
A study on selected physical fitness components of rural and urban school going adolescent students

Dr. Kaveri Hanmanthappa

Dept Physical Education, Gulbarga University, Kalaburagi, Karnataka

Abstract

The main aim of this study was to find out the differences of selected physical fitness components between urban and rural school going adolescent students. 40 boys' students have been selected for this study. Selected age group 14-18 was taken for this study. After completing the research, the researcher found that significance mean difference found between Urban and Rural school going adolescent boys. The researcher found that there are some components where rural students are showing good and there are some components where urban students are showing good results. The mean timing of urban school boys in 50 mt sprint is 8.25 sec. whereas the mean timing of rural boys is 7.04 sec. The mean timings of urban and rural students in shuttle run are 11 sec and 11.45 sec. The mean distances covered in standing broad jump by urban and rural students are 1.79 mt and 2.09 mt. Mean sit ups count of urban and rural boys are 34.15 and 30.05. From the above table the

researcher found urban school boys are showing good results in shuttle run and bent knee sit ups. Whereas rural boys are showing good results in 50 mt sprint and standing broad jump.

Keywords: physical fitness, adolescent students, standing broad jump

Introduction

Physical fitness is a state of health and well-being and, more specifically, the ability to perform aspects of sports, occupations and daily activities. Physical fitness is generally achieved through proper nutrition, moderate-vigorous physical exercise, and sufficient rest. People who are physically fit are also healthier, are able to maintain their most optimum weight, and are also not prone to cardiac and other health problems. In order to maintain a relaxed state of mind, a person should be physically active. A person who is fit both physically and mentally is strong enough to face the ups and downs of life, and

is not affected by drastic changes if they take place. The main aim of this study was to find out the differences of selected physical fitness components between urban and rural school going adolescent students. 40 boys' students have been selected for this study. Selected age group 14-18 was taken for this study. After completing the research, the researcher found that significance mean difference found between Urban and Rural school going adolescent boys.

Objective of the study: Objectives of this study was to prepare a fitness related profile of urban and rural school going boys.

Methodology: Total 40 students were selected as the subjects for this study. Only boys have been taken as the subjects for the study. 50mt.dash and shuttle run was measured by in second by using stopwatch, standing broad jump was measured by using a still tape & bent knee sit up in reference with the time duration of one minute.

Tools: Stop watch, steel tape.

Procedure : Total 40 adolescent students were selected for the study. 20 students from rural school and 20 students from urban school.

Findings: The mean timing of urban school boys in 50 mt sprint is 8.25 sec.

whereas the mean timing of rural boys is 7.04 sec. The mean timings of urban and rural students in shuttle run are 11 sec and 11.45 sec. The mean distances covered in standing broad jump by urban and rural students are 1.79 mt and 2.09 mt. Mean sit ups count of urban and rural boys are 34.15 and 30.05. From the above table the researcher found urban school boys are showing good results in shuttle run and bent knee sit ups. Whereas rural boys are showing good results in 50 mt sprint and standing broad jump.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Rural School Going Adolescent Students

	50mt	10MT(SEC)	SBJ(MT)	SIT UP(60 SEC)
Mean	7.04	11.46	2.09	30.05
Standard Error	0.11	0.15	0.03	1.35
Standard Deviation	0.51	0.68	0.14	6.06
Minimum	6.25	10.65	1.80	20.00
Maximum	7.97	12.56	2.25	42.00
N	20	20	20	20

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Urban School Going Adolescent Students

	50mt	10MT(SEC)	SBJ(MT)	SIT UP(60 SEC)
Mean	8.25	11.00	1.79	34.15
Standard Error	0.30	0.23	0.05	2.73
Standard Deviation	1.35	1.01	0.22	12.21
Minimum	6.62	9.87	1.52	10.00
Maximum	12.64	14.20	2.20	57.00
N	20	20	20	20

Results

Table 3: Mean Difference of Selected Physical Fitness Components of Rural School Going Adolescent Students

	Mean	Mean Difference	Std. Error Diff.	t-value	P-value
Urban	8.25	1.21	0.32	3.74	0.0006
Rural	7.04				
Urban	11	-0.46	-0.28	1.65	0.11
Rural	11.46				
Urban	1.79	-0.30	-0.06	5.11	0.0009
Rural	2.09				
Urban	34.15	4.10	3.04	1.35	0.19
Rural	30.05				

*. Significant at

.05 level

Table value = 2.02

From table 3: Mean difference of timing in 50 mt. dash between urban and rural students is 1.21 second. Mean difference of timing in shuttle run between urban and rural students is 0.46 second. Mean difference of distance covered in standing broad jump between urban and rural students is 0.30 mts. Mean difference of bent knee sit up between urban and rural students is 4.10. Table value of $t = 2.02$ whereas $df = 19$.

Conclusion

From this study the researcher significant difference found in different physical fitness components. This study may help other people to prepare a physical fitness parameter.

References

- [1]. Friedenreich CM, Orenstein MR. Physical activity and cancer prevention: etiologic evidence and biological mechanisms. *The Journal of Nutrition*; 2002; 132(11):3456S-3464S.
- [2]. Hallal PC, Andersen LB, Bull FC, Guthold R, Haskell W, Ekelund U. Global physical activity levels: Surveillance progress, pitfalls, and prospects. *The Lancet*, 2012; 380(9838):247-257.

[3]. Janssen I, Carson V, Lee IM, Katzmarzyk PT, Blair SN. Years of life gained due to leisure-time physical activity in the U.S. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*;2013; 44(1):23-9.

[4]. Lee IM, Shiroma EJ, Lobelo F, Puska P, Blair SN, Katzmarzyk PT. Lancet Physical Activity Series Working Group. Effect of physical inactivity on major non-communicable diseases worldwide: an analysis of burden of disease and life expectancy. *Lancet*. 2012; 380(9838):219-29.