

EFFECTS AND DIFFERENCES IN POSITIONS DURING VIBRATION TRAINING ON THE CAUDAL MUSCULATURE

(Original scientific paper)

Andrija Atanasković and Vladimir Mutavdžić

University of Niš, Faculty of Sport and Physical Education, Niš, Serbia

Abstract

Mechanical vibration of the whole body has recently been attracting a lot of interest. During the explosive strength training gravity $g = 9.81 \text{ ms}^{-2}$ has a very important role, and this vibration plate changes conditions of the action of gravity. The results of the training effect may have frequency vibration amplitudes, as well as the position of the respondent takes the vibrating plate. The position depends primarily on which muscle groups will be most active during the training. The aim of this study is to determine the effects and differences of different positions on the vibrating plate. During the research 40 male respondents participated, average age 14.02 ± 1.18 , the average body weight of 59.90 ± 11.99 , average body height 168.57 ± 8.77 . Divided into four groups: control (K) group of 10 subjects, which were not included in the plate, the experimental (E1) group, which occupied a normal upright position on the vibrating plate, (E2), a group that has occupied the position of the squat and (E3) group, which is occupied the position of a deep squat. Myotest included the execution of the half squat jump (CMJ) as well as a jump from a squat (SJ) defined variables: HightC, PowerC, ForceC, VelocityC, HightS, PowerS, ForceS, VelocityS, the maximum weight of thruster legs (leg press) 1RM. Vibration training lasted six weeks, three times a week period of stimulation per workout was 6 minutes, with 8 repetitions of 45 seconds, and a break between repeating of 30 to 60 seconds. Frequency of vertical vibration varied from 30Hz to 40Hz and the amplitude of the vertical displacement of 3-5 mm. Results: Based on the results found, it can be concluded that the different positions of the vibrating plate lead to different results. Normal upright position leads to improvements in explosive power compared to the initial measurement of the sig = 0.005, while the position of the high and deep squatting leads to an improvement compared to the initial measurement of the significance of the sig = 0.002. They are also visible and intergroup differences in the final measurement between E1 and E2, and between E1 and E3 with the sig < 0.001. Conclusion: It can be concluded that the position of the squat during training at the vibro plate further engage the muscles of the lower extremities.

Keywords: *vibration plate, explosive power, boys, vibration training, normal upright position, position of the high and deep squatting, multiple analysis of variance*

INTRODUCTION

Mechanical vibration of the whole body has recently been attracting a lot of interest. Basco et al. (1998) showed that the vibration affects the increase in muscle strength and their flexibility. In this study he also examined the effect of 10-d vibration on muscle power, where the vibration of 10 min x d-1 increases explosive power.

During the explosive strength training gravity $g = 9.81 \text{ ms}^{-2}$ has a very important role, and this vibration plate changes conditions of the action of gravity. Vibration training in addition to the power increase (Roelants, Delecluse, & Goris, 2004.; Roelants,

Delecluse & Verschueren, 2004), has a positive effect on bone density (Verschueren, Roelants & Delecluse, 2004), as well as the physical status (Roelants, Delecluse, & Goris, 2004.) because it has great popularity in medicine, physical preparation of athletes and the rehab. Vibration training increases muscle temperature and accelerates the circulation (Issurin & Tenenbaum, 1999). The results of the training effect may have frequency vibration amplitudes, as well as the position of the respondent takes the vibrating plate. The position depends primarily on which muscle groups will be most active during the training.

Vibration training works best with passive subjects,

while within athletes these results are much weaker (Cardinale & Basco, 2003.; Delecluse, Roelants, & Verschueren, 2003). The research of Rønnestad, (2009.). proves that passive respondents had a significantly higher growth rate in force at CMJ jump, while Bautmans, Van Hees, Lemper & Mets (2005.) determined that vibration training has an impact on balance, mobility and muscle performance of the elderly. Different frequencies of vibration have different effect on force (Da Silva et al, 2006.). Research that shows the impact of different types of exercises and positions on the vibrating plate is very small (Rolents, Verchuren, Delecluse, Levin, & Stijnen, 2006).

