

Physical Profiles of Female Academy Netball Players by Position

Brief Running Head: Female Netball Position Characteristics

Research conducted at the University of Salford

Christopher Thomas, Kemal Thomas Ismail, Robert Simpson, Paul Comfort, Paul A. Jones, and Thomas Dos'Santos

All authors are affiliated with the Directorate of Sport, Exercise and Physiotherapy. University of Salford, Salford, Greater Manchester, UK

Address correspondence to Christopher Thomas, Directorate of Sport, Exercise and Physiotherapy. University of Salford, Salford, Greater Manchester, UK

Telephone number: +447925871029

Email address: c.thomas2@edu.salford.ac.uk

No funding was received for this study from any organization.

1

2 **ABSTRACT**

3 The purpose of this study was to evaluate the height, body mass and physical characteristics of female
4 academy netball players by position (centers, defenders and shooters). Data were collected on 43
5 regional academy players during the preseason period and comprised of height and body mass, and
6 physical characteristics (single-leg hop [SLH], squat jump [SJ], countermovement jump [CMJ], 5- and 10-m
7 sprint, 505 and cardiorespiratory fitness). Defenders and shooters demonstrated significantly ($p < 0.05$;
8 $d \geq 1.1$) greater body mass compared to centers. Defenders demonstrated significantly ($p < 0.05$; $d =$
9 1.6) greater height compared to centers, however no significant differences were noted between centers
10 and shooters ($p = 0.19$; $d = 0.7$) and defenders and shooters ($p = 0.70$; $d = 0.5$). Centers performed better
11 during the SLH left leg ($p = 0.01$; $d = 1.0$), SJ ($p = 0.03$; $d = 1.1$), CMJ ($p = 0.01$; $d = 1.4$), 5 m ($p = 0.04$; $d \geq$
12 -0.9) and 10 m sprint ($p = 0.01$; $d = -1.2$), 505 left ($p \leq 0.03$; $d \geq 1.0$), 505 right ($p \leq 0.03$; $d = 1.3$), and
13 cardiorespiratory fitness ($p = 0.01$; $d \geq 1.2$), compared to other positions. No other significant differences
14 were observed. These findings demonstrate that height, body mass and physical characteristics differ
15 between positions in female netball players, and provide normative data for English academy netball
16 players. Strength and conditioning coaches should consider the specific demands on individual positions
17 when training female netball players.

18 **KEYWORDS:** fitness testing; netball; youth athletes; sprint; countermovement jump

19

20 **INTRODUCTION**

21 Success in netball is highly dependent on physical fitness characteristics including strength, power, speed,
22 and agility (35). To perform consistently throughout the 60-minute game, and recover effectively
23 between bouts of high-intensity exercise, netball players must also display a high level of aerobic fitness.
24 This has been highlighted in previous work (4, 34), with heart rates reported between 75-85% of the
25 maximum heart rate during match play. Furthermore, match-play analysis reveals center-court players

Female Netball Position Characteristics

26 (center [C], wing attack [WA], wing defense [WD]) cover more distance (8) and accumulate greater player
27 loads (6, 11, 44), compared to defenders (goal keeper [GK], goal defense [GD]) and shooters (goal attack
28 [GA], goal shooter [GS]). These differences are likely due to the differing roles of the positions combined
29 with positional restrictions during play relating to which areas of the court individual players can play in.

30 Netball players must successfully complete multiple high-intensity short-duration sprints, cutting and
31 pivot maneuvers, and up to 60 jump landings per game (12, 15), all requiring high levels of concentric and
32 eccentric force production (27). The literature provides normative data for sprinting speed (35, 37, 39),
33 change of direction speed (CODS) (1, 37, 39), vertical jump (24, 35, 37, 39), maximum strength (35, 37),
34 and a range of other factors including anthropometric and aerobic capacity measurements (35, 39).
35 However, very little is known about the physical profiles (height and body mass, and physical
36 characteristics) across netball playing positions. Physical profiling of netball players by position would
37 assist coaches and practitioners to prescribe appropriate training programmes in line with the position-
38 specific demands shown to exist during training and competition.

