



Influence of Continuous and Interval Running on Selected Strength and Endurance Parameters

Dr. R.Chinnaiyan

Assistant Professor, Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Annamalai University, Chidambaram, Tamilnadu, India.

Received 16th July 2017, Accepted 16th August 2017

Abstract

The purpose of the present study was to find the effect of continuous running and interval running on selected strength and endurance parameters. For this purpose of the study, forty five subjects studying M.P.Ed 's degree in Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Annamalai university, Annamalai Nagar, Tamilnadu were selected as subjects. The age group of 18 – 24 years were selected. They were divided into three equal groups of fifteen subjects each. In which group – I underwent continuous running, group – II underwent interval running and group – III acted as control, who did not participate in any special training. The experimental groups underwent their respective training programme for three days in a week for twelve weeks. The following variables namely explosive strength, strength endurance and cardio respiratory endurance were selected as criterion variables. The selected strength and endurance parameters namely explosive strength, strength endurance and cardio respiratory endurance were tested by using standing broad jump, bend knee sit ups and cooper's 12 min run/ walk test separately. The pre and post test data were collected with the subjects at prior to and after the training period on selected strength and endurance parameters. The analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to find out the significant difference, if any among the groups separately. Since, three groups were involved, whenever the obtained 'F' ratio for the adjusted post test was found to be significant, the scheffe's test was applied as post hoc test to find out the paired mean differences. In all the cases .05 level of confidence was fixed to test the significance, which was considered as an appropriate. It was concluded from the results that the continuous running and interval running groups have improved selected strength and endurance parameters significantly.

Keywords: Continuous, Interval, Strength, Endurance Parameters.

© Copy Right, IJRRAS, 2017. All Rights Reserved.

Introduction

J.P. Thomas says that "physical education is education through physical activities for the development of total personality of the child and its fulfillment and perfection in body mind and spirit". Butcher considers physical education as "an integral part of total education process which has its aim the development of physically, mentally, emotionally and socially fit citizen through the medium of physical activities which have been selected with a view of realizing these out come.

Methodology

The purpose of the study was designed to examine the effect of continuous and interval running on selected strength and endurance parameters. To achieve this purpose of the study, forty five men students studying M.P.Ed 's s degree in Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Tamilnadu were selected as subjects were randomly selected as subjects. They were divided into three equal groups. Each group consisted of the

fifteen subjects. Group I underwent continuous running and Group II underwent interval running for three days per week for twelve weeks. Group III acted as control who did not undergo any special training program apart from their regular physical education program. The following variables namely explosive strength, strength endurance and cardio respiratory endurance were selected as criterion variables. The selected strength and endurance parameters namely explosive strength, strength endurance and cardio respiratory endurance were tested by using standing broad jump, bend knee sit ups and cooper's 12 min run/ walk test separately. All the subjects of three groups were tested on selected dependent variables at prior to and immediately after the training program. The analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to analyze the significant difference, if any among the groups. The .05 level of confidence was fixed as the level of significance to test the 'F' ratio obtained by the analysis of covariance, which was considered as an appropriate.

Analysis of the Data

The influence of continuous and interval running on each criterion variables were analyzed separately and presented below.

Correspondence

Dr.R.Chinnaiyan
Annamalai University

Explosive strength

The analysis of covariance on explosive strength of the pre and post test scores of continuous

running group interval running group and control group have been analyzed and presented in Table I.

Table I. Analysis of covariance of the data on explosive strength of pre and post tests scores of continuous running, interval running and control groups

Test	Continuous Running Group	Interval Running Group	Control Group	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Squares	Obtained 'F' Ratio
Pre Test								
Mean	1.80	1.81	1.79	Between	0.008	2	0.004	2.00
S.D.	0.02	0.01	0.02	Within	0.19	42	0.002	
Post Test								
Mean	1.86	1.83	1.80	Between	0.022	2	0.011	12.22*
S.D.	0.02	0.02	0.02	Within	0.04	42	0.0009	
Adjusted Post Test								
Mean	1.86	1.84	1.80	Between	0.19	2	0.095	47.50*
				Within	0.09	41	0.002	

* Significant at .05 level of confidence.

(The table values required for significance at .05 level of confidence for 2 and 42 and 2 and 41 are 3.222 and 3.226 respectively).

The table I shows that the adjusted post-test means of continuous running group interval running group and control group are 1.86, 1.84 and 1.80 respectively on explosive strength. The obtained "F" ratio of 47.50 for adjusted post-test means is more than the table value of 3.226 for df 2 and 41 required for significance at .05 level of confidence on explosive strength. The results of the study indicated that there was

a significant difference between the adjusted post-test means of continuous running group, interval running group and control group on explosive strength. Since, three groups were compared whenever the obtained "F" ratio for the adjusted post test was found to be significant, the scheffe's test was applied as post hoc test to find out the paired mean differences, if any and it was presented in table I- A.

Table I – A. The scheffe's test for the differences between paired means on explosive strength

Continuous Running Group	Interval Running Group	Control Group	Mean differences	Confidence interval value
1.86	1.84	-	0.02*	0.006
1.86	-	1.80	0.06*	0.006
-	1.84	1.80	0.04*	0.006

* Significant at .05 level of confidence.

The table I- A showed that the mean difference values between continuous running group and interval running group, continuous running group and control group and interval running group and control group on explosive strength were 0.02, 0.06 and 0.04 respectively which were greater than the required confidence interval value 0.006 at .05 level of confidence. The results of the study showed that there was a significant difference between continuous running group and interval running

group, continuous running group and control group and interval running group and control group on explosive endurance.

Strength endurance

The analysis of covariance on strength endurance of the pre and post test scores of continuous running group interval running group and control group have been analyzed and presented in Table II.

