INTRODUCTION
The history of tennis dates back several thousand years. The game was first created by European monks to be played for entertainment purposes during religious ceremonies. Tennis is a sport played between two players (singles) or between two teams of two players each (doubles). The modern game of tennis originated in the united kingdom in the late 19th century as “lawn tennis.” Tennis is an Olympic sport and is played at all levels of society at all ages. The sport can be played by anyone who can hold a racket, including people in wheelchairs.

Tennis is played by millions of recreational players and is also a popular worldwide spectator sport. The four Grand Slam tournaments (also referred to as the “Majors”) are especially popular: the Australian Open played on hard courts, the French Open also played on hard courts, the US Open played on red clay courts, Wimbledon played on grass courts, and the Open played also on hard courts. The purpose of the study is to investigate “the effect of specific training programme on selected physiological variables of men tennis players” (Thomas Reilly, 1990)

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
The study was aimed at to find out the effect of specific training programme on selected skill performance variables of men tennis players.

METHODOLOGY
The study was aimed at to find out the effect of specific training programme on selected skill performance variables of men tennis players. To achieve the purpose of the study, thirty college level tennis players (n = 30) from SRKV Maruthi College of Physical Education and faculty of GAPEY, Ramakrishna Mission Vivekananda Educational and Research Institute, Coimbatore were selected as subjects. Their age are ranged from 18 to 25 years. All the subjects were divided in to two groups with 15 subjects each as experimental and control group. Group-I underwent specific training for a period of twelve weeks of five days per week and group-II acted as control who did not participate in any special training other than the regular routine. The skill performance variables such as forehand and backhand drive were selected as dependent variables. Forehand and backhand drive was tested by using hewitt’s forehand and backhand test in points. Pre and post test random group design was used for this study. The dependent ‘t’ test was applied to determine the difference between the means of two group. To find out whether there was any significant difference between the experimental and control groups on adjusted post test means the analysis of covariance was used. To test the level of significant of difference between the means 0.05 level of confidence was fixed. The result of the study shows that, there was a significant improvement takes place on forehand and backhand drive of experimental group and control group. Group-I underwent specific training for a period of twelve weeks of five days per week and group-II acted as control who did not participate in any special training other than the regular routine. The skill performance variables such as forehand and backhand drive were selected as dependent variables. Forehand and backhand drive was tested by using hewitt’s forehand and backhand test in points. Pre and post test random group design was used for this study. The dependent ‘t’ test was applied to determine the difference between the means of two group. To find out whether there was any significant difference between the experimental and control groups on adjusted post test means the analysis of covariance was used. To test the level of significant of difference between the means 0.05 level of confidence was fixed.

ANALYSIS OF DATA
The collected data were statistically analyzed and presented in the following tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre test mean ± SD</th>
<th>Post test mean ± SD</th>
<th>M. D</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>'t'-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Forehand Drive</td>
<td>Experimental group</td>
<td>21.93 ±4.23</td>
<td>27.27 ±5.47</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>21.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>21.53 ±4.50</td>
<td>21.67 ±3.50</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Backhand Drive</td>
<td>Experimental group</td>
<td>21.13 ±5.30</td>
<td>25.93 ±5.39</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>14.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>21.00 ±4.74</td>
<td>21.20 ±4.62</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 0.05 level. Table Value = 2.14 with DF (14)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Experimental group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>Sources of variance</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>Obtained F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forehand drive</td>
<td>27.10</td>
<td>21.84</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>206.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>206.96</td>
<td>74.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>75.47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhand drive</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td>21.65</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>158.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>158.94</td>
<td>112.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>38.20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant 0.05 level (The table value required for significance at 0.05 level with df (1,27) and 4.21 respectively)
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DISCUSSION ON FINDING

The result of the study indicated that the experimental group had significantly improved on forehand drive and backhand drive. However control group showed insignicant. The results of the study also indicate that there is a significant mean difference exist between the adjusted post test means of experimental group and control group on forehand drive and backhand drive.

The result may in accordance with the following research findings.

There is significant difference found between the means of all selected skill performance variables (service, forehand drive, backhand drive, and volley). Fernandez-Fernandez, j. (2016) reported to that 8 weeks of specific drills training may help to improve such skill performance variables forehand drive and backhand drive. Aymeric Guillot., et al. (2015) also reported to that specific tennis high intensity training to improved ground stroke performance. Nicholas j. Smeeton., et al. (2013) also reported significant improvement on forehand drive, backhand drive, cross court, and up the line at the end of anticipation of tennis skill training. Strecker, E., et al. (2011) also reported to that specific target hitting to improve skill performance based on accuracy. It is inferred from the above literature and from the results of the present study, it is concluded that twelve weeks of specific training improve the forehand drive and backhand drive.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the interpretation of the data, the following conclusion may be drawn.

- There was a significant improvement takes place on selected skill performance variables such as forehand drive and backhand drive of college level men tennis players.
- There was a significant difference exists between experimental group and control group on selected skill performance variables such as forehand drive and backhand drive.
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