COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PHYSICAL FITNESS COMPONENTS BETWEEN FAST BOWLERS AND BATSMEN: A STUDY OF HPCA CRICKET ACADEMY, SOLAN DISTRICT, HIMACHAL PRADESH

Ankush Gautam

Ph.D. Research Scholar (Physical Education) Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Rohilkhand University, Bareilly Uttar Pradesh

Abstract : This study compared six components of physical fitness — arm and shoulder strength, abdominal strength, agility, leg explosive strength, speed, and cardio-vascular endurance — between batsmen and fast bowlers of the HPCA Cricket Academy, Solan district, Himachal Pradesh. A purposive sample of 40 male cricket players (20 batsmen and 20 fast bowlers), aged 15–25 years, was assessed using the AAHPER (1976) fitness test battery, comprising pull-ups, sit-ups, shuttle run, standing broad jump, the 50-yard dash, and the 600-yard run. Data were analysed using mean, standard deviation, and the independent-samples t-test at the 0.05 level of significance. Results showed no statistically significant difference between batsmen and fast bowlers on any of the six fitness variables, and all null hypotheses formulated for the fitness components were accepted. The findings suggest that, within the same academy setting, general physical fitness conditioning is broadly comparable across playing roles, even though batting and fast bowling place distinct biomechanical demands on players. Implications for talent development and role-specific conditioning are discussed.

Index Terms — physical fitness, cricket, fast bowlers, batsmen, AAHPER test, comparative analysis

I. INTRODUCTION

Physical fitness is widely regarded as the foundation on which sporting performance is built. It is generally defined as the capacity of the heart, lungs, and muscles to function at optimal efficiency, allowing an individual to carry out daily tasks and physical activity without undue fatigue, while still retaining reserve energy for unforeseen demands. Physical fitness is not a single, unitary trait but a composite of several relatively independent components, commonly identified as strength, endurance, speed, agility, flexibility, and coordination. Each of these components contributes differently to performance depending on the sport and the specific role a player occupies within it.

Cricket is a sport that places varied physiological and biomechanical demands on players depending on their playing role. Batsmen require sustained concentration, quick reflexes, and repeated short bursts of running between wickets, interspersed with long periods of relatively low-intensity activity while fielding or waiting to bat. Fast bowlers, by contrast, depend heavily on explosive leg and core power, dynamic upper-body strength, and the ability to repeatedly generate near-maximal effort across long bowling spells, often across multiple days of a match. These contrasting demands raise a natural question for coaches and sports scientists: do the different technical roles of batting and fast bowling translate into measurably different physical fitness profiles, or does shared training within the same team environment produce broadly similar levels of fitness across roles?

Physical education and sports science literature has long recognised that mental, emotional, and social development in young athletes is closely tied to physical development, and that a well-conditioned body supports both skill execution and long-term athletic development. Fitness is shaped by a combination of factors, including heredity, maturation, nutrition, rest, and — most importantly from a training perspective — the type, intensity, and consistency of physical activity a player is exposed to. In competitive team sports such as cricket, coaches increasingly rely on objective fitness assessment, using standardised test batteries, to guide training design, monitor progress, identify talent, and design role-specific conditioning programmes rather than relying on subjective impressions of a player's condition.

Historically, fitness assessment in Indian school and college sport has often relied on generic batteries such as the AAHPER Youth Fitness Test, which, despite being developed several decades ago, remains widely used because of its simplicity, low equipment requirements, and ease of administration in field settings such as academy grounds and school playgrounds. Such batteries allow coaches to benchmark players against normative data and against one another, and are particularly useful in

developing sporting regions — such as the hill districts of Himachal Pradesh — where access to laboratory-based physiological testing is limited.

