Comparison of Motor Fitness Components among Players of Different Sports

Dr. K. M. Valsaraj

Associate Professor, L. C. C., Lucknow (U.P.)

INTRODUCTION

A sport is as old as the human society and it has achieved a universal status in the modern society. It now enjoys a popularity, which outstrips any other form of social activity. It has become an integral part of the educational process as physical education and sports have been included in the regular curriculum. The students are taught various games and sports in a systematic manner. Besides teaching the students are evaluated in their performance. Many people participate in games and sports for getting enjoyment besides deriving physical, mental social and emotional benefits.

Although Motor Fitness is most often used synonymously with the physical fitness by the coaches but it is very important for the physical education students to understand the basic difference between physical fitness and motor fitness. Physical fitness is used to denote only the five basic fitness components (muscular strength, muscular endurance, cardiovascular endurance, freedom from obesity and flexibility), whereas motor fitness is a more comprehensive term which include all the ten fitness components including additional five motor performance components (power, speed, agility, balance and reaction time), which are important mainly for success in sports. In other words, motor fitness refers to the efficiency of basic movements in addition to the physical fitness.

Motor fitness is the final criterion through which all other elements of physical fitness are seen and measured in man. How continuously and efficiently he performs his daily work in industry, on the farm, in the armed forces, or in athletic performance was at one time the only criterion that man had of physical fitness. He might know little or nothing about scientific facts of body structure, physiology or functioning the organs, strength test on dynamometer, or organic efficiency tests. But he could understand an outstanding performance displaying power, speed and endurance. The purpose of the study was to compare the motor fitness components among different match practice group.

METHODOLOGY

The study was delimited to the B. P. Ed. 2012-13 session male students of different match practice group of L.C.C., Lucknow. The study was confined to the motor fitness components namely muscular strength, muscular endurance, speed, Agility and Explosive strength. The study was further delimited to Football, Hockey, Basketball, Volleyball and Track & Field. It was hypothesized that there is a significant difference in motor fitness components among different match practice players.

The research scholar chose 50 male students of L.C.C., Lucknow and 10 students from each Match practice group. The performance of the subject in 50-yard dash, shuttle run, standing broad jump, sit ups, 600m run/walk and pull-ups were taken as a criterion measure for the study. The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied to finding out the difference in various motor fitness components at 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS

The data collected was statistically analysed by One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) in Table 1.

Table-1ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIENCE OF MOTORFITNESS AMONG DIFFERENT MATCH PRACTICEGROUPS

Source of	Degree	Sum of	Mean	F Value	F
Variance	of	Squares	Sum of		critical
	Freedom		Square		
Between Groups	4	5.614	1.4035		
				0.19	2.57
Within groups	45	329.82	7.329		

Table –1 Indicate motor fitness comparison between different match practice groups i.e. Hockey, Basketball, Football, Volleyball and Track and Field which was not significant as calculated 'f' ratio 0.19 was less than tabulated 'f' ratio 2.57.

DISCUSSIONS

The statistical finding of the present study revealed that there were no significant differences among different match practice groups in relation to their motor fitness this may be attributed to the fact that all the subjects of the study are basically under graduate students (B. P. Ed.) of L. C. C., who undergo similar activities throughout the day, apart from the match practice session of one hour. The sports groups were involved in more or less similar nature of activity and motor movements during the daily routine. They all possess similar type of motor components due to the type of exercise and movements involved basically all sports groups are team games except Track and Field and undergo similar strategies and tactical elements during their skill practices and training so the motor abilities are almost same so there was no significant difference among them.

CONCLUSIONS

With the limitation of the study it may be concluded that there was no significant difference between the different match practice groups i.e. Basketball, Hockey, Volleyball, Football and Track & Field in relation to their motor fitness when the subjects were involved in similar type of daily routine.

REFERENCES

Bucher A. Charles, Foundation of Physical Education. Mosby, 1975, Edn 7.

Barrow and McGee, A Practical Approach to Measurement in Physical Education, Philadelphia, London, 1989.

Clark David H. and Harrison Clark, Application of Measurement to Health and Physical Education, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1976)

Brock, Lox and Pennock, Motor Fitness (Athletic Performance as Indicators of Fitness), Research Quarterly, 1941.

Bose, Robson and Uppal, A.K., "Variation in selected Physical fitness components of boys and girls at different.