



ISSN: 2456-0057
IJPNPE 2019; 4(1): 1266-1269
© 2019 IJPNPE
www.journalofsports.com
Received: 27-11-2018
Accepted: 28-12-2018

Suraj Singh Pawar
Ph.D Scholar, ASPES, Amity
University, Noida, Uttar
Pradesh, India

Dr. Ajit Kumar
Assistant Professor, ASPES,
Amity University, Noida,
Uttar Pradesh, India

A comparative exploration between students and teachers viewpoint towards utilization of sports facilities parameters in schools of Delhi

Suraj Singh Pawar and Dr. Ajit Kumar

Abstract

Physical Education and Sports going through an evolutionary process in India, Various Sports schemes were initiated by Government of India since inception. This study efforts to assess the students and teachers perception towards Utilization of sports facilities parameters i.e. sports equipment, Sports Infrastructure, Sports Personnel's, Sports Events organization and participation in both Public and Private Schools of Delhi. Study focuses on comparison between student and teachers perception towards sports facilities provided in Public and private Schools of Delhi in terms of utilization of various Sports facilities parameters in relation to frequency of use, Quality and level of satisfaction of beneficiaries towards one or other available sports facilities rather than just analysing availability or non-availability of available resources. A total of 616 subjects from 56 Government and Private Schools of Delhi (28 Government schools 28 Private Schools 10 students and one physical education teacher from each school) were selected for the study. Data was collected with the help of a self-made questionnaire. The data was analysed using Mann-whitney U test for assessing the difference between the means of Students and Teachers of Public and Private schools of Delhi. Study reveals that there are no significant differences between Students and Teachers perception towards sports facilities in Public sector schools for all the selected variables but in Private sector schools of Delhi Perception students and teachers shows significant differences in relation to Frequency of Use (0.36) of selected Sports Facilities variable. For other selected variables, no significant differences between Students and Teachers perception towards sports facilities is found.

Keywords: Sports facilities, sports equipments, sports infrastructure, sports personnel, and sports events

Introduction

Sports in school education

Sport is a powerful tool that humanity can use to improve the well-being of society. However, various international agencies, governments, sport organizations, and entrepreneurs need to pull together to effectively use sport to positively impact people. The role of physical education and sport should particularly be emphasized in school curriculum (Simiyu, 2007) [8] Sports actively educates young people about the importance of certain key values, such as honesty, fair play, respect for self and others, adherence to the rules and respect for the self and others. It provides a forum for them to learn how to cope with competitions. Sports are a way to build understanding of the value of common bonds. Traditional sports and games are usually lower cost in terms of facilities and equipments. (UNICEF, 1999) [10]. As for social development, we must remember that the game is "a get-together, of liberation, of expression." Through it the child "grows, learns, knows and compares with the others having fun" [19]. From A historical point of view then, the Importance of activities that have been handed down for so long and who have survived so many social changes, are to be analysed in depth and to be valued (Marta D'atri, 2013) [13]. It is necessary to conduct sports activities in schools for school students for which we need proper sports facilities i.e. sports infrastructure, sports equipments, human resources and sports events, researches shows lack of facilities in schools (Mili, 2016) [4] (R.P.Sharma., 1956) [7] (Suresh Patil, Vithal D Metri, 2016) [9].

Need for research

It seems that Physical education and sports is promoted in India according to Government of

Correspondence
Suraj Singh Pawar
Ph.D Scholar, ASPES, Amity
University, Noida, Uttar
Pradesh, India

India but situation differs according to studies conducted in respective area. It has also been observed that opinion and perception of students and teachers differs. Students may have different perception in comparison to teachers for a particular sports facility. It draws the attention towards ground reality of numerous schemes initiated by government of India. Although almost all the researches were purely focused on finding presence or absence of one or other facility, infrastructure or personal but presence of absence of certain resource does not explains its functionality and utility. In some cases it is seen that facilities, infrastructure, and personnel were available but not properly utilized on the contrary few cases were seen where facilities, infrastructure, and personnel were not available but somehow arranged and used to promote physical education and sports. This draws attention of researcher towards the gap within policies, programs and their utilization for promotion of sports among the students so the purpose of the study was to conduct a comparative analysis of sports facilities among student and teachers of different government and private schools of Delhi in relation to Utilization of sports facilities.

