



ISSN: 2456-0057  
IJPNE 2019; 4(1): 242-244  
© 2019 IJPNE  
www.journalofsports.com  
Received: 19-11-2018  
Accepted: 22-12-2018

**Dr. Manju Lata**  
Ass. Prof. Dept. Phy. Edu.  
TRKM College, Aligarh,  
Uttar Pradesh, India

## Player's attitude regarding playing facilities

**Dr. Manju Lata**

### Abstract

Present study was conducted to find out satisfaction level of players towards facilities available at college and university level of U.P state. A sample 300 state / university level players with an equal number were drawn from the university level of Uttar Pradesh i.e Dr. Chattrapati Shahuji Maharaj University Kanpur (C.S.M.U., Kanpur), Dr. Bhim Rao Ambedkar University agra (Dr. BRAU Agra) and Dr. Ram Manohar lohia Avadh university faizabad (Dr. RMLU Faizabad). All the player were administered a questionnaire developed by (Prasad 1993) for measuring the perceived satisfaction level of the university / state level players. Two items were to be respond on a three point scale i.e. highly satisfied/ satisfied and not satisfied. The first item related to playing facilities i.e. at college level and second item related to playing facilities at university level.

**Keywords:** Player's attitude, playing facilities

### Introduction

Physical education and sports is a practical oriented discipline. Effective implication of programs of Physical Education and sports depends upon the availability of facilities and infrastructure which is a very complex proposition because of the diversity in the nature of activities for which it is intended. The performance in sports is directly related to the quality of required facilities and infrastructure. Sharma (1956) <sup>[3]</sup> found that 83% of the schools in Delhi suffered badly for grant of playground facilities. Anand. (1965) <sup>[1]</sup> made some valuable recommendation in his study for minimum physical education facilities required at Village level, Taluka level, District level, State level and National level. Apart from planning of facilities their maintenance and utilization is equally important. Bhullar (1965) found sufficient area for playgrounds in high and higher secondary schools in Chandigarh with their poor maintenance. These playing areas presented horrible picture and even served as a cattle rancher in some of the schools.

The sports facilities should be created and maintained with an aim to satisfy the user. Well-developed and maintained play grounds are considered to be source of motivation and attraction for the young athletes.

### Method

To achieve the objectives of the study a survey approach was followed to examine the level of satisfaction of the players towards existing playing facilities in colleges and universities of Uttar Pradesh state.

A sample of 300 state/university level players with an equal number were drawn from three universities of U.P. State i.e., CSMU, Kanpur, Dr. BRAU Agra and Dr. RML University Faizabad. All the players were administered a questionnaire developed by Prasad (1993) for measuring the perceived satisfaction level of the university and state level players. Two items were to be responded on a three point scale i.e. highly satisfied/ satisfied and not satisfied The first item related to playing facilities i.e. at college level and second item related to playing facilities at university level

### Result and Discussion

The scores of 300 players were tabulated and analysed at percentages and Chi-square( $X^2$ ). The result are given in Table No.1, 2 and 3.

**Correspondence**  
**Dr. Manju Lata**  
Ass. Prof. Dept. Phy. Edu.  
TRKM College, Aligarh,  
Uttar Pradesh, India

**Table 1:** Percentage responses of C.S.M. U. Kanpur players regarding playing facilities.

Item	Responses			X <sup>2</sup>
	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Not Satisfied	
Playing facilities at college level	29.00	55.00	16.00	23.66**
Playing facilities at University level	36.00	52.00	12.00	24.32**

\*\* Significant at .01 level as  $p > 9.21$

From table no. 1 it is evident that out of 100 players of CSMU Kanpur 29% were highly satisfied with the existing facilities at the college level existing 55% were satisfied however 16% were not satisfied with playing facilities at college level. These observed frequencies were significantly different from those of expected one (on normal distribution). The Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) value was 23.66 found to significant at .01 level of confidence University level. When it comes to facilities at University level, 36% of the respondents were highly satisfied

52% were satisfied and 12% were not satisfied with the playing facilities available at the CSMU Kanpur. The observed frequencies differ significantly from those of expected one ( $\chi^2=24.32$ ,  $p < .01$ )

The result indicated that majority of the players of CSMU Kanpur expressed their satisfaction towards the playing facilities at college and university level. Yet another good number of players found highly satisfied. Only a handful of players were not satisfied with the existing facilities.

