

---

## **EFFECT OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS UP ON PHYSICAL FITNESS AMONG PHYSICAL EDUCATION COLLEGE'S STUDENTS**

**Sunil Kumar**

Director Of Physical Education , Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, Mahavidyalay, Amravati.

**Abstract:-** The general purpose of the study was to study the effect of socio-economic status up on physical fitness of students studying in physical education colleges of Amravati University, Amravati. A sample of 240 male students of B.P.Ed. (Bachelor of Physical Education) one year course was selected randomly from twenty selected physical education colleges of Amravati University. AAHPER youth physical fitness test battery, Harvard step test, and Socio-economic Status Scale were used as a tool for data collection. ANOVA, Mean, S. D. and standard error of mean were the main statistical measures that were used in the analysis of data. It was found in the study that there was a significant mean difference found in physical fitness among the three different socio-economic status groups of Physical Education students, which lead to the conclusion that physical fitness was effected by the Socio-economic Status.

**Keywords:**Socio-economic Status ,Physical Fitness ,Physical Education.

### **INTRODUCTION**

The modern man is the inheritor and custodian of the activities of the ancient man. Before civilization had ushered into the historic arena and before the onset of the machine age led a hard and robust life in contrast to the soft and sedentary life of the present days. On ceremonial occasion he revealed in dances and completed in matching his strength, wits and skill with others in wrestling, foot racing, throwing the spear etc. Hence the (Tirunaryan and Hariharan, 1967) stated that great need of physical education is now to compensate the loss sustained by man in natural physical type activities.

The socio-economic status denoted the sub-group to which an individual belongs in the society. Each sub-group has its own typical sub culture with emphasis on different values, morals, ideas etc. for instance, educationists all over the world have found low aspiration level for educational achievement in the lower socio-economic strata as they do not get ideal images for educational attainment from adults in their immediate social environment. They lack facilitation to make optimum use of educational opportunities and they have lower expectations of educational outcomes.

Kulcinki (1945) pointed out that the relationship between intelligence and the learning of fundamental muscular skill was vary quick and significant. (Thomas 1970) found that there was relationship between physical fitness and socio-economic status. (Young, 1970) conducted the study on personal social adjustment, physical fitness, attitude towards physical education of high school girls by social economic level for that he used AAHPER physical fitness test to measure physical fitness and found no significant difference between socio-economic group with reference to physical fitness.( Davis 1970) found that physical fitness was not infused by socio-economic status.

An individual's socio economic status may influence his opportunity for participation, his desire to excel, his choice of activity, and his success. However as athletic prowess enhances socio prestige and acceptance, one in a low strata may be motivated to develop his athletic prowess to gain social prestige and acceptance which is denied to him otherwise being belonging to a low socio-

Please cite this Article as :Sunil Kumar, "EFFECT OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS UP ON PHYSICAL FITNESS AMONG PHYSICAL EDUCATION COLLEGE'S STUDENTS" : Academic Sports Scholar (Nov ; 2014)

economic strata.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

- 1)To find out the effect of socio-economic status up on physical fitness among students studying in physical education colleges.
- 2)To compare the physical fitness level of the students having different socio-economic status

**METHODOLGY**

The sample comprised of Two hundred forty (240) male students from B.P.E. course studying in twenty (20) selected Physical Education Colleges of Amravati University, Amravati, (M.S.) selected randomly for the present study. The age of the B.P.Ed. students were ranging from 20 years to 25 years.

**Tools used :-**

The following tools were used for data collection :

- 1)AAHPER Youth Physical Fitness Test battery and Harvard Step Test were used to measure the physical fitness.
- 3) ‘Kulshrestha and Dey Socio-economic Status Scale’ was used to determine the socio-economic status.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The data collected by above mentioned tools was analysed in accordance with the objectives of the study. The data were examined by employing One way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

**Table No.- 1**  
**ANOVA for the data on AAHPER Youth fitness test of three different groups in socio economic status of B.P.E. students.**

Source of variance	D.F.	S.S	M.S.S.	Obtained- F	Required D.F. At .05 level
Between the group	02	225589.94	112794.97	86.76*	3.0353
With in the group	237	308118.302	1300.77		

N = 240

[Tabulated F .05(2, 237) = 3.0353]

From the above table no.-1 it is revealed that there is a significant difference in the means of three different groups. The obtained F-ratio i.e. 86.76 is higher as compared to F .05(2, 237) = 3.0353. As difference is found to be significant by one way analysis of variance the Scheffee’s Post Hoc test was applied to assess the significance of difference between the paired means.

