Vol - V
 Issue-IV
 APRIL
 2018
 ISSN 2349-638x
 Impact Factor 4.574

A Critical Study of Socio-economic Status and Its Relation with Performance of Athletes

Rain Kumar Jamwal	Surendra Tiwari
PGTD of Physical Education,	Jyotiba College of Physical Education,
RTM Nagpur University, Nagpur	Digdoh, Hingana Road, Nagpur

1.0 Introduction

Physical education and sport also build health activity habits that encourage life-long participation in physical activity. This extends the impact of physical education beyond the schoolyard and highlights the potential impact of physical education on public health. Moreover, to achieve broader goals in education and development, sports programmes must focus on the development of the individual and not only on the development of technical sports skills. While the physical benefits of participation in sport are well known and supported by large volumes of empirical evidence, sport and physical activity can also have positive benefits on education.

Performance in a given sports is a complex combination of several factors. Certain factors are dominating and other supportive. Nevertheless, every factor has its own role to play. The complex nature of performance is not merely the product of physical, psychic, physiological prerequisites. It is the accrued result of training and competition, over a period supported by the society in general. The teacher or coach will have to organize and lay stress and guide this process (Natraj and Kumar, 2006).

Performance in a given sports competition or a training session like any other type of human performance is a highly complex process and is a product of several internal and external factors encompassing all the aspects of human personalities. Sports performance is the unity of execution and result of a sports action or a complex sequence of actions measured or evaluated according to socially determined and agreed norms (Singh, 1991).

The socio-economic status (SES) has aspects of the intrapersonal (e.g. education level, employment status and income of the individual), interpersonal (e.g. education level, employment status and income of parents or caregivers) and environmental (e.g. profiles of education level, employment status and income for neighbourhoods as a whole). Another important SES-related environmental factor is access to facilities, which in turn has various aspects including levels of provision (presence), geographical accessibility (proximity) and affordability. All these aspects have direct impact on the performance of players. SES is associated with physical activity participation, with those adolescents from higher SES households and/or neighbourhoods more likely to participate in physical activity (Pan et al., 2009). There is evidence that players whose parents have attained higher education levels are more likely to participate in organised sport, structured exercise and games play in their leisure time than those with parents with lower education levels (Ommundsen, 2006). With regard to employment, some recent research has indicated that players with one or two unemployed parents were less likely to participate in sports that those with two employed parents (Toftegaard-Støckel et al., 2011).

Performance of a player depends upon demographic and psychological parameters where the knowledge and application is important. Hence, the principles based on the knowledge of these disciplines are of great importance from the very early phase of initial selection of players for advanced training and they can prove to be the limiting factors in performance. Each player has his own demographic and psychological conditions and characteristics. So according to the psychological requirements for a player the proper type of psychological education programme and satisfaction with the demographic condition that can give appropriate work load and effort best suited so that the player can perform his best in the tournament or competition. In view of the above information this study has been carried out to know the role of socioeconomic status of athletes vis-à-vis their sports performance.

2.0 Research Methodology

2.1 Design of Study

The design of the study was random group design, where the athletes belonging to age group 12 to 16 years from ICSE board schools in Mumbai were selected randomly. Total 15 ICSE Board schools were identified and 20 athletes from each school were selected; hence, total 300 athletes who participated in different level athletics tournament were selected in the study.

2.2 Data Collection

Data collection was done by using survey methodology.

2.3 Instrument of Data Collection

For data collection purpose following standardized tests was used-

2.3.1 Socioeconomic Status

The information regarding socioeconomic status of athletes was collected by using Socio-Economic Status Scale prepared by Ashok K. Kalia and Sudhir Sah.

2.3.2 Sports Performance:

The information regarding sports performance of sportsperson was collected by using a short questionnaire, which was developed by the researcher. Prior to its use, the reliability and validity of the same was tested.

2.4 Tester's Reliability

To ensure that the investigator will be well versed with techniques of conducting the tests, the investigator along with an assistant had a number of practice sessions in testing procedure under the guidance of supervisor. The tester's reliability was evaluated together with reliability of tests. A Pearson's product moment correlation was computed between the two measures of each variable.

2.5 Secondary data collection

Secondary data collection was carried out from the general publications, scientific journals, publications of various sports associations, internet sources, research institutes and books from National and International authors.

2.6 Statistical Procedure employed and Significance Level

The descriptive statistics such as Frequency, Mode, etc. were determined. Chi-Square test was used to analyze the data. The data will be analysed using SPSS 18.0 Software. The significance level will be chosen to be 0.05 (or equivalently, 5%).

3.0 Analysis of Data and Results of the Study

3.1 Socio-cultural component of Socio-economic Status 638

Table 1: Socio-cultural component of the players			
Socio-cultural component	No. of Players	Percentage	
High socio economic status	48	16.0	
Middle socio economic status	194	64.7	
Low socio economic status	58	19.3	
Total	300	100.0	

Chi-square 133.04; df: 2, P=<0.05; Table Value: 5.99

Above **Table 1** presents results pertaining to the socio-cultural component of the socio-economic status of the athletes participating in different level tournaments. Result shows that 16.0% athletes belong to high socio-economic status, whereas 64.7% athletes belong to middle socio-economic status and further, 19.3% athletes belong to low socio-economic status.

