



P-ISSN: 2394-1685  
E-ISSN: 2394-1693  
Impact Factor (ISRA): 5.38  
IJPESH 2022; 9(3): 157-161  
© 2022 IJPESH  
[www.kheljournal.com](http://www.kheljournal.com)  
Received: 19-02-2022  
Accepted: 11-04-2022

**Dr. Nirlep Kaur**  
Associate Professor, Department  
of Physical Education, G.N.N  
College Doraha, Ludhiana,  
Punjab, India

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Dr. Nirlep Kaur**  
Associate Professor, Department  
of Physical Education, G.N.N  
College Doraha, Ludhiana,  
Punjab, India

## Effect of economic background of physical education teachers on their sports performance

**Dr. Nirlep Kaur**

### Abstract

The economic status of any society determined by various factors. The economic status generally coincides with social status. It may be evaluated on the basis of a number of factors such rural/urban background, family size, family achievements in sports, family income, occupation and family status. The purpose of this study is to find out the affect of economic background on Physical Education teachers. 48 teachers from 11 states of India were selected as sample who were attending refresher course -206 at H.P. University, Shimla. The data were collected through questionnaire method. From that data it was seen that out of 48 respondents women participation is very less. (i. e. only eleven) Out of the total population (48) 3 persons participated up to the International level, 20 up to the National level, 23 up to the International University level and 2 participated only up to district and inter college level. The data was analyzed through percentage method. Analysis regarding to their economic background, it was found that (i) Most of the sportspersons belong to rural areas but with respect to their performance urbanize person showed the high performance at International level. (ii) Most of them belonged upper and lower middle class families (iii) Most of them came from big families. (iv) Educated parents take more interest for their participation in sports activities and provided them facilities as per their needs. (v) Most of them involved in sports in the age of 12 – 17 years. (vi) Joint or nuclear families did not show any influence on their sports performances. It is concluded that the data brought to light that most of the economic variables shown significant effect on the player's participation in sports. The recommendation of the study is that similar study can be carried out all over India in both sexes and different ages.

**Keywords:** Economic background, physical education, sports performance

### Introduction

The Economic status of any society determined by various factors some of them may be objective in nature like education, employment, income etc or others are subjective depending on the social values prevailing in the society. The economic status generally coincides with social status. The economic status may be evaluated on the basis of a number of factors such as caste and class, rural/urban background, family size, education, achievements in sports, training received the ratio of income and expenditure, occupational mobility and freedom of choice in service.

As the economic status of any society is determined by various factors in the same way society reflects the economic status, which also affects the sports. The structure and formation of society has the most powerful influence individual's life. When a child born society put influence on his/her early age. In society sports serves as a role model. Sports play an important role to make society more active and fit. There is no doubt that industrialization and technology have given a good boost to sports in modern times but economic backgrounds directly influence the involvement in sports and games. Participation in sports cannot become popular among the masses unless the people have achieved economic influence. The level of economic independence also plays a vital role in achievement of sports.

In the present study many economic factors have been taken which affects the sports performance in negative and positive way. These main factors are income of family, status of family, family support, family size and type of family (joint and nuclear) encouragement and facilities availed etc. Many studies have been conducted earlier regarding different factors of family backgrounds and status i.e. as:

