

## Effect of Kinetic Duties Educational Program on Level of Shot Put with Rotation

*Aziza Mohamed Afife*

Department of Track and Field, Faculty of Physical Education for Female,  
Zagazig University, Zagazig, Egypt

---

**Abstract:** This research was carried out to identify the effect of using method of kinetic duties on level of shot put with rotation in specialized female students. The researcher utilized the experimental approach, the pre and post design for two groups, an experimental group and a control group. 63 students from third grade Prep school for the academic year, 2010 / 2011 were selected by intentional way, 17 students were excluded (15 to conduct survey-2 were infected by injuries), thus the actual number become 46 students, which have divided into two equal groups, one experimental and the other control. Results revealed that learning style has a positive impact on basic skills learning in various sports activities: It was concluded that teaching with both kinetic duties method and learning with orders method have a positive impact on level of the shot put. Kinetic duties method is more effective than learning with orders method in level of the shot put.

**Key words:** Kinetic Duties • Educational Program • Shot Put

---

### INTRODUCTION

Teaching methods (Teaching Styles) for different types of learning is a means of communication real message of learning whether the content of this message cognitive, psychological or value unto., Specializes in teaching methods as well as teachers must choose the best methods which suit their abilities and capabilities of students' verbal, soul-dynamic and their interests and experience [1].

The field of Physical Education has provided a range of teaching methods for teaching basic skills, which meet many of the educational goals in order to learn individual, according to students abilities, potential and their preparations as soon as appropriation to needs and inclinations, these methods are learning commands-practice-the peer application guidance-self review-Method of kinetic duties-discovery-oriented-problem solving-individual style program-cooperative learning and self-learning [2].

Physical education teacher must be experienced with more than one method for teaching, whereas without his knowledge in these ways, his efficiency in teaching decrease and abilities remain limited in educational process [3].

The atmosphere you establish in your classroom is as important as your rapport with each individual student. You want to provide an environment where students will feel safe voicing their opinions and where they will understand that discussions are meant to foster learning. Students bring into the classroom a complex range of attitudes about free speech. Some students may make statements such as "I have a right to my opinion" while others may insist on the authority of special experience or knowledge, criticizing other students by saying, "You don't have the right to say that, because you're not a woman/black/Christian etc." The instructor must find a way to mediate between the view that anyone can say anything and the view that only certain people have the right to speak about certain issues. While you do want to let students respond freely to each others' statements, you have a responsibility to restrict personal attacks. Many students who complain about the lack of attention to diversity in the classroom explain that they believe their teachers respect issues of diversity, but that they let students make injurious statements. Because you are the one who controls the classroom climate, you must be particularly attentive to the dynamics occurring during any given discussion [4].

Fundamental difference between kinetic duties style (inclusion style) and other methods, that student chooses level of difficulty according to his level and extent of his compatibility with capabilities to accomplish this motor duty, when teacher choose this method intended to acquire each student's experiences on level of Beginning and extent of his success in achieving this duty, the transition to other duties achieve its aims [5].

The researcher indicated that the role of parameter here is in planning, monitoring and guidance role of student to determine the beginning level with the implementation and evaluation, through the paper standard submitted and designed by the parameter, such as interview, student in some difficulties during implementation should listen to the directives of the parameter.

Shot put is the most important event and primary objective to obtain the largest displacement possible tool without violating the laws competition governing, evolved modes of delivery to contest the shot put, it's shot put of the situation, (the front movement, the goal) change ways of performance to the best use of physical forces rider to be able to generate greater rate of speed from the moment of exit of the tool (shot put) from the hand [6].

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

**The Research Sample:** The researcher utilized the experimental approach, the pre and post design for two groups, one as the experimental group and other as the control group. 63 students from third grade Prep school for the academic year, 2010 / 2011 were selected by intentional way selection, 17 students were excluded (15 to conduct survey-2 were infected), thus 46 students

were available, have divided into two equal groups, one experimental and the other control. Their age, height and weight (Mean  $\pm$  SD) were  $15.24 \pm 0.95$  years,  $154.85 \pm 4.78$  cm,  $60.11 \pm 2.96$  kg, respectively The muscular strength of legs and arms-constant-power of legs and arms-Flexibility-compatibility) and level of shot put competition (Mean  $\pm$  SD) were,  $44.70 \pm 5.19$  kg,  $6.5 \pm 2.11$  num,  $142.91 \pm 11.98$  second,  $4.12 \pm 0.69$  meter,  $1.45 \pm 0.55$  meter,  $11.90 \pm 3.78$  cm,  $1.85 \pm 0.70$  num and  $4.70 \pm 0.83$  meter respectively.

