

Plyometric training

- Popular form of physical conditioning of healthy individuals
- Aimed at improving conditioning capacities that require the fast development of muscular force
- Involves performing bodyweight jumping-type exercises and throwing medicine balls (and some derivations) using the so-called stretch-shortening cycle (SSC) muscle action
- The SSC enhances the ability of the neural and musculotendinous systems to produce maximal force in the shortest amount of time, prompting the use of plyometric exercise as a bridge between strength and speed
- Plyometric training has been extensively used for augmenting dynamic athletic performance (i.e. jumping, throwing, sprinting)



Effects of plyometric training (in brief)

- Earliest studies examined the effects on jumping performance (mostly vertical jumps)
- The focus later evolved and studies frequently investigate effects on throwing, kicking, sprinting, and agility performances
 Also, plyometric training has the potential
 - To improve biomechanical technique and neuromuscular control during highimpact activities like cutting and landing
 - To reduce the risk of lower-extremity injuries
 - To induce bone and musculo-tendinous adaptation

Skill-based conditioning

- Another popular training method in contemporary sports (mainly "sport/games)
- Based on the postulate that the greatest improvement in performance occurs when the stimulus of training mimics real-game (ie, real-sport) metabolic and technical demands
- Aimed at the simultaneous improvement of fitness and skills, which is particularly important in young athletes
- Includes various sport-specific exercises performed in "sport-specific environment"



Effects of skill-based conditioning

- 1. When compared to "traditional exercises" skill based conditioning resulted in
 - Similar improvement in aerobic endurance as traditional aerobic exercise
 - Similar improvement in 10-m speed, agility as traditional speed- agiltytraining
- 2. When "non-compared" to traditional exercises Significant improvement in 5 and 10-m sprint
 - Significant improvement in jumping, and agility performances

What is important

- Most team-sports (football, basketball, volleyball, handball, etc.) involve include upper and lower body activities that involve stretch-shortening cycles (volleyball: spiking and jumping),
- It is reasonable to expect that team-sport skill-skill conditioning could result in training effects similar to those seen as a result of plyometric conditioning
- But, studies rarely examined the concurent effects of Skill-based-conditioning vs. Plyometric conditioning in development of "important conditioning capacities" (jumps, throws, sprints, etc.)
 - This question is particularly important as it comes to differences between young and "older" athletes

Herein

- We will present findings of two studies
- Both studies included female volleyball players First one examined "18+" players
 - Second one examined ...<18" players
- In both studies we compared effects of plyometric vs. Skill based conditioning
- In both studies experimental programs were applied as "an addition" to standard volleyball training (5-7 sessions weekly)
 - Throughout 12 weeks (3 months)
 Twice a week

 - 30-60 min each session (plyo or skill-based)
 Done at the beginning of the season (after summer break)



Methods (most important)

- 41 highly skilled female volleyball players (1st division), all older than 18 years
- Divided into plyometric group (n=20) and skill-based group (n=21)
 Plyometric- and skill-based conditioning were performed as an addition to the regular technical and tactical volleyball training

Measures

- Body height and body mass
 Sprinting 20 meters \$20M,
- Vertical countermovement jump CMJ
- Standing broad jump SBJ,
- Medicine ball toss MBT







