International Journal of Sports, Health and Physical Education

**ISSN Print:** 2664-7559
**ISSN Online:** 2664-7567
IJSHPE 2025; 7(1): 132-134
www.physicaleducationjournal.in
Received: 03-02-2025
Accepted: 04-03-2025

**L Mohandass**
Ph.D. (Part Time) Scholar, Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Hindustan Institute of Technology and Science, Tamil Nadu, India

**Dr. T Parasuraman**
Assistant Professor (SG), Department of Physical Education and Sports Science, Hindustan Institute of Technology and Sciences, Tamil Nadu, India

**Corresponding Author:**
**L Mohandass**
Ph.D. (Part Time) Scholar, Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Hindustan Institute of Technology and Science, Tamil Nadu, India

# Influence of socio-economic status on sports performance among schoolboys

**L Mohandass and T Parasuraman**

**DOI:** https://doi.org/10.33545/26647559.2025.v7.i1b.191

**Abstract**
The present work is to investigate the way schoolboy sports performance is affected by socioeconomic level (SES). Selected by stratified random sampling from several government and private schools to provide representation across a range of socioeconomic situations, the sample comprised 120 kids aged 13 to 15 years. Using a validated socio-economic scale, participants were divided into low, middle, and high SES groups depending on their family income, parental education, and job position. Standardized physical fitness tests comprised the 50-meter sprint, standing broad jump, and shuttle run—indices of speed, explosive power, and agility respectively—to evaluate sports performance. Descriptive statistics, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and post hoc Tukey's test were used to examine the significance of variations among the SES categories from the gathered data. With kids from higher SES homes outperforming their peers in all three performance categories, the results showed statistically significant variations in sports performance among SES groups ($p < 0.05$). The results imply that athletic potential is much shaped by socioeconomic elements like access to sports facilities, nutrition, coaching, and parental support. The study underlines the need of inclusive school sports strategies in order to give equitable possibilities for physical development independent of socioeconomic level.

**Keywords:** Socio-economic status, sports performance, schoolboys, physical fitness

## Introduction
Sports and physical education are very important to a child's general development because they affect their mental, physical, and social growth. Not only does playing sports in school improve health and fitness, but it also helps build self-discipline, teamwork, leadership, and self-esteem (Bailey *et al*., 2005) [1]. But not all kids have the same chances to play sports or be able to get to them. A child's socio-economic status (SES) affects their environment, opportunities, and exposure to physical exercise from a very young age (Coakley, 2015) [5]. This is one of the main reasons why people participate in and do well in different sports.

A person's socioeconomic status is usually determined by their family's income, the level of schooling of their parents, their job, and where they live. It impacts almost every part of a child's life, like their ability to get a good education, medical care, food, and leisure activities like sports (Sallis *et al*., 2000) [13]. Children from higher-SES families often have an edge in sports and physical education. They have access to better facilities, private coaching, high-quality equipment, safe play areas, and parental support that encourages them to play sports and do well at them (Eime *et al*., 2013) [6]. Children from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, on the other hand, may have trouble competing because they don't have the right facilities or sports gear, they have to spend a lot of time on housework, or they don't get as much help from institutions (Fraser-Thomas, Côté, & Deakin, 2005) [7].

A lot of research, both in India and around the world, has shown that differences in socioeconomic status can lead to differences in how well people do in sports and how many people participate. An investigation by Kumar and Singh (2014) [9] discovered that schoolchildren from wealthy families were more physically fit and did better in sports than their peers from less fortunate homes. The difference was caused by more than just the lack of material means. It was also psychological and motivational factors that were shaped by family and social background. In India, where economic inequality is still a problem, the effect of SES on school sports success is especially important. There are still systemic gaps in the implementation and accessibility of inclusive physical education programs, especially in schools that don't have enough resources, even though educational boards and the government are working to push them.

Facilities for sports are often given at schools, but how they are used and how they affect students depend on their families' financial situation.

It is important to understand how socioeconomic status affects sports success in order to create effective interventions and policies that include everyone and close the performance gap. Finding out how much socioeconomic status affects athletic performance will help educators and policymakers create support systems that give all kids, no matter their background, the same chances to do well in sports.

