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## Introduction and Research Question:

Zaidan, Mustafa and Ramadan, Gamal in 2004 AD believes that the sport of basketball is a team sport of wide popularity, and it is one of the fastest developing and growing sports, and its good performance requires the use of the most appropriate skills and plans in meeting each situation in order to win the match and this is why the skills and plans varied in the game of basketball. (22:18).

Abdel-Rahim, Muhammad 2003 believes that the kinematic basics in basketball must be owned by basketball players. The success of any team in reaching high levels depends primarily on their possession of these kinematic basics in addition to their ability to use them tactically with a high degree of efficiency, bearing in account that the kinematic basics are the essence of tactical maneuvers. (14:41)

Muhammad Abdul Aziz 2001 and Weal al-Dasiti 2001 agree with that the players' possession of offensive performances according to the requirements of the match allows them to choose the most suitable for different playing positions as well as implement plans in different places and directions, and then achieve the speed of outstanding performance with accuracy and compatibility in the implementation of the required planning duty as Understanding the plan is easy mentally, but more important than the success of that plan is the practical application that depends on the extent to which the player has such different situations. (15:30) (25:38)

Muhammad Abd al-Rahim 2003 agrees with Ayman al-Kiki in 2003 that the playing positions in basketball matches depend on the use of the individual skills of the player in overcoming the defender (the position of a player against a player). Individual plans should not be the main goal of offensive plans. Therefore, coordination between individual skills must be done. For players to perform a unified team work, and therefore it shows us the importance of planning preparation aimed at developing individual performances and making use of them in a unified team framework. (14:63) (5:32)

[^0]Ibrahim, Mohammed and Abdul-Aziz, Randy 2008 agree with Brian, Hainez 2010 that the player with good planning intelligence is characterized by speed and good behavior in changing playing situations, and is more able to quickly perceive and read situations to anticipate the opponent's behavior while playing and can take the appropriate decision at the appropriate time and quickly. Occasion, it is currently considered one of the most important features of a good player. (19: 103) (31)

Hence, it becomes clear that there is a role for general intelligence and a player's intelligence (athlete) in how to behave on the field and overcome various difficulties in playing roles and implement appropriate plans in sports matches.

And after reviewing the many references, studies and scientific research conducted in the field of basketball, it shows us the importance of preparing and developing basketball player's planningally, through his possession of many positions and planning moves that occur in matches, in addition to the ability to find various solutions for each situation.

Through the experiences of the researcher in the field of training in the youth sector, he found that the basketball game requires collective solutions from the players in multiple playing situations that need speed and good behavior, so basketball players need to be intelligent, which requires the ability to quickly make a sound planning decision to overcome the competitor Therefore, the researcher tried to use modern technology to develop the tactical side of basketball players, as he designed a technical program using computers to develop schematic thinking, which raised the ire of the researcher to study this idea in a scientific way to answer the following main question:

## "What is the effect of a training program in developing offensive skill performance and tactical thinking of basketball juniors $3 \times 3$ ?'

The following two sub-questions emerged from this question:

- Can the effect of a training program in developing offensive skill performance of basketball juniors $3 \times 3$ ?
- What is the effect of a training program in developing tactical thinking of the basketball juniors $3 \times 3$ ?


## Research objective:

The research aims at developing through a training program:

1. The level of offensive skill performance for basketball juniors $3 \times 3$.
2. The level of offensive tactical thinking for basketball juniors $3 \times 3$.

## Research hypotheses:

$\mathbf{1}$-There are statistically significant differences between the mean of the pre and post measurements in favor of the post measurement of the research sample in the level of offensive skill performance of basketball juniors $3 \times 3$.
2- There are statistically significant differences between the averages of the pre and post measurements in favor of the post-measurement of the research sample in the level of offensive tactical thinking of basketball juniors $3 \times 3$.
3- There are improvement rates between pre and past measurement in the level of tactical thinking and offensive skills (under consideration) for basketball juniors $3 \times 3$ in favor of the post measurements.
Research terms:

## 1. Technical application

It is an electronic application that includes a set of tactical situations in basketball ( 2 on 1, 2 on 2,3 on 2 , and 3 on 3 ) that require responses from the user.

## 2. Tactical thinking

"It is a multiple and variable mental process that occurs before the apparent motor response and works to select and direct it and this activity is done in a hidden manner". (11: 21)

## 3. Tactical intelligence

"It is a mental process guided to make an appropriate decision during matches according to the different situations that the player is exposed to."

- Research procedures
- Research Methodology

The researcher used the experimental method to suit the nature of this research by using the experimental design of pre and post measurement for one group.

- Research community

The research community represents basketball youth under 16 years old, who are registered in the Giza area of the Egyptian Basketball Federation for the season 2020/2021.

## - Research Sample:

The research sample was randomly selected from the basketball junior at Tarsana Sports Club under 16 years for the sports season2020/2021, and the total number of the research sample was (31) youngsters.

Table (1)
Characterization of the research sample

| Research Sample |  | Number | percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Basic Sample | 16 years old Team | 16 | $51.61 \%$ |
|  |  | 3 | $9.68 \%$ |
| Players excluded |  | $19.35 \%$ |  |
| Exploratory | 14 years old Team | 6 | $19.35 \%$ |
| total |  | 31 | $100 \%$ |

- Some players were excluded due to their complete irregularity in attending training.
- Homogeneity of the research sample:

The researcher made homogeneity for the basic research sample in growth variables (height - weight - chronological age) as well as the physical and skill variables under study. As shown in Table (2) (3).

Table (2)
Homogeneity of the research sample $\quad \mathrm{n}=28$

| Ser. | Variables | Meas. <br> unit | SMA | Arithmetic <br> mediator | standard <br> deviation | Coefficient <br> of torsion |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Height | CM | 172.95 | 174 | 2.729 | 0.006 |
| 2 | the weight | KG | 75.48 | 75 | 1.914 | 0.513 |
| 3 | Chronological <br> age | Year | 15.505 | 15.6 | 0.257 | 0.580 |
| 4 | Age of training | Year | 4.38 | 5 | 0.740 | 0.774 |
| 5 | smartness | Degree | 29.23 | 30 | 1.60 | 0.049 |

It is evident from Table (2) that the skew coefficient of growth variables is limited to ( $\pm 3$ ), indicating that the research sample falls under the moderate curve, which confirms the moderation of the data.

## Table (3)

Homogeneity of the research sample in physical and skill variables $\mathbf{n = 2 8}$

| Ser. | Variables | test | Meas. <br> unit | SMA | Arithmetic <br> mediator | standard <br> deviation | Coefficient <br> of torsion |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | transition <br> speed | Sprint 30 M | second | 5.45 | 5.40 | 0.328 | 0.920 |
| 2 | Kinematic <br> velocity | Sprint 20M with <br> ball | second | 4.56 | 4.50 | 0.211 | 1.602 |
| 3 | Reaction <br> speed | Nelson Kinetic <br> Response | second | 2.33 | 2.30 | 0.048 | 0.809 |
| 4 | Muscle <br> strength in <br> the arms | Tilted depression <br> pushed the <br> ground | cm | 11.6 | 12 | 1.10 | 0.203 |
| 5 | Muscle <br> strength in <br> the legs | The vertical jump <br> from constancy | cm | 41.61 | 42 | 1.196 | 0.096 |
| 6 | Endurance | Running test 5x <br> 30 meters | second | 57.61 | 57.50 | 1.931 | 0.074 |
| 7 | Agility | Zigzag running | second | 7.95 | 8.10 | 0.391 | 0.531 |
| 8 | Compatibility | Throwing and <br> receiving tennis <br> balls | degree | 16.1 | 16 | 0.547 | 0.302 |
| 9 | Dribbling | Dribbling with a <br> ball between <br> cones | second | 9.41 | 9.40 | 0.072 | 0.088 |
| 10 | Passing | Passing speed 15 <br> passes | second | 20.2 | 20.20 | 0.076 | 0.274 |
| 11 | Lay-up Shoot | lay-up shooting <br> from both sides | degree | 5.39 | 5 | 0.497 | 0.464 |
| 12 | Jump Shoot | Shooting from <br> jumping | degree | 3.57 | 4 | 0.503 | 0.305 |

It is evident from Table (3) that the torsion coefficient of the physical and skills is limited to ( $\pm 3$ ), indicating that the research sample falls under the moderate curve, which confirms the moderation of the data.

## Research fields:

1- Time domain: The researcher began the procedures for carrying out the research on Sunday 6/9/2020 AD to Wednesday 16/12/2020 AD

2- Spatial domain: basketball court in Tersana Sports Club.

## - Methods and tools for data collection:

1- Questionnaire
The researcher surveyed the opinion of 14 experts in the field of basketball, in order to determine the most important skill tests under consideration, and they were arranged as follows in Table (4) attached (10).

