-university volleyball players exhibited a significantly lower endomorphic component ($t=2.17$, $p=0.030$) compared to inter-college volleyball players. Similarly, the mean values of the mesomorphic component for inter-university and inter-college volleyball players were 3.74 and 3.37, respectively. The analysis

revealed a significant difference ($t=2.08$, $p=0.039$), indicating that inter-university volleyball players had a significantly greater mesomorphic component than their inter-college counterparts. Regarding the ectomorphic component, the mean values for inter-university and inter-college volleyball players were 3.74 and 3.60, respectively. Interestingly, no significant difference in the ectomorphic component was observed between inter-university and inter-college volleyball players. This comprehensive comparison sheds light on the distinct somatotype profiles of inter-university and inter-college volleyball players, highlighting notable differences in endomorphy and mesomorphy between the two groups.

Discussion

This study aimed to compare the somatotype characteristics of volleyball players between inter-university and inter-college levels, revealing notable differences between the two. Our findings highlight significant disparities in endomorphy and mesomorphy characteristics between inter-university and inter-college volleyball players. However, no significant difference was observed in ectomorphy between the two levels of players. The somatotyping scores of volleyball players in this study ranged from 2.5 to 3.7-3.7, indicating a meso-ectomorphic body type. Interestingly, our results diverge from those reported by Gualdi and Zaccagni (2001) ^[13], who described volleyball players as balanced mesomorphs. Conversely, our findings align more closely with research on Indonesian volleyball players, who exhibited a mesomorphic ectomorph body type with somatotype values of 2.4-3.5-3.7 (Rahmawati *et al.*, 2007) ^[23]. These discrepancies may stem from various factors such as differences in sample characteristics, training regimens, genetic predispositions, and environmental influences. Additionally, variations in methodologies for somatotype assessment could contribute to contrasting findings across studies. Further research exploring the nuanced interplay between somatotype characteristics and volleyball performance across diverse populations is warranted. Such investigations could provide valuable insights into optimizing player selection, training protocols, and performance enhancement strategies tailored to specific somatotype profiles.

Conclusions

The physique of inter-university players is distinguished by a higher mesomorphy component, indicating a more muscular build compared to inter-college players. As a result, it can be inferred that inter-university players demonstrate superior somatotype characteristics compared to their inter-college counterparts.

References

1. Bandyopadhyaya A. Anthropometry and body composition in soccer and volleyball players in West Bengal, India. *Journal of Physiological Anthropology*. 2007;26(4):501-505.
2. Bayios IA, Bergeles NK, Apostolidis NG, Noutsos KS, Koskolou MD. Anthropometric, body composition and somatotype differences of Greek elite female basketball, volleyball and handball players. *Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness*. 2006;46(2):271-280.
3. Carter JEL, Heath BH. Somatotyping-development and applications. Cambridge University Press; c1990.
4. Duncan MJ, Woodfield L, al-Nakeeb Y. Anthropometric and physiological characteristics of junior elite volleyball

