

**PROCEEDINGS OF  
FISU/CESU CONFERENCE  
UNIVERSIADE '87 ZAGREB  
YUGOSLAVIA**



**FISU**



**UNIVERSIADE '87 ZAGREB**

# SPORT ACTIVITY PREFERENCES AND STUDENT ATTITUDES ABOUT PHYSICAL EDUCATION IN SPLIT

D. BONACIN and Z. KOSINAC

*University of Split, Fac. of Philosophy Zadar, OOUR Split, Yugoslavia*

## AN INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM

Physical activity is one of most important factors in health preservation and advancement, and in regular development too. Undoubtedly it is supposition for all human activities, and important quality of living determinance. Therefore, these incontestable values have to be under the social task and care. Just those logical premisses based on scientific founded information system, bring up to modern understanding conception of physical and hygienic education array (PHE in text above), formed like a Program bases – 1984. Program characteristics for student population are attached, of course, on bio-psycho-social peculiarities, and a special importance is directed to contacts which are based on free appropriation subjects in proces of education. A recurrent information which gives us important answers of corresponding student attitudes is of paramount importance. It seems that continual aim of actions in this education array is hit very very good, and is absolutely to hold on (6). It seems necessary to include students in proces, more than a pasive realisation is, specially because of their active, positive and objective attitudes inn physical education. Meanwhile, those conscious and positive student position of PHE is not necessary actual in sport. They are, maybe, not so critical and objective in sport discipline estimation, because it is well known that society heavily keeps appropriate control of evaluation system in sport. It is very interesting and of a practical significance to get informations about differences in student attitudes of PHE, based on group identification, or of preferences to sport discipline, respectively. Precious indexes are, maybe right here, to derive suggestions for better way of organisation, in education and sport, and is maybe a chance of qualitative move forward.

## METHