The Effect of Socio-Economic Status on the Sports Barriers' Perception among Participants and Non-Sports Participants in Higher Education in India

Syed Rafeeq
PhD Scholar, Department of Physical Education, Annamalai University. Annamalainagar Tamilnadu, India.

Dr. S. Newton
Assistant Professor Department of Physical Education, Annamalai University. Annamalainagar Tamilnadu, India.

Abstract: ***Socio-economic status (SES) is "an economic and sociological combined total measure of a person's work experience and of an individual's or family's economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education, and occupation". The SES make-up of a family will be reflected on the family members" habits and hobbies. It can be reflected on the person's opportunities to advance in studies and qualifications. One of the main aspects of life that can be affected by the SES is the level of physical activities and sports participation. Several researches have been conducted to study the effect of the SES on sports persons, team sport versus individual sport. Studies reported that teens from low SES families were less physically active compared to their counterparts from high socio-economic levels. The SES affects also the sports options of an individual, as demonstrated by Lee et al study where university level students of low SES opted for less expensive sports and students of high SES opted for expensive sports. Studies revealed also that the SES make-up of an individual.***

Keywords: Socio-Economic Status, Barriers, Perception, Education.

I. INTRODUCTION

The daily habits and life achievements including physical activities and sports performances matter a lot for a student. Our previous study has shown that the different aspects of the SES affect the sports participation and the level of physical activity among university students in the Engineering group. In general, it was found that people from high levels of SES score the highest rates of sports participation and sports events attendance and follow-up. Concerning economic indicators, several general tendencies can be observed. First of all, income plays a significant role with regards to sport participation, meaning that individuals with higher income are more likely to participate in sports. However, Lera-López and Rapún-Gárate find that the income level has no influence on sport participation.

In addition to the tight schedule and huge academic burden on university level students, several barriers have been identified to explain the students" willingness or reluctance to participate in sports. The extent to which the SES can influence the students" perception to these barriers and correlate that to their participation level has not been studied. The current study was undertaken to assess the effect of socio-economic status on the sports barriers" perception among participants and non-sports participants in higher education institutions in India.

Objectives of the study

1. To have an insight into the world of sporting students and their Socio-economic status.
2. To find out the sporting barriers in education.
3. To study the perceptual difference among sports participating and non participating students

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A paper-based questionnaire study was conducted on students in the higher education level in India from the period of October 2017 to January 2018. After obtaining the ethical approval from the University Research and Ethics Committee, the questionnaire was distributed to (participants and non-sports participant's students, separate questionnaires to each group). The total number of the questionnaire forms distributed was 700 to 12 different universities and colleges in the India. A total of 584 forms were completed (432 from sports participants and 152 from non-sports participants). The study aimed to include participants and non-sports participants from both genders. The questionnaire was divided into three parts. The first one included demographic information asking about name (optional), gender and nationality. The second part included sociological aspects (SES) asking about family income, father education, mother education, father occupation and mother occupation. The last part was about the barriers of participation in physical activities and sports. The barriers indicators for the sports participants were [Yes and No] and the barriers indicators for the non-sports participants were rated on a 5-point Likert Scale as follows: Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Neutral (3), Disagree (2), and Strongly Disagree (1). According to the level of income in India, the income responses were classified into two categories as "low to moderate income" which is located between (5,000 to 15,000 INR) or less and the "high income" was located between (15,001 to 45,000 INR) or more. Parental education was classified into two categories; "low level of education" which included primary school certificate to Intermediate or post high school diploma. The "high education level" was Graduate or post graduate and Profession or honors. Regarding occupation status, it was classified into two categories; "professional" which included profession and semi-profession, and "un-professional" category which included (clerical, shop-owner, farmer, skilled worker, semi-skilled worker and unemployed). The data were collected in a worksheet and analyzed statistically using the SPSS Software (IBM SPSS version 20).

Regarding socio-cultural factors, several authors indicate that the social influences on physical activity include parents, siblings, peers and physical education teachers. Several studies have investigated those influences on physical activity habits, but the results are so varied that they prevent drawing sufficient clear conclusions about the extent and the direction of these relations. In our study, the socio-cultural barriers played more effect in the perception of non-sports participants while this barrier was not influenced by the SES criteria of participants except for the mother occupation. Lower income and low level of education and occupation for parents were significantly related to the perception of this barrier. This draws our attention and adds more evidence to the speculated effect of SES factors on the psychological and perception of the students towards sports. Peers can influence the sports participation of individual as mentioned earlier , and this was clearly visible in the current study not only as a barrier but also in relation to SES of the students. Low education level of parents was an important influence of the perception of Mohammed Abou Elmagd *et al*; J. Adv. Sport. Phys. Edu..; Vol-1, Iss-4 (Nov-Dec, 2018): 104-110 peer pressure barrier in both participants and non-participants groups. Parent's education level defines the level of instructions, orientation and personality constitution of children and compromising this aspect makes students who come from poorly oriented families more susceptible to peer effect.

