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#### Abstract

The aim of the present study was to analysis the differences in anthropometric characteristics among various playing positions in Hockey. In Hockey the players were classified according to their playing position. These playing position were attackers, Midfielders and Defenders. Fifteen players each from attackers (A), Midfielders (B) and Defenders (D) were chosen as subject for this study. The data were collected during South Zone Inter- University Hockey Tournament held at Bharathiar University Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India. The subjects were randomly selected from various provinces. Body height, body mass, arm span, arm length, palm length, palm span, triceps, subscapular, Biceps, Iliac crest, lateral abdomen, Abdomen, Front thigh, Medial calf, Elbow diameter, knee diameter, arm girth relax, arm girth flex, fore arm girth, waist girth, gluteus girth, thigh girth and calf girth were selected as a anthropometrical variables for this study. The collected data was statistically analysed by using analysis of variance. The scheffe's test was used as a post hoc test to determine which of the paired mean differ significantly. The result reveals that there was significant differences between the playing position on the following variables namely body height, body weight, palm span, palm length, sub scapularis, triceps, biceps, lateral abdomen, abdomen, iliac crest, front thigh, mid calf, elbow diameter, arm girth relax. Arm girth flex, fore arm girth, waist girth, gluteus girth, thigh girth, \& calf girth is high in Midfielders. Defenders have greater value in the arm length, arm span and knee diameter followed by mid fielders and attackers.
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## Introduction

Hockey is an intermittent endurance sport involving short sprinting as well as movement with and without ball (Manna et al. 2009). In current scenario the game Field Hockey requires lots of Physiological and Physical demands to compete in Olympics. Physical characteristics and body composition have been known to be fundamental to excellence in athletic performance (Mathur 1985), (Mandeep Singh 2010). Today it has been widely accepted by the experts that top performance in sports is achieved if an athlete possesses the basic anthropometric characteristics suitable for the event. Therefore, the athletes in a particular sport must possess such typical characteristics which are of advantage to their performance. Body composition also makes an important contribution to an individual's level of physical fitness for performance, particularly in such sports that require one to carry one's body weight over a distance, which is facilitated by a large proportion of active tissue (muscle) in relation to a small proportion of fat tissue. Jain (2004). Anthropometric measurements relevant to human movement gained formal recognition as a discipline ISAK in 1986. Anthropometrists of all continents have participated in several major multidisciplinary studies that are being or have been conducted to assess the physical characteristics of people. Kinanthropometry has been defined as the quantitative interface between human structure and function (Ross, Drinkwater, Bailey, Marshall, Leahy, 1980). This interface is examined through the measurement and analysis of age, body, size, shape, proportion, composition and maturation as they relate to gross body function. Today it has been widely accepted by the experts that top performance in sports is
achieved if an athlete possesses the basic anthropometric characteristics suitable for the event. Therefore, the athletes in a particular sport must possess such typical characteristics which are of advantage to their performance. As far as the field hockey is concerned, very few references literature can be found in the positional wise analysis. The present study, therefore, aims to evaluate the anthropometric measurement of hockey players in three different positions such as attackers, mid fielders and defenders. The purpose of the study was to analysis the position - wise anthropometric profile of field hockey players.

## Materials and methods Samples

To achieve the purpose of this study the Hockey players were classified according to their playing position. These playing positions were attackers, mid fielders and defenders. For this study 45 male Hockey players were selected. Fifteen players each from attackers (A), mid fielders (M) and defenders (D) were chosen as subject for this study. The data were collected during South Zone Inter- University Hockey Tournament held at Bharathiar University Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India. The subjects were randomly selected from different provinces.

## Anthropometric Variables and Testing Methods

The investigators reviewed the available scientific literature pertaining in the game of Hockey and Anthropometric from books, journals, periodicals and research articles. Resulting from the review of literature and discussion with the experts and considering the feasibility criteria of the study. The following anthropometrical variables namely Body height, body mass, arm span, arm length, palm length, palm span, Triceps, subscapular, Biceps, Iliac crest, Lateral abdomen, abdominal, Front thigh,

Medial calf, Elbow diameter, knee diameter, arm girth relax, arm girth flex, fore arm girth, waist girth, Gluteal girth, Thigh girth and Calf girth were selected variables for this study. To make study more scientific, the reliability of the instruments and data was established. All measurements were taken by the investigators. One of the investigators was trained and qualified level two anthropometrist of International Society for the Advancement of Kinanthropometry (ISAK). The standardized testing protocol was used to collect the relevant data and test description is presented hereunder in a nutshell.