Objectives of the Study

1. To compare the student and teacher’s perception towards selected Sports Facilities in government and private schools of Delhi in terms of frequency of use, quality, and level of satisfaction of students.

Methodology

Selection of Respondents

560 students and 56 physical education teachers of different government and private schools were selected for the study which is of different standards i.e. of X TO XII class. Ten students and one physical education teacher from each school become part of the present study.

Selection of Tools of Survey

Data collected in a phased manner through self-made questionnaire. The following parameters of sports facilities were finally selected for the better conduct of study:

1. Sports equipments.
2. Sports infrastructure.
3. Sports Personnel.
4. Organization/participation in sports events.

The scale consisted total of four parameters and each parameter have 16-30 items. Each parameter further has

second level of categorical variables for each item i.e.

- a) Frequency
- b) Quality
- c) Level of satisfaction

Each parameter has five levels of opinion regarding the Frequency of use, Quality and Level of Satisfaction. Respondents can fill number (1-5) which represents level opinions for frequency, Quality and Level of satisfaction. (Frequency: “Never Used” or “almost never used”, “Occasionally Used” or “Almost every time used” or “Frequently used”) (Quality: “Poor” or “Fair”, “Good” or “Very good” “Excellent”) (Level of Satisfaction: :“Not Satisfied” or “Slightly Satisfied”, “Moderately Satisfied” or “Very much Satisfied” “ Extremely Satisfied”) according to their opinion or actual status of sports facilities in their school.

Administration of Questionnaire

560 questionnaires were distributed to the Students and 56 to teachers as mentioned above. Data was collected in school premises after establishing contacts with the physical education teachers of various schools and data collection was done at the time of Zonal Sports Tournaments conducted by Delhi Government for School Students in each Zone.

Statistical technique employed in the study

Descriptive analysis was used to find the status of sports facilities in government and Private schools of Delhi. Further to compare the status of each parameter between government and private schools of Delhi Mann-Whitney Test was used and effect size was also used in the study to assess the Impact of each Sports Facility parameter.

Result and Analysis

Analysis of the data conducted in a phased manner so that each fact of the study may reveal. In first phase tables showing the comparative analysis between Government and Private schools Physical Education teachers in respect to the sub variables of Sports Facilities i.e. Sports Infrastructure, Sports Equipments, Sports Personnel and Organization and participation in Sports Events. First phase also provides a comparative analysis between Teachers and Students of Government School as well as of Private schools. Second phase shows the Comparative analysis between Government and Private Schools of Delhi in respect to each Sports Facility parameter.

Table 1: Results of the Mann Whitney u test on sports facilities of physical education teachers and students of government schools of Delhi with respect to frequency of use, quality, and level of satisfaction

	Grouping type	N	Sports Infrastructure			Sports Equipments			Sports Personnel			Sports Events		
			Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Freq	Students	280	156	3579	.444	153	3373	.222	154	3869	.908	154	3857	.887
	Teachers	28	142			174			156			157		
	Total	308												
Qual	Students	280	156	3629	.513	155	3888	.943	155	3838	.854	154	3910	.982
	Teachers	28	144			153			152			155		
	Total	308												
Satis	Students	280	155	3835	.848	154	3669	.573	155	3758	.715	155	3740	.685
	Teachers	28	151			163			149			148		
	Total	308												