Week	Body part	Exercises	Intensity	Reps (total)	Sets (total)	Rest between
	Lower body	Leg hops, tuck jumps, vertical jumps	Low	40	12	2-3 min
	Upper body	Explosive push-ups, jumping spider	Low	40	12	2-3 min
	Lower body	Lateral/diagonal and broad jumps	Low	40	12	2-3 mm
4	Upper body	Clapping push-ups, medicine ball presses, rotational throws	Low	40	12	2-3 min
	Lower body	Vertical and obstacle jumps, box shuffles	Low	-46	18	2-3 min
3	Upper body	Clapping push ups, medicine ball presses, chest passes	Low	50	21	2-3 min
	Lower body	Lateral/diagonal jumps, obstacle jumps, box shuffles	Medium	46	18	2-3 min
	Upper body	Clapping push-ups, rotational throws, chest passes	Medium	50	21	2-3 min
	Lower body	Broad jumps, box jumps, box shuffles, drop jumps	Low	46	18	2-3 min
	Upper body	Medicine ball presses, rotational throws, overarm throws	Low	50	21	2-3 min
	Lower body	Vertical jumps, obstacle jumps, box shuffles, drop jumps	Medium	48	18	2-3 min
0	Upper body	Jumping spider, chest passes, overarm throws	Medium	52	21	2-3 min
	Lower body	Lateral jumps, drop jumps (+ vertical jumps), box jumps	Medium	46	18	2-3 mm
7	Upper body	Explosive push-ups, clapping push-ups, rotational throws, overarm throws	Medium	52	21	2-3 min
	Lower body	Tuck jumps, box jumps, drop jumps, box shuffles, obstacle	Dish	46	10	2.4 min
	Unner hedy	Journa ander chast masses avarant throw	High	52	21	3.4 min
	Lower body	Obstacle jumps, box shuffles, drop jumps, broad jumps, box jumps	Madaam	42	10	2.4 mm
	Coner hade	Immoing sources antational theory, opprant theory	Madama	52	21	2.4 min
10	Lower body	Drop jumps, drop jumps + vertical jump, lateral/diagonal jumps, obstacle jumps	High	46	18	3-4 min
10	Upper body	Jumping spider, medicine ball throw, chest passes, overarm throws	High	56	24	3-4 min
	Lower body	Tuck jumps, drop jumps, broad jumps, box jumps	High	48	20	3-4 min
	Upper body	Rotational throws, Chest passes, overarm throws	High	58	24	3-4 min
12	Lower body	Drop jumps, drop jumps + vertical jumps, lateral/diagonal jumps, obstacle jumps	High	48	20	3-4 min
	Unper body	Chest passes, overarm throws	High	58	24	3-4 min

Winds	Post.			Percentage of total for
Week	Druis	Exercises	Intensity	skill-based conditioning
	Voleybill drills	restonned as a sugge-element	LOW	50%
	Situati stored games	4 vs. 4 games	LOW	2376
	Game druis	o vs. o games	LOW	2378
127	Volleyball dnills	Performed as a single-element	Low	50%
2	Small sided games	4 vs. 4 games	Low	25%
	Game drills	6 vs. 6 games	Low	25%
252	Volleyball drills	Performed as a single-element	Medium	40%
3	Small sided games	4 vs. 4 games	Medium	30%
	Game drills	6 vs. 6 games	Low	30%
	Volleyball drills	Performed as a combined-element	Medium	40%
4	Soull sided games	4 vs. 4 games	Medium	30%
	Game drills	6 yr. 6 games	Low	30%
	Volleyball drills	Performed as a combined-element	Medium	40%
5	Small sided sames	4 vs. 4 games: 3 vs. 3 games	Medium	30%
	Garne deitta	firm frameway	Medium	30%
_	Volleshall dolla	Performed as a combined element	Medium	10%
6	Small rided moment	3 va 3 mmar	Maderen	40%
. Č	Game drills	6 va 6 manuel	Medicin	30%
	Volleshall dolls	Performed as a combined element	Medium	10%
	Front sided man	2 contracts as a constants containing	Mint	108
	Statut store games	3 vs. 3 games	rman .	10%
	Come arms	o vs. o games	Medium	30%
	Vouestall drus	Pertormed as a computed-esement	Madam	3076
	Senan sadeo games	5 vs. 5 games	Madan	10%
	Come arun	o vs. o games	Stearan	30%
-	Volleyball drills	Performed as a combused-element	Medmm	25%
9	Small sided games	3 vs. 3 games	High	50%
	Game drills	0 vs. 0 games	Medmm	25%
	Volleyball drills	Performed as a combined-element	Medium	20%
10	Small sided games	3 vs. 3 games	High	40%
	Game drills	6 ts. 6 games	High	40%
	Volleyball drills	Performed as a combined-element	Low	20%
11	Small sided games	3 vs. 3 games	High	40%
	Game drills	6 vs. 6 games	High	40%
	Volleyball drills	Performed as a combined-element	Medium	20%
12	Small sided games	3 vs. 3 games	High	40%
. NS	Game drills	fix figames	Hich	40%