## Statistical Analysis

To test the significance of the mean difference among the players of various position namely attackers, mid fielders and defenders on criterion measures of selected anthropometrical variables, one - way analysis of variance was used. In case of significance of mean difference observed on the criterion measures, to find out which pair of group is high among the others scheffe's post - hoc test was applied.

## Result and Discussion

The descriptive statistics for anthropometric characteristics for all players are presented in the table below

The general observation of players with reference to the position played confirm that the midfield player are better in some parameters like body height, body weight, palm span, palm length, sub scapularis, triceps, biceps, lateral abdomen, abdomen, iliac crest, front thigh, mid calf, elbow diameter, arm girth relax. Arm girth flex, fore arm girth, waist girth, gluteus girth, thigh girth, \& calf girth followed by defenders and attackers. Defenders have greater value in the arm length, arm span and knee diameter followed by mid fielders and attackers.
Figure: I Mean Values Of Different Playing Position On Anthropometric Characteristics Of Hockey Players


It was evident from the above table -II variability exist among the Hockey players of different playing position at which they play.

The result of one-way analysis of variance on anthropometric characteristics among the three groups namely attacker, mid fielder \& defender were presented. From the table it can be seen that the calculated F value of body mass ( $\mathrm{F}=$ 5.67), palm length ( $F=10.68$ ), sub scapularis $(F=4.66)$, triceps ( $\mathrm{F}=5.29$ ), biceps $(\mathrm{F}=4.22)$, lateral abdomen $(\mathrm{F}=3.25)$, iliac crest $(\mathrm{F}=4.91)$, arm girth relax $(\mathrm{F}=6.11)$, arm girth flex $(\mathrm{F}=$ 6.73), fore arm girth $(\mathrm{F}=5.29)$, waist girth $(\mathrm{F}=5.38)$, gluteus girth $(\mathrm{F}=11.71)$, and thigh girth $(\mathrm{F}=5.14)$ among the three group were greater than the table value of 3.22 indicating that it was significant $(\mathrm{P}<0.05)$ for the degree of freedom $(2,42)$ at 0.05
level of confidence. Since the F value was significant, the scheffe's post hoc test was further computed to find out which pair of group was high among the others and the results are tabulated in the table no.III.

From the table - III, in body mass there was a significant mean difference observed between attackers and mid fielders (10.20), rest of the comparison showed no significant mean difference. In palm length there was a significant mean difference observed between attacker and mid fielders (8.66), and defenders and attackers (5.86) but no significant mean difference was observed between midfielders and defenders (2.80). In sub scapularis there was a significant mean difference observed between attackers and mid fielders (2.03), but no significant mean difference was observed between midfielders and defenders \& defenders and attackers. In triceps there was a significant mean difference observed between attackers and midfielders (2.60), but no significant mean difference was observed between midfielders \& defenders and defenders and attackers. In biceps there was a significant mean difference observed between attackers \& midfielders (1.25) but no significant mean difference was observed between midfielders \& defenders and defenders \& attackers. In lateral abdomen there was a significant mean difference observed between attackers \& midfielders (2.66) but no significant mean difference was observed between midfielders \& defenders and defenders \& attackers. In iliac crest there was a significant mean difference observed between midfielders \& defenders (1.05) but no significant mean difference was observed between attackers \& midfielders and defenders \& attackers. In arm girth relax there was a significant mean difference observed between attackers \& midfielders (3.26) but no significant mean difference was observed between midfielders \& defenders and defenders \& attackers.

In arm girth flex there was a significant mean difference observed between attacker and mid fielders (2.66), and midfielders \& defenders (2.13) but no significant mean difference was observed between defenders \& attackers. In forearm girth there was a significant mean difference observed between attackers \& midfielders (1.66) but no significant mean difference was observed between midfielders $\&$ defenders and defenders \& attackers. In waist girth there was a significant mean difference observed between attackers \& midfielders (6.46) but no significant mean difference was observed between midfielders \& defenders and defenders \& attackers. In gluteus girth there was a significant mean difference observed between attacker and mid fielders (8.40), and defenders and attackers (5.00) but no significant mean difference was observed between midfielders and defenders. In thigh girth there was a significant mean difference observed between attackers \& midfielders (4.00) but no significant mean difference was observed between midfielders \& defenders and defenders \& attackers.

