



ISSN Print: 2664-7559  
ISSN Online: 2664-7567  
IJSHPPE 2022; 4(1): 41-43  
[www.physicaleducationjournal.in](http://www.physicaleducationjournal.in)  
Received: 19-02-2022  
Accepted: 28-03-2022

**Ashok Kumar**  
Research Scholar, Department  
of Physical Education,  
University of Lucknow, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

**Prashant Kumar**  
Research Scholar, Department  
of Physical Education,  
University of Lucknow, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

## Comparison of selected physical fitness components between badminton and handball athletes

**Ashok Kumar and Prashant Kumar**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33545/26647559.2022.v4.i1a.86>

### Abstract

The aim of this study was to distinguish between handball and badminton players based on selected physical fitness components. A total of 50 male players, comprising 25 badminton and 25 handball male inter-university players of University of Lucknow participated in the study. The physical fitness variables under investigation included speed, agility, and explosive strength.

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS Software, employing measures such as arithmetic mean, standard deviation, standard error of mean, and t-test for comparisons. For explosive strength, badminton players recorded mean and SD values of 26.37 and 1.52, while handball players displayed values of 29.33 and 1.58. The t-value of 6.78 suggested a noteworthy difference in explosive strength between the two groups.

The mean and standard deviation values for speed in badminton players were 7.43 and 0.46, respectively, while handball players exhibited mean and SD values of 6.76 and 0.44. The resulting t-value was 5.3, indicating a significant difference in speed between the two groups.

Regarding agility, badminton players demonstrated mean and SD values of 10.5 and 1.9, whereas handball players showed values of 8.9 and 0.67. The t-value of 6.24 signified a significant disparity in agility between the two sets of players.

Overall, significant differences were observed between badminton and handball players in relation to explosive strength ( $t = 6.78, p < .05$ ). Speed ( $t = 5.3, p < .05$ ), agility ( $t = 6.24, p < .05$ ).

**Keywords:** Badminton, handball, speed, agility, explosive strength

### Introduction

Engaging in physical activity is a vital component for maintaining overall well-being. It promotes sustained vitality and a heightened sense of well-being. Various individuals hold diverse perspectives on physical fitness. According to experts, the optimal functioning of physiological systems defines physical fitness. In essence, physical fitness is a broad term with multifaceted significance. For an average person, it signifies the capacity to perform routine tasks without experiencing fatigue or strain. Moreover, it entails having the energy to engage in additional activities.

In earlier eras, the assessment of physical fitness underwent diverse perspectives and was appraised through various methodologies. The genesis of physical well-being, rooted in military or athletic objectives, has endured for centuries, tracing back to ancient Chinese and Athenian civilizations.

The goal is to maintain optimal physical well-being, ensuring the capability to perform everyday tasks, participate in recreational activities, and respond to emergencies as they arise. In essence, an individual's physical fitness is influenced by their enthusiasm for vigorous activities. This aspect of fitness varies among individuals, workplaces, and evolves over time and circumstances. It is currently a topic of discussion regarding how to uphold the standard of ideal fitness. From a physiological standpoint, physical fitness can be described as the body's ability to undertake and recover from strenuous exercise.

The proficiency in sports significantly relies on these capabilities. Physical fitness is indispensable for individuals in every facet of life, with levels varying from an average person to that of a global athlete. Greater emphasis should be placed on the physical well-being of individuals. The strength of a nation is truly fortified only through the physical fitness and health of its people. Physical fitness encompassed the comprehensive set of five motor capacities: speed, strength, endurance, flexibility, and coordination abilities. These qualities, along with their intricate manifestations such as strength, endurance, maximum strength,

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Ashok Kumar**  
Research Scholar, Department  
of Physical Education,  
University of Lucknow, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

explosive strength, maximum speed, and agility, constituted the fundamental prerequisites for human motor skills.

### Objective

The aim of this study is to compare physical fitness elements, specifically speed, agility, and explosive strength, among male inter-university players of handball and badminton represented the University of Lucknow.

### Methodology

To conduct this study, a total of 50 male players were chosen, comprising 25 handball and 25 badminton inter-university players from the University of Lucknow. The physical fitness variables under investigation include speed, agility, and explosive strength. Data collection involved the application of tests such as the 50-yard dash, shuttle run, and standing broad jump. The collected data underwent analysis using SPSS Software, employing statistical measures such as arithmetic mean, standard deviation, standard error of mean, and t-test for comparison.

### Result

To analyze the outcomes, we employed mean and standard deviation. The mean and standard deviation of the chosen dimensions for both handball and badminton players were calculated, and the results are presented in the subsequent tables.

**Table 1:** Descriptive and comparative table of handball and badminton players in relation to Agility

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	S.D. Error	p-value	t-value
Handball	25	8.9	0.67	0.13	.000	6.24*
Badminton	25	10.5	1.19	0.24		

Table 1 discloses the mean and standard deviation figures for the agility of handball and badminton players. Specifically, Badminton players displayed mean and standard deviation values of 10.5 and 1.19, respectively. In contrast, handball players exhibited mean and standard deviation values of 8.9 and 0.67, with a corresponding t-value of 6.24.