39 In academy athletes, mean sprint times for 5- and 10 m range from 1.10 and 1.88 s, respectively, for
40 English academy netball players (37, 39), to 1.25 and 2.07 s, respectively, for Australian academy netball
41 players (35). Average vertical jump performances demonstrate great variation, ranging from 0.34 to 0.41
42 m for squat jump (SJ) and 0.35 to 0.46 m for countermovement jump (CMJ) height (35, 39). Recently,
43 Thomas et al. (37) reported isometric mid-thigh pull strength ($30.70 \pm 5.26 \text{ N}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$) in academy netball
44 players. The authors reported that stronger athletes also demonstrated significantly faster 5 m (stronger:
45 $1.08 \pm 0.06 \text{ s}$; weaker: $1.15 \pm 0.05 \text{ s}$), 10 m (stronger: $1.91 \pm 0.06 \text{ s}$; weaker: $1.99 \pm 0.06 \text{ s}$) sprint times
46 than weaker athletes. Furthermore, stronger athletes demonstrated significantly faster 505 L (stronger:
47 $2.44 \pm 0.08 \text{ s}$; weaker: $2.55 \pm 0.11 \text{ s}$) and 505 R (stronger: $2.41 \pm 0.08 \text{ s}$; weaker: $2.54 \pm 0.07 \text{ s}$) CODS times
48 than weaker athletes. Moreover, stronger athletes produced significantly greater jump heights in the SJ
49 (stronger: $0.41 \pm 0.06 \text{ m}$; weaker: $0.36 \pm 0.04 \text{ m}$) and the CMJ (stronger: $0.42 \pm 0.05 \text{ m}$; weaker: $0.37 \pm$
50 0.04 m). These findings highlight the importance of maximum strength in female netball athletes. This
51 result may be explained by the fact that peak ground reaction forces and impulse are strong
52 determinants of sprint, CODS, and vertical jump performances (20, 36, 40-42). **Furthermore, greater**

53 **levels of maximum strength may improve an athlete's ability to hold static and dynamic positions, such**
54 **as jumping and landing (27), sprinting (23) and CODS (31, 32), providing a greater acceleration,**
55 **acceptance of higher eccentric forces, thus preparing athletes for the movement demands and injury**
56 **risks associated with the sport.**

57 Most of the existing literature focuses on the physical demands of netball match-play (4, 6, 8, 11-15,
58 44) and physical characteristics (24, 37, 39). There are currently no normative data available in the
59 published literature regarding position-specific physical characteristics in female netball players. The
60 aim of this study was to determine differences in height and body mass, and physical characteristics
61 between positions (centers, defenders and shooters) of female netball players using a netball-
62 specific testing battery. It was hypothesized that there would be clear differences in height and body
63 mass, and the physical characteristics of the different position groups. Specifically, centers would
64 demonstrate superior hop, SJ, CMJ, sprint, CODS, and cardiorespiratory fitness performances than
65 both defenders and shooters. It was further hypothesized that both defenders and shooters would
66 exhibit greater height and body mass values, compared to centers.

67 **METHODS**

68 **Experimental Approach to the Problem**

69 **A cross-sectional observational design** of a regional female netball academy in the United Kingdom was
70 conducted using field tests specific to the sport. Athletes were assessed on height and body mass, and a
71 range of physical characteristics (single-leg hop [SLH], SJ, CMJ, 5- and 10 m sprint, 505 CODS and 30-15
72 intermittent fitness test [30-15_{IFT}]). Players were defined into positions by the academy coaching staff,
73 thus allowing comparisons between female academy netball players per their position. The positions
74 were classified as: centers ($n = 15$; C, WA, WD), defenders ($n = 15$; GK, GD) and shooters ($n = 13$; GA, GS).

75 **Subjects**

76 Female academy netball players ($n = 43$; age = 15.51 ± 1.49 years; height = 1.74 ± 0.06 m; body mass =
77 66.56 ± 8.15 kg) participated in this study. A power analysis determined that with 43 subjects, the study is

Female Netball Position Characteristics

78 adequately powered for a between factors analysis with multiple groups, to detect differences with an
79 alpha of 0.05 and 80% power (G*Power version 3.1.9.2. Universität Kiel, Germany) (10). All players were
80 fully informed of the requirements of the investigation and provided appropriate consent to participate,
81 with consent from the parent or guardian of all players under the age of 18. The investigation was also
82 approved by the institutional review board.

83 Procedures

84 Testing was conducted in the preseason (October 2015), at the end of a 4-week general preparation
85 mesocycle. All athletes rested the day before testing and were asked to attend testing in a fed and
86 hydrated state, similar to their normal practices before training. All participants were familiar with the
87 tests performed in this study as part of their normal training and monitoring regime. On arrival, all
88 participants had their height (Stadiometer; Seca, Birmingham, United Kingdom) and body mass assessed
89 (Seca Digital Scales, Model 707) while in bare feet, measured to the nearest 0.1 kg and 0.1 cm,
90 respectively. Testing order was as follows: SLH, SJ, CMJ, sprint, CODS and 30-15_{IFT}. Before the start of
91 testing, athletes were instructed to perform a standardized warm-up, as directed by the investigator (39).
92 Furthermore, standardized progressive warm-ups were applied before all tests to control potential
93 variables and improve the reliability of all tests. All testing was performed indoors on a hardwood netball
94 court.

95 Hop Testing

96 A 6-m long, 15-cm-wide line was marked on the floor, along the middle of which was a standard tape
97 measure, perpendicular to the starting line. The SLH test began with participants placing the toes of both
98 feet on the back of the start line, before balancing on the leg to be tested. Participants had to “stick” the
99 landing for the trial to be counted. If the subject did not do this, the trial was disregarded and another
100 was attempted. In accordance with previous research (28), participants performed 3 warm-up trials on
101 each leg. Participants performed a simultaneous arm swing and crouch, then hopped as far forward as
102 possible, taking off from one leg, before landing on the same leg. Three maximal trials were recorded on
103 each leg, with one minute of rest between trials. Intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) and coefficient of

Female Netball Position Characteristics

104 variation (CV) for hops were as follows: SLH left leg (ICC = 0.89; CV = 3%) and SLH right leg (ICC = 0.91; CV
105 = 3%). The best performance of each leg was used for further analysis.