- players. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2006;40(7):649-651.
5. Ercolessi D. La caduta dal salto. *Super Volley*. 1999;1:79-82.
 6. Fattahi A, Ameli M, Sadeghi H, Mahmoodi B. Relationship between anthropometric parameters with vertical jump in male elite volleyball players due to game's position. *Journal of Human Sport and Exercise*. 2012;7(3):714-726.
 7. Gabbett T, Georgieff B. Physiological and anthropometric characteristics of Australian junior national, state, and novice volleyball players. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*. 2007;21(3):902-908.
 8. Gaurav V, Singh A. Anthropometric characteristics of Indian volleyball players in relation to their performance traits. *Turkish Journal of Sport and Exercise*. 2014;16(1):87-89.
 9. Gaurav V, Singh M, Singh S. Anthropometric characteristics, somatotyping and body composition of volleyball and basketball players. *Journal of Physical Education and Sports Management*. 2010;1(3):28-32.
 10. Gaurav V. A study of selected components of physical fitness anthropometric measurements and physiological variables of volleyball players (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Guru Nanak Dev University; c2012.
 11. Gaurav V, Singh M, Singh S. A comparative study of somatic traits and body composition between volleyball players and controls. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*. 2011;4(2):116-118.
 12. Gjinovci B, Valon Nikqi V, Miftari F. The distinction between teams ranked third and fourth in the super league volleyball of Kosovo. *Sport Montenegro*. 2014;64:40-42.
 13. Gualdi-Russo E, Zaccagni L. Somatotype, role and performance in elite volleyball players. *The Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness*. 2001;41(2):256-262.
 14. Hadzic R, Belica D, Popovic S. A comparative study of anthropometric measurement and body composition between elite basketball and volleyball players. *Physical Education of Students*. 2012;1:103-108.
 15. Malousaris GG, Bergeles NK, Barzouka KG, Bayios IA, Nassis GP, Koskolou MD. Somatotype, size and body composition of competitive female volleyball players. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*. 2008;11:337-344.
 16. Milicerowa H. Somatotype characteristics as a main criterion in the process of sport selection. *Physical Education and Sport*. 1973;5:51-109.
 17. Nikolaidis PT, Afonso J, Buško K. Differences in anthropometry, somatotype, body composition and physiological characteristics of female volleyball players by competition level. *Sport Science and Health*. 2014;11:29-35.
 18. Norton K, Olds T. Morphological evolution of athletes over the 20th century. *Sports Medicine*. 2001;31:763-783.
 19. Palao J, Manzanares P, Valadés D. Anthropometric, Physical, and Age Differences by the Player Position and the Performance Level in Volleyball. *Journal of Human Kinetics*. 2014;44:223-236.
 20. Palao J, Santos J, Ureña A. Effect of team level on skill performance in volleyball. *International Journal of Performance Analysis in Sport*. 2004;4:50-60.
 21. Pastuszak A, Buško K, Kalka E. Somatotype and body composition of volleyball players and untrained female students - reference group for comparison in sport. *Anthropological Review*. 2016;79(4):461-470.
 22. Petroski EL, Fraro JD, Fidelix YL, Silva DAS, Pires-neto CS, Dourado AC, Rocha MA, Stanganelli LCR, Oncken P, Vieira FS. Anthropometric, morphological and somatotype characteristics of athletes of the Brazilian Men's volleyball team: an 11-year descriptive study. *Revista Brasileira de Cineantropometria & Desempenho Humano*. 2013;15(2):184-192.
 23. Rahmawati NT, Budiharjo S, Ashizawa K. Somatotypes of young male athletes and non-athlete students in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *Anthropological Science*. 2007;115:1-7.
 24. Singh S, Singh K, Singh M. Anthropometric measurements, body composition and somatotyping of high jumpers. *Brazilian Journal of Biomotricity*. 2010;4(4):266-271.
 25. Stec M, Smulsky V. The estimation criteria of jump actions of high performance female volleyball players. *Research Yearbook*. 2007;13:77-8.
 26. Sterkowicz-Przybycien K, Sterkowicz S, Zak S. Sport skill level and gender with relation to age, physical development and special fitness of the participants of Olympic volleyball tournament Beijing 2008. *Collegium Antropologicum*. 2008;38:511-516.
 27. Teixeira DM, del Fraro J, Soares F, Stanganelli LCR, Pires-Neto CS, Petroski EL. Anthropometric characteristics in elite athletes of the Brazilian team Juvenile and adult volleyball. *Revista Andaluza de Medicina del Deporte*. 2016;9:160-165.
 28. Toriala AL, Adeniran S, Ogunremi RT. Body composition and anthropometric characteristics of elite male basketball and volleyball players. *Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness*. 1987;27:235-239.
 29. Ugarkovic D. Biomedical foundations of sports medicine. Novi Sad; c2004.
 30. Viswanathan J, Chandrasekaran K. Optimizing Position-wise Anthropometric Models for Prediction of Playing Ability among Elite Indian Basketball Players. *International Journal of Sports Science and Engineering*. 2011;5(2):67-76.