Migration Letters

Volume: 19, No: S2 (2022), pp. 39-49

ISSN: 1741-8984 (Print) ISSN: 1741-8992 (Online)

www.migrationletters.com

Assessing The Impact Of Six-Week Training On Countermovement (CMJ) Jump And Depth Jump (DJ) For Enhancing Vertical Jump In Badminton Players

Abhishek Balo [1], Dr. Sambhu Prasad [1], Sandip Sinha [1], Heta Meto [2], Sonam Ramchiary [2], Umesh Mimi [2]

Abstract:

This research delves into the nuanced effects of countermovement jump (CMJ) training on the vertical jump ability of 30 male state-level badminton players. Through meticulous allocation, participants were assigned to one of three groups: CMJ, Depth Jump, or Control. Preceded by comprehensive pre-test assessments, a series of targeted interventions ensued, followed by post-test evaluations to gauge the efficacy of CMJ training. Employing rigorous statistical methodologies, including ANCOVA and pairwise comparisons, the study unveils compelling insights. Results underscore a remarkable enhancement in vertical jump proficiency among CMJ participants relative to their Depth Jump and Control counterparts, with statistically significant mean differences of 3.120 (p = .024) and 3.300 (p =.018), respectively. These findings not only highlight the pronounced efficacy of CMJ training but also underscore its potential as a cornerstone in the optimization of athletic performance within the realm of badminton. Such empirical evidence provides invaluable insights for coaches, athletes, and sports scientists, informing evidence-based strategies aimed at maximizing athletic potential and fostering competitive excellence.

Keywords: *Countermovement (CMJ) Jump, Depth Jump (DJ), Vertical Jump, Badminton, Sports Training.*

Introduction

Since its formal induction into the pantheon of Olympic sports during the year 1992, badminton has burgeoned into a venerated pursuit within the global athletic arena. Revered for its alacrity and strategic intricacies, badminton stands as an e[1]pitome of finesse among racquet sports, garnering universal acclaim. Chief among its array of techniques, the overhead smash emerges as an apex maneuver, demanding a fusion of precision, temporal acumen, and explosive athleticism to execute with aplomb. Central to the mastery of this stroke lies the exigent demand upon players to achieve notable vertical elevation, necessitating a rigorous regimen of conditioning embracing tenets of strength, explosive power, agility, and suppleness. Despite its global cachet and exacting physical requisites, the scientific inquiry into badminton remains relatively embryonic, bespeaking an opportune avenue for further exploration into its nuanced physiological and biomechanical nuances.

[1] Department of Physical Education, Rajiv Gandhi University, Rono Hills, Doimukh, Arunachal Pradesh.
[2] Faculties of Physical Education and Sports Science, Rajiv Gandhi University, Rono Hills, Doimukh, Arunachal Pradesh.

In the pursuit of athletic excellence across a heterogeneous array of sporting disciplines, the art of executing proficient jumps and landings assumes an imperious significance (Sheppard & Young, 2006). Within this paradigm, plyometric training emerges as a pivotal cornerstone, buoyed by a surfeit of empirical data extolling its efficacy in eliciting augmented power output through refined neuromuscular adaptations (Markovic, 2007). Among the constellation of athletic movements, the vertical jump ascends to a zenith of paramountcy, emblematic of a ubiquitous performance metric transcending disciplinary boundaries (Bobbert, 1990). Consequently, the cultivation of vertical jump proficiency emerges as a sine qua non for coaches and athletes alike, proffering implications ranging from heightened athletic performance to the mitigation of injury and convalescence.

Within the purview of enhancing vertical leap prowess, depth jumps and countermovement jumps (CMJ) emerge as preeminent modalities (Markovic, 2007). Depth jumps harness the gravitational force in tandem with the athlete's corporeal mass to engender potent ground reaction forces, characterized by a rapid descent from an elevated precipice succeeded by an explosive ascension to the initial altitude (Young et al., 1995). In contradistinction, the CMJ method espouses a distinct technique typified by the sequential flexion and extension of the lower extremities, orchestrating muscular stretch-shortening cycles to orchestrate maximal vertical propulsion (Bobbert, 1990). This method commences from a static postural stance, wherein the athlete initiates a rapid descent through flexion of the knee joint before catalyzing a forceful ascent propelled by concentric muscular contractions.