**Table 2:** Percentage responses of Dr. B.R.A. University Agra players regarding playing facilities

Item	Responses			X <sup>2</sup>
	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Not Satisfied	
Playing facilities at college level	20.00	60.00	20.00	32.00**
Playing facilities at University level	00.00	23.00	77.00	93.74**

\*\* Significant at .01 level as  $p > 9.21$

From table no. 2 it is evident that out of 100 players of Dr. B.R.A. University Agra 20% were highly satisfied with existing playing facilities at the college level, 60% were satisfied, however 20% were not satisfied with the playing facilities at the college level. These observed frequencies were significantly different from those of expected one (on Normal distribution). The Chi-Square ( $\chi^2$ ) value (i.e. 32) was found to be significant at .01 level of confidence. But when it

comes at the University level the situation is alarming. Only 23% players were satisfied whereas 77% were not satisfied at all. The chi-Square ( $\chi^2$ ) value (93.74) reported to be significant at .01 level of confidence in favor of not satisfied.

The results indicated that the playing facilities available at collage level were significantly acceptable but the same were not acceptable at university level.

**Table 3:** Percentage responses of Avadh University faizabad players regarding playing facilities

Item	Responses			X <sup>2</sup>
	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Not Satisfied	
Playing facilities at college level	16.00	43.00	41.00	13.58**
Playing facilities at University level	38.00	46.00	16.00	14.48**

\*\* Significant at .01 level as  $p > 9.21$

From table no.3 it is observed that out of 100 players of Avadh University Faizabad 16% players were highly satisfied; 43% were satisfied, however 41% were not satisfied with the playing facilities at the college level. These observed frequencies were significantly different from those of expected frequencies (on normal distribution). The Chi-Square ( $\chi^2$ ) value (13.58) was found to be significant at .01 level of confidence. When it comes to facilities at university level 38% of the respondents were highly satisfied, 46% were satisfied and merely 16% were not satisfied with the playing facilities available at Avadh University faizabad. The observed frequencies differ significantly from those of expected one ( $\chi^2=14.88$ ,  $p < .01$ )

From the results it can be concluded that majority of the players were satisfied with the playing facilities available at the college and university level. Yet a substantial number of players were found unsatisfied with the facilities available at the college level.

A comparison of perceived satisfaction level of players from the existing playing facilities at CSMU Kanpur, Dr. BRAU Agra and RML University Faizabad revealed that greater number of players of CSMU were highly satisfied with existing playing facilities at collage level as compared to

RML university Faizabad., and Dr. BRAU Agra,. Players of CSMU Kanpur and RML University Faizabad, were almost equally satisfied with the playing facilities in their respective universities. However, not a single player was highly satisfied with the existing facilities at Dr. BRAU Agra campus. On the other hand when we come to those who were not satisfied, almost equal number of players fall in this category in case of CSMU Kanpur and RMLU Faizabad. However there was a drastic shift in case of Dr. BRAU Agra, players which revealed that 77% of the Dr. BRAU players were not satisfied with the existing facilities at the university level.

### Recommendations

Still there is scope for further improvement in playing facilities at college as well as university level in all the three universities of U.P. State yet Dr. BRAU Agra needs more efforts to improve their playing facilities at university level because 77% of the respondents were not satisfied with the existing facilities. Similarly Avdh University Faizabad. Also needs to improve playing facilities at college level.

**References**

1. Anand RL. Playing Field Manual. Faridabad (Haryana): Thomson Press Limited, 1968, 79
2. Prasad Y. A study of facilities organization and administration of physical education and sports in Himachal Pradesh University. An Unpublished Ph.d Punjab University Chandigarh, 1993.
3. Sharma RP. Survey of high and higher secondary schools of Delhi in connection with qualified personnel, programme facilities and quipment and their gradation, 1956.