Results									
way analysis	riptive statistics of the variance f	(Mean ± Standar or main effects (C	d Devi Froup :	ation) for pre- and Time) and	and post-train Interaction (G	ng resu roup x	Its in each Fime), and	group; res pre- to po	ults of two- st-training
differences in	percentages (%). `		,		•		 R	~
	Plyometric-group (n = 21) Skill-based-group (n = 20) Analysic of variance F			nce (F test)					
	Pre-	Post-	%	Pre-	Post-	%	Group	Time	Interaction
BH (cm)	177.9 ± 5.5	177.2 ± 5.1	< 0.1	175.4±7.0	176.0±7.1	<0.1	12/	A N.V.	
BM (kg)	61.9 ± 5.2	61.2 ± 5.4 *	1.1	58.5±7.5	58.5±7.9	<0.1	Ver I		
S20m (s)	3.80 ± 0.32	3.53 ± 0.22 *	7.6	4.15±0.27	4.10±0.30	1.2	34.7#	44	1 12#
SBJ (cm)	190.7 ± 22.9	205.3 ± 17.3 *	7.6	167.3±18.5	172.4±18.7 *	3.1	21.8 #	96.0#	=#2¥#)
CMJ (cm)	38.0 ± 6.5	48.5 ± 5.2 *	27.6	28.9±7.2	34.1±7.1*	18.0	\$4.3#	275 #	The state
MBT (m)	6.1 ± 0.6	7.6 ± 0.7 *	24.5	5.3±0.8	5.8±0.8 *	9.4	34.5#	166.1#	40.2 #
BH – body heig medicine ball th	ht, BM – body mi row, # denotes F-te	ass, S20m – sprint o st significance of p ≺	ver 20 1 0.05, *	neters distance, denotes pre- to j	SBJ – standing br ost-measurement	oad jump post-hoc	, CMJ – cou significance	ntermoveme of p < 0.05.	nt jump, MBT –
K									





_			

Most important finding

Both training programs resulted in improvements in jumping and throwing capacities, but the changes induced by plyometric training were larger than those achieved by skil-based conditioning

Is this expected, and why?

Sprinting

Plyometric training is known to be effective for sprint performance (rugby, tennis)

- But there are also reports that similar improvements in sprint can be
 achived by skill based conditioning (soccer)
 However, it seems that similar results of training modolities may be a result of
 difference in testing length (soccer study investigated 40 ms print)
 CONCLUSION: In +18 volleyball players **plyometric conditioning improves** sprint (but skill-based conditioning doesn't)





Indeed

 Plyametric conditioning is known to be effective for jumping and throwing (even in similar participants such as female soccer and voleyball players)
 Skill based conditioning did not improve jumps and throws in volleyball (but these studies were shorter, 8 weeks vs. 12, weeks)



Where to seek for a difference between plyometric and skill-based conditioning?

- There are some "physiological" and "real-world" explanations, but we will present it later
- For a moment the most important idea is (was) (copied-pasted from the article)
- article) It is likely that the skill-based conditioning program did not result in changes of higher magnitude because of the players' familiarity with voleybalt-related skills. Namely, in this study we included experienced serior players (18 years of age), which could have resulted in a low impact of this skill-based constraining and consequently did not exact in the study of the skill-based constraining and consequently did not exact in the study of the skill-based constraining and consequently did not exact in the skill-based constraining a skill-based constraining a skill-based constraining a skill-based constraining a skill-based constraining and consequently did not exact in the skill-based constraining a skill-based skill-based constraining a skill-base



Methods (most important)

- Participants were divided in 3 groups
 Plyometric (n=13) ... but we will talk about it later
 Skill-based conditioning (n = 17)
 Control (n = 17)

Variables (measures)

- Body mass and height
 Calf girth
 Calf skinfold

- Corrected calf girth (calf girth ,,minus" calf skinfold \rightarrow indicator of musculature)
- Countermovement jump (CMJ),
 20-m-sprint (SPRINT20M),
- Medicine ball toss from a laying position (MEDBALL) Sit-and-reach flexibility (SIT-AND-REACH)



What was different?