Table II. Analysis of covariance of the data on strength endurance of pre and post tests scores of continuous running, interval running and control groups

Test	Continuous Running Group	Interval Running Group	Control Group	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Squares	Obtained 'F' Ratio
Pre Test								
Mean	37.22	37.41	37.36	Between	0.008	2	0.004	0.210
S.D.	0.95	0.81	0.99	Within	0.81	42	0.019	
Post Test								
Mean	43.21	40.83	38.41	Between	0.978	2	0.489	12.54*
S.D.	0.98	0.77	0.88	Within	1.66	42	0.039	
Adjusted Post Test								
Mean	43.75	41.59	37.99	Between	0.812	2	0.406	9.90*
				Within	1.71	41	0.041	

* Significant at .05 level of confidence.

(The table values required for significance at .05 level of confidence for 2 and 42 and 2 and 41 are 3.222 and 3.226 respectively).

The table II shows that the adjusted post-test means of continuous running interval running group and control group are 43.75, 41.59 and 37.99 respectively on strength endurance. The obtained "F" ratio of 9.90 for adjusted post-test means is more than the table value of 3.226 for df 2 and 41 required for significance at .05 level of confidence on strength endurance. The results of the study indicated that there was a significant difference

between the adjusted post-test means of continuous running group, interval running group on strength endurance. Since, three groups were compared whenever the obtained "F" ratio for the adjusted post test was found to be significant, the scheffe's test was applied as post hoc test to find out the paired mean differences, if any and it was presented in table II- A.

Table II – A. The scheffe's test for the differences between paired means on strength endurance

Continuous Running Group	Interval Running Group	Control Group	Mean differences	Confidence interval value
43.75	41.59	-	2.16*	1.98
43.75	-	37.99	5.76*	1.98
-	41.59	37.99	3.60*	1.98

* Significant at .05 level of confidence.

The table II- A showed that the mean difference values between continuous running group and interval running group, continuous running group and control group and interval running group and control group on strength endurance were 2.16, 5.76 and 3.60 respectively which were greater than the required confidence interval value 1.98 at .05 level of confidence. The results of the study showed that there was a significant difference between continuous running group and interval running

group, continuous running group and control group and interval running group and control group on strength endurance.

Cardio Respiratory Endurance

The analysis of covariance on cardio respiratory endurance of the pre and post test scores of continuous running group, interval running group and control group have been analyzed and presented in Table III.

Table III. Analysis of covariance of the data on cardio respiratory endurance of pre and post tests scores of continuous running, interval running and control groups

Test	Continuous Running Group	Interval Running Group	Control Group	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Squares	Obtained 'F' Ratio
Pre Test								
Mean	1536.12	1539.47	1541.05	Between	200.48	2	100.24	0.18
S.D.	26.41	20.04	20.99	Within	23090.10	42	549.76	
Post Test								
Mean	1564.55	1550.81	1542.82	Between	3626.03	2	1813.015	3.35*
S.D.	24.71	20.25	22.20	Within	22709.10	42	540.69	
Adjusted Post Test								
Mean	1563.55	1549.64	1540.32	Between	5302.88	2	2651.44	42.88*
				Within	2535.01	41	61.83	

* Significant at .05 level of confidence.

(The table values required for significance at .05 level of confidence for 2 and 42 and 2 and 41 are 3.222 and 3.226 respectively).

The table III shows that the adjusted post-test means of continuous running group, interval running group and control group are 1563.55, 1549.64 and 1540.32 respectively on cardio respiratory endurance. The obtained "F" ratio of 42.88 for adjusted post-test means is more than the table value of 3.226 for df 2 and 41 required for significance at .05 level of confidence on cardio respiratory endurance. The results of the study

indicated that there was a significant difference between the adjusted post-test means of continuous running group, interval running group on cardio respiratory endurance. Since, three groups were compared whenever the obtained "F" ratio for the adjusted post test was found to be significant, the scheffe's test was applied as post hoc test to find out the paired mean differences, if any and it was presented in table III- A.

Table III – A. The Scheffe's test for the differences between paired means on cardio respiratory endurance

Continuous Running Group	Interval Running Group	Control Group	Mean differences	Confidence interval value
1563.55	1549.64	-	13.91*	7.99
1563.55	-	1540.32	23.23*	7.99
-	1549.64	1540.32	9.32*	7.99

* Significant at .05 level of confidence.

The table III - A showed that the mean difference values between continuous running group and interval running group, continuous running group and control group and interval running group and control group on cardio respiratory endurance were 13.91, 23.23 and 9.32 respectively which were greater than the required confidence interval value 7.82 at .05 level of confidence. The results of the study showed that there was a significant difference between continuous running group and interval running group, continuous running group and control group and interval running group and control group on cardio respiratory endurance.

Conclusions

1. There was a significant difference among continuous running group interval running group and control group on explosive strength, strength endurance and cardio respiratory endurance.
2. And also it was found that there was a significant improvement on selected criterion variables such

as explosive strength, strength endurance and cardio respiratory endurance due to continuous running and interval running.

References

1. Harrison Clarke, Application of Measurement of Health and Physical Education, (Englewood Cliffs: New Jersey Prentice Hall, 176), p. 50.
2. Charles A. Bucher, Administration of School Health and Physical education Programme, (Saint Louis: C.V. Mosby Company, 1958), p. 156.
3. Chu, D.A. (1998) Jumping into plyometrics. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
4. Baechle, T.R. and Earle, R.W. (2000) Essentials of strength training and conditioning. 2nd edition. Champaign, IL: National Strength and Conditioning Association
5. Hardayal Singh, Science of Sports Training, (New Delhi: D.V.S. Publication, 1991), p.5.