106 Vertical Jump Testing

107 Vertical jump height data were collected using a portable jump mat (Just Jump; Probiotics, Huntsville, AL,
108 USA), as previously described by Thomas et al. (37). Vertical jump tests began with the SJ condition. On
109 stepping onto the jump mat, athletes were instructed to get in the “ready position,” which consisted of
110 the subject having their hands-on hips and assuming a self-selected squat depth. Once in position, a
111 countdown of “3, 2, 1 Jump” was given. A three second hold of the bottom position was used to
112 eliminate the involvement of the stretch-shorten cycle. If players failed to adhere to the strict protocol
113 and either performed a countermovement or moved their hands off their hips, the trial was repeated
114 after an additional one-minute rest. For the CMJ, athletes were instructed to perform a rapid eccentric
115 phase, immediately followed by a rapid concentric phase with the intention to jump as high as possible.
116 Countermovement jumps were performed with the hand on the hips, and countermovement depth of
117 the eccentric phase was self-selected by the athletes to maximize CMJ height. For both SJ and CMJ,
118 athletes performed three trials, with one minute of rest between trials. Alternate jump height was
119 calculated from flight time ($1/8 [g \times t^2]$) (where g = the acceleration due to gravity and t = air time), and
120 subsequently corrected per the formula by McMahon et al. (26). The ICC and CV for vertical jump
121 performances were as follows: SJ (ICC = 0.94; CV = 3%) and CMJ (ICC = 0.92; CV = 2%). The best
122 performance from each of the three trials was used for further analysis.

123

124 Sprint Testing

125 The 10 m sprint test was administered as a test of acceleration and sprint ability. All athletes performed
126 three trials, with two minutes rest between trials, using “Brower photocell timing Gates” (model number
127 BRO001; Brower, Draper, UT, USA) setup at 0-, 5-, and 10 m. Timing gates were placed at the
128 approximate hip height for all athletes as previously recommended (43), to ensure that only one body
129 part, such as the lower torso, breaks the beam. Athletes started 0.5 m behind the first gate, to prevent

Female Netball Position Characteristics

130 any early triggering of the initial start gate, from a two-point staggered start. The ICC and CV for sprint
131 performances were as follows: 5 m (ICC = 0.60; CV = 4%) and 10 m (ICC = 0.75; CV = 2%). The best
132 performance of the three trials was used for further analysis.

133 Change of Direction Speed Testing

134 Change of direction speed was assessed utilising a 505 test. Athletes started 0.5 m behind the photocell
135 gates, to prevent any early triggering of the initial start gate, from a two-point staggered start. Timing
136 gates were again placed at the approximate hip height for all athletes. Athletes were instructed to sprint
137 to a line marked 15 m from the start line, placing either left or right foot on the line, depending on the
138 trial, turn 180° and sprint back 5 m through the finish (16). If the subject changed direction before hitting
139 the turning line, or turned off the incorrect foot, the trial was disregarded and the subject completed
140 another trial after the rest period. All athletes performed three trials, with a two-minute rest between
141 trials. The ICC and CV for 505 performances were as follows: left leg (ICC = 0.60; CV = 2%) and right leg
142 (ICC = 0.69; CV = 2%). The best performance from each of the three trials was used for further analysis.

143 30-15 Intermittent Fitness Test

144 The 30-15_{IFT} was performed to assess cardiorespiratory fitness as previously described (17). Players were
145 instructed to complete as many 'stages' as possible, and the test ended when a player could no longer
146 maintain the imposed running speed or when they were unable to reach a 3-m zone around each line at
147 the moment of the audio signal on three consecutive occasions. If players were unable to complete the
148 stage, then their score was recorded as the stage that they last completed successfully, and the running
149 velocity recorded as their maximal intermittent running velocity (V_{IFT}).

150 STATISTICAL ANALYSES

151 **Data are presented as either mean \pm SD or mean with 90% confidence intervals (90% CI) where**
152 **specified.** Normality of data was assessed by Shapiro–Wilk statistic, and homogeneity of variance was
153 verified with Levene's test. A series of one-way analysis of variance were conducted to analyse
154 differences in physical characteristics between positions. Where significant differences were found,

Female Netball Position Characteristics

155 Bonferroni post hoc analyses were completed to detect differences between positions. The magnitude of
156 differences between position groups was also expressed as standardized mean difference [Cohen' d ,
157 effect sizes, (ES)] (5), and based on the scale by Hopkins (19). All statistical analyses were completed
158 using SPSS (version 23, IBM, New York, NY, USA). An *a priori* alpha level of $p \leq 0.05$ was used as the
159 criterion for statistical significance.

