

University of North Dakota
UND Scholarly Commons

Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects

5-1-1964

# Warn-Up Exercise: Comparing Static and Conventional Methods of Exercise With Freshman Male Studnets at the University of North Dakota

Thomas B. Reynolds

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.und.edu/theses

## **Recommended Citation**

Reynolds, Thomas B., "Warn-Up Exercise: Comparing Static and Conventional Methods of Exercise With Freshman Male Studnets at the University of North Dakota" (1964). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3974. https://commons.und.edu/theses/3974

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.commons@library.und.edu.

#### WARM-GO EXERCISE: CONVARING STATIC AND CONVENTIONAL METHODS OF EXERCISE WITH FRESHMAN MALE STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SORTH DANOTA

#### Thomas B. Reynolds, Master of Science

The thesis here abstracted was written under the direction of Walter C. Bosnig, and approved by John L. Quaday and Pelix J. Vendracek as members of the examining committee, of which Mr. Keenig was chairman.

This study had three purposes: one, to determine the effectiveness of static remistance exercises as compared to conventional exercises while being used in physical education classes; secondly, to provide a series of exercises where-by static remistance exercises may be taught without the use of equipment in physical education classes; thirdly, to compare the arm, leg, and back strength gained as a result of the different warm-up programs.

Thirty-four University of North Dakota freehmen male physical education service students were divided into two grops, equated on the basis of results takes from their American Association of Health Physical Education and Recreation Youth Fitness Test.

Each group was tested the first week, the fourth week and at the end of the eight week progras. The tests were the leg and back strength tests using the dynamometer, the arm strength tests using the bent arm hang and bar dips.

The significance of difference between the test-retest-rotest within each group and between groups was tested by the "t" technique for paired observations of ascall manples. Rejection of the null hypothesis was assumed beyond the .05 level of significance.

The conclusions indicated by this study weret.

1. Static resistance can significantly increase arm, back, and leg strength in four weaks.

2. The static resistance group showed no significant gais of strength during the last four weeks.

3. The convectional exercise group revealed no significant differences in their test-retest-retest.

This abstract of a thesis submitted by Thomas 3. Reynolds in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of science in the University of North Datota is hereby approved by the committee under whom the work of the thosis has been done.

al raten a. gunny

This thesis submitted by Thomas B. Reynolds in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Science in the University of North Dakota, is hereby approved by the Committee under whom the work has been done.

W.C. Koenig Chairman

John L. Quaday Felix Hondrocck.

leverplus J. A

Dean of the Graduate School

T1964 R33

WARM-UP EXERCISE: COMPARING STATIC AND CONVENTIONAL MUTHODS OF EXERCISE WITH FRESHMAN MALE STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF BORTH DAKOTA

By

#### Thomas B. Reynolds

B. S. in Mysical Education, North Dakota State University 1962

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty

of the

Graduate School

of the

University of North Dakota

in pertial fulfillment of the requimements

for the Degree of

Master of Science

Grand Forks, North Dakota

May 1964

#### ACENOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his grateful appreciation for the valuable assistance rendered by Dr. John Quaday and Mr. Walter C. Keenig, for their helpful suggestions and guidance in the writing of this research.

The author also wishes to express his appreciation for valuable moral support and patience from his wife, Gail.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	111
LIST OF TADLES	₹
Chapter I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study Need for the Study Limitations of the Study Definition of Terms	
II. RELATED LITERATURE	4
Warm-up Exercise Research in Isometrics	
III. METHODS OF RESEARCH	12
Procedure Warm-up Exercise Programs Testing Experimental Design and Procedure	
IV. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA	18
Statistical Procedure Results of Comparison	
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	33
Summary Conclusions Recommendations	
BIRLIOGRAPHY	36
APPENDIX A	38
APPENDIX B	49
APPENDIX C	64

Page

## LIST OF TABLES

Table

Page

1.	Paired Scores on the American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation Youth Fitness Test	13
2.	Date and Amount of Time Spent on Each Emercine Program	17
3.	Comparison of Mean Scores of 34 Subjects Tested for Leg Strength	26
4.	Comparison of Mean Scores of 34 Subjects Tested for Back Strength	27
5.	Comparison of Mean Scores of 34 Subjects Tested on Arm Strength using the Bent Arm Mang	88
6.	Comparison of Mean Scores of 34 Subjects Tested on Arm Strength using Bar Dips	29
7.	Conventional Warm-up Test-Netest-Retest Comparisons of Mean Scores of Leg Strength, Back Strength, Bent Arm Hang, and Bar Dips	30
8.	Static Resistant Warm-up Test-Retest-Retest Comparisons on Mean Scores on Leg Strength, Back Strength, Bent Arm Hang and Bar Dips	31
9.	Comparison of Results using Accumulative Scores	32

V

#### CHAPTER I

#### INTRODUCTION

Because of the interest developed in static resistance exercises, many new programs have been developed and encouraged for use by physical educators and coaches in their professions. It was felt that static resistance exercise could provide the individual with an exercise program equivalent to the conventional exercise program used in today's physical education programs. The exercises selected for the static resistance program were based on the buddy system with the objective of determining the amount of strength gained through participation in warm-up exercises as illustrated in Appendix A on page 38. The exercises selected for the conventional exercise program were popular exercises used in physical education programs. The objective of the conventional program was to determine the amount of strength that could be gained through warm-up exercises as illustrated in Appendix B on page 49.

#### PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of static resistance exercise as compared to conventional exercise while being used as warm-up exercises for physical education classes. The specific purposes of the study were as follows: 1. To provide a series of exercises where-by static resistance exercises may be taught without the use of equipment in physical education classes.

2. To compare the amount of arm, leg, and back strength gained as a result of the different warm-up programs.

#### NEED FOR THE STUDY

Due to the amount of interest developed in the last few years for static resistance exercise, it would seem to be of utmost importance to develop and justify the feasibility of static resistance exercise in the physical education program. This basic question can be answered by determining the amount of strength gained in warm-up exercises by comparing the use of static resistance and conventional exercises. Due to the emphasis on physical fitness there seems to be a need for further research in this area.

#### LIMITATIONS

The study involved two physical education classes comprising a total of forty-seven students. This number was narrowed down to thirty-four so the two classes could be equated on a matched pairs basis with seventeen subjects in each class. The classes were equated and the individuals were paired on the basis of their scores from the American Assocation of Health Physical Education and Research Youth Fitness Test. Although all freshmen students in the physical education service program at the University of North Dakota had an equal chance of being selected in this study, it must be stated here that the final selection was based on the two sections with mean scores closest to the mean derived from the American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Research Youth Fitness Test.

The study was completed during the first semester 1963-1964, at the University of North Dakota. The study started after a seven week conditioning program, which was designed to help the student attain a higher level of physical fitness.

#### Definition of Terms

Certain concepts are explained below in terms of their meaning as used in this study.

Warm-up-For this study warm-up is considered the exercising period before participation in skilled activity.

Isometric or Static Resistance-Exercises performed using an immovable object as resistance. For this study the resistance was supplied by another student.

Conventional Exercise-Exercises with a wide range of motion with gravity and other body parts acting as resistance.

# CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE

With additional emphasis being placed on physical fitness the author has tried to find a physical education program in which warm-up exercises will retain strength. "The topic of the effects of warm-up upon the efficient development of strength has received the attention of some investigators but, as yet, its value has not been fully determined."<sup>1</sup> Some writers have concluded that warm-up is not beneficial as did Karpovich and Hale in their study, <u>Brogogenic Aids in Athletics</u>, in which they stated, "To our surprise, we could not find any beneficial effect of not only massage, but even of preliminary exercise."<sup>2</sup>

From the related literature found for this study the majority of the writers accepted the idea of warm-up exercises. Morehouse and Miller<sup>5</sup> stated that work of great intensity should be preceded either by a warming up period of work progressive in intensity from low to great, or should be commenced at a reduced rate, load, or range of movement and then gradually increased.

<sup>1</sup>Craig Davis and Gene A. Longan, <u>Warm-up</u> Strength Development and <u>Biophysical Values of Muscular Activity</u> (135 South Locust Street, Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Pub. Co., 1961), p.79.

Peter V. Karpovich, "Erogogenic Aids in Athletics," Exercise and Fitness (University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois: Athletic Institue, 1960), p. 82.

Laurence E. Morehouse and Augustus T. Miller, Physiology of Exercise (3rd ed. rev.; St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Co., 1959), p. 243. Miller<sup>4</sup> maintained that the four general advantages of warming-up are: (1) greater safety, (2) physiological economy, (3) mental readiness, and (4) effective coordination. He also implied that warming-up was beneficial for improvement in skill, endurance, strength, and speed activities in track and field events.

Karpovich' stated informal movements are the general, free movements (such as swinging the area about and stationary running) undertaken solely for raising the temperature of the muscles. This is achieved through the liberation of heat during contraction of the muscles and also through an increased blood flow from the inside of the body. A greater blood supply will insure a greater output of energy because more oxygen and nutriments will be transported more rapidly. A warm muscle will also have a lower viscosity which is of a great importance in the rate of speed of biochemical reactions. Miller stated that "observations on the contraction of isolated muscles provide a clus to the nature of the warming-up process. If the muscle is warmed, the speed with which the muscle contracts and relaxes and the force of contraction are all increased. If previously inactive muscles are stimulated repeatedly, the first few contractions are often small and irregular and relaxation is incomplete.

"Richard I. Miller, "The Science and Practice of Warming-up: Part II," Athletic Journal, XXXI (March, 1951), pp. 46-48, 50-59.

<sup>2</sup>Peter V. Karpovich, "The Physiology of Athletics," <u>Scholastic</u> Coach, (September, 1934), pp. 22-23.

Laurence E. Merchouse and Augustus T. Miller, Physiology of Exercise (2nd ed. rev.; St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Co., 1953), pp. 30-31.

After this, the contractions become stronger and relaxation is complete." Morehouse and Miller agree with Karpovich as they stated that "it is possible that the viscosity of the muscle is thereby decreased by a local rise in temperature and the accumulation of metabolic products which allows contraction and relaxation to occur with greater promptness."<sup>7</sup> Moodward<sup>8</sup> investigating injuries and the safety of athletes stated that one of the causes of torn muscles is the habit of taking strenuous exercise suddenly and in unaccustomed ways when the muscles are not tuned up. The average runner requires from twenty to thirty minutes of steady regular exercise.

Davis and Logan' stated that they felt more attention should be given to the effects of the "buddy system" of exercise for the application of resistance, one athlete providing resistance for another during conditioning phases of the activity. The above recomendation and Berny Warner's<sup>10</sup> article, "Simple Isometrics," fostered the decision to study the effectiveness of using "buddy system" isometrics as a warm-up exercise for students before participation in skilled activity.

7 Ibid., II, 31.

<sup>8</sup>Christopher Woodward, <u>Sports Injuries</u> (London: Max Parris, 1954), p. 117.

<sup>9</sup>Davis and Longan, p. 139.

<sup>10</sup>Berny Warner, "Simple Isometrics," <u>Scholastic Coach</u>, XXXII December, 1962), pp. 22-23.

## Research in Isometric Exercises

In the Hettinger and Miller study, nine male subjects performed static contraction exercises for a period of eighteen months with seventy-one tests administered to each subject to discover the improvement of maximal static strength. All training was performed by pulling and holding a pre-determined amount of tension against a dynamometer. On Saturday of each week maximal strength was measured.

On the average, the increase of maximal muscle strength per week was 5% of the original starting value for that week. Increases in muscular strength were more rapid with increasing intensity of training loads up to two-thirds of the maximal strength. Increases in the training load from two-thirds to maximal tension had no additional effect. One daily exercise in which the tension was held for six seconds resulted in as much increase in strength as did exercises which involved longer periods and more frequent practices.

Mathews and Kruse<sup>12</sup>, in their study, said the purpose of their investigation was to study the effects of isometric type exercises. One hundred and twenty Springfield College male students were tested.

