



ISSN: 2456-0057
IJPNE 2016; 1(1): 115-118
© 2016 IJPESH
www.journalofsports.com
Received: 24-02-2016
Accepted: 25-03-2016

Asma Hassan
Research Scholar, Bhagwant
University, Rajasthan, India

Socio-economic status and sports participation of physical education students of Kashmir valley (J&K)

Asma Hassan

Abstract

Sports Participation among the physical education students with respect to their socio-economic status is the main aspire objective of the investigation. A sample of 150 physical education students. The sample was collected from different degree colleges of Kashmir valley (J&K) with the random sampling technique. A self constructed questionnaire was developed for the present study to access the socio-economic status and level of participation among the physical education students. The students were requested to fill up the questionnaire they were explained the purpose of study and its relevance and significance in sports. The study revealed that majority of the physical education students found that 72.0% had received monthly pocket money from their parents and 36.0% agree that they receive part time pocket money, 34.0% has played at inter-college level, 82.0% agreed that possession of own means of transport effect the sports participation, 86% physical education played at inter-national level never played on these level of games.

Keywords: Socio-economic, sports participation, physical education, students, Kashmir

Introduction

Family Socio-economic status (SES) and social support of parents have a significant role on the amount of participation of children in physical activities. Parents as fundamental basis of families, in addition to the pattern of physical exercises, play a central role in organizing and financing the participation of children play sports. The amount of physical activity of children can be considered as a function of SES of parents and family (Bois & *et al*, 2005), consequently. In fact, families spending money and encourage their children to participate in sport and physical activity in order to develop their skills and becoming more social. Physical activity in youth is a complex, highly variable behavior determined by a number of factors (Sallis, Prochaska, & Taylor, 2000; Woodfield, Duncan, AlNakeeb, Nevill, & Jenkins, 2002) [19]. Past quantitative research has identified a number of physical activity correlates among youth (Bauman, Sallis, Dzewaltowski, & Owen, 2002; Higgins, Gaul, Gibbons, & Van Gyn, 2003; Sallis, Prochaska, *et al.*, 2000) [8]. Many studies have identified these correlates using an ecological model of physical activity behavior (Spence & Lee, 2003). This model hypothesizes that physical activity is influenced by three domains: (a) intrapersonal (biological, psychological, and behavioral influences), (b) social (family or peer support, modeling), and (c) environmental (facilities, communities, accessibility, etc.) (Sallis & Owen, 1999). Therefore, an ecological model suggests that to understand fully the factors that affect physical activity participation among youth, one must address the characteristics of physical activity at multiple levels and consider the integration and interaction of the factors within each of the three domains.

Besides, the wealth has been investigated on a familial ground because the individual's property circulates in a family and eventually passes on as inheritance to other family members. Undoubtedly, it is not an easy task to verify the exact amount of citizens' assets in any society which is essential to the investigation of the individual's social class and economic status. This status presupposes a set of rights and responsibilities that defines the individual's position which is relative to others and which is based on equality, hierarchy, social credibility and/or honor.

Correspondence
Asma Hassan
Research Scholar, Bhagwant
University, Rajasthan, India

The prevalence of adolescent obesity has increased dramatically over the past several decades across all socioeconomic (SES) strata, and data suggest that risk for adolescent obesity is inversely associated with SES. A better understanding of associations among SES, gender, and physical activity level over time is important for identifying which subgroups of youth are at particularly high risk of inadequate physical activity. Such information is critical for developing tailored obesity prevention and physical activity interventions that will best meet the needs of all youth.

An important factor within the intrapersonal domain of the ecological model is socioeconomic status (SES). Studies report that youth who are considered to be lower SES participate in less physical activity than their more advantaged counterparts (Crespo, Ainsworth, Keteyian, Heath, & Smit, 1999; Lowry, Kann, Collins, & Kolbe, 1996; Woodfield *et al.*, 2002) [12, 19]. Despite the association between SES and the level of physical activity undertaken by young people, there is little information on what factors influence the decision of high- and low-SES youth to be physically active. It is possible that lower SES youth experience greater barriers to becoming or being physically active. For example, less disposable income would influence physical activity participation, as those who are less well off financially could not afford to participate, resulting in lower average daily physical activity than those youth in high-SES groups. Therefore, it might be that youth from low-SES groups are just as interested in being physically active but their circumstances are such that they cannot participate.

Objectives

1. To identify the socio-economic status among physical education students
2. To assess the level of participation of physical education students among high and low socio economic status.

Sample

The sample for the present study consists of 150 physical education students. The sample was collected from different degree colleges of Kashmir valley (J&K) with the random sampling technique. The sample for the study has been drawn amongst the physical education students who were admitted to their respective courses for the academic year 2009 in different degree colleges of Kashmir valley.