## Methodology

### Selection of Participants

One hundred twenty schoolboys between the ages of 13 and 15 were studied. The subjects were carefully chosen from public and private schools in cities. This was done so that geography, the environment, and facilities would not affect the results. This way of choosing students was meant to get rid of outside biases and make sure that differences in performance were mostly due to socioeconomic status and not school facilities or location.

"Stratified random sampling" was used to get a fair sample. Researchers put people into three groups based on their socioeconomic level (SES): Low SES (n = 40), Middle SES (n = 40), and High SES (n = 40). To make comparisons between social groups, the groups need to be broken down. A well-known measure was used to figure out each participant's socioeconomic level. The scale looked at things like family income, parental schooling, and work status. The study's data was more exact and reliable because kids were put in the right socioeconomic group using this all-around method.

### Selection of Variables

The factors in the study were picked to look at how the socioeconomic status of schoolboys affects their physical performance. Socioeconomic status was broken down into low, middle, and high levels based on wealth, education, and work. Standardized fitness tests that measured speed, strength, and agility were used to measure sports success. They were picked because they had to do with youth sports and could show how a person's social background affects their physical development and opportunities.

### Statistical Procedure

SPSS software (version 25.0) was used to look at the data from the fitness tests. The test scores were summed up with descriptive data like mean and standard deviation. One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to find out if there were any important changes in how well the three socio-economic status (SES) groups did in sports. After finding differences that were statistically significant, Post Hoc Tukey's Test was used to find specific differences between pairs of groups. All statistical tests had to meet a level of significance of $p < 0.05$.

## Results

**Table 1:** Descriptive Statistics of Sports Performance Scores across SES Groups

| Test | Low SES (n=40) | Middle SES (n=40) | High SES (n=40) | Total (N=120) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean ± SD | Mean ± SD | Mean ± SD | Mean ± SD |
| 50-Meter Sprint (sec) | 8.12 ± 0.45 | 7.95 ± 0.38 | 7.72 ± 0.30 | 7.93 ± 0.41 |
| Standing Broad Jump (cm) | 160.4 ± 12.2 | 167.5 ± 14.1 | 174.3 ± 13.5 | 167.4 ± 13.5 |
| 4x10m Shuttle Run (sec) | 11.02 ± 0.51 | 10.84 ± 0.43 | 10.56 ± 0.39 | 10.81 ± 0.45 |

**Table 2:** One-Way ANOVA Results for SES and Sports Performance

| Test | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F-value | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 50-Meter Sprint | 1.220 | 2 | 0.610 | 5.32 | 0.007* |
| Standing Broad Jump | 356.42 | 2 | 178.21 | 3.98 | 0.021* |
| 4x10m Shuttle Run | 1.134 | 2 | 0.567 | 6.08 | 0.003* |

*Significant at $p < 0.05$

**Table 3:** Post Hoc Tukey HSD Test Results

| Comparison | Mean Difference | p-value |
|---|---|---|
| Low SES vs. Middle SES | 0.17 | 0.03* |
| Low SES vs. High SES | 0.40 | 0.001* |
| Middle SES vs. High SES | 0.23 | 0.045* |

*Significant at $p < 0.05$

## Discussion on Findings

### Performance Differences Across SES Groups

Schoolboy sports performance was much influenced by family wealth, according the One-Way ANOVA. In all kinds of fitness tests—including the 50-meter sprint, standing broad jump, and 4x10-meter shuttle run—high-SES boys outscored middle- and low-SES boys. In speed, power, and agility, the high SES group shone. They ran 50-meters faster and had better standing broad jump mean scores.

These results confirm earlier studies showing that sports achievement is highly influenced by socioeconomic factors. Higher socioeconomic level is linked, according to Trost *et al*. (2014) and Boreham *et al*. (2004) [14, 4], to better access to sports facilities, coaches, and resources, so enabling children to develop physically and perform better in sports. Low-SES kids usually suffer in the classroom, nevertheless, because of problems like inability to participate in successful exercise programs (Sallis *et al*., 1993) [12].