Table (4)
Arranging tests that measure basic offensive skills according to expert opinion

| Ser. | Variables | Tests | Repetitions | Percentage <br> $\%$ | arranging |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | dribbling | Dribbling with a ball <br> between cones | $\mathbf{8}$ | $57.14 \%$ | First |
|  | 12 barriers dribbling in <br> 30 seconds | $\mathbf{5}$ | $35.71 \%$ | Second |  |
| Test of dribbling ended <br> with shoot | $\mathbf{1}$ | $7.14 \%$ | third |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Passing | Passing speed to make <br> 15 passes | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $71.42 \%$ | first |
| Test of pass the ball <br> towards the target on <br> the wall. | $\mathbf{4}$ | $28.57 \%$ | second |  |  |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Lay-up <br> shooting | Lay-up shooting from <br> both sides | $\mathbf{8}$ | $57.14 \%$ | first |
| Lay-up shooting within <br> 30s | $\mathbf{6}$ | $42.85 \%$ | second |  |  |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | jump Shoot | jump Shoot | $\mathbf{9}$ | $64.28 \%$ | First |
|  | Under basket shoot | $\mathbf{5}$ | $35.71 \%$ | second |  |

## 2- Interview:

Through a personal interview, the researcher presented the forms attached (1), (2), (14) separately to the experts to obtain data or information, they were (14) experts. Attached (10)

## 3- Data registration form:

Data registration form for junior growth variables. Attachment (9)
Form for recording junior results in physical aptitude tests. Attachment (11)

Form for recording the results of junior offensive skills tests. Attachment (12)
Tlerm for recording the results of the juniors in the offensive planning performance test. Attachment (13)

4- Tests used in research:
A. Test of General Mental Ability. (Intelligence) Attachment (7)

The general mental ability test that was developed by Ahmed Zaki Saleh was used, which was used in a number of researches where the stability coefficients ranged between (0.75-0.85), and it was also confirmed for its validity through its association with other tests or by factor analysis.

## B. Physical Tests

Table (5)
Physical Abilities Tested

| Ser. | test | Variables | Measuring <br> tool | Meas. <br> unit | Attached |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Sprint 30 M | transition speed | Stop Watch | second | $\mathbf{5 / 1}$ |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Sprint 20M with ball | Kinematic velocity | Stop Watch | second | $\mathbf{5 / 2}$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Nelson Kinetic Response | Reaction speed | Stop Watch | second | $\mathbf{5 / 3}$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Tilted depression pushed <br> the ground | Muscle strength in <br> the arms | tight | cm | $\mathbf{5 / 5}$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | The vertical jump from <br> constancy | Muscle strength in <br> the legs | tight | cm | $\mathbf{5 / 6}$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | Running test 5 x 30 <br> meters | Endurance | Stop Watch | second | $\mathbf{5 / 1 0}$ |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | Zigzag running | Agility | Stop Watch | second | $\mathbf{5 / 7}$ |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | Throwing and receiving <br> tennis balls | Compatibility | tight | degree | $\mathbf{5 / 8}$ |

Table (5) shows the physical tests that the researcher used to ensure the homogeneity of the research sample .

## C. Skill Tests

Table (6)
Skill Abilities Tests

| Ser. | test | Variables | Measuring <br> tool | Meas. <br> unit | Attached |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Dribbling with a ball <br> between cones | Dribbling | Stop Watch | second | $\mathbf{6 / 1}$ |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Passing speed 15 passes | Passing | Stop Watch | second | $\mathbf{6 / 2}$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | lay-up shooting from <br> both sides | Lay-up Shoot | tight | degree | $\mathbf{6 / 3}$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Shooting from jumping | Jump Shoot | tight | degree | $\mathbf{6 / 4}$ |

Table (6) shows the offensive skill performance tests that the researcher used to ensure the homogeneity of the research sample, as well as the pre and post measurement of the research sample.

## D. Offensive Tactical Performance Test:

Steps for designing a technical program to measure the offensive tactical performance in basketball: (Prepared by the researcher) Attached (8)

The researcher has designed a technical program that contains a set of planned situations for cases ( $\mathbf{2}$ on 1, $\mathbf{2}$ on 2, $\mathbf{3}$ on 2, 3 on $\mathbf{3}$ ) and asks the youth to choose the best solution from the alternatives presented to him for each situation, at the end of the test, the total score of the player appears .

The researcher used the technical program in measuring the tactical thinking variable for juniors under 16 years of age in basketball, and the researcher also used skill tests to measure the skill aspect, after calculating the scientific parameters for both the technical program and the skill tests.

## - Technical program for offensive tactical thinking (under discussion)

Steps to design the technical program for offensive thinking: (prepared by the researcher) attached (4)

The researcher designed a technical program using the computer to measure the level of offensive tactical thinking for young people less than 16 years of age $3 \times 3$, and the researcher followed the following steps in building the program:

## 1. Determine the objective of the technical program:

The researcher identified the main objective of the program in measuring tactical thinking level of basketball juniors less than 16 years old $3 \times 3$.
2. Determine the main axes included in the technical program:

The researcher reviewed scientific studies and research that dealt with the planning aspect, and followed up many 16 -year stage matches, and then conducted many personal interviews to reach the main themes included in the technical program, by designing a form for presentation to the experts to determine the relative importance of the axes of the technical program. As shown in Table (7), Attachment (1)

Table (7)
The percentage of technical program axes according to expert opinion

| Ser. | The main axis | Duplicates | Percentage $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 on 1 playing situation | 8 | $57.14 \%$ |
| 2 | 2 on 1 playing situation | 12 | $85.71 \%$ |
| 3 | 2 on 2 playing situation | 14 | $100 \%$ |
| 4 | 3 on 2 playing situation | 14 | $100 \%$ |
| 5 | 3 on 3 playing situation | 14 | $100 \%$ |

Table (7) shows the approval ratings of the experts on the main axes of the technical program for developing tactical thinking, and the axes that did not exceed $80 \%$ of the experts 'opinions were excluded.

The researcher adopted the axes ( $\mathbf{2}$ on $\mathbf{1 , 2}$ on $\mathbf{2 , 3}$ on $\mathbf{2 , 3}$ on $\mathbf{3}$ ) as these axes require the player to use tactical thinking to solve them, while the axis ( $\mathbf{1}$ on $\mathbf{1}$ ) has been excluded as it depends very much on the level The skill of the player.
3. Defining the offensive tactical thinking situations that are included in the technical program:

- The researcher designed an expert opinion survey form containing (25) situation for the offensive tactical performance of youth less than 16 years, depending on the researcher's follow-up of a number of matches for the same age. As attached (2)
- Then the researcher conducted a personal interview with the experts to reach the final form of the situation of the tactical performance. as in table (8) , Attachment (3)

Table (8)
Approval of the experts on the situation of the offensive tactical thinking

| The axis | Nu situation | percenta ge | The axis | Nu situation | percentage | The axis | Nu situation | percen <br> tage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { r } \\ & \stackrel{1}{0} \\ & N \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 78.5\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { m } \\ & \stackrel{1}{0} \\ & N \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 85.7\% | $\begin{gathered} m \\ \overline{0} \\ m \end{gathered}$ | 19 | 78.5\% |
|  | 2 | 92.9\% |  | 11 | 57.2\% |  | 20 | 92.9\% |
|  | 3 | 64.3\% |  | 12 | 50\% |  | 21 | 85.7\% |
|  | 4 | 57.2\% | $\begin{gathered} n \\ \underset{0}{0} \\ m \end{gathered}$ | 13 | 92.9\% |  | 22 | 78.7\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{N} \\ & \text { C } \\ & \mathbf{N} \end{aligned}$ | 5 | 71.4\% |  | 14 | 78.5\% |  | 23 | 92.9\% |
|  | 6 | 92.9\% |  | 15 | 71.4\% |  | 24 | 85.7\% |
|  | 7 | 85.7\% |  | 16 | 92.9\% |  | 25 | 92.9\% |
|  | 8 | 78.5\% |  | 17 | 92.9\% |  |  |  |
|  | 9 | 64.2\% |  | 18 | 85.7\% |  |  |  |

Table (8) shows the approval percentages of the experts 'opinion on the situations of the offensive tactical thinking of the under 16 years, and situations that exceeded ( $70 \%$ ) of the experts' opinion were accepted.
-The researcher excluded the tactical situations for axis (2 on 1), two situations (3, 4), for axis (2 on 2), parking number (9), and for axis (3 on 2), for two positions (11, 12).

Then the researcher designed an expert situations survey form to set a score for each of the choices that appear to the young person for each situation separately, and this score represents the level of thinking of the emerging, as the score (80) represents a high level of tactical thinking for the emerging. As shown in Table (9) (10)

Table (9)
The key to correcting the situations of the technical program is to develop emerging tactical thinking

| Playing <br> situation <br> number | first <br> choice | second <br> choice | The <br> third <br> choice | Fourth <br> choice | Playing <br> situation <br> number | first <br> choice | second <br> choice | The <br> third <br> choice | Fourth <br> choice |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 14 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 15 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| 6 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 16 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7 | 1 | 2 | 4 |  | 17 | 4 | 2 | 1 |  |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 18 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 19 | 1 | 4 | 2 |  |
| 10 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 20 | 3 | 4 |  |  |

It is clear from Table (9) the degree for each selection for each situation of the technical program according to the opinions of experts, as each situation was linked to a degree that shows the level of thinking of the emerging.