It is reported that a battery of anthropometric and morphological tests can distinguish between players of different ability in the same sport (Keogh 1999) and in field Hockey (Singh et al. 2010). The finding reveals that mid fielders are remarkably the tallest in the team and they present greater body segments than all other playing positions followed by defenders are comparatively taller than attackers which is an agreement with other literature (Manna 2009).Mid fielders participate in the central defense in the field, aiming to block the opponents shoot and support the defenders in saving the goal and mid fielders will support the attackers for scoring the goals.

| S.NO | VARIABLES | $\begin{gathered} \text { EQUIPMENT } \\ \text { NEEDED } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | TEST DESCRIPTION | $\begin{gathered} \text { MEASURING } \\ \text { UNITS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Body Height | Stadiometer | The stretch stature method requires the subject to stand with the heels together and the heels, buttocks and upper part of the back touching the scale. The head, when placed in the frankfort plane, need not be touching the scale. | Meter |
| 2 | Body mass | Electronic weighing machine | The player just stands on the weighing machine with minimal movement with hands by their side. Shoes and excess clothing should be removed. | Kilogram |
| 3 | Arm span | Anthropometric tape | Facing away from the wall, with back and buttocks touching the arms are stretched out horizontally. Measure from one furthermost finger tips to the others. | Meter |
| 4 | Arm length | Segmometer | The arm length measurement from acromiale to datylion is made from the point of the shoulder to the tip of the mettle finger. | Centimetre |
| 5 | Palm length | Segmometer | Palm length was measured from the midstylion to dactylion. | Centimetre |
| 6 | Palm span | Segmometer | Palm span was measured from the tip of the thump to the tip of the little finger with all fingers are outstretched as far as possible. | Centimetre |
| 7 | Triceps | Skinfold calliper | Triceps was measured parallel to the long axis of the arm at the triceps, when the shoulder is relaxed with the shoulder joint externally rotated to the mids-prone position and elbow extended by the side of the body | Millimetre |
| 8 | Subscapular | Skinfold calliper | Subscapular was measured obliquely downward at subscapular skinfold site \& determined by the natural fold lines of the skin. | Millimetre |
| 9 | Biceps | Skinfold calliper | Biceps was measured parallel to the long axis of the arm at the biceps, when the shoulder is relaxed with the shoulder joint externally rotated to the mids-prone position and elbow extended by the side of the body | Millimetre |
| 10 | Iliac crest | Skinfold calliper | Iliac crest was measured horizontal at the iliac crest, the right arm should be either abducted or placed across the trunk, the line of the skin fold generally runs slightly downward posterior - anterior. | Millimetre |
| 11 | Lateral abdomen | Skinfold calliper | Lateral abdomen was measured obliquely and medially downward at the supraspinale skinfold site. The skin fold runs medially downward and anteriorly at about a $45^{\circ}$ angle | Millimetre |
| 12 | Abdominal | Skinfold calliper | Abdominal was measured vertically, at this site that the initial grasp should be firm for the thickness of the subcutaneous layer of tissue. | Millimetre |
| 13 | Front thigh | Skinfold calliper | Front thigh was measured parallel to long axis of thigh, the lateral side of the thigh was grasped \& measured | Millimetre |
| 14 | Medial calf | Skinfold calliper | Medial calf was measured vertically by keeping the right foot on the box. The right knee is bent at about $90^{\circ}$. | Millimetre |
| 15 | Elbow diameter | Small sliding calliper | The linear distance between the mostlateral aspect of the lateral humeral epicondyle and the most medial aspect of the medial humeral epicondyle, with the small sliding calliper gripped correctly to palpate the epicondyles of the humerus. | Centimetre |
| 16 | Knee diameter | Small sliding calliper | The linear distance between the most lateral aspect of the lateral femoral epicondyle and the most medial aspect of the medial femorial epicondyle | Centimetre |
| 17 | Arm girth relax | Anthropometric tape | The circumference of the arm at the level of the Mid - acromiale radiale. The subject standing relaxed with the arms hanging by the sides, slightly abducted to allow the tape to be passed around the arm | Centimetre |
| 18 | Arm girth flex | Anthropometric tape | The circumference of the arm perpendicular to the long axis of the arm at the level of the peak of the contracted Biceps brachii, when the arm is raised anteriorly to the horizontal. The subjects right arm is raised anteriorly to the horizontal with the forearm supinated and flexed at about $45-90^{\circ}$ to the arm. | Centimetre |
| 19 | Fore arm girth | Anthropometric tape | Forearm girth was measured at the distal to the humeral epicondyles. The subjects holds te palm in supinated position by using cross hand technique for the measurement | Centimetre |
| 20 | Waist girth | Anthropometric tape | Waist girth was measured at its narrowest point between the lower coastal ( $10^{\text {th }}$ rib) border and the top of the iliac crest perpendicular to the long axis of the trunk. The subject should breath normally and the measurement is taken at the end of a normal expiration (end tidal). | Centimetre |
| 21 | Gluteus girth | Anthropometric tape | The circumference of the buttocks at the levelof their greatest posterior protuberance, perpendicular to the long axis of the trunk | Centimetre |
| 22 | Thigh girth | Anthropometric tape | The circumference of the thigh 1 cm distal to the gluteal fold site, perpendicular to the long axis, the subject stand on a box or stool for this measure . | Centimetre |
| 23 | Calf girth | Anthropometric tape | The circumference of the leg at the level of the medial calf skinfold site, the subject asked to stand at the elevated position for the measurement | Centimetre |