12 Bill Morgan, "Static Exercises, <u>Scholastic Coach</u>, Volume XXXII, n. 6, (February, 1963), p. 24, quoting Hettinger, Thomas and E.A. Muller, "Muskelleistung and Muskeltraining," <u>Arbeitsphysiologie</u>, October, 1953.

LED.K. Mathews and Robert Eruse, "Effect of Isometric and Isotonic Exercise on Elbow Flexor Muscle Groups," <u>Research Quarterly</u>,XXVIII, n. 1 (March, 1957), pp. 26-38

half exercising isometrically and the other half isotonically. The 60 subjects in the isotonic unit exercised to exhaustion on the Kelso-Hellebrandt ergometer with a weight load equal to 3/16 of their maximum strength. The subjects in the isometric unit exercised by exerting maximum effort in three consecutive sixsecond pulls on a strap. The respective groups exercised two, three, four and five times a week over a period of four weeks.

The following results were obtained: (1) no common regression line was found in the eight groups, indicating the strength changes peculiar to the individual, regardless of exercise frequency; (2) the isometric type exercise caused a greater number of subjects to significantly gain in strength; and (3) the five-day-a-week exercise program was most beneficial in terms of strength gains.

Dennison, Howel, and Morford<sup>15</sup> found a slightly different change in their study as they divided twenty subjects into two groups of ten, each enrolled in required programs. The groups were equated on the basis of the scores taken from the Arm Strength Index. Group I participated in a weight training program and Group II performed the thirteen exercises taken from the Commander Set. Both groups met twice a week for eight weeks. The purpose of this study was to determine the relative effects of an isometric exercise program known as the Commander Set developed by Commander Grauque, USN, and Arthur H. Steinhaus.

13 J.D. Dennison, M.S. Howell and W.R. Morford, "Effect of Isometric and Isotonic Exercise Programs Upon Muscular Endurance," Research Quarterly, XXXII, n. 3 (October, 1961), pp. 348-352.

The test given to both groups consisted of (1) dipping strength test, (2) chinning strength test, and (3) the arm strength index. From this study the following conclusions were drawn:

- 1. Both groups showed significant improvement in chinning and dipping ability and the arm strength index.
- Both exercise programs were significant in improvement of the upper arm.
- 3. Group I showed improvements at the .Ol level of confidence in chinning and .O2 level of confidence in dipping.
- Group II showed improvements at the .05 level of confidence in both chinning and dipping.

Morgan<sup>14</sup>stated, "static exercise is of definite value in the development of strength." Morgan based his study on three sources: (1) scientific research conducted in the United States, England, and Germany; (2) the claims made by athletes and teams employing static exercise; and (3) an experimental study conducted by Bill Morgan at the University of Maryland.

The basic program was very similar to the Hettinger and Mueller study previously discussed. The results found by Morgan were:

- 1. The pain phenomena pain must be present to gain strength was the idea of many athletes.
- Endurance static exercises developed strength but could not find a correlation with endurance.
- 3. Static exercises do not develop total fitness.

Morgan took the research material and experience into consideration and then concluded that static exercise permits rapid muscle training with the lowest expenditure of time and energy.

14 Morgan, loc. cit.

A great deal of work has been done with comparing isometric and isotonic programs. Thompson<sup>15</sup> stated that the major conclusion that he could draw from his study was that there is no significant difference in training with either isometrics or weights in the development of strength. The study consisted of comparing many studies from leaders in physical education such as: (1) Councilman, (2) Karpovich, (3) Rasch, (4) Pierson, (5) Locback, (6) Asprey, (7) Swegan, and (8) Maller. The studies were made in either isotonic or isometric training and from these Thompson concluded:

- 1. "Both isotonic and isometric training against resistance cause significant increases in strength development.
- 2. Isotonic and isometric training programs have been compared in the development of strength with conflicting results. However, the majority of the studies indicate there is no significant difference between the two methods in total strength development.
- 3. There appears to be no difference in the tension which can be exerted in a single maximum isometric contraction and the maximum weight which can be moved in a single isotonic contraction."

Wolbers and Sills<sup>16</sup> took two groups of students from the State University of Iowa's High School, which served as subjects to determine whether static muscle contractions would result in significant changes in strength. Four tests of strength were administered at the beginning and at the end of an eight week period. The test was used to determine the significance of the differences between the mean gains of the two groups. The experimental groups made

<sup>13</sup>Hugh Thompson, "Weight Training Vs. Isometric Training," Scholastic Coach, XXXII, n. 1. (September, 1962), p. 38.

16 Charles P. Wolbers and Frank D. Sills, "Development of Strength in High School Boys by Static Muscle Contractions," Research Quarterly, XXXII, n. 4, (December, 1956), p. 446.

greater gains in the back lift, the leg lift and the combined hand grip test than did the control group. These gains were statistically significant.

It was concluded that for the muscle groups tested in this experiment, static muscle contractions of six seconds duration will cause significant gains in strength. The increase in leg strength made by the members of the experimental group were not proportionately great enough to produce a statistically significant gain in the Sargent Jump.

#### CHAPTER III

#### PROCEDURE

The subjects used in this study were all freshman students participating in the physical education service program at the University of North Dakota.

Two physical education classes were selected based on their results on the American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation Youth Fitness Test. This test was administered to all freshman physical education service classes after a six week conditioning program. Two classes with mean scores of 390.8 and 391.2 were selected for the study. The mean score for all students in the freshman physical education service classes was 390.

The results of each individual's American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation Youth Fitness Tests were placed on a T-scale allowing the scores to be totaled. The individual's total scores were used for equating the two groups by the matched pairs procedure as illustrated in Table 1 on page 13

## Warm-up Exercise Program

Group I- The seventeen students that participated in the conventional exercise program shall, from here on, be referred to as Group I. The program for Group I consisted of thirteen exercises that could be executed with gravity serving as the only resistance to the performance of the exercise. The conventional used were: (1) shoulder adduction, (2) shoulder abduction, (3) shoulder extension, (4) shoulder flexion, (5) bicep flexion, (6) triceps flexion, (7) leg adduction, (8) leg abduction, (9) leg extension, (10) leg flexion, (11) back hyper-extension, (12) static sit-up, and (13) static resistance rowing exercise.

#### Testing

Leg Strength - The leg lift was measured with the back and leg dynamometer, with the use of the belt. This test took the longest time to administer and was probably the most difficult to administer. The boy stood erect, with feet placed parallel and with the center of the foot opposite the anchoring chain. The bar was placed in the subject's hands, which were held close together with arms straight down. The bar was pressed lightly against the thighs. The looped end of the belt was slipped over one end of the bar. The free end of the belt was placed around the hips and wrapped around the remaining end of the bar. The subject then assumed partial squat position, with knees bent to an angle of about 130°. The nearest link of the chain attached to the dynamometer was then placed on the anchoring hook. The arms were straight with head held erect and chest up. The subject applied a maximum upward effort. When the belt was released, the score was read to the nearest pound as given on the dial.17

<u>Back lift</u> - The same dynamometer was used for the back lift. The subject stood erect on the platform with the feet in the same

<sup>17&</sup>lt;sub>H. Harrison, Clarke, Application of Measurement to Health</sub> and Physical Education, (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 187.

exercises used were: (1) 20 jumping jacks, (2) running in place, (3) 5 neck twisters each way, (4) wind mill for 30 seconds, (5) 10 burpees, (6) 20 situps, (7) 5 spread eagles, (8) 20 push-ups, (9) 10 modified pull-ups, (10) bicycle for 20 seconds, (11) sit and bob 10 times, (12) 5 wing lifts, and (13) run one lap around the gym. (For explanation and illustrations see Appendix A.)

#### TABLE I

Group I	Test Scores	Gro	up II	Test Score
1. I. S.	424	1.	No No	428
2. R. C.	395	.2.	Bo No	390
3. R. J.	405	3.	F. B.	405
4. J. G.	361	4.	Ro Wo	366
5. J. F.	405	5.	T. A.	405
6. T. O.	428	6.	J. L.	430
7. J. S.	346	7.	W. B.	340
8. W. T.	384	8.	J. C.	386
9. F. B.	410	9.	G. C.	408
10. M. C.	399	10.	M. L.	398
11. D. L.	408	11.	To Jo	408
12. J. H.	354	12.	M. G.	348
13. J. C.	357	13.	B. E.	356
14. H. N.	422	14.	G. G.	424
15. K. W.	370	15.	Ro Wo	372
16. S. L.	386	16.	L. F.	382
17. R. B.	407	17.	R. N.	406
Mean	390.8		Mean	391.2

PAIRED SCORES ON THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, AND RECREATION YOUTH FITNESS TEST

Group II - The seventeen students that participated in the static resistance exercise program, from here on, shall be referred to as Group II. The program for Group II consisted of thirteen exercises that were executed for a maximum duration of six seconds each. The exercises were performed through the use of the buddy system as illustrated in Appendix B. The static resistance exercises

position as for the leg lift, hands on the front of the thigh, fingers extended downward. The chain was booked so that the bar level was just below the finger tips. The handle was grasped at the ends of the bar, with one palm forward and one palm backward. The back was slightly bent at the hips and did not completely straighten when lifting. Care was taken to keep the knees straight. The lift was recorded to the nearest pound as given on the indicator.

<u>Bent arm hans</u> - The subjects were helped to a position on the bar where they could place their hands shoulder width apart, palms outward, on a one-inch standard horizontal bar, with elbows flexed to permit the chin to be level with the bar. The support is removed and the subject holds his chin at the level of the bar as long as he can do so. The legs should remain extended throughout the exercise. The score is the number of seconds the student is able to maintain the bent arm position.

<u>Bar dips</u> - The bar dips or the push-up tests were administered on the regular gymnasium parallel bars. The bars were adjusted approximately to shoulder height and width. The subjects stood at one end of the parallel bars, grasping one bar in each hand. The subject jumped to the front support with arms straight (this counted one) and then lowered his body until the angle of the upper arm add forearm was less than a right angle, then pushed up to the straightarm position (this counted two). This movement was repeated as many times as possible by each student. The subjects were not permitted to jerk or kick when executing push-ups.

18<u>Ibid</u>., pp. 187-188. 19<u>Ibid</u>., p. 239

During the first dip for each subject, the tester gauged the proper elbow angle. The tester then held his fist so that the subject's shoulder touched on each repeated dip. If the subject did not go down to the proper bent-arm angle or all the way to a straight-arm position half-credit was given, up to four half credits.<sup>20</sup>

#### Experimental Design and Procedure

The physical education service program for freshman students at the University of North Dakota was divided into six weeks of conditioning, one week to administer the American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation Youth Fitness Test, and eight weeks of skilled activities. The activities were divided into four class periods each of volleyball, backetball, tumbling, and wrestling.

The experiment for this study started after the completion of the conditioning and testing programs. It was felt that testing at this time would find all subjects at a high level of performance and this should aid in establishing more valid and reliable results. The physical education service program classes met twice a week for one hour periods. The pre-test was given the first day that the skilled activities were to be taught. At this time an explanation was given of the tests, testing equipment, and the exercise program in which they were going to participate.

The bent arm hang was administered by the class instructor, the bar dips by the student leader and the leg and back lifts were

20 Ibid., p. 193

administered by the author. The exercises used were under the direction of the student leaders, (illustrations in Appendix A and Appendix B). The warm-up exercises were performed before each for eight weeks. The warm-up exercises were timed and recorded as each group was expected to finish their warm-up exercises within five minutes after the class period started. The times and dates are given in Table 2

#### TABLE 2

Dates		Dates	
Group I	Time	Group II	Time
Nov. 13	Test #1	Nov. 12	Test A
Nov. 18	10:07	Nov. 14	9:17
Nov. 20	7:04	Nov. 19	6:02
Nov. 25	No classes	Nov. 21	5:48
Nov. 27	6:10	Nov. 26	5:27
Dec. 2	5:35	Dec. 3	5:27
Dec. 4	5:17	Dec. 5	5:23 Test #2
Dec. 9	5:24 Test #2	Dec. 10	5:17
Dec. 11	5:24	Dec. 12	5:19
Dec. 16	5:19	Dec. 17	5:16
Dec. 18	5:21	Dec. 19	5:20
Jan. 6	5:17	Jan. 7	5:17
Jan. 8	5:15	Jan. 9	5:14
Jan. 13	Test #3	Jan. 14	Test #3

DATE AND AMOUNT OF TIME SPENT ON EACH EXERCISE PROGRAM

The second test was given during the class period closest to the beginning of Christmas vacation. The same procedure and tester were used as in the initial test. The author felt it necessary to test at this time because of the two week vacation.

