SUMMARY
A study on Somatotypes of Football players of Meghalaya is made with the following objectives:

i) to report the somatotypes of football players,

ii) to examine differences in the somatotypes of football players and the general population (or control sample),

iii) to compare the present data with that reported in the literature, and

iv) to make suggestions in the light of the above.

The subjects of the present study are Khasi and Jaintia adult men, ranging in age from 18 to 33 years. A total of 143 football players participating at local (urban, rural), District and State level, and 117 control subjects were investigated. The data were collected from East Khasi Hills, West Khasi Hills and Jaintia Hills Districts of Meghalaya. Heath and Carter (1967) Anthropometric Somatotype Method was used. Somatotype categories and mean somatotypes have been calculated and plotted on Somatocharts. Other statistics applied include, Somatotype Dispersion Index, Somatotype Dispersion Distance, Somatotype Attitudinal Distance, percentage frequencies, mean, standard deviation, chi-square, and Student's t-test. The important findings of the present study are as follows.
i) Football players of Meghalaya are predominantly Ectomorphic-Mesomorph.

ii) Out of a total of 13 generalized categories of somatotypes, they are distributed only among 5 categories.

iii) On the basis of somatotype categories no significant differences are observed between urban and rural, District and State level players.

iv) Similarly, Chi-square test does not differentiate the football players from control according to distribution of various somatotypes categories.

v) Statistically significant differences are observed for all the three components of physique between football players and control, on the basis of mean somatotype ratings. The mean somatotype of Meghalaya State level players is 1.28-5.69-1.94, while that of the control sample is 1.55-4.65-2.89.

vi) The values for Somatotype Dispersion Distance and Somatotype Attitudinal Distance show that football players are quite distant from the control subjects.

vii) Mean somatotypes of players according to their playing position in field reveal significant differences for one or the other of the three components, between Goal keepers and Forwards, Stoppers, Halves and Backs. Goal keepers happen to be the most Endomorphic and Ectomorphic, and the least Mesomorphic of all players.
viii) A majority of football players of present study have sufficient experience, formal training, and complained of improper playgrounds, lack of sports kit, inadequate coaching, lack of financial assistance, special diet, practicing time, and exposure to better teams at higher levels. Most of the players are habitual smokers and chewers, and indulge in drinking also.

ix) Players of Meghalaya are more mesomorphic, but less Ectomorphic and Endomorphic than other Indian players of football. Differences in mean somatotypes of players in five field positions are also significant.

x) American football players are high on Endomorphy and Mesomorphy, but low on Ectomorphy, when compared with players of Meghalaya.

xi) Indian players of all other sports considered in the present study are more Endomorphic and Ectomorphic, and less Mesomorphic than our football players.

xii) When compared with Olympic players of various sports, football players of present study are less Endomorphic, but high on Mesomorphy and Ectomorphy than Olympic players of some of the sports.

xiii) In the light of present study it is suggested that, in order to search talent, extensive somatotype surveys should be conducted among Khasi-Jaintia children.