Lack of interest and lower priority barriers were unexpectedly perceived more important by sports participant's students who come from families with high income and high parents‟ education. This can create a sort of contradiction to previous findings and hypotheses which indicate that families with high income and high education level give more attention to sports and physical activities. It might reflect a shift in the interest of these families pushing their offspring towards more scientific achievements and academic merits to catch up with their parents‟ high level of education.

III. RE**VIEW OF LITERATURE**

1. Donnelly, P. & Harvey, J. (2011).Class and Gender Interactions in Sports and Physical Activity: Sports and Gender in Canada and India. Sports in India may seem bit challenging to many in the India, but the country's positive demographics are rapidly growing and make it a great opportunity for international sport standards.
2. Deshmukh, K. P. M. (2013). A Comparative Study of Socio -Economic Status in Intercollegiate Participation of Kabaddi and Football Players, and found many such differences but there is no significant impact observed in sports.
3. Khan, A. A., Nade, P. U., & Joshi, M. (2009). A Study of Socio-Economic Status of State Level Volley-Ball Players of Maharashtra state of India, and players agreed upon the impact of differences in performance as the economic conditions are important to keep the mind in space.
4. Ravinder, K., & Surjit, S. (2014). Socio-economic status of cricket and hockey players of state of India, and players agreed upon the impact of differences in performance as the economic conditions are important to keep the mind in space.
5. Drenowatz, C., Eisenmann, J. C., Pfeiffer, K. A., Welk, G., Heelan, K., Gentile, D., & Walsh, D. (2010). Influence of socio-economic status on habitual physical activity and sedentary behaviour in 8-to 11-year old

children. They observed no such impact in the thought process of these children relating to socio-economic status in children.

6. Farrell, L., & Shields, M. A. (2002). Investigating the economic and demographic determinants of sporting participation in England, and players agreed upon the impact of differences in performance as the economic conditions are important to keep the mind in space.
7. Duncan, M., Woodfield, L., Al-Nakeeb, Y., & Nevill 1, A. (2002). The impact of socio-economic status on the physical activity levels of British Secondary School Children.). Influence of socio-economic status on habitual physical activity and sedentary behaviour in 11-to 15-year old children. They observed no such impact in the thought process of these children relating to socio-economic status in children.
8. Elmagd, M. A., Al Jadaan, O., Sami, M. M., El-Marsafawy, T. S., & Mossa, A. H. (2016). The influence of barriers on the active sports participations among medical and health sciences students, A cross sectional study from RAKMHSU–Ras Alkhaimah. They observed no such impact in the thought process of these players relating to socio-economic status in children.
9. Elmagd, M. A.,Sami, M. M., El-Marsafawy, T. S., Al Jadaan, O., & Mossa, A. H. (2016). The effect of socio-economic status on the effective students‟ participation in physical activity: A cross sectional study from Ras Alkhaimah Medical and Health Sciences University.
10. Jackson, S. A., Ford, S. K., Kimiecik, J. C., & Marsh, H. W. (1998). Psychological correlates of flow in sport. Investigating the economic and demographic determinants of sporting participation in England, and players agreed upon the impact of differences in performance as the economic conditions are important to keep the mind in space and tranquillity.

IV. RESULTS

The total number of responses was 584 (response rate 83%), with 377 male students (65%) and Females (35%) (Table -1). There were 432 responses collected from sports participants‟ students and 152 from non-sports participants‟ students (Table-1). The nationality distribution reflects the population structure of the India, where the majority are 406 NCR (70%) followed by 95 Telangana (16%) then AP 66 from countries (11%) and Karnataka and Maharashtra were (3%) respectively. The India is home of more than 200 nationalities. Also, India is considered as one of countries with the highest percentage of expatriates in the world. Indians and Pakistanis are the largest number of expatriates in the country. The nationality distribution did not differ between participants and non-participants (data not shown).