Sig at 0.05 level of confidence

Table 1.3 shows the results of Mann Whitney U test, applied to compare the data obtained from Physical education

teachers and Students of Government schools of Delhi with respect to Frequency of use, Quality and Level of Satisfaction

of selected sports facilities variables i.e. Sports Infrastructure, Sports Equipments, Sports Personnel, and Sports Events. Table shows No Significant statistical difference for variables i.e. Sports Infrastructure Frequency $U= 3579, p=.444 \geq .05$, Quality $U=3629, p=.513 \geq .05$, Level of Satisfaction $U=3835, p=.848 \geq .05$ respectively. For variable Sports Equipments Frequency $U= 3373, p=.222 \geq .05$, Quality $U=3888, p=.943 \geq .05$, Level of Satisfaction $U=3669, p=.573 \geq .05$ respectively. For Variable Sports Personnel Frequency $U= 3869, p=.908 \geq .001$, Quality $U=3838, p=.854 \geq .05$, Level of Satisfaction $U=3758, p=.715 \geq .05$ respectively. Similarly for

the variable Sports Events organization and participation Frequency $U= 3857, p=.887 \geq .05$, Quality $U=3910, p=.982 \geq .05$, Level of Satisfaction $U=3740, p=.685 \geq .05$ respectively. If we analyse the descriptive data mean rank differences are present but as the rank difference is not significant enough to differentiate the scores, we may conclude that more or less frequency of use, quality, and level of satisfaction of selected sports facilities variables are same according to physical education teachers and students of Government schools of Delhi.

Table 2: Results of the Mann Whitney U test on sports facilities of government and private schools of Delhi with respect to frequency of use, quality, and level of satisfaction of physical education teachers.

	Grouping type	N	Sports Infrastructure			Sports Equipments			Sports Personnel			Sports Events		
			Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Freq	Teachers	28	169	3511	.362	151	3829	.838	164	3649	.546	188	2979	.036
	Students	280	153			155			154			151		
	Total	308												
Quality	Teachers	28	133	3321	.182	173	3412	.258	155	3909	.980	178	3259	.141
	Students	280	157			153			154			152		
	Total	308												
Satis	Teachers	28	139	3485	.333	154	3916	.992	163	3684	.599	166	3598	.473
	Students	280	156			155			154			153		
	Total	308												

Sig at 0.05 level of confidence

Table 1.4 demonstrates the results of Mann Whitney U test, applied to compare the data obtained from Physical education teachers and Students of Private schools of Delhi with respect to Frequency of use, Quality and Level of Satisfaction of selected sports facilities variables i.e. Sports Infrastructure, Sports Equipments, Sports Personnel, and Sports Events. Table shows No Significant statistical difference for variables i.e. Sports Infrastructure Frequency $U= 3579, p=.444 \geq .05$, Quality $U=3629, p=.513 \geq .05$, Level of Satisfaction $U=3835, p=.848 \geq .05$ respectively. For variable Sports Equipments Frequency $U= 3373, p=.222 \geq .05$, Quality $U=3888, p=.943 \geq .05$, Level of Satisfaction $U=3669, p=.573 \geq .05$ respectively. For Variable Sports Personnel Frequency $U= 3869, p=.908 \geq .001$, Quality $U=3838, p=.854 \geq .05$, Level of Satisfaction $U=3758, p=.715 \geq .05$ respectively. Similarly for the variable Sports Events organization and participation Quality $U=3910, p=.982 \geq .05$, Level of Satisfaction $U=3740, p=.685 \geq .05$ respectively. However, the data reveal significant differences for the variable frequency of sports events organization and participation Sports Events organization and participation Frequency $U= 3857, p=.887 \geq .05$. Significant difference between scores obtained from Physical education teachers and Students for the respective variables may be due to their perception towards sports events. Each physical education teacher has some limitations for organization sports events and sending students for participation in various sports events, whereas students wants to get involved more and more in sports events. Higher Mean rank of teachers (188) data shows that according to them frequency of sports events organisation and participation is optimum but on the other hand students (151) finds it on a lower side. After analysing other variables, it shows that mean rank differences are present but as the rank difference is not significant enough to differentiate the scores, we may conclude that more or less frequency of use, quality, and level of satisfaction of other sports facilities variables are same according to physical education teachers and students of Private schools of Delhi.