Tool Used

A self-constructed questionnaire was developed for the present study to access the socio-economic status and level of participation among the physical education students. The students were requested to fill up the questionnaire they were explained the purpose of study and its relevance and significance in sports. They were also explained that the information received would be kept confidential. During filling up the questionnaire, the questions were explained one by one, and in some questions further help was given if asked.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Showing the economic background of the respondents

Response	Monthly pocket money	Part time income
Yes (%)	72.0	36.0
No (%)	28.0	64.0
<i>If Yes, how much (in Rs.)</i>		
>500 (%)	32.0	20.0
401-500 (%)	10.66	5.33
301-400 (%)	6.66	2.66
201-300 (%)	80.0	2.68
101-200 (%)	10.68	5.33
<100 (%)	4.0	0.0

The perusal of the above table shows the economic background of the respondents. The results of the table depicts that 72.0% had received monthly pocket money from their parents and 36.0% agree that they receive part time pocket money. On the other hand 28.0% not receiving any pocket on monthly from their parents and 64% has received their pocket money in part time from their parents. In case of yes, 32.0% received rupees 500 above monthly pocket money from their parents, 20.0% agree that they receive part time pocket money of above 500 rupees, 10.66% received 401-500 rupees monthly pocket money from their parents, 5.33% agree that they receive part time pocket money rupees 401-500, 6.66% received 301-400 rupees monthly pocket money from their parents, 2.66% agree that they receive part time pocket money rupees 301-400, 80.0% received 201-300 rupees monthly pocket money from their parents, 2.68% agree that they receive part time pocket money rupees 201-300, 10.68% received 101-200 rupees monthly pocket money from their parents, 5.33% agree that they receive part time pocket money rupees 101-200, 4.0% received less or equal to 100 rupees monthly pocket money from their parents, 0.0% agree that they receive part time pocket money less or equal to 100

rupees.

Table 2: Showing the materialistic possession (Personal)

	Personal Vehicle	Personal Mobile Phone(s)
Yes (%)	72.0	36.0
No (%)	28.0	64.0
Car (%)	32.0	20.0
Two wheeler (%)	10.66	5.33
Cycle (%)	6.66	2.66
All (%)	80.0	2.68

The above table shows the materialistic possession (personal) of the physical education students. The table indicates that 72.0% have agreed that they have own personal vehicle and 36.0% physical education students have personal mobile phones. While, on the other hand, 28.0% does not have personal vehicle and 64.0% also not their personal mobile phones. The table further indicates that 32.0% has own car and 20.0 has own personal mobiles, 10.66% has own two wheeler and 5.33% has personal mobile phone, 6.66% has personal cycle and among them 2.66% has personal mobile phones and the majority of the physical education students i.e. 80% has all types of personal vehicles and among them only

2.68% has personal mobile phones.

Table 3: Showing the number of games played at different level

No. of Games Played	Inter-College (%)	Inter-University (%)	Inter-National (%)
Only one	34.0	26.0	14.0
Only two	26.0	6.0	0.0
Only three	16.0	0.0	0.0
Only four	10.0	0.0	0.0
None	14.0	68.0	86.0

The above table shows the no. of games played at different levels. The result of the table indicates that 34.0% has played at inter-college level, 26.0% played inter-university level and 14.0% played at inter-national level only at one time. 26% has played at inter-college level, 6% played at inter-university level and none physical education played at inter-national level only at two times. 16% has played at inter-college level, none played at inter-university level and none physical education played at inter-national level only at three time. 10% has played at inter-college level, none played at inter-university level and none physical education played at inter-national level only at four times. The results further indicates that 14% has played at inter-college level, 68% played at inter-university level and 86% physical education played at inter-national level never played on these level of games.

Table 4: Effect of present place of stay and possession of personal vehicle on sports performance

Items	Yes (%)	No (%)
Present place of residence has any effect on sport participation programmes of your institution	23.0	77.0
Possession of own means of transport effect the sports participation	82.0	18.0

The above table shows that the effect of present place of stay and possession of personal vehicle on sports performance. The table indicates that 23.0% agreed that present place of residence has any effect on sport participation programmes of your institution and 77.0% does not agree that present place of residence has any effect on sport participation programmes of your institution. On the other hand, the table further indicates that 82.0% agreed that possession of own means of transport effect the sports participation and only 18% physical education students does not agree that possession of own means of transport effect the sports participation.

Conclusion

The following conclusion have been put forth for the present study:

- It was found that 72.0% had received monthly pocket money from their parents and 36.0% agree that they receive part time pocket money.
- It was found that 28.0% not receiving any pocket on monthly from their parents and 64% has received their pocket money in part time from their parents.
- It was found that in case of yes opinion 32.0% received rupees 500 above monthly pocket money from their parents, 20.0% agree that they receive part time pocket money of above 500 rupees, 10.66% received 401-500 rupees monthly pocket money from their parents, 5.33% agree that they receive part time pocket money rupees 401-500, 6.66% received 301-400 rupees monthly pocket money from their parents, 2.66% agree that they receive

part time pocket money rupees 301-400, 80.0% received 201-300 rupees monthly pocket money from their parents, 2.68% agree that they receive part time pocket money rupees 201-300, 10.68% received 101-200 rupees monthly pocket money from their parents, 5.33% agree that they receive part time pocket money rupees 101-200, 4.0% received less or equal to 100 rupees monthly pocket money from their parents, 0.0% agree that they receive part time pocket money less or equal to 100 rupees.

