



ISSN: 2456-4419

Impact Factor: (RJIF): 5.18

Yoga 2018; 3(1): 528-530

© 2018 Yoga

www.theyogicjournal.com

Received: 11-11-2017

Accepted: 12-12-2017

Dr. Ajay Kumar

Assistant Professor of Physical
Education, SGGS Khalsa College
Mahilpur, Punjab, India

Comparison of physical fitness of government and non-government school boys

Dr. Ajay Kumar

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to compare the Physical Fitness different age groups boys. The present study was conducted on the 4000 School Boys (2000 Govt. School and 2000 Non- Govt. School), 500 subjects from each group. Their age was ranged 13 to 16 year. In the selection of the subject's random sampling technique was employed. The AAHPER Youth Fitness (1976) test was selected for the purpose of this study. The result of the study concluded that there was statistically significant difference in age groups. There were significant difference obtained on pull-up, sit-up and shuttle run among various groups (13 years to 16 years) boys. When the paired mean differences existed between 13 years & 14 years, 13 years & 15 years, 13 years & 16 years, 14 years & 15 years, 14 years & 16 years and 15 years & 16 years of boys.

Keywords: Physical Fitness, AAHPER, sampling, technique, difference, pull-up, etc.

Introduction

It is self-evident that the fit citizens are a nation's best assets and weak ones its liabilities. It is therefore the responsibility of every country to promote physical fitness of its citizens because physical fitness is the basic requirement for most of the tasks to be undertaken by an individual in his daily life. If a person's body is under-developed or grows soft or inactive and if he fails to develop physical prowess, he is undermining his capacity for thought and for work, which are of vital importance to one's own life and society in a welfare state.

Physical fitness is the ability of your body systems to work together efficiently to allow you to be healthy and effectively perform activities of daily living. Being efficient means being able to do daily activities with the least amount of effort. A fit person is able to perform schoolwork as well as responsibilities at home and still have enough energy and vigor to enjoy school sports and other leisure activities. A fit person has the ability to respond to normal life situations a part time job or marching in the band at school. A fit person also has the ability to respond to emergency situations such as running to get help or aiding a friend in distress.

Procedure and Methodology

In the present study a sample of 4000 boys ranging between 13 to 16 years studying in Govt. school and Non-Govt. school of Chandigarh was selected as the subjects for this present study. the sample was included 2000 Govt. school and 2000 Non-Govt. school boys. 500 subjects from each age groups (13 years, 14 years, 15 years, 16 years). The AAHPER Youth Fitness (1976) test was selected for the purpose of this study, because the test has been frequently used in the existing literature. 1. Pull-up, 2. Sit-up, 3. Shuttle-run, 4. Standing broad jump, 5. 50 yard dash, 6. 600 yard run/walk. For the analysis of data, collected by administering to the entire subject's random sampling, mean differences between age groups. To investigate the significance of mean differences between Government school and Non-Government school boys, t-test was applied at 0.05 level of confidence.

Results

To the above analysis it revealed that there were significant difference obtained on pull-up, sit-up and shuttle run among various age groups (13 years to 16 years) of boys. When the paired mean difference on pull-up, sit-up and shuttle-run were found that significant differences

Correspondence

Dr. Ajay Kumar

Assistant Professor of Physical
Education, SGGS Khalsa College
Mahilpur, Punjab, India

existed between 13 years & 14 years, 13 years & 15 years, 13 years & 16 years, 14 years & 15 years, 14 years & 16 years, 15 years 16 years of boys. There were significant difference obtained on standing broad jump and 50 yard dash among significant differences were obtained between 13 years and 15 years, 13 years and 16 years, 14 years and 15 years, 14 years and 16 years. There were significant differences obtained on 600 yard run/walk among different age groups of boys.