Table (10)
Raw grades and levels of tactical thinking reasoning for the technical program

| Levels of tactical thinking | Raw grade |
| :--- | :---: |
| High level of thinking | $\mathbf{( 7 0 : 8 0 )}$ |
| Good level of thinking | $\mathbf{( 5 0 : 6 9 )}$ |
| Medium level of thinking | $(\mathbf{4 0 : 4 9 )}$ |
| Below average | $\mathbf{( 3 0 : 3 9 )}$ |
| Weak | $\mathbf{( 2 2 : 2 9 )}$ |

- The researcher reached the final form of offensive tactical thinking situation in junior basketball for less than 16 years. As attached (3)

4. Presentation of the technical program for offensive tactical thinking: Attachment (4)

- The language used in designing the technical program

Visual studio 2012.
Microsoft exe cell dll library.
Macromedia flash player.

- Technical program opening window

The name of the program (Attack Plan) appears in this window.
Figure (1)

Image of the software icon

## Attack_Plan

(Searcher's name - researcher's picture) appears in this window.


Figure(2)
*Researcher's name and data: Dr. Mahmoud Mohamed Naguib Hussein- Dr. Lecturer at the Department of Theories and Applications of Team Sports and Racquet Sports - College of Physical Education - Benha University.

In this window, a presentation of the position of strategic thinking and the solutions that are chosen from them appear


Tape the name of program / research bar Bar containing the legend
Offensive tactical position \& player number
set of the situation appropriate options

Figure (3)

The numerical sequence of the offensive tactical positions Transfer keys (previous/next)

## The final window of the technical program



A tape containing the name of the program/the name of the research

The analyst's score on the scale

New experience
figure (4)

## 5. The modus operandi of the technical program for offensive tactical thinking:

The measure-based operator stands on the program's Attack Plan icon, then double-clicking the left mouse button, the program starts to run, and then a window appears with the program's name, a picture of the program designer, and the name of the designer.

Then the main window that contains the drawing key appears, the tactical situation to be solved with specifying the number of the player who is carrying out the offensive tactical thinking behavior, and a set of solutions for the tactical situation appears, and it requires that the person in charge of the measurement choose the most appropriate solutions for the situation.

The analyst can move between situation through the previous and next keys located inside the window at the bottom, and the color of the numerical sequence of the situations changes to green if it is resolved, and it is red if it is not resolved.

When the person in charge of the measurement finishes answering all the tactical situations, the program shows the score obtained by the laboratory from the total score for the tactical situations, which is 80 points.
6. The final form of the tactical thinking position has been developed so that it can be displayed on computer screens.
7. After designing the program and placing it on the computer, it was presented to a group of experts in the field of basketball, in order to verify the validity of the program in terms of purpose, content, evaluation, organization and ease of use, through a personal interview. As in the table (15).

Table (11)
Percentage of experts' agreement on the technical program (under discussion) $\mathrm{n}=14$

| Ser. | The axles | available | To <br> some <br> extent | not <br> available | percentage |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Evaluate the program in terms of the <br> objective | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | - | - | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Evaluation of the program in terms of <br> content | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | - | - | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Program evaluation in terms of design | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | - | $\mathbf{9 2 . 8 5 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Evaluate the program in terms of <br> organization and ease of use | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | - | $\mathbf{9 2 . 8 5 \%}$ |

Table (11) shows the percentage of experts' agreement on the technical program and the evaluation of the program in terms of the objective was $100 \%$, in terms of content $100 \%$, in terms of design $92.85 \%$ and in terms of ease of use $92.85 \%$.

## Exploratory studies

## First: The first exploratory study

The researcher conducted this study from Sunday 6/9/2020 AD to Thursday 17/9/2020 AD on a sample consisting of (12) juniors from Al Tersana Sports Club.
A. The aim of the first exploratory study:

- Determine where to conduct the skill in question.
- Calculating the scientific parameters for the skill tests and the offensive tactical thinking test under discussion.


## B. Results of the first exploratory study:

## 1. Honesty

The researcher calculated the validity of the tests by finding the validity of the differentiation between two groups, the first (6) youngsters less than 14 years old as a non-distinguished group, and the second group (6) teenagers less than 16 years old as a distinguished group of Al Tersana sports club. As shown in Table (12)

Table (12)
The arithmetic mean, standard deviation, and (t) value between each group The non-distinguished and the distinguished group in tests $\quad \mathrm{N} 1=\mathrm{N} 2=6$

| Tests | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Unit } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { meas } \\ \text { u. } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | non-distinguishedgroup |  | distinguished group |  | Difference between 2 means | Thecalculate$d(t)$value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | -S | $\pm$ SD | -S | $\pm$ SD |  |  |
| Offensive skill tests |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dribbling with a ball between cones | Sec. | 10.63 | 0.287 | 9.39 | 0.0917 | 1.241 | 3.912 |
| Passing speed to make 15 passes | Sec. | 22.88 | 1.00 | 20.98 | 0.643 | 1.90 | 3.912 |
| Lay-up shooting from both sides | Deg. | 3.50 | 0.547 | 6.83 | 0.408 | 3.33 | 11.952 |
| 10 jump Shoots | Deg. | 2.66 | 0.816 | 6.16 | 0.408 | 3.50 | 9.319 |
| Offensive schematic program |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| schematic thinking | Deg. | 32.83 | 1.60 | 47.32 | 0.516 | 14.50 | 21.101 |

The tabular " t " value is at the level of significance 0.05 and the degree of freedom of $\mathbf{1 0}=\mathbf{2 . 2 3}$

Table (12) shows that there are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the two non-distinguished and the distinguished groups in favor of the distinguished group at a level of significance (0.05) in the skill tests and the offensive tactical thinking test, which indicates that it can distinguish between different groups and thus are honest tests that perform the goal that It was set for it.

## 2. Stability:

The researcher found the parameters of the stability of the tests used using the method of applying the tests and re-applying them to (6) juniors less than 16 years of age from Tersana Sports Club, with a time difference of (10) days between the two applications and under the same conditions and with the same instructions. As shown in table (13)

Table (13)
The arithmetic mean, standard deviation, and correlation coefficient between each of the first application and the second application in the tests $\mathrm{N}=6$

| Tests | $\begin{gathered} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Unit } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { meas } \\ \text { u. } \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | First application |  | Second application |  | correlation coefficient |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | -S | $\pm$ SD | -S | $\pm$ SD |  |
| Offensive skill tests |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dribbling with a ball between cones | Sec. | 9.38 | 0.0752 | 8.70 | 0.460 | $\pm 0.808$ |
| Passing speed to make 15 passes | Sec. | 20.98 | 0.643 | 21.83 | 1.169 | $\pm 0.989$ |
| Lay-up shooting from both sides | Deg. | $7 . .166$ | 0.752 | 5.50 | 0.547 | $\pm 0.759$ |
| 10 jump Shoots | Deg. | 6.167 | 0.408 | 4.83 | 0.752 | $\pm 0.759$ |
| Offensive tactical thinking program |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tactical thinking | Deg. | 47.67 | 0.816 | 47.00 | 0.632 | $\pm 0.775$ |

The tabular " $R$ " value is at the level of significance 0.05 and the degree of freedom of $5=0.754$

## Second: The second exploratory study

The researcher conducted this study from Saturday 19/9/2020 AD to Thursday 24/9/2020 AD on the basic research sample, as its number reached (21) juniors from Tersana Sports Club.

## A. The aim of the second exploratory study

- Applying (4) training units to determine the time of each training unit and determine the degree of training load for each unit during the medium, high and maximum endurance weeks.
- Standardize the training load by using the target pulse during training (THR) equation.
- To ensure the appropriate playgrounds, equipment and tools used in the implementation of the training program.
B. Results of the second exploratory study
- Junior pulse rates were measured and then the target pulse equation (THR) was applied.
- The training loads have been codified by using the components of the training load (intensity - volume - density). As attached to Table (13) attached (8/1: 8/3)

Table (14)
Determine load intensity using your target pulse rate

| Rest pulse | Pulse reserve | Degree of <br> load | Required <br> intensity | Target pulse rate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | maximum | $\mathbf{9 0}: 100 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 9 1 : 2 0 4}$ | $\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{m}$ |
|  |  | Less than | $\mathbf{7 5 : 8 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0 : 1 9 0}$ | $\mathrm{p} / \mathbf{m}$ |
|  |  | medium | $\mathbf{4 7 : 5 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 9 : 1 3 6}$ | $\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{m}$ |

- Steps to design the training program to develop offensive tactical thinking $3 \times 3$


## The aim of the program:

The research aims to design a proposed training program to develop tactical thinking among basketball beginners less than 16 years of age $3 \times 3$, in order to create a distinguished basketball player and reach the best technical and tactical level.

## Designing the training program:

The researcher has identified the most important variables of the training program, as the training period (preparation period) was chosen and it is divided into three parts:

## 1. General preparation duration

This period took a time of (2) weeks as a foundation period for the basic physical abilities and skills in basketball.