The means of AAPER Youth Physical Fitness Test and difference between the means of high, average and low socio-economic status groups has been presented in table –2.

**Table No.- 2**  
**Paired mean of AAPHER Youth Physical Fitness Test and difference between the means of high, average and low socio-economic status groups :**

High socio-economic status	Average socio-economic status	Low socio-economic status	Mean difference	Confidence values
235.75	302.42		66.67*	12.57
235.83		319.56	83.73*	14.16
	295.12	313..81	18.69*	12.66

\*Significant at .05 level of significance

Table no.-2 shows that there is significant difference between high and average socio-economic status, in between high and low, and average and low socio-economic status, as the mean difference of 66.67, 83.73 and 18.69 respectively are greater than the significance interval values required for significant at 0.05 level of significance at 0.05 level of 12.57, 14.16, and 12.66 respectively.

**Table No.- 3**  
**ANOVA for the data on Harvard Step test of three different groups in Socio-economic status of B.P.E. students.**

Source of variance	D.F.	S.S	M.S.S.	Obtained-F	Required D.F. At .05 level
Between the group	02	14754.41	7377.205	<b>130.46*</b>	3.0353
With in the group	237	13401.19	56.54		

N = 240

[Tabulated F .05(2, 237) = 3.0353]

From the above table no.-3 it is revealed that there is a significant difference in P.E.I. of High, Average and Low socio-economic groups. The obtained F-ratio i.e. 130.46 is higher as compared to  $F .05(2, 237) = 3.0353$ . As difference is found to be significant by one way analysis of variance the Scheffee's Post Hoc test was applied to assess the significance of difference between the paired means.

The means P.E.I. and difference between the means of high, average and low socio-economic status groups has been presented in table-4.

**Table No.- 4**  
**Paired mean of Harvard Step Test and difference between the means of high, average and low socio-economic status groups :**

High socio-economic status	Average socio-economic status	Low socio-economic status	Mean difference	Confidence values
68.35	85.26		16.91*	3.04
69.35		90.24	20.89*	2.95
	93.68	91.25	2.43	2.64

\*Significant at .05 level of significance

Table no.-4 reveals that the significant difference between high and average Group (M.D = 16.91) and high and low socio-economic group (M.D = 20.89) are greater than that of required level. Interval values of 3.04 and 2.95 respectively at .05 level of significance. Whereas insignificant difference is found in between average and low socio economic group (M.D = 2.43) is less than the required significance interval value of 2.64.

The difference in physical fitness among students having different socio-economic status may be due to difference in income of parents, diet, living standard, life style and exercise behaviour, because all these factors affect the physical fitness of an individual.

#### **FINDINGS :**

The followings were the main findings of the study :

- 1)The students of B.P.Ed. course belonged to low socio-economic status were superior in physical fitness than the average and high socio-economic group.
- 2)The students of average socio-economic status were also superior in physical fitness than the high socio-economic group.
- 3)There was insignificant difference found in low and average socio-economic group, while Harvard step test was administered. But the same was found significant while administering AAPER test.

The findings of the study lead to the conclusion that physical fitness is affected by the socio-economic status.

#### **REFERENCES :**

- 1.Buchar, A. Charles (1969), "Physical Education for life" (Newyork : Webster division Mecgraw Hill Company).
- 2.Camaione, N. David (1983), "Fitness management" ( Dubuque USA : WCB Brown and Benchmark).
- 3.Davis , G. S. (1970), "An Investigated The Existing Relationship Between Socio-Economic Status Of Parents And The Physical Fitness Scores Of Their Fifth Grade Pupils", Complete Research In Health Physical Education And Recreation, Vol-12
- 4.Kulcinki, L.E (1945), "The Relation of Intelligence to the Learning of Fundamental Muscular Skill", Research Quarterly, Vol.-16.
- 5.Lowrence Slote, (1987), "Handbook of Occupational Safety and Health", (NewYork : Wiley-Interscience Publication).
- 6.Seaton Don Cash, Irene E. Clayton (1974), "Physical Education Handbook" (USA: Prentice hall, INC. Englewood Cliffs).



**Sunil Kumar**

Director Of Physical Education , Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, Mahavidyalay, Amravati.