UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN POSSESSION FOOTBALL TEAMS AND DIRECT FOOTBALL TEAMS THAT LEAD TO WINNING IN ENGLISH PREMIER LEAGUE 2016/2017

MUHAMMAD ARIFF HAFIZI BIN ABD RAHIM

2016690898

Research project submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Bachelor of Sports Science (Hons.)

Faculty of Sports Science and Recreation

July 2018

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION

I declare that the work in this research project was carried out in accordance with the regulations of Universiti Teknologi MARA. It is original and is the results of my own work, unless otherwise indicated or acknowledged as a referenced work. This thesis has not been submitted to any other academic institution or non-academic institution for any degree or qualification.

I, hereby, acknowledge that I have been supplied with the Academic Rules and Regulations for Post Graduate, Universiti Teknologi MARA, regulating the conduct of my study and research.

Name of Student : Muhammad Ariff Hafizi bin Abd Rahim

Student I.D. No. : 2016690898

Programme : Bachelor of Sports Science (Hons.)

Faculty : Faculty of Sports Science and Recreation

Dissertation Title : Difference between Possession Football Teams and Direct Football Teams that Lead to Winning in English Premier League 2016/2017

Signature of Student : .....

Date : July 2018

ABSTRACT

The ultimate purpose of this study was to identify the differences style of attacking patterns between possession football teams and direct football teams that lead to winning in English Premier League 2016/2017. The sample size in this study was 79 videos (N=79) of English Premier League 2016/2017 and it divided into possession football teams and direct football teams. The data will be analyze by using independent T-test to seek the differences between two group ($p<0.05$). The findings shown there are significant different in term of successful short pass from center area for possession football teams (M=324.97, SD=96.37) and direct football teams (M=168.07, SD=45.60),($p<0.05$), unsuccessful short pass right for possession football teams (M=10.02, SD=4.06) and direct football teams (M=7.47, SD=3.70)),($p<0.05$), unsuccessful long pass center for possession football teams (M=17.28, SD=8.01) and direct football teams (M=27.13, SD=8.57),($p<0.05$), unsuccessful long pass right for possession football teams (M=5.78, SD=4.33) and direct football teams (M=8.73, SD=4.37), ($p<0.05$), successful shoot inside penalty box for possession football teams (M=4.19, SD=2.10) and direct football teams (M=3.53, SD=1.36), ($p<0.05$) and unsuccessful shoot outside penalty box for possession football teams (M=5.58, SD=3.00) and direct football teams (M=3.47, SD=2.13), ($p<0.05$) between possession football teams and direct football teams in English Premier League 2016/2017. The result show that p value <0.05. Due to this null hypothesis was accepted to reject. The others variable show there is no significant different data and the p value >0.05. The present study revealed that the outcome can be used by team manager, coaches and team analyst to create the best formula for the team and develop systematic training program. Hence, it will improve the athlete performance and will improve the quality of play during the competition

TABLE OF CONTENT

TITLE			PAGE
AUTHOR'S DECLARATION			i
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL			ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS			iii
ABSTRACT			iv
TABLE OF CONTENT			v
LIST OF TABLES			vii
LIST OF FIGURES			ix
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION			
	1.1	Background of the Study	1
	1.2	Statement of Problem	4
	1.3	Research Objectives	4
	1.4	Research Hypothesis	5
	1.5	Significance of Study	8
	1.6	Limitation	8
	1.7	Delimitation	8
	1.8	Definition of Terms	9
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW			
	2.1	Introduction	11
	2.2	Possession Football	11
	2.3	Direct Football	13
	2.4	Performance Indicator	14
		2.4.1 Short pass	15
		2.4.2 Long pass	15
		2.4.3 Crossing	16
		2.4.4 Shoot to the goal	16
		2.4.5 Scoring	17
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY			
	3.1	Introduction	18
	3.2	Research Design	19
	3.3	Sampling	19

3.4 Instrumentation 20
3.5 Data Collection Procedure 20
3.6 Data Analysis 21
3.7 Research Framework 22

CHAPTER 4 RESULT

4.1 Reliability 23
4.2 Intra-tester Reliability 23
4.3 Assumption of Normal Distribution 23
4.4 Reliability 25
4.5 Inferential Statistics 27
4.5.1 Score 27
4.5.2 Short pass 29
4.5.3 Long pass 35
4.5.4 Crossing 41
4.5.5 Shoot 45

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Discussion 49
5.2 Conclusion 54
5.3 Recommendation 55

REFERENCES 56

APPENDICES 60