



LEEDS  
BECKETT  
UNIVERSITY

---

Citation:

Owen, C and Till, K and Phibbs, P and Read, D and Weakley, J and Atkinson, M and Stokes, K and Kemp, S and Jones, B (2019) Countermovement jump qualities of elite academy rugby union players. In: 2019 NSCA National Conference, 11 July 2019 - 13 July 2019, Washington D.C, USA.

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:

<https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/6210/>

Document Version:

Conference or Workshop Item (Published Version)

---

The aim of the Leeds Beckett Repository is to provide open access to our research, as required by funder policies and permitted by publishers and copyright law.

The Leeds Beckett repository holds a wide range of publications, each of which has been checked for copyright and the relevant embargo period has been applied by the Research Services team.

We operate on a standard take-down policy. If you are the author or publisher of an output and you would like it removed from the repository, please [contact us](#) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Each thesis in the repository has been cleared where necessary by the author for third party copyright. If you would like a thesis to be removed from the repository or believe there is an issue with copyright, please contact us on [openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.



# COUNTERMOVEMENT JUMP QUALITIES OF ELITE ACADEMY RUGBY UNION PLAYERS

Cameron Owen<sup>1,2</sup>, Kevin Till<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Padraic Phibbs<sup>1,2</sup>, Dale Read<sup>1</sup>, Jonathon Weakley<sup>1,4</sup>, Mark Atkinson<sup>5</sup>, Keith Stokes<sup>5,6</sup>, Sean Williams<sup>5</sup>, Simon Kemp<sup>6</sup> & Ben Jones<sup>1,2,3,7,8,9</sup>



## INTRODUCTION

- Jump height is considered the most popular variable when assessing countermovement jump (CMJ) performance, however due to differences in body mass it may be beneficial to use multiple kinetic and kinematic variables.
- While collecting large amounts of data can be advantageous in understanding athletic performance, this can lead to information overload and alienate coaches.
- The aim of this study was to identify positional differences in countermovement jump qualities using dimension reduction techniques.

## METHOD

- With ethics approval, 166 U18 male rugby union players participated from six English Regional Academies.
- Participants completed two maximal CMJ on portable force platforms (Pasco PS-2141, Roseville, California, USA) sampling at 500 Hz. The best of the two trials was used for analysis.
- A custom-designed R-script was used to find kinetic (peak force, mean rate of force development, impulse, peak power and total area under the force velocity curve) and kinematic variables (take-off velocity, jump height, centre of mass displacement and reactive strength index modified) for each jump identifying eccentric and concentric jump phases where applicable.
- Principal component (PC) analysis was conducted to identify the variance explained by the variables and collinearity. From the first three PCs (i.e., power and force variables [PC1; 35.0%], impulse variables [PC2; 26.9%] and velocity variables [PC3; 25%])
- Variables with the greatest loading factors were selected for analysis using a one-way ANOVA and Tukey Kramer post hoc ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) to identify positional differences.

## RESULTS




Figure 1. Principal component analysis plots showing positions differences and variable loadings.

Table 1. A comparison of the highest loading variables for each principal component between playing positions for U18 academy rugby union players (mean  $\pm$  SD)

Playing Position	PC1 Area under the force velocity curve (W)	PC2 Concentric impulse (N.s)	PC3 Take-off velocity (m.s <sup>-1</sup> )
Front Row (n=35)	6640 $\pm$ 858*	267 $\pm$ 54*	2.38 $\pm$ 0.19
Second Row (n=16)	6532 $\pm$ 596*	235 $\pm$ 50*	2.55 $\pm$ 0.18
Back Row (n=40)	6239 $\pm$ 1006	211 $\pm$ 43 <sup>†</sup>	2.58 $\pm$ 0.18 <sup>†</sup>
Half Backs (n=34)	5630 $\pm$ 1008	169 $\pm$ 38	2.64 $\pm$ 0.23 <sup>†</sup>
Centres (n=15)	6612 $\pm$ 1055*	193 $\pm$ 35 <sup>†</sup>	2.64 $\pm$ 0.28 <sup>†</sup>
Back Three (n=26)	6244 $\pm$ 970	187 $\pm$ 29 <sup>†</sup>	2.73 $\pm$ 0.18 <sup>†#</sup>

\*Significantly different,  $p < 0.05$ , compared to half backs

<sup>†</sup>Significantly different,  $p < 0.05$ , compared to front row

<sup>#</sup>Significantly different,  $p < 0.05$ , compared to back row

## CONCLUSIONS

- Countermovement jump qualities vary by playing position in U18 academy rugby union players.
- PC analysis provides a way of reducing the dimensionality of the data in order to observe differences.

## PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

- Results from the present study suggest that a multivariate approach may provide additional information for monitoring neuromuscular performance.
- The positional differences observed in this study should be combined with knowledge of match demands to determine a suitable training intervention for U18 rugby union players.