160 **RESULTS**

161 The mean \pm SD values for height and body mass, SLH, SJ, CMJ, sprint, CODS, and cardiorespiratory fitness
162 of female academy netball players by position can be found in Table 1. The table presents overall effects
163 and ES between positions.

164 ** INSERT TABLE 1 AROUND HERE **

165 There were no significant differences ($p > 0.05$; $d = -0.1$ to 0.3) in age between the groups (Table 1). One-
166 way analysis of variance revealed differences in height, post-hoc analysis that defenders were
167 significantly taller ($p = 0.01$; $d = 1.6$) compared to centers. Trivial-to-moderate, yet non-significant
168 differences were found between the heights of centers and shooters ($p = 0.19$; $d = -0.7$) and defenders
169 and shooters ($p = 0.70$; $d = 0.5$). Body mass was significantly different with defenders significantly heavier
170 than shooters ($p = 0.02$; $d = 1.1$) and shooters heavier than centers ($p = 0.03$; $d = 1.1$), whereas small non-
171 significant differences were found between defenders and shooters ($p = 0.78$; $d = 0.4$).

172 With regards to SLH L performances, centers scored significantly higher compared to shooters ($p = 0.01$; d
173 = 1.0), whereas small, yet non-significant differences were found between centers and defenders ($p =$
174 0.26 ; $d = 0.9$) and defenders and shooters ($p = 0.35$; $d = 0.5$). No significant differences ($p > 0.05$) were
175 identified for SLH R performances with small-to-moderate effects identified between positions ($d = 0.2$ to
176 0.7).

177 Significant moderate differences were found for SJ height, with centers jumping higher than defenders (p
178 = 0.03 ; $d = 1.1$), whereas small-to-moderate, yet non-significant differences were found between both
179 the centers and shooters ($p = 0.06$; $d = 0.8$) and defenders and shooters ($p = 0.99$; $d = -0.2$).

Female Netball Position Characteristics

180 Countermovement jump height was significantly greater for the centers compared to defenders ($p = 0.01$;
181 $d = 1.4$), whereas trivial and moderate non-significant differences were observed between the defenders
182 and shooters ($p = 0.44$; $d = -0.2$) and centers and shooters ($p = 0.12$; $d = 0.8$).

183 Five metre sprint performances were significantly faster in the centers than the shooters ($p = 0.04$; $d =$
184 -1.0) and defenders than the shooters ($p = 0.04$; $d = -0.9$), whereas trivial and non-significant differences
185 were found between centers and defenders ($p = 0.96$; $d = 0.1$). Ten metre sprint performances were
186 significantly faster in the centers than the shooters ($p = 0.01$; $d = -1.2$), whereas small and moderate non-
187 significant differences were identified between defenders and shooters ($p = 0.91$; $d = -0.4$) and centers
188 and defenders ($p = 0.14$; $d = -0.7$).

189 Centers were significantly faster, during the 505 L compared to both the defenders ($p = 0.03$; $d = -1.0$)
190 and shooters ($p = 0.01$; $d = -1.2$), whereas trivial non-significant differences were found between
191 defenders and shooters ($p = 0.99$; $d = -0.2$). Similarly, centers demonstrated significantly faster 505 R
192 performances than both the defenders ($p = 0.01$; $d = -1.3$) and shooters ($p = 0.03$; $d = -1.3$), whereas
193 small non-significant differences were found between defenders and shooters ($p = 0.83$; $d = 0.2$).

194 Maximal intermittent running velocity was significantly greater in the centers to that of both the
195 defenders ($p = 0.01$; $d = 1.4$) and shooters ($d = 1.2$), whereas trivial non-significant differences were
196 observed between the defenders and shooters ($p = 0.83$; $d = 0.1$).

197 DISCUSSION

198 The aim of this study was to evaluate the height and body mass, and physical characteristics between
199 position groups in female academy netball players, using a complete field testing battery specific to the
200 sport. The results of this study indicate that differences in height and body mass, and physical
201 characteristics (SLH, SJ, CMJ, sprint, CODS, and cardiorespiratory fitness) exist between position groups in
202 female academy netball players. **The current findings add to a growing body of literature on the physical**
203 **characteristics of female netball players, and will serve as a basis for future studies, with the findings**
204 **used to establish normative values for monitoring and assessment of academy level netball players.**

Female Netball Position Characteristics

205 The results of the current study indicate height was greater in defenders compared to centers. This
206 supports the hypothesis and consistent with previous findings (33) whereby differences were identified
207 between positions for height in male soccer players. Differences in height are likely explained by the
208 positional demands of the sport. Netball squads are relatively heterogeneous in physical stature,
209 whereby tallness is routinely accepted as selection criteria for defenders and shooters in netball.
210 Surprisingly, there was no difference in height when comparing centers to shooters. This finding may
211 partly be explained by 1) **while tallness may be seen to be a desirable characteristic, it may not be**
212 **essential for success in netball for shooters compared to defenders, or 2) players in the current study**
213 **were pre-elite youth athletes (15.51 ± 1.49 years old)** and may have been at different stages away from
214 their peak height velocity (21). Further studies, which take natural development (maturation) into
215 account, will need to be undertaken. Defenders and shooters were significantly heavier than center
216 players, while there were no significant differences in body mass between defenders and shooters. These
217 findings are similar to those previously reported (33), whereby goalkeepers demonstrated heavier body
218 mass compared to outfield players in elite male soccer players.

219 In this study, center players demonstrated superior SLH L performances compared to shooters. These
220 findings may be explained by the fact that center players perform a greater percentage of hop landings
221 during matches, therefore center players may be better prepared to performing hop techniques due to
222 their playing position and individual fitness characteristics (15). However, in the current study, no
223 differences were observed between position groups for SLH R. **While it is difficult to explain this result,**
224 **positional and/or training related factors may, in part, play a more significant role than first thought.**
225 For example, athletes may have a more “preferred” side when hopping, which may differ within- and
226 between-positions, thus masking any differences in SLH R performances between positions. Indeed,
227 Hewit et al. (18) found that between-limb asymmetries are task and variable dependent, and magnified
228 when data is analysed at an individual level.

229 The current study found that center players demonstrated significantly greater SJ and CMJ heights
230 compared to defenders, yet non-significant differences were found between both the centers and

Female Netball Position Characteristics

231 shooters and defenders and shooters. However, it is argued that non-significant results do not necessarily
232 imply the nonexistence of a worthwhile differences in vertical jump performances. From our findings,
233 there is evidently a trend of increased SJ and CMJ height between centers and shooters ($d = 0.8$). **The**
234 **players in the current study appeared to have similar SJ (0.37-0.41 m) and CMJ (0.37-0.42 m) heights**
235 **when compared to other female netball players (37, 39)**. The findings of this study may partly be
236 explained by the fact that centers are found to perform more jumps and perform more frequent multi-
237 directional movements during play (13, 14), requiring high levels of force production, like the SJ and CMJ.
238 Furthermore, centers were found to have significantly lighter body mass' than defenders, thus having less
239 inertia to overcome. Given acceleration is inversely proportional to its mass, centers may have applied a
240 greater concentric impulse, causing greater acceleration which could have attributed to greater jump
241 heights (25); however, these variables were not assessed in this study. A further study with more focus
242 on the force-time characteristics during vertical jumping in female netball players is therefore suggested.

243 Professional netball players have been reported to execute a change in activity pattern on average every
244 6 seconds (8, 13). However, positional and court restrictions prevent players from achieving a maximal
245 velocity. Therefore, the ability to change velocity to evade a defender, or when reacting to an attacker,
246 plays an important role in netball performance (13, 14). The results from this study showed that centers
247 demonstrated significantly faster 5- and 10 m sprint performances when compared to shooters.
248 Additionally, defenders produced significantly faster 5 m sprint performances compared to the shooters.
249 **These findings are similar to those by Lockie et al. (22) whereby midfielders demonstrated fastest 5 m**
250 **sprint times compared to other positions in female soccer players. The data from this study reveal**
251 **subjects from this cohort were faster over 5- and 10-m when compared to Australian academy netball**
252 **players (35), and similar to English academy players (37, 39). It can thus be suggested that players of**
253 **the present study could be classified pre-elite youth players, as far as their short sprint performance is**
254 **considered.**

255 The findings of this study reveal centers demonstrated faster 505 CODS performances compared to both
256 defenders and shooters for both left and right legs. This result may be explained by the fact that centers
257 perform a greater number of sprints and multi-directional movements during play (8), **therefore the 505**

258 **test may be related to the movements frequently performed by center court players compared to**
259 **other positions. Additionally, it is unknown whether these differences would still exist if a different**
260 **CODS test was utilised within this study (modified 505, t-test).** There are, however, other possible
261 explanations. The centers ability to decelerate a lower body mass more effectively may provide the
262 explanation for superior CODS performances; however, their ability to decelerate was not assessed.
263 Recent work by Dos'Santos et al. (9) suggests faster CODS performances to be strongly associated with
264 shorter ground contact times, greater horizontal propulsive forces, and greater horizontal braking forces.
265 Because there was no difference in 10 m sprint times between centers and defenders, sprint ability
266 cannot account for the differences in CODS performance in these positions. Conversely, because there
267 was a difference in 10 m sprint times between centers and shooters, differences in CODS performances
268 may be attributed to sprint ability (29). Lastly, given center players have the least number of court
269 restrictions, perform more frequent multidirectional movements, and change activity every 2.8 seconds,
270 it is likely differences in CODS performances are determined by both playing position and an individual's
271 fitness. **When considering the overall data, these results are similar to those obtained in academy**
272 **netball players (37, 39) and faster when compared to club netball players (1). The ability to change**
273 **velocity or direction to evade a defender or when reacting to an attacker plays an important role in**
274 **netball performance, and thus should be developed accordingly across all playing positions.**