Moreover, the confluence of technological innovation and biomechanical analysis has engendered unprecedented insights into the intricate mechanics underpinning jumping and landing modalities (McMahon & Cheng, 1990). Leveraging sophisticated motion capture systems and force platforms, scholars have elucidated the kinetic and kinematic determinants of optimal jump performance, thereby furnishing the impetus for the formulation of tailored training regimens aimed at maximizing athletic potential (McMahon & Cheng, 1990; Markovic, 2007). Thus, the symbiosis between scholarly inquiry and practical application continues to catalyze advancements in vertical jump training methodologies, fostering a nuanced comprehension of human locomotion and the optimization of athletic prowess.

Methodology

For this scholarly inquiry, a cohort comprising 30 male athletes of state-level caliber in the sport of badminton was meticulously assembled through a process of random selection. This select group of participants was then subdivided into three distinct clusters to facilitate a rigorous experimental exploration of methodologies aimed at augmenting vertical jumping proficiency. Accordingly, two experimental cohorts were established, each dedicated to a specific training regimen: one dedicated to countermovement (CMJ) jump exercises and the other to depth jump exercises. Additionally, a control group was meticulously delineated, comprising individuals who maintained their customary daily activities without intervention.

Each experimental and control group was meticulously constituted to encompass 10 individuals, ensuring a balanced distribution of participants across the experimental landscape. Throughout the experimental protocol, the control group faithfully adhered to their established lifestyle patterns, serving as a reference benchmark against which the outcomes of the experimental interventions could be meticulously scrutinized. In stark contrast, participants allocated to the experimental groups diligently engaged in the prescribed countermovement (CMJ) jump exercises or depth jump exercises, thereby subjecting themselves to a structured regimen designed to enhance their vertical jumping abilities.

The crux of the investigation revolved around the comparative analysis of adjusted mean scores about vertical jumping proficiency among the countermovement (CMJ) jump training group, depth jump training group, and the control cohort. To obviate potential confounding variables and enhance statistical robustness, pre-existing data about vertical jumping ability served as a covariate in the analysis. Measurements of the experimental variables were meticulously administered at the outset of the study and subsequently upon the culmination of an intensive six-week experimental period.

Upon the culmination of the rigorous six-week training regimen, participants from all three cohorts underwent a meticulously orchestrated post-test evaluation, specifically targeting their static vertical jump capabilities - a parameter consistent with initial baseline assessments. Through this meticulously structured methodology, the study aimed to discern any discernible enhancements in vertical jumping ability attributable to the prescribed countermovement (CMJ) jump and depth jump training protocols.

Procedure

Before commencing the measurements, each participant was attired in comfortable, loose-fitting cotton garments conducive to unrestricted movement. Subsequently, a static vertical jump test was meticulously administered to ascertain and document the vertical jumping capabilities of thirty male badminton players hailing from diverse badminton clubs.

In the execution of the static vertical jump test, each participant was positioned six inches (15.2 cm) away from a vertical wall, poised to initiate the assessment. The participant's hand, proximate to the wall, was carefully coated with chalk, serving as a marker for subsequent measurements. With a steadfast grounding of their feet, the participant was instructed to extend their body upward to the fullest extent, culminating in an initial measurement whereby the chalk-marked fingertips delineated the highest reach attainable from a static stance.

Following this preliminary measurement, the participant executed a series of preparatory movements, involving a rapid forward and upward swing of both arms, culminating in a vigorous leap intended to achieve maximal vertical elevation. At the apogee of the leap, a second chalk mark was deftly inscribed upon the wall, demarcating the pinnacle of the participant's vertical ascent. This process was iterated thrice, with a judicious 30-second interlude between each trial to mitigate fatigue and optimize performance consistency.

Subsequent analysis entailed meticulous measurement of the distance between the initial standing mark and the highest jump reach, affording quantitative insights into vertical jump proficiency. Participants were comprehensively briefed on the overarching objectives and procedural intricacies of the study, ensuring informed consent and clarity regarding their involvement in the investigative endeavor.

The experimental protocol unfolded over six weeks, during which subjects allocated to both the depth jump and countermovement (CMJ) jump groups were imparted with specific directives. Notably, participants were instructed to maintain their hands firmly affixed to their hips throughout each jump iteration, thereby isolating the contributory effects stemming from lower limb musculature. Furthermore, participants were fervently encouraged to exert maximal effort and strive for maximal jump heights, fostering an ethos of dedication and diligence in pursuit of athletic excellence.

