The University at Greensboro	of North Carolina
JACKSON	LIBRARY
STIN OF NORT	CQ
	No.928
GIFT OF Maureen Luc	ille Connolly
COLLEGE (	COLLECTION

CONNOLLY, MAUREEN LUCILLE. A Comparison of the Effect of Body Build on Selected Tests of Arm Strength Among College Women. (1972) Directed by: Dr. Gail M. Hennis. Pp. 167

It was the purpose of this study to examine the performance of college women of three different body builds on selected tests of arm strength. Fourteen cable tensiometer arm and shoulder girdle strength tests served as the criterion measure. The three arm strength measures investigated were the flexed arm hang, modified pull-ups, and modified push-ups.

Three null hypotheses were tested: (1) there would be no significant difference in performance of subjects of three different body builds on the cable tensiometer tests, the flexed arm hang, the modified pull-ups, and the modified push-ups; (2) there would be no significant difference between the performance on the three selected arm strength tests within each body build group; and (3) there would be no significant difference in the relationship between the criterion of the cable tensiometer tests and the three other selected arm strength measures.

The subjects were forty-three women students, aged 18-20 years, who were enrolled in eleven recreational sports classes at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro during the 1970 spring semester. The subjects were chosen from 105 volunteers. Their height ranged from 62.5 to 65.5 inches. They were divided into three body build groups--slender, average, and heavy--determined by their weight and ponderal index.

The data were collected from measures of height, weight, ponderal index, fourteen cable tensiometer tests, total cable

1

tensiometer strength, the flexed arm hang, modified pull-ups, and modified push-ups. The three selected arm strength measures were ordered in a Latin square design and administered at two-day intervals. The data were treated statistically by the analysis of variance design, the Latin square analysis of variance design, the Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation, and the Scheffe test of source of difference between group means. The means and standard deviations of the scores for all variables were computed. The .05 level of significance was chosen to test the null hypotheses formulated.

The three null hypotheses were rejected at the .05 level of confidence. In relation to these rejections, three general conclusions were drawn: (1) Persons of different body builds perform differently on four selected measures of arm strength--total cable tensiometer strength, the flexed arm hang, modified pull-ups, and modified push-ups; (2) The performance of the flexed arm hang, modified pull-ups, and modified push-ups does not differ within the average or the heavy build, however, performance on the flexed arm hang and the modified push-ups differ within the slender build; and (3) The only arm strength measure significantly related to the criterion measure of total cable tensiometer strength is the flexed arm hang for the average build. A COMPARISON OF THE EFFECT OF BODY BUILD ON SELECTED TESTS OF ARM STRENGTH AMONG COLLEGE WOMEN

by

Maureen Lucille Connolly

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Master of Science in Physical Education

> Greensboro 1972

> > Approved by

Stennis

Thesis Advisor

## APPROVAL PAGE

This thesis has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Thesis Advisor <u>Hair M. Idennis</u> mination Members <u>Cleat Unit</u> Thesis

Oral Examination Committee Members

Seffler

november 1971

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

"Because of your strong faith, we kept the track Whose sharp-set stones our feet had well nigh spent. We could not meet your eyes if we turned back, So on we went."

Unknown

The writer wishes to express her sincere gratitude and appreciation to Dr. Gail Hennis for her time, patience, guidance, and inspirational motivation.

To Dr. Frank Pleasants, who gave of his time and knowledge in the cable tensiometer testing, the writer is indebted. Gratitude is also expressed to Miss Lucy Ciesla and Miss Betty Lou Dunn for their time and invaluable assistance during the testing period and throughout the study.

The writer extends a sincere thanks to her loyal subjects who gave so freely of their time and cooperation to make this study possible.

Appreciation is also given to Mrs. Mary Jane Knight who gave of her time and assistance in the typing of this thesis.

iii

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
	and the second
LIST OF	TABLES. V1
LIST OF	FIGURES
Chapter	
г.	INTRODUCTION
II.	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
	PURPOSE
	Subproblems
	Null Hypotheses 8
	SUBJECTS
	COLLECTION OF DATA
	LIMITATIONS
III.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 10
	STRENGTH TESTS
	APM STRENGTH TESTS
	Cable Tensiometer
	Modified Push-Ups
	Modified Pull-Ups 21
	Flexed Arm Hang
	BODY BUILD
	Methods of Assessing Body Build
	Age-Height-Weight Studies
	Ponderal Index Studies
	Anthropometric Studies
	Sheldon Studies
	RELATIONSHIP OF BODY BUILD TO STRENGTH 40
	SUMMARY
IV.	PROCEDURES
	SELECTION OF SUBJECTS
	SELECTION PROCEDURES
	SELECTION OF TESTS
	Cable Tensiometer Tests
	Arm Strongth Tests
	Arm Strength lests