275 Maximal intermittent running velocity was found to be significantly higher in centers than both defenders
276 and shooters, yet non-significant differences were found between defenders and shooters. Based on the
277 ES, the differences that existed were sizeable. **The V_{IFT} scores in current study are similar to those**
278 **reported in male and female handball (3), male and female soccer (7, 38) and rugby league (30),**
279 **illustrating that high levels of cardiorespiratory fitness are required for academy netball competition,**
280 **despite the positional restrictions placed upon players. Furthermore, the V_{IFT} attained by players in the**
281 **current study would be similar to values reported in sub-elite netball players (2).** The findings of the
282 current study confirm the conclusions of previous studies (4, 6, 8, 11, 44), that center players require high
283 levels of cardiorespiratory fitness as they cover greater distances, spend higher proportions of match
284 time being active, perform more sprints, and change direction more frequently than defenders and

Female Netball Position Characteristics

285 shooters. These findings may help us to understand the importance of cardiorespiratory fitness for center
286 court netball players. Further research should be undertaken to investigate the influence of common
287 netball training-related activities on the cardiorespiratory fitness of female netball players.

288 Some limitations exist in the current study. This study did not examine the influence of physical
289 maturation on physical capabilities in netball players. Research has shown that physical capabilities
290 develop in a nonlinear fashion as a result of growth and maturation, which may have affected the
291 findings in the current study. Secondly, sprint and CODS tests were performed on a hardwood netball
292 court, making direct comparisons to tests performed in laboratories difficult. However, this surface is
293 common to netball training and competition, thus ensuring sprint and CODS tests were performed in an
294 ecologically valid manner.

295 PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

296 The findings of this study indicate that centers exhibit different physical characteristics compared to
297 defenders and shooters. **Specifically, center court players demonstrated superior performances in**
298 **vertical jump, sprint acceleration, CODS and cardiorespiratory fitness when compared to other playing**
299 **positions.** These differences could be attributed to both playing position and an individual's fitness. **Such**
300 **information regarding the physical characteristics of academy pre-elite youth netball players may be**
301 **used by coaches and practitioners to individualize training programs to meet the sport-specific playing**
302 **position requirements. Indeed, center court players may need to complete more position-specific**
303 **training to ensure they meeting the demands of the playing position.** Further research should identify
304 the importance of maximum strength in female netball players so that more specific training
305 recommendations can be provided with regards to this capacity.

306

307 REFERENCES

- 308 1. Barber OR, Thomas C, Jones PA, McMahon JJ, and Comfort P. Reliability of the 505 Change of
309 Direction Test in Netball Players. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*, 2015.
- 310 2. Bruce L and Moule S. Validity of the 30-15 Intermittent Fitness Test in sub-elite female
311 athletes. *J Strength Cond Res* Publish Ahead of Print, 2016.

Female Netball Position Characteristics

- 312 3. Buchheit M. The 30–15 intermittent fitness test: 10 year review. *Myorobie J* 1, 2010.
- 313 4. Chandler PT, Pinder SJ, Curran JD, and Gabbett TJ. Physical Demands of Training and
314 Competition in Collegiate Netball Players. *J Strength Cond Res* 28: 2732-2737, 2014.
- 315 5. Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Lawrence Erlbaum
316 Associates, Incorporated, 1988.
- 317 6. Cormack SJ, Smith RL, Mooney MM, Young WB, and O'Brien BJ. Accelerometer load as a
318 measure of activity profile in different standards of netball match play. *Int J Sports Physiol*
319 *Perform* 9: 283-291, 2014.
- 320 7. Čović N, Jelešković E, Alić H, Rađo I, Kafedžić E, Sporiš G, McMaster DT, and Milanović Z.
321 Reliability, Validity and Usefulness of 30–15 Intermittent Fitness Test in Female Soccer
322 Players. *Front Physiol* 7, 2016.
- 323 8. Davidson A and Trewartha G. Understanding the physiological demands of netball: A time-
324 motion investigation. *International Journal of Performance Analysis in Sport* 8: 1-17, 2008.
- 325 9. Dos'Santos T, Paul CT, Jones A, and Comfort P. Mechanical determinants of faster change of
326 direction speed performance in male athletes. *J Strength Cond Res*, 2016.
- 327 10. Faul F, Erdfelder E, Buchner A, and Lang A-G. Statistical power analyses using G* Power 3.1:
328 Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behav Res Methods* 41: 1149-1160, 2009.
- 329 11. Fish K and Greig M. The Influence of Playing Position on the Biomechanical Demands of
330 Netball Match-Play. *J Athl Enhancement* 3, 2014.
- 331 12. Fox A, Spittle M, Otago L, and Saunders N. An investigation of in-game landings in elite
332 netball: Implications for injury risk. *J Sci Med Sport* 15: S229, 2012.
- 333 13. Fox A, Spittle M, Otago L, and Saunders N. Activity profiles of the Australian female netball
334 team players during international competition: Implications for training practice. *J Sports Sci*
335 31: 1588-1595, 2013.
- 336 14. Fox A, Spittle M, Otago L, and Saunders N. Offensive Agility Techniques Performed During
337 International Netball Competition. *Int J Sports Sci Coach* 9: 543-552, 2014.
- 338 15. Fox AS, Spittle M, Otago L, and Saunders N. Descriptive analysis of landings during
339 international netball competition: Enhancing ecological validity of laboratory testing
340 environments. *Int J Perform Anal Sport* 13: 690-702, 2013.
- 341 16. Gabbett TJ, Kelly JN, and Sheppard JM. Speed, change of direction speed, and reactive agility
342 of rugby league players. *J Strength Cond Res* 22: 174-181, 2008.
- 343 17. Haydar B, Al Haddad H, Ahmaidi S, and Buchheit M. Assessing inter-effort recovery and
344 change of direction ability with the 30-15 Intermittent Fitness Test. *J Sports Sci Med* 10: 346,
345 2011.
- 346 18. Hewit JK, Cronin JB, and Hume PA. Asymmetry in multi-directional jumping tasks. *Phys Ther*
347 *Sport* 13: 238-242, 2012.
- 348 19. Hopkins WG. A scale of magnitudes for effect statistics. *A new view of statistics from*
349 <http://sportsci.org/resource/stats/effectmaghtml>, 2002.
- 350 20. Hunter JP, Marshall RN, and McNair PJ. Relationships between ground reaction force
351 impulse and kinematics of sprint-running acceleration. *J Appl Biomech* 21: 31-43, 2005.
- 352 21. Lloyd RS and Oliver JL. The youth physical development model: A new approach to long-term
353 athletic development. *Strength & Conditioning Journal* 34: 61-72, 2012.
- 354 22. Lockie RG, Moreno MR, Lazar A, Orjalo AJ, Giuliano DV, Risso FG, Davis D, Crelling JB,
355 Lockwood JR, and Jalilvand F. The Physical and Athletic Performance Characteristics of
356 Division I Collegiate Female Soccer Players by Position. *J Strength Cond Res*, 2016.
- 357 23. McBride JM, Blow D, Kirby TJ, Haines TL, Dayne AM, and Triplett NT. Relationship between
358 maximal squat strength and five, ten, and forty yard sprint times. *J Strength Cond Res* 23:
359 1633-1636, 2009.
- 360 24. McKeown I, Chapman DW, Taylor K, and Ball N. Time course of improvements in power
361 characteristics in elite development netball players entering a full time training program. *J*
362 *Strength Cond Res*, 2015.