Aayushi International Interdisciplinary Research Journal (AIIRJ) UGC Approved Sr.No.64259					
					/ol - V

3.2 Economic component of Socio-economic Status

Economic component	No. of Players	Percentage
High socio economic status	64	21.3
Middle socio economic status	180	60.0
Low socio economic status	56	18.7
Total	300	100.0

Chi-square 96.32; df: 2, P=<0.05; Table Value: 5.99

Above **Table 2** presents results pertaining to the Economic component of the socio-economic status of the athletes participating in different level tournaments. Result shows that 21.3% athletes belong to high socio-economic status, whereas 60.0% athletes belong to middle socio-economic status and further, 18.7% athletes belong to low socio-economic status.

3.3 Possession of goods and services of Socio-economic Status

Possession of goods and services	No. of Players	Percentage
High socio economic status	174	58.0
Middle socio economic status	86	28.7
Low socio economic status	40	13.3
Total	300	100.0

Table 3: Possession	of goods and services	of the players
---------------------	-----------------------	----------------

Chi-square 92.72; df: 2, P=<0.05; Table Value: 5.99 Above Table 3 presents results pertaining to the Possession of goods and services of the socioeconomic status of the athletes participating in different level tournaments. Result shows that 58.0% athletes belong to high socio-economic status, whereas 28.7% athletes belong to middle socio-economic status and further, 13.3% athletes belong to low socio-economic status.

3.4 Health Component of Socio-economic Status

Table 4: Health Component of the players		
Health Component	No. of Players	Percentage
High socio economic status	198	66.0
Middle socio economic status	66	22.0
Low socio economic status	36	12.0
Total	300	100.0

Table 4: Health Component of the players

Chi-square 148.56; df: 2, P=<0.05; Table Value: 5.99

Above **Table 4** presents results pertaining to the Health Component of the socio-economic status of the athletes participating in different level tournaments. Result shows that 66.0% athletes belong to high socio-economic status, whereas 22.0% athletes belong to middle socio-economic status and further, 12.0% athletes belong to low socio-economic status.

3.5 Educational Component of Socio-economic Status

Table 5: Educational Component of the players		
Educational Component	No. of Players	Percentage
High socio economic status	29	9.7
Middle socio economic status	144	48.0
Low socio economic status	127	42.3
Total	300	100.0

Chi-square 77.06; df: 2, P=<0.05; Table Value: 5.99

Aayushi International Interdisciplinary Research Journal (AIIRJ) UGC Approved Sr.No.64259					
Vol - V	Issue-IV	APRIL	2018	ISSN 2349-638x	Impact Factor 4.574

Above **Table 5** presents results pertaining to the Educational Component of the socio-economic status of the athletes participating in different level tournaments. Result shows that 9.7% athletes belong to high socio-economic status, whereas 48.0% athletes belong to middle socio-economic status and further, 42.3% athletes belong to low socio-economic status.

3.6 Overall Socio-economic Status

Overall socio-economic status	No. of Players	Percentage
High	42	14.0
Middle	168	56.0
Low	90	30.0
Total	300	100.0

Table 6: Overall Socio-economic Status of the players

Chi-square 80.88; df: 2, P=<0.05; Table Value: 5.99

Above **Table 6** presents results pertaining to the overall socio-economic status of the athletes participating in different level tournaments. Result shows that 14.0% athletes belong to high socio-economic status, whereas 56.0% athletes belong to middle and further, 30.0% athletes belong to low socio-economic status.

3.7 Relationship between Socio-economic status and Sports Performance of Athletes

Table 7: Relationship between Socio-economic status and Sports Performance of Athletes

	Sports performance Correlation coefficient (r ²)
Socio-cultural component	0.608**
Economic component	0.843**
Possession of goods and services	0.429*
Health Component	0.845**
Educational Component	0.394
Overall socio-economic status	0.681**
	*

* **Significant at p 0.05 level**

** : Significant at p 0.01 level

Above **Table 7** presents results regarding the relationships between Socio-economic status and Sports Performance of Athletes.

- Socio-cultural component: The data showed that there is significant positive relationship between Socio-Cultural component and Sports Performance ($r^2 = 0.608$, p < 0.01) of the athletes.
- *Economic Component*: The data showed that there is positive relationship between Economic component and Sports Performance ($r^2 = 0.843$, p < 0.01) of the athletes.
- Possession of goods and services: The study results showed that there is significant positive relationship between Possession of goods and services and Sports Performance ($r^2 = 0.429$, p<0.05) of the athletes.
- *Health Component*: The study results showed that there is significant positive relationship between Health component and Sports Performance ($r^2 = 0.845$, p < 0.01) of the athletes.
- *Educational Component*: The study results showed that there is significant positive relationship between Educational component and Sports Performance ($r^2 = 0.394$, p = Not significant) of the athletes.
- *Overall socio-economic status*: The study results showed that there is significant positive relationship between Overall socio-economic status and Sports Performance ($r^2 = 0.681$, p < 0.01) of the athletes.