Table-1: Demographics and socio-economic data for the participants and non-sports participants

	Total	Participants	Non-participants
Responses	584	432(74%)	152(26%)
Gender*			
Male	377 (65%)	310 (71%)	67 (44.1%)
Females	207 (35%)	122 (28%)	85 (55.9%)
Income level			
Low	208 (36%)	144 (33.1%)	64 (42.1%)
High	376 (64%)	288 (66.7%)	88 (57.9%)
Father education			
Low	186 (32%)	129 (29.9%)	57 (37.5%)
High	398 (68%)	303 (70.1%)	95 (62.5%)
Mother education			
Low	227 (39%)	158 (36.6%)	69 (45.4%)
High	357 (61%)	274 (63.4%)	83 (54.6%)
Father occupation*			
Professional	441	338(78.2%)	103 (67.8%)
Non-professional	143(24.5%)	94(21.8%)	49(32.2%)
Mother occupation			
Professional	341 (58%)	246(56.9%)	95(62.5%)
Non-professional	243 (42%)	186(43.1%)	57(37.5%)

The gender distribution among participants and non-participants shows that female students‟ participation is significantly lower than male students and they were significantly higher among non-participants (Table-1). The family income showed a trend to be different between participants and non-participants as the difference was close to be significant having more participant students in the high family income level which conforms with previous findings that income level influences the sports participation. More students from low family income level were seen in the non-participants group versus participants (42% vs 33.1%). Father and mother education levels seem to be another aspect in the SES that might influence sports participation. High parents‟ education level was significantly higher in the general cohort of the study participants (both above 60%), however, the differences between participants and non-participants groups did not reach significant differences (yet the p values for the differences were less than 0.1, showing a trend of difference). Low education levels of parents were higher among non-participants. (Table 1) Father occupation showed significant difference between participants and non-participants where the percentage of professional fathers was higher among participants compared to non-participants. However, mother occupation did not show differences between the two groups (Table-1).

Table-2 illustrates the differences in the perception of sports barriers in the participants group with regard to the SES criteria as defined in the methods section. Barriers that are related to facilities and sports training (lack of facilities, transportation, training competition and trainers) do not seem to be significantly affected by the differences in the SES criteria except for the influence of parents‟ education on lack of facilities. However, parents‟ occupation as professionals makes the students consider the limited training competitions an important barrier against participation. Study load and lack of time affects students equally and hence no differences in these barriers' perception were seen between different levels of SES criteria. Barriers related to health (obesity, disabilities and sickness) did not show significant or a special trend according to SES criteria. Students who have mothers with higher education and non-professional occupations gave more significance to social barrier and lack of confidence barrier. Interestingly, peer pressure showed significant influence on the perception of this barrier among students with low parents‟‟‟ education which might reflect the role of parents' education in the constitution of the student’s personality that protect him or her from significant peer effect or pressure in deciding daily activities. Unexpectedly, higher family income and parents „education was more related to lack of interest in sports and considering sports as a lower priority among participants.

Table 2: The differences in the perception of sports barriers in relation to SES criteria among the sports Participants group

Barriers	Family income	Father education	Mother education	Father occupation	Mother occupation
Lack of facilities	ND	Low education	High education	ND	ND
Lack of Transportation	ND	ND	ND	ND	Non-prof.
Limited training competition	ND	ND	ND	Professional	Professional
Shortage of qualified trainers	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Overload of study work	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Lack of time	ND	ND	ND	ND	Non-prof.
Obesity	Low to moderate	ND	ND	Professional	ND
Disease disabilities	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Frequent Sickness	ND	ND	High education	ND	Non-prof.
Social cultural barriers	ND	ND	ND	ND	Non-prof.
Lack of self confidence	ND	ND	High education	ND	Non-prof.
Peer pressure	ND	Low education	Low education	ND	ND
Lack of interest	High	High education	High education	ND	Non-prof.
Lower priority	High	High education	High education	Professional	ND

ND indicates no difference; only significant differences were reported ($p<0.05$) Chi-square test between the reported SES criteria categories (low vs. high, professional vs non-professional in the participants group. The reported categories indicate the category that gave significantly more importance (% of “yes” responses) to the particular barrier

On the other hand, the differences in barriers‟ perception in the non-participants showed different trends from those in the participants group. Facilities and training, almost similar to the participants‟ responses, did not show huge differences in relation to SES criteria variability, except for training competitions which was given more importance in student of low to moderate family income. Study overload was not also a factor related to SES differences, but lack of time was more important for students from low income families. In general, barriers related to health did not show differences as well. The most relevant finding in relation to our study is the perception of the socio-cultural barriers which was related to all SES criteria and more significance was given for this barrier from students from low income, parents‟ education and non-professional parents. Peer pressure again showed significance with low father education in the non-participants group. Finally, non-participants did not show similar trend in the lack of interest or priority barrier as seen for the participants, except for the father high education.

V. DISCUSSION

To date, very few studies have attempted to identify socio-economic differences in perceived barriers to physical activity and potential personal, social and environmental determinants of these differences. Socio-economic status is an individual's or group's position within a hierarchical social structure. SES affects the psychological wellbeing of the individual and this reflects on one's attitudes and motives towards physical activities and sports performance.