The aim of this study is to determine the effects and differences of different positions in training on the vibrating plate.

METHODS

During the research 40 male respondents participated, average age 14.02 ± 1.18 , the average body weight of 59.90 ± 11.99 , average body height 168.57 ± 8.77 . Divided into four groups: control (K) group of 10 subjects, which were not included in the plate and has not performed any physical activity that could affect the explosive power of the lower extremities, experimental (E1) group, which occupied a normal upright position on the vibrating plate, (E2), a group that has occupied the position of the squat where the angle of the knee joint was 125° and the angle of the hip joint 145° and (E3) group, which is occupied the position of a deep squat with angle in the knee and hip of 90° . All respondents who were involved in the training process were completely healthy, with no hidden injuries.

Using Myotest and execution of the half squat jump (CMJ) and jump from a squat (SJ) following variables were determined:

(CMJ)

- 1 HightC (height in cm)
- 2 PowerCore (power expressed in W / kg),
- 3 ForceC (force expressed in N / kg),
- 4 VelocityC (acceleration expressed in cm / s).

(SJ)

- 1 HightS (height expressed in cm)
- 2 PowerS (power expressed in W / kg),

3 ForceS (force expressed in N / kg),

4 VelocityS (acceleration expressed in cm / s).

Determined the maximum weight of thruster legs (leg press) in a repeating, formula $\text{weight} / (1.0278 - (0.0278 \times \text{number of repetitions})) = 1\text{RM}$ (Brzycki, 1993) 1RM (expressed in kg)

Protocol of training

After the initial measuring of respondents who were involved in training the vibrations of the vibrating plate (Power-Plate, Badhoevedorp, The Netherlands). Training vibration lasted six weeks, three times a week the total period of stimulation per workout was 6 minutes, with 8 repetitions of 45 seconds, and a break between repeating of 30 to 60 seconds. Frequency of vertical vibration varied from 30Hz to 40Hz depending on the week, as well as the amplitude of the vertical displacement of 3-5 mm (Bautmans, Van Hees, Lemper, & Mets, 2005.). Additional physical activity that could affect the course of the study was not allowed.

Data Processing

All data was analyzed with the program "SPSS 11". Variable power shown by the descriptive statistics, separately for each group and how the initial and the final measurement went. To determine the differences in the arithmetic means the respondents use analysis of variance with one factor (ANOVA) and multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA).

RESULTS

From Table 2. we can conclude that there were no statistically significant differences between the groups in the initial measurement $\text{sig} > 0.005$.

From Table 3. it can be seen that in the final analysis, a statistically significant difference between K and E1 groups $\text{sig} = 0.000$; E1 and E2 $\text{sig} = 0.001$; E1 and E3 $\text{sig} = 0.000$ was found, while between E2 and E3 groups there were no statistically significant differences $\text{sig} = 0.236$.

In Table 4. it can be seen that at RM1 variables there were no statistically significant differences between the groups $\text{sig} > 0.005$ were found. In K vs E1 differences do not exist only in VelocityS $\text{sig} = 0.010$; E1 vs. E2 there are no differences in the PowerC, $\text{sig} = 0.023$; PowerS $\text{sig} = 0.202$; between E1 vs. E3 differences exist not

Table 1. Protocol of training

| Week | Frequency | Amplitude | Duration repe-tition x times | Break |
|------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|--------|
| 1 | 30Hz | 3mm | 8 x 45s | 30-60s |
| 2 | 35Hz | 3mm | 8 x 45s | 30-60s |
| 3 | 40Hz | 4mm | 8 x 45s | 30-60s |
| 4 | 30Hz | 4mm | 8 x 45s | 30-60s |
| 5 | 35Hz | 4mm | 8 x 45s | 30-60s |
| 6 | 40Hz | 5mm | 8 x 45s | 30-60s |