Female Netball Position Characteristics

- 363 25. McMahon J, Rej S, and Comfort P. Sex Differences in Countermovement Jump Phase
364 Characteristics. *Sports* 5: 8, 2017.
- 365 26. McMahon JJ, Jones PA, and Comfort P. A Correction Equation for Jump Height Measured
366 Using the Just Jump System. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*, 2015.
- 367 27. Mothersole GA, Cronin JB, and Harris NK. Key prerequisite factors influencing landing forces
368 in netball. *Strength Cond J* 35: 47-54, 2013.
- 369 28. Munro AG and Herrington LC. Between-session reliability of four hop tests and the agility T-
370 test. *J Strength Cond Res* 25: 1470-1477, 2011.
- 371 29. Nimphius S, Callaghan SJ, Sptieri T, and Lockie RG. Change of direction deficit: A more
372 isolated measure of change of direction performance than total 505 time. *J Strength Cond*
373 *Res*, 2016.
- 374 30. Scott TJ, Delaney JA, Duthie GM, Sanctuary C, Ballard DA, Hickmans JA, and Dascombe BJ.
375 The reliability and usefulness of the 30-15 Intermittent Fitness Test in Rugby League. *J*
376 *Strength Cond Res* Publish Ah, 2015.
- 377 31. Spiteri T, Newton RU, Binetti M, Hart NH, Sheppard JM, and Nimphius S. Mechanical
378 Determinants of Faster Change of Direction and Agility Performance in Female Basketball
379 Athletes. *J Strength Cond Res* 29: 2205-2214, 2015.
- 380 32. Spiteri T, Nimphius S, Hart NH, Specos C, Sheppard JM, and Newton RU. Contribution of
381 Strength Characteristics to Change of Direction and Agility Performance in Female Basketball
382 Athletes. *J Strength Cond Res* 28: 2415-2423, 2014.
- 383 33. Sporis G, Jukic I, Ostojic SM, and Milanovic D. Fitness profiling in soccer: physical and
384 physiologic characteristics of elite players. *J Strength Cond Res* 23: 1947-1953, 2009.
- 385 34. Steele JR. Biomechanical factors affecting performance in netball. Implications for improving
386 performance and injury reduction. *Sports Med* 10: 88-102, 1990.
- 387 35. Taylor K-L, Bonetti DL, Tanner R, Tanner R, and Gore C. Netball Players. *Physiological tests*
388 *for elite athletes*, 2013.
- 389 36. Thomas C, Comfort P, Chiang C, and Jones PA. Relationship between isometric mid-thigh pull
390 variables and sprint and change of direction performance in collegiate athletes. *Journal of*
391 *Trainology* 4: 6-10, 2015.
- 392 37. Thomas C, Comfort P, Jones PA, and Dos'Santos T. A Comparison of Isometric Mid-Thigh Pull
393 Strength, Vertical Jump, Sprint Speed, and Change of Direction Speed in Academy Netball
394 Players. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform* 0: 1-20, 2016.
- 395 38. Thomas C, Dos' Santos T, Jones PA, and Comfort P. Reliability of the 30-15 Intermittent
396 Fitness Test in Semi-Professional Soccer Players. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*, 2015.
- 397 39. Thomas C, Ismail K, Comfort P, and Jones P. Physical Profiles of Regional Academy Netball
398 Players. *Journal of Trainology*, 2016.
- 399 40. Weyand PG, Lin JE, and Bundle MW. Sprint performance-duration relationships are set by
400 the fractional duration of external force application. *Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol*
401 290: R758-765, 2006.
- 402 41. Weyand PG, Sandell RF, Prime DNL, and Bundle MW. The biological limits to running speed
403 are imposed from the ground up. *J Appl Physiol* 108: 950-961, 2010.
- 404 42. Weyand PG, Sternlight DB, Bellizzi MJ, and Wright S. Faster top running speeds are achieved
405 with greater ground forces not more rapid leg movements. *J Appl Physiol* 89: 1991-1999,
406 2000.
- 407 43. Yeadon M, Kato T, and Kerwin D. Measuring running speed using photocells. *J Sports Sci* 17:
408 249-257, 1999.
- 409 44. Young C, Gustin P, Sanders N, Mackey L, and Dwyer D. Player Load in Elite Netball: Match,
410 Training and Positional Comparisons. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*, 2016.