Table - I Mean and standard deviation of different playing position on anthropometric characteristics of hockey players

| S.No | Variables | Units |  | Attackers |  |  | Did fielders |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | Mean | $\mathrm{SD}( \pm)$ | Mean | $\mathrm{SD}( \pm)$ | Mean | $\mathrm{SD}( \pm)$ |
| 1 | Height | In Centimetres | 169.40 | 6.57 | 173.86 | 5.42 | 173.53 | 8.13 |
| 2 | Weight | In Kilogram | 61.40 | 9.14 | 71.60 | 8.73 | 65.26 | 7.11 |
| 3 | Arm length | In Centimetres | 78.46 | 4.37 | 78.06 | 4.58 | 79.60 | 4.50 |
| 4 | Arm span | In Centimetres | 171.86 | 16.50 | 179.20 | 9.00 | 179.40 | 9.71 |
| 5 | Palm span | In Centimetres | 8.83 | .44 | 9.13 | .58 | 9.02 | .57 |
| 6 | Palm length | In Centimetres | 91.33 | 4.57 | 100.00 | 5.27 | 97.20 | 5.79 |
| 7 | Sub Scap | In Millimetres | 9.12 | 2.04 | 11.16 | 1.65 | 10.10 | 1.74 |
| 8 | Triceps | In Millimetres | 6.24 | 1.86 | 8.85 | 2.42 | 7.60 | 2.25 |
| 9 | Biceps | In Millimetres | 3.81 | .99 | 5.06 | 1.35 | 4.46 | 1.16 |
| 10 | Lateral abdomen | In Millimetres | 12.33 | 2.88 | 14.99 | 3.20 | 14.35 | 2.83 |
| 11 | Abdomen | In Millimetres | 12.58 | 2.51 | 14.57 | 3.06 | 14.46 | 2.68 |
| 12 | Iliac crest | In Millimetres | 4.57 | 1.05 | 4.93 | .91 | 3.88 | .81 |
| 13 | Front thigh | In Millimetres | 10.33 | 2.80 | 12.32 | 2.34 | 12.06 | 2.11 |
| 14 | Mid calf | In Millimetres | 8.98 | 2.48 | 11.08 | 3.52 | 10.77 | 2.56 |
| 15 | Elbow diameter | In Centimeters | 6.06 | .52 | 6.33 | .57 | 6.27 | .39 |
| 16 | Knee diameter | In Centimeters | 6.91 | 1.20 | 7.21 | .83 | 7.57 | .59 |
| 17 | Arm girth relax | In Centimeters | 24.20 | 3.66 | 27.46 | 2.13 | 26.13 | 1.35 |
| 18 | Arm girth flex | In Centimeters | 28.93 | 2.57 | 31.60 | 2.06 | 29.46 | 1.55 |
| 19 | Fore arm girth | In Centimeters | 24.26 | 1.62 | 25.93 | 1.62 | 24.80 | .94 |
| 20 | Waist girth | In Centimeters | 74.66 | 5.56 | 81.13 | 6.47 | 76.60 | 4.38 |
| 21 | Gluteus girth | In Centimeters | 87.86 | 4.29 | 96.26 | 5.86 | 92.86 | 3.97 |
| 22 | Thigh girth | In Centimeters | 48.73 | 3.12 | 52.73 | 3.39 | 52.13 | 4.40 |
| 23 | Calf girth | In Centimeters | 32.53 | 3.44 | 34.73 | 2.49 | 33.86 | 2.23 |