**Review of literature:** Studies conducted on economic status and sports participation showed as Joke (1952) [5] suggested that sports achievement in Olympic Games and other international meets reveals that higher achievement had perfect correlations with the level of industrial and economic development. Lueschen (1970) and Grueaee (1975) [8, 3] formed that athlete from prosperous families participated in selected sports where as other which belong to lower class background and having poor economic conditions faced greater social obstacles for their participations. Regarding the study of family support – Sohi and Singh 1986 [12], formed that the interest in sports was initially aroused within the family, mainly by the father. Hall 1976, conducted a study of 552 Canadian women and he found that Bourassa, for example, caddied for her brother who became a teacher professional. Both her parents encouraged her continued participation in Golf. Athletics also came from families who are sport oriented. Fathers are often coaches in the school system or tutors of sport. They may also come from families where brother were professional athletes. Mach Pherson (1978) [9], concluded in his study that father was the sole family member concerning girls participation and encouraging them to participate in sports. Orlick (1972) [11], identified three factors which may be responsible for learning sports roles, role models, expectancies and sport related reinforcement more specifically Orlick found that boys who began to participate in organized sport at an early age had parents who were or had been effective role models. These boys came from an environment in which parents actively participated in sports activities. Similarly Watson (1975) [14] noted that children perceive their parents as being an important reference group for sports involvement. Regarding family size and type of family (joint or Nuclear) Morten Chung (1967) [10], observed that family size has played prominent role on psychological, morphological and structural development of an athlete. According to the Borge Nancy (1984) [1], family size and joint family increases both sexes participation in sports. Kleiber *et al.* (1983) [7], found that joint family spares more time for boys and girls to step in sports fields. They further mentioned that inspiration from family members motivate them to play games and sports. In nuclear family parents play remarkable role in inspiring their children to take part in sports by providing them sufficient facilities. According to Kari (1982) [6], family type and economic status of women effect their participation in games and sports, social and psychological variables are also the strongest predictor of women sports participation. The facilities of equipment, training received in early years and encouragement from the social systems has linear relationship with women and men's participation in sports. There are many people who want to be involved in sports but because of an incomplete sports environment and facilities, their desire cannot be fulfilled. Welch *et al.* (1982) [15] and Vasant (1973) [13], concluded in their studies that availability of facilities may lead to mass participation in sports and games. But it cannot increase the achievement. They further stated that achievement depends on motivation, encouragement and availability of same sex coaches. According to Dyer (1982) [2],

women's performance in sports is rapidly improving and this degree of improvement is related to the opportunities they received in their learning periods.

### Hypothesis

The investigation is based on the assumption that participation in different sports is influenced by the various economic factors e.g.

1. Rural and urban background.
2. Size and type of the family
3. Status and income of the family
4. Parents education and their sports involvement
5. Occupation of the parents
6. Age of participation in sports activities and facilities they availed in early ages.

### Delimitation of the study

The study will be delimited to the Physical Education teachers of (11) eleven states of India attending Refresher Course -206 in H.P. University, Shimla.

### Objectives of the study

1. To identify the correlation of their family income and class status with their sports performance.
2. To identify the effect of rural urban background on their sports performance.
3. To find out the effect of family size and type on their sports achievement.
4. To find out the effect of their parents occupation on their sports achievements.
5. To determine and point out the contribution of the other factor like their age of participation in sports, sports facilities they avail in their early ages and encouragement they received from their family members and others.

### Significance of the study

1. The findings of this study will contribute to the knowledge about the different economic factors which affects the sport performance of both sexes in different games.
2. It will also give help to the Physical Education teachers and Coaches during the training and selection of teams.

### Selection of sample and methodology

The data collection was planned from the 48 physical education teachers of 11 different states of India who were attending RC-206 in H.P. University Shimla. The 25 questions have been designed in questionnaire which included the different factors of economic status and background of respondents and distributed to all the 48 participants. The filled questionnaires had been collected from the respondent then tabulated and analyzed through percentage (%) method. For any empirical study, the researcher has to identify the method of study. Here in the present study survey method had been chosen.

### Analysis of data and interpretation

**Table 1:** Distribution of the Respondents as per their background and level of Participation in Sports

Background	Inter College	Inter University	National	Inter National	Total
Rural	1 (2.08%)	14 (29.17%)	10 (20.83%)	1 (2.08%)	26 (54.16%)
Urban	1 (2.08%)	6 (12.5%)	13 (27.08%)	2 (4.16%)	22 (45.83%)
Total	2 (4.16%)	20 (41.66%)	23 (42.91)	3 (6.25%)	48 (100%)

The distribution of the above data shows that 54.16% respondents belongs to rural background and 45.83% are from urban background. At International level 4.16% belong to

urban background whereas at National level 27.08% are from urban area. This result shows that even the differences are very less but rural area players are dominant over all.