- It was found that 34.0% has played at inter-college level, 26.0% played inter-university level and 14.0% played at inter-national level only at one time. 26% has played at inter-college level, 6% played at inter-university level and none physical education played at inter-national level only at two times. 16% has played at inter-college level, none played at inter-university level and none physical education played at inter-national level only at three time. 10% has played at inter-college level, none played at inter-university level and none physical education played at inter-national level only at four times.
- It was found that 14% has played at inter-college level, 68% played at inter-university level and 86% physical education played at inter-national level never played on these level of games.
- It was found that 23.0% agreed that present place of residence has any effect on sport participation programmes of your institution and 77.0% does not agree that present place of residence has any effect on sport participation programmes of your institution.
- It was found that 82.0% agreed that possession of own means of transport effect the sports participation and only 18% physical education students does not agree that possession of own means of transport effect the sports participation.

References

1. Anderssen N, Wold B. Parental and peer influences on leisure time physical activity in young adolescents. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 1992; 63(4):341-348.
2. Brodersen N, Williamson A, Wardle S. Socio-demographic, developmental, environmental, and psychological correlates of physical activity and sedentary behavior at age 11 to 12. *Journal of Ann Behav Med*. 2005; 29:2-11.
3. Department of Health and Physical Activity. *Health Improvement and Prevention: At Least Five a Week: Evidence on the Impact of Physical Activity and its Relationship to Health*. In A Report from the Chief Medical Officer London: Department of Health, 2004.
4. Dollman J, Lewis N. Interactions of socioeconomic position with psychosocial and environmental correlates of children's physical activity: an observational study of South Australian families. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2009.
5. Dollman J, Ridley K, Magarey A, Martin M, Hemphill M. Dietary intake, physical activity and TV viewing as mediators of the association of socioeconomic status with body composition: A cross-sectional analysis of Australian youth. *International Journal of Obesity*. 2007; 31(1):45-52.
6. Florentino R, Villavieja G, Lana R. Dietary and physical activity patterns of 8-10-year-old urban school children in Manila, Phillipines. *Food Nutr Bull*. 2003; 23:267-7.
7. Guba E, Lincoln YS. *Effective evaluation: Improving the*

- usefulness of evaluation results through responsiveness and naturalistic approaches. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
8. Higgins JW, Gaul C, Gibbons S, Van Gyn G. Factors influencing physical activity levels among Canadian youth. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*. 2003; 94(1):45-51.
 9. Kremarik F. A family affair: Children's participation in sports. *Canadian Social Trends* (No. 11-008:20-24). Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 2000.
 10. Kristjansdottir G, Vilhjalmsson R. Socio demographic differences in patterns of sedentary and physically active behavior in older children and adolescents. *Acta Paediatrica*, 2001; 90(4):429-435.
 11. Lincoln YS, Guba EG. *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1985.
 12. Lowry R, Kann L, Collins JL, Kolbe LJ. The effect of socioeconomic status on chronic disease risk behaviors among US adolescents. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1996; 276(10):792-797.
 13. MacKelvie KJ, Khan KM, McKay HA. Is there a critical period for bone response to weight bearing exercise in children and adolescents? *Asystematic review*. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*. 2002; 36:250-257.
 14. Raudsepp L. The relationship between socio-economic status, parental support and adolescents physical activity. *Institute of sport pedagogy and coaching science*. University of Tartu, Estonia, 2006.
 15. Sallis J, Zakarian J, Hovell M, Hofstetter C. Ethnic, socioeconomic, and sex differences in physical activity among adolescents. *Journal of Clin Epidemiol*. 1996; 49(2):125-134.
 16. Van der Horst K, Paw M, Twisk J, Van M. A brief review on correlates of physical activity and sedentariness in youth. *Journal of Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2007; 39:1241-1250.
 17. Veerecken C, Todd C, Roberts C, Mulvihill C, Maes C. TV viewing behaviour and associations with food habits in different countries. *Journal of Public Health Nutrition*. 2006; 9(2):244-250.
 18. Vilhjalmsson R, Thorlindsson T. Factors related to physical activity: a study of adolescents. *Journal of Soc Sci Med*;47:/665_/75. Wright M, Wilson D, Griffin S, Evans A.2010. A qualitative study of parental modeling and social support for physical activity in underserved adolescents. *Journal of health education research*. 1998; 25:224-232.
 19. Woodfield L, Duncan M, Al-Nakeeb Y, Nevill A, Jenkins C. Sex, ethnic, and socioeconomic differences in children's physical activity. *Pediatric Exercise Science*. 2002; 14:277-285.
 20. Zakarian JM, Hovell MF, Hofstetter CR, Sallis JF, Keating KJ. Correlates of vigorous exercise in a predominantly low SES and minority high school population. *Preventive Medicine*. 1994; 23:314-321.