Sports science literature has offered several frameworks for understanding fitness as a multi-component construct. Johnson and Nelson (1974) classified fitness into health-related, motor, and skill-performance components, a distinction later reinforced by Bucher and Wrest (1991) and Davis (2000), who characterised general fitness as the capacity to carry out tasks without undue fatigue. Clark (1976) extended this view through the concept of motor fitness, which incorporates health-related components alongside agility, power, flexibility, and speed — attributes essential for efficient movement — while excluding the highly specialised hand–eye and foot–eye coordination skills unique to individual sports. Tancred (1995) similarly identified nine underlying components of fitness — power, strength, speed, agility, balance, flexibility, coordination, cardio-respiratory fitness, and reaction time — arguing that participation in a sport alone is insufficient to develop these qualities fully, and that structured, year-round conditioning is required for consistent improvement and balanced athletic ability. Physical fitness in the narrower sense used in the present study — encompassing body composition, endurance, flexibility, strength, and speed (Davis, 2000) — is best understood as one part of this broader motor-fitness framework, distinguishable from, but closely related to, sport-specific motor fitness qualities such as agility, balance, coordination, and reaction time.

Despite the distinct technical demands of batting and fast bowling, and despite a substantial body of international literature comparing physical fitness across different sports, age groups, and demographic categories, comparatively little empirical work has directly compared batsmen and fast bowlers on standard, field-based fitness measures within the same cricket academy setting in Himachal Pradesh. Most existing Indian studies on cricketers' fitness have focused on elite, university, or national-level samples, leaving a gap in understanding of how fitness is distributed across playing roles at the developmental, academy level, where many players first specialise into batting or bowling. This study addresses that gap by comparing batsmen and fast bowlers of the HPCA Cricket Academy, Solan district, on six components of physical fitness, with the aim of informing more role-sensitive conditioning practices at the grassroots level.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Comparative fitness research in cricket has generally focused on distinguishing bowlers from batsmen on anthropometric and physiological grounds. Bal and Sandhu (2013) compared selected psychomotor abilities between baseball pitchers and cricket fast bowlers and reported measurable differences linked to the specific throwing and bowling actions involved. Similarly, Pradeep Kumar et al. (2013) examined physiological variables across batsmen, pace bowlers, spin bowlers, wicketkeepers, and all-rounders at the all-India intervarsity level, finding role-based variation in several physiological markers.

Anthropometric work by Koley (2011) profiled Indian inter-university male cricketers and highlighted body-composition differences relevant to playing position, while Stuelcken, Pyne, and Sinclair (2007) documented the distinct anthropometric characteristics of elite fast bowlers compared with other playing roles. At the school level, Jeyson (2013) compared selected physical fitness variables between basketball and cricket players in rural areas, underscoring that fitness profiles can vary as much by sport as by role within a sport.

Beyond cricket-specific research, a long tradition of comparative fitness studies in physical education has examined how fitness varies across groups defined by sport, sex, ethnicity, geography, and socio-economic background, and this broader literature offers useful methodological parallels for the present study. Using the AAHPER battery on international samples, Mean (1954) found that Philippine schoolboys showed weaker arm and abdominal fitness relative to American and Japanese peers, while Ikeda (1962) reported that Tokyo schoolchildren outperformed their Iowa counterparts on most motor fitness items except sit-ups, a difference attributed partly to greater access to structured physical education.

Several early studies examined fitness in relation to sport participation itself. Del (1968) compared university athletes and non-athletes over a four-year period and found that athletes improved significantly on most AAHPER fitness measures except the 50-yard dash and sit-ups, while non-athletes improved mainly in cardio-vascular endurance and abdominal strength. Miller (1971) compared the effects of individual sports (badminton, bowling, tennis) and team sports (basketball, soccer, softball, volleyball) on motor ability among college freshmen, finding that team-sport participation produced significantly different effects on sprint and wall-pass performance relative to individual sports.

A number of studies have specifically compared fitness components across playing positions or sports, closely paralleling the aim of the present study. Chandrashekar (1981) compared football and basketball players on speed, flexibility, leg explosive strength, coordination, and cardio-respiratory endurance, finding basketball players superior in flexibility and football players superior in leg power, abdominal strength, and coordination. Chattopadhyay (1982) compared university-level soccer and hockey players using the AAHPER battery together with Cooper's twelve-minute run, reporting a significant difference favouring soccer players in sprint speed and hockey players in pull-ups, with no significant differences on the remaining measures — a pattern of largely comparable fitness with a few isolated differences that closely resembles the results of the present study.

Group-comparison studies using the AAHPER battery have also examined broader demographic contrasts. Ray (1979) compared tribal and urban students in Tripura and found no overall significant difference in fitness, despite urban students performing better on two of the seven test items. Mehta (1980) compared tribal and non-tribal schoolgirls in the Indore division and found non-tribal girls significantly fitter overall, while Maity (1983) reported that tribal high-school students in West Bengal

were significantly superior in speed and endurance relative to non-tribal peers. Andrews (1976) established AAHPER-based fitness norms for South African boys and found them significantly fitter than a comparable Canadian sample. Collectively, these studies illustrate that AAHPER-based comparisons can reveal significant group differences in some contexts, but not in others, depending on the degree to which the compared groups share training exposure and environment.

More recent Indian studies have continued this comparative tradition using the AAHPER battery and related instruments. Chaterjee and Das (1993) examined physical and motor fitness in 629 Indian schoolboys aged 9 to 18 and found fitness scores rising steadily with age, height, and weight, with Indian boys outperforming Belgian boys of comparable age on the sit-and-reach test but scoring lower on the vertical jump, and falling below American boys on grip strength — illustrating that fitness comparisons between groups often reveal a mixed pattern rather than uniform superiority of one group over another. Chandel (1993) compared physical fitness, physiological, and anthropometric variables between 260 tribal and 220 non-tribal students using the same six-item AAHPER battery employed in the present study, while Subhash Chandra (2003) assessed physical and motor fitness in over 4,000 fifth-grade boys and girls using the Kraus–Weber and Oregon Motor Fitness tests, finding boys superior in leg strength, power, abdominal strength, and endurance, and girls superior in flexibility. These studies confirm the continued relevance of standardised fitness batteries for group comparison research in the Indian schooling and sporting context.

Singh (1990) studied motor fitness among 157 male physical education majors using the revised AAHPER Youth Fitness Test alongside body-composition measures, situating fitness performance within a broader psycho-physiological and body-composition framework rather than treating it as an isolated outcome. Similarly, Sethi (2004) examined physical fitness components — including speed, strength, cardio-vascular endurance, balance, agility, power, and flexibility — as predictors of competitive performance among 100 university-level weightlifters, illustrating how the same general fitness components examined in the present study are also used elsewhere in sports science to predict skilled performance rather than merely describe group differences. Taken together, this body of work indicates that AAHPER-style batteries remain a valid and widely used tool both for descriptive group comparisons, as undertaken here, and for predictive research linking fitness to competitive outcomes.

Taken together, prior literature suggests that role-based or group-based fitness differences are more consistently observed when the compared groups differ substantially in training background, environment, or developmental exposure, while groups that train within the same programme or institution — as is often the case for teammates at the same academy — tend to show more homogeneous fitness profiles. The present study tests this proposition directly by comparing batsmen and fast bowlers who train together within a single district-level cricket academy.

III. OBJECTIVES

The study was guided by the following objectives:

1. To compare arm and shoulder strength between batsmen and fast bowlers of the HPCA Cricket Academy, Solan district.
2. To compare abdominal strength between batsmen and fast bowlers of the HPCA Cricket Academy, Solan district.
3. To compare agility between batsmen and fast bowlers of the HPCA Cricket Academy, Solan district.
4. To compare leg explosive strength between batsmen and fast bowlers of the HPCA Cricket Academy, Solan district.
5. To compare speed between batsmen and fast bowlers of the HPCA Cricket Academy, Solan district.
6. To compare cardio-vascular endurance between batsmen and fast bowlers of the HPCA Cricket Academy, Solan district.

Corresponding to each objective, a null hypothesis was formulated stating that there would be no significant difference between batsmen and fast bowlers on the respective fitness variable.

IV. METHODOLOGY

4.1 Sample and Sampling Technique

A purposive sample of 40 male cricket players from the HPCA Cricket Academy, Solan district, Himachal Pradesh, was selected for the study, comprising 20 batsmen and 20 fast bowlers aged between 15 and 25 years. All subjects were contacted at their practice venues, briefed on the purpose of the study, and volunteered to participate.

4.2 Tools and Test Battery

Physical fitness was assessed using the AAHPER (1976) youth fitness test battery, comprising six items: pull-ups (arm and shoulder strength), sit-ups (abdominal strength), the shuttle run (agility), the standing broad jump (leg explosive strength), the 50-yard dash (speed), and the 600-yard run (cardio-vascular endurance). Standard administration and scoring procedures for each test item were followed as specified in the AAHPER manual.