## 2. Special preparation duration

This period lasted for a time of (4) weeks, the general goal of which is to develop offensive tactical thinking for basketball beginners, by focusing on
developing the offensive skills of the juniors and giving training similar to the conditions of sports competitions, providing the youth with the ability to choose the best solutions for all situations that they may encounter Inside the competition.

## 3. The time of preparation for matches

This period lasted for a duration of (4) weeks, and the aim was to develop planning thinking for juniors under 16 years of age, using offensive planning positions similar to match situations, giving different solutions for each planned situation within the training units. As attached (5/8)

## Program and degrees of load:

The implementation of the program as a whole took (10) weeks, with a total time of the program as a whole (4550) minutes, where the time of the general physical part within the program was (463) minutes, the special physical part reached (1333) minutes, and the skill part (1661) minutes, and finally the planetary part reached (1093) minutes, the percentage of planning preparation reached nearly (24.5\%) due to the nature of the research in relying on the s schematic aspect, this time does not include the time for both warm-up and cool down. Attachment (8/4)

Table (15)
The degrees of training load and the time of each training unit within the training week

| Ser. | Unit Time <br> Degree of load | Maximum | High | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Maximum load | 160 M | 150 M | 120 M |
| 2 | High load | 135 M | 110 M | 90 M |
| 3 | Average load | 120 M | 100 M | 80 M |

Note: the distribution of times does not include the warm-up and cooldown times.

## Training units:

The number of training units for the training program reached (40) units, where the number of units for the general preparation period reached (8) units, with a total time (785) minutes, and the number of units for the special preparation period reached (16) units at a time (1965) minutes Preparation for matches (16) units, with a total time of (1800) minutes. The training unit included the warm-up part with a time of (15) minutes, the main part, the time ranging between (90-120) minutes, and the time of the cooling off part (5) minutes. Attached (8/6: 8/15)

Table (16)
The executive plan of the training program during the weeks showing the physical, skills and tactical goals for (research sample)

| Period | Weeks | physical goals | offensive skills goals | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Defensive skill } \\ \text { goals } \end{gathered}$ | Tactical goals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | first <br> second | - Basic Endurance <br> - Strength endurance <br> - Balance <br> - Static flexibility <br> - Agility | - Dribbling <br> - Passing <br> - shooting | - defensive stance <br> - Defensive Against Dribbler <br> - Defensive Against Shooter | - Attacking and defending in a ( 1 on 0 ), ( 1 on 1 ) situation. |
| 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | third <br> four <br> Five <br> six <br> Seven | - Maximum strength <br> - Strength caracteristique <br> - Strength endurance <br> - Sprint <br> - Reaction time <br> - Speed for movement <br> - Dynamic flexibility <br> - Agility <br> - Coordination <br> - Accuracy <br> - Special endurance | - Dribbling Passing <br> - Shooting <br> - Offensive rebound <br> - Feck <br> - cutting | - defensive stance <br> - Defensive Foot <br> Work <br> - Defensive <br> Against <br> Dribbler <br> - Defensive <br> Against Passer <br> Defensive <br> Against <br> Shooter <br> - defensive <br> rebound <br> - steal the ball | - Attacking and defending in a ( 2 on 0 ) ( 2 on 1 ) ( 2 on 2 ) situation. <br> - Attacking and defending in a ( 0 on 3 ), (2 on 3) situation. |
| 粊 | eight <br> Nine <br> ten | - Sprint <br> - Maximum strength <br> - Speed for movement <br> - Coordination <br> - Special endurance <br> - Agility | - Screen <br> - Pick and Roll <br> - Read and React | - Defensive Against Screen <br> - Defensive Against Pick and Roll <br> - Defensive Against Read and React | - Attacking and defending in a (2 on 2) situation. <br> - Attacking and defending in a (3 on 3) situation. |

- Research implementation procedures


## 1. Pre-measurement

The pre-measurement was applied to the research sample in skill variables and the offensive tactical thinking test in the period from Monday, 9/28/2020 AD, until Wednesday, 9/30/2020 AD.

## 2. Implementation of the training program

The training program was applied to the research sample from Saturday, 10/3/2020 AD, until Friday, 11/12/2020 AD.

## 3. The post measurement

The post measurement was applied to the research sample in skill variables and the offensive tactical thinking test from Monday 14/12/2020 AD until Wednesday $16 / 12 / 2020 \mathrm{AD}$, with the same procedures and order that was done in the pre-measurement.

- Statistical treatments

Arithmetic mediator<br>SMA<br>T test<br>Improvement percentage \%

## Presentation and discussion of results

## First: Presenting the results

- Present the results of the first hypothesis:" There are statistically significant differences between the mean of the pre and post measurements in favor of the post measurement of the research sample in the level of offensive skill performance of basketball juniors $3 \times 3$ ".

Table (17)
The significance of the differences between the mean of the two measures, pre and post, in the level of offensive skill performance, $\mathrm{n}=16$

| Tests | Unit | Pre- measure. |  | Post- measure. |  | difference | Value <br> of T |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | - S | $\pm$ SD | - S | $\pm$ SD |  |  |
| dribbling | Second | $\mathbf{9 . 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 9 4}$ |  |  |
| Passing | Second | $\mathbf{2 0 . 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 . 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 1 . 0 7 7}$ |
| Lay-up shoot | Degree | $\mathbf{5 . 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 9 3 8}-$ | $\mathbf{1 3 . 7 6}$ |
| Jump shoot | degree | $\mathbf{3 . 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 0 6 3 -}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 0 5 2}$ |

The tabular " $t$ " value is at the level of significance 0.05 and the degree of freedom of $\mathbf{1 5}=\mathbf{1 . 7 5}$

- Presentation of the results of the second hypothesis:" There are statistically significant differences between the averages of the pre and post measurements in favor of the post-measurement of the research sample in the level of offensive tactical thinking of basketball juniors $3 \times 3$ ".

Table (18)
The significance of the differences between the mean of the pre and post measurements at the level of tactical thinking- $\mathrm{n}=16$

| Tests | Unit of measu. | non-distinguished group |  | distinguished group |  | Differe nce between 2 means | $\begin{gathered} \text { The } \\ \text { calculate } \\ d(t) \\ \text { value } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | -S | $\pm$ SD | -S | $\pm$ SD |  |  |
| Planned thinking | degree | 49.88 | 0.885 | 73.19 | 0.911 | 23.31- | 60.668 |

The tabular " $t$ " value is at the level of significance 0.05 and the degree of freedom of $\mathbf{1 5}=\mathbf{1 . 7 5}$

- Presentation of the results of the third hypothesis:" There are improvement rates between pre and past measurement in the level of tactical thinking and offensive skills (under consideration) for basketball juniors $3 \times 3$ in favor of the post measurements".

Table (19)
The percentage of improvement between the average of the pre and post measures in the level of tactical thinking and offensive skills

| Tests | Unit | SMA |  | Percentage of improv. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PRE | POST |  |
| dribbling | Second | 9.41 | 6.56 | 30,49\% |
| Passing | Second | 20.21 | 17.30 | 14.39\% |
| Lay-up shoot | Degree | 5.38 | 8.31 | 54.46\% |
| Jump shoot | degree | 3.50 | 7.56 | 116\% |
| tactical thinking | degree | 49.88 | 73.19 | 46,732\% |

## Second: Discussing the findings:

## - Discuss the results of the first hypothesis

Table (17) show that there are differences between the tribal and dimensional measurements of the research sample in the level of offensive skill performance under investigation, where the value of ( t ) in the ball dribbling test reached (18.61), and it reached (91.07) in the passing test. The lay-up shooting aiming test was (13.76), and I also reached the test of the jump shooting (21.05).

The researcher attributes the rates of improvement to the positive impact of the planned program and its nature, as it relied on training for the provision of basic skills for the players, as skill preparation is one of the means of implementing the playing plans, so mastering skills and knowing how and when to use them is necessary for the success of playing plans.

Both Zidan, Mustafa and Moussa, Jamal 2004 AD (22) and Gregory 2007 AD (28) add that the players' possession of offensive skills allows them to choose the most appropriate for different playing positions, as well as implement plans in different places and directions and contribute to achieving speed and accuracy of performance as well as greatly contribute to achieving victory Matches.

Thomas and others 2006 AD (30) indicate that the use of stadium images and images of players and their movements contributes to a degree in learning and developing skill performance on the field, in addition to providing feedback to the player during performance.

These results are consistent with the study of Etab Mohamed 2016 AD (7) , Islam fathy 2018 AD (11 ), Ahmad Taher 2006 AD (2), Ahmad Abbas,2013 AD (1), Mohamed Ibrahim 2008 AD (18), and Weal al-Dasiti, 2001 AD (25),
And so, the first hypothesis is fulfilled, which states:
" There are statistically significant differences between the mean of the pre and post measurements in favor of the post measurement of the research sample in the level of offensive skill performance of basketball juniors $3 \times 3$ ".

## - Discuss the results of the second hypothesis:

Table (18) show that there are differences between the tribal and dimensional measurements of the research sample in the offensive tactical thinking test under consideration, where the value of ( t ) in the test of linear thinking was $(60,668)$, which is greater than the value of ( t ) calculated, which indicates There were differences in favor of the telemetry of the sample under study, and the improvement rate for the sample under study in the tactical reasoning test was ( $\mathbf{4 6 . 7 3 2 \%}$ ).