411

Table 1. Age, height, body mass and physical characteristics of academy netball players by playing position.*

	Centres (<i>n</i> = 15)		Defenders (<i>n</i> = 15)		Shooters (<i>n</i> = 13)		Centres vs. Defenders Cohen's <i>d</i>	Centres vs. Shooters Cohen's <i>d</i>	Defenders vs. Shooters Cohen's <i>d</i>
Age (years)	15.73	± 1.44	15.53	± 1.64	15.23	± 1.42	-0.1 (-0.5 to 0.7)	0.3 (-0.3 to 1.0)	0.2 (-0.4 to 0.8)
Height (m)	1.70	± 0.04	1.77	± 0.05†	1.74	± 0.07	-1.6 (-2.2 to -0.9)	-0.7 (-1.3 to -0.1)	0.5 (-0.1 to 1.1)
Body Mass (kg)	61.80	± 4.63	70.60	± 10.45†	67.38	± 5.50†	1.1 (-1.7 to -0.5)	1.1 (-1.7 to -0.4)	0.4 (-0.3 to 1.0)
SLH L (m)	1.85	± 0.14	1.75	± 0.09	1.66	± 0.22†	0.9 (0.2 to 1.5)	1.0 (0.4 to 1.7)	0.5 (-0.1 to 1.2)
SLH R (m)	1.83	± 0.15	1.74	± 0.13	1.71	± 0.19	0.6 (0.1 to 1.2)	0.7 (0.1 to 1.3)	0.2 (-0.4 to 0.8)
SJ (m)	0.41	± 0.05	0.36	± 0.04†	0.37	± 0.05	1.1 (0.5 to 1.8)	0.8 (0.1 to 1.4)	-0.2 (-0.8 to 0.4)
CMJ (m)	0.42	± 0.04	0.37	± 0.03†	0.38	± 0.06	1.4 (0.8 to 2.1)	0.8 (0.1 to 1.4)	-0.2 (-0.8 to 0.4)
5 m (s)	1.12	± 0.06	1.11	± 0.09	1.18	± 0.05†‡	0.1 (-0.5 to 0.7)	-1.0 (-1.7 to -0.4)	-0.9 (-1.6 to -0.3)
10 m (s)	1.92	± 0.06	1.97	± 0.08	2.00	± 0.07†	-0.7 (-1.3 to -0.1)	-1.2 (-1.9 to -0.5)	-0.4 (-1.0 to 0.2)
505 L (s)	2.44	± 0.11	2.54	± 0.10†	2.56	± 0.09†	-1.0 (-1.6 to -0.3)	-1.2 (-1.8 to -0.5)	-0.2 (-0.8 to 0.4)
505 R (s)	2.41	± 0.06	2.52	± 0.10†	2.50	± 0.07†	-1.3 (-2.0 to -0.7)	-1.3 (-2.0 to -0.7)	0.2 (-0.4 to 0.8)
30-15_{IFT} (km·h⁻¹)	18.50	± 1.31	16.87	± 0.97†	16.88	± 1.23†	1.4 (0.7 to 2.1)	1.2 (0.6 to 1.9)	0.1 (-0.6 to 0.6)

*Data are presented as mean ± *SD* and Cohen's *d* effect size (90% confidence intervals).

L = left leg; R = right leg; SLH = single-leg hop; SJ = squat jump; CMJ = countermovement jump; 30-15_{IFT} = 30-15 intermittent fitness test.

†Significantly different from centres ($p \leq 0.05$).

‡Significantly different from defenders ($p \leq 0.05$).