



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

THE EFFECT OF LOW VERSUS HIGH LOAD RESISTANCE TRAINING ON SELECTED HEALTH RELATED PHYSICAL FITNESS ON THROWING EVENT ATHLETES IN UNIVERSITY LEVEL

YERRATHOTA RAVISANKAR BABU¹, Physical Director ,College Of Horticulture ,Anantharajupeta, Andhrapradesh
GULIVINDALA LAXMANA RAO², Physical Director, College Of Horticulture ,Parvathipuram ,Andhrapradesh.

Abstract

This study was to examine the effects of low versus high load resistance training on selected health related physical fitness on throwers in Athletics . Body composition cardio vascular endurance and muscular strength testing measure were recorded in meal throwers (N=22, age 18-25 years before and after 8 week low versus high load resistance training. Body composition assessment include 'BMI' test and 3 site skin folds test for body fat percentage and cardio vascular endurance test 12minute run test and step test, for strength test 1RM test and squat test for upper body strength and lower body strength respectively. A comparison was made using pared sample 'T' test. Significant improvement was made skin fold calipers and BMI test ($p<0.05$), 1RM test ($p<0.05$), squat test ($p<0.05$) and cupper test ($p<0.05$), step test ($p<0.05$). Generally based on mean value the respondent 8 week low versus high load resistance training on some selected health related physical fitness of throwers there were little difference between high load and low load resistance training on some selected health related physical fitness and HLR training have a greater significant improvement on body composition and strength performance. But LLR training has a great significant improvement on cardiovascular fitness.

Keywords: physical fitness, high load, low load, resistance training, Dr.Y.S.R Horticulture University athletes.

INTRODUCTION

Resistance training has been well accepted as the primary mode of exercise to enhance muscular fitness. The American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) recommends performing 8–12 repetitions to muscular fatigue for general health , whereas the National Strength and Conditioning Association (NSCA) recommends performing repetitions of 10–12 with 65–85% of one repetition maximum (1RM) to maximize hypertrophy and repetitions of 1–5 with greater than 85% of the 1RM to maximize strength development. Resistance training (RT) program variables is necessary to maximize physical fitness . The intensity of load used, often delineated by repetition ranges within various loading zones, is widely considered amongst the most important of these variables. Training with heavy loads at or near an individual's 1 repetition maximum (RM) necessarily results in fewer repetitions completed when compared to training with lighter loads at lower intensities. Consistent with the concept of a strength-cardiovascular endurance continuum, the following loading strategies have been proposed to maximize physical fitness adaptations: a low-repetition loading zone (1- 5RM) maximizes muscular fitness; and a high-repetition loading zone (15+RM) maximizes cardiovascular fitness . The volume of RT also has been shown to play a role in physical fitness improvement. There is a positive relationship, whereby greater RT volumes are associated with greater increases physical fitness and muscle hypertrophy . Volume load (VL), defined as the product of the total number of repetitions performed for an exercise and the corresponding amount of load, is affected by the loading zone employed; progressively higher VLs are seen as loading proceeds to the right of the strength-

endurance continuum . Thus, a substantially greater number of sets are required to equate volume load between lower and higher loading zones.

METHOD

22 men throwers (mean ±SD; age 21.3±1.05 years, height 1.64±.08 meter. All participants were informed of the potential risks and benefits and provided written informed consent and parental consent prior to participation. During the first week of the study, participants performed the baseline testing Protocol, followed by an 8-week training program the final week consisted of the post-testing protocol. Procedures First the researcher obtained the ethical clearance from concerning body and meets the participants of the study, during the familiarization session; participants were informed all procedures and familiarized with all performance measured. Before the participants were started the training program the participant were got awareness not exercise for at least 24 hours prior to each trial. Next to this the participants were performed pretest process at base line week 0 and muscular strength variables, cardiovascular endurance and body commotion were measured. Then the participants were grouped randomly into control and experimental group. After that both groups were going to start resistance training. Testing was conducted at the same time of day for both preand post-testing sessions. Anthropometric data such as age, height, weight, body mass index (BMI), and 3-site skin fold assessment, cardiovascular endurance and strength performance was recorded first.

BODY FAT PERCENTAGE ASSESSMENT

The athletes’ height and weight were taken at the start of the testing sessions using a studio meter followed by skin fold measurement using Skin fold Calipers performed all pre- and posttest-skin fold assessments to ensure validity. All measurements were made on the right side of the body, with the subjects in the standing position. A 3-site method for males was used chest, calf and thigh) following standard ACSM skin fold testing procedures.

