*

.

(11)

-13) (80)

. / (50) (Sony) (15

) :

.(

(20)

.

0.284 + **x 0.712 =**

(20)

(15 -13)

.

. :

.1

.(2003)

)

.(1995 :

" :(Gunter Lange, 1993)

(1990) ."

:

.

.

1994   1993   Hay)

(2002

.

.

.

.

.(1994   )

.(2003   1987   )

(1000)   .

.(Kilani, 1990)

.

.

.

:

.

(45   )

.

.(1994   Kilani, 1990)
(

.(2003   (45)

(45)

(   )   (45)   (45)
(30-25   .
)
.(1987

(Nixdorf and Braggemann, 1990)

(   )
(21.6 – 17.7)   (
/ (9.9 – 9.2)
. / (8.5)   (24.9)   .
(Hay, 1999)   :
.   X =
1   -2   X   =
ن △

1   – 2   =
ن △
.

(Gerhard, 1990)

=   X
(   )   (   )

–

–
:   .

(   )

(25-18)   :

(17- 13)

(15-13)   .(65 – 60)

(40)

)

(

40)

.   (.(1990   )

:   (1987)   " (1968)

"   (Bob Beamon)

29)

."   (8.90)   (

."

.

:

-1   (Hildreth,

.   (1990)   (37 - 29)   1962)

-2   (1987)   (45- 40)   (Hay, 1993)

.   (25)   (1997)

-3

.

.(40)

-1

%90

-2   1981   )

.(1988

-3

-4

2.   .

.

(15-13)

■

.   (80)   2004

-

.   ■   (11)

.

(1)

:

(1)

.11=   :

-   (Digital)(Sony)
-1

.   /   (50)

-2   . 8 (Digital)(Sony)

3.03	58.18	( )
0.61	14.27	( )
3.33	170.36	( )

(1)

± 14.27)   (3.03 ± 58.18)

.   (3.33 ± 170.36)   (0.61

-3   .
-4   .
-5   .
-6   .(50)
-7   .
-8   .

-

-1   .
-2   .(APAS)

.3

-1

11.80

(3)

(106)   8

.(3   )

-2

.(   )

35)

-3

.(40   10   30   25   15   20

:

-1

.

-2   .

-

-

. (35)   ■

. (20)   ■

. (15)   ■

. (25)   ■

. (30)   ■

. (10)   ■

. (40)   ■

-

.   ■

.   ■

.   ■

.   ■

.   ■

…

3-   .

4-

.

5-

.

1-

.

2-

)

)   (

.(

(1)

.

d1=

X=

(1)   0 .04

.=

θ

20   35)

(40   10   30   25   15

(231)   (11)

.

.

:

.   .   -1

.   -2

.

.   .   -3

:   -1

.   -2   (Digitizing)   (APAS)

.(One-Way ANOVA)   -3   .

.(LSD)   -4

.   -5

- 112 -

الوسط الحسابي لمسافة الوثب المنجزة

(2)

.

(2)   4.

:   .

-
.

-

0.26	4.02	10
0.24	4.31	15
0.32	4.48	20
0.22	4.32	25
0.23	4.31	30
0.33	4.32	35
0.52	4.33	40

(2)   ) :   :

.(

(20)

4.33   (40)   0.32 ± 4.48
0.33 ± 4.32   (35)   0.52±   .

(3) (2)

(3)

		0.27	6	1.63		
*0.023	2.62	0.10	70	7.26		
			76	8.89		

.2.23 = (0.05 ≥ α)

(4)

(LSD)

	0.46	20 – 10	
20	0.29	30 -20	
	0.15	40 -20	

(5)

0.44 -	5.49	15.61		
0.27 -	0.79	6.33	/	
0.09 -	0.05	0.85		
0.68	0.47	6.61	/	
0.52	0.75	6.06	/	
0.06	0.64	1.70	/	
0.20	0.34	4.34		

(LSD) (4) 0.22 ± 4.32 (25)

(30) 0.24 ± 4.31 (15)

(10) 0.23 ± 4.31

.0.26 ± 4.02

10

(3)

20 20

(4.48) 2.62

(4.02) 10

30 20 2.23

. 20 .

(6)

(20)

0.85-	7.04	16.27		
0.52-	1.10	6.64	/	
0.94-	0.06	0.83		
0.93-	0.97	7.39	/	
0.28	0.47	6.38	/	
0.13	0.19	1.86	/	
0.22	0.32	4.48		

(7)

(20)

0.116-	0.113-	**0.841	0.196-	0.480	0.428	1.0	
0.293	**0.611	**0.929	0.293-	0.534-	1.0		
0.104	0.016	0.185	0.114	1.0			
**0.955	0.112	0.261	1.0				
**0.802	**0.794	1.0					
0.218-	1.0						
1.0							

$(\alpha \geq 0.05) = 0.602.$ **

40   20

(0.15)

.   20

6.33   5.49 ±15.61

/   0.79 ±   )   :

± 6.61   0.05 ± 0.85

± 4.34   /   0.47   .(

0.34

0.68   0.09 –

.   (5)

/   0.75 ± 6.06   .

