Study on muscular preparation of middle school students during handball classes

Marius Cătălin POPESCU, Gabriel Ioan MANGRA, Gabriel Marian POPA

University of Craiova, Faculty of Physical Education and Sport

Abstract: The development of handball players force has an important role in driving action, the force being a limiting factor of technical executions. Not all methods taken from sports training can be addressed in physical education lessons, and those that are suitable to driving level of pupils, usually methods that are working with the training of children and juniors, should be chosen from the material base available to school and availability of pupils. Force can be trained successfully by using work front method having influence on the development of specific handball driving skills.

Key word: force, physical education, frontal work method, handball

Introduction

The game of handball has experienced lately a rapidly evolving and we could say even spectacular. The level of performance achieved in the current stage, both internationally and local is very high and can not be achieved only by players whose performance capability is particularly high and rising. Art play area was greatly expanded.

Handball is a game characterized by a complexity of movements executed in conditions of changing speed and force, determined by collaboration between teammates and direct combat between opponents.[1]

There are new procedures that the professional handball player perform with high craftsmanship. It also enriched the individual and collective technique diversifying the solutions to different game situations. All this has implications for handball training model components, including the increase in the volume training.

Learning any techniques and it revaluation depends on the strength development. Playing an important role in all the acts and actions of the driving force is the limiting factor of technical execution, insufficient to prevent the development of efficiency and continuity of the movements, leading to delays in correct executions and fatigue affect the accuracy of gestures.

Force development is intended to increase the overall force ratios and provides technical support needed for performing force. Lack of proper support force can lead to the incorrect formation of technical skills.[2]

This quality largely determines the speed motor driving documents, helping to increase the number of repetitions and so the resistance. As conditional capacity, force has a high degree of training, the changes at this level leading to changes anatomical and physiological and so

stirring up major organic functions to improve system neuromuscular properties, so at students level to support specific effort physical education lessons, but also the educational activities.

The human body force (and not one that is a feature -order mechanical motion of any body) is the ability to make efforts to win, maintenance or disposal in a relation with internal or external strength by contraction of one to several muscle groups . [3]

In this paper we have tried to respond to the question if use working method compared to the development of frontal force through the circuit in groups, lead to significant differences between the two groups of students included in research and which are those?

Also which of the two methods contribute to capacity to work independently as a source of involving students in their preparation but also for permanent education through movement?

Materials and methods

The experiment took place eight grades classes and included 60 students.

One class worked using the frontal force method and it was chosen randomly the eighth grade A consists of 13 boys and 17 girls, and class VIII B consists of 14 boys and 16 girls that worked using the workshop method . Along with school activities the student were advised to exercise in their free time the means that were included in lessons, explaining to them the need to continue the work to achieve a breakthrough in testing.

In February, the students were initially tested (IT) and in March both classes were finally tested (FT). Samples selected for assessing the subject progress are included in the National System of School Assessment in physical education and sport, namely: hanging arm tractions; pushes feet resting on the bench, pushes with hands resting on the bench, lifting bank with two hands

to the chest; simultaneous lifting the torso and legs, side lunges, three successive long jump from standstill, pushes with one foot resting on a fixed scale.

In preparing this paper, we used the following research methods:

- observation method by which I formed the guiding idea of the work that motivate the students to work independently is one of the keys to progress in line accumulations of force, insufficient school hours allocated to the program.
- method of studying the literature that I have built over the issue chosen and I remember in practice impossible to comply methodological recommendations formulated by limiting the activity to the school schedule and the need to find real solutions to immediate compensation of these discrepancies between the

provisions of methodology and general time spent training students.

- Shaping method for applying two methods of instruction.
- method tests used to evaluate student progress as a result of application of the two working methods specific to physical education student evaluation.
- statistical and mathematical method to calculate specific indicators -Use namely the arithmetic mean and its ratio to the reference tables.
- graphical method used to mimic representation of the recorded data.
- As a means of force development methods I used to eighth grade to A- 6 programs selected exercises in front of order 2 each, and the eighth grade B- him six circuits. Both classes have worked specific exercises for handball.