**Tools and Equipment of Collecting Data:** Best physical test were Dynamometer test to measure leg muscular strength, pull up for female to measure arms muscular strength, stand on beam to measure constant, push medical ball 3 kg by hands to measure arms power, wide jump test to measure legs power, sit and reach test to measure flexibility and rope jump test to measure compatibility [7-9].

Shot put were measured by roles of international federation of athletes [10].

**Educational Program:** The pre-measures were performed on Wednesday 23/2/2011 up to 26/2/2011 for both experimental and control groups. Started by applying the kinetic duties educational program for a period of 8 week at the rate of 2 lessons per week and for 90 minutes per session. Thus, the educational program totalled 24 hours after eight weeks, the experimental group was taught by kinetic duties educational program and the control group was taught by teaching by orders [11-14], until 26/4/2011 up to 28/4/2011 the researcher performed the post measures.

**Statistical Methods:** SPSS 15.0, statistical program was used for data processing.

Table 1: Pre and Post Measures (meter) level of Shot Put with Rotation in experimental and Control groups (Mean $\pm$  SD)

Group	Pre		Post		t-stat
	Mean	Variance	Mean	Variance	
Experimental	4.65	0.87	6.85	0.79	*10.87
Control	4.60	0.71	5.90	0.83	*8.99

\* Significantly different at  $p < .05 = 2.074$

Table 2: Difference in Post Measures for Both Groups in Level of Shot Put with Rotation N=23

Variable	Unit	Experimental Group		Control Group		t-stat
		Mean	Variance	Mean	Variance	
Level of Shot put	Meter	6.85	0.61	5.90	0.45	*5.9

\* Significantly different at  $p < .05 = 2.031$

Table 3: Rate of Improvement for Post Measures for Both Groups in Level of Shot Put with Rotation N=23

Variables	Experimental Group			Control Group		
	Pre	Post	Rate of Improvement	Pre	Post	Rate of Improvement
Level of Shot put	4.65	6.85	47.3%	4.60	5.90	28.3%

## RESULTS

Table 1 shows significant statistical differences ( $P < 0.05$ ) in level of shot put with rotation for the experimental as well as the experimental groups in favour of the post measuring to the pre measuring.

Table 2 shows significant statistical differences ( $P < 0.05$ ) of post measures in level of shot put with rotation in favour of the experimental group.

Table 3 shows significant statistical differences ( $P < 0.05$ ) of improvement for post measures for both groups in level of shot put with rotation, with the percentage of improvement 47.3% for experimental group, while it was 28.3% for the group control which refers that experimental group increases than the control group in level of shot put.

## DISCUSSION

The present study showed significant statistical differences for the experimental as well as the control groups in level of shot put with rotation in favour of the post measuring to the pre measuring. In the experimental group, his progress may be attributed to the positive impact of kinetic duties method as a way of proposal teaching and of its identification of specific kinetic duties placed very carefully in terms takes into account the progression from easy to difficult, simple to complex, this creating a learning environment helped to understand and accommodate aspects of learning and this led to increased collection of motor skill in shot put. In this respect, it was reported that kinetic duties method in learning basic skills in various sports activities is effective [15-19]. Moreover, the kinetic duties method increases collection rate, productivity and contribute to solve the problems concerning matters of spatial motor memory [20].

On the other hand, the progress in the control group may be returned to a parameter that gives a clear idea of how to correct performance (model and oral explanations) provide feedback to students from time to time during module, comment on common errors and how to correct to members of control group. In this respect, it was reported that learning style has a positive impact on basic skills

learning in various sports activities [16-19, 21-23]. However, Repetition, which runs on a single frequency, does not lead to a high degree of improvement in most cases, when learning motor skills [24].

This study also, showed obvious changes in level of shot put with rotation in favour of the experimental group. Improvement in experimental group as applying the kinetic duties method, contains several advantages by addressing the problem of individual differences between students in one group, which increases collection of student motor activity, keep information and motivation for learning, confidence and perseverance, as it provides multiple sources of feedback before the performance requesting motor duty, it looked on standard paper that perform skill information, track motor and watch performance through serial skill caption image and this in turn earns the student a clear mentally vision and motor performance for learned skill. Impact of learning style commands had little impact compared to kinetic duties in a manner to improve the motor performance of basic skills in field of sports [15-19, 21, 23, 26]. The present investigation revealed that the level of shot put.

Increased in the experimental than in the control group. Learning style with orders does not give enough time for each student to perform large number of times, does not allow teacher to correct errors for all students at same time and reduces large extent of the creative students' capabilities. Learning style with orders makes all responsibility in educational process on teacher through decision-making related to the unit before education learning, during lesson implementation and evaluation during and after educational situations through the module [27].

In conclusion, teaching with both kinetic duties method and learning with orders method have a positive impact on level of the shot put. kinetic duties method is more effective than learning with orders method in level of the shot put.