The third test was administered two weeks after the return of the students from Christmas vacation. The same procedure and testers were used as in the two previous testings.

#### CHAPTER IV

#### ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The purpose of this experiment was to determine the relative effects of two warm-up methods upon arm, leg, and back strength. Performances on the three tests for each of the experimental warm-up procedures were analyzed and compared for each of the thirty-four subjects. It became necessary at this point in the study to choose a statistical instrument that would test the significance of the difference between the means of the groups utilizing the two warm-up procedures.

#### Statistical Procedure

The null hypothesis was assumed in analyzing the differences between the means of the two groups. This hypothesis declares that there is no true difference between the two mean scores, and the difference, if found, would be due to a chance occurrence of no significance.<sup>21</sup>

Of the several possible tests of the null hypothesis, the "t" technique for testing the significance of the difference between means derived from paired observations of small samples appeared best suited for this study. This test determines the ratio

<sup>21</sup> Henry E. Garrett, <u>Statistics in Psychology and Education</u>, New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1955, p. 213.

between the mean difference and the estimate of sampling error of the mean difference. This ratio was expressed as "t" and was verified for significance in a "t" table.<sup>22</sup> The value of "t" is proportional to the degrees of freedom (n - 1) allowed in determining the relationship between the mean differences and the estimate of sampling error of the mean difference.<sup>23</sup>

For this study, the null hypothesis was retained up to the .05 level of confidence.

Complete data and the mathematical procedures in the statistical analysis are presented in Appendix C.

#### Leg Strength

#### Conventional Warm-up vs. Static Resistance Warm-up

The conventional warm-up procedure for leg strength (used by Group I) resulted in mean scores of 88.58 pounds (test #1), 893.52 (test #2), 901.76 pounds (test #3) as compared to mean scores of 747.35 pounds (test #1), 861.17 pounds (test #2), 892.22 pounds (test #3) for the static resistance warm-up procedure used by Group II. The standard errors of the differences between means for the two groups were 54.51, 73.54, 64.68 pounds respectively. With 16 degrees of freedom, "t" value at the .05 level of confidence was 2.19, so the null hypothesis was rejected on test #1 and accepted on tests #2 and #3 as shown on Table 3 on page 26. Group I

22 Allen L. Edwards, Statistical Methods for the Behavioral Sciences, New York: Reinhart and Co. Inc., 1954, p. 255.

23 Quinn McNemar, Psychological Statistics, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1949, p. 221. was significantly superior on leg strength to that of Group II on test #1. There was no significant difference in leg strength between the two groups on tests #2 and #3.

#### Test-Retest-Retest for Conventional Warm-up

The conventional warm-up procedure for leg strength resulted in mean scores as given on page 19. The standard error of the difference between two means for test #1 and test #2, test #1 and test #3, test #2 and test #3 were 26.97, 28.60, and 241.94 pounds respectively. With 16 degrees of freedom, "t" values of .294, .594, and .330 were obtained. The null hypothesis was accepted on the test-retest-retest for conventional warm-up on the amount of leg strength gained and lost as shown in Table 6 on page 29. The leg strength test indicated that Group I had no significant changes in leg strength between tests #1 and #2, #1 and #3, #2 and #3.

## Test-Retest-Retest for Static Resistance Wara-up

The static resistance warm-up procedure for leg strength resulted in mean scores as given above. The standard error of the difference between two means for tests #1 and #2, #1 and #3, #2 and #3 were 25:<sup>79</sup>, 46.84, and 10.72 pounds respectively. With 16 degrees of freedom, "t" values of 2.64, 3.09, and 2.89 were obtained. From the "t" values obtained the null hypothesis was rejected on the test-retest-retest for exercises used for Group II as shown on Table 7 on page 30. The leg strength test indicated that Group II had significant improvement in leg strength between tests #1 and #2, #1 and #3, #2 and #3.

#### Back Strength

#### Conventional Warm-up vs. Static Resistance Warm-up

The conventional warm-up procedure for back strength resulted in mean scores of 318.53, 312.64, and 322.94 pounds respectively for the three tests as compared to mean scores of 247.41, 294.70, and 308.23 pounds for the static resistance warm-up procedure. The standard errors of the differences between means were 15.95, 12.45, and 17.03 pounds respectively. With 16 degrees of freedom, "t" values of 4.46, .144, and .863 were obtained. The needed "t" value at the .05 level of confidence was 2.19, so the null hypothesis was rejected on test #1 and accepted on tests #2 and #3, as shown on Table 4 on page 27. Group I was significantly superior on back strength to that of Group II on test #1. There was no significant difference in back strength between the two groups on test #2 and #3.

#### Test-Retest-Retest for Conventional Warm-up

The conventional warm-up procedure for back strength resulted in mean scores as given above. The standard errors of the difference between means for tests #1 and #2, #1 and #3, #2 and #3 were 6.88, 8.48, 5.29 pounds respectively. With 16 degrees of freedom, "t" values of .858, .520, and 1.94 were obtained. The null hypothesis was accepted on the test-retest-retest for conventional warm-up on the amount of back strength gained and lost as shown in Table <sup>6</sup>, page 29.

#### Test-Retest-Retest for Static Resistance Warm-up

The static resistance warm-up procedure for back strength resulted in mean scores as given above. The standard errors of the differences between means for tests #1 and #2, #1 and #3, #2 and #3 were 5.22, 6.42, and 13.23 pounds respectively. With 16 degrees of freedom, "t" values of 9.05, 6.42, and 1.02 were obtained. From the "t" values obtained, the null hypothesis was rejected on Tests #1 and #2. The null hypothesis was accepted on test #3 as shown on Table 7 on page 30. The back strength test indicated that Group II made significant improvement in back strength between tests #1 and #2, #1 and #3, but failed to show significant improvement between tests #2 and #3.

#### Arm Strength (Bent Arm Hang)

#### Conventional Warm-up vs. Static Resistance Warm-up

The conventional wars-up procedure for an strength using the bent arm hang test resulted in mean scores of 45.64, 38.52, and 50.47 seconds for tests #1, #2, and #3 as compared to sean scores of 38.25, 45.88, 40.17 seconds for the static resistance wars-up procedure group. The standard errors of the differences between means were 4.98, 4.33, and 4.07 seconds respectively on tests #1, 2, and #3. With 16 degrees of freedom, "t" values of 1.43, .1306 and 2.53 were obtained. The needed "t" value at the .05 level of confidence was 2.19, so the null hypothesis was accepted on tests #1 and #2 and was rejected on test #3 as shown on Table 5, page 28. Group I had superior arm strength to that

of Group II when using the bent are hang test on test #5. There was no significant difference in are strength between the two groups on tests #1 and #2.

## Test-Retest-Retest for Conventional Warm-up

The conventional warm-up procedure for arm strength using the bent arm hang test resulted in mean scores as given above. The standard errors of the differences between means for tests #1 and #2, #1 and #3, #2 and #3 were 1.68, 2.34, and 1.84 seconds respectively. With 16 degrees of freedom, "t" values of .208, 2.06, and 2.81 were obtained. The null hypothesis was accepted on tests #1 and #4 and was rejected on test #3 as shown in Table 6, page 29. The bent arm test indicated that Group I had a significant improvement in arm strength between tests #2 and #3. Ho significant difference in arm strength resulted between tests #1 and #2, #1 and #3.

#### Test-Retest-Retest for Static Resistance Warm-up

The static resistance were-up procedure for arm strength using the bent arm hang test resulted in mean scores as given above. The standard errors of the differences between means for tests #1 and #2, #1 and #3, #2 and #3 were 2.51, 2.74, 1.71 seconds respectively. With 16 degrees of freedom, "t" values of 2.83, .600, 3.33 were obtained. Group II rejected the null hypothesis with a significant gain of arm strength developing between tests #1 and #2. No significant change in arm strength occurred between tests #1 and #3. The null hypothesis was again rejected on the differences of arm strength between tests #2 and #3. Group II had a significant loss of arm strength between Tests #2 and #3 using the bent arm hang test.

#### Arm Strength (Bar Dips)

#### Conventional Warm-up vs. Static Resistance Warm-up

The conventional warm-up procedure for arm strength using the bar dip test resulted in mean scores of 10.05, 10.00, 12.47 for the three tests as compared to mean scores of 7.82, 10.76, and 11.58 dips for the static resistance warm-up procedure group. The standard errors of the differences between means were 1.15, 1.39, 1.35 dips respectively on tests #1, #2, and #3. With 16 degrees of freedom, "t" values of 1.85, .547, and 1.37 were obtained. The needed "t" value at the .05 level of confidence was 2.19, so the null hypothesis was accepted on tests #1, #2, and #3 as shown on Table 8, page 31. The bar dip test indicated that no significant changes were made in arm strength between the two warm-up programs.

#### Test-Retest-Retest for Conventional Warm-up

The conventional wars-up procedure for arm strength using the bar dip test resulted in mean scores as given above. The standard errors of the differences between means for tests #1 and #2, #1 and #3, #2 and #3 were .578, 1.36, and 1.67 dips respectively. With 16 degrees of freedom, "t" values of .096, 1.78 and 1.47 were obtained. The bar dip test indicated that Group I had no significant improvement in arm strength, so the null hypothesis was accepted on all three comparisons as shown on Table 6 page 29.

#### Pest-Retest-Retest for Static Resistance Warm-up

The static resistance wars-up procedure for arm strength using the bar dip test resulted in mean scores as given above. The standard errors of the differences between means for tests #1 and #2, #1 and #3, #2 and #3 were 1.16, 1.30, and .97 dips respectively. With 16 degrees of freedom, "t" values of 2.53, 2.88, and .845 were obtained. Group II rejected the null hypothesis with a significant gain of arm strength developing between tests #1 and #2, and tests #1 and #5. No significant change in occurred between tests #2 and #3.

#### Accumulative Scores

Through the use of accumulative scores (combining scores from all four tests for each group) it was found that the null hypothesis was rejected on test #1 as the "t" value showed a significant difference between mean scores. Tests #2 and #3 accepted the null hypothesis. It was found that on test #1, Group I had a mean score of greater significance than did Group II. Group I accepted the null hypothesis on the test-retest-retest as illustrated on Table 9 page 32. Group II rejected the null hypothesis on comparisons between tests #1 and #2, but accepted the null hypothesis on comparisons between tests #1 and #3, and test #2 and #3.