405279

Page

	Al	DMINISTRATION OF TESTS			•				48
		Cable Tensiometer Tests							48
		Arm Strength Tests	•	•	•	•	•	•	53
	TI	REATMENT OF DATA							56
v.	ANAI	LYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA							58
	A	NALYSIS OF DATA			•	•			59
		Preliminary Statistics							59
		Means and Standard Deviations							65
		Analysis of Variance of Arm							
		Strength Measures							68
		Latin Square Analysis of Variance							
		of Body Build							77
		Analysis of Variance of Body Build .							80
		Correlation.							83
	TN	TERPRETATION OF DATA							93
		Comparison Between Body Builds on	-	-			-		
		Arm Strength Measures					÷		93
		Comparison Patwoon Arm Strongth	•	•	•	•	•	•	55
		Variables Within Bedy Builds							00
		variables within Body Builds	•	•	•	•	•	•	90
		Comparison Between Arm Strength							~~
		Variables and the Criterion Measure	•	•	•	•	•	• 1	.02
		ADV. AND CONCLUCTONS							00
VI.	SUMM	MARY AND CONCLUSIONS	•	•	•	•	•	• 1	.09
		SUMMARY		1				- 1	09
		CONCLUSIONS		-				1	14
				•	•		•	1	18
		IMPLICATIONS	•	•	•	•	•	• •	.10
SELECTED P	TDIT	CCDAPHY						1	21
SELECTED E	DIDLI			•		•	•	•••	
APPENDIXES	· · ·		•	•	•	•		.1	.30
APPENDIX	A	Raw Data Tables						.1	31
APPENDIX	B	Conversion Table for Cable							
in i bribin		Tensiometer Readings						.1	46
APPENDIX	C	T-Scores of Arm Strength Measures		-	-		-	-	
In I DIDIN		T-Score Means			1		10	1	48
APPENDIX	D	Cable Tensiometer Correlations						1	53
ADDENDIX	F	Sample Scorecard for Becording		•	•	•	•	• +	33
AFFENDIX	E	Baw Data						1	60
ADDENIDTY	E	Raw Data	•	•	•	•	•	• +	00
APPENDIX	F	The stand Arm Comments Manager						,	60
		lests and Arm Strength Measures .					•	•1	02

### LIST OF TABLES

Analysis of Variance of Weight for the

Table

1

	and Heavy Body Build 61
2	Significance of Difference Between Mean Differences of Slender, Average, and Heavy Body Builds for Weight of the Original Subjects 61
3	Analysis of Variance of Weight for the Subjects of Slender, Average, and Heavy Body Builds Who Completed the Study 62
4	Significance of Difference Between Mean Differences of Slender, Average, and Heavy Body Builds for Weight of Subjects Who Completed the Study
5	Analysis of Variance of Ponderal Index for the Original Subjects of Slender, Average, and Heavy Body Builds 63
6	Significance of Difference Between Mean Differences of Slender, Average, and Heavy Body Builds for Ponderal Index of the Original Subjects
7	Analysis of Variance of Ponderal Index for the Subjects of Slender, Average, and Heavy Body Builds Who Completed the Study
8	Significance of Difference Between Mean Differences of Slender, Average, and Heavy Body Builds for Ponderal Index of Subjects Who Completed the Study
9	Means and Standard Deviations of Height, Weight, Ponderal Index, Cable Tensiometer Tests, Flexed Arm Hang, Modified Pull-Ups, and Modified Push-Ups for Total Subjects
10	Means and Standard Deviations of Height, Weight, and Ponderal Index for Three Body Builds

Table

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Tensiometer Tests for Three Body Builds 69	
Means and Standard Deviations of the Flexed Arm Hang, Modified Pull-Ups, and Modified Push-Ups for Three Body Builds	
Analysis of Variance of Total Cable Tensio- meter Strength for Slender, Average and Heavy Body Builds	
Significance of Difference Between Mean Differences of Slender, Average, and Heavy Body Builds for Total Cable Tensiometer Strength	
Analysis of Variance of the Flexed Arm Hang for Slender, Average, and Heavy Body Builds	
Significance of Difference Between Mean Differences of Slender, Average, and Heavy Body Builds for the Flexed Arm Hang	
Analysis of Variance of the Modified Pull-Up for Slender, Average, and Heavy Body Builds	
Significance of Difference Between Mean Differences of Slender, Average, and Heavy Body Builds for the Modified Pull-Up	
Analysis of Variance of the Modified Push-Up for Slender, Average, and Heavy Body Builds	
Significance of Difference Between Mean Differences of Slender, Average, and Heavy Body Builds for the Modified Push-Up	
"t" Test Significance of Difference Between Mean Differences of Slender, Average, and Heavy Body Builds for the Modified	

Page

77

. . .