Table 2. Intergroup differences in the initial measurement of the variables in the multivariate level power

| | Effect | Value | F | Hypothesis df | Error df | Sig. | |
|--|----------|---------------|------|--------------------|----------|--------|------|
| | K vs E1 | Wilks' Lambda | .126 | 7.682 ^a | 9.000 | 10.000 | .192 |
| | K vs E2 | Wilks' Lambda | .571 | .834 ^a | 9.000 | 10.000 | .602 |
| | K vs E3 | Wilks' Lambda | .578 | .812 ^a | 9.000 | 10.000 | .618 |
| | E1 vs E2 | Wilks' Lambda | .305 | 2.529 ^a | 9.000 | 10.000 | .382 |
| | E1 vs E3 | Wilks' Lambda | .321 | 2.354 ^a | 9.000 | 10.000 | .099 |

Table 3. Intergroup differences of the final measurements of variables forces the multivariate level

| Effect | | Value | F | Hypothesis df | Error df | Sig. |
|----------|---------------|-------|---------------------|---------------|----------|------|
| K vs E1 | Wilks' Lambda | .053 | 19.700 ^a | 9.000 | 10.000 | .000 |
| E1 vs E2 | Wilks' Lambda | .057 | 18.343 ^a | 9.000 | 10.000 | .000 |
| E1 vs E3 | Wilks' Lambda | .043 | 24.592 ^a | 9.000 | 10.000 | .000 |
| E2 vs E3 | Wilks' Lambda | .409 | 1.602 ^a | 9.000 | 10.000 | .236 |

Table 4. Intergroup differences of the final measurements in variable power of the univariate level

| Dependent variable | K vs E1 | | E1 vs E2 | | E1 vs E3 | | E2 vs E3 | |
|--------------------|---------|------|----------|------|----------|------|----------|------|
| | F | Sig. | F | Sig. | F | Sig. | F | Sig. |
| HeightC | 22.180 | .000 | 13.924 | .002 | 16.257 | .001 | .760 | .395 |
| ForceC | 16.322 | .001 | 49.107 | .000 | 61.682 | .000 | .411 | .529 |
| PowerC | 11.713 | .003 | 6.224 | .023 | 12.048 | .003 | .963 | .340 |
| VelocityC | 12.902 | .002 | 10.378 | .005 | 16.036 | .001 | .369 | .551 |
| HeightS | 26.356 | .000 | 36.560 | .000 | 41.930 | .000 | 2.594 | .125 |
| ForceS | 14.691 | .001 | 15.081 | .001 | 59.796 | .000 | 12.890 | .002 |
| PowerS | 11.211 | .004 | 1.756 | .202 | 2.732 | .116 | .036 | .852 |
| VelocityS | 8.384 | .010 | 14.887 | .001 | 15.336 | .001 | .166 | .688 |
| RM1 | .216 | .648 | 2.660 | .120 | .039 | .845 | 1.115 | .305 |

Table 5. Intragroup differences between the initial and final measurements of variables forces

| Grupa | Effect | F | Hypothesis df | Error df | Sig. |
|-------|---------------|---------------------|---------------|----------|------|
| K | Wilks' Lambda | 43.235 ^a | 8.000 | 2.000 | .423 |
| E1 | Wilks' Lambda | 6.762 ^a | 8.000 | 2.000 | .005 |
| E2 | Wilks' Lambda | 10.742 ^a | 8.000 | 2.000 | .002 |
| E3 | Wilks' Lambda | 28.589 ^a | 8.000 | 2.000 | .002 |

only at PowerS sig = 0.116. Between E2 vs. E3 group differences exist only within ForceS sig = 0.002, while all other variables sig > 0.005 remain unchanged.

Table 5. shows that there was no statistically significant difference between the initial and final

measurements in the K group sig = 0.423, while for the other groups there was statistically significant difference in the E1 group sig = 0.005, with E2 and E3, sig = 0.002. In Table 6. it can be seen that K groups improved almost non-existent or was deteriorated