It appeared to us that the rates of improvement of the research sample in the offensive tactical test are due to the planned training program, which was based on analyzing the different playing situations that the player is exposed to on the field and presenting them in the form of training within the training unit, in addition to providing the players with information that helps them and enables them to behave properly inside The playing field, in addition to developing the tactical aspect through training on how to perform the skill and when to use it.

The researcher points out the need to develop the offensive tendency of the juniors through devising solutions, good behavior and making quick and successful decisions for the various offensive positions to ensure victory in matches.

These results are in agreement with the results of Hossam Moqbel's study 2015 AD (8), and Mona Shehata's study 2017 AD (20), which show us the importance of using technical programs that are planned on scientific bases that are commensurate with the nature of performance in the match,
which leads to improving skillful and tactical performance and reaching positive results in sports competitions.

Mohamad Abdul Rahim, 2003 AD (14) adds to the importance of relying on various ways of playing in competitions and training them, such as screen games, Pick and Roll games, and Read and React games.

These results are consistent with the results of studies concerned with developing the tactical aspect of the players, such as the study of Ayman AlKiki, 2003 AD (5), Shaaban Ibrahim, 2005 AD (23), Ahmed Mustafa , 2010 AD (3).

It agrees with some studies in similar sports, such as the study of Tariq Abdel Moneim, 2003 AD (24), Elsaid Ibrahim, 2009 (6), Mohamed Ibrahim, and Hassan, Randy 2008 AD (19), Mohammed Al-Hefnawi, 2000 AD (16), Muhammad hassan Allawi, and Abbas, Imad 2003 AD (17).

And so, the second hypothesis is fulfilled, which states:
" There are statistically significant differences between the averages of the pre and post measurements in favor of the post-measurement of the research sample in the level of tactical thinking of basketball juniors

$$
3 \times 3^{\prime \prime}
$$

- Discuss the results of the third hypothesis:

Table (19) show that the percentage of improvement for the sample under investigation ranged in the dribbling test $\mathbf{( 3 0 . 2 9 \%}$ ), the passing test ( $\mathbf{1 4 . 3 9 \%}$ ), the lay-up shooting correction test $\mathbf{( 5 4 . 4 6 \%}$ ), and the jump shooting test ( $\mathbf{1 1 6 \%}$ ).

And through analyzing the results of Table (18) that the level of tactical thinking of the research sample in the pre-measurement reached (49.88) degrees, that is, the average level of offensive tactical thinking, and after applying the training program for the research sample, the level of thinking increased to reach (73.19) degrees at the high level of thinking. The plans, and the goal of the technical program was to try to reach the teenager to the offensive play situation that occurs in matches in an actual way to make a decision and implement the skills accurately and quickly, and this is what was confirmed by Mohammad Abdul Rahim 2003 AD (14) that the diversity of training experiences and their organization increases the players' experience and their ability to perform Skills better.

The researcher adds that successful tactical performance requires players to have the ability to think tactically that depends on good behavior and making the right decision, by training juniors on the latest methods using scientific codified methods to raise the level of their tactical performance and keep pace with the high levels of basketball teams, as well as taking care of preparing and supplying coaches The latest programs and advanced scientific methods for teaching and training juniors.

## And so, the third hypothesis is fulfilled, which states:

'There are improvement rates between pre and past measurement in the level of tactical thinking and offensive skills (under consideration) for basketball juniors $3 \times 3$ in favor of the post measurements".

## - Conclusions

Through the research results, the research sample, and statistical treatments, the researcher has reached the following conclusions:

1. The training program has a great role in developing the skill level of basketball juniors under 16 years $3 \times 3$, as the value of "T" calculated in the dribbling test ranged from (18.6), in the pass test (91.1), in the test of lay-up shooting correction (13.8), and in Jumping Aunt Test (21.1).
2. The percentage of improvement in the level of offensive skill performance of the research sample ranged between (14\%: 116\%), which indicates the effective role of the training program.
3. The tactical training program has a positive effect on the tactical thinking of basketball juniors under 16 years $3 \times 3$, as the calculated value of "T" reached ( $\mathbf{6 0 . 6 6}$ ).
4. The rate of improvement in tactical thinking was (46.73\%) among basketball juniors under 16 years $3 \times 3$, which contributes positively to effectively ending the attack.

## - Recommendations

Through the research results showed, which depended on the nature of the research, the sample, and the procedures that were followed, the researcher was able to define the following recommendations:

1. Using the application designed by the researcher to measure the tactical thinking of male and female players in the basketball competitions $3 \times 3$.
2. The use of the technical program in assessing the level of tactical thinking of basketball beginners.
3. Establishing training programs that include the basics of tactical situations ( $\mathbf{2}$ on 1, 2 on 2, $\mathbf{3}$ on 2, 3 on 3) for beginners basketball for all ages and for both genders.
4. The coaches' interest in training in situation ( $\mathbf{2}$ on $\mathbf{1 , 2}$ on 2,3 on 2, 3 on 3) and providing the youth with information that contributes to making the right decisions in different playing situations.
5. Conducting further research and studies on samples of players in the different age stages of both sexes.
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## Attachment (1)

Expert opinion survey form to defining the axes of the offensive tactical situations of basketball juniors $3 \times 3$

Mr. Prof. Dr.

## After Greetings

Because of our belief in the great role that you play in the field of school sports, and our great confidence in benefiting from your experiences and opinions in this field, so we hope that your bright opinions will be used in this form so that this work is supported by the experience that you can contribute to, as the researcher Mahmoud Mohamed Naguib Hussain Rabie to conduct a study entitled:" The Effect of a training program in developing offensive skill performance and tactical thinking of basketball juniors $3 \times 3$ "

Please, kindly express an opinion on identifying axes for offensive situations that enable the researcher to measure the tactical thinking of basketball juniors $3 \times 3$.

You're Excellency, my sincere thanks and appreciation
Private data
Name
The jop
Academic degree

## Follow Attachment (1)

## A list of the axes of the tactical situations of attack for the basketball juniors:

Please read it and express an opinion on the axes desired to be investigated and measured, and to suggest what is added to and deleted from them, and to determine the relative importance of each axis.

| Ser. | The axes of the offensive <br> tactical situations | Opinion |  | Relative <br> importance |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | agree | not agree |  |
| 1 | 1 on 1 playing situation |  |  |  |
| 2 | 2 on 1 playing situation |  |  |  |
| 3 | 2 on 2 playing situation |  |  |  |
| 4 | 3 on 2 playing situation |  |  |  |
| 5 | 3 on 3 playing situation |  |  |  |

## Other suggestions:

1. .
2. .
3. .

Faculty of Physical Education Department of theories and Applications of Team
Sports

## Attachment (2)

## Expert opinion survey form to determine the offensive tactical situations of basketball juniors $\mathbf{3 \times 3}$

Mr. Prof. Dr

## After Greetings

Researcher / Mahmoud Mohamed Naguib Hussein Rabie is conducting a entitled:" The Effect of a training program in developing offensive skill performance and tactical thinking of basketball juniors $\mathbf{3 \times 3}{ }^{\prime \prime}$

And in view of your expertise in the field of sports training, and to benefit from your scientific expertise and opinions in determining the offensive tactical situations of the $3 \times 3$ basketball junior.

Please express your opinion on the vocabulary of the cognitive test designed by the researcher, and the appropriateness of the vocabulary to judge the cognitive aspect of the students of the research sample.

You're Excellency, my sincere thanks and appreciation
Private data
Name :
The jop
Academic degree

Follow Attachment (2)
Attacking tactical performance situations in its initial form The graphic key to the tactical situations of basketball juniors $3 \times 3$

| Ser. | Draw | indication |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (1) | attacking player No. 1 |
| 2 | (2) | attacking player No. 2 |
| 3 | 3 | attacking player No. 3 |
| 4 | A | Defensive player No. 1 |
| 5 | A | Defensive player No. 2 |
| 6 | - | Defensive player No. 3 |
| 7 | $\rightarrow$ | The player's move line without a ball |
| 8 | ---------> | Pass the ball |
| 9 | $\square$ | screen |
| 10 | $\cdots$ | The player moves the ball |
| 11 | \# | Lay-up shooting |
| 12 | - | The ball |

## Follow Attachment (2)

The key to correcting the situations of the technical program is to develop emerging tactical thinking

| Playing <br> situation <br> number | first <br> choice | second <br> choice | The <br> third <br> choice | Fourth <br> choice | Playing <br> situation <br> number | first <br> choice | second <br> choice | The <br> third <br> choice | Fourth <br> choice |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 14 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 15 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 16 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | 17 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 18 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 19 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 7 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 20 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 21 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9 | 3 | 4 |  |  | 22 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 23 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| 11 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 24 | 1 | 3 | 2 |  |
| 12 | 4 | 2 |  |  | 25 | 3 | 4 |  |  |
| 13 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |

Follow Attachment (2)
Situations of the offensive tactical performance of basketball juniors
Prepared by Dr. Mahmoud Mohamed Naguib Hussein

| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | Dribbling with <br> the ball and <br> stopping and <br> jump shot | Dribbling with <br> the ball and <br> penetration the <br> basket and fake <br> Thot and passing | Dribbling with the <br> ball and penetration <br> the basket and fake <br> pass and lay up shot <br> of player <br> No. 1 | Dribbling with <br> the ball and <br> penetration the <br> basket |



| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Tactical thinking of player No. 1 | Player 1 waits for player 2 to play $V$ Cut and then stops High Post, Player 1 passes the ball to Player 2 for a jump shot | Player 1 waits for player 2 to play $V$ Cut and then stops at High Post, Player 1 passes the ball to Player 2 by tricking and then making lay-up shot | Player 1 waits for the pieces from Player 2 to perform L Cut and then unites the basket to escape, Player 1 passes the ball to Player 2 for a jump shot | Player 1 waits for Player 2 to perform a V Cut, then stops outside the 3-point arc, so Player 1 makes a dribble and lay-up shot. |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 |  |  |  |
| Tactical thinking of player No. 1 | Player 1 dribble and move in the direction of the High <br> Post, at the same time Player 2 approaches him to receive the ball from Player 1's hand off and jump shoot | Player 2 L Cuts and cuts toward the basket, Player 1 passes the ball to Player 2 and jump shoot. | Player 1 dribble and move toward the High Post, at the same time Player 2 performs the L Cut and cuts toward the basket, then Player 1 passes the ball to Player 2 and lay up shoot. |
|  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Tactical thinking of player No. 1 | Dribbling and penetration the basket, then fake shot and passing | Dribbling, penetration the basket, then fake passing, then lay-up shoot | Dribbling, penetration the basket, then stop and jump shoot | Dribbling with the ball, then stopping and jump shoot |
|  |  |  |  |  |



| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |
| Tactical thinking of player No. 1 | Dribble the ball towards the basket, then stop and pass to player 2 Kik out | Dribbling in the direction of player 2, then pass the ball to him and move on the arc of 3 points to receive the ball and jump shoot | Pass the ball to Player 2, then cheat the opposite of the ball and cut in the direction of the ball to receive it and then lay-up shoot | Pass the ball to player 2 and cut toward the basket to receive the ball and aim for a jump shoot |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Tactical thinking of player No. 2 | Move to end line and outside the 3-point area, then receive a pass and jump shoot | Move in the direction of player 1 and receive the ball and then penetration of the basket, then pass Kick out player 1 | Receiving the ball from player 1 and then passing it to him after making the cut | fake and cutting from behind the defender and receiving the ball then jump shoot |
|  |  |  |  |  |



| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 |  |  |  |
| Tactical thinking | Player 1 passes the ball to player 2 or 3, then dribbles, gets into the basket, and jump shot | Player 1 passes the ball to 2 and at the same time player 3 cuts in the direction of the basket, then player 2 makes a powerful pass to player 3, then lay-up shoot | Player 1 passes the ball to 2 and then pivots with it in the direction of the basket, at the same time player 3 cuts in the direction of the basket, then Player 1 cuts in the High Post and Player 2 passes the ball to Player 1, then jump shoot |
|  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |
| Tactical thinking | Player 3 passes to player 2, who dribbles towards the basket and then passes the ball to player 1, who has cut in the direction of the basket, to jump shoot | Player 3 passes to Player 1, then performs Back Cut, receiving a pass from Player 1, and lay-up shoot | Player 3 passes to Player 1, then performs a Back Cut, receives a pass from Player 1, then passes to Player 2, who is facing the basket, and jump shoot | Player 3 passes to Player 1, then Player 1 passes to Player 2, and at the same time, Player 3 cuts in the direction of the basket to receive the ball and lay-up shoot |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 |  |  |
| Tactical thinking | Player 3 moves a step in, then Player 2 moves toward the basket and behind Player 3 to receive a pass from Player 1 and then jump shoot | Player 3 moves a step in, then Player 2 moves towards the basket and behind Player 3 to receive a pass from Player 1 Then, Player 2 passes again to Player 1, who moves with the ball on the boundaries of the 3-point arc, at the same time Player 3 moves in the direction of Player 1 then crosses towards the basket to receive a pass from Player 1 and Lay up shoot |
|  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis <br> of tactical <br> thinking <br> player <br> No. <br> after the <br> pass | Cutting by cutting, <br> then cutting, <br> receiving the ball <br> and dribbling, and <br> then lay-up shoot | Cutting and trying to <br> receive the bottom of <br> the basket and moving <br> against the direction of <br> passing and receiving <br> the ball, then <br> deception, dialogue <br> and lay up shoot |  |  |
| Fake cut, receiving <br> the ball, then jump <br> shoot | Cut toward the <br> pass, then receive <br> the ball and jump <br> shoot |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 1 after the received the ball | Fake shooting and passing to the cutter number (1), then cutting in the direction of the basket and receiving the ball and lay-up shoot | Fake shooting, then passing to player No. (3), then cutting and receiving the ball, and then jump shoot | fake shooting, dribbling the ball, and lay-up shoot | Fake shooting, dribbling and jump shoot |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of the tactical thinking of player No. 3 after 1 passes the ball to player No. 2 | Fake by cutting, moving towards the three-point line, receiving the ball, then passing or dribbling | Move towards the three-point line High post and receive the ball and pass | Move towards the free throw line Then outside the three-point line and receive the ball | Move towards the free throw to receive the ball |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 1 | Dribbling and penetration to the basket and lay-up shoot | Passing to player 2, then deception of passing, then cutting towards the ball, receiving the ball, lay-up shoot | Passing to player 2 and then cutting in the direction of passing | Passing to player 2, then running against the pass and making switsh with playing 3 and cutting toward the basket and receiving the ball, then shooting by jumping |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 2 | Receive a pass from Player 1, dialogue, and then a lay-up shoot | Fake then cutting towards the basket and receiving a pass from Player 1 and shooting | Running and switsh with player 3, then receiving the pass from player 1 , then negotiating and penetration the basket | Running and switsh work with player 3, then receiving the pass from player 1, then stopping and waiting for deception and cutting player 1 and passing the ball to player 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 3 | Receive a pass from Player 1, then dribble and penetration the basket | V cut and received a pass from player 1 and then passed the ball to player 2 after the process of cutting on the basket | Running and switsh with player 2 then receiving the pass from player 1 then stopping and waiting for player 2 doing switsh with player 1 and then passing the ball to player 2 who is jump shoot | Running and making switsh with player 2 then receiving the pass from player 1 then stopping and waiting for player 2 doing switsh with player 1 and then passing the ball to player 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 1 | Passing the ball to player <br> 2 , then making a deception against the direction of the ball, then cutting in the direction of the basket with the action of switch with player 3, then receiving the ball from the movement and lay-up shoot | Pass the ball to player 2, who passes the ball to player 3, and at the same time 1 moves along the 3 point line towards the end line to receive the ball, then deceives and lay-up shoot | Passing the ball to player 3, then switching to player 2, receiving a pass from player 3, and shooting | Pass the ball to player 2, then switch with player 3 and move outside the 3-point arc and receive his pass from player 2 , then jump shoot |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 2 | Receive a pass from player no 1 and penetration the basket | Wait for player 1 to pass the ball to player 3 and then switch with player 1 and cut onto the basket and receive a pass from player 3 and lay-up shoot. | L cut and switch made with player 3 , then receiving the ball from player 1 and jump shoot | Make a v cut, receive the ball from player 1, then jump shoot |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 3 | Receiving a pass from Player 1 and then dribbling to play on the basket | Waiting for the ball to pass from player 1 to player 2, then move and swith with player 1 , receive a pass from player 2, and jump shoot | Moving in the direction of Player 2, then cutting toward the basket, receiving his pass from Player 1, and lay-up shoot | Waiting for the ball to pass from player 1 to 2 and then swith with player 1 where player 2 makes an attempt to parallel the arc of 3 points and at the same time I do a back door and cut and receive the ball from player 2 and then the lay-up shoot |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22 |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 1 | Waiting for a move from player 3, then passing the ball to him, making a bluff, then cutting in the direction of the basket, receiving the ball, and a and lay-up shoot | Waiting for a move from player 3, then passing the ball to him and making a trick, then cutting towards the basket, then outside the 3 -point arc and receiving the ball and jump shoot | Waiting for a move from player 3 , then passing the ball to him and making a trick, then cutting towards the basket, then outside the 3-point arc and receiving the ball, then dribbling and passing to player 2 |
|  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 2 | Deceive then move outside the 3-point arc and ascend a 1 pass, then dribble and jump shoot | Waiting for the ball to pass from player 1 to player 3 , then I move outside the 3-point arc and switch with player 1 and receive the ball from player 3 , then jump shoot | Waiting for the ball to pass from player 1 to player 3, then I move outside the 3-point are and make a switch with player 1, then cut towards the basket and receive the ball from player 3, then lay-up shoot | Switch with Player 3 and receiving the ball with Player 1 and then jump shoot |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 3 | Switch action with Player 2 and then move outside the 3 point arc and receive a pass from Player 1 and jump shoot | switch with player 2 , move outside the 3-point arc, then back door, receive a pass from player 1, and lay-up shoot | Fake, then move outside the 3 point arc, then dribble and penetration the basket |
|  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking | Player 2 works v cut and receives a pass from Player 1, Player 1 cuts in the direction of the basket and receives the pass from Player 2 and lay-up shoot | Player 2 works $v$ cut and receives a pass from Player 1, Player 1 cuts in the direction of the basket and then moves outside the 3 point arc, at the same time Player 2 passes to Player 3 and then to Player 1 and jump shoot |
|  |  |  |