Vol - V Issue-IV APRIL 2018 ISSN 2349-638x Impact Factor 4.574

4.0 Conclusions

4.1 Socio-cultural component of Socio-economic Status

• On the basis of study results it is concluded that most of the athletes participating in different level tournaments belong to middle socio economic status with respect to Socio-Cultural Component.

4.2 Economic component of Socio-economic Status

• In view of the study results it is concluded that most of the athletes participating in different level tournaments belong to middle socio economic status with respect to Economic Component.

4.3 Possession of goods and services of Socio-economic Status

• From the study results it is concluded that most of the athletes participating in different level tournaments belong to high socio economic status with respect to Possession of goods and services.

4.4 Health Component of Socio-economic Status

• On the basis of study results it is concluded that most of the athletes participating in different level tournaments belong to high socio economic status with respect to health Component.

4.5 Educational Component of Socio-economic Status

• On the basis of study results it is concluded that most of the athletes participating in different level tournaments belong to middle socio economic status with respect to educational Component.

4.6 Overall Socio-economic Status

• On the basis of study results it is concluded that most of the athletes participating in different level tournaments belong to middle socio economic status.

4.7 Relationship between Socio-economic status and Sports Performance of Athletes

• From the study results it is concluded that there is positive relationship between the socio-economic status and sports performance of the athletes participating in different level tournaments.

5.0 Bibliography

- 1) Bauer, K., Nelson, M., Boutelle, K and Neumark-Sztainer, D. (2008). Parental influences on adolescents' physical activity and sedentary behavior: longitudinal findings from Project EAT-II, Int J Behav Nutr PhysAct, 5(12).
- 2) Beets, M., Vogel, R.J., Forlaw, L., Pitetti, K and Cardinal, B. (2006). Social support and youth physical activity: the role of provider and type, Am J Health Behav, 30(3), pp. 278-289.
- 3) Casey, M., Eime, R., Payne, W and Harvey, J. (2009). Using a socio-ecological approach to examine participation in sport and physical activity among rural adolescent girls, Qual Health Res, 19(7), pp. 881-893.
- 4) Deforche, B., Van Dyke, D., Verloigne, M and De Bourdeaudhuij, I. (2010). Perceived social and physical environmental correlated of physical activity in older adolescents and the moderating effect of self-efficacy, Prev Med, 50, pp. 24-29.
- 5) Drenowatz, C., Joey, C., Eisenmann, Pfeiffer, K.A., Welk, G., Heelan, D., Gentile, K and Walsh, D. (2010). Influence of socio-economic status on habitual physical activity and sedentary behavior in 8- to 11-year old children, BMC Public Health, 10(214).
- 6) Eitzen, D.S & Sage G.H. (1978). Sociology of American Sports, Dubuque IA:W.C. Brown, pp: 211-212.
- Lok-chun, L and Janet. (2012). The effects of socio-economic status on physical activity participation in Hong Kong adolescents: asocial ecological approach, Thesis submitted to The University of Hong Kong (Pokfulam, Hong Kong)
- 8) Natraj, H. V. and Kumar, C. (2006). "Selected Motor ability variable and Kabaddi performance", Journal of sports and sports sciences, 29(1), p.11.
- 9) Ommundsen, Y., Klasson-Heggebo, L and Anderssen, S. (2006). Psycho-social and environmental correlates of location-specific physical activity among 9- and 15- year-old Norwegian boys and girls: the European Youth Heart Study, Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act 2006, 3(32), p.13.

Aayushi International Interdisciplinary Research Journal (AIIRJ)UGC Approved Sr.No.64259Vol - VIssue-IVAPRIL2018ISSN 2349-638xImpact Factor 4.574

- 10) Pan, S., Cameron, C., DesMeules, M., Morrison, H., Craig, C and Jiang, X. (2009). Individual, social, environmental, and physical environmental correlates with physical activity among Canadians: a cross-sectional study, BMC Publ Health, 9(1), p. 21.
- 11) Sallis, J., Prochaska, J and Taylor, W. (2000). A review of correlates of physical activity of children and adolescents, Med Sci Sports Exerc, 32(5), pp. 963-975.
- 12) Singh, H. (1991). "Science of Sports Training". First edition, DVS Publication, New Delhi, p 86.
- Snyder, E. and Spreitzer, E. (1973). Family infuence and involvement in sports. Research Quarterly 44, pp. 249-255
- 14) Toftegaard-Støckel, J., Nielsen, G.A., Ibsen, B and Andersen, L.B. (2011). Parental, socio and cultural factors associated with adolescents' sports participation in four Danish municipalities, Scand J Med Sci Sports, 21(4), pp. 606-611.