Training Protocol:

The countermovement (CMJ) jump regimen was meticulously administered to a cohort comprising 10 players, commencing with a traditional 10-minute warm-up routine incorporating mild aerobic activity and targeted lower-limb muscle stretching exercises.

Participants were meticulously instructed to initiate each jump from a standing position, swiftly descending to a knee angle of precisely 90 degrees before executing a maximal vertical leap. To circumvent any confounding influences stemming from arm swing dynamics, participants maintained their hands firmly planted on their hips throughout the jump sequence. A judicious interlude of 5 seconds was observed between each jump iteration, with an additional one-minute respite interspersed between successive sets. Participants were advised to maintain a fixed gaze forward throughout the exercise regimen, fostering optimal focus and alignment.

Conversely, the depth jump protocol, tailored for an equivalent cohort of 10 players, commenced with a comprehensive 10-minute warm-up regimen integrating mild cardiovascular activity and targeted lower-limb muscle stretching protocols. Each participant received meticulous guidance on the nuanced mechanics of executing a box countermovement, followed by an opportunity to practice under the tutelage of knowledgeable instructors, who provided real-time feedback. Athletes were exhorted to execute a synchronized exit from the countermovement box platform, ensuring both feet made simultaneous contact with the ground before swiftly flexing their knees to a precise angle of 90 degrees, followed by a forceful vertical rebound propelled by maximal muscular effort. Maintaining a steadfast forward gaze was strongly emphasized throughout the exercise protocol. Following each repetition, participants observed a 5-second intermission before commencing the subsequent iteration of the 40cm step. Additionally, a one-minute interval was enforced between each set to optimize recovery and sustain exercise intensity. The choice of a 40 cm height for the platform was informed by observations of elevated Achilles tendon strain associated with higher jump heights, thereby mitigating potential risk factors while preserving the efficacy of the training regimen.

Training regime

The training schedule for a 6-week program is designed to progressively increase the intensity of the workouts. In the initial two weeks, both Experimental Group 1 and 2 will perform countermovement (CMJ) and depth jumps on Monday through Saturday. Each session will consist of 3 sets with 15 repetitions per set. There will be no training on Sunday. As the participants progress to the third and fourth weeks, the number of sets will increase to 4, maintaining the 15 repetitions per set. In the final phase, during the fifth and sixth weeks, the regimen will intensify to 5 sets of 15 repetitions, ensuring a gradual and consistent increase in workout volume. This structured approach aims to enhance the participants' explosive power and endurance systematically.

Days	Group	Training protocol	No. of repetition
Monday	Experimental Group1 and 2	Countermovement (CMJ) and depth jump	15
Tuesday	Experimental Group1 and 2	Countermovement (CMJ) and depth jump	15
Wednesday	Experimental Group1 and 2	Countermovement (CMJ) and depth jump	15
Thursday	Experimental Group1 and 2	Countermovement (CMJ) and depth jump	15
Friday	Experimental Group1 and 2	Countermovement (CMJ) and depth jump	15

Saturday	Experimental Group1 and 2	Countermovement (CMJ) and depth jump	15
Sunday	No training on Sunday		

Outcome Measure:

In the static vertical jump evaluation, participants are tasked with achieving maximal vertical elevation commensurate with their physical capabilities. Positioned six inches (15.2 cm) from a vertical wall, the participant's hand, proximal to the wall, is meticulously coated with chalk, serving as a tactile marker for subsequent measurements. With feet firmly planted on level ground, the participant endeavors to extend their body upward to its zenith, thereby delineating an initial measurement wherein the chalk-imbued fingertips leave an indelible mark upon the wall. Subsequently, the participant executes a preparatory sequence, involving a swift oscillation of both arms before transitioning into a dynamic squatting motion, culminating in an explosive vertical leap. At the culmination of the leap, a second chalk mark is deftly inscribed upon the wall, signifying the pinnacle of the participant's vertical ascent. This process is iterated thrice, with each trial punctuated by a judicious 30-second intermission to facilitate recuperation and sustain performance consistency. The distance between the initial standing mark and the highest leap reach is meticulously measured, affording precise quantification of vertical jump proficiency.

Findings and Result: To assess the impact of countermovement (CMJ) and depth jump training on the vertical jumping ability of badminton players, the statistical technique Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was utilized, with a predetermined significance level set at 0.05.

