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#### Abstract

In modern sports, the anthropometric measurements and their relationship with various motor abilities are an important guide for coaches for classification and selection of sportsperson according to their age, ability etc. Several factors such as age, height, weight and various growth and motor fitness parameters influence the selection of players. The most fundamental characteristic of life is movement. Man is born with certain fundamental movements; these movements in various forms express the existence of life from the minute microscopic organism to the higher animal. The variations in physical out look of human are interesting aspects which has tempted the scientists to analyze and classify them. Growth and Development of human being is a continuous process which begins at conception and ends at death. The term growth and development are often used inter changeably, but there is a difference in emphasis implied by each though growth considers to be one aspects of development. In this study an attempt has been made to find out the age related changes on growth and motor performance of 14 and 15 years boys. The subjects of the present study were selected randomly from the school Naihati Narendra Vidyaniketan of 24 Pgs (N) District,WB. Thirty students of each age group's i.e. 60 boy's students were randomly selected for this purpose. The criteria measured in this article were- Growth Parameters i.e.; height, weight, thigh girth, calf girth, biceps girth and Motor Performance parameters i.e.; $4 \times 10 \mathrm{mt}$. shuttle run, standing broad jump, stork stand and 600 yd. run \& walk. The data on the growth and motor performance parameters were analyzed by applying ANOVA to find out significant differences if any among the various age groups. Significant results were found in height, weight, thigh girth, calf girth, biceps girth, $4 \times 10 \mathrm{mt}$. shuttle run, SBJ, stork stand and 600 yd run \& walk.
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## INTRODUCTION:

Man is born with certain fundamental movements; these movements in various forms express the existence of life from the minute microscopic organism to the higher animal. In the field of research in Physical Education and Sports, to study the relationship of human performance and body Growth, perhaps, is the oldest one. Human beings differ in many ways in their external
body form. The variations in physical out look of human are interesting aspects which has tempted the scientists to analyze and classify them. Growth and Development of human being is a continuous process which begins at conception and ends at death. Right from the time of conception to the death in the full age of a human organism runs through various stages of growth and development viz. pre-natal and post-natal.

The term growth and development are often used inter changeably, but there is a difference in emphasis implied by each though growth considers to be one aspects of development.

## THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY-

1) To observe the growth characteristics of $14 \& 15$ years old boys.
2) To observe the motor ability status of the said group of boys.
3) To analysis and compare the age wise differences, if any, the selected growth and motor performance variables among the $14 \& 15$ years old boys.
4) To study the relationship between selected Growth and motor performance variables of said age group boys.

## METHODOLOGY-

## Subjects-

The subjects of the present study were selected randomly from the school Naihati Narendra Vidyaniketan, 24 Pgs (N),WB. Thirty students of each age group's i.e. total 60 boy's students were randomly selected for this purpose.

Criterion Measured-
Parameters Measured by

1) Height (cm.) Stadiometer
2) Weight (Kg) Weighing machine
3) Thigh Girth (cm) Using standard protocol
4) Calf Girth (cm) Using standard protocol
5) Biceps Girth (cm) Standard measurement technique
6) Agility (sec) $4 \times 10 \mathrm{mt}$. Shuttle Run
7) Leg Explosive Strength (cm.) Standing Broad Jump
8) Balance (sec) Stork Stand
9) Endurance (sec) 600 yd run \& walk

Statistical Procedure-
The data on the growth and motor performance parameters were analyzed by applying ANOVA to find out significant differences if any among the various age groups.

## RESULTS \& DISCUSSION-

Discussions were made on the basis of the findings of the present study and compared with available literatures.

Height
Table-1: Mean and SD of height (cm.) between $14 \& 15$ age group boys.

| Age | Mean | SD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 years | 151.03 | 5.95 |
| 15 years | 155.94 | 5.60 |



Table-2: ANOVA between the two age groups for height

| Source of variance | SS | df | MS | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between Groups | 3582.66 | 4 | 895.67 | $14.93^{* *}$ |
| Within Groups | 8461.27 | 141 | 60.01 |  |
| Total | 12043.93 | 145 |  |  |

* Sig. at 0.05 levels ${ }^{* *}$ Sig. at 0.01 levels, NS -Not significant.
$\mathrm{F}_{0.05(4,141)}=2.44, \quad \mathrm{~F}_{0.01(4,141)}=3.46$

Higher the age higher was the height, Teeple and Massey (1976) had shown that the average height of 10,11 and 12 years old boys were $143.6,147.6$ and 152.4 cm respectively. Grassi et al. (2006) had found that standing height had significantly increased with age. F-value 14.93 was found significant at both levels. Comparing the observation of above leading researchers with the findings of the present study it may be concluded that 15 years boys were relatively taller in height than 14 years group.