## TABLE III Comparison of Mean Scores of 34 Subjects Tested for Leg Strength

	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of the difference between two means	Critical Ratio ("t")
Group I (Test # 1) Group II	885.58	224.772	54.51	2.53
(Test # 1)	747.35			
Group I	893.52			
(Test # 2) Group II (Test # 2)	861.17	303.165	73.54	•439
Group I (Test # 3)	901.76		同時に	
Group II (Test # 3)	892.22	267.525	64.88	.147

"t" significance of difference at .05 level = 2.19

# TABLE IV

## Comparison of Mean Scores of 34 Subjects Tested for Back Strength

	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of the difference between two means	Critical Ratio ("t")
Group I (Test # 1) Group II	318.53	65.697	15.03	1.16
(Test # 1)	247.41	0,071	17075	4.40
Group I (Test # 2)	312.64			
Group II (Test # 2)	294.70	51.327	12.45	1.44
Group I (Test # 3)	322.94			
Group II (Test # 3)	308.23	70.255	17.03	.863

"t" significance of difference at .05 level = 2.19

	TABLE V	
Comparison	of Mean Scores of 34 S	ubjects
Tested on Arm	Strength using the Ben	a Arm Hang

	Hean Scores	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of the difference between two means	Critical Ratio ("t")
Group I (Test # 1)	45.64			
Group II (Test # 1)	38.52	20.565	4.98	1.43
Group I	45.29			실목의
Group II (Test # 2)	45.88	17.867	4.33	.1306
Group I	50.47			
Group II (Test # 3)	40.17	16.810	4.07	2.53

"t" significance of difference at .05 level = 2.19
Kean Scores	Tests # 1 and # 2		Tests # 1 and # 3		Tests # 2 and # 3	
Leg Strength Back Strength Bent Arm Hang Bar Dips	885.58 318.53 45.64 10.05	893.52 312.64 45.29 10.00	885.58 318.53 45.64 10.05	901.76 322.94 50.47 12.47	693.52 312.64 45.29 10.00	901.76 322.94 50.47 12.47
Standard Deviation Leg Strength Back Strength Bent Arm Hang Bar Dips	111.2 28.2 6.9 2.3	201 296 257 284	117. 34. 9. 5.	.92 .999 .655 .615	102. 21. 7. 6.	.847 .812 .632 .925
Standard Error of the difference <u>between two means</u> Leg Strength Back Strength Bent Arm Hang Bar Dips	26.9 6.8 1.6	77 66 98 978	28. 8. 2. 1.	.60 .48 .34 .36	24. 5. 1. 1.	.94 .29 .84 .67
Critical Ratio ("t") Leg Strength Back Strength Bent Arm Hang Bar Dips	.2	194## 58## 106## 1962#	2.	564** 520** 06** 78**	1.2.1.	.330#* .94** .81 .47**

## TABLE VI Conventional Warm-up Test-Retest-Retest Comparisons Of Nean Scores on Leg Strength, Back Strength, Bent Arm Hang and Bar Dips

"t" significance of difference at .05 level = 2.19 \*\* Not significant at the .05 level.

Nean Score	Tests # 1 and # 2		Tests # 1 and # 3		Tests # 2 and # 3	
Leg Strength Back Strength Bent Arm Hang Bar Dips	747.35 247.41 38.52 7.82	861.17 294.7 45.88 10.76	747.35 247.41 36.52 7.62	892.22 308.23 40.17 11.58	861.17 294.7 45.88 10.76	892.22 308.23 40.17 11.58
Standard Deviation Leg Strength Back Strength Bent Arm Hang Bar Dips	106.365 21.525 10.358 4.554		193.123 26.41 11.302 5.369		44.20 54.57 7.042 4.014	
Standard Error of the difference <u>between two means</u> Leg Strength Back Strength Bent Arm Hang Bar Dips	25. 5. 2. 1.	79 22 51 16	46. 6. 2. 1.	.84 .42 .74 .30	10. 13. 1.	.72 23 .71 .97
<u>Critical Ratio ("t")</u> Leg Strength Back Strength Bent Arm Hang Bar Dips	2. 9. 2. 2.	.64 .05 .83 .53	3. 9. 2.	.09 47 600**	2. 1. 3.	89 02** 33 845**

## TABLE VII Static Resistant Warm-up Test-Retest-Retest Comparisons of Nean Scores on Leg Strength, Back Strength, Bent Arm Hang and Bar Dips

"t" significance of difference at .05 level = 2.19

\*\* Not significant at the .05 level

# TABLE V111

# Comparison of Mean Scores of 34 Subjects

# Tested on Arm Strength using Bar Dips

	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of the difference between two means	Critical Ratio ("5")
Group I (Test # 1) Group II	10.05	4.776	1.15	1.85
(Test # 1)	7.82			
Group I (Test # 2)	10.00	5.760	1.39	.547
(Test # 2)	10.76			
Group I (Test # 3)	12.47	5.667	1.35	1.37
Group II (Test # 3)	11.58		and the second	

"t" significance of difference at .05 level = 2.19

## TABLE IX

## Comparison of Results using Accumulative Scores

						letter and the barren
Mean Scores	Tests // 1 and // 2		Tests # 1 and # 3		Tests # 2 and 3	
Group I Group II	1268.36 1087.52	1260.88 1212.76	1268.36 1087.52	1293.11 1199.647	1260.88 1212.76	1293.11 1199.647
Standard Deviation						
Group I Group II	135.65 144.247		165.38 234.64		98.51 153.03	
Standard Error of the difference between two means						
Group I	32.90		40.11		27.28	
UFOUD II	34.70	0	<b>90</b> .	YL.	51.	"
Critical Ratio "t"						
Group I Group II	.227** 3.580		.617** 1.968**		1.181**	

"t" significance of difference at .05 level = 2.19 ## Not significant at the .05 level

#### CHAPTER V

#### SUMMARY

Thirty-four young men were tested in an attempt to find out whether there were any significant differences between two programs of warming-up. One warm-up program consisted of thirteen static resistance exercises, the other program consisted of thirteen conventional exercises. The exercises were taken by the participants for the purpose of warm-up before participation in regular class activities.

Static contraction and conventional exercises were compared for the following purposes: to determine which method retained strength in the arms, legs, and back longer after the student had been physically conditioned for six weeks; and to determine the feasibility of static contraction as a new warm-up exercise program for physical education classes.

Two classes were selected from the freshman physical education service program. Both classes had participated in the six weeks conditioning program established during the first semester 1963-1964, at the University of North Dakota. The two classes selected were equated on the basis of results on the American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation Youth Fitness Test. The selected classes took part of the PFI Test to determine arm, back, and leg strength. A statistical comparison was made between the two groups investigated in this paper. As this study was concerned with observations of paired groups for small samples, the "t" test was used to determine the retention or rejection of the null hypothesis. The .05 level of significance was established as the acceptable point of confidence on the Table of "t", for rejection of the null hypothesis.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The results of the investigation indicate the following:

1. The static resistance group revealed significant differences in arm, back, and leg strength between the initial testsand test two, and the initial test and test three. Performances on tests two and three were significantly superior to those on the initial test.

2. The static resistance group revealed no significant difference in back and leg strength between test two and test three.

3. Arm strength, as measured by the bent arm hang, for the static resistance group revealed a significant difference between test two and test three. Test three was significantly inferior to test two.

4. The conventional exercise group revealed no significant difference in their test-retest-retest.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

L. A similar study should be made with larger samples of the two groups in this study.

34

2. A study should be made to attempt to determine the feasibility of static resistance exercise. This should be done where there is no more than one skilled activity being taught during the experiment.

5. A study should be made to determine the results on nonconditioned physical education students.

4. A similar study should be made with junior and senior high school students.

5. A similar study should be conducted without a vacation period.

ARM CIRCLES 44



<u>Arm Circling</u>: Standing, feet parallel and shoulder distance apart, arms out from body at horizontal level, move arms in small, medium and large circles. Reverse and go in opposite direction.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

#### Books

- Clarke H. Harrison, Application of Measurement to Health and Physical Education, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.
- Davis, Craig and Gene A. Longan, Warm-up Strength Development and <u>Biophysical Values of Muscular Activity</u>, Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Fub. Co., 1961.
- Edwards, Allen L., Statistical Methods for the Behavioral Sciences, New York: Reinhart and Company, Inc., 1954.
- Garrett, Henry E., Statistics in Psychology and Education, New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1955.
- Karpevich, Peter V., Exercise and Fitness, Urbana, Illinois: Athletic Institute, 1960.
- Morchouse, Laurence E., and Augustus T. Miller, Physiology of Exercise, 3rd ed., St. Louis: C. V. Mosby Co., 1959.
- McNemar, Quinn, <u>Psychological Statistics</u>, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1949.

#### Articles

- Dennison, J. D., Howell, M.S. and W. R. Morford, "Effect of Iscmetric and Isotonic Exercise Programs Upon Muscular Endurance," Research Quarterly,XXVII, December, 1956.
- Karpovich, Peter V., "The Physiology of Athletics" Scholastic Coach, September, 1934.
- Mathews, D. K., and Robert Kruse, "Effects of Isometric and Isotonic Exercise on Elbow Flexor Muscle Groups," <u>Research</u> Quarterly, XXXII, October, 1961.
- Miller, Richard I., "The Science and Practice of Warming-Up: PartII," Athletic Journal, XXXI, March, 1951.

Morgan, Bill, "Static Exercises," <u>Scholastic Coach</u>, XXXII, February, 1963. Thompson, Hugh, "Weight Training Vs. Isometric Training," <u>Scholastic</u> Coach, XXXII, September, 1962.

Warner, Berny, "Simple Isometrics," <u>Scholastic Coach</u>, XXXII, December, 1962.

Wolbers, Charles P. and Frank D. Sills, "Development of Strength in High School Boys by Static Muscle Contraction," <u>Research</u> Quarterly, XXVII, December, 1956.



39

<u>Bicycle</u>: Lie on floor with legs extended toward the ceiling, bracing the hips with your hands. Flex and extend the legs as in running.

SIT-AND-BOB





<u>Sit-and-Bob</u>: Sitting with legs straight out and feet at right angles to the legs. Extend arms toward toes by bending at hip joints and tilting pelvis forward. Bob forward, (count one) reaching for toes and forehead to knee. Eack to sitting position on count two.



Burpee: Start in normal standing position. On count one bend at the knees and place hands on the floor. Count two extend legs behind you with hands in position from count one. Count three return to position in count number two. Count four return to starting position.



<u>Sit-ups</u>: Lie on your back. Tilt pelvis to flatten lower back to floor. With hands clasped behind the head, curl head, shoulders back and come to sitting position. Keep knees slightly bent, with a partner or some support on them.

•

•



<u>Push-ups</u>: Lie face down on floor. Place hands directly under shoulder joint with fingers parallel and turned inward slightly. Etend arms and lift body in straight line. Lower body slowly until chin touches the floor and then push up again. Movement in arms and shoulders, not in any other part of the body. Chin touches before thighs. Keep body line straight from head to toes.



Spread Eagle: Lie on back with arms out from body at horizontal level. Raise keft leg vertical to the floor, then rotate hips so leg touches hand. Try not to move the arms from the floor. Alternate using both legs.



Jumping Jack: Start in a normal standing position and on count one flex and abduct the arms above the head, and abduct the legs to the side. Count two return to the starting position. 46 RUNNING IN PLACE



<u>Running in Place</u>: In a standing position bring knees one at a time as close to the chest as possible. Use same procedure as if running but stay in a stationary place on the floor.

NECK TWISTER



<u>Neck Twister</u>: Standing in a normal position, on count one, bend neck forward so the chin touches the chest. On count two, rotate the head to the right so the ear touches the right shoulder. On count three rotate the head to the back. On count four, rotate the head so the left ear touches the left shoulder.





Modified Pull-up: Partner lying on the floor reach up and clasp hands with partner in standing position. On count one raise the body from the floor using only the arms. Keep the body straight and heels on the floor.





Wing Lifts: Lie face down on the floor, arms clasped at the back of neck and eyes directed straight down, legs straight, and toes touching floor. Lift head, upper back, and arms off floor about 12 inches. Chin in. Return to starting position. Do not allow elbows to touch floor or toes to leave floor. Repeat.

L COT TO F PILE RECENTER



Bicep Flexion - Partner clasp wrist then try to curl are upward while partner applies pressure downward.



Shoulder Abduction - Place arms inside of partners arms and exert pressure outward while partner exerts pressure inward.



Shoulder Extension - Place hands on top of partners shoulders and exert pressure downward.



Are Adduction - Place your hands on partners shoulders, force area inward while using partners shoulders as resistance.



Tricep Flexion - Flace area behind you and raise in an upward motion while partner applies downward pressure.

55

Back Hyper-extension - Naise shoulders from floor while partner applies pressure to shoulders and legs.