**Table 2:** Distribution of the Respondents as per their Parents Occupation and their level of Participation

Occupation of the parents	Inter College	Inter University	National	Inter National	Total
Business	0	1 (2.08%)	1 (2.08%)	0	2 (4.16%)
Service	2 (4.16%)	14 (29.16%)	14 (29.16%)	2 (4.16%)	32 (66.6%)
Agriculture	0	7 (14.58%)	6 (12.50%)	1 (2.08%)	14 (29.16%)
Total	2 (4.16%)	22 (45.83%)	21 (43.75%)	3 (6.22%)	48 (100%)

The distribution of the above table shows that respondents from serving parents (e.g. teachers defense personnel extra) had higher number of participation at Inter College, Inter University, National and at International level i.e. 66.6% and

from agriculture background only 29.16% and from business class families only 4.16% has been observed, so it is concluded that players belongs to service oriented families shows higher participation rather than other category.

**Table 3:** Distribution of the Respondents as per their Parents Qualification and their level of Participation

Level of Qualification	Inter College	Inter University	National	Inter National	Total
Illiterate	1 (2.08%)	0	1 (2.08%)	0	2 (4.16%)
Primary	0	3 (6.22%)	0	0	3 (6.22%)
Middle	0	6 (12.50%)	11 (22.91%)	2 (4.16%)	19 (39.58%)
Higher Secondary	0	2 (4.16%)	1 (2.08%)	0	3 (6.22%)
Graduation & above	1 (2.08%)	9 (18.75%)	10 (20.83%)	1 (2.08%)	21 (43.75%)
Total	2 (4.16%)	20 (41.66%)	23 (47.92%)	3 (6.22%)	48 (100%)

As per respondents parents educational qualification the above data shows that majority of the respondents are those whose parents are graduate and above i.e. 43.75 percent. Even at International level 2.08 percent are those whose parents are

graduate and above. The analysis shows that parent's awareness is effects on sports participation more rather than qualification.

**Table 4:** Distribution of the Respondents as per their Family size and level of Participation

Size of family	Inter College	Inter University	National	Inter National	Total
Small	0	10 (20.83%)	6 (12.5%)	1 (2.08%)	17 (35.41%)
Big	2 (4.16%)	10 (20.83%)	17 (35.41%)	2 (4.16%)	31 (64.58%)
Total	2 (4.16%)	20 (41.66%)	23 (47.91%)	3 (6.22%)	48 (100%)

The distribution of the above data reveals that 64.58% respondents belong to big families and 35.41% belongs to small family. Big families mean having six and above

member in their family. From big families more National and International level players were produced

**Table 5:** Distribution of the Respondents as per their Sports background of their Family

Family sports Background	State /Inter College	Inter University	National	Inter National	Total
With sports background	1 (2.08%)	11 (22.91%)	11 (22.91%)	1 (2.08%)	24 (50%)
Without sports background	1 (2.08%)	9 (18.75%)	12 (25%)	2 (4.16%)	24 (50%)
Total	2 (4.16%)	20 (41.66%)	23 (47.91%)	3 (6.22%)	48 (100%)

The table shows that 50 percent respondents came from sports background families and another 50 percent are from without sports background families. But at the International level 2 (out of 3) are those whose parents have not taken part in any

sport activities. So the result does not show significance relation of sports background or without sports background families and with their children participation in sports.

**Table 6:** Distribution of the Respondents as per their type of Family and their level of Participation

Type of Family	Inter College/State	Inter University	National	Inter National	Total
Joint	2 (4.16%)	7 (15.62%)	13 (27.01%)	1 (2.08%)	23 (47.91%)
Nuclear	0	13 (27.01%)	10 (20.83%)	2 (4.16%)	25 (52.08%)
Total	2 (4.16%)	20 (41.66%)	23 (47.91%)	3 (6.22%)	48 (100%)

The analysis of the above data revealed that 47.91% respondents belong to joint families and other 52.8% were from nuclear families. The difference is very less but at

International level 2 (out of 3) are belong to nuclear families. There is slightly difference between the type of family and their relation with sports performance.

