IJIREEICE ISSN (O) 2321-2004, ISSN (P) 2321-5526

International Journal of Innovative Research in Electrical, Electronics, Instrumentation and Control Engineering

Impact Factor 8.021 ⨳ Peer-reviewed & Refereed journal ⨳ Vol. 13, Issue 2, February 2025

DOI: 10.17148/IJIREEICE.2025.13211

ANTHROPOMETRIC VARIATIONS AND SPORTS PERFORMANCE: A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Jai Bhagwan Singh Goun

Maharana Pratap Government PG College -Hardoi

Abstract: Anthropometry — the measurement and analysis of human body dimensions — has long been central to understanding athletic potential, optimizing training, and guiding talent identification. This review synthesizes theoretical foundations and empirical findings on how anthropometric variations (height, body mass, limb lengths, body composition, somatotype, and proportionality) relate to performance across a range of sports. Evidence indicates that certain anthropometric profiles confer advantages in specific activities: taller stature and longer limb segments favor basketball, volleyball, rowing, and sprinting start mechanics; mesomorphic build and greater lean mass are advantageous in power and contact sports (e.g., weightlifting, rugby, throwing); ectomorphic profiles commonly characterize endurance runners; while a compact, hyperflexible body often benefits gymnasts and divers. However, relationships are complex and moderated by factors such as sex, age, training history, biomechanics, physiological capacities (VO_2max, anaerobic power), and technical skill. Talent identification models that rely solely on static body measurements can misclassify potential because anthropometry interacts dynamically with growth, maturation, and training-induced adaptations. Practical applications include position-specific profiling, individualized strength and conditioning plans, equipment and technique optimization, and long-term athlete development frameworks that account for maturation. The review also highlights methodological challenges in the literature — inconsistent measurement protocols, small and heterogeneous samples, cross-sectional designs, and limited longitudinal tracking — and calls for multimodal, longitudinal research that integrates anthropometry with biomechanical, physiological, and psychosocial variables. Finally, ethical considerations (labeling, early specialization, and discrimination) and culturally sensitive approaches to anthropometric assessment are discussed. Recommendations are provided for researchers, coaches, and sport scientists to use anthropometric information responsibly to enhance performance and athlete well-being.

Keywords: anthropometry, body composition, somatotype, talent identification, sports performance, body proportions, maturation

I. INTRODUCTION

Anthropometry, the systematic measurement of body size, shape, and composition, provides a fundamental framework for describing human physical variability and its implications for sports performance (Norton & Olds, 2001). Within sport science, anthropometric variables play diverse roles: they characterize athletic populations, inform talent identification and selection, predict performance in specific disciplines, and guide individualized training and equipment design (Ackland et al., 2012). From early studies linking height, limb length, and body composition to athletic success, to contemporary multi-disciplinary models of talent identification, anthropometry remains a central component of applied sport science (Gabbett et al., 2007).

The rationale for examining anthropometric variation in sport is grounded in biomechanics and physiology. Athletic performance is constrained by geometric and physical principles: for instance, longer limbs can generate greater linear velocity at distal segments, which benefits throwing and striking actions (Norton & Olds, 2001). Similarly, taller athletes often possess lever advantages in sports demanding reach or vertical displacement, whereas greater lean mass contributes to enhanced maximal strength and power outputs (Sánchez-Muñoz et al., 2007). Conversely, excess body fat elevates the metabolic cost of locomotion and impairs endurance and relative power performance (Wilmore & Behnke, 1969). Somatotype frameworks — endomorphy, mesomorphy, and ectomorphy — remain a practical, though simplified, means of aligning morphological characteristics with sport-specific demands (Carter & Heath, 1990).

Nonetheless, interpreting anthropometric determinants of performance requires caution. Body profiles are sport- and position-specific, such that the morphology of elite sprinters differs substantially from that of distance runners or throwers (Sedeaud et al., 2014). Furthermore, anthropometry interacts with physiological, biomechanical, technical, and psychological dimensions, making morphology only one determinant of performance outcomes (Ackland et al., 2012).