56

Static Sit-up - Raise shoulders from floor while pressure is being applied to shoulders and legs by partner.



Leg Abduction - Partner places his legs outside of knees, try to spread legs apart.



59

Ence Extension - Try to straighton log while partner applies pressure at buttoch and ankle.

60

Nee Flexion - Try to bend leg at knoe while partner applies pressure at butteek and ankle.

Static Rowing - Both men in a sitting position place feet together, cleep hands together and pull, try to have as little movement as possible.

	warren a citta i	ALCOUP AS ALCOUP	w	
bjects	Group 1	Group II	D	D <sup>2</sup>
1	1297	1163	134	17956
2	1104	942	162	26244
3	1201	1248	-47	2209
4	1509	951	558	311364
5	1274	1666	-392	153644
6	1452	1437	15	225
7	733	733	0	0
8	1121	1294	-173	29929
9	1580	1024	556	309136
10	1211	1165	-54	2916
11	1142	951	191	36481
12	1221	787	434	188356
13	1004	767	237	56169
14	1173	1160	13	169
15	1693	1090	594	352836
16	1294	890	404	163216
17	1553	1211	342	116964
Σ	X = 21502	$\Sigma X = 18488$	$\Sigma D = 2974$	$\Sigma D^2 -$

 $\bar{x} = 1268.36$ 

**x** = 1087.52

The Significance of the Difference between Means from Paired Observations



Significance of Difference: <u>Beyond</u> .05 level

	Group 1 and	Group II (Teet	: #2)		
Subjects	Group 1	Group 11	D	D <sup>2</sup>	
1	1356	1417	-61	3721	
2	1297	1058	239	57121	
3	1214	1613	-299	89401	
4	1913	904	627	393129	
5	1063	1776	-713	506369	
6	1511	1426	83	7225	
7	941	940	1	1	
8	1170	1122	48	2304	
9	1640	1127	531	263169	
10	1157	1651	494	244036	
11	1173	1134	39	1521	
12	1197	889	308	94864	
13	987	009	178	31686	
14	986	1262	-276	76176	
15	1634	1306	328	107584	
16	1235	963	272	79084	
17	1343	1320	23	529	
	$\Sigma X = 21435$	$\Sigma X = 20617$	$\Sigma D = 010$	$\Sigma D^2 =$	1954818

Area of Comparison: <u>Accumulative Segres</u>

x = 1260.66

 $\vec{X} = 1212.76$ 

65

### The Significance of the Difference between Means from Paired Observations



	Group I and C	komp II (Test #3)	<u> </u>		
Subjects	Group I	Group II	D	D <sup>2</sup>	
1	1263	1365	-82	6734	
2	1277	1024	249	59049	
3	1462	1448	14	196	
4	1516	1046	666	219024	
5	1206	1604	398	158404	
6	1435	1599	-144	20756	
7	924	863	61	3721	
8	1237	1283	white	2116	
9	1693	1226	427	162329	
10	1159	1999	*771	594441	
11	1177	1939	138	19044	
12	1263	670	413	170569	
13	2255	910	345	60025	
14	1027	1295	-266	71824	
15	1614	1630	-216	46656	
16	1410	1250	160	25600	
17	1352	1196	165	24336	
	$\Sigma X = 21995$	<b>S</b> X =	<b>Σ</b> D = 400	$\Sigma D^2 =$	1664794

Area of Comparison: Accumilative Scores

**x** = 1293.81

**x** = 1199.647

67
Test: Accumulative	Scores (Test # 3)	
n =	ΣD = <u>400</u>	$\Sigma D^2 = 1.664.794$
$\Sigma d^2 = \Sigma D^2 - (\Sigma D)^2$	$\mathbb{Z}d^2 = $	1,655,302
$S_d = \sqrt{\frac{\sum d^2}{n-1}}$	S <sub>d</sub> = 17 ~	s <sub>d</sub> = <u>321,5075</u> 1
$S\bar{x} - \bar{x} = \frac{S_d}{\sqrt{n}}$	$s\bar{x} - \bar{x} =$	<u>√ 17</u>
Sx - x = <u>321.5075</u> 4.123	Sx -	x =
$t = \frac{\overline{X} - \overline{X}}{Sx - x}$	t =	<del>).11 1199.65</del> 77.97
t =		
t at .05 level = 2.19		
df = n-1		
df = 16		
Significance of Difference	ce: Not Sie	sifteent

	Tost \$1.and D	not 02 . (Group	<u>1)</u>		
Subjects	Test 61	Tost #2	D	D <sup>2</sup>	
1	1297	1356	-59	3481	
2	1104	1297	-193	37249	
3	1201	1214	-13	169	
4	1509	1591	-22	486	
5	1274	1063	211	44521	
6	1452	1511	-59	3481	
7	733	941	-208	43264	
8	1121	1170		2401	
9	1580	1640	-60	3600	
10	1211	1157	•54	2916	
11	2442	1173	269	72961	
12	1221	1197	24	576	
13	2004	987	27	229	
14	1173	986	187	34969	
15	1693	1694	59	3481	
16	1294	1235	59	3481	
17	1553	1343	210	44100	
	<b>E</b> X = 21562	<b>X</b> x = 21435	<b>Σ</b> D = 100	$\Sigma D^2 = 30$	0823

Area of Comparison:

x = 1260.36

 $\vec{X} = 1260.68$ 



	Test él es	d Test #3 (Group	1)	
	Test fl	Test #3		-2
jects	1297	1283	D 14	D- 196
2	1104	1277	-173	29929
3	1201	1468	-261	68121
4	1509	1516	*7	49
5	1274	1206	68	4624
6	1452	1455	-3	9
7	733	924	-191	36481
8	1121	1237	-116	13456
9	1580	1653	-73	5329
)	1211	1159	52	2704
L	1442	1177	256	70225
2	1221	1283	-62	3844
3	1004	1155	-151	22801
¥.	1173	1027	146	21316
5	1693	1414	279	77841
5	1294	1410	-216	46656
	1553 <b>21562</b>	1352 21995	201	40401
2	. X =	<b>Σ</b> X =	<b>٤</b> D =	328 44 <b>с</b> р2

Accumulative Scores

1268.36

x = 1293.11

**x** =



	Test #2 en	1 Test #3 (Ocoup	1)		
Subjects	Test #2	Test #3	D	$D^2$	
1	1956	1283	73	5329	
2	1297	1277	20	400	
3	1214	1462	-158	24964	
4	1513	1516	16	225	
5	1063	1206	-133	17689	
6	1511	1455	56	3136	
7	941	924	17	289	
8	1170	1237	-67	4489	
9	1640	1653	-13	169	
10	1157	1159	-2	4	
11	1173	1177	-4	16	
12	1197	1265	-86	7396	
13	987	1027	-41	1681	
14	986	1155	-168	26224	
15	1634	1414	220	48400	
16	1235	1400	-175	30625	
17	1343	1352	-9	61	
	<b>Z</b> X = 21435	<b>S</b> X = 21995	ΣD =	$\Sigma D^2 =$	
			-039		173117

Area of Comparison: \_\_\_\_\_Accumulative Scores

X = 1260.88

**x** = 1293.11



## Accumulative Scores

Area	or Comparison	t #2 (Group II)	<u>12</u>	
	Test #1	Test #2		
Subjects	1163	1417	*254 D	645 <b>32</b> 5
1	942	1058	-116	13456
2	1248	1513	+256	70225
3	951	904	47	2209
4	1666	1776	-110	12100
5	1437	1426	11	121
6	733	940	-207	42849
7	1294	1122	172	29584
8	1024	1127	-103	10609
9	1165	1651	-486	236196
10	951	1134	-183	33489
11	787	889	-102	10404
12	767	809	-42	1764
13	1160	1262	-102	10404
14	1090	1306	-216	46656
15	890	963	-73	5329
16	1211	1320	-109	11881
17	18488	20617	-2138	601709
	ΣX =	<b>Σ</b> X =	<b>Σ</b> D =	<b>S</b> D <sup>2</sup> -
	1067.52		1212.76	
	<b>x</b> =		<b>x</b> =	



Significance of Difference: Stanificant beyond .05 level

	Test 61 a	nd Test #3 (Group	11)		
Subjects	Test #1	Test #3	D	D <sup>2</sup>	
1	1163	1365	-202	40804	
2	942	1034	-92	8464	
3	1246	1446	-200	40000	
4	951	1048	-97	9409	
5	1666	1604	62	3844	
6	1437	1599	-162	26244	
7	733	863	-130	16900	
8	1294	1283	11	121	
9	1024	1226	-202	40804	
10	1165	1930	-765	585225	
11	951	1039	-88	7744	
12	787	870	-83	6889	
13	767	910	-143	20449	
14	1160	1295	-135	18225	
15	1090	1630	-54 0	291000	
16	890	1250	-360	129000	
17	1211	1196	115	13225	
	<b>S</b> X = 18408	<b>X</b> = 20394	<b>E</b> D = -2911	$\Sigma D^2 = 125$	250

Area of Comparison: \_\_\_\_\_Accumulative Scores

 $\bar{x} = 1087.52$ 

X = 1199.647



	Test #2 and	Test #3 (Group I	1)		
Subjects	Test #2	Test #3	D	D <sup>2</sup>	
1	1417	1365	52	2704	
2	1058	1034	24	576	
3	1513	1448	65	4225	
4	904	1048	-144	20736	
5	1776	1604	172	29584	
6	1426	1599	-172	29584	
7	940	863	77	5929	
8	1122	1283	-161	25921	
9	1127	1226	-99	9801	
10	1651	1930	-279	77841	
11	1134	1039	95	9025	
12	889	870	19	361	
13	809	910	-101	10201	
14	1262	1295	-33	1089	
15	1306	1630	-324	104976	
16	963	1250	-267	82369	
17	1320	1196	124	15376	
	$\Sigma X = \frac{20617}{1000}$	<b>X</b> x = 20394	<b>Σ</b> D = •972	$\Sigma D^2 = 430298$	

Area of Comparison: Accumulative Scores

 $\bar{x} = 1212.76$ 

 $\mathbf{\tilde{X}} = 1199.647$ 



Significance of Difference: Mat Stanfficant

	Test #1 and T	est #2 (Group ]	3	
Subjects	Tost #1	Test #2	D	D <sup>2</sup>
1	900	960	-40	1600
2	800	960	-160	25600
3	940	910	30	900
4	1135	1140	*5	25
5	930	720	210	44100
6	990	1040	-50	2500
7	490	680	-190	36100
8	700	760	-60	3600
9	1190	1230	-40	1600
10	760	790	-30	900
11	640	790	-150	22500
12	840	860	-20	400
13	680	680	0	0
14	630	680	1.50	22500
15	1190	1100	10	100
16	860	840	20	400
17	1160	970	90	36100
	$\Sigma X = 15055$	ΣX <b>4</b> 5190	<b>E</b> D = -135	$\Sigma D^2 = 198925$

Area of Comparison: Leg Strength

X = 005.50

 $\vec{x} = 893.52$ 



Significance of Difference: Not Significant

	Test \$1 en	d Test #3			
Cubécobe	Tost 61	Past 62	٩	<sup>2</sup>	
I	900	860	40	1600	
2	800	920	-120	24400	
3	940	1120	-180	32400	
4	1139	1080	55	3025	
5	930	880	-50	2500	
6	990	990	0	0	
7	490	660	-190	36100	
8	700	810	-110	12100	
9	1190	1220	-30	900	
10	760	700	60	3600	
11	640	760	-120	14400	
12	640	910	~70	4900	
13	680	810	-130	16900	
14	830	720	110	12300	
15	1190	980	210	44100	
16	860	940	80	6400	
17	1160	950	210	46100	
	<b>E</b> X = 15055	$\Sigma X = 15330$	<b>S</b> D = 95	$\Sigma D^2 = 231$	525