Further significant differences were obtained between 13 years and 14 years, 13 years and 15 years, 13 years and 16 years. The calculated 't' values in case of Government and Non-Government school boys 4.77(pull-up), 8.52(sit-up), 1.86(shuttle run), 1.087 (standing broad jump), 11.04 (50 yard dash), 15.93 (600 yard run/walk). ($p < 0.05$, t-value being 1.96)

Table 1: Comparison of Scores on Physical Fitness Variables of Government (Gsb) School Boys and Non-Government School Boys (Ngsb)

Variable	Group	Mean	SD	MD	SED	t-value
Pull-up	Gsb	4.87	2.942	0.448	.094	4.77*
	NGsb	5.32	2.983			
Sit-up	Gsb	20.35	4.804	1.330	.156	8.52*
	NGsb	19.02	5.071			
Shuttle-Run	Gsb	11.558	.7057	0.0483	.0259	1.86
	NGsb	11.510	.9184			
Standing Broad jump	Gsb	1.5820	.20330	0.00726	.00668	1.087
	NGsb	1.5892	.21906			
50 yard dash	Gsb	8.599	.7582	0.2761	.250	11.04*
	NGsb	8.323	.8212			
600 Yard Run/walk	Gsb	121.60	8.402	4.031	.253	15.90*
	NGsb	125.64	7.607			

*Significant at .05 level

't'.05 (3998) = 1.96

A glance at the results depicted in table would show that with regard to Government School boys and Non-Government school boys groups on the variable pull-up, the Government school boys group has obtained the mean scores and SD values of 4.87 and 2.942. As compared to their values, Non-Government school boys group had obtained the mean and SD value of 5.32 and 2.983 respectively. The t-value was found to be statistically significant as the obtained was 4.77 whereas; the tabulated value was 1.96 which 3998 degrees of freedom at .05 level of significant.

The results presented in table on the variable sit-up among Government School boys and Non-Government school boys groups revealed the mean score of 20.35 and SD 4.804 for pervious group whereas for the other group respectively. The t-value was found to be statistically significantly as the value obtained was 8.52 whereas; the tabulated value was 1.96 which 3998 degrees of freedom at .05 level of significant.

A perusal of content of table pertaining to Government school boys and Non-Government school boys and Non-Government school boys groups on the variable shuttle run would show that the first group i.e. Government school boys group had secured the mean and SD values of 11.558 and .7057 respectively. On the other hand, Non-Government school boys group had meant secured mean and SD Significant as the value obtained was 1.86 whereas, the tabulated values was 1.96 which 3998 degrees of freedom at .05 level of significant. The results presented in table on the variable standing broad jump among Government school boys and Non-Government school boys groups revealed the mean score of 158.20 and SD.20330 for former group whereas for the other group i.e. Non-Government school boys group the same were 158.92 and .21906 respectively. The t-value was not found to be statistically significant as the value obtained was 1.087 whereas; the tabulated value was 1.96 which 3998 degrees of freedom at .05 level of significant.

From the result in table on the variable 50 yard dash among Government school boys and non-Government school boys groups revealed the mean score o 8.599 and SD.7582 for pervious group whereas for the other i.e. Non-Government school boys group the same were 8.323 and .8212

respectively. The t-values was found to be statistically significant as the values obtained was 11.04 whereas, the tabulated values was 1.96 which 3998 degrees of freedom at .05 level of significant.

A perusal of inside of table pertaining to Government school boys and Non-Government School boys groups on the variable 600 yard run/walk would show that the first groups i.e. Government school boys group had secured the mean and SD Values of 121.60 and 8.402 respectively. On the other hand, Non-Government school boys group had secured mean and SD values of 125.64 and 7.607. the t-value was not found to be statistically significant as the value obtained was 15.90 whereas, the tabulated values was 1.96 which 3998 degrees of freedom at .05 level of significant.

Discussion and Conclusions

The results of the study are concluded as follows:

To the above analysis it revealed that there were significant difference obtained on pull-up, sit-up and shuttle run among various age groups (13 years to 16 years) of boys. When the paired mean difference on pull-up, sit-up and shuttle-run were found that significant differences existed between 13 years & 14 years, 13 years & 15 years, 13 years & 16 years, 14 years & 15 years, 14 years & 16 years, 15 years 16 years of boys. There were significant difference obtained on standing broad jump and 50 yard dash among significant differences were obtained between 13 years and 15 years, 13 years and 16 years, 14 years and 15 years, 14 years and 16 years. There were significant differences obtained on 600 yard run/walk among different age groups of boys. Further significant differences were obtained between 13 years and 14 years, 13 years and 15 years, 13 years and 16 years.

