



P-ISSN: 2394-1685
E-ISSN: 2394-1693
Impact Factor (ISRA): 5.38
IJPESH 2018; 5(4): 06-08
© 2018 IJPESH
www.kheljournal.com
Received: 02-05-2018
Accepted: 03-06-2018

Dr. Monika Verma
Department of Physical
Education, Chaudhary Devi Lal
University, Sirsa Haryana, India

Suman
Ph.D. scholar, Department of
Physical Education, Chaudhary
Devi Lal University, Sirsa
Haryana, India

Family environment of alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson

Dr. Monika Verma and Suman

Abstract

The study examined the family environment of alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson. Sample of 120 subjects (60 alcohol addicted and 60 non-alcohol addicted) was randomly selected from the various university campus and colleges of Haryana in age group of 17-28 years. Who have participated in district, state level, and national and inter-university level sports competitions. The selected interested topics were used to reveal their family environment using standard questionnaire. The results obtained from them were statistically analyzed using mean, standard deviation and t-test. The results proved that there was significant difference between alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted in sub scale cohesion, expressiveness, conflict (relationship dimensions) sub scale independence (personal growth dimensions) and sub scale control (system maintenance dimensions) but no significant difference exist in sub scale acceptance and caring (relationship dimensions), sub scale active- recreational orientation (personal growth dimensions) and sub scale organization (system maintenance dimensions). From these studies we conclude that non-alcohol addicted are much better in cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, independence and control than alcohol addicted sportsperson. But both are similar in acceptance and caring, active- recreational orientation and organization.

Keywords: Family environment, alcohol addicted, non-alcohol addicted, sportsperson

Introduction

Family is oldest and most important to the all institutions that man has designed to control and restore his behaviour as he strives to fulfill his basic needs. In the societies the family is the fundamental institution for socialization of children. The family is essential a unit in which parents and their children live together for overall growth, protection and well-being. In all of the part of world, families perform an important part in socio-economic and cultural affairs. Families continued to provide the natural platform for the demonstrative, financial and other help necessary to the growth and development of their members. As basic agent of socialization, families remain a vital means of conserving and transmitting cultural qualities. According to modern challenge to social, economical and psychological changes family environment becomes a primary essential agent of socialization. The family environment "involves the circumstances and social climate conditions within families. Since each family is made up of different individuals in different positions, each family environment is unique. The environment can differ from many conditions for ex. one understood respect lies in the socio-economic level. The family can have a powerful influence on making the attitude, value and behaviour of children. In many conditions peer and friends may exert a great influence than attitude of parents. Many researchers observed that peer, friends and parental influence are synergistic, with the highest rate of alcohol use being noticed among adolescent whose parents and friends are alcohol users. Therefore, parents exercising traditional family roles may be able to limit the influence of peer groups on children's attitude to alcohol used. So have a crucial influence on children's behaviour.

Objective

1. To study the family environment in comparison of alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson.

Correspondence
Dr. Monika Verma
Department of Physical
Education, Chaudhary Devi Lal
University, Sirsa Haryana, India

Materials and method

Participants

The purpose of the study to analyze the family environment of alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson. To achieve this, 120 subjects were randomly selected from various university campus and colleges of Haryana. All subjects were male with age ranging from 17-28 years, who have participated in district, state, national and inter university level sports competitions. Investigator used survey types to study. Alcohol addicted sportsperson those subjects who used to alcohol occasionally, frequently or daily and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson those subjects who do not used of alcohol in any time.

Method

To measure the family environment of the subjects, Harpreet Singh Bhatia and Chhadha (1993) which contains 69 questions which have five response options was in two forms. In these forms have 41 positive statements and 28 negative

statements. Positive statements assigned as 5 4 3 2 1 and negative statements as 1 2 3 4 5. The questionnaire has three dimensions with eight sub scales. The reliability of the test developed by Split-half method and both face and content validity was tested by giving the scales of eighteen experts to evaluate the test items. The questionnaire was administered among the subjects and responses were scored following the norms.

Statistical technique

The obtained score was subjected to statistical technique for comparison using t-test. In all cases 0.05 levels was fixed as significant level of differences. The data were tabulated and analyzed in the light of objective.

Results: The comparison of alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted in family environment was statistically made through Mean, SD and t-test. The results are shown in Table no 1 to 3.

Table 1: Comparison of mean score of family environment (relationship dimensions) of alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson

Relationship Dimensions sub scales	Group	Mean	SD	t-value
Cohesion	Alcohol addicted	45.63	6.99	2.810*
	Non-alcohol addicted	48.66	9.00	
Expressiveness	Alcohol addicted	29.46	5.04	2.455*
	Non-alcohol addicted	31.96	6.06	
Conflict	Alcohol addicted	41.41	5.10	2.072*
	Non-alcohol addicted	43.75	7.06	
Acceptance and caring	Alcohol addicted	41.46	5.10	0.578 **
	Non-alcohol addicted	40.70	6.77	

*Significant at 0.05 level of significance ** Non significant at 0.05 level of significance