Table - II Analysis of variance of selected anthropometric characteristics of hockey players

| S.No | Variables | Group | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | height | Between Groups | 185.733 | 2 | 92.867 | 2.01 |
|  |  | Within Groups | 1943.067 | 42 | 46.263 |  |
| 2 | Weight | Between Groups | 795.511 | 2 | 397.756 | 5.67* |
|  |  | Within Groups | 2948.133 | 42 | 70.194 |  |
| 3 | Arm length | Between Groups | 18.978 | 2 | 9.489 | . 47 |
|  |  | Within Groups | 846.267 | 42 | 20.149 |  |
| 4 | Arm span | Between Groups | 552.844 | 2 | 276.422 | 1.85 |
|  |  | Within Groups | 6271.733 | 42 | 149.327 |  |
| 5 | Palm span | Between Groups | . 694 | 2 | . 347 | 1.19 |
|  |  | Within Groups | 12.176 | 42 | . 290 |  |
| 6 | Palm length | Between Groups | 586.844 | 2 | 293.422 | 10.68* |
|  |  | Within Groups | 1153.733 | 42 | 27.470 |  |
| 7 | Sub scap | Between Groups | 31.022 | 2 | 15.511 | 4.66* |
|  |  | Within Groups | 139.835 | 42 | 3.329 |  |
| 8 | triceps | Between Groups | 50.992 | 2 | 25.496 | 5.29* |
|  |  | Within Groups | 202.364 | 42 | 4.818 |  |
| 9 | biceps | Between Groups | 11.788 | 2 | 5.894 | 4.22* |
|  |  | Within Groups | 58.644 | 42 | 1.396 |  |
| 10 | Lateral abdomen | Between Groups | 57.828 | 2 | 28.914 | 3.25* |
|  |  | Within Groups | 373.360 | 42 | 8.890 |  |
| 11 | abdomen | Between Groups | 37.721 | 2 | 18.861 | 2.47 |
|  |  | Within Groups | 321.387 | 42 | 7.652 |  |
| 12 | Iliac crest | Between Groups | 8.599 | 2 | 4.300 | 4.91* |
|  |  | Within Groups | 36.747 | 42 | . 875 |  |
| 13 | Front thigh | Between Groups | 35.129 | 2 | 17.565 | 2.95 |
|  |  | Within Groups | 249.899 | 42 | 5.950 |  |
| 14 | Mid calf | Between Groups | 38.761 | 2 | 19.381 | 2.31 |
|  |  | Within Groups | 352.671 | 42 | 8.397 |  |
| 15 | Elbow diameter | Between Groups | . 619 | 2 | . 310 | 1.23 |
|  |  | Within Groups | 10.579 | 42 | . 252 |  |
| 16 | Knee diameter | Between Groups | 3.276 | 2 | 1.638 | 1.96 |
|  |  | Within Groups | 35.124 | 42 | . 836 |  |
| 17 | Arm girth relax | Between Groups | 80.933 | 2 | 40.467 | 6.11* |
|  |  | Within Groups | 277.867 | 42 | 6.616 |  |
| 18 | Arm girth flex | Between Groups | 59.733 | 2 | 29.867 | 6.73* |
|  |  | Within Groups | 186.267 | 42 | 4.435 |  |
| 19 | Fore arm girth | Between Groups | 21.733 | 2 | 10.867 | 5.29* |
|  |  | Within Groups | 86.267 | 42 | 2.054 |  |
| 20 | Waist girth | Between Groups | 330.533 | 2 | 165.267 | 5.38* |
|  |  | Within Groups | 1290.667 | 42 | 30.730 |  |
| 21 | Gluteus girth | Between Groups | 535.600 | 2 | 267.800 | 11.71* |
|  |  | Within Groups | 960.400 | 42 | 22.867 |  |
| 22 | Thigh girth | Between Groups | 139.600 | 2 | 69.800 | 5.14* |
|  |  | Within Groups | 569.600 | 42 | 13.562 |  |
| 23 | Calf girth | Between Groups | 46.978 | 2 | 23.489 | 2.40 |
|  |  | Within Groups | 298.000 | 42 | 7.095 |  |