Table 1 *Descriptive Statistics for countermovement (CMJ), depth jump, and control group on vertical jump ability of badminton players*

Group	Countermovement (CMJ)		Depth Jump		Control Group	
	Pre Test	Post Test	Pre Test	Post Test	Pre Test	Post Test
Mean	40.12	47.10	36.43	39.64	45.55	48.11
SD	6.55	5.04	5.79	6.32	4.08	3.81

The table illustrates the pre-test and post-test measurements of vertical jumping ability across three distinct groups: the Countermovement (CMJ) group, the Depth Jump group, and the Control group. Notably, both the CMJ and Depth Jump groups displayed significant improvements in mean scores from pre-test to post-test assessments, indicating the efficacy of the respective training interventions in enhancing vertical jumping proficiency. Specifically, the CMJ group exhibited a substantial increase in mean scores from 40.12 to 47.10, while the Depth Jump group saw a notable rise from 36.43 to 39.64. In contrast, the Control group, devoid of any structured intervention, displayed relatively stable mean scores throughout the study duration, with pre-test and post-test means of 45.55 and 48.11, respectively. Variability within the groups, as indicated by standard deviations (SD), also reflects the impact of interventions, with the CMJ group showcasing a reduction in SD from pre-test (6.55) to post-test (5.04), while the Depth Jump group exhibited a slight increase in SD from pre-test (5.79) to post-test (6.32). Conversely, the Control group demonstrated consistent SD values in both pre-test (4.08) and post-test (3.81) measurements, suggesting a relatively stable distribution of scores. Overall, the data underscores the efficacy of countermovement (CMJ) and depth jump training in augmenting vertical jumping ability among badminton players, thereby highlighting the potential benefits of structured training interventions in athletic performance enhancement.

Table 2 *Levene's test of equality of error variances*

F	df1	df2	p-value
5.732	2	27	.008

Levene's test of equality of error variances yielded an F-statistic of 5.732 with degrees of freedom (df) of 2 and 27 for the numerator and denominator, respectively. The associated p-value for this test was found to be .008. This result indicates that the assumption of equality of error variances across the different groups or conditions under consideration is violated, as the obtained p-value is less than the conventional significance level of .05. Therefore, there is evidence to suggest that the variability in the errors (residuals) differs significantly between groups. Consequently, caution should be exercised when interpreting the results of subsequent statistical analyses, particularly those that rely on the assumption of homogeneity of variance. Adjustments or alternative analytical approaches may be warranted to account for the observed heterogeneity in error variances.

Table 3 *ANCOVA table for the post-test on vertical jump ability of badminton players*

Source	**Type III Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**p-value**	**Partial Eta Squared**
Pre-test	532.619	1	532.619	73.825	.000*	.740
Groups	68.811	2	34.406	4.769	.017*	.268
Error	187.581	26	7.215			
Total	61722.000	30				
Corrected Total	1151.867	29				

The ANCOVA table provides a detailed breakdown of the statistical analysis conducted to assess the post-test evaluation of vertical jump ability among badminton players. One key aspect highlighted is the significant influence of pre-existing performance levels, as evidenced by the substantial Type III Sum of Squares for the pre-test variable (532.619), accompanied by a notably high F-value of 73.825 and a very low p-value of .000, indicating the robust statistical significance of pre-test performance in shaping post-test outcomes. This underscores the pivotal role played by pre-test scores in elucidating variations in post-test vertical jump ability.

Additionally, the analysis reveals the discernible impact of group categorizations on post-test vertical jump ability, as indicated by the Type III Sum of Squares for the group’s variable (68.811). The associated F-value of 4.769, with a corresponding p-value of .017, signifies a statistically significant effect, underscoring the substantive influence exerted by group allocations on post-test scores. This emphasizes the importance of considering group dynamics in understanding variations in vertical jump proficiency among badminton players. Overall, the ANCOVA analysis provides valuable insights into the factors influencing post-test vertical jump ability, shedding light on the multifaceted determinants shaping athletic performance outcomes in the context of badminton.

Table 4 *Estimate tables of adjusted means for countermovement jump, depth jump, and control group on vertical jump ability of badminton players*

			95% Confidence Interval	
Groups	Mean	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Countermovement Jump	47.073[a]	.849	45.327	48.819
Depth Jump	43.954[a]	.989	41.921	45.987
Control Group	43.773[a]	.987	41.743	45.803

a. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: pre-test vertical jump = 40.0667.

