



ISSN: 2456-0057

IJPNPE 2016; 1(2): 14-17

© 2016 IJPESH

Impact Factor: RJIF 4.68

[www.journalofsports.com](http://www.journalofsports.com)

Received: 03-05-2016

Accepted: 04-06-2016

**Gayathramma GP**

Research scholar Phy. Edu.

Director, G F G C W, K R Pet

Mandy district, India.

**Dr. KP Martin**

Directorate of sports K.S.W.U

Jnanashakthi campus, Thoravi

Vijayapura, India.

## Socio- Economic status and level of participation of volleyball players in the selected Universities of Southern Universities of Karnataka State

**Gayathramma GP, Dr. KP Martin**

### Abstract

The purpose of the study was to assess the socio economic status of university Volleyball players of various universities of Karnataka state. The objectives of the study was to find out whether there is any significant association exists in the socio economic status of university Volleyball players participating at various levels of Volleyball tournaments. For the purpose of the study the researcher selected 60 Volleyball players from the different universities of Karnataka as subjects. The researcher administered the socio economic status developed by Bharadwaj (2001) used as tool for gathering the data. The data were analysed through chi-square and Cramer's V tests. Results revealed that majority of them were belonged to middle socio economic status group with 71.7%, 15.0% of them were in lower SES class and remaining 13.3% of them were in high SES class. Tumkur University belonged to low SES compared to players from other universities. On the whole, at all India level, only Mysore university players participated than other universities. At the national level more participation has come from Mangalore university compare to rest of the universities.

**Keywords:** Socio- Economic, Volley Ball Players, Economic Status.

### 1. Introduction

Sports and physical education play an important role in human resource development. Games and other outdoor activities, properly planned and executed, promote social harmony, discipline and increased productivity. These activities develop in student's right attitudes and values and help them grow into balanced, integrated and healthy citizens. Participation in physical activities and sports is a fundamental right of every citizen. Physical education and sports are essential elements of educational processes which promote among the participants health, physical fitness and quality of life (UGC report, 1987)<sup>[2]</sup>

Sports is now become part and parcel of our life as it is observed by many of the Philosophers, Historians and Sociologists. A rigorous scientific analysis is still to be required to explain how and why half of the human race is distinct and downgraded in the socio-economic and cultural arena of society in comparison to other. A socio-economic status is an important factor in sports success and sports a best fit ingredient in a democratic society. A player's progress may enhance his social prestige and acceptance by his peers. The home environment and the influences motivate him to succeed in sports and degree to which success in the endeavour leads to inner satisfaction. The general cultural setting determines an individual's selection of physical activity or sports. An individual's choice of an activity level of participation and achievement level is not only due to his physical ability or skills but also various social factors entertaining his high or low level of performance. Personal qualities like attitude, aptitude, intelligence, adjustment and personality of player do help and speed up the success rate of a player. Pertaining to the personal qualities of player are the being replica of the socio economic status.

Socio-economic status is an individual's or group's position within a hierarchical social structure. Socioeconomic status depends on a combination of variables, including occupation, education, income, wealth and place of residence. Sociologists often use socioeconomic status as means of predicting behaviour (Hirsch, Kett, and Trefil, 2002)<sup>[1]</sup>

Index of socio-economic status comprises of occupational status, area of residence, monthly income, type of housing, condition of house, house ownership or rental status, level of living

**Correspondence**

**Gayathramma GP**

Research scholar Phy. Edu.

Director, G F G C W, K R Pet

Mandy district, India.

and formal social participation (Nair, 1978) [3]

Socio-economic status of an individual may influence his opportunity, his desire to excel, his choice of activity and his success. The home environment often influences his motivation to succeed in sports and the degree to which success in this endeavour leads to inner satisfaction. Many psychological factors like socio-economic status, attitudes, motives, spectators, self-concept, motivation, adjustment etc., which influence the participation and performance of sportsmen in games and sports.