References

1. Andrew BC. Physical Education level of Canadian and South African Schools Boys. Dissertation Abstracts International. 1976; 36:5912.
2. Anindya KD. School-Based Physical Fitness Testing Identifies Large Disparities in Childhood Overweight in Los Angeles". Journal of American Dietetic Association.

- 2006; 106(1):118-121.
3. Anna E. Fitness of Fourth Grade Children". Research Journal, Quarterly. 1958; 29; 3:274-278.
 4. Anyanwu SU. Physical Fitness of Nigerian Youth". Dissertation Abstract International. 1977; 38:2642.
 5. Arnason A. Physical Fitness, Injuries and Team Performance in Soccer. Journal of Medical Science & Sports. 2004; 36(2)278-285.
 6. Ball DC. The Effect of Physical Education Curricula on Physical Fitness Knowledge and Life-Style". Dissertation Abstract International. 1995; 48:861-A.
 7. Barbanti VJ. A Comparative Study of Selected Anthropometric and Physical Fitness Measurement of Brazilian and American School Children." Dissertation Abstract International. 1983; 43:3840.
 8. Barbara A. Childhood Physical Fitness Tests: Predictor of Adult Physical Activity Levels". Journal of Pediatrics. 1998; 82(3):324-330.
 9. Carlyle F. Physical Fitness Training and Mental Health". Journal of American Psychologist. 1981; 36(4):373-389.
 10. Chandel AS. A Comparative study of selected Physical Fitness Physiological and Anthropometric Variables of Tribal and Non-Tribal Students of Himachal Pradesh". Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Panjab University, Chandigarh. 1993.
 11. Frost RB. Psychology Concept Apple Physical Education and Coaching". Addison Wesley Publication C. Inc. 1971, 15-155.
 12. Gatchell B. Physical Fitness a Way of Life." New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1976.
 13. Gentona L. Energy and Macronutrient Requirements for Physical Fitness in Exercising Subjects". Journal of Clinical Nutritional. 2010.
 14. Glen LR. A Normative Study of the AAHPER Youth Fitness Test for Boys in Grade Seventh Through Ten in State of South Dakota". Completed Research in Health, Physical Education and Recreation. 1970, 207.
 15. Goslin RB, Stephen BB. Physical Fitness of South African Children". Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness. 1986; 26(2):120-136.
 16. Hamer M. Prospective Study of Physical Fitness, Adiposity, and Inflammatory Markers in Healthy Middle-Aged Men and Women. Journal of American Clinical Nutrition. 2009; 89:85-89.
 17. Harma M. Ageing, Physical Fitness and Shift-Work Tolerance. Journal of Applied Ergonomics. 1996; 27(1):25-29.
 18. Harold MMR. A Practical Approach to Measurement in Physical. 1979.
 19. Sloan AW. Physical Fitness of College Student in South African, United States of American and England." Research Quarterly. 1963; 34:244.
 20. Stephens GH. The Effect of the Additions of an Obstacle Course on Physical Fitness of Fifth Grade Children". Dissertation Abstract International. 1970; 30:5278.
 21. Stroth S. Physical Fitness, But Not Acute Exercise Modulates Event-Related Potential Indices for Executive Control in Healthy Adolescents. Journal of Brain Research, Germany. 2009; 1269:114-124.
 22. Stube KL. Improving Motor Skills and Physical Fitness in the Elementary School: Can you do both". Dissertation Abstract International. 1990; 51:1547-A.
 23. Uppal AK. Physical Fitness How to Develop." New Delhi: Friends Publication.
 24. Health Education. 1992; 40(1):30-36.
 25. Zajko C. Physical Fitness Cognitive Performance and Aging". Journal of American Medical Association. 1991; 23(7):
 26. Zuti B. William CBC. Physical Fitness Norms for College Freshman". Research Journal, Quarterly. 1977; 48:499.