The estimate table presents adjusted means for vertical jump ability among badminton players across three distinct groups: Countermovement Jump, Depth Jump, and Control Group. After accounting for covariates such as pre-test vertical jump scores (evaluated at a value of 40.0667), participants in the Countermovement Jump group exhibit an estimated mean vertical jump score of approximately 47.073, with a standard error of .849. Similarly, participants in the Depth Jump group demonstrate an adjusted mean vertical jump score of approximately 43.954, with a standard error of .989, while those in the Control Group display an adjusted mean vertical jump score of about 43.773, with a standard error of .987. These findings provide valuable insights into the comparative effectiveness of countermovement jump, depth jump, and control interventions on vertical jump ability among badminton players.

Table 5 *Pair-wise comparison of countermovement jump, depth jump, and control group on vertical jump ability of badminton players*

(I) Groups	(J) Groups	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	p-value
Countermovement Jump	Depth Jump	3.120*	1.305	.024
	Control Group	3.300*	1.301	.018
Depth Jump	Countermovement Jump	-3.120*	1.305	.024
	Control Group	.181	1.570	.909

NG Control Group	Countermovement Jump	-3.300*	1.301	.018
	Depth Jump	-.181	1.570	.909

Table 5 elucidates the pair-wise comparisons conducted to scrutinize the differences in vertical jump ability among badminton players across the Countermovement Jump group, Depth Jump group, and Control Group. Notably, significant disparities emerge between the Countermovement Jump and Depth Jump groups, with a statistically significant mean difference of 3.120 (p = .024) indicating that participants in the Countermovement Jump cohort achieved markedly higher vertical jump scores compared to their Depth Jump counterparts. Similarly, a substantial mean difference of 3.300 (p = .018) is observed between the Countermovement Jump and Control groups, underscoring the superior vertical jump ability exhibited by participants in the Countermovement Jump group relative to those in the Control Group.

Conversely, the comparison between the Depth Jump and Control groups reveals no statistically significant disparities, with a negligible mean difference of .181 (p = .909) suggesting comparable vertical jump abilities between these two cohorts. These findings underscore the efficacy of countermovement jump training in fostering enhanced vertical jump performance among badminton players when juxtaposed with both depth jump training and control conditions. Such insights illuminate the differential impacts of distinct training modalities on athletic performance outcomes, thereby informing tailored intervention strategies aimed at optimizing athletic proficiency and fostering competitive advantage within the realm of badminton.

Discussion

The findings of this study illuminate significant insights into the efficacy of countermovement jump (CMJ) and depth jump training regimens in augmenting vertical jump ability among badminton players. Our analysis revealed that participants undergoing CMJ training exhibited substantially greater improvements in vertical jump performance compared to their counterparts undergoing depth jump training and those in the control group. This observation aligns with existing literature underscoring the superiority of CMJ exercises in eliciting enhancements in explosive power and vertical jump proficiency (Sheppard et al., 2008). The biomechanical advantages conferred by the CMJ technique, characterized by a pre-stretch phase facilitating greater muscular activation and force production during the subsequent concentric phase, likely contributed to the observed superiority of CMJ training outcomes (Markovic et al., 2013).

Moreover, the absence of significant differences in vertical jump ability between the depth jump and control groups underscores the nuanced interplay between training modalities and athletic performance outcomes. While depth jump training has been purported to elicit improvements in reactive strength and power production, its efficacy in enhancing vertical jump performance among badminton players may be contingent upon various factors such as individual biomechanical characteristics and training protocols (Suchomel et al., 2016). Thus, while depth jump training may confer benefits in specific athletic contexts, its efficacy in fostering vertical jump ability among badminton players warrants further exploration.

These findings carry practical implications for coaches and practitioners involved in badminton player development. By prioritizing CMJ training modalities characterized by their demonstrated efficacy in enhancing vertical jump ability, coaches can optimize training interventions to maximize athletic performance gains among badminton players. Moreover, the insights gleaned from this study underscore the importance of individualized training approaches tailored to athletes' unique physiological profiles and training needs. Future research endeavors should aim to elucidate the longitudinal effects of CMJ and depth jump training regimens on athletic performance outcomes, thereby informing evidence-based training practices aimed at fostering optimal athletic development in badminton and beyond.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, the findings of this study underscore the significant impact of countermovement jump (CMJ) training on enhancing vertical jump ability among badminton players. Through rigorous statistical analysis, it has been elucidated that participants in the CMJ group exhibited markedly superior vertical jump performance compared to both the Depth Jump group and the control group. This assertion is substantiated by the significant mean differences observed between the CMJ group and both the Depth Jump group (mean difference = 3.120, $p = .024$) and the Control Group (mean difference = 3.300, $p = .018$), highlighting the pronounced efficacy of CMJ training in fostering enhanced athletic performance.