Performance Testing Procedures

Following anthropometric measurements, the athletes performed a 5-minute general warm-up consisting of dynamic movements and sub maximal running intervals. The athletes were given a 5-10 minute rest period between each performance test, and were encouraged to drink water as needed during the testing sessions.

Table 1: testing and training schedule

Week 1		Week 2-9	Week 10
Pre test	Post test	intervention program	Post test

Table 2: sample low load resistance training for the first month

	Monday	Wednesday	Friday	Sunday
Week 1 (40%)	Shoulder pres3x15 Squat 3x25	Dead lifts (3 x 14) Pushup (3x16)	sit up (3x25) Dead lifts (3x 16)	Shoulder pres(3x15) Squat (3x25)
Week3 (45%)	Shoulder pres(3x12)	Dead lifts (3 x 12)rep	sit up (3x20)	Shoulder pres(3x12)
	Push up(3x14)	Pull-ups (18-20) reps	Squat (3x20)	Pusup3x14
Week3 (50%)	Shoulder pres3x10)	Dead lifts(3x 10	sit up 3x15	Shoulder pres3x10
	Pusup3x12	Pull-ups (15-17 reps	Squat 3x15	Pusup3x12
Week4 (55%)	Shoulder pres3x6	Dead lifts (3 x 6 rep	sit up 3x12	Shoulder pres3x6
	Pusup3x10	Pull-ups (13-15 reps	Squat 3x13	Pusup3x10

Training load was increase progressively in each week based on individual ability trainees were increased to progress by 2- 4 lbs weekly each lift. Lifts that were performed more than 2 times. Per a week if the athletes unable to perform properly at the chosen the load were decreased until the lift could properly performed the training volume remained the same in 8 week period.

Table 3: sample high load resistance training for the first month

	Monday	Wednesday	Friday	Sunday
Week 1 (70%)	Shoulder pres3x8 Squat 3x20	Dead lifts (3 x 8) Pushup 3x8	sit up 3x15 Dead lifts (3 x 8)	Shoulder pres3x8 Squat 3x20
Week3 (75%)	Shoulder pres3x6	Dead lifts (3 x 8 rep)	sit up (3x15)	Shoulder pres3x6
	Push up3x7	Pull-ups (10-15 reps)	Squat (3x15)	Pusup3x7
Week3 (80%)	Shoulder pres3x6	Dead lifts(3x 6)	sit up 3x10	Shoulder pres3x6
	Pusup3x6	Pull-ups (10-15 reps)	Squat 3x10	Pusup3x6
Week4 (85%)	Shoulder pres3x5	Dead lifts (3 x 5 rep)	sit up 3x8	Shoulder pres3x5
	Pusup3x5	Pull-ups (10-12 reps)	Squat 3x8	Pusup3x5

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: mean values of pretest and posttest result of low load resistance training

No	Variables	Types of test			mean dif
			Pre test	Post test	
1	Body composition				
		body mass index	21.2+0.47	20.9+0.47	-0.3
		Percent of body fat (%BF)	25.6+0.53	25.1+0.4	-0.5
2	Strength	1RM bench press test	0.9	1	0.1
		Squat test	74.8+1.34	77.3+1.25	2.5
3	Cardiovascular fitness	step test	111.20±5.	2 90.80±1.6	20.4
		Cupper test	2061.4.± 9	416.6±6	55.2

As we observed in the above table the mean values in low load Resistance training group of body mass index for body composition assessment was 21.2+0.47 to 20.9+0.47 and in Percent of body fat was 25.6+0.53 to 25.1+0.4 from pretest to posttest respectively and in strength performance test for upper body strength 1RM bench press test was 0.9 +0.2 to 1+0.3 and in Squat test for lower body strength was 74.8+1.34 to 77.3+1.25 copper test 2061.4.± 93.0 to 2416.6±62.3 and from pre to posttest and there were a significance change from pretest to posttest on the improvement of body composition, strength performance and cardio vascular fitness in an LLR training group on 8 week high and low load resistance training group at $p<0.05$.