Attachment (3)
The final image of the design of the situations Attacking tactical performance
The graphic key to the tactical situations of basketball juniors $3 \times 3$

| Ser. | Draw | indication |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | 1 | attacking player No. 1 |
| 2 | 2 | attacking player No. 2 |
| 3 | 3 | attacking player No. 3 |
| 4 |  | Defensive player No. 1 |
| 5 |  | Defensive player No. 2 |
| 6 |  | Defensive player No. 3 |
| 7 | $\longrightarrow$ | The player's move line without a ball |
| 8 | $\cdots+\cdots$ | Pass the ball |
| 9 |  | screen |
| 10 |  |  |
| 11 |  | The player moves the ball |
| 12 |  | Lay-up shooting |

## Follow Attachment (3)

The key to correcting the situations of the technical program is to develop emerging tactical thinking

| Playing <br> situation <br> number | first <br> choice | second <br> choice | The <br> third <br> choice | Fourth <br> choice | Playing <br> situation <br> number | first <br> choice | second <br> choice | The <br> third <br> choice | Fourth <br> choice |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 14 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 15 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| 6 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 16 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7 | 1 | 2 | 4 |  | 17 | 4 | 2 | 1 |  |
| 8 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 18 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 19 | 1 | 4 | 2 |  |
| 10 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 20 | 3 | 4 |  |  |

Follow Attachment (3)
Situations of the offensive tactical performance of basketball juniors
Prepared by Dr. Mahmoud Mohamed Naguib Hussein

| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | Dribbling with <br> the ball and <br> stopping and <br> jump shot | Dribbling with <br> the ball and <br> penetration the <br> basket and fake <br> shot and passing <br> of player <br> No. 1 | Dribbling with <br> the ball and <br> penetration the <br> basket <br> ball and penetration basket and fake <br> pass and lay up shot |



| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Tactical thinking of player No. 1 | Dribbling and penetration the basket, then fake shot and passing | Dribbling, penetration the basket, then fake passing, then lay-up shoot | Dribbling, penetration the basket, then stop and jump shoot | Dribbling with the ball, then stopping and jump shoot |
|  |  |  |  |  |



| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Tactical thinking of player No. 1 | Dribble the ball towards the basket, then stop and pass to player 2 Kik out | Dribbling in the direction of player 2 , then pass the ball to him and move on the arc of 3 points to receive the ball and jump shoot | Pass the ball to Player 2, then cheat the opposite of the ball and cut in the direction of the ball to receive it and then lay-up shoot | Pass the ball to player 2 and cut toward the basket to receive the ball and aim for a jump shoot |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Tactical thinking of player No. 2 | Move to end line and outside the 3-point area, then receive a pass and jump shoot | Move in the <br> direction of player <br> 1 and receive the <br> ball and then <br> penetration of the <br> basket, then pass <br> Kick out player 1 | Receiving the ball from player 1 and then passing it to him after making the cut | fake and cutting from behind the defender and receiving the ball then jump shoot |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 |  |  |  |
| Tactical thinking | Player 1 passes the ball to player 2 or 3, then dribbles, gets into the basket, and jump shot | Player 1 passes the ball to 2 and at the same time player 3 cuts in the direction of the basket, then player 2 makes a powerful pass to player 3, then lay-up shoot | Player 1 passes the ball to 2 and then pivots with it in the direction of the basket, at the same time player 3 cuts in the direction of the basket, then Player 1 cuts in the High Post and Player 2 passes the ball to Player 1, then jump shoot |
|  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 |  | Cutting and trying to <br> receive the bottom of <br> the basket and moving <br> against the direction of <br> passing and receiving <br> the ball, then <br> deception, dialogue <br> and lay up shoot |  |  |
| Analysis <br> of tactical <br> thinking <br> player <br> No. <br> after the <br> pass | Cutting by cutting jump <br> then cutting, <br> receiving the ball <br> and dribbling, and <br> then lay-up shoot | Cut toward the <br> pass, then receive <br> the ball and jump <br> shoot |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 1 after the received the ball | Fake shooting and passing to the cutter number (1), then cutting in the direction of the basket and receiving the ball and lay-up shoot | Fake shooting, then passing to player No. (3), then cutting and receiving the ball, and then jump shoot | fake shooting, dribbling the ball, and lay-up shoot | Fake shooting, dribbling and jump shoot |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of the tactical thinking of player No. 3 after 1 passes the ball to player No. 2 | Fake by cutting, moving towards the three-point line, receiving the ball, then passing or dribbling | Move towards the three-point line High post and receive the ball and pass | Move towards the free throw line Then outside the three-point line and receive the ball | Move towards the free throw to receive the ball |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 1 | Dribbling and penetration to the basket and lay-up shoot | Passing to player 2, then deception of passing, then cutting towards the ball, receiving the ball, lay-up shoot | Passing to player 2 and then cutting in the direction of passing | Passing to player 2, then running against the pass and making switsh with playing 3 and cutting toward the basket and receiving the ball, then shooting by jumping |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 2 | Receive a pass from Player 1, dialogue, and then a lay-up shoot | Fake then cutting towards the basket and receiving a pass from Player 1 and shooting | Running and switsh with player 3, then receiving the pass from player 1 , then negotiating and penetration the basket | Running and switsh work with player 3, then receiving the pass from player 1, then stopping and waiting for deception and cutting player 1 and passing the ball to player 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 3 | Receive a pass from Player 1, then dribble and penetration the basket | V cut and received a pass from player 1 and then passed the ball to player 2 after the process of cutting on the basket | Running and switsh with player 2 then receiving the pass from player 1 then stopping and waiting for player 2 doing switsh with player 1 and then passing the ball to player 2 who is jump shoot | Running and making switsh with player 2 then receiving the pass from player 1 then stopping and waiting for player 2 doing switsh with player 1 and then passing the ball to player 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 1 | Passing the ball to player <br> 2 , then making a deception against the direction of the ball, then cutting in the direction of the basket with the action of switch with player 3, then receiving the ball from the movement and lay-up shoot | Pass the ball to player 2, who passes the ball to player 3, and at the same time 1 moves along the 3 point line towards the end line to receive the ball, then deceives and lay-up shoot | Passing the ball to player 3, then switching to player 2, receiving a pass from player 3, and shooting | Pass the ball to player 2, then switch with player 3 and move outside the 3-point arc and receive his pass from player 2 , then jump shoot |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 2 | Receive a pass from player no 1 and penetration the basket | Wait for player 1 to pass the ball to player 3 and then switch with player 1 and cut onto the basket and receive a pass from player 3 and lay-up shoot. | L cut and switch made with player 3 , then receiving the ball from player 1 and jump shoot | Make a v cut, receive the ball from player 1, then jump shoot |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 3 | Receiving a pass from Player 1 and then dribbling to play on the basket | Waiting for the ball to pass from player 1 to player 2, then move and swith with player 1 , receive a pass from player 2, and jump shoot | Moving in the direction of Player 2, then cutting toward the basket, receiving his pass from Player 1, and lay-up shoot | Waiting for the ball to pass from player 1 to 2 and then swith with player 1 where player 2 makes an attempt to parallel the arc of 3 points and at the same time I do a back door and cut and receive the ball from player 2 and then the lay-up shoot |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 1 | Waiting for a move from player 3, then passing the ball to him, making a bluff, then cutting in the direction of the basket, receiving the ball, and a and lay-up shoot | Waiting for a move from player 3 , then passing the ball to him and making a trick, then cutting towards the basket, then outside the 3-point arc and receiving the ball and jump shoot | Waiting for a move from player 3 , then passing the ball to him and making a trick, then cutting towards the basket, then outside the 3 -point arc and receiving the ball, then dribbling and passing to player 2 |
|  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 2 | Deceive then move outside the 3-point arc and ascend a 1 pass, then dribble and jump shoot | Waiting for the ball to pass from player 1 to player 3 , then I move outside the 3-point arc and switch with player 1 and receive the ball from player 3, then jump shoot | Waiting for the ball to pass from player 1 to player 3, then I move outside the 3-point arc and make a switch with player 1 , then cut towards the basket and receive the ball from player 3, then lay-up shoot | Switch with Player 3 and receiving the ball with Player 1 and then jump shoot |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 |  |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking player No. 3 | Switch action with Player 2 and then move outside the 3 point arc and receive a pass from Player 1 and jump shoot | switch with player 2 , move outside the 3-point arc, then back door, receive a pass from player 1, and lay-up shoot | Fake, then move outside the 3 point arc, then dribble and penetration the basket |
|  |  |  |  |


| Ser. | Explanation of the tactical situation |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 |  |  |
| Analysis of tactical thinking | Player 2 works v cut and receives a pass from Player 1, Player 1 cuts in the direction of the basket and receives the pass from Player 2 and lay-up shoot | Player 2 works $v$ cut and receives a pass from Player 1, Player 1 cuts in the direction of the basket and then moves outside the 3 point arc, at the same time Player 2 passes to Player 3 and then to Player 1 and jump shoot |
|  |  |  |