**Table 7:** Distribution of the Respondents as per Sports facilities they availed during early years and level of Participation

Facilities availed during early age	Inter College	Inter University	National	Inter National	Total
Yes	1 (2.08%)	13 (27.01%)	14 (29.16%)	2 (4.16%)	30 (62.5%)
No	1 (2.08%)	7 (14.58%)	9 (18.75%)	1 (2.08%)	18 (37.5%)
Total	2 (4.16%)	20 (41.66%)	23 (47.91%)	3 (6.22%)	48 (100%)

The distribution of the above table revealed that majority of the respondents 62.50% are those who received sports facilities in earlier age and 37.50% are those who did not

receive any sports facilities in the early ages. It is concluded that players who had availed facilities in the early ages got more achievement as compared to others.

**Table 8:** Distribution of the Respondents as per type of their Age of first Participation in Sports and level of Participation

Age of Involvement	State /Inter College	Inter University	National	Inter National	Total
Less than 12 years	0	2 (4.16%)	2 (4.16%)	1 (2.08%)	5 (10.41%)
12 to 14 Years	1 (2.08%)	9 (18.75%)	8 (16.66%)	1 (2.08%)	19 (39.58%)
15 to 17 Years	0	6 (12.5%)	12 (25%)	0	18 (37.5%)
18 to 20 Years	1 (2.08%)	3 (6.25%)	1 (2.08%)	1 (2.08%)	6 (12.5%)
Total	2 (4.16%)	20 (41.66%)	23 (47.91%)	3 (6.22%)	48 (100%)

As relation to the age of first participation in sports activities the above table shows that 39.58% respondents have involved in sport activities in the age of 12 - 14 years and 37.50% in the age of 15-17 years. But at International level this trend changed. 1 out of 3 engaged in sports activities in the age of

10 years, another one in the age of 12 years and third one in the age of 18-20 years. The above table shows that the frequent age range of participation in sport was between 12-17 years.

**Table 9:** Distribution of the Respondents as per their Parents Income during their sports Involvements

Per Annum Income	State /Inter College	Inter University	National	Inter National	Total
Above 1,50,000	0	1 (2.08%)	1 (2.08%)	0	2 (4.16%)
Between 90,000 – 1,50,000	1 (2.08%)	1 (2.08%)	3 (6.22%)	2 (4.16%)	7 (14.58%)
Between 60,000 – 90,000	0	18 (37.5)	19 (39.7%)	1 (2.08%)	38 (79%)
Between 40,000 – 60,000	1 (2.08%)	0	0	0	1 (2.08%)
Total	2 (4.16%)	20 (41.66%)	23 (47.91%)	3 (6.22%)	48 (100%)

The distribution of the above table shows that majority of the respondents 79% are those whose parents per annum income was between 60,000 – 90,000. They did not belong to rich

families. The analysis of above table shows middle class families give support to their children to take part in sport activities.

**Table 10:** Distribution of the Respondents as per type of their class status and level of Participation in Sports

Class States	State /Inter College	Inter University	National	Inter National	Total
Upper high class	0	1 (2.08%)	1 (2.08%)	0	2 (4.16%)
Upper Middle Class	1 (2.08%)	1 (2.08%)	3 (6.22%)	2 (4.16%)	7 (14.58%)
Middle class	0	18 (37.5)	19 (39.7%)	1 (2.08%)	38 (79%)
Lower class	1 (2.08%)	0	0	0	1 (2.08%)
Total	2 (4.16%)	20 (41.66%)	23 (47.91%)	3 (6.22%)	48 (100%)

As relation to the status of their family 79 percent respondents belong to middle class families. Their parents per annum income were Rs. 60,000 – 90,000 per annum. They did not

belong to rich families. The analysis of the above table shows that middle class families put great influence on sports participation.

**Table 11:** Distribution of the Respondents as per type of their houses and home comforts

Type of House	State /Inter College	Inter University	National	Inter National	Total
Big Bunglow	0	0	2 (4.16%)	1 (2.08%)	3 (6.25%)
Small Bunglow	0	1 (2.08%)	4 (8.33%)	1 (2.08%)	6 (12.5%)
Big House	1 (2.08%)	6 (12.5%)	15 (31.25%)	1 (2.08%)	23 (47.91%)
Small House	1 (2.08%)	13 (27.08%)	2 (4.16%)	0	16 (33.33%)
Total	2 (4.16%)	20 (41.66%)	23 (47.91%)	3 (6.22%)	48 (100%)

Analysis of the above data revealed that 47.91% respondents having big houses. Here big house means not very high class house. And the analysis of the above data shows that majority of the respondents are having normal houses and they showed maximum participation at the National level. The families belongs to small houses also showed average participation at the different level i.e. 33.33%.