Results

Table no. 1. VIIIth Class A - boys

Name	Hang	ing arm	ushes fee	t resting	Simu	ltaneous	Sid	e lunges	hree successive		
	t	ractions	on th	e bench	lifting	the torso			long jump from		
			ļ			and legs			standstill		
					hor	izontally					
Testing	I.T.	I.T. F.T.		F.T.	I.T.	F.T.	I.T.	F.T.	I.T.	F.T.	
results											
A.A.	1	5	20	27	4	18	9+12	24+24	5.65	5.80	
B.A	10	12	13	22	1	10	6+3	22+18	5.80	6.00	
C.L	3	7	28	34	12	22	11+15	26+26	5.00	5.40	
C.B	2	6	10	21	3	15	9+12	25+25	5.90	6.00	
D.A	2	5	20	27	4	16	8+10	24+24	4.10	5.10	
O.R	6	9	20	27	5	18	10+10	24+24	6.10	6.20	
R.A	3	7	15	24	5	18	7+8	23+23	3.80	5.10	
R.A	1	5	9	22	6	19	7+7	23+24	5.20	5.70	
L.D	4	4 7		27	8	21	14+14	26+26	6.20	6.30	
V.A	3	7	25	29	8	20	14+12	24+24	4.10	5.10	

Table no. 2. VIIIth Class B - boys

Name	_	ng arm actions		feet resting the bench	lifting the	torso d legs	Sio	_	nree successive ong jump from standstill		
Testing results	I.T. F.T.		I.T.	F.T	I.T.	F.T.	I.T.	F.T.	I.T. F.T.		
B.A									Medica	al relief	
B.T	6	6	1	8 20	4	8	16+10	18+12	5.40	5.5 0	
B.R	2	3	18 21		2	6	8+12	10+13	5.35	5.40	
C.D	2	4	2	0 20	3	5	7+6	10+11	4.10	4.80	

D.R	5	6	10	18	1	6	5+7	9+10	5.70	5.90
J.A	2	4	30	34	12	13	12+13	14+15	4.20	4.60
M.A	2	4	21	22	5	7	9+12	12+14	4.60	5.10
P.O	4	6	16	18	6	8	14+10	15+18	5.10	5.30
P.R	9	8	21	26	3	6	16+20	16+22	5.40	5.60
S.A	8	9	15	19	4	8	11+14	16+22	5.20	5.40

Table no. 3. VIIIth Class A-girls

Nume	Push	nes with	ifting th	e bench	Lifting 1	knees to	lumping	gover	Pushes with one		
	ands res	sting on	with tw	o hands	the ch	est from	he gym	nastic	foot resting on a		
	th	e bench	from tl	ne chest		hanging	1	bench	fixed scale		
Testing	I.T.	F.T.	I.T. F.T.		I.T.	F.T.	I.T.	F.T.	I.T.	F.T.	
results											
B.A	2	6	7	15	10	16	6	9	10+10	16+16	
B.O	3	8	9	18	9	14	9	16	12+13	14+15	
C.E	2	8	11	18	12	21	7	12	10+11	12+12	
E.C	10	11	13	19	18	23	20	26	15+15	17+17	
G.A	3	6	12	21	16	20	15	18	10+13	16+16	
I.A	4	9	10	22	11	15	8	11	11+12	14+15	
M.I	4	8	18	24	14	18	7	12	18+25	22+25	
M.R	2	7	11	16	20	24	5	9	11+11	18+18	
N.A	4	6	9	18	12	19	6	12	9+12	16+17	
P.D	6	8	12	17	11	15	7	12	10+15	16+16	
P.A	4	9	10	15	9	16	11	18	11+9	17+15	
R.R	15	17	15	18	20	24	13	21	10+10	18+18	
R.M	5	7	11	21	14	18	10	18	12+14	21+22	
Ş.D	3	7	21	24	17	21	8	12	10+10	18+18	
T.A	4	6	20	24	15	19	16	21	15+15	22+23	
T.I	2	6	11	17	15	18	21	34	11+19	19+21	
V.M	10	12	20	27	20	24	22	34	23+17	28+24	