The effects of socio-economic disadvantage on children's development have been explained through parents' decisions about how to allocate a range of resources, for example money, time and energy (investment model) (Foster *et al.*, 2005) [4]. The amount of money parents spend on children (e.g. purchasing books, toys) and the time they spend with them in joint activities (e.g. reading books) are considered investments

that have the potential to enhance children's cognitive skills and language (Gershoff *et al.*, 2007) and emergent literacy (e.g. Dickinson & Tabors, 2001). The investment model often explains the link between family income and children's cognitive and linguistic development, whereas the link between socio-economic disadvantage and children's behavioural functioning is explained through the impact of poverty on parental skills and capabilities (family stress model, see Foster *et al.*, 2005) [7] and has been found to be modest (Linver *et al.*, 2002) [8].

## Methodology

### Sample

A total of 60 volleyball players from various universities of Karnataka are selected, the details of which are as follows. There are 84 items to answer to arrive at socio-economic status of the individual.

**Table 1:** Distribution of the sample selected by university

Game		University					Total
		Mysore	Mangalore	Bangalore	Tumkur	Kuvempu	
Volleyball	F	12	12	12	12	12	60
	%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	100%

### Tool employed

To assess socio economic status of the sports person, socio-economic status scale developed by Bharadwaj (2001) was employed for the present study. This scale contains 84 items on various areas regarding socio economic status-family, social, education, profession, caste, total assets, and monthly income. The subjects or testees were asked to give responses for father, mother, and himself/herself separately in the scale. The reliability of the test of the scale has been calculated by test and re test method. The obtained reliability coefficients varied from .69 to .94 for various areas indicating high reliability of the tool. The content validity of the revised scale, since area and then item are solely based on research proven items is high and promising.

### SES and Universities

**Table 2:** Distribution of sports participants by SES and universities and results of Cramer's V for Volleyball game

University		Socio-economic status			Total	CV	P
		<41	42-50	50+			
Mysore	F	2	10	0	12		
	%	16.7%	83.3%	.0%	100.0%		
Mangalore	F	2	9	1	12		
	%	16.7%	75.0%	8.3%	100.0%		
Bangalore	F	0	5	7	12		
	%	.0%	41.7%	58.3%	100.0%		
Tumkur	F	3	9	0	12		
	%	25.0%	75.0%	.0%	100.0%		
Kuvempu	F	2	10	0	12		
	%	16.7%	83.3%	.0%	100.0%		
Total	F	9	43	8	60		
	%	15.0%	71.7%	13.3%	100.0%		

On the whole we find 71.7% of the volleyball players fall under medium SES category, 15.0% of them were in low SES category and remaining 13.3% of them were in high SES category.

Chi-square test revealed a significant difference between these groups of frequencies, having majority of them medium socio-economic status. Further, Cramer's V revealed a significant

association between universities and socioeconomic status in the case of volleyball game. Cramer's V value of .482 is found to be significant at .000 level. From the table it is evident that majority of Tumkur university players belonged to low SES category, and majority of volleyball players from Bangalore, Mysore and Kuvempu universities belong to medium SES class.

**Table 3:** Distribution Of Sports Participants At All India Inter University Level and Universities and Results of Cramer's V for Volleyball Game

University		Participation		Total	CV	P
		Yes	No			
Mysore	F	-	12	12	-	-
	%	-	100.0%	100.0%		
Mangalore	F	-	12	12	-	-
	%	-	100.0%	100.0%		
Bangalore	F	-	12	12	-	-
	%	-	100.0%	100.0%		
Tumkur	F	-	12	12	-	-
	%	-	100.0%	100.0%		
Kuvempu	F	-	12	12	-	-
	%	-	100.0%	100.0%		
Total	F	-	60	60	-	-
	%	-	100.0%	100.0%		

In Volleyball, though there were 60 sports women, we do not find anybody who represented all India Inter university level championships.

**Table 4:** Distribution of sports participants at State Level and universities and results of Cramer's V for Volleyball game

University		Participation		Total	CV	P
		Yes	No			
Mysore	F	8	4	12	.461	.012
	%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%		
Mangalore	F	12	0	12		
	%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%		
Bangalore	F	6	6	12		
	%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%		
Tumkur	F	4	8	12		
	%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%		
Kuvempu	F	6	6	12		
	%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%		
Total	F	36	24	60		
	%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%		

In the case of Volleyball game, we find that 60 were participating and of them a majority of 60% of them took part in state level competitions. Further, Cramer's V revealed a significant association between universities and participation status at state level ( $CV=.461$ ;  $p=.012$ ). From the table it is evident that participation of women in volleyball was more from Mangalore and Mysore universities compared to Bangalore, Tumkur and Kuvempu universities.