## REFERENCES

1. Rashid, A., 1996. Selection, teacher preparation and education manual process, Arab Thought Press, Cairo, pp: 65.

2. Mosston, A. and W. Ashworth, 1986. Teaching Physical Education, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Merrill pub., Com., Columbu S. London, pp: 234-242.
3. Singer, S.A. and G. Dich, 1988. Teaching Physical Education, system approach, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Hawgton Miftling Co., Boston, pp: 242.
4. Perfetti, L., R. Christine, A.B. Cheryl, D. DeRosa and R. Vander, 1997. Teaching for Inclusion Diversity in the College Classroom, Centre for Teaching and Learning, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, pp: 16.
5. Joyce, H., 1996. Instructional Strategies for Secondary School physical education, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, Brown Bench mark, pp: 219-221.
6. Oleg Collodi, *et al.*, 1990. Athletics, the translation of Malik Hasan, Radoga House, Moscow, pp: 285-290.
7. Bastawisi, A., 1997. Racing track and field (education-Technique-Training), Arab Thought Press, Cairo, pp: 67.
8. Shamoby, S.E. and A.M. Haridi, 1998. Track and field, radiation, Technical Library, Alexandria, pp: 77.
9. Khalil, M.S., 1998. Bulletin of athletics, number (21), International Federation of Athletics, Center for Regional Development, Cairo, pp: 25.
10. Saudi Arabian Union of athletics, 1989. International law of athletics, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, King Saud University, Saudi Arabia.
11. Kheiry, E.A., *et al.*, 1989. Track and field games, Arab Thought Press, Cairo.
12. Abdel Rahman, N., *et al.*, 1989. Jump and throwing, part 1, art of printing and publishing, Alexandria.
13. Othman, M.M., 1990. Encyclopaedia of Athletics (Training-Technique-Education-Arbitration), House of pen for publication and distribution, Kuwait.
14. Khairya, E. and S.A. Hassan, 1997. A guide in education and training in throwing competitions, Knowledge House, Cairo.
15. Morgan, K.A., 1996. The impact of using teaching methods at level of performance of pole vault for beginners, Ph.D. thesis, Faculty of Physical Education for Boys, Alexandria University, pp: 88.
16. Salem, Y.A., 1998. The impact of using duties kinetic style in learning some essential football skills for students in middle school, Journal of Physical Education, Faculty of Physical Education for Boys, Zagazig University, 21(24): 23.
17. El-Mowafi, A.E., 1999. Impact of use certain teaching methods to learn some skills of volleyball in students of Faculty of Physical Education, Master Thesis, Faculty of Physical Education for male, Zagazig University, 7: 34.
18. Abdel-Latif, A.O., 1999. The impact of learning duties style on motor skill performance in studied physical education for students in middle school," Master Thesis, Faculty of Physical Education for Boys, Zagazig University, pp: 112.
19. Anwar, H.M., 2003. The effectiveness of using style duties kinetic learn some basic skills in handball for the students of the Faculty of Physical Education for Boys in Zagazig, Journal of Arts and Sports Sciences, Faculty of Physical Education for Girls, Helwan University, 20(1): 55.
20. Homos, M.M., 1997. Leader in teaching physical education, knowledge press, Alexandria, pp: 97.
21. Ali, A.M., 1997. The impact of some teaching methods learning skill of throwing the performance of disk (pilot study), the scientific journal Physical Education and Sports, Faculty of Physical Education for Boys, Helwan University, 29(2): 56.
22. Hassan, M.A., 1997. Using of teaching individual extension booklet programme in treatment some difficulties of learning and its impact on the attainment of knowledge and performance skills of long jump, the scientific journal Physical Education and Sports, Faculty of Physical Education for Boys, Helwan University, 29(3): 76.
23. Ali, H.S., 2001. The impact of practice and reciprocity styles in learning skills of athletics studying physical education for the preparatory phase, Journal of Physical Education Research, Faculty of Physical Education for Boys, Zagazig University, 14(56): 171.
24. Saad, J. and M.H. Allawi, 1986. Sports Psychology, 7<sup>th</sup> edition, Knowledge House, Cairo, pp: 67.
25. El-Din, T.E. and M.S.A. Mustafa, 1992. The impact using solving problem (discovery independent) on level of shot put competition in students in the Department of Physical Education in Tanta, Journal of Physical Education, Faculty of Physical Education for Boys, Zagazig University, 10(19,20): 34: 88.
26. Abdel-Fattah, A.M. and S.F. Abdel-Fattah, 2005. The effectiveness of a program using the packet-education to learn shot put for beginners, Journal of Arts and Sciences, Sports, Faculty of Physical Education for Girls, Helwan University, 23(3): 133.
27. Alfred, B., 2001. Problems the Command Style in Physical Education, the Journal of Educational Res., 114(40): 94.