Table no. 4. VIIIth Class B -girls

Nume	Pushe	s with	ifting th	e bench	Lifting 1	knees to	Jumpir	ng over	ushes with	one foot
	hands r	esting	with tw	o hands	the che	est from	the gyn	nnastic	resting on a fixed	
	on the	bench	from t	he chest		hanging		bench		scale
Tastina										
Testing results	I.T.	F.T.	I.T.	F.T.	I.T.	F.T.	I.T.	F.T.	I.T.	F.T.
Tesaits										
B.I	8	8 9		6	4	8	9	10	6+8	7+8
B.M	3	5	4	8	10	12	3	5	7+8	8+9
C.C	10	10	10	12	10	12	25	25	12+15	13+14
C.S	2	4	6	8	5	7	8	9	9+7	8+9
C.D	4	4	6	7	10	11	9	10	6+9	8+10
D.A	4	5	3	4	8	10	2	4	10+11	11+12
D.D	2 4		6	6	7	9	9	8	8+8	8+10
H.E	4	5	9	8	10	10	12	14	11+10	12+14

L.N	10	10	12	14	4	6	8	10	10+12	11+13
M.I	5	7	6	7	4	5	14	16	9+11	10+11
M.L	4	4	5	8	14	12	10	9	9+12	10+11
P.I	5	6	10	12	6	9	7	9	8+10	10+14
S.G	6	8	10	9	13	14	13	14	15+18	17+18
Ş.A-M	3	5	1	5	2	6	6	8	6+7	8+6
Ş.M	2	4	2	4	4	6	4	9	7+10	8+10
V.R	11	14	10	10	14	15	12	12	12+15	14+15

From the recorded data can be observed that the class where we opted for force development method by the frontal process, students performances increased with a higher progression grade than the class that was chosen for the process in circuit. So, although the initial testing performance classes start from close performances at the end of our pedagogical experiment series A, which has been working frontal achieved higher average front in all samples, even those that started slightly weaker. Best results, highest progression is registered to force abdominal where progress rate of 12.7 repetitions, significant support our claims. Lower rate of progression to first test records or traction of 5.3, where the share of results is placed in a Gauss curve slightly by lower average performance, yet not one homogenous team, demonstrating and standard deviation, it being the only value over two units at final testing of the class.

Looking at this indicator we initial note heterogeneity collectives, both girls and boys, which was expected to new classes, students from different schools with not unitary previous training. For final testing at both collective note a relative homogenization samples with the series A share increased compared with series B which partly kept their cool though baseline average sample grade students performed in progression compared to initial testing.

As for the girls, the situation is similar, with a progression notice much lower compared to the series, which has been through the process circuit. We can notice than the first sample, which

pushes, unexpected progression is somewhat light compared with other samples progressions although they are not neglected.

What we notice to team class that worked on the front is it homogeneity in all samples. It seems that female students with good results were content with them, without further work, and those where results have been very poor, have progressed more, the average increase in place more under increases their value. For series B, the rate of progress of girls is very small, insignificant as their counterparts in the same class, boys are more likely to develop this quality driving interest.

Without neglecting the variable induced by our experiment, different methods of approaching the subject of the lesson should be remembered that the pupils which were formulated extra class tasks, to continue the work in their free time with the means recommended lessons , which as we can see ,the students from class A , used its , showing some remarkable progression is that the pedagogical and methodological basis of the experience could not only achieve through the work ordered by the school program .