These findings align with existing literature emphasizing the utility of CMJ training in augmenting vertical jump ability across various athletic populations (Lamas et al., 2020; Moir et al., 2004). Moreover, they corroborate the established notion that CMJ exercises elicit greater muscular activation and neuromuscular adaptations conducive to improved jump performance compared to alternative training modalities (Bompa & Haff, 2009; McBride et al., 2002). Consequently, the integration of CMJ training regimens into the athletic conditioning protocols of badminton players emerges as a viable strategy for optimizing vertical jump proficiency and, by extension, enhancing on-court performance.

Nevertheless, it is imperative to acknowledge certain limitations inherent in this study, including the relatively small sample size and the confined scope of the investigation to a specific sporting discipline. Future research endeavors could benefit from larger sample sizes encompassing diverse athletic populations to corroborate and generalize the observed findings. Additionally, longitudinal studies tracking the sustained effects of CMJ training over extended periods could provide invaluable insights into its long-term efficacy and potential implications for athletic development.

In summary, the present study contributes to the burgeoning body of literature elucidating the efficacy of CMJ training in enhancing vertical jump ability among badminton players. By substantiating the pronounced benefits of CMJ interventions, this research underscores the importance of integrating evidence-based training protocols to optimize athletic performance and foster athletic excellence.

References:

1. Bompa, T. O., & Haff, G. G. (2009). Periodization: Theory and methodology of training (5th ed.). Human Kinetics.
2. Lamas, L., Ayan, C., Di Massa, A. D., & Lage, G. M. (2020). Effects of different strength training protocols on strength and power development of the lower extremities: A review. European Journal of Human Movement, 44, 55-68.
3. McBride, J. M., Triplett-McBride, T., Davie, A., & Newton, R. U. (2002). A comparison of strength and power characteristics between powerlifters, Olympic lifters, and sprinters. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 16(4), 581-585.
4. Moir, G. L., Button, C., Glaister, M., Stone, M. H., & Haff, G. G. (2004). The influence of familiarization on the reliability of force variables measured during unloaded and loaded

vertical jumps. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 18(4), 874-879.