International Journal of Innovative Research in Electrical, Electronics, Instrumentation and Control Engineering
Impact Factor 8.021 ⁜ Peer-reviewed & Refereed journal ⁜ Vol. 13, Issue 2, February 2025
DOI: 10.17148/IJIREEICE.2025.13211

Growth and maturation further complicate talent identification, as adolescent athletes undergo rapid shifts in body proportions and composition (Malina et al., 2004).

This review synthesizes the literature on anthropometric variations and sports performance, highlighting theoretical frameworks, empirical evidence, methodological considerations, and applied implications for sport scientists and coaches.

II. METHODOLOGY

This review adopts a narrative, integrative approach to synthesize findings from diverse study designs (cross-sectional, longitudinal, cohort, and review articles) rather than a formal systematic review or meta-analysis. Key topics and sections were defined a priori (basic anthropometric constructs; somatotype; body composition; limb lengths and proportions; sport-specific evidence; mechanisms; practical applications). Literature was drawn from classical anthropometry, sport science, biomechanics, and applied coaching literature.

Anthropometric Constructs: Definitions and Measurement

Understanding the predictive power of anthropometry requires clarity on variables and measurement techniques.

Linear measures: Height (stature), sitting height, limb segment lengths (e.g., femur, tibia, humerus, forearm), and breadths (biacromial, bicristal) are measured using stadiometers, anthropometers, and calipers. Limb lengths and segment ratios (e.g., leg length:height) inform leverage and stride characteristics.

Mass and indices: Body mass (scale-measured) and indices such as Body Mass Index (BMI = kg/m²) provide gross descriptors. BMI is limited in athlete populations because it confounds muscle and fat mass.

Body composition: Skinfold thickness (sum of standardized sites), bioelectrical impedance, dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA), and hydrodensitometry quantify fat mass and lean mass. Percent body fat and fat-free mass are critical because relative performance in many sports depends more on lean mass and distribution than total mass alone.

Somatotype: The Heath–Carter somatotype describes individuals along three dimensions — endomorphy (relative fatness), mesomorphy (musculoskeletal robustness), and ectomorphy (linearity/leanness). While broad, somatotype helps categorize morphological tendencies across athletic populations.

Proportionality and ratios: Ratios such as wingspan:height, limb length:height, torso:leg ratio, and relative sitting height capture body shape features linked to sport-specific mechanics (e.g., longer wingspan benefits reach and stroke length).

Other measures: Hand or foot size (grip and contact interfaces), chest circumference (relevance for respiratory mechanics in some sports), and flexibility measures (e.g., sit-and-reach) are sometimes considered anthropometric in applied settings.

Measurement reliability/validity: Accurate anthropometry demands standardized protocols, trained measurers, and consistent instruments. Inter-rater variability for skinfolds and segment lengths can bias comparisons across studies. Modern imaging (DXA, 3D scanning) improves precision but is less accessible in many applied contexts.

Sport-Specific Evidence

Below are condensed syntheses by sport or performance domain.

Endurance Running (Middle- and Long-Distance)

Anthropometric hallmarks of elite distance runners: low body mass, low percent body fat, long lower limbs relative to body height (but not necessarily extreme height), and a lean ectomorphic to mesomorphic somatotype. Lower body mass reduces energetic cost; longer legs can increase stride length without compromising economy when accompanied by appropriate musculature. Excess upper-body mass provides little propulsion and increases oxygen cost. In hot environments, lower fat mass facilitates thermoregulation.

Sprinting and Power-Based Track Events

Sprinters and jumpers typically show higher mesomorphy, greater muscle cross-sectional area (particularly in lower limbs), and relatively high body mass composed predominantly of lean tissue. Shorter ground contact times, high force production, and neuromuscular power are crucial; limb lengths must balance leverage and the requirement for rapid cyclic movements. While taller sprinters can achieve longer strides, the elite field includes a range of statures — illustrating multifactorial determinants.

Throwing and Hitting Events (Javelin, Shot Put, Baseball, Tennis)

Throwers often combine height, long limb segments, and substantial lean mass to maximize the kinematic chain velocity transfer to implements. Anthropometric advantages are complemented by technique that exploits segmental sequencing (proximal-to-distal transfer). In racket sports, limb length and hand size influence reach and racket control.