Discussions of Findings

Comparative analysis between Students and Teachers of Government and private school conducted respectively, which shows no significant differences in case of Students and Teachers of Government schools of Delhi. It shows no significant differences for all other variables except one i.e. Sports Events Organisation and Participation in case of Students and Teachers of Private schools of Delhi. Significant difference between scores obtained from Physical education teachers and Students for the respective variables may be due to their perception towards sports events. Each physical education teacher has some limitations for organization sports events and sending students for participation in various sports events, whereas students wants to get involved more and more in sports events. Higher Mean rank of teachers (188) data shows that according to them frequency of sports events organisation and participation is optimum but on the other hand students (151) finds it on a lower side. After analysing other variables, it shows that mean rank differences are present but as the rank difference is not significant enough to differentiate the scores, we may conclude that more or less frequency of use, quality, and level of satisfaction of other sports facilities variables are same according to physical education teachers and students of Private schools of Delhi. A report published in DNA India website also supports the present study Under the Right to Education (RTE) Act, 2009, it is mandatory to have a playground on school premises. And, in the absence of space, the schools have to make adequate arrangements in a nearby park/ playground. "No such effort has been taken by the school authority even as we don't have a sports ground," said a faculty member at Government Boys Senior Secondary School, Mangolpuri. The Delhi government recently constructed two new swimming pools - one in Mayur Vihar Phase-2 and another in west Vinod Nagar - and a world-class hockey stadium in Boys Senior Secondary School in Ghumanhera village. "What will they do in the absence of trained teachers? 50 per cent of the

sanctioned posts for Physical Education Teachers are lying vacant," said Ajay Veer Yadav, general secretary, Government School Teachers Association and a physical education teacher at a school in Karol Bagh. As per a recent data, of the 864 sanctioned posts of post-graduate teacher (PGT) Physical Education, 636 are lying vacant. In addition, among graduate teachers (TGTs), supposed to teach up to class VIII, of the 2205 sanctioned posts, 901 are lying vacant. This leads us to a conclusion that student's perception and teacher's viewpoint towards utilization of sports facilities is more or less similar.

References

1. Banergee A. sports infrastructure in India the present status and future roadmap, 2103. Retrieved Feb 8, 2019, from thesportsdigest.com: <http://thesportsdigest.com/2013/05/sports-infrastructure-in-india-the-present-status-and-future-roadmap/>
2. Center (NIC) NI. Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, 2017. Retrieved feb 14, 2019, from www.yas.nic.in: <https://yas.nic.in/documents/citizen-charter>
3. Marta D'atri AR. Traditional sports and games in an European scenario, 2013.
4. Mili A. Status of physical education and sports development in North Eastern region: A critical study. *International Education and Research Journal*. 2016; 2(12).
5. Misra SR. A Survey on the Physical Education Programme in Schools and Colleges of Orissa States. Unpublished Thesis, Madras University, 1980.
6. National Sports Development Code of India, 2011. Retrieved feb 10, 2019, from Yas.nic.in: <https://Yas.nic.in/sports/National-Sports-Development-Code-of-India-2011>
7. Sharma RP. Survey of high and higher secondary schools, Delhi state in connection with qualified personal programme facility and equipment and their gradation. Chandigarh, 1956. Unpublished DPES thesis Panjab University.
8. Simiyu NW. Agenda for Sport for Development in Developing Countries. In *The sports Digest*. 2007; 15:2002-2010. United States Sports Academy.
9. Suresh Patil, Vithal Metri D. A survey of physical education and sports facilities. *International Journal of Sports Sciences*, 2016, 265-268.
10. UNICEF. Convention on the right of the child implementation Manual, 1999.