### Summary, conclusion and recommendations

The sample constituted of 48 respondents and out of 48 respondents 2 played up to District or Inter College level, 20 up to the Inter University level, 23 up to National level and only 3 participated at the International level. Following are few suggestions and a recommendation for the summary of the study concludes that Most of the respondents 54.16



percent were from rural area. Their parents were service oriented, graduate and above. Whereas the question of sports facilities 62.50 percent respondents availed during their early ages and performed better at National and International level. Most of the respondents 64.58% belongs to big families which are having 6 or more members in their families. The frequent age of participation in the sports activities has been seen 12-17 years. Maximum respondents 79 percent belong to middle class families and their parents per annum income was Rs. 60,000- Rs. 90,000. 83 percent respondents are residing in small and big houses which are not belong to the high status families. Nature of the family (Joint or Nuclear) did not show much difference. With regard to their family's sports background it has not shown significant relation with their sports achievements.

### Conclusion

The analysis of the data brought to light that most of the economic background variables which were studied have shown positive effect on the player's participation in sports.

### Recommendation

1. A similar study can be carried out all over India.
2. A similar study can be conducted to see differences of male and female players.
3. A study can be conducted on school and college going players.

### References

1. Berge Nancy. On the need for a more adequate theory of sports participation. (35 refs) *Sociology of sports journal*. 1984;1(1):26-35.
2. Dyer KF. Challenging the men the social biology of female sporting achievements. St. Lucia, Australia: University of Queensland Press, 1982, 271.
3. Grunea RS. Sports social differences and social inequality *Sports and social order contribution to the sociology of sports*, 1975, 127-184.
4. Hall Ann M. Sport and Physical activity in the lives of Canadian Women in Crunea Richords and John G. Albinson Canidina Sport sociological perspectives Don Mills., Ontario: Addison Wesley Canada Ltd.), 1976.
5. Joke. Sports in the cultural of the world a study of Olympic Games held at institutes of occupational health, Helsinki. Social aspect aspects of sports planning N.T.S. Journal, 1952.
6. Kari F. A Prediction model for the participation in sports. *International Review of sports sociology*. 1982;17(37):29-38.
7. Klieber DA, Robert GC. The relationship between game and sports involved in later childhood. A Preliminary investigation research quarterly for exercise and sports. 1983;54(2):200-203.
8. Lue Schen G. The inter dependence of sport and culture. In G. Lueschen (eds). *The Cross cultural analysis of sport and games*. Stipes Champaign Illinois, 1970.
9. Mc Pherson BD. The child in competitive sport. Influence of the social milieu. INR Mogil, M Ash, and F. Small (Eds). *Children in sports. A contemporary Anthology*, Champaign, Ill. Human Kinechtics Publishers, 1978.
10. Mortan Chung. Genetic and interracial crosses in Hawaii, Monograph in Human Culture, Kerger basal, 1967.
11. Orlick T. Family Sports environment and early sports participation Paper presented at fourth Canadian

- Psychomotor learning and sports Psychology symposium, University of Waterloo Ontario, Canada, 1972.
12. Sohi AS, Singh KJ. A Study family's role a social system in socialization of sports in Nigeria. In Mangan, J.A. and small, R.B. (eds), *Sports, culture and society, International historical and perspectives*, London: E and F. No. Spon, 1986.
  13. Vasant G. Will India ever with Davis Cup? *Disserts N.I.S. Journal*. 1973;8(1).
  14. Watson G. Sex role Socialization and competitive process in little athletics, *The Australian journal of health, Physical education and recreation*. 1975;70:10-21.
  15. Welch PD, Harold LA. The emergence of American women in winter Olympic games, 1920-1980 *Deeta Bikappa Roil*. 1982;65(2):34-43.