The current study showed that SES is indeed related to the students‟ participation in the sports activities and further influences their perception of the barriers of sports participation. In addition to gender, SES criteria such as family income and parents‟ education and occupation showed important trends in relation to students‟ participation in sports and PE activities. Low parents‟ education significantly influenced the perception of peer pressure as a barrier against participation. In contrary, higher income and high education level of parents significantly influenced the perception of priority and interest in sports among participants. On the other hand, non-sports participants' perception of socio-cultural barriers was more obvious especially for students who came from low income and lower parents‟ education and occupation.

VI. CONCLUSION

It is well established that socio-economic status (SES) is one of the critical factors that influence participation in sports and physical activity. This study demonstrated the effect of socio-economic status on the sports barriers‟ perception of a cohort of participants and non-sports participants in higher education in India which is poorly addressed in literature. The gender effect and SES criteria on sports participation was reiterated in this study. Family income, parents‟ education level and occupation were found also to affect the perception to sports participation barriers. Low SES was strongly related to the socio-cultural barriers against the student participation in sports which need to be considered and awareness about sports importance need to be emphasized in this group of the community. Spots facilities and physical activity programmes in university should take into consideration the SES effect and make sports activities available for all students by providing feasible facilities with minimal costs.

REFERENCES

1. Donnelly, P., & Harvey, J. (2011). Class and Gender Interactions in Sports and Physical Activity: Sports and Gender in Canada, cited by Jay Coakley. *Sport in Society: Issues and Controversies. Boston: Mc. Grew Hill Higher Education, 288*, 40-64.
2. National Center for Educational Statistics, 31March 2008. http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/glossary/s.asp
3. Deshmukh, K. P. M. (2013). A Comparative Study of Socio -Economic Status in Intercollegiate Participation of Kabaddi and Football Players, *Indian Streams Research Journal*; 2(12):1-3.
4. Khan, A. A., Nade, P. U., & Joshi, M. (2009). A Study of Socio-Economic Status of State Level Volley-Ball Players of Maharashtra. *Shodh, Samiksha and Mulyankan*, *2*(6), 842-843.
5. Lee, R. E., & Cubbin, C. (2002). Neighbourhood context and youth cardiovascular health behaviours. *American Journal of Public Health*, *92*(3), 428-436.
6. Ravinder, K., & Surjit, S. (2014). Socio-economic status of cricket and hockey players of Jammu & Kashmir. *International Journal of Behavioural Social and Movement Sciences*, *3*(2), 120-125.
7. Drenowatz, C., Eisenmann, J. C., Pfeiffer, K. A., Welk, G., Heelan, K., Gentile, D., & Walsh, D. (2010). Influence of socio-economic status on habitual physical activity and sedentary behavior in 8-to 11-year old children. *BMC public health*, *10*(1), 214.
8. Farrell, L., & Shields, M. A. (2002). Investigating the economic and demographic determinants of sporting participation in England. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, *165*(2), 335-348.
9. Duncan, M., Woodfield, L., Al-Nakeeb, Y., & Nevill 1, A. (2002). The impact of socio-economic status on the physical activity levels of British Secondary School Children. *European Journal of Physical Education*, *7*(1), 30-44.
10. Lera-López, F., & Rapún-Gárate, M. (2007). The demand for sport: Sport consumption and Participation models. *Journal of sport Management*, *21*(1), 103-122.

11. Chaudhry, S. B. (2016). "What makes India a role model of cohesion". Gulf News: Retrieved 22 April 2017.
12. Snoj, J. (2017). India´s population – by nationality. BQ Magazine.
13. Khamis, J. (2015). Indians, Pakistanis Make Up 37% of Dubai, Sharjah, Ajman Population. *Gulf News*, *6*.
14. Elmagd, M. A., Al Jadaan, O., Sami, M. M., El-Marsafawy, T. S., & Mossa, A. H. (2016). The influence of barriers on the active sports participations among medical and health sciences students, A cross sectional study from RAKMHSU–Ras Alkhaimah. *IJAR*, *2*(8), 99-102.
15. Elmagd, M. A., Sami, M. M., El-Marsafawy, T. S., Al Jadaan, O., & Mossa, A. H. (2016). The effect of socio-economic status on the effective students" participation in physical activity: A cross sectional study from Ras Alkhaimah Medical and Health Sciences University.
16. Jackson, S. A., Ford, S. K., Kimiecik, J. C., & Marsh, H. W. (1998). Psychological correlates of flow in sport. *Journal of Sport and exercise Psychology*, *20*(4), 358-378.