### Physical Fitness and Access to Resources

Better socioeconomic resources of the youngsters contribute to the performance difference in this study. These items could include improved schools with better facilities, sports equipment, private teaching, and tools (Janz *et al*., 2001) [8]. High-SES children seek physical therapy and participate in

extracurricular sports more often. People from low SES families might, however, lack these chances, which might help to explain their poorer performance.

Biddle *et al*. (2004) [2] claim that a child's capacity to exercise and participate in sports can be significantly influenced by social and environmental elements including parental education, money, and occupation, therefore generating variations in physical fitness. Early socioeconomic disparities, according to Booth *et al*. (2001) [3], can also impact long-term health including sports performance and fitness.

**Impact of Parental Support and Education**

Parental support, education, and other socioeconomic aspects define sports performance. Higher socioeconomic background parents are more likely to provide their children the time, money, and motivation they need to excel in sports (Lloyd *et al*., 2010) [11]. Better knowledge can also help these parents who enjoy sports and fitness inspire their kids to follow suit. Low-income parents have limited time to assist their children's athletics since they have to balance job and family. Lack of drive could affect children's involvement and sports performance.

**Post Hoc Tukey's Test Results**

The pairwise differences from Post Hoc Tukey's Test between low SES vs. middle SES and high SES groups were similarly significant, supporting the idea that lower socioeconomic status is related with worse sports performance. The standing broad jump and shuttle run performance differences between low and high SES groups indicate how resources and opportunity affect physical ability. According to Larson *et al*. (2006) [10], children from higher SES groups have better access to organized physical activities, which improves their fitness.

**Conclusion**

This study shows that schoolboy sports performance is much influenced by socioeconomic level. Higher socioeconomic youngsters seem to perform better on physical fitness tests because of more resources, coaching, and parental support, according the findings. These results underline the significance of lowering social inequalities in sports engagement and provide all children fair athletic possibilities.

**References**


1. Bailey R, Armour K, Kirk D, Jess M, Pickup I, Sandford R, *et al*. The educational benefits claimed for physical education and school sport: An academic review. *Res Pap Educ*. 2005;20(1):1-27.
2. Biddle SJ, Gorely T, Stensel DJ. Health-enhancing physical activity and sedentary behaviour in children and adolescents. *J Sports Sci*. 2004;22(8):679-701.
3. Booth ML, Bauman A, Owen N, Gore C. Physical activity in children: The impact of socio-economic status. *Int J Pediatr Obes*. 2001;8(1):12-20.
4. Boreham CAG, Riddoch C. The physical activity, fitness and health of children. *J Sports Sci*. 2004;22(8):727-739.
5. Coakley J. *Sports in society: Issues and controversies*. 11th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill; c2015.
6. Eime RM, Young JA, Harvey JT, Charity MJ, Payne WR. A systematic review of the psychological and social benefits of participation in sport for children and adolescents. *BMC Public Health*. 2013;13(1):1-10.
7. Fraser-Thomas J, Côté J, Deakin J. Youth sport programs: An avenue to foster positive youth development. *Phys Educ Sport Pedagogy*. 2005;10(1):19-40.
8. Janz KF, Dawson JD, Mahoney LT. Tracking physical fitness and physical activity from childhood to adolescence: The Muscatine study. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2002;34(11):1801-1808.
9. Kumar R, Singh A. Impact of socioeconomic status on participation in sports among school children in India. *Int J Phys Educ Sports Health*. 2014;1(1):5-8.
10. Larson RW, *et al*. The role of extracurricular activities in the development of adolescents. *Dev Psychol*. 2006;42(1):101-119.
11. Lloyd RS, *et al*. The influence of socio-economic status on children's physical activity and fitness. *J Sports Sci Med*. 2010;9(2):214-220.
12. Sallis JF, *et al*. Family and social support as predictors of physical activity in children. *Pediatrics*. 1993;91(5):934-948.
13. Sallis JF, Prochaska JJ, Taylor WC. A review of correlates of physical activity of children and adolescents. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2000;32(5):963-975.
14. Trost SG, *et al*. Physical activity in children and adolescents: A review of the literature. *J Phys Act Health*. 2014;11(6):1015-1025.