Table - III Scheffe's Post - Hoc Test For Mean Differnces Between The Attacker, Mid Fielder \& Defender Positions Of Anthropometric Characteristic Of Hockey Players

| S.No. | Variable | Attacker | Midfielder | Defender | M D | C.I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Weight | 61.40 | 71.60 | - | 10.20 | 7.67 |
|  |  | - | 71.60 | 65.26 | 6.33 |  |
|  |  | 61.40 | - | 65.26 | 3.36 |  |
| 2 | Palm length | 91.33 | 100.00 | - | 8.66 | 4.80 |
|  |  | - | 100.00 | 97.20 | 2.80 |  |
|  |  | 91.33 | - | 97.20 | 5.86 |  |
| 3 | Sub Scap | 9.12 | 11.16 | - | 2.03 | 1.68 |
|  |  | - | 11.16 | 10.10 | 1.05 |  |
|  |  | 9.12 | - | 10.10 | 0.98 |  |
| 4 | Triceps | 6.24 | 8.85 | - | 2.60 | 2.01 |
|  |  | - | 8.85 | 7.60 | 1.24 |  |
|  |  | 6.24 | - | 7.60 | 1.36 |  |
| 5 | Biceps | 3.81 | 5.06 | - | 1.25 | 1.09 |
|  |  | - | 5.06 | 4.46 | 0.60 |  |
|  |  | 3.81 |  | 4.46 | 0.65 |  |
| 6 | Lateral abdomen | 12.33 | 14.57 | - | 2.66 | 2.61 |
|  |  | - | 14.57 | 14.46 | 0.64 |  |
|  |  | 12.33 | - | 14.46 | 2.02 |  |
| 7 | Iliac crest | 4.57 | 4.93 | - | 0.36 | 0.86 |
|  |  | - | 4.93 | 3.88 | 1.05 |  |
|  |  | 4.57 | - | 3.88 | 0.69 |  |
| 8 | Arm girth relax | 24.20 | 27.46 | - | 3.26 | 2.36 |
|  |  | - | 27.46 | 26.13 | 1.33 |  |
|  |  | 24.20 | - | 26.13 | 1.93 |  |
| 9 | Arm girth flex | 28.93 | 31.60 | - | 2.66 | 1.93 |
|  |  | - | 31.60 | 29.46 | 2.13 |  |
|  |  | 28.93 | - | 29.46 | 0.53 |  |
| 10 | Fore arm girth | 24.26 | 25.93 | - | 1.66 | 1.32 |
|  |  | - | 25.93 | 24.80 | 1.13 |  |
|  |  | 24.26 | - | 24.80 | 0.53 |  |
| 11 | Waist girth | 74.66 | 81.13 | - | 6.46 | 5.05 |
|  |  | - | 81.13 | 76.60 | 4.53 |  |
|  |  | 74.66 | - | 76.60 | 1.93 |  |
| 12 | Gluteus girth | 87.86 | 96.26 | - | 8.40 | 4.37 |
|  |  | - | 96.26 | 92.86 | 3.40 |  |
|  |  | 87.86 | - | 92.86 | 5.00 |  |
| 13 | Thigh girth | 48.73 | 52.73 | - | 4.00 | 3.38 |
|  |  | - | 52.73 | 52.13 | 0.60 |  |
|  |  | 48.73 | - | 52.13 | 3.40 |  |

And the other study reported that the taller soccer players are most suitable for the central defense and central attack (Reilly, Bangsbo, \& Franks, 2000). The defenders has long arm span and arm length when compare to midfielders and attackers, it helps to tackle the ball from the opponent easily and to block the through pass, the hypothesis of the other literature stated that field hockey players will have longer upper limb length (Francis E. Holway 2011). The attackers are shorter when compare to other position of players, shorter players have low centre of gravity, they have good speed and play at the boundaries, so that they have good balance to achieve the goal.

## Conclusions

The results demonstrate that a number of significant differences in anthropometric characteristics exist between playing positions.

1. Midfield players were taller, body weight, with the bigger palm span, palm length, sub scpularies, triceps, Biceps, Lateral abdomen, abdomen, Iliac crest, front thigh, mid calf, elbow diameter, arm girth relax, arm girth flex, fore arm girth, waist girth, gluteus girth, thigh girth and calf girth.
2. Defender are bigger in arm span, arm length and knee diameter among all players
3. Attackers are shortest in nature, with the less anthropometric charterstics among all players.
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