Area of Comparison: Leg Strength

X = 885.58

 $\vec{X} = 901.76$ 



	Test # 2 4	and Test # 3 : (Gr	oup I)				
Subjects	Test Ø 2	Teat Ø 3	D		D <sup>2</sup>	1	
1	960	860	100		10000		
2	960	920	40		1600		
3	910	1120	-210		44100		
4	1140	1000	60		3600		
5	720	860	-160		25600		
6	1040	990		2500			
7	680	680	0		0		
8	760	810	- 50		2500		
9	1230	1220	10		100		
10	790	700	90		8100		
11	790	760	30		900		
12	860	910	-50		2500		
13	680	810	-130		16900		
14	680	720	-40		1600		
15	1180	980	200		400000		
16	840	940	-100		10000		
17	970	950	20		400		
	ΣX = 15190	ΣX =	<b>٤</b> D =	-140	$\Sigma D^2 =$	170400	

Area of Comparison: Leg Strength

x = 893.52

x = 901.76



	1		Design of the second se							
	Test # 1 and Test # 2 : (Group II)									
Subjects	Test # 1	Test # 2	D	$D^2$						
1	800	1000	-200	40000						
2	670	760	-110	12100						
3	920	1150	-230	52900						
4	690	610	90	6400						
5	1200	1290	-90	8100						
6	1010	990	20	400						
7	480	670	-190	36100						
8	640	830	-190	36100						
9	680	750	-70	4900						
10	900	1280	-380	244400						
11	690	810	-120	14400						
12	520	625	-105	11025						
13	440	460	-20	400						
14	840	925	-85	7225						
15	695	950	-155	24025						
16	630	660	~30	900						
17	900	980	- 80	6400						
Σ	X = 12705	$\Sigma X = 14640$	ΣD = *1	955 $\Sigma D^2 = 405775$						

Area of Comparison: Leg Strength

x = 747.35

<del>x</del> = 861.17

![](_page_92_Figure_1.jpeg)

Significance of Difference: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Significant beyond .05 level of confidence

	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	80	7	6	ы	4	ω	2	1	Subject
<b>X</b> X =																		e la
12705	000	630	695	040	640	520	690	000	630	040	430	1010	1220	690	920	670	000	Cot # 1
<b>S</b> X = 15270	800	016	1190	920	500	570	620	1540	040	950	570	1190	1120	660	1000	740	076	Soot & U
<b>E</b> D = 2565	8	-280	-495	-20	-120	-50	70	-640	-160	-310	-90	-180	8	30	-160	-70	-140	D
<b>E</b> D <sup>2</sup> = <b>761225</b>	900	78400	245025	6400	14400	2500	0067	409600	25600	96100	0100	32400	6400	006	25600	4900	19600	D <sup>2</sup>

Area of Comparison: <u>tes strength</u>

Test # 1 and Test # 3 : (Group II)

X = 892.22

X = 767,35

![](_page_94_Figure_1.jpeg)

Area c	of Comparison: _	Leg Strength			
	Test # 2 and	Test # 3 : (Gr	oup II)		
Subjects	Test # 2	Test # 3	D	$D^2$	
1	2000	940	60	3600	
2	760	740	20	400	
3	1150	1080	70	4900	
4	610	660	-50	2500	
5	1290	1120	70	4900	
6	990	1190	-200	40000	
7	670	570	100	10000	
8	830	950	-120	14400	
9	750	840	-90	8100	
10	1280	1540	-260	67600	
11	310	620	190	36100	
12	625	570	55	3025	
13	460	560	-100	10000	
14	925	920	5	25	
15	850	1190	-340	115600	
16	660	910	-250	62500	
17	980	870	110	12100	
٤	$X = \frac{14640}{1}$	<b>X</b> = 15270	$\Sigma D = -730$	$\Sigma D^2 =$	395750

**x** = 861.17 **x** = 892.22

![](_page_96_Figure_1.jpeg)

Significance of Difference: Significent buyend .05 level of confidence

Area	of Comparison:	Back Strength	al and a second second	
	Test # 1 and	Test # 2 :(Group I	)	
Subjects	Test # 1	Test # 2	D	$D^2$
1	310	330	-20	400
2	270	290	-20	400
3	230	275	-45	2025
4	320	340	-20	400
5	310	310	0	0
6	375	375	0	0
7	210	225	-15	225
8	360	355	5	25
9	320	355	-35	1225
10	340	300	40	1600
11	330	310	20	400
12	340	300	40	1600
13	290	260	30	900
14	280	260	20	400
15	440	390	50	2500
16	350	320	30	900
17	340	320	20	400
2	x _5415	<b>S</b> X = 5315	<b>Σ</b> D = 200	$\Sigma D^2 = 13400$

x = 318.53

 $\vec{x} = 312,64$ 

![](_page_98_Figure_1.jpeg)

Area	or comparison:	Charles and a second second	and the second se	Conservation of the State of Lot	
	Test # 1 and	Test # 3:	(Group 1)		
Subjects	Test # 1	Test	#3 D	D <sup>2</sup>	
1	310	340	-30	900	
2	270	300	-30	900	
3	230	295	-65	4225	
4	320	380	-60	3600	
5	310	290	20	400	
6	375	380	-5	25	
7	210	210	0	0	
8	360	370	-10	100	
9	320	360	-40	1600	
10	340	290	50	2500	
11	330	330	0	0	
12	340	320	20	400	
13	290	290	0	0	
14	280	250	30	900	
15	440	370	70	4900	
16	350	375	-25	625	
17	340	340	0	0	
٤	X = 5415	<b>X X</b> =	5490 <b>Σ</b> D =	-75 <b>£</b> D <sup>2</sup> =	21075

rea of Comparison: Back Strength

X = 318.53

 $\vec{x} = 322.94$ 

![](_page_100_Figure_1.jpeg)

Significance of Difference: Mat Significant

Area	of Comparison:	Back Strength	14.19.53		
	Test # 2 and 1	lest # 3 : (Grou	2 I)		
Subjects	Test #2	Test Ø 3	D	D <sup>2</sup>	
1	330	340	~10	100	
2	290	300	-10	100	
3	275	295	-20	400	
4	340	380	40	1600	
5	310	290	20	400	
6	375	380	-5	25	
7	225	210	15	225	
8	355	370	-15	225	
9	355	360	15	225	
10	300	290	10	100	
11	310	330	-20	400	
12	300	320	-20	400	
13	260	290	-30	900	
14	260	250	10	100	
15	390	370	20	400	
16	320	375	-55	3025	
17	320	340	-20	400	
	$\Sigma X = 5315$	<b>S</b> X = 5490	<b>ک</b> D =	$\Sigma D^2 =$	9024

x = 312,64

**x** = 322,94

![](_page_102_Figure_1.jpeg)

Significance of Difference: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

	Test # 1 and	Test # 2 : (Grou	ap II)	
Subjects	Test # 1	Teat # 2	D	$D^2$
1	305	350	-45	2025
2	210	235	-25	625
3	290	310	-20	400
4	200	230	-30	900
5	420	420	0	0
6	380	370	10	100
7	210	210	0	0
8	230	240	-10	100
9	290	300	-10	100
10	270	315	-45	2025
11	230	275	-45	2025
12	250	245	5	25
13	270	280	-10	100
14	250	280	-30	900
15	360	420	- 60	3600
16	230	260	-30	900
17	270	270	0	0
٤	X = 4665	<b>S</b> X = 5010	<b>Σ</b> D = 355	$\Sigma D^2 =$
				- 1382

Area of Comparison: Back Strength

x = 247,41

 $\vec{X} = 294.7$ 

![](_page_104_Figure_1.jpeg)

Significance of Difference: Stenificant beyond .05 level

Area	of Comparison:	Back Strength		
	Test # 1 and Te	st # 3 : (Group	) I)	
Subjects	Test # 1	Test Ø 3	D	D <sup>2</sup>
1	303	360	-55	3025
2	210	230	-20	400
3	290	310	-20	400
4	200	230	-30	900
5	420	420	0	0
6	380	360	20	400
7	210	240	-30	900
8	230	280	-50	2500
9	290	320	-30	900
10	270	340	-70	4900
11	230	280	-50	2500
12	250	230	~30	900
13	270	290	-20	400
14	250	330	-80	6400
15	360	410	-50	2500
16	230	290	-60	3600
17	270	270	0	0
Σ	X = 4665	$\Sigma X = 5240$	$\Sigma D = 575$	$\Sigma D^2 = 30625$

x = 247,41

**x** = 308,23

![](_page_106_Figure_1.jpeg)

Area of	Comparison: _	Back Strength		-
	Test Ø 2 and 1	Reat # 3 : (Grou	p I)	
Subjects	Test Ø 2	Test # 3	D	D <sup>2</sup>
1	350	360	-5	25
2	235	230	5	25
3	310	310	0	0
4	230	230	0	0
5	420	420	0	0
6	370	360	10	100
7	210	240	-30	900
8	240	280	~40	1600
9	300	320	-20	400
10	315	340	-25	625
11	275	280	-5	25
12	245	280	-35	1225
13	280	290	-10	100
14	280	330	-50	2500
15	420	410	10	200
16	260	290	-30	900
17	270	270	0	0
ΣΧ	= 5010	<b>X</b> = 5240	$\Sigma D = -225$	$\Sigma D^2 = 8525$

 $\bar{x} = \frac{294.7}{}$ 

-

 $\vec{x} = 308.23$


Significance of Difference: Not Significent at .05 level

	Test Ø 1 s	nd Test # 2 : ((	Group I)		
Subjects	Test # 1	Test Ø	2 D	D <sup>2</sup>	
1	52	53	-	16	
2	24	60	-16	256	
3	27	25	2	4	
4	43	61	-2		
5	33	32			
6	65	69	-4	1.	
7	25	27	-2	CON.	
8	51	43	8	64	
9	61	59	2	1. A.	
10	56	58	-2	4	
11	57	58	-1	1	
12	34	31	3	9	
13	27	39	-12	144	
14	49	37	12	144	
15	53	53	0	0	
16	71	61	10	100	
17	62	44	-2		
	EX = 776	<b>S</b> X = 77	Ω <b>Σ</b> D =	$\mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{D}^2 =$	775

Area of Comparison: Arm Strength (Bent Arm Hene)

x = 45.64

**x** = 45,29



df = 16

Significance of Difference: Not Significant at .05 level

	Test #1 and	Test #3 (Group )		
Subjects	Test #1	Test #3	D	D <sup>2</sup>
1	57	70	-19	169
2	24	45	-21	441
3	27	42	*15	225
4	43	43	0	0
5	33	34	-1	1
6	65	60	S	25
7	25	26	-1	1
8	51	41	10	100
9	61	62	-1	1
10	56	55	1	1
11	57	65	-8	64
12	34	48	-14	196
13	27	50	-23	529
14	49	40	9	81
15	53	53	0	0
16	72.	74	-3	0
17	42	50	-8	64
	<b>S</b> X = 776	<b>x</b> = 858	<b>∑</b> D = -84	$\Sigma D^2 = 1907$

Area of Comparison: \_\_\_\_\_Arm Strength (Bent Arm Hang)

 $\bar{x} = 45.64$ 

**x** =50,47



Area	of Comparison:	Arn Strengt	h (Bent Arm Hang)	
	Test # 2 and	Test # 3 : (Group	2)	
Subjects	Test # 2	Tost # 3	D	D <sup>2</sup>
1	53	70	-17	289
2	40	45	5	25
3	25	42	-17	289
4	41	43	-2	4
5	32	34	-2	4
6	69	60	9	81
7	27	26	1	1
8	43	41	2	4
9	59	62	-3	9
10	\$8	55	3	9
11	\$8	65	-7	49
12	31	48	-17	289
13	39	50	-11	121
14	37	40	-3	9
15	53	53	0	0
16	61	74	-13	169
17	44	50	-6	36
	ΣX = 770	<b>x</b> = 858	ΣD = *88	$\Sigma D^2 = 1380$

x = 45.29

x = 5047



	Test # 1 and	Test # 2 : (Group	(II)		
Subjects	Test # 1	Test # 2	D	$D^2$	
1	48	55	-7	49	
2	52	49	3	9	
3	30	45	-15	225	
4	48	49	-1	1	
5	40	54	-14	196	
6	36	54	-18	324	
7	41	53	-12	144	
8	41	45	-6	a	
9	44	66	-12	144	
10	26	46	+20	400	
11	24	36	-12	144	
12	16	18	-2	4	
13	50	59	-8	81	
14	60	444	16	256	
15	37	23	14	196	
16	26	31	-9	25	
17	36	53	-17	289	
٤	X = 655	ΣX = 780	<b>S</b> D = -115	$\Sigma D^2 =$	2495