4.3 Statistical Procedure

Data were analysed using descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) and the independent-samples t-test to compare batsmen and fast bowlers on each fitness variable, with significance evaluated at the 0.05 level (df = 38).

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Arm and Shoulder Strength

table 1: arm and shoulder strength (pull-ups)

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	M.D.	df	t-value
Batsmen	20	14.75	4.327	1.6	38	1.26
Fast Bowlers	20	16.35	3.675			

The mean arm and shoulder strength score (measured by pull-ups) was 14.75 for batsmen and 16.35 for fast bowlers, a mean difference of 1.600. The calculated t-value of 1.260 (df = 38) was below the critical value at the 0.05 level, indicating no statistically significant difference between the two groups. The null hypothesis for this variable was therefore accepted.

5.2 Abdominal Strength

table 2: abdominal strength (sit-ups)

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	M.D.	df	t-value
Batsmen	20	24.8	4.188	1.95	38	1.411
Fast Bowlers	20	22.85	4.545			

Batsmen recorded a mean abdominal strength (sit-up) score of 24.80 against 22.85 for fast bowlers. The obtained t-value of 1.411 was not significant at the 0.05 level, indicating comparable abdominal strength across the two groups

.

5.3 Agility

table 3: agility (shuttle run)

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	M.D.	df	t-value
Batsmen	20	11.5	0.607	0	38	0
Fast Bowlers	20	11.5	0.607			

Both groups recorded an identical mean shuttle-run time of 11.50 seconds, with a t-value of 0.00, confirming no difference in agility between batsmen and fast bowlers in this sample.

5.4 Leg Explosive Strength

table 4: leg explosive strength (standing broad jump)

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	M.D.	df	t-value
Batsmen	20	6.35	0.745	0.25	38	1.031
Fast Bowlers	20	6.1	0.788			

Standing broad jump scores averaged 6.35 m for batsmen and 6.10 m for fast bowlers. The t-value of 1.031 did not reach significance at the 0.05 level, indicating similar leg explosive strength across roles.

5.5 Speed

table 5: speed (50-yard dash)

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	M.D.	df	t-value
Batsmen	20	8.45	0.51	0	38	0
Fast Bowlers	20	8.45	0.51			

Both groups recorded an identical mean 50-yard dash time of 8.45 seconds, yielding a t-value of 0.00 and confirming no difference in speed between the two groups.

5.6 Cardio-vascular Endurance

table 6: cardio-vascular endurance (600-yard run)

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	M.D.	df	t-value
Batsmen	20	2	0	-0.9	38	-1
Fast Bowlers	20	2.9	0.9			

On the 600-yard run, batsmen averaged 2.00 minutes compared with 2.90 minutes for fast bowlers. The t-value of −1.000 was not significant at the 0.05 level, indicating no meaningful difference in cardio-vascular endurance between the groups.

5.7 Discussion

Across all six fitness components tested, no statistically significant differences emerged between batsmen and fast bowlers. This pattern contrasts with some elite-level studies (e.g., Pradeep Kumar et al., 2013; Stuelcken et al., 2007) that report role-based physiological divergence, but is broadly consistent with the view that academy-level players training within a shared conditioning programme tend to develop similar general fitness profiles, with role-specific skill demands (such as bowling action mechanics or batting reflexes) developing independently of general fitness. It is also possible that the modest sample size (n = 20 per group) limited statistical power to detect smaller true differences, particularly for variables such as arm and shoulder strength and abdominal strength where mean differences were present but did not reach significance.

VI. CONCLUSION

Within the HPCA Cricket Academy, Solan district, batsmen and fast bowlers did not differ significantly in arm and shoulder strength, abdominal strength, agility, leg explosive strength, speed, or cardio-vascular endurance. All six null hypotheses were accordingly accepted. These findings suggest that general physical fitness training at the academy level may not yet be strongly differentiated by playing role, and that observed performance differences between batsmen and fast bowlers in match play are more likely attributable to technical skill, biomechanics, and tactical factors than to underlying general fitness.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Similar studies may be conducted with cricket players at inter-university, inter-college, and inter-school levels.
2. Comparable studies may be extended to state, national, and international level cricketers to examine whether role-based fitness differences emerge at higher competitive levels.
3. Future research could incorporate larger samples and role-specific fitness batteries (e.g., bowling-specific power and repeated-sprint measures) to capture demands not reflected in general fitness tests.