Table 6: Descriptive indicators of variables forces the initial and final measurement

| Groups | K group | | E1 group | | E2 group | | E3 group | |
|-------------|---------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|
| Measurments | Initial | Final | Initial | Final | Initial | Final | Initial | Final |
| HeightC | 28.19 | 30.27 | 23.20 | 27.04 | 26.69 | 32.04 | 26.44 | 34.21 |
| ForceC | 24.15 | 22.16 | 26.33 | 26.72 | 27.68 | 38.06 | 26.49 | 39.20 |
| PowerC | 33.57 | 33.37 | 42.38 | 43.11 | 39.10 | 50.86 | 39.78 | 53.94 |
| VelocityC | 198.4 | 191.3 | 208.4 | 213.7 | 205.9 | 229.6 | 208.5 | 233.6 |
| HeightS | 25.55 | 28.84 | 20.39 | 22.24 | 22.52 | 31.05 | 23.85 | 33.66 |
| ForceS | 24.73 | 24.83 | 26.05 | 29.39 | 24.64 | 34.43 | 25.24 | 39.08 |
| PowerS | 40.67 | 40.38 | 40.13 | 49.30 | 38.88 | 53.78 | 42.36 | 54.33 |
| VelocityS | 217.4 | 215.8 | 208.7 | 231.5 | 207.0 | 250.2 | 220.1 | 251.7 |
| RM1 | 57.4 | 57.3 | 51.8 | 55.7 | 57.5 | 60.6 | 50.7 | 56.5 |

(Δ HeightC = 2,8cm; Δ ForceC = -1.99 N/kg; Δ PowerC = -0.2 W/kg; Δ VelocityC = -8.1 cm/s; Δ HeightS = 3.29 cm; Δ ForceS = -0.1 N/kg; Δ PowerS = -0.29 W/kg; Δ VelocityS = -1.6 cm/s), while the largest increase was in the E3 group (Δ HeightC = 7, 77cm; Δ ForceC = 12.71 N/kg; Δ PowerC = 15,16 W/kg; Δ VelocityC = 25.1 cm/s; Δ HeightS = 19,81 cm; Δ ForceS = 14.84 N/kg; Δ PowerS = 11, 97 W/kg; Δ VelocityS = 30 cm/s) when comparing E2 and E3 group no statistical significance in the differences in the final measurements was noticed, but the results of the final measurements in E2 and E3 groups were statistically significant compared to the results of the E1 group (Δ HeightC = 3,84cm; Δ ForceC = 0.39 N/kg; Δ PowerC = 0.73 W/kg; Δ VelocityC = 5.3 cm/s; Δ HeightS = 1,85 cm; Δ ForceS = 3.34 N/kg; Δ PowerS = 9.17 W/kg; Δ VelocityS = 22.8 cm/s).

DISCUSSION

As in other studies (Roelants et al., 2004.; Bosco et al., 1998.;) whole body vibration training has had a positive impact on the explosive power of the lower extremities. In normal upright position on the vibrating plate, there was a statistically significant difference in the variables of explosive strength sig = 0.005, which is also the case in the study of Roelants et al. (2006.), also in this study there was a much higher growth in the deep squat position (90°, 90°); sig <0.001; the plate position in relation to the high squat (125°, 145°); sig = 0.005. The difference between the research of Roelants et al. (2006) in relation to the current is that the high squat had minor changes sig = 0.005 as compared to the current sig = 0.002. Deep squat position on the vibrating plate has made positive and identical results in both studies sig = 0.002. The positions of the high and deep squat on the vibrating plate led to significant improvements in the variables of explosive strength sig = 0.002, but there was no statistically significant difference between E2 and E3 groups sig = 0.236, while between E1 and E2 and E1 and E3, sig <0.001 there was. Roelants et al. (2006) in his research also came to the conclusion that there was no statistically significant difference between the upright position during the treatment of the vibrating plate and

the deep squat on the vibrating plate with significance sig <0.005. The vibro training not only had an impact on variable RM1 where in all cases sig > 0.005, ie. there was no statistically significant change in the maximum ejection during thrust legs (leg press).

