



ISSN: 2456-0057

IJPNPE 2021; 6(1): 429-431

© 2021 IJPNPE

www.journalofsports.com

Received: 23-01-2021

Accepted: 04-03-2021

Dr. NS Gnanavel

Assistant Professor, Mother
Teresa College of Physical
Education, Mettusalai, Illuppur,
Pudukottai, Tamil Nadu, India

A comparative study of selected physical fitness qualities among university men volleyball basketball and handball players

Dr. NS Gnanavel

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to compare the selected physical and physiological variables among university men volleyball, basketball and handball players. To achieve this purpose of the study, twenty men volleyball players, twenty basketball players and twenty handball players from Colleges affiliated to Tamil Nadu Physical Education and sports University, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India were selected as subjects. The data were collected for all subjects on selected physical fitness qualities such as speed, agility and cardio respiratory endurance by using 50mts run, shuttle run and cooper's 12 min run / walk test. The one way analysis of variance was used to find out the significant difference among university men volleyball, basketball and handball players. The Scheffe's test was used as a post hoc test to find out the paired mean differences, if any. In all cases, .05 level of confidence was fixed to test the significance, which was considered as an appropriate. The results of the showed that there was a significant difference among university men volleyball, basketball and handball players on speed, agility and cardio respiratory endurance.

Keywords: Maximal power training, strength parameters and leg strength

Introduction

Sport has a very prominent role in modern society. It is important to an individual to an individual, a group, a nation in deed the world. The word sports has a popular appeal among people of all ages and both sexes. The sports performance in international competition and tournament not only denote the high level of efficiency of an individual sportsmen but also give expression to the overall efficiency of a nation. "Physical education is the sum of those experience which come to the individual through movement"

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to compare the selected physical and physiological variables among university men volleyball, basketball and handball players. To achieve this purpose of the study, twenty men volleyball players, twenty basketball players and twenty handball players from Colleges affiliated to Tamil Nadu Physical Education and Sports University, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India were selected as subjects. The data were collected for all subjects on selected physical fitness qualities such as speed, agility and cardio respiratory endurance by using 50 mts run, shuttle run and cooper's 12 min run / walk test. The one way analysis of variance was used to find out the significant difference among university men volleyball, basketball and handball players. The Scheffe's test was used as a post hoc test to find out the paired mean differences, if any. In all cases, 0.05 level of confidence was fixed to test the significance, which was considered as an appropriate.

Speed

The mean, standard deviation and 'F' ratio values on speed among university men volleyball, basketball and handball players have been presented in Table 1.

(The table value required for significance with DF 2 and 57 was 3.138) Table I shows that the mean values of university men volleyball, basketball and handball players were 8.12, 7.19 and 7.41 respectively on speed. The obtained 'F' ratio 3.86 was greater than the table value 3.138 required for significance with DF 2 and 57.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. NS Gnanavel

Assistant Professor, Mother
Teresa College of Physical
Education, Mettusalai, Illuppur,
Pudukottai, Tamil Nadu, India

Table 1: The mean, standard deviation and ‘F’ ratio values on speed among university men volleyball, basketball and handball players

Groups	Mean	Standard Deviation	Obtained ‘F’ Ratio
Volleyball players	8.12	0.88	3.86*
Basketball players	7.19	0.94	
Handball players	7.41	0.92	

* Significant at .05 level of confidence.

The results of the study showed that there was a significant difference on speed among university men volleyball, basketball and handball players.

Since, three groups were compared, whenever the obtained ‘F’ Ratio for adjusted post test was found to be significant, the Scheffe’s test to find out the paired mean differences and it was presented in Table 2.

Table 2: The Scheffe’s test for the differences between paired means on speed

Volleyball players	Basketball players	Handball players	Mean Differences	Confidence Interval Value
8.12	7.19	-	0.93*	0.41
8.12	-	7.41	0.71*	0.41
-	7.19	7.41	0.22	0.41

* Significant at .05 level of confidence.

The table 2 shows that the mean difference values between college university volleyball players and basketball players and volleyball players and handball players on speed 0.93 and 0.71 which were greater than the confidence interval value 0.41. And also the mean difference value between university men basketball players and handball players on speed 0.22 which was less than the confidence interval value 0.41.

The results of the study showed that there was a significant difference between university men volleyball players and basketball players and volleyball players and handball players on speed. There was no significant difference between university men basketball players and handball players on speed.

Agility

The mean, standard deviation and ‘F’ ratio values on agility among university men volleyball, basketball and handball players have been presented in Table 3.

Table 3: The mean, standard deviation and ‘F’ ratio values on agility among university men volleyball, basketball and handball players

Groups	Mean	Standard Deviation	Obtained ‘F’ Ratio
Volleyball players	7.71	0.84	3.92*
Basketball players	6.92	0.92	
Handball players	7.15	0.90	

* Significant at .05 level of confidence.

(The table value required for significance with DF 2 and 57 was 3.138) Table 3 shows that the mean values of university men volleyball, basketball and handball players were 7.71, 6.92 and 7.15 respectively on agility. The obtained ‘F’ ratio 3.92 was greater than the table value 3.138 required for significance with DF 2 and 57. The results of the study showed that there was a significant difference on agility among university men volleyball, basketball and handball players.