.   /   0.64 ±1.70   (5)

(8)

0.143-	0.025-	**0.932	0.064-	0.038	0.170	1.0
0.063	**0.500	**0.978	0.042	0.190-	1.0	
0.093-	0.048-	0.199-	0.344	1.0		
**0.74	0.068-	0.058	1.0			
**0.88	**0.316	1.0				
0.104-	1.0					
1.0						

** $\alpha (0.05 \geq \alpha) = 0.231$.

(9)

(20)

91.7	0.712	0.284	

0.955   .

0.016   (6)

.

) :   : 16.27 ± 7.04

                    / 6.64 ± 1.10

.(0.83 ± 0.06

                    / 7.39 ± 0.97

               "   "   . 4.48 ± 0.32

.   (9)   (8)   −

         (8)   0.28   0.94

                   / 6.38 ± 0.47

           0.978   . / 1.86 ± 0.19

0.038   (7)

.

(20) .

(20)

.

. .(Hay)

(4)

(: :

20 – 10 .(

40 – 20   30 – 20

20

. (4.48)   . (20)

" :(1987)   (9)

.

." .

(9)

(Hay,   (Kilani, 1990)

1993   91.7

. :

(1998)

12   0.284+   ×0.712=

(18 -16)

(22-20)   14   (20-18)   13   .5

. (25)   15   (2)

(Hay,

(45 -40)   1993)

(1988)   (20)

(Hildreth, 1962)   (45-35)

(37-29)   . (4.48)

(45-35)

.

(Kilani and Alkilani,   .

1993)   35   40

.

.   .

(8)

.

(5)   –

.

(5)

/ (6.06)

.   / (6.61)   :

X   =

(2002)

.

.(%95.3)

(2002)

(20)

.

(1994) (1992)   :(%91.7)

.   :

(Kilani, 1990)   =

0.284 +   × 0.712

(2001)

.

.

.

(8)

(0.978)

(9)   .   .

.

(1988)

)

.   (.

1995)

.

. / (6.33)

.6

(0.85)

:

20 -1

)

. (Hay, 1999) (

-2

.

-3

. .

-4 (15.61)

:

= (Linthorne et al., 2002)

0.284 + × 0.712 (23)

.7

:

20 -1

. (15-13) .

-2

.

-3

.

-4

. .

(Berg and Nancy,

1994

15

1981

Alkilani and Kilani. 1993. Optimization of Triple Jump Performance, A Simple Model. *Dirasat*, University of Jordan.

Berg, W. and Nancy, L. 1995. A Kinematic Profile of the Approach Run of Novice Long Jumpers. *Journal of Applied Biomechanics,* 11: 142-162.

Bridgett, L., Galloway, M., Linthorne, N. 2002. The Effect of Run-Up Speed on Long Jump Performance. International Symposium on Biomechanics in Sport.XX, 80-84.

Gerhard, Moser. 1990. Biomechanic Analysis of Criteria and Qualitative Levels of the Technique of the Long Jump. First International Conference Techniques in Athletics, Volume I., Cologne, U.S.A., 705.

Gunter Lange.1993. *Trends in Long Distance Training.* New Studies in Athletics, December (4): 23-25.

Hay, C. James. 1993. *The Biomechanic Sports Techniques*. 4th Edn., New Jersey. U.S.A., 424-430.

Hay, J. 1999. The Take-off in the Long Jump and Other Running Jumps. Abstracts from ISBS Symposium. XVII, from the World Wide Web: http://www.education.ed.ac.uk/field-ath/papers/jh.html.

Hildreth, Peter. 1962. *Athletics an Areg*. Handy Book, London, 121-123.

Kilani, Hashem. 1990. A Periodic Analysis of An Elite Female Triple Jumper. *Abhath Al-Yarmouk Humanities and Social Sciences Series*, 6. Yarmouk University. Jordan.

Linthorne, N. Guzaman, M. and Brigdt, L. 2002. The Optimum Take-off Angle in Long Jump. International Symposium on Biomechanics in Sport. XX, 126-129.

Nixdorf, E. and Broggemann, G. 1990. Techniques of Elite Male and Female Long Jumpers. First International Conference Techniqes in Athletics, I. Cologne.

2002

1997

1968

1

1998

1994

1994

1987

1987

1990

1988

3

1995

1990

2001

3

2003

1987

1992

2

Run-Up Distance and Some Kinematic Variables As
An Indicator to Long Jump Performance for Novice Long Jumpers

Hashem A. Kilani and Jehad A. Al-Rofu*

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the best run-up length contributing to long jump distance, and to investigate the relationship between the run-up and the kinematic variables. For this purpose, a regression formula was established to predict jumping performance that can be used for athletes selections. (80) long jumping students served as subjects in this study, in which the best 11 athletes, whose ages range between "13-15", had been assigned 3 trials in six run-up lengths and these were randomly ordered to each subject (10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35 and 40m). The kinematic variables were calculated at the center of gravity of the body and they were: Take-Off Angle (TOA), Take-Off Velocity (TOV), Horizontal Take-Off Velocity (HTV), Vertical Take-Off Velocity (VTV), Take-Off Height (TOH) and Run-Up Velocity (RUV). Results showed that (20) meters run-up length was the best for the subjects of the study and that the relationship between the Horizontal Take Off Velocity and the jump distance was strong and proportional. A provisional prediction formula was established and it was suggested to adopt shorter run-up lengths for the primary students in Jordan to achieve a better kinematic relation.

Keywords: Run-up Distance, Kinematic Variables, Long Jump, Novice Long Jumpers.