Area of Comparison: Arm Strength (Bent Arm Hang)

X = 38.52

**x** = 45.88

Test: Bent Arm Hang			
n = <u>17</u>	ΣD =	<u></u> ۶ D	2 = 2,495
$\sum d^2 = \sum D^2 - \frac{(\sum D)^2}{n}$	2	$d^2 = 1717.06$	_
$s_d = \sqrt{\frac{\boldsymbol{\xi} d^2}{n-1}}$	s <sub>d</sub> =	1717.06 16	\$ <sub>d</sub> = <u>30,358</u>
$S\bar{x} - \bar{x} = \frac{S_d}{\sqrt{n}}$	sž	$-\overline{x} = \frac{10.358}{\sqrt{17}}$	
Sx - x = <u>30.350</u> 4.123		$S\bar{x} - \bar{x} = 2.5$	L
$t = \overline{X} - \overline{X}$ Sx - x	t =	38.52 - 45.88	
t = 2.83	_		
t at .05 level = 2.19			
df = n-1			
df = 16			

Significance of Difference: Significant beyond the .05 level

9	44	54	-10	100
10	26	39	-13	169
11	24	26	-2	4
12 13	16 50	17 51	-1	1
14	60	33	27	729
15	37	22	15	225
16 17	26	36	-10	100
17	36	39	-3	<b>5</b> p <sup>2</sup> -
Σ	X = 655	2 x = 683	ΣD = 28	



Area	of Comparison:	Arm Strength	(Bent Ara Ha	ng)
	Test # 2 and	Test # 3 : (Grou	DII)	
				2
Subjects	Test 0 2	Test # 3	D	<u> </u>
1	55	51	4	10
2	49	47	2	4
3	45	49	als	16
4	49	39	10	200
5	54	56	-2	4
6	54	36	18	324
7	53	44	9	31
8	45	44	1	1
9	66	54	12	144
10	46	39	7	49
11	36	26	10	100
12	18	17	1	1
13	59	51	0	64
14	44	33	11	121
15	23	22	1	1
16	31	36	-5	25
17	53	39	14	196
2	EX = 780	<b>x</b> = 683	<b>Σ</b> D =	$\Sigma D^2 = 124$

**x** = 45.88

**x** = 40.17



Significance of Difference: Significant at the .05 level

Area	a of Comparison:	Arm Strengt	h (Bar Dips)	Contraction of the Contraction
	Test # 1 and Te	ist 🖗 2 s (Grou	<u>p 1)</u>	
Subjects	Test # 1	Test # 2	D	$D^2$
1	10	13	-3	9
2	10	7	3	9
3	4	4	0	0
4	11	10	1	1
5	1	1	0	0
6	22	27	-5	25
7	3	9	-1	1
8	10	12	-2	4
9	9	6	3	9
10	9	9	0	0
11	15	15	0	0
12	7	6	Z	1
13	7	8	-1	2
14	24	9	5	25
15	10	11	-1	1
16	13	14	-1	1
17	11	9	2	4
	ΣX = 171	<b>E</b> X = 170	<b>S</b> D = <b>1</b>	<b>5</b> D <sup>2</sup> -
				91

x = 10.05

**x** = 10



Area	of Comparison: _	Arm Strength (Ba	ir Dips)	
	Test # 1 and 1	leat Ø 3 : (Group	) I)	
Subjects	Test # 1	Test # 3	D	D <sup>2</sup>
1	10	13	-3	9
2	10	12	-2	4
3	4	5	-1	1
4	11	13	-2	4
5	1	2	-1	1
6	22	25	-3	9
7	8	8	0	0
8	20	16	-6	36
9	9	11	-2	4
10	9	24	-5	25
11	15	22	-7	49
12	7	5	2	4
13	7	5	2	4
14	24	17	-3	9
15	14	11	-1	1
16	13	21	-8	64
17	11	12	-1	1
Σ	X = 171	<b>X</b> = 212	<b>Σ</b> D = -41	$\Sigma D^2 = 225$

x = 10.05

**x** = 12,47



Significance of Difference: Not Significant at .05 Inter

Area	of Comparison:	Ann Strength (3	lar Dips)	 	
	Test # 2 and 1	lest @ 3 : (Group I	0		
Subjects	Test # 2	Test Ø 3	D	$D^2$	
1	13	13	0	0	
2	7	12	-5	25	
3	4	5	-1	1	
4	10	13	-3	9	
5	2	2	-1	1	
6	27	25	2	4	
7	9	8	1	2	
8	12	16	-4	16	
9	6	11	~5	25	
10	9	14	-5	25	
11	15	22	-7	49	
12	6	5	1	1	
13	8	5	3	9	
14	9	17	-8	64	
15	11	11	0	0	
16	14	21	-7	49	
17	9	12	-3	9	
	ΣX = 170	ΣX = 212	$\Sigma D = 42$	$\Sigma D^2 =$	288

x = 10

**x** = 12.67



	$\Sigma X = 199$	$\Sigma X = 100$	-	
17	15	17	-2	4
16	4	12	-8	66
15	7	23	-6	36
14	20	13	-3	9
13	7	10	-3	9
12	1	2	0	0
11	7	23	-6	36
10	5	20	-5	25
9	10	2.2	-1	2
8	7	7	0	0
7	2	7	-5	25
6	22	12	-1	1
5	6	8	-2	4
4	2,3	15	-2	4
3	8	8	0	0
2	2.0	24	-4	8
1	20	12	*2	4
Subjects	test # 1	West # 2	D	D <sup>2</sup>

Area of Comparison: Arm Streamth (Bar Dios)

X = 7.82

**x** = 10.76



Significance of Difference: Significant at the OS Lovel

Area	of Comparison:	Arm Strøngth	Arm Strength (Bar Dipe)	
	Test # 1 ea	d Test # 3 ; (Geo	ap 13)	
Subjects	Tost # 1	Test Ø 3	D	D <sup>2</sup>
1	10	26	-4	26
2	10	17	-7	49
3	8	9	-2	1
4	13	29	-6	36
5	6	8	-2	4
6	11	23	-2	4
7	2	9	-7	69
8	7	9	-2	4
9	2.0	12	-2	4
10	5	22	-6	36
11	7	23	-6	36
12	1	3	-2	4
13	7	9	-2	4
14	20	12	-2	4
15	7	8	-2	1
16	4	26	-20	100
17	15	27	-2	4
	EX = 133	<b>X</b> = 197	ΣD = -64	$\Sigma D^2 = 356$

x = 7.82

**x** = 11,58



Significance of Difference: Significant beyond the .05 level

Are	a of Comparison:	Arn Strength (	Bar Digs)	ngan gan att a dir i d
	Test # 2 and	Yest Ø 3 : (Group	<u>(11)</u>	
Subjects	Teat & 2	Yest # 3	D	D <sup>2</sup>
1	12	14	-2	4
2	36	17	-3	9
3	8	9	-1	1
4	25	19	-4	16
5	8		0	0
6	12	13	-1	1
7	2	9	-2	4
8	7	9	-2	4
9	11	12	-1	1
10	10	11	-1	2
11	19	13	0	0
12	1	3	-2	4
13	10	9	1	1
14	13	12	1	1
15	13	8	5	25
16	12	14	-2	4
17	17	17	0	0
	ΣX = 183	<b>S</b> X = 197	<b>S</b> D = 16	$\Sigma D^2 = 70$

**x** = 10.76

**x** = 11.53



Significance of Difference: Not significant

		17	16	15	14	: 5	12	5 11	10	5 c	>	-	1 0		4	دىن		, н	Subjects	
X =	15055	TT 1100	88	1190	836	680	340	550	760	1190	300F	490	066	930	1135	076	000	906	Group I	
	ΣX = 12705	900	630	695	940	440	520	000	900	690	640	480	1010	1200	000	920	670	000	Group II	
X =	ED = 2130	260	8	495	-16	240	320	-50	-140	S10	8	20	-20	-270	445	20	130	100	đ	
	<b>x</b> d <sup>2</sup> = 1075250	67600	808	245125	100	57600	102400	2500	19000	260100	3600	100	400	72900	220025	400	16900	10000	D <sup>2</sup>	

Area of Comparison: Log Strength

Test of 1

.

Test: Leg Strength (Tes	st \$1)
n = <u>17</u>	$\Sigma D = 2.130$ $\Sigma D^2 = 1.075,250$
$\Sigma d^2 = \Sigma D^2 - (\Sigma D)^2$	Ed <sup>2</sup> = <u>\$98,373,53</u>
$s_d = \sqrt{\frac{\boldsymbol{z} d^2}{n-1}}$	$s_d = \frac{808,373,53}{16}$ $s_d = \underline{224.772}$
$S\bar{x} - \bar{x} = \frac{S_d}{\sqrt{n}}$	$s\bar{x} - \bar{x} = 224.772$
Sx - x =	$S\bar{x} - \bar{x} = 54.51$
$\mathbf{t} = \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{S}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}}$	t = 885.58 + 747.35 54.51
t =2,53	
t at .05 level = 2.19	
df = n-1	
df = 16	

Significance of Difference: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Significant beyond .05 level

Subjects			U.	D <sup>2</sup>	
1	Group I	Group II		hay the	
1	960	1000	-40	1600	
2	960	760	200	40000	
3	910	1150	-240	57600	
4	1140	610	530	280900	
5	720	1290	-570	324900	
6	1040	990	50	2500	
7	680	670	10	100	
8	760	830	-70	4900	
9	1230	750	400	230400	
10	790	1280	-490	240100	
11	790	810	-20	400	
12	360	625	235	55125	
13	680	460	220	49400	
14	680	925	~245	60025	
15	1130	850	330	103900	
16	840	660	180	32400	
17	970	980	-10	100	
Σ	. X = 15190	<b>X</b> = <b>1</b> 4660	<b>Σ</b> D = 550	$\Sigma D^2 =$	1488350

Area of Comparison: Les Strength

X = 893.52

**x** = 861,17



Significance of Difference: Not Significant at .05 level

Area	of Comparison:	Leg Strength				
	Test § 3					
Subjects	Group I	Group II	D		$D^2$	
1	008	940	- 20		6400	
2	920	740	190		\$2400	
3	1120	1080	40		1600	
4	2000	660	420		176400	
5	088	1120	-240		57600	
6	990	1190	-200		40000	
7	600	570	210		12100	
8	010	950	-140		19600	
9	1220	:40	350		133400	
10	700	1540	-840		369 600	
11	760	620	140		19600	
12	910	570	340		115600	
13	810	560	250		12500	
14	720	920	-200		40000	
15	980	1190	-210		44100	
16	940	910	30	A las	000	
17	050	870	80		6400	
	ΣX = 15330	ΣX = 15270	<b>Σ</b> D =	60	$\Sigma D^2 =$	1143200

x = 901.76

**x** = 892,22



Area	of Comparison:	Back Strengt	ħ	1
	Tept # 1			
Subjects	Group I	Group TX	D	$D^2$
1	320	305	5	25
2	270	210	60	3600
3	250	290	-60	3600
4	320	200	120	14400
5	320	420	-100	12100
6	375	380	~5	25
7	210	220	0	0
8	360	230	130	16900
9	320	290	30	900
10	340	270	70	4900
11	330	230	200	10000
12	340	250	90	3200
13	290	270	20	400
14	200	250	30	900
15	640	360	80	6400
16	350	230	120	24400
17	340	270	70	4900
	ΣX = 5415	<b>X</b> = 466B	ΣD = 750	$\Sigma D^2 = 101550$