Since, three groups were compared, whenever the obtained ‘F’ ratio for adjusted post test was found to be significant, the Scheffe’s test to find out the paired mean differences and it was presented in Table 4.

Table 4: The Scheffe’s test for the differences between paired means on agility

Volleyball players	Basketball players	Handball players	Mean Differences	Confidence Interval Value
7.71	6.92	-	0.79*	0.39
7.71	-	7.15	0.56*	0.39
-	6.92	7.15	0.23	0.39

* Significant at .05 level of confidence.

The table IV shows that the mean difference values between university men volleyball players and basketball players and volleyball players and handball players on agility 0.79 and 0.56 which were greater than the confidence interval value 0.39. And also the mean difference value between university men basketball players and handball players on agility 0.23 which was less than the confidence interval value 0.39.

The results of the study showed that there was a significant difference between university men volleyball players and basketball players and volleyball players and handball players on agility. There was no significant difference between university men basketball players and handball players on agility.

Cardio Respiratory Endurance

The mean, standard deviation and ‘F’ ratio values on cardio respiratory endurance among university men volleyball, basketball and handball players have been presented in Table 5.

Table 5: The mean, standard deviation and ‘F’ ratio values on cardio respiratory endurance among college men volleyball, basketball and handball players

Groups	Mean	Standard Deviation	Obtained ‘F’ Ratio
Volleyball players	1432	0.99	4.81*
Basketball players	1610	0.81	
Handball players	1598	0.90	

* Significant at .05 level of confidence.

(The table value required for significance with DF 2 and 57 was 3.138) Table 5 shows that the mean values of university men volleyball, basketball and handball players were 1432, 1610 and 1598 on cardio respiratory endurance. The obtained ‘F’ ratio 4.81 was greater than the table value 3.138 required for significance with DF 2 and 57. The results of the study showed that there was a significant difference on cardio respiratory endurance among university men volleyball, basketball and handball players.

Since, three groups were compared, whenever the obtained ‘F’ ratio for adjusted post-test was found to be significant, the Scheffe’s test to find out the paired mean differences and it was presented in Table 6.

Table 6: The Scheffe’s test for the differences between paired means on cardio respiratory endurance

Volleyball players	Basketball players	Handball players	Mean Differences	Confidence Interval Value
1432	1610	-	178.0*	14.11
1432	-	1598	166.0*	14.11
-	1610	1598	12.0	14.11

* Significant at .05 level of confidence.

The table 6 shows that the mean difference values between university men volleyball players and basketball players and volleyball players and handball players on cardio respiratory endurance 178.0 and 166.0 which were greater than the confidence interval value 14.11. And also the mean difference value between university men basketball players and handball

players on cardio respiratory endurance 12.0 which was less than the confidence interval value 14.11.

The results of the study showed that there was a significant difference between university men volleyball players and basketball players and volleyball players and handball players on cardio respiratory endurance. There was no significant difference between university men basketball players and handball players on cardio respiratory endurance.

Conclusions

1. There was a significant difference among university men volleyball, basketball and handball players on speed.
2. There was a significant difference among university men volleyball, basketball and handball players on agility.
3. There was a significant difference among university men volleyball, basketball and handball players on cardio respiratory endurance.

References

1. Çakir-Atabek H, Demir S, Pinarbassili R. Physical fitness attributes of team sport athletes. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*. 2010;24(5):1348-1354. DOI: 10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181cb7039
2. Chaouachi A, Brughelli M, Chamari K, Levin GT, Ben Abdelkrim N. Anthropometric, physiological and performance characteristics of elite team-handball players. *Journal of Sports Science*. 2009;27(2):151-157. DOI: 10.1080/02640410802448766
3. Gabbett T, Georgieff B. Physiological and anthropometric characteristics of Australian junior national, state, and novice volleyball players. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*. 2007;21(3):902-908. DOI: 10.1519/R-20715.1
4. Hoare DG. Predicting success in junior elite basketball players the contribution of anthropometric and physiological attributes. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*. 2000;3(4):391-405. DOI: 10.1016/S1440-2440(00)80062-0
5. Krstrup P, Mohr M, Amstrup T, Rysgaard T, Johansen J, Steensberg A, *et al.* The Yo-Yo intermittent recovery test: physiological response, reliability, and validity. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*. 2003;35(4):697-705. DOI: 10.1249/01.MSS.0000058441.94520.32
6. Madsen K, Pedersen PK. Effects of strength training, endurance training and combined endurance/strength training on aerobic power and isometric strength gains. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*. 2004;93(3):420-429. DOI: 10.1007/s00421-004-1202-7
7. Mujika I, Santisteban J, Castagna C. In-season effect of short-term sprint and power training programs on elite junior soccer players. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*. 2009;23(9):2581-2587. DOI: 10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181b1f4a0
8. Scanlan AT, Dascombe BJ, Reaburn PR, Osborne M. The physiological and activity demands experienced by Australian female basketball players during competition. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*. 2011;14(4):375-380. DOI: 10.1016/j.jsams.2011.02.001
9. Silva JR, Nassis GP. Anthropometric and physiological traits of high- level male and female volleyball players. *Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness*. 2015;55(3):164-171.
10. Sporis G, Milanovic L. Fitness profiling in handball: Physical and physiological characteristics of elite players. *Coll Antropol*. 2010;34(3):1009.