REFERENCES

Andrews, J. C. (1976). Physical fitness norms for South African boys and a comparison with Canadian boys. South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation, 1(1), 5–14.

Bal, B. S., & Sandhu, R. S. (2013). A comparative study on selected psychomotor abilities between male baseball pitcher and cricket fast bowler. International Journal of Physical Education, Fitness and Sports, 2(4), 8–11.

Bucher, C. A., & Wrest, R. D. (1991). Foundations of physical education and sport. Times Mirror/Mosby College Publishing.

Chandel, R. (1993). A comparative study on physical fitness, physiological and anthropometric variables between tribal and non-tribal students (Unpublished master's thesis). Physical education research archive.

Chandrashekar, K. (1981). A comparative study of selected physical fitness components of football and basketball players (Unpublished master's thesis). Physical education research archive.

Chaterjee, S., & Das, B. (1993). Physical and motor fitness levels of Indian school-going boys. Journal of Sports Sciences, 11(4), 331–336.

Chattopadhyay, B. (1982). A comparative study of physical fitness of university-level soccer and hockey players (Unpublished master's thesis). Physical education research archive.

Clark, H. H. (1976). Application of measurement to health and physical education. Prentice-Hall.

Davis, B. (2000). Physical education and the study of sport. Harcourt Publishers.

Del, R. (1968). A comparison of physical fitness levels of athletes and non-athletes over a four-year period (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of North Dakota.

Hunsicker, P. A., & Reiff, G. G. (1976). AAHPER youth fitness test manual (Rev. ed.). American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.

Ikeda, N. (1962). A comparison of the physical fitness of Iowa and Tokyo children using the Iowa Test of Motor Fitness (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Iowa.

Jeyson, J. (2013). Comparison of selected physical fitness variables of Radhapuram Block level school basketball and cricket players in rural areas. Indian Streams Research Journal, 3(8), 1–3.

Johnson, B. L., & Nelson, J. K. (1974). Practical measurements for evaluation in physical education. Burgess Publishing.

Koley, S. (2011). A study of anthropometric profile of Indian inter-university male cricketers. Journal of Human Sport and Exercise, 6(2), 427–435.

Maity, S. (1983). A comparative study of physical fitness between tribal and non-tribal high school students of Midnapur district, West Bengal (Unpublished master's thesis). Physical education research archive.

Mean, J. (1954). A study of the physical fitness of Philippine freshman boys compared with American and Japanese boys (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Physical education research archive.

Mehta, N. (1980). A comparative study of physical fitness of tribal and non-tribal school girls of Indore division (Unpublished master's thesis). Physical education research archive.

Miller, W. (1971). A comparison of the effects of individual and team sports programmes on the motor ability of intercollegiate freshmen (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Physical education research archive.

Pradeep Kumar, Singh, R., Singh, R., & Kumar, S. (2013). Comparative analysis of the physiological variables of all India intervarsity level batsmen, pace bowlers, spin bowlers, wicketkeepers and all-rounders men cricketers of India. International Journal of Behavioral Social and Movement Sciences, 2(1), 104–117.

Ray, S. (1979). A comparative study of physical fitness of tribal and urban students in Tripura (Unpublished master's thesis). M.B.B. College, Agartala.

Sethi, P. K. (2004). Physical fitness components as predictors of performance in male weightlifters (Unpublished master's thesis). Physical education research archive.

Singh, H. (1990). Motor fitness of physical education majors in relation to psycho-physiological variables and body composition (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Physical education research archive.

Stuelcken, M., Pyne, D., & Sinclair, P. (2007). Anthropometric characteristics of elite cricket fast bowlers. Journal of Sports Sciences, 25(14), 1587–1597.

Subhash Chandra. (2003). A survey on physical fitness status of fifth grade boys and girls (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Physical education research archive.

Tancred, B. (1995). Key methods of sports conditioning and fitness training. A & C Black.