 $\bar{x} = 310,53$ 

**x** = 267.6%



Significance of Difference: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Significant beyond \_05 lovel

	Tost II	<u></u>			
				<sub>2</sub> 2	
Subjects	Group I	Group II	D	D	
1	330	350	-20	400	
2	240	235	55	3025	
3	275	310	-35	1225	
4	340	230	110	12100	
5	310	420	-110	12100	
6	375	370	5	25	
7	225	210	15	225	
8	355	240	15	225	
9	355	300	55	3025	
10	300	315	-15	225	
11	310	275	35	1225	
12	300	245	55	3025	
13	260	260	-20	400	
14	260	260	-20	400	
15	390	420	-30	900	
16	320	260	60	3600	
17	320	270	50	2300	
Σ	X = 5315	ΣX = 5010	<b>E</b> D = 205	$\Sigma D^2 = 0$	44625

Area of Comparison: \_\_\_\_\_\_

x =

**x** =

294.7

rest: mach strength (100	2 223	
n = <u>17</u>	$\Sigma D = 205 \qquad \Sigma D^2 =$	
$\Sigma d^2 = \Sigma D^2 - \frac{(\Sigma D)^2}{\pi}$	Ed <sup>2</sup> = <u>62,152,95</u>	<u>.</u>
$s_d = \sqrt{\frac{\sum d^2}{n-1}}$	$s_d \neq \frac{42,152,95}{16}$ $s_d$	=
$S\bar{x} - \bar{x} = \frac{S_d}{\sqrt{n}}$	$s\bar{x} - \bar{x} = \frac{s_{1,327}}{\sqrt{17}}$	-
$S\bar{x} - \bar{x} = 51.327$	Sx - x =	
4+263		
$\mathbf{\hat{r}} = \underline{\mathbf{X}} - \underline{\mathbf{X}}$ $\mathbf{Sx} - \mathbf{x}$	t = 312.64 + 294.7 12.45	
t = 1.44		
t at .05 level = 2.19		
df = n-1		
df = 16		

Significance of Difference: Not Significant at .05 Level

Area	of Comparison:	Bock Stren	geb	12.2
	Test # 3		Same Maria	
Subjects	Group I	Group II	D	$D^2$
1	340	360	-20	400
2	300	230	70	4900
3	295	310	-15	225
4	300	230	150	22500
5	290	420	-130	16900
6	380	360	20	400
7	210	240	-30	900
8	370	280	90	8100
9	360	320	40	1600
10	290	340	-50	2500
11	330	280	50	2500
12	320	280	40	1600
13	290	290	0	0
14	250	330	-30	6400
15	370	410	-40	1600
16	375	290	85	7225
17	340	270	70	4900
	ΣX = 5490	<b>X</b> = 5240	ΣD = 250	$\Sigma D^2 = 2255$

x = 322.94

**x** = 308.23


Significance of Difference: Not Significant at .05 Level

	Test Ø 1			
Subjects	Group I	Group II	D	$D^2$
1	57	48	9	81
2	24	52	-28	784
3	27	30	-3	9
4	43	48	-5	25
5	33	40	-7	49
6	65	36	29	841
7	25	41	-16	256
8	51	41	10	100
9	61	44	27	189
10	56	26	30	900
11	57	24	33	1089
12	34	16	18	324
13	27	50	-23	529
14	49	60	-11	121
15	53	37	16	256
16	71	26	45	2025
17	42	36	6	36
	ΣX = 776	$\Sigma X = 655$	<b>Σ</b> D = 120	$\Sigma D^2 = 7614$

Area of Comparison: Arm Strength (Bent Arm Hang)

 $\bar{x} = 45.64$ 

 $\vec{x} = 38.52$ 

Test: Bent Arm Hang (Te	et #1)	
n = <u>17</u>	$\Sigma D = 120$ $\Sigma D^2 = 7.61$	4
$\Sigma d^2 = \Sigma D^2 - \frac{(\Sigma D)^2}{n}$	$\Sigma d^2 = 6.766.95$	
$s_d = \sqrt{\frac{\boldsymbol{\xi} d^2}{n-1}}$	$s_d \neq \sqrt{6.766.93}$ $s_d =$	20.545 -
$S\bar{x} - \bar{x} = \frac{S_d}{\sqrt{1-2}}$	$s\bar{x} - \bar{x} = 20.565$	
Vn	V I/	
$S\bar{x} - \bar{x} = 20,565$ 4,123	Sx - x =	
$t = \overline{X} - \overline{X}$ Sx - x	t = <u>45.64 - 35.62</u> 4.98	
t = <u>1.43</u>	_	
t at .05 level = 2.19		
df = n-1		
df = 15		

Significance of Difference: Not Significant at .05 Level

Area	of Comparison:	win screnges (	Bene Arm Hang)		
	Test # 2	8			
Subjects	Group I	Group II	D	$D^2$	
1	53	55	-2	4	
2	40	49	-9	81	
3	25	45	-20	400	
4	41	49	*8	64	
5	32	54	-22	484	
6	69	54	15	225	
7	27	53	-26	676	
8	43	45	-2	4	
9	59	66	-7	49	
10	58	46	12	144	
11	31	18	13	169	
12	58	36	22	484	
13	39	59	-20	400	
14	37	44	-7	49	
15	53	23	30	900	
16	61	31	30	900	
17	44	53	-9	81	
٤	X = 770	EX = 700	ΣD = -10	$\Sigma D^2 =$	5114

x = 45.29

x = 45.88

Test: Dent Arm Hang (Test #2)  

$$n = 17$$
  $\Sigma D = 410$   $\Sigma D^2 = 5,114$   
 $\Sigma d^2 = \Sigma D^2 - (\underline{S} \underline{D})^2$   $\Sigma d^2 = 5,108,12$   
 $S_d = \sqrt{\frac{\underline{S} d^2}{n-1}}$   $S_d = \sqrt{\frac{5,108,12}{16}}$   $S_d = 12.867$   
 $S\overline{x} - \overline{x} = \frac{Sd}{\sqrt{n}}$   $S\overline{x} - \overline{x} = \frac{17,867}{\sqrt{17}}$   
 $S\overline{x} - \overline{x} = \frac{17,867}{4,123}$   $S\overline{x} - \overline{x} = \frac{4,33}{4,33}$   
 $t = \frac{\overline{x} - \overline{x}}{Sx - x}$   $t = 4,33$   
 $t = 1206$   
 $t = 1,005$  level = 2,19  
 $df = n-1$   
 $df = 16$   
Significance of Difference: Det Significant at 05 level

Area o	of Comparison:	Aru Strength	(Bent Arm Hong)	-	
	Test # 3				
Subjects	Group I	Group II	D	$D^2$	
1	70	51	19	361	
2	45	47	-2	4	
3	42	49	-7	49	
4	43	39	4	16	
5	34	56	-22	484	
6	60	36	24	576	
7	26	445	18	324	
8	41	44	-3	9	
9	62	54	8	64	
10	55	39	16	256	
11	65	26	39	1521	
12	48	17	31	961	
13	50	51	-1	1	
14	40	33	7	49	
15	53	22	31	961	
16	74	36	38	1304	
17	50	39	11	121	
٤	X = 858	<b>X</b> = 683	ΣD = 211	$\Sigma D^2 = 71$	41

x = 50.47

<del>x</del> = 40.17

Test: Beat Arm Hang (T	(St d3)			
n =	$\Sigma D = 211$		$\Sigma D^2 = $	.141
$d^2 = \sum D^2 - \frac{(\sum D)^2}{n}$		æd <sup>2</sup> = <u>6,52</u>	2.12	
$s_d = \sqrt{\frac{\boldsymbol{\xi} d^2}{n-1}}$	s <sub>d</sub> =	4,522,12 16	- \$ <sub>d</sub> = _	16,61
$\vec{x} - \vec{x} = \frac{s_d}{\sqrt{n}}$	8	$\bar{x} - \bar{x} = \underline{16.1}$	17	
$\bar{x} - \bar{x} = \frac{16.81}{4.122}$		$S\bar{x} - \bar{x} = $	4.07	
$= \frac{\overline{X} - \overline{X}}{Sx - x}$	t	= <u>50,47 = 1</u> 4,07	0.37	
- 2.32				
at .05 level = 2.15	)			
f = n-1				
lf = 16				

Significance of Difference: Significant beyond .05 Level

146

	Teat & 1		and a state of	
	<u></u>			
Subjects 1	Group I 10	Group II 10	D	D <sup>2</sup>
2	10	10	0	0
3	4	8	-4	16
4	11	13	-2	4
5	2	6	-5	25
6	22	11	11	121
7	8	2	6	36
8	10	7	3	9
9	9	10	-1	1
10	9	5	4	16
11	15	7	8	64
12	7	1	6	36
13	7	7	0	0
14	24	10	4	16
15	10	7	3	9
16	13	4	9	81
17	11	15	-4	16
	<b>E</b> X = 171	<b>X</b> = 133	<b>Z</b> D = 38	$\Sigma D^2 = 450$

Area of Comparison: Ann Strength (Bar Ding)

x = 10.05

X

**x** = 7.82



Significance of Difference: Not Significant at .05 Lovel

Ar	ea of Comparison:	Arm Strength	(Bar Dips)	
	Test #2		-	
Subjects	Group I	Group II	D	$D^2$
1	13	12	1	1
2	7	14	-7	49
3	4	8	-4	16
4	10	15	<b>-</b> S	25
5	1	8	-7	49
6	27	12	25	225
7	9	7	2	4
8	12	7	5	25
9	6	11	-5	25
10	9	10	-1	1
11	15	13	2	4
12	6	1	5	25
13	8	10	-2	4
14	9	13	-4	14
15	11	13	-2	4
16	14	12	2	4
17	9	17 <sub>55</sub>	-8	64
	ΣX = 170	<b>X</b> = 183	<b>Z</b> D = -13	$\Sigma D^2 = 541$

**x** = 10

 $\vec{x} = 10.76$ 



Significance of Difference: Not Significant at .05 Leval

	Teat #3			
Subjects	Group 1	Group II.	D	D <sup>2</sup>
1	13	34	#1	8
2	12	27	**3	25
3	\$	9	mile	16
4	13	19	*6	36
5	2	8	*5	36
6	25	13	\$2	166
7	8	9	**	2
8	16	9	2	49
9	22	12	-2	2
10	2.4	22	3	9
11	22	13	9	61
12	S	3	2	4
13	5	9	-4	16
14	27	12	5	25
15	22	8	3	
16	21	54	1	49
17	12	17	*5	29
	ΣX = 212	<b>Σ</b> X = 107	<b>Σ</b> D =	$\Sigma D^2 = 32$

Area of Comparison: Are Strength (Are Ding)

x = 12.47

**x** = \*\*\*\*\*

151

Test: Ear Dips (Test #3)				
n = <u>37</u>	ΣD =	<u></u>	٤ D <sup>2</sup> =	127
$\Sigma d^2 = \Sigma D^2 - (\Sigma D)^2$		æd <sup>2</sup> =	513.77	
$s_d = \sqrt{\frac{\sum d^2}{n-1}}$	s <sub>d.</sub> =	<u>\$13.77</u> 16	\$ <sub>d</sub> =	5.667
87 7 SI				
$S_X = X = \frac{S_d}{\sqrt{n}}$		sx - x =	V 17	
Sx - x =		$S\bar{x} - \bar{x} =$	1.95	
4.123				
$\dot{\mathbf{z}} = \underline{\mathbf{x}} - \overline{\mathbf{x}}$		t =	. 11.59	
5x = x		1.	.35	
1,37				
t at .05 level = 8.19				
df = n-1 $df = 16$				

Significance of Difference: \_\_\_\_\_\_