Table 2: Pretest and Posttest result of high load resistance training

No	Variables	Types of test			mean dif
			Pre test	Post test	
1	Body composition				
		body mass index	21.6+0.54	21.28+0.43	-0.32
		Percent of body fat (%BF)	25.8+0.45	25.2+0.36	0.6
2	Strength	1RM bench press test	0.9 +0.4	1.4+0.3	0.5
		Squat test	76.4+1.34	81.6+3.19	0.2
3	Cardiovascular fitness	step test	111.20±5.2	90.20±5.16	21
		Cupper test	2044.6±64	2293.8±27	249

As we observed in the above table the mean values in high load resistance training group of body mass index for bod composition assessment was $21.6+0.54$ to $21.28+0.43$ and in Percent of body fat was $25.8+0.45$ to $25.2+0.36$ from pretest to posttest respectively and in strength performance test for upper body stren1RM bench press test was $0.9 +0.4$ to $1+0.3$ and in Squat test for lower body strength was $76.4+1.34$ to $81.6+3.19$ and also in cardio vascular fitness test step test was 111.20 ± 5.2 to 90.20 ± 5.16 and also in cupper test was 2044.6 ± 64 to 2293.8 ± 27 from pre to posttest and there were a significance change from pretest to posttest on the improvement of body composition, strength performance and cardio vascular fitness in an LLR training group on 8 week high and low load resistance training group at $p<0.05$.

Table 3: mean difference of pretest to post test of both high load and low load resistance training.

No	Variables	Types of test	Mean difference for (LLR)	Mean difference for (HLR)
1	Body composition	body mass index	-0.3	-0.32
		Percent of body fat (%BF)	-0.5	-0.6
2	Strength	1RM bench press test	0.1	0.5
		Squat test	2	5.2
3	Cardiovascular fitness	step test	20.4	21
		Cupper test	355.2	249

As we observe and compared in the above table there was some significant difference in high load resistance training than low load resistance training on body composition test it means that mean difference of LLR training of BMI= -0.3 and -0.32 in HLR training, body fat percentage in LLR training was -0.5 and in HLR training -0.6 in strength performance 1RM bench press test for upper body strength in LLR training was 0.1 and in HLR was 0.5 and also squat test for lower body strength in LLR training was 2 and 5.2 respectively. In case of cardiovascular fitness test step test in LLR training was -20.4 and in HLR training -21 but in cupper test 355.2 and 249 meter in LLR training and HLR training respectively. Generally from the above table there were little difference between high load and low load resistance training on some selected health related physical fitness and HLR training have a greater significant improvement on body composition and strength performance. But LLR training has a great significant improvement on cardiovascular fitness.

CONCLUSION

The finding of this study showed that there were little difference between high load and low load resistance training on some selected health related physical fitness and HLR training have a greater significant improvement on body composition and strength performance. But LLR training has a great significant improvement on cardiovascular fitness. Based on the above finding in all variables both group alternative hypotheses accepted and null hypothesis rejected.

REFERENCE

1. Baechle TR, Earle RW. Essentials of strength training and conditioning. Champaign, IL. Human Kinetics, 2008.
2. Schoenfeld BJ, Peterson MD, Ogborn D, Contreras B, Sonmez GT. Effects of low- versus high-load resistance training on muscle strength and hypertrophy in welltrained men. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research / National Strength & Conditioning Association. 2015; 29:2954-2963.
3. Krieger JW. Single versus multiple sets of resistance exercise: A meta-regression. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research/ National Strength & Conditioning Association. 2009; 23:1890-1901.
4. Dr Kamlesh ML, Dr Sangral Ms. "principles and history of physical education", New Delhi friends. Publication. 2017, 134.

5. Sreehari P, Khan MI, Sreemala P, Tanweer KT, Mriza M. Estimation of VO₂ max before and after Yoga Training in Healthy Male Medical Students. *Journal of contemporary medicine and dentistry*. 2013; 1(1):26-29.
6. Vinu W. Effect of yogic practices on selected cardio respiratory endurance of men students. *International Journal of Physical Education, Sports and Health*. 2015; 1(6):109-111.
7. Dr. K Palanisamy. Effect of yogic practices on cardio respiratory endurance of adolescents students. *International Journal of Advanced Educational Research*. 2017; 2(6):423-424.
8. Kasundra DC. A comparative study of speed and endurance among Kho-Kho and Kabaddi players. *Res Rev Int J Multidiscip* 2020;5:18-20.
9. Dick R, Hootman JM, Agel J, Vela L, Marshall SW, Messina R. Descriptive epidemiology of collegiate women's field hockey injuries: National collegiate athletic association injury surveillance system, 1988-1989 through 2002-2003. *J Athl Train* 2007;42:211-220.
10. Singh KS. Comparison of motor fitness components among different racket game players of national level. *Int J Phys Educ Sports Health* 2016;3:386-8.