CONCLUSION

Whole body vibration training has led to desired results in the variables of explosive strength, while at maximum power (RM1) there was no statistically significant change sig > 0.005. On the basis of the results found it can be concluded that the different positions of the vibrating plate lead to different results. Normal upright position leads to improvements in explosive power compared to the initial measurement of the sig = 0.005, while the position of the high and deep squatting leads to an improvement compared to the initial measurement of the significance of the sig = 0.002. There are also visible intergroup differences in the final measurement between E1 and E2, and between E1 and E3 with the sig <0.001. Based on these results it can be concluded that the position of the squat during training on vibration further engage the muscles of the lower extremities and leads to intensive improvements in explosive force.

It is necessary to carry out more research within this field, whole body vibration training is a relatively new type of training because it must examine its effect on other motor skills, and how it affects the vertical moving in relation to the horizontal movement of plate compactors.

REFERENCE

- Atanacković, A., Georgiev, M., & Mutavdžić, V. (2015). The impact of vibration training on the whole, explosive leg strength, speed and agility in basketball players aged 14-15. *Research in Kinesiology*, 43(1), 33-37.
- Atanacković, A., Georgiev, M., & Mutavdžić, V. (2015). The impact of plyometrics and aqua plyometrics on the lower extremities explosive strength in children aged 14-15. *Research in Kinesiology*, 43 (1), 111-114.
- Bautmans, I., Van Hees, E., Lemper, J.C. & Mets, T. (2005). The feasibility of whole body vibration in institutionalised elderly persons and its influence on muscle performance,

- balance and mobility: a randomised controlled trial. *BMC Geriatrics*, 5(17), 56-64.
- Bosco, C., Cardinale, M., Tsarpela, O., Colli, R., Tihanyi, J. et al. (1998). The influence of whole body vibration on jumping performance. *Biology of Sport*, 15(3), 157-164.
- Brzycki, M. (1993). Strength testing: predicting a one-rep max from repetitions to fatigue. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 64(3), 88-90.
- Cardinale, M. & Basco, S. (2003). The use of vibration as an exercise intervention. *Exercise and Sport Science Reviews*, 31(1), 3-7.
- Da Silva, M. E., Nuñez, V. M., Vaamonde, D., Fernandez, J., Poblador, M. S., & et al. (2006). Effects of different frequencies of whole body vibration on muscular performance. *Biology of Sport*, 23(3), 267-282.
- Delecluse, C., Roelants, M. & Verschueren, S. (2003). Strength increase following whole-body vibration compared to resistance training. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 35, 1033-1041.
- Herodek, K., Joksimović, A., Nejić, D., Raković, A., Marković, K., & Stanković, D. (2011). Plyometric training and its effects on quickness. *Research in Kinesiology*, 39(2), 171-176.
- Issurin, V.B., & Tenenbaum, G. (1999). Acute and residual effects of vibratory stimulation on explosive strength in elite and amateur athletes. *Journal of Sports Science*, 17(3), 177-182.
- Roelants, M., Delecluse, C., & Goris, M. (2004). Effects of 24 weeks of whole body vibration training on body composition and muscle strength in untrained females. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 25(1), 1-5.
- Roelants, M., Delecluse, C., & Verschueren, S. (2004). Whole body vibration increases knee extension strength and speed of movement in older women. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 52(6), 901-908.
- Rolents, M., Verchuren, S., Delecluse, C., Levin, O., & Stijnen, V. (2006). Whole body vibration induced increase in leg muscle activity during different squat exercises. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 20(1), 124-129.
- Roelants, M., Verschueren, S., Delecluse, C., Levin, O., Stijnen, V. et al. (2006). Whole body-vibration-induced increase in leg muscle activity during different squat exercises. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 20(1), 124-129.
- Rønnestad, B.R. (2009). Acute effects of various whole-body vibration frequencies on lower-body power in trained and untrained subjects. *Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research*, 23(4), 1309-1315.
- Verschueren, S. M. P., Roelants, M., & Delecluse, C. (2004). Effect of 6-month whole body vibration training on hip density, muscle strength, and postural control in postmenopausal women: a randomized controlled pilot study. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research*, 19(3), 352-359.

Correspondence:

Vladimir Mutavdžić

University of Niš

Faculty of Sport and Physical Education

Čarnojevića 10a, 18000 Niš, Serbia

E-mail: muta61@open.telekom.rs