**Table 2:** Descriptive and comparative table of handball and badminton players in relation to Explosive strength

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	S.D. Error	p-value	t-value
Handball	25	29.33	1.58	0.32	.000	6.78*
Badminton	25	26.37	1.52	0.30		

Table 4 presents the mean and standard deviation metrics for the explosive strength of handball and badminton players. Specifically, Badminton players demonstrated mean and standard deviation values of 26.369 and 1.52, respectively. In parallel, handball players exhibited mean and standard deviation values of 29.332 and 1.58, with a corresponding t-value of 6.78.

**Table 3:** Descriptive and comparative table of handball and badminton players in relation to speed

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	S.D. Error	p-value	t-value
Handball	25	6.76	.44	0.09	.000	5.3*
Badminton	25	7.43	.46	0.10		

Table 3 illustrates the mean and standard deviation measurements for the speed of handball and badminton players. Specifically, Badminton players exhibited mean and standard deviation values of 7.43 and 0.46, respectively. Meanwhile, handball players demonstrated mean and standard deviation values of 6.76 and 0.44, with a corresponding t-value of 5.3.

### Discussion

The mean and standard deviation measurements for agility in Badminton and Handball players were 10.5 & 1.19 and 8.9 & 0.67, respectively, with a t-value of 6.24. The results indicate a significant difference between Badminton and Handball players concerning agility. This discrepancy is attributed to the specific demands of Handball, where players require exceptional speed and agility for swift movements during the game.

For the comparison of explosive strength, the mean and standard deviation values for Badminton and Handball players were documented as 26.37 & 1.52 and 29.33 & 1.58, respectively, with a t-value of 6.78 indicating a significant difference between the two groups. The results suggest that Handball players exhibit greater explosive strength compared to Badminton players. This is attributed to the inherent need for good explosive strength in Handball, where quick bursts of power are essential for optimal performance.

In the context of speed, the mean and standard deviation values for Badminton and Handball players were 7.43 & 0.46 and 6.76 & 0.44, respectively, with a t-value of 5.3 indicating a significant difference between the two groups. This discrepancy underscores that Handball players exhibit greater speed compared to Badminton players. Given that Handball is renowned as one of the fastest-paced sports, players in this category necessitate excellent speed for enhanced performance during matches.

### Conclusions

Significant difference was found between badminton and Handball players in compare to explosive strength ( $t=6.78$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Significant difference was found between badminton and Handball players in relation to speed ( $t=5.3$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Significant difference was found between badminton and Handball players in compare to agility ( $t=6.24$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Initially it was hypothesized that there will be no significant difference between badminton and Handball I players in comparison to speed, agility, explosive strength is not accepted at 0.05 level of significant.

### References

1. Cronin JB, Hansen KT. Strength and power predictors of sports speed. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*. 2005;19(2):349-357.
2. Dastoor BW. *Modern Athletics System*. Owens: Chief Honorary Distribution; c1960.
3. Davis K, Rossi S, Langdon J, McMillan J. The Relationship between Jumping and Sprinting Performance in Collegiate Ultimate Athletes. *Journal of Coaching Education*. 2012;5(2):24-92.
4. Harison Clarke H, David Clarke H. *Application of Measurement to Physical Education*, Sixth Edition. Prentice Hall, Inc. Eaglewood Cliff, New Jersey, 123.
5. Harnak James E, Philips Allen D. *Measurement and Evaluation in Physical Education*. New York: John Wiley and Sons; c1942.

6. Johnson BL, Nelson JK. Practical Measurement for Evaluation in Physical Education. Delhi: Sujeet Publication; c1982.
7. Kansal DK. Test and Measurement in sports and Physical Education. New Delhi: D.V.S. Publication; c1996.
8. Mathew DK. Measurement in Physical Education. Philadelphia London: W.B. Saunders Company; c1973.
9. Miller Augustus T, Morehouse Laurence E. Physiology of Exercise 1<sup>th</sup> ed. St. Louis: The C.V. Mosby Company; c1976.
10. Rao Prabhakar J. A comparative study on physical fitness among swimmers and athletics between age group of 12 to 14 years. Asian Journal of Physical Education and Computer Science in Sports. 2010;2:225-229.
11. Singh K, Singh R. Relationship of Selected Anthropometric Variables with the Throwing Distance of Cricket Ball in Cricket. Academic Sports Scholars. 2015;4(8):1-6.
12. Singh K, Singh R. Relationship of selected physical fitness variables with the performance of male long jumpers. International Journal of Physical Education and Sports. 2016;1(1):23-27.
13. Singh K, Singh R. (Selected Anthropometric Variables As Predictors of Fast Bowling Performance in Cricket. Academic Sports Scholars. 2016;5(6):01-09.
14. Singh R, Singh K. Difference between batsman and fast0 bowlers in relation to grip strength, back strength, leg strength and flexibility in cricket. International Journal of Advanced Research and Development. 2016;1(1):97-99.