5. Markovic, G., Dizdar, D., Jukic, I., & Cardinale, M. (2013). Reliability and factorial validity of squat and countermovement jump tests. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 27(7), 1627-1632.
6. Sheppard, J. M., & Young, W. B. (2006). Agility literature review: classifications, training, and testing. Journal of Sports Sciences, 24(9), 919-932.
7. Suchomel, T. J., Nimphius, S., Bellon, C. R., & Stone, M. H. (2016). The importance of muscular strength: Training considerations. Sports Medicine, 46(10), 1539-1559.
8. Markovic, G. (2007). Does plyometric training improve vertical jump height? A meta-analytical review. British Journal of Sports Medicine, 41(6), 349-355.
9. Bobbert, M. F. (1990). Drop jumping is a training method for jumping ability. Sports Medicine, 9(1), 7-22.
10. Young, W., McDowell, M., & Scarlett, B. (1995). Specificity of sprint and agility training methods. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 9(1), 15-19.
11. McMahon, T. A., & Cheng, G. C. (1990). The mechanics of running: how does stiffness couple with speed? Journal of Biomechanics, 23(S1), 65-78.
12. Aagaard, P., Simonsen, E. B., Magnusson, S. P., Larsson, B., and Dyhre –Poulsen, P.(1998). A New Concept For Isokinetic Hamstring: Quadriceps Muscle Strength Ratio. The American Journal of Sports Medicine, 26(2), 231-237. https://doi.org/10.1177/03635465980260021201
13. Aginsky, K. D., Neophytou, N., and Charalambous, T. (2004). Isokinetic hamstring and quadriceps muscle strength profiles of elite South African football players. African Journal for Physical, 20(2), 1225-1236.
14. Bobbert, M., Huijing, P., & Van Ingen Schenau, G. (1987). Countermovement (CMJ)ing. I. The influence of jumping technique on the biomechanics of jumping. Medicine & Science In Sports & Exercise, 19(4), 332-338. https://doi.org/10.1249/00005768-198708000-00003
15. Chatzinikolaou, A., Fatouros, I.G., Gourgoulis, V., Avloniti, A., Jamurtas, A.Z., & Nikolaidis, M.G. (2010). Time course of changes in performance and inflammatory responses after acute plyometric exercise. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 24, 1389-1398.
16. Gehri, D. J., Ricard, M. D., Kleiner, D. M., and Kirkendall, D. T. (1998). A comparison of plyometric training techniques for improving vertical jump ability and energy production. J. Strength Cond. Res. 12, 85–89. doi: 10.1519/00124278-199805000-00005
17. Hettinger, T. and Muller, E.A. Muskelliestung and Muskel Training" Arbelts Physical Isometric Exercises and Value to the Athlete" Track Technique, 6(Dec. 1961).166.
18. Mathew, Donald K. Measurement of Physical Education, (London : W.B. Sunders and Co., 1973): P.S.
19. Millard, N.D., King Barry G. And Showers, Marry Jane.Zfrian Anatomy and Physiology, (London : W.B. Sanders Company, February, 1959),
20. Smith, L., 2020. Is There a Difference Between a Depth and countermovement (CMJ)?. [online] www.stack.com. Available at: <https://www.stack.com/a/is-there-a-difference-between-a-depth-and- countermovement-jump/> [Accessed 9 August 2021].
21. Tofas, T., Jumurtas, A.Z., Fatouros, I., Nikolaidis, M.G., Koutedakis, Y., Sinouris, E.A., Papageorgakopoulou, N., & Theochathios D.A. (2008). Plyometric exercise increases serum indices of muscle damage and collagen breakdown. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 22, 490-496.
22. Zekan-Petrinović L, et. al. “Badminton--unknown sport” Acta Med Croatica. 2007; 61 Suppl 1:49-52.
23. The Badminton Association of England Mission Statement, Badminton Association of England Ltd, April 2002.
24. SmashXiang Liu, et. al. “An Analysis of the Biomechanics of Arm Movement During a Badminton”, Physical Education and Sports Science, National Institute of Education, Singapore, October, 1, 2002
25. Majumdar P, Khanna GL, Malik V, et al. “Physiological analysis to quantify training load in badminton”, Br J Sports Med 1997;31:342–5
26. Cabello Manrique D, Gonzalez-Badillo JJ. “Analysis of the characteristics of competitive

badminton", Br J Sports Med. 2003 Feb;37(1):62-6
27. Mark D. Tillman, et. al, "Jumping and landing techniques in Elite Women's Volleyball", Journal of Sports Science and Medicine (2004) 3, 30-36
28. Andrea L. Ross and Jackie L. Hudson "Efficacy of a Mini-Trampoline program for improving the vertical jump". Physical Education and Sport 2 (1), 2005, 63-69
29. Rahman Rahimi1,NaserBehpur,"The effects of plyometric, weight and plyometric-weight training on anaerobic power and muscular strength", Physical Education and Sports Science, 2005, 3: 81-91.
30. Pereira, R., Machado, M., Miragaya dos Santos, M., Pereira, L. N., & Sampaio-Jorge, F. (2008) Muscle activation sequence compromises vertical jump performance. Serb J Sports Sci., 2(3): 85-90.
31. Jan Babi and Jadran Lenari, "Vertical Jump: Biomechanical Analysis and Simulation Study", Humanoid Robots, New Developments, Vienna, Australia, June 2007, 31, 551
32. Mostafa Afifi "A GRF comparison between landing from a countermovement jump and landing from stepping off a box", 2009, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ,USA, 3,45.
33. M. F. Bobbert, et. al, "Biomechanical analysis of drop and countermovement jumps", European Journal of Applied Physiology and Occupationat Physiology (1986) 54:566—573
34. Knudson D. "Validity and reliability of visual ratings of the vertical jump", Percept Mot Skills. 1999 Oct;89(2):642-8.
35. Hicks C.M. Research Method for Clinical Therapists, 1999, Churchil Livingstone, 3-164.
36. Mostafa Afifi "A GRF comparison between landing from a countermovement jump and landing from stepping off a box", 2009, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ,USA, 3,45.