Control group

- Volleyball training only (10 hours per week)
- Plyometric group
 Volleyball training (10 hours per week) + 2 sessions weekly of plyo (30-60 min)
- Skill based group
- Volleyball training (10 hours per week) + 2 session weekly of skill-based conditioning (30-60 min)

What was different?

Control group

- Volleyball training only (10 hours per week)Plyometric group
- Valleyball training (10 hours per week) + 2 sessions weekly of plyo (30-60 min)
- Skill based group

 Volleyball training (10 hours per week) + 2 session weekly of skill-based conditioning (30-60 min)

Basically: Is more also the better?













Main findings

- Plyometric training resulted in positive anthropometric changes
- The changes in jumping and throwing were positive for all 3 groups but plyometric training induced most evident changes
 Additional skil based conditioning did not contribute to improvement of conditioning capacities (when compared to valleyball training alone)

Plyometric training induced positive changes in body build

- Generally, plyometric training was rarely studied with regard to changes in anthropometrics
- Possible explanations:
 Representing is applied for all
- Plyometric is applied for other purposes
 Authors examined but did not lind changes and therefore did not present II
 Our results indirectly confirmed positive changes in body composition (ie, decrease in skinfold and increase in corrected girth).
- Such changes, together with maintenance of body mass at the baseline level, indicate positive changes in body composition (ie, an increase in lean body mass and decrease of fat mass in JUNIOR FEMALE VOLLEYBALL PLAYTES

Plyometric training improved sprinting, jumping and throwing capacities

- Main physiological explanations:
 - elongation of the Achilles tendon and a consequent increase in the amount of stored elastic energy → jumping
 - stimulation of an increased number of muscle units and higher (neural) firing frequency \rightarrow jumping, sprinting, throwing Improved joint proprioception \rightarrow sprinting
- Alltogether resulted in "fast production of force"

Skill-based conditioning "did not contribute" to improvement in conditioning capacities

- Main explanation
- lack of training intensity due to lack of control over training intensity In brief:
 - The proper adjustment of training intensity is crucial in achieving exercise goals Adjustment is dependent on "controllability" (you can not adjust if can not control)
 - monitoring the single-session intensity of skill-based conditioning is inaccurate
 intensity during skill-based conditioning depends on the partner and/or opponent's
 performance, which is hardly controllable

Conclusion (of the 2nd study)

- Plyometric training is effective for junior volleyball players Skill-based conditioning is not effective
- Note that we did not observe changes in sport-specific skills!









_

-

-

In general

- 12-week plyometric training is "equally" for "senior" and "junior" female volleyball athletes
- Skill based conditioning is similarly effective for JUN and SEN
 But, plyometric is more effective than skill-based for both groups
- And skill-based did not contribute to additional improvement when compared to "regular" training (in studied capacities)

But, there is BUT!





But, there is BUT!

- The original number of participants (starting) was
- Plyo: 16; Control: 18; Skill-based: 18
- At the end of the study we observed only those who participated at >80% training sessions (PLYO: 13, SKIL-BASED: 17, CONTROL: 17 players), meaning that drop-outrates were:
 20% for plyametric
 - 6% for control and skill-based groups
- We did not study it specifically, girls did not report injuries, etc.
- But ... it is indicative, don't you think?

In conclusion

- Plyometric training performed twice-a-week as an addition to regular voleyball training in 12-week period will improve _explosive capacities"
 There is no evidence that plyometric training is _differentially" effective for different age-groups
- When performed under "similar" conditions (i.e. not "specifically tailared")
 There is no evidence that additional skill-based conditioning performed hydre-a-week's effective for development of jumping-, throwing-, and sprinting-capacities in female volleyball players
- But, caution is needed when it comes to "risks"
- It is indicative that drop-out rates were much higher in plyo- than in skill-based conditioning (studied in juniors only)
- What happened with volleyball skills, still have to be evaluated

