



Comparative Study of Physical Fitness of Government and Non-Government School Boys

¹Dr. Ajay Kumar, ²Dr. Nandalal Singh

¹Lecturer of Physical Education, Govt. Sen. Sec. School, Chandigarh, India

²Assistant Professor, Department of Physical Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

^{1&2}nandalal_th@yahoo.co.in

Abstract: The purpose of the present study was to compare the physical fitness of Government and Non-Government school boys of Chandigarh. The AAHPER (1976) Youth Physical Fitness Test (Test Item Six : Pull-up, Sit-up, Shuttle Run, Standing Broad Jump, 50 yard Dash and 600 Yard Run/Walk) was conducted on 4000 male students ranging between 13 to 16 years students in different schools from Government (N=2000) and Non-Government (N=2000) area of Chandigarh (UT). To compare the mean differences between the Government and Non-Government school boys 't' test was computed with the help of SPSS Software. The level of significance chosen was .05. There were significant differences obtained between government and Non-Government school boys. The finding reveals that Non-Government school boys are superior in their physical fitness than their counterparts.

Key Words: *Physical Fitness, Shuttle Run and Standing Broad Jump.*

Introduction:

“Physical fitness is one’s richest possession; it cannot be purchased, it has to be earned through a daily routine of physical exercises.”

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 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.

The American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Recreation emphasizes the necessity for individualized instruction, aimed at assisting students to find themselves physically. Physical fitness is the capacity to carry out reasonably well various forms of physical activities without being excessively tired and includes qualities importance to the

individual's health and wellbeing. Regular participation in vigorous exercise increases physical fitness. A high level of physical fitness is desirable for a full, productive life. Sedentary living habits and poor physical fitness have a negative impact on both health and daily living.

Concept of Physical Fitness is as old as mankind, keeping in mind the survival of the fittest, down through the ages, only strong and agile people could defend invaders, protect themselves and their property. It is a hard fact that physically fit people are in a better position to bear the rigorous and abnormal stress and strain, than those. Who are less physically fit? The basic moments like running, jumping, climbing, throwing, lifting etc, require specific physical attributes such as muscular strength, muscular endurance, cardio-respiratory endurance, and strength, balance and coordination. Therefore this present study was an effort to investigate the physical fitness status between Government and Non-Government school boys.

Materials and Methodology:

In this current study, a sample of 4000 male students ranging between 13 to 16 years studying in different high schools from Government (2000 students) and Non-Government (2000 students) area of Chandigarh was taken as subjects for this study. AAPHER Youth Physical Fitness Test Battery (1976) was used to measure Physical Fitness Status of the subjects. The test battery consist these six test items: Pull-up, Sit-up, Shuttle Run, Standing Broad Jump, 50 yard Dash and 600 Yard Run/Walk. To compare the mean differences between the Government and Non-Government school boys, "t" test was applied using Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) Software. The level of significance chosen was .05.

Results and Discussion:

The data collected by adopting above procedure were statistically analyzed. The results are presented in the following tables. For testing the significance in Pull-up, Sit-up, Shuttle Run, Standing Broad Jump, 50 yard Dash and 600 Yard Run/Walk, the level of significance chosen was .05. The comparison between the Government and Non-Government school boys for the selected physical fitness variables: Pull-up, Sit-up, Shuttle Run, Standing Broad Jump, 50 yard Dash and 600 Yard Run/Walk were statistically analyzed using, "t" test. The data pertaining to the same is presented in Table 1.

TABLE: 1

Comparison of Scores on Pull-up, Sit-up, Shuttle Run, Standing Broad Jump, 50 yard Dash and 600 Yard Run/Walk of Government (G) and Non-Government (NG) School Boys

Variables	Group	N	Mean	S D	M D	SED	„t“ ratio
Pull-up	GSB	2000	4.87	2.942			4.77*
	NGSB	2000	5.32	2.983	0.448	.094	
Sit-up	GSB	2000	20.35	4.804			8.52*
	NGSB	2000	19.02	5.071	1.330	.156	
Shuttle-Run	GSB	2000	11.558	.7057			1.86
	NGSB	2000	11.510	.9184	0.0483	.0259	
SBJ	GSB	2000	1.5820	.20330			1.087
	NGSB	2000	1.5892	.21906	0.0072	.0067	
50 Yard Dash	GSB	2000	8.599	.7582			11.04*
	NGSB	2000	8.323	.8212	0.2761	0.250	
600Yard Run/Walk	GSB	2000	121.60	8.402			15.90*
	NGSB	2000	125.64	7.607	4.031	.253	

*Significant at .05 level

„t“_{.05 (3998)} = 1.96

It is depicted from the Table 1 that the calculated „t“ values in case of Government and Non-Government school boys on pull-up, Sit-up, 50 yard Dash and 600 Yard Run/Walk were found to be statistically significant as the value obtained were 4.77(Pull-Up), 8.52 (Sit-Up), 11.04 (50 yard Dash), 15.90 (600 Yard Run/Walk) whereas, the tabulated value was 1.96 which 3998 degrees of freedom at .05 level of significant.

Discussion:

There were significant differences obtained on pull-up, sit-up, 50 yard Dash and 600 Yard

Run/Walk, Government and Non-Government school boys. There were no significant differences obtained on shuttle run and standing broad jump of Government and Non-Government school boys. The probable reason could be that the subjects of this study were during growth period and their physical fitness differed because of their diet, infrastructure, daily routine, home environment and way of living differences. Hence, the Government and Non-Government school boys were differed significantly. The finding reveals that Non-Government school boys are superior in their physical fitness status than their counterparts.

Conclusions:

In the light of the findings and limitations of the present study the following conclusions were drawn: There were significant differences obtained on pull-up, sit-up, 50 yard Dash and 600 Yard Run/Walk, Government and Non-Government school boys. There were no significant differences obtained on shuttle run and standing broad jump of Government and Non-Government school boys.

References:

1. Alston D J 1965. The Physical Fitness Programme of High School Girls on Three Physical Fitness Test. Completed Research in Health, Physical Education and Recreation. 7 (74).
2. Andrew BC 1976. Physical Fitness Levels of Canadian and South African Schools Boys. Dissertation Abstracts International. 36: 5912-A.
3. Blair SN 1993. Physical Activity, Physical Fitness and All-Cause Mortality In Women: Do Women Need To Be Active. Journal of American College of Nutrition. 12(4):368-371.
4. Carlyle F 1981. Physical Fitness Training and Mental Health. Published American Psychologist. 36(4): 373-389.
5. Chandel AS 1993. 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.
6. Clarke HH 1984. Research Processes in Physical Education. Prentice Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs: New Jersey.
7. Fraser G 1983. Physical Fitness and Blood Pressure in School Children. Online Journal of Chest. 115: 158-164.

8. Hakkinen A 2010. Association of Physical Fitness with Health-Related Quality of Life in Finnish Young Men. *Online Journal of Health and Quality of Life Outcomes* 10: 1477-7525.
9. Hunsicker P 1976. AAPHER Youth Fitness Test Manual Revised. American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Washington, D.C.
10. Johnson, B L and Nelson JH 1982. *Practical Measurements for Evaluations in Physical education*. Surjeet Publication: New Delhi.
11. Kansal DK 1996. *Test and Measurement in Sports and Physical Education*. D.V.S Publication: New Delhi.
12. Singh A 1986. *Normative Study of Physical Fitness of Panjab University Men Students Unpublished Doctoral Thesis*. Panjab University, Chandigarh.