**Table 5:** Distribution of sports participants at National Level and universities and results of Cramer's V for Volleyball game

University		Participation		Total	CV	P
		Yes	No			
Mysore	F	6	6	12	.624	.000
	%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%		
Mangalore	F	10	2	12		
	%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%		
Bangalore	F	5	7	12		
	%	41.7%	58.3%	100.0%		
Tumkur	F	1	11	12		
	%	8.3%	91.7%	100.0%		
Kuvempu	F	0	12	12		
	%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Total	F	22	38	60		
	%	36.7%	63.3%	100.0%		

Of the 60 sports women playing Volleyball, 22 of them represented at the National level and 38 did not. Cramer's V

revealed a significant association between universities and participation status at National level ( $CV=.624$ ;  $p=.000$ ), where we find that majority of the participation has come from Mangalore university to the extent of 83.3% and no participation at National level from Kuvempu university

## Discussion

Major findings of the study

- Majority of the Volleyball players selected in the study were belonged to middle socio economic status group with 71.7%, 15.0% of them were in lower SES class and remaining 13.3% of them were in high SES class.
- University level comparison indicated that players from Tumkur University belonged to low SES compared to players from other universities.
- On the whole, at all India level, only Mysore university players participated than other universities.
- At the national level more participation has come from Mangalore university compare to rest of the universities.

Socioeconomic status (SES) of a person depends on the level of income and other social factors. However, economic status is a major factor related to the SES. Socioeconomic status refers to an individual's position within a social structure. It is one of the important determinant factors for the health status. Socioeconomic status is the combination of the social and economic variables. Scheerder *et al.* (2006) in their study indicated that sport participation during adolescence is a better predictor of adults' involvement in sports than educational level or parental socioeconomic status.

## Conclusion

1. In the high socio-economic status the Bangalore university comes first securing 58.3% followed by Mysore university securing 8.3% in compare with other three universities having nil report with 0.0%.
2. The SES of volleyball players in the middle category Mysore and Kuvempu University stands first position sharing 83.3% equilly. The second position taken by Mangalore and Tumkur University securing 75.0% equillyagin and last place is taken by Bangalore University securing 41.7%.
3. In the low SES of Volleyball players Bangalore University stands first position with a percentage of 33.3%, Tumkur University stands second position with a percentage of 20.0%, Mangalore university falls third position with a percentage of 16.7%, Mysore university stands forth position with a percentage of 8.3%, and kuvempu university stands fifth position with a percentage of 0%. Further it was concluded of none of the kuvempu university kabaddi player falls in low SES group.

## References

1. Hirsch ED, Kett, Joseph F, Trefil, James. The New dictionary of Cultural Literacy Edn 3, Houghton: Mifflin Company, 2002, 7.
2. Author's Guide, University Grants Commission Report, New Delhi, 1987.
3. Nair KS. Ethnicity and urbanization. New Delhi: Ajanta Publication, 1978, 36.
4. Foster M, Lambert R, Abbot-Shim M, McCarty F, Franze S. A model of home learning environment and social risk factors in relation to children's emergent literacy and social outcomes, Early Childhood Research Quarterly 2005; 20:13-36.

5. Gershoff ET, Aber JL, Raver CC. Child poverty in the United States: an evidence- based conceptual framework for programs and policies, in: F. Jacobs, D. Werthlieb, & R. M. Lerner (Eds) *Handbook of applied developmental science: promoting positive child, adolescent and family development through research, policies and programs* (Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage) 2003; 2:81-136.
6. Dickinson DK, Tabors P. Beginning literacy with language (Baltimore, MD, Paul H. Brooks), 2001.
7. Foster M, Lambert R, Abbot-Shim M, McCarty F, Franze S. A model of home learning environment and social risk factors in relation to children's emergent literacy and social outcomes, *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 2005; 20:13-36.
8. Linver M, Brooks-Gunn J, Kohen D. Family processes as pathways from income to young children' development, *Developmental Psychology* 2002; 38(5):719-734.