Key takeaway: limb geometry + high power output + technical sequencing drive success.

International Journal of Innovative Research in Electrical, Electronics, Instrumentation and Control Engineering
Impact Factor 8.021 ⁘ Peer-reviewed & Refereed journal ⁘ Vol. 13, Issue 2, February 2025
DOI: 10.17148/IJIREEICE.2025.13211

Jumping Events (High Jump, Long Jump, Volleyball)
Jumpers benefit from lower-body power, optimized body mass, and favorable limb proportions (longer legs relative to body). In high jump, a combination of speed, center-of-mass management, and body shape (e.g., height and flexibility) is critical. In vertical jumping, relative power (per kg) is decisive.

Swimming
Longer limbs and larger hand and foot surface areas increase propulsive surface and stroke length. Taller swimmers with greater wingspan and larger hands/feet often excel, though technique, power, and hydrodynamic positioning are essential.

Rowing and Cycling
Rowers often present tall, long-limbed morphologies allowing long stroke length and high work per stroke; heavier athletes can produce more absolute power, particularly in heavyweight classes. In cycling, power-to-weight ratio strongly dictates climbing and time-trial performance. Anthropometric optimization differs by cycling discipline (track sprint vs road climbing).
Key takeaway: interaction of absolute power with mass defines discipline-specific success.

Gymnastics, Diving, and Artistic Sports
These sports favor compact, light, and often shorter athletes with exceptional strength-to-mass ratios and flexibility. Lower moment of inertia about the rotation axes facilitates somersaults and twists. Body proportions that reduce rotational inertia (shorter limbs) help aerial maneuvers.

Team Sports (Soccer, Rugby, Basketball, Hockey)
Team sports show position-specific anthropometric patterns:

- **Soccer:** Midfielders often balance endurance, agility, and moderate lean mass; central defenders and strikers trend taller and heavier for aerial duels.
- **Rugby/American Football:** Forwards/linemen are heavier with high muscle mass; backs are leaner and faster.
- **Basketball:** Clear height advantage across positions, but guards emphasize speed and agility with slightly smaller stature than centers.

Mechanisms Linking Anthropometry to Performance
Anthropometric effects on performance operate through several mechanistic pathways:

1. **Biomechanical Leverage and Kinematics:** Limb lengths and segment proportions determine lever arms and influence moment generation, angular velocity translation to linear velocity (distal segment speed), and moment of inertia for rotational tasks.
2. **Force and Power Production:** Muscle cross-sectional area (a component of lean mass) correlates with maximal force and power, which interacts with body mass to determine acceleration and jump performance. Relative power (power per kg) is necessary for weight-bearing locomotion.
3. **Energy Cost and Economy:** Additional non-functional mass (fat) increases metabolic cost per distance and reduces endurance performance. Body shape (e.g., torso-to-leg ratio) influences economy via stride biomechanics and breathing mechanics.
4. **Rotational Dynamics:** In aerial sports, mass distribution and limb length determine rotational inertia, affecting the ease of generating rotation and controlling angular momentum.
5. **Aerodynamic and Hydrodynamic Effects:** Body size and shape affect drag in swimming and cycling; slender, streamlined morphologies reduce resistive forces.
6. **Developmental and Hormonal Influences:** Growth, sexual maturation, and endocrine factors shape anthropometry and concurrent neuromuscular development; early maturation can transiently confer size advantages but not necessarily long-term superiority.
7. **Equipment Interaction:** Anthropometry influences equipment fit and effectiveness (e.g., bike frame size, racket length), which can enhance or impede performance.

Understanding these mechanisms emphasizes why anthropometric data must be interpreted within an integrated model that includes neuromuscular, metabolic, technical, and tactical factors.

