



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-55623**

Title: A STUDY ON SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS BETWEEN INTERCOLLEGIATE MENÂ'S AND WOMENÂ'S FOOTBALL PLAYERS

Recommendation:

Accept as it is
Accept after minor revision.....
Accept after major revision
Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity			✓	
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr. P.Manochithra

Detailed Reviewer's Report

General Evaluation

The manuscript addresses an important and relevant issue in sports sociology by examining socio-economic status (SES) differences between intercollegiate men's and women's football players. The topic is timely, particularly in the context of gender equity and access to sports opportunities in higher education. The study attempts to contribute empirical evidence from an Indian setting, which is a positive aspect. However, while the intention and framework of the study are commendable, several methodological, analytical, and presentation-related issues need attention before the manuscript can be considered for publication.

Originality and Significance

The study demonstrates **moderate originality**. While SES and sports participation have been widely studied, gender-based comparison among intercollegiate football players in a regional Indian context provides some novelty. The manuscript contributes incremental knowledge rather than a strongly novel theoretical or methodological advancement. The significance would be enhanced if the authors explicitly positioned the study within existing gender and sports inequality

REVIEWER'S REPORT

literature and clearly articulated how their findings extend or challenge previous research

Literature Review

The introduction provides a broad overview of socio-economic status and its relevance to sports participation. However, the **literature review lacks depth and critical synthesis**. Many references are cited descriptively rather than analytically. The manuscript would benefit from:

- A clearer separation between conceptual discussion and empirical evidence.
- Inclusion of more **recent and gender-focused studies**.
- Explicit identification of research gaps that justify the present study.

Additionally, some paragraphs are overly long and repetitive, particularly those explaining SES scales and classifications, which could be condensed for better readability.

Objectives and Hypothesis

The objective of the study is clearly stated and aligned with the hypothesis. However, the hypothesis is very general. It would be methodologically stronger if:

- Sub-hypotheses were framed for different SES dimensions (education, income, assets, caste, etc.).
- The hypothesis clarified whether the expected difference favored a particular gender based on prior evidence.

Methodology

The methodology section is adequate but requires **greater clarity and justification**:

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- The sample size ($N = 30$) is small, which limits statistical power and generalizability.
- The use of purposive sampling introduces potential selection bias, which is acknowledged but not adequately addressed.
- More information is required regarding the **validity and reliability** of the Bharadwaj (2005) SES scale in the present context.
- Ethical considerations such as informed consent and confidentiality are not mentioned and should be explicitly stated.

Statistical Analysis

The use of an independent sample t-test is appropriate for comparing two groups. The results are presented clearly in tabular form, and the interpretation of p-values is generally correct. However:

- Effect sizes are not reported; inclusion of effect size measures (e.g., Cohen's d) would strengthen the analysis.
- Assumptions of the t-test (normality, homogeneity of variance) are not discussed.
- Minor formatting issues are present in Table 1, and consistency in terminology (e.g., "men team," "women team") should be improved.

Results and Discussion

The results section is well-structured, with clear variable-wise interpretations. However, the **discussion is limited** and largely reiterates the results instead of interpreting them in light of existing literature. The authors should:

- Compare findings with previous national and international studies.
- Provide socio-cultural explanations for why women players showed higher SES in most dimensions.
- Discuss the unexpected non-significant findings (education and income perspectives) more critically.

REVIEWER'S REPORT**Conclusion and Implications**

The conclusion appropriately summarizes the findings and acknowledges limitations such as small sample size and cross-sectional design. This is a strong point of the manuscript. However, practical implications for:

- Sports administrators,
- University policy makers,
- Gender-inclusive sports development

are not sufficiently elaborated and should be strengthened.

Language, Style, and Presentation

The manuscript is **understandable but requires language polishing**. There are grammatical errors, spacing issues, and inconsistencies in formatting (e.g., headings, spacing between words, figure labeling). Professional copy-editing is recommended to enhance clarity and academic tone.

Recommendation**Major Revision Required**

The manuscript has potential for publication after substantial revisions addressing methodological clarity, deeper literature engagement, improved discussion, and language refinement. With these improvements, the study can make a meaningful contribution to the literature on socio-economic status and gender in sports.