## Weight

Table-3: Mean and SD of Weight $(\mathrm{kg})$ between $14 \& 15$ year's boys

| Age of subjects | Mean | SD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 years | 38.02 | 6.41 |
| 15 years | 40.17 | 4.23 |



Table-4: ANOV A between the two age groups for weight

| Source of variance | SS | df | MS | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between Groups | 2850.87 | 4 | 712.72 |  |
| Within Groups | 7058.42 | 141 | 50.06 |  |
| Total | 9909.29 | 145 |  |  |

Higher the age, higher was the body weight. Barabas and Eiben (1993) observed that 10, 11, 12 years old Hungarian boys carried the weight of $36.16,35.39$ and 39.49 Kg . respectively. Teeple \& Massey (1976) and Shephard (1982) had shown similar results. Therefore, the present study was in close proximity to above researchers. F value 14.24 was statistically significant at both levels. It may further be inferred that body weight was related to the age of the subjects.

## Thigh Girth

Table-5: Mean and S.D. of Thigh Girth (cm.) between 14 and 15 years boys

| Age of Subjects | Mean | S.D. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 years | 41.18 | 5.00 |
| 15 years | 37.85 | 1.27 |



Table-6: ANOVA between the two age groups for Thigh Girth

| Source of <br> Variation | SS | df | MS | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between Groups | 688.18 | 4 | 172.04 |  |
| Within Groups | 2289.07 | 141 | 16.23 | $10.60 * *$ |
| Total | 2977.24 | 145 |  |  |

$*$ Sig. at 0.05 levels $\quad{ }^{* *}$ Sig. at 0.01 levels, NS -Not significant.
$\mathrm{F}_{0.05(4,141)}=2.44, \quad \mathrm{~F}_{0.01(4,141)}=3.46$

It was observed that thigh girth of 14 years boys was significantly higher than that of 15 years boys. Banerjee et al. (1990) observed that higher thigh girth had positively correlated with performance than any other measurements in physical dimension. In the present study thigh girth of 14 years boys was higher than 15 years boys and 14 years group performed better than 15 years group in Shuttle Run test. ' $F$ ' value was found to be 10.60 which were statistically significant at 0.05 and 0.01 levels.

## Calf Girth

Table-7: Mean and S.D. of Calf Girth (cm.) between 14 and 15 years boys

| Age of Subjects | Mean | S.D. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 years | 29.93 | 2.94 |
| 15 years | 27.25 | 0.94 |



Table-8: ANOVA between the two age groups for Calf Girth

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between Groups | 209.71 | 4 | 52.43 | $8.19 * *$ |
| Within Groups | 902.98 | 141 | 6.40 |  |
| Total | 1112.68 | 145 |  |  |

It was found from Table-8 that calf girth of 15 years boys had lower than 14 years group and ' $F$ ' value was found 8.19 which were statistically significant at 0.05 and 0.01 level. Banerjee et al. (1990) observed that higher calf girth had positively correlated with performance when studied on 43 male athletes aged from 14 to 18 years. Analyzing all the relevant data and statistical treatment it appeared 14 years boys had significantly higher calf girth than 15 years group and they performed better than the other group in Shuttle Run test.

## Biceps Girth

Table-9: Mean and S.D. of Biceps Girth between $14 \& 15$ years boys.

| Age of Subjects | Mean | S.D. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 years | 20.82 | 2.23 |
| 15 years | 21.03 | 0.84 |



Table-10: ANOVA between the two age groups for Biceps Girth.

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between Groups | 87.43 | 4 | 21.86 | $4.53 * *$ |
| Within Groups | 679.79 | 141 | 4.82 |  |
| Total | 769.23 | 145 |  |  |

Higher the age higher was the biceps girth. Slaughter et al. (1982) observed that the mean biceps circumference of 9.0-9.9, 10.0-10.9 and 11.0-11.9 years old American boys were 21.4, 23.1 and 23.6 cm . respectively. It may be seen from the observed ' $F$ ' value i.e., 4.53 were statistically significant at both 0.05 and 0.01 levels. It appeared 15 years boys had significantly higher biceps girth than 14 years group. This improvement has a bearing on motor performance.

## Shuttle Run

Table-11: Mean and S.D. of Shuttle Run ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) between $14 \& 15$ years group.

| Age of Subjects | Mean | S.D. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 years | 11.20 | 0.46 |
| 15 years | 11.49 | 0.59 |



Table-12: ANOVA between the two age groups for Shuttle Run (m/sec).