III. CONCLUSION

Anthropometric variation is a powerful lens through which to understand, predict, and optimize sports performance. Clear, sport-specific patterns exist — taller athletes with long limbs excel in reach- and leverage-dependent sports, mesomorphic athletes dominate power disciplines, and lean ectomorphs typically succeed in endurance events. Yet anthropometry is only one part of the performance mosaic. Its predictive utility is maximized when combined with measures of physiology, biomechanics, skill, and psychological readiness, and when placed within a developmental, longitudinal framework that accounts for growth and training. Practically, anthropometry supports targeted talent identification, individualized training, equipment fitting, and injury-prevention strategies — provided it is applied ethically and with awareness of its limitations. Going forward, rigorous longitudinal studies and integrative models will

International Journal of Innovative Research in Electrical, Electronics, Instrumentation and Control Engineering
Impact Factor 8.021 ⅔ Peer-reviewed & Refereed journal ⅔ Vol. 13, Issue 2, February 2025
DOI: 10.17148/IJIREEICE.2025.13211

better capture how body form and function co-evolve with training to produce elite performance, reducing overreliance on static morphological snapshots and promoting inclusive athlete development pathways.

REFERENCES

[1]. Adhikari, A., & McNeely, E. (2015). Anthropometric characteristic, somatotype and body composition of Canadian female rowers. *American Journal of Sports Science, 3*(3), 61–66. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajss.20150303.12

[2]. Ackland, T. R., Lohman, T. G., Sundgot-Borgen, J., Maughan, R. J., Meyer, N. L., Stewart, A. D., & Müller, W. (2012). Current status of body composition assessment in sport. *Sports Medicine, 42*(3), 227–249. https://doi.org/10.2165/11597140-000000000-00000

[3]. Alves, J., Barrientos, G., Toro, V., Sánchez, E., Muñoz, D., & Maynar, M. (2021). Changes in anthropometric and performance parameters in high-level endurance athletes during a sports season. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18*(5), 2782. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18052782

[4]. Carter, J. E. L., & Heath, B. H. (1990). *Somatotyping: Development and applications*. Cambridge University Press.

[5]. Chetan, & Saxena, V. (2024). Impact of anthropometric characteristics on football performance by playing position. *Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities, 4*(4), 208–216. https://ijrah.com/vol-4-issue-4

[6]. Gabbett, T. J., Georgieff, B., & Domrow, N. (2007). The use of physiological, anthropometric, and skill data to predict selection in a talent-identified junior volleyball squad. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 25*(12), 1337–1344. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410601188777

[7]. Giampietro, M., Ebner, E., & Bertini, I. (2011). The clinical significance of body composition and anthropometric evaluation in athletes. *Mediterranean Journal of Nutrition and Metabolism, 4*(2), 93–97. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12349-011-0061-3

[8]. Heath, B. H., & Carter, J. E. L. (1967). A modified somatotype method. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology, 27*(1), 57–74. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.1330270108

[9]. Malina, R. M., Bouchard, C., & Bar-Or, O. (2004). *Growth, maturation, and physical activity* (2nd ed.). Human Kinetics.

[10]. Norton, K., & Olds, T. (2001). *Anthropometrica: A textbook of body measurement for sports and health courses*. UNSW Press.

[11]. Sánchez-Muñoz, C., Zabala, M., & Williams, K. (2007). Anthropometric characteristics, body composition and somatotype of elite Spanish female cyclists. *Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness, 47*(2), 163–169. PMID: 17557075

[12]. Sedeaud, A., Marc, A., Marck, A., Dor, F., Schipman, J., Dorsey, M., ... & Toussaint, J. F. (2014). Secular trend: Morphology and performance. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 32*(12), 1146–1154. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2014.889841

[13]. Wilmore, J. H., & Behnke, A. R. (1969). An anthropometric estimation of body density and lean body weight in young men. *Journal of Applied Physiology, 27*(1), 25–31. https://doi.org/10.1152/jappl.1969.27.1.25

[14]. *International Journal of Morphology and Kinesiology.* (2020). A new strategy to integrate Heath–Carter somatotype assessment with bioelectrical impedance analysis in elite soccer players. *International Journal of Morphology and Kinesiology, 38*(3), 721–727. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0717-95022020000300721

[15]. *Science & Sports.* (2022). Anthropometry and physical performance in swimmers of different styles. *Science & Sports, 37*(7), 542–551. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scispo.2022.05.004

[16]. *PubMed.* (2014). Reference values for body composition and anthropometric measurements in athletes. *Journal of Sports Medicine, 45*(6), 563–575. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24781757