The table no.1 shown that the mean score of alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson in sub scale (Cohesion) are 45.63 and 48.66 and SDs is 6.99 and 9.00 respectively. The t-value is 2.810, which is greater than table value of 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson in sub scale (Expressiveness) are 29.46 and 31.96 and SDs is 5.04 and 6.06 respectively. The t-value is 2.455, which is greater than table value of 0.05 level of significance. The mean scores of alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson in sub scale (Conflict) are 41.41 and 43.75 and SDs is 5.10 and 7.06 respectively. The t-value is 2.072, which is greater than table

value of 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson in sub scale (Acceptance and caring) are 41.46 and 40.70 and SDs is 5.10 and 6.77 respectively. The t-value is 0.578, which is less than table value of 0.05 level of significance. So the null hypothesis i.e. 'there is no significant difference between alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson in family environment (relational dimensions)' is rejected in sub scale cohesion, expressiveness and conflict and accepted in sub scale acceptance and caring (relationship dimensions) of family environment.

Table 2: Comparison of mean score of family environment (personal growth dimensions) of alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson

Personal growth Dimensions sub scales	Group	Mean	SD	t-value
Independence	Alcohol addicted	28.85	4.44	2.12*
	Non-alcohol addicted	30.41	4.49	
Active- Recreational Orientation	Alcohol addicted	29.40	4.11	0.464**
	Non-alcohol addicted	28.95	5.96	

*Significant at 0.05 level of significance ** Non-significant at 0.05 level of significance

The table no.2 shown that the mean score of alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson in sub scale (Independence) are 28.85 and 30.41 and SDs is 4.44 and 4.49 respectively. The t-value is 2.12, which is greater than table value of 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson in sub scale (Active-Recreational Orientation) are 29.40 and 28.95 and SDs is 4.11 and 5.96 respectively. The t-value is 0.464, which

is less than table value of 0.05 level of significance. So the null hypothesis i.e. 'there is no significant difference between alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson in family environment (personal growth dimensions)' is rejected in sub scale independence and accepted in sub scale active-recreational orientation (personal growth dimensions) of family environment.

Table 3: Comparison of mean score of family environment (system maintenance dimensions) of alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson

System maintenance Dimensions sub scales	Group	Mean	SD	t-value
Organization	Alcohol addicted	7.61	2.32	0.578 **
	Non-alcohol addicted	7.86	2.41	
Control	Alcohol addicted	14.91	2.35	2.623*
	Non-alcohol addicted	16.08	2.66	

*Significant at 0.01 level of significance **Non-significant at 0.05 level of significance

The table no.3 shown that the mean score of alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson in sub scale (Organization) are 7.61 and 7.86 and SDs is 2.32 and 2.41 respectively. The t-value is 0.578, which is less than table value of 0.05 level of significance. The mean score of alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson in sub scale (Control) are 14.91 and 16.08 and SDs is 2.35 and 2.66 respectively. The t-value is 2.623, which is greater than table value of 0.05 level of significance. So the null hypothesis i.e. 'there is no significant difference between alcohol addicted and non-alcohol addicted sportsperson in family environment (system maintenance dimensions)' is accepted in sub scale organization and rejected in sub scale control (system maintenance dimensions) of family environment.

Conclusion

This research indicates that non-alcohol addicted sportsperson is good in sub scales cohesion, expressiveness and conflict (relationship dimensions) of family environment but in sub scale acceptance and caring (relationship dimensions) both is equal. Non-alcohol addicted sportsperson has high degree of commitment, help and support family members provided for one another and also have extend to which family members are encouraged to act openly and express their feelings and thought directly. Non-alcohol addicted sportsperson is lived in low conflict family. Conflict sub scale (relationship dimensions) is amount of openly expressed aggression and conflict among family members. High score in conflict indicated low conflict in the family. Non-alcohol addicted is also good in sub scale independence (personal growth dimensions) than alcohol addicted sportsperson. Their family members are assertive and independently make their own decisions. But in sub scale active-recreational orientation (personal growth dimensions) both is equal, their equal role of participation in social and recreational activities. In sub scale organization (system maintenance dimensions) both is equal, their degree of importance of clear organization structures in planning family activities and responsibilities. Non-alcohol addicted sportsperson is also good in sub scale control (system maintenance dimensions) than non-alcohol addicted sportsperson. Because non-alcohol addicted sportsperson is in degree of limit set within a family.

References

1. Bhatia H, CNK. Manual for family environment scale, NPC Agra Psychological agency, 1993.
2. <http://enm.wikipedia.org/wiki/family>.
3. United nations population information network (Popin) UN population division, department of economic and social affairs with support from UN population fund (UNFPA)- united nations www.un.org/popin/icpd/official/RAP/RAP4
4. www.MHAnkyswoh.org/
5. Richard Blum. Horatio Alger's children: The role of the family in origin and prevention of drug risk, San Francisco, Jossey- Boss, 1972.

6. Emery K. the child in family disruption in family functions. In. D.C. & D.J. Cohen (Eds.) developmental psychopathology: Risky disorder and adoption New York; Wiley, 1995; 2:3-31
7. Egeland B, SLA. Attachment and Early Maltreatment, Child Develop. 1981; 52:44-52.