## Attachment (4)

The Technical program by using the computer to measure the Technical thinking of basketball juniors $3 \times 3$

The program icon shape


Information about the designer and how to contact him



$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { الدكتور / محمو2 محم نجيب حسين ربيع }
\end{aligned}
$$

A figure showing the interface of the technical program


Follow Attachment (4)
The Technical program by using the computer to measure the Technical thinking of basketball juniors $3 \times 3$

A form showing how to choose the answer from the available options,
by clicking on the answer with the mouse button
When answering the situation, its numerical sequence turns green


A figure showing that there are my positions
 the same )

A form showing the degree of the
laboratory after completing the answer to all the planning situations

Follow Attachment (4)
The Technical program by using the computer to measure the Technical thinking of basketball juniors $3 \times 3$

In the absence of an answer to one of the schematic situations, the program does not correct and the word (error) appears at the bottom of the screen for us


When you click on New Experience, the program prompts you to choose Yes or No


## Attachment (8)

## The proposed training program

Scientific procedures and steps for developing the proposed training program
A model was developed to distribute the time distribution of the training modules during the weeks of average load to determine the total time of the week.

## Table (1)

A template for the time distribution of the training units' content during weeks of average load

| Day. | Saturday | Sunday | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Degree of load |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum load |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High load |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Medium load |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rest without <br> training |  | Rest | 100 | Rest | 80 | Rest | 100 |
| Training time <br> in minutes | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

It is clear from Table () that:
Training load cycle (1: 2) (1: 1).

- The number of training units per week (4) units.
- The average unit time of the load is (80) minutes.
- The time of the unit of high load (100) minutes.

The maximum load unit time is (120) minutes.

- The total time for the average week is (360) minutes.

Note: The time distribution does not include the warm-up and cool-down times.

## Follow Attachment (8)

A model was developed for the time distribution of the training modules' contents during the weeks of high load to determine the total time of the week.

Table (2)
A template for the time distribution of the training units' content during weeks of high load

| Day. | Saturday | Sunday | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Degree of load |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum load |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High load |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Medium load |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rest without <br> training |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Training time <br> in minutes | 90 | Rest | 110 | Rest | 135 | Rest | 90 |

It is clear from Table () that:
Training load cycle (1: 2) (1: 1).

- The number of training units per week (4) units.
- The average unit time of the load is (90) minutes.
- The time of the unit of high load (110) minutes.

The maximum load unit time is (135) minutes.

- The total time for the average week is (425) minutes.

Note: The time distribution does not include the warm-up and cool-down times.

## Follow Attachment (8)

A model was developed for the time distribution of the training modules' contents during the weeks of Maximum load to determine the total time of the week.

Table (3)
A template for the time distribution of the training units' content during weeks of Maximum load

| Day. | Saturday | Sunday | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Megree of load |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum load |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Medium load |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rest without <br> training |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Training time <br> in minutes | 150 | Rest | 160 | Rest | 120 | Rest | 160 |

It is clear from Table () that:
Training load cycle (1: 2) (1: 1).

- The number of training units per week (4) units.
- The average unit time of the load is (120) minutes.
- The time of the unit of high load (150) minutes.

The maximum load unit time is (160) minutes.

- The total time for the average week is (590) minutes.

Note: The time distribution does not include the warm-up and cool-down times.

Follow Attachment (8)
The percentage of the types of preparation was distributed among the main parts of the training weeks

Table (4)
Percentage distribution of the types of physical - skill - tactical planning

| Weeks preparation |  | first | second | third | four | Five | six | Seven | eight | Nine | ten |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Physical | general | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 |
|  | Especially | 40 | 40 | 35 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 25 | 25 | 20 | 20 |
| Skill |  | 35 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 40 | 35 | 35 | 30 | 35 | 35 |
| tactical |  | 10 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 35 | 40 |

Table () shows the percentages for each component (physical physical - plans) on the training weeks for the period as a whole.


Form ()
It shows the proportions of the distribution of the planning preparation on the weeks of the training program


```
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { الخامس ■ الرابع ■ الثالث ■ الثاني ■ الأولـ ■ } \\
& \text { العاثشر ■ التاسع ■ الثامن ■ السابع ■ السادس ■ ■ }
\end{aligned}
\]
```

Follow Attachment (8)
Table (5)
The dynamics of the load and the temporal and relative distribution of the components of the training modules of the training program

|  |  |  | The period of special preparation and preparation for matches |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time |  |  | Saturday, 10/3/2020: Friday, 11/12/2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weeks. <br> Degree of load |  |  | first | second | third | four | Five | six | Seven | eight | Nine | ten | Total |
|  | Maximum <br> High lo <br> Medium | oad <br> d <br> ad |  | $r$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| warm-up |  |  | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 600 m |
|  | Physical general | \% | 15\% | 15\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 5\% |  |
|  |  | time | 54 | 64 | 59 | 36 | 42 | 59 | 42 | 36 | 42 | 29 | 463 m |
|  | Physical Especially | \% | 40\% | 40\% | 35\% | 30\% | 30\% | 30\% | 25\% | 25\% | 20\% | 20\% |  |
|  |  | time | 144 | 170 | 206 | 108 | 128 | 177 | 107 | 90 | 85 | 118 | 1333 m |
|  | Skills | \% | 35\% | 35\% | 40\% | 45\% | 40\% | 35\% | 35\% | 30\% | 35\% | 35\% |  |
|  |  | time | 126 | 149 | 236 | 162 | 170 | 206 | 148 | 108 | 149 | 207 | 1661 m |
|  | Tactical | \% | 10\% | 10\% | 15\% | 15\% | 20\% | 25\% | 30\% | 35\% | 35\% | 40\% |  |
|  |  | time | 36 | 42 | 89 | 54 | 85 | 148 | 128 | 126 | 149 | 236 | 1093 m |
| Total main part |  |  | 360 | 425 | 590 | 360 | 425 | 590 | 425 | 360 | 425 | 590 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathbf{4 5 5 0 \mathrm { m }} \\ 75.84 \\ \text { Hour } \end{gathered}$ |
| cool-down |  |  | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 200 m |

Follow Attachment (8)
Table (6)
Formation of the training load and the relative and temporal distribution of the components of the training unit in the first week

| week |  |  | first |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Degree of load |  |  | Medium load |  |  |  |  |
| Training unit number |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 units |
| Days of training |  |  | Saturday | Monday | Wednesday | Friday |  |
| Degree of load | Maximum |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | d High |  |  | - | V | $\longrightarrow$ |  |
| warm-up |  |  | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 60 |
| The main part | Physical general | \% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% |  |
|  |  | time | 12 | 15 | 12 | 15 | 54 |
|  | Physical <br> Especially | \% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% |  |
|  |  | time | 32 | 40 | 32 | 40 | 144 |
|  | Skills | \% | 35\% | 35\% | 35\% | 35\% |  |
|  |  | time | 28 | 35 | 28 | 35 | 126 |
|  | Tactical | \% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% |  |
|  |  | time | 8 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 36 |
| Total |  |  | 80 | 100 | 80 | 100 | 360 |
| cool-down |  |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 |

Note: The time distribution does not include the warm-up and cooldown times.

## Follow Attachment (14)

## Examples of dills to develop the level of tactical thinking of basketball juniors $3 \times 3$

As soon as possible use the shoot from closest spot to do basket with the most available player.
What can he do with ball?

- Pass: is faster than the dribble.
- Dribble : dribbling in more guaranty option than the pass
- Shoot: 2pt- lay-up - under the basket pull up - 3pt.


## How do you make the decision making?

- Read the position
- If you look you can see (face up)
- If you see you can read (select the option)

What is the plan B ?

- If the player couldet succeed $\qquad$ (defense come help - he saw the more closer)
- Situation is change always in one second.
- The player has to get up jump stop or 1,2 stop.


## Drill no. 1




Player 1 passes the ball to the coach Then he makes a cut
Then he receives the ball from pass player no. 2 and then lay-up shoot
Player no. 2 who passes the ball he makes a v-cut, receives a pass from the coach, and then jump shoot

Drill no. 2


Player No. 1 if a dribbling laboratory had the ball in the direction of Player No. 2 Player No. 2 must read Player No. 1's behavior and move down toward the finish line to receive a pass from Player No. 1 and then shoot at the basket.

## Drill no. 3



Player 1 makes a penetration on the basket
Player 2 must change position and head to the end line in order to open the field Player 1 should train on me

1. Penetration on the basket and a lay-up shoot .

2 .Penetration on the basket and passing to player 2.
3 . Passing in high poet to Player 2.


[^0]:    *Dr. Lecturer at the Department of Theories and Applications of Team Sports and Racquet Sports - Faculty of Physical Education - Benha University