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between Groups | 13.47 | 4 | 3.37 | $11.21 * *$ |
| Within Groups | 42.36 | 141 | 0.30 |  |
| Total | 55.82 | 145 |  |  |

From the present study it was revealed that 14 years boys had performed better than 15 years boys. Several investigators reported that agility improved rapidly before puberty because of early maturation of central nervous system. Clarke (1971) opined from a study on shuttle run that the
performance increased in a straight line rise from ages 8 to 14 years. Analyzing the present study it may be concluded that this study was in agreement with the findings of the above researcher.

Standing Broad Jump
Table-13: Mean and S.D. of SBJ (cm.) between $14 \& 15$ year's boys

| Age of Subjects | Mean | S.D. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 years | 171.37 | 15.92 |
| 15 years | 180.13 | 11.43 |



Table-14: ANOVA between the two age groups for Standing Broad Jump

| Source of <br> Variation | SS | df | MS | F |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Between Groups | 50887.69 | 4 | 12721.92 | $62.03 * *$ |
| Within Groups | 28919.68 | 141 | 205.10 |  |
| Total | 79807.38 | 145 |  |  |

Higher the age higher was the jumping ability. Chauhan et al. (1987) reported that age had been found to be positive and significant relationship with performance of standing broad jump. Slaughter et al. (1982) and Sodhi \& Singh (1987) had shown the similar results. Analyzing the present study it may be concluded that this study was in agreement with the findings of the above researchers. So, from the findings of the present study it may be concluded that leg explosive Strength of 15 years boys were better than 14 years group.

Stork Stand
Table-15: Mean and S.D. of Stork Stand (sec) between $14 \& 15$ year's boys

| Age of Subjects | Mean | S.D. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 years | 76.13 | 33.32 |
| 15 years | 98.13 | 59.21 |



Table-16: ANOVA between the two age groups for Stork Stand

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between Groups | 36575.02 |  | 9143 | 4.18** |
| Within Groups | 308396.48 | 41 | 2187.21 |  |
| Total | 344971.51 | 145 |  |  |

* Sig. at 0.05 levels $\quad{ }^{* *}$ Sig. at 0.01 levels, NS -Not significant.
$\mathrm{F}_{0.05(4,141)}=2.44, \quad \mathrm{~F}_{0.01(4,141)}=3.46$

Higher the age higher was the balance ability. Gallahue (1982) reported from the findings of Kcogh (1965), De Oreo (1971) and Van Slooten (1973) that static balance ability of children showed a linear trend toward improved performance with age. Geuze(2003) showed improvement of static balance with age. So, from the findings of study and analyzing the relevant data it appeared that 15 years boys had higher balance ability than 14 years group.

600 yd Run \& Walk

Table-17: Mean and S.D. of 600 yd Run \& Walk ( $\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{min}$ ) between $14 \& 15$ years' boys

| Age of Subjects | Mean | S.D. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 years | 2.26 | 0.06 |
| 15 years | 2.23 | 0.05 |



Table-18: ANOVA between the two age groups for 600 yd Run \& Walk

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between Groups | 0.06 | 4 | 0.01 | $5.14 * *$ |
| Within Groups | 0.40 | 141 | 0.00 |  |
| Total | 0.46 | 145 |  |  |

In the present study it was observed that endurance ability of 15 years boys showed better than 14 years group. So it can be concluded that 15 years boys were better than 14 years boys in respect of 600 yards Run \& Walk. The computed 'F' Value was 5.14 which reflect significant difference between the two means. So it can be concluded that 15 years boys were better than 14 years boys in respect of 600 yards Run \& Walk.

## CONCLUSIONS-

## GROWTH PARAMETERS

1) 15 years boys were relatively taller in height than 14 years group.
2) Body weight was related to the age of the subjects and 15 years boys had better weight than 14 years.
3) In the present study thigh girth of 14 years boys was higher than 15 years boys.
4) 14 years boys had significantly higher calf girth than 15 years group.
5) Significant difference existed in biceps girth between the two groups and 15 years boys had significantly higher biceps girth than 14 years group.

## MOTOR PERFORMANCE PARAMETERS

6) 14 years boys group was more agile than 15 years group.
7) Maximum leg explosive strength was observed in 15 years group.
8) 15 years boys had higher balance ability than 14 years group. This is due to maturation of central nervous system.
9) Endurance ability of 15 years boys showed better than 14 years group.
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