Chapter V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was conducted to compare the physical, physiological and skill proficiency variables among the college, district, university and state level basketball players.

The Physical variables were speed, strength, agility, flexibility, power, endurance which were measured by 50 yard distance (sec.), grip dynamometer (kg.), Semo agility test (sec.), flexibility (cm.), power Sargent jump test (cm.) and 2.4 km run (min.) tests respectively.

The Physiological variables were, pulse rate at the radial artery (beat/min.), blood pressure - systolic and diastolic (mm.Hg), peak flow rate (lit/min) and body composition (fat %). The Skill Proficiency variables were, front shot (points), side shot (points), under basket shot (points), dribble shoot (sec.), dribble (sec.), speed pass (sec.), push pass (points) and over arm pass (points).
All the skill variables were measured by AAHPEn basketball skill test except dribble shoot which was measured by Knox basketball test.

The subjects were 200 (fifty from each level) who were selected randomly by lots. Age of the subjects ranged between 17 to 30 years. All the variables were tested twice and the best score was recorded for each variable.

The data collected on the different level basketball players were analysed by one way analysis of variance for each variable separately wherever 'F' ratio proved significant the Scheffe's Post-hoc significance test was used for which the level of significance was set at .05.

**Conclusions**

Based on the findings and with in the limitations of the present study the following conclusions are drawn:

1. In speed the state and university level basketball players are leading and district and college level players are second.
2. In strength state level players are the best followed by the university players and the third place is shared by the district and college players.

3. State university and college level players are equally good in agility and significantly better than district level basketball players.

4. State level basketball players are best in flexibility followed by the university players. Third place is shared by the district and college level players.

5. State level players exhibit the best power university players are second best and college and district level players are of equal standard securing the third position.

6. State level players are the best in endurance followed by the college and university and district players. However the college players are significantly better in endurance when compared to the district level basketball players.

7. Blood pressure - The four levels of basketball players were not different in both systolic and diastolic blood pressure.
9. State level players have the best pulse rate the second best is shared by university and district players and the college players have the worst pulse rate.

10. State players have the best peak flow rate and all other level players have nearly equal peak flow rate.

11. In body composition state level players are leading district level players are second best and the third category is shared equally by university and college level players.

12. In front shot the state level players and university level players are leading and district and college players share the second place.

13. In side shot the state level players are best among all level players while university and district level players share second place and the college level players are the least efficient.

14. In the case of under basket shot the state level players are at first rank, while university and district are ranked second and the college level players are at the third rank.
15. The state level players are at the top among all levels of basketball players in dribble shoot, university and district level players are second best and college level players are third.

16. In dribble skill, the state level basketball players are first and second place is shared by university and district players, and college players secured third place.

17. In speed pass the state level players hold first position, second best are the university level players and third and fourth are district and college level players respectively.

18. In push pass for accuracy, the state and university players have shared first place and district and college level players have shared second place.

19. In over arm pass the state level basketball players are leading, the university level players are at second and district and college players are jointly hold third position.
Recommendations

In the light of the conclusions drawn the following recommendations are made:

1. Physical education teachers and coaches may utilize the findings of the present study by preparing their training schedules for basketball players at different levels.

2. The present study may be replicated with other physical physiological and skill proficiency variables not employed in this study.

3. A similar study may be undertaken with female players as subjects.

4. The present study may be undertaken involving other variables namely psychological, anthropometric, sociological etc. not employed in this study.

5. It is recommended that the present study may be repeated by selecting subjects belonging to lower age groups.

6. Similar study may be carried out on international level.

7. Research study of this nature may be conducted on other games and sports.