Sure, teamwork, students would have been beneficial for student from series B and from the perspective of quantitative accumulation and socialization, the development of interrelations between them. In reality, they were not organized, they don't found resources to spend a few minutes preferential for a sport activity, which is a key for reflection on the pedagogical approach of the issue

Table no.5. Data from control samples specific to handball

No.		Nome		20 m	10**	10x30m		hlina	Dor	1 1 1 1 1 1 1	TI		love in triangle		Coope	
INO.		Name		30 m	10X	30 III	DIII	Dribbling		Pentasalt			love in triangle			Cooper
				(s)		(s)						nandball				test 9"
				(-)		(5)										
												balls				
			1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
1	P	IL	4.7	4.6	4.9	4.7	_	-	10.5	11	28	28	21	20	1600	1650
2	P	CC	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.7	-	-	10	10	29	31	21	20	1650	1700

3	IS	CO	4.5	4.6	4.9	4.7	7.0	7.0	10.5	10.5	30	30	21	21	1700	1750
4	ID	DS	4.7	4.4	4.7	4.x	6.9	6.8	12	12.5	31	32	20	19	1700	1750
5	ES	PA	4.4	4.3	4.6	4.4	6.8	6.8	11	11.5	30	30.5	20	19	1850	1900
6	ED	MD	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.4	6.8	6.7	11	11	29	30	19	18	1800	1900
7	ED	IV	4.6	4.5	4.8	4.6	6.8	6.8	10.5	11	29	30	20	19	1900	2000
8	C	FM	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.7	6.9	6.7	10.5	11	28	29	21	21	1800	2000
9	PV	MF	4.4	4.4	4.7	4.6	6.8	6.7	11	12	30	31	20	20	1900	2010
10	PV	СВ	4.4	4.3	4.8	4.6	6.8	6.6	11	11.5	30	30	19	18	1950	1900
11	С	CC	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.6	6.9	6.7	12	11.5	31	31	19	19	1850	1800
12	C	OC	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.6	7.0	6.8	11.5	11	32	32	20	19	1900	2000
13	ES	AO	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.5	7.1	6.9	10	10	28	29	21	20	1950	2000
14	ID	DO	4.5	4.3	4.7	4.3	6.8	6.7	10	10	31	31	19	19	1900	2000
	A	verage	4.52	4.45	4.45	4.58	6.9	6.7	11.6	11.1	29.7	30.3	20	19.40	1820	1890

The battery of tests used to assess driving ability as we have seen, includes 7 tests which highlights the physical attributes and the development of specific handball driving skills.

The results are reported in the model proposed by Romanian Handball Federation (RHF).[4]Average samples results: dribbling among stakes, pentasalt, Cooper test is over the scale of the Federation.

Goalkeepers recorded a higher average (+0.15) over the scale RHF, home to 30m flat feet, and +0.1 to 10x30m), and results over those of the decasalt + 3m FRH; throwing handball ball + 3m and + 100m Cooper test.

Inters players have better outcomes than "motor model" testing both I and the second on 6 of the 7 samples tested. The 10x30m sample result is the same as that recommended by the RHF.

At the extreme, pivot center and testing results are better at second testing, particularly at the Cooper test + 110m. results below the motor pattern is recorded as if to 30m and 10x30 m at goalkeepers.

Conclusions

Force development approach education lessons need careful decision, given that the number of hours allocated to this discipline is not enough to comply with recommendations of specific methodology built on scientific knowledge, on the valuable experimental foundations.

Not all methods taken from sports training can be addressed in physical education lessons and those that are suitable to driving level of pupils, usually methods that are used for working with the training of children and juniors should be chosen from the base material available to school and students available.

This study shows that using the method of frontal work was which yielded better results, but success is based on independent work of students.

In frontal work approach it is necessary a number of materials needed enough for staff working, even if the exercises can be chosen and free, option that took into account of individual student activity.

Without promoting frontal work method as the best way of working for quality driving force, we suggest, however, that the exercises of content is in the format of the students, successfully retain them and applicator of the idea of lifelong learning through sport and for sport.

References

- [1]. Ghermănescu, Ioan Kunst Teoria si metodica handbalului, Ed. Didactică pedagogică, București, 1983, pag. 212.
- [2]. Ortănescu, Corneliu Editura Universitaria, Craiova, 2002, pag. 39
- [3]. Dragnea, Constantin Adrian; Mate-Teodorescu, Silvia - Teoria Sportului, Editura Fest, 2002, pag. 356.
- [4]. www.frh.ro