. .

. . . . . .

Push-Up. . . . . . . . . . . . .

Page

Table

22	3 x 3 Latin Square Analysis of Variance of the Slender Build for the Flexed Arm Hang, Modified Pull-Ups, and Modified Push-Ups			79
23	3 x 3 Latin Square Analysis of Variance of the Average Build for the Flexed Arm Hang, Modified Pull-Ups, and Modified Push-Ups		•	79
24	3 x 3 Latin Square Analysis of Variance of the Heavy Build for the Flexed Arm Hang, Modified Pull-Ups, and Modified Push-Ups		•	80
25	Analysis of Variance of the Slender Build for the Flexed Arm Hang, Modified Pull-Ups, and Modified Push-Ups			81
26	Significance of Difference Between Mean Differences of the Flexed Arm Hang, Modi- fied Pull-Ups, and Modified Push-Ups for the Slender Build			81
27	Analysis of Variance of the Average Build for the Flexed Arm Hang, Modified Pull- Ups, and Modified Push-Ups			82
28	Analysis of Variance of the Heavy Build for the Flexed Arm Hang, Pull-Ups, and Modified Push-Ups			82
29	Correlations Between Cable Tensiometer Tests and the Flexed Arm Hang, Modified Pull-Up, and Modified Push-Up Tests for the Slender Build.			84
30	Correlations Between Cable Tensiometer Tests and the Flexed Arm Hang, Modified Pull-Up, and Modified Push-Up Tests for the Average Build			85
31	Correlations Between Cable Tensiometer Tests and the Flexed Arm Hang, Modified Pull-Up, and Modified Push-Up Tests for the Heavy Build			86
32	Correlations Between Combined Right and Left Cable Tensiometer Tests and the Flexed Arm Hang, Modified Pull-Up, and Modified Push- Up Tests for the Slender Build			89

Table

33	Correlations Between Combined Right and Left Cable Tensiometer Tests and the Flexed Arm Hang, Modified Pull-Up, and Modified Push-Up Tests for the Average Build	90
34	Correlations Between Combined Right and Left Cable Tensiometer Tests and the Flexed Arm Hang, Modified Pull-Up, and Modified Push-Up Tests for the Heavy Build	91
35	Correlations Between Total Cable Tensiometer Strength and the Flexed Arm Hang, Modified Pull-Up, and Modified Push-Up Tests for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds	94
36	Raw Data of Height for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds	132
37	Raw Data of Weight for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds	L 33
38	Raw Data of Ponderal Index for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds	L34
39	Raw Data of Elbow Flexion as Measured by the Cable Tensiometer for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds	135
40	Raw Data of Elbow Extension as Measured by the Cable Tensiometer for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds	136
41	Raw Data of Shoulder Flexion as Measured by the Cable Tensiometer for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds	137
42	Raw Data of Shoulder Extension as Measured by the Cable Tensiometer for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds	138
43	Raw Data of Shoulder Abduction as Measured by the Cable Tensiometer for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds	139
44	Raw Data of Shoulder Adduction as Measured by the Cable Tensiometer for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds	140

Page

Table

15	Raw Data of Shoulder Inward Rotation as Measured by the Cable Tensiometer for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds	1
46	Raw Data of Total Cable Tensiometer Strength for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds 14	2
17	Raw Data of the Flexed Arm Hang for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds	3
48	Raw Data of Modified Pull-Ups for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds	4
49	Raw Data of Modified Push-Ups for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds	5
50	Conversion Table for Cable Tensiometer Readings	7
51	T-Scores for the Flexed Arm Hang of Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds 14	9
52	T-Scores for the Modified Pull-Ups of Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds 15	0
53	T-Scores for the Modified Push-Ups of Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds 15	1
54	Means of the T-Scores of the Flexed Arm Hang, Modified Pull-Ups and Modified Push-Ups for Three Body Builds and for Total Subjects	2
55	Correlations Between Cable Tensiometer Tests and the Flexed Arm Hang for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds	4
56	Correlations Between Cable Tensiometer Tests and the Modified Pull-Up for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds	5
57	Correlations Between Cable Tensiometer Tests and the Modified Push-Up for Slender, Average, and Heavy Builds	6
58	Correlations Between Combined Right and Left Cable Tensiometer Tests and the Flexed Arm Hang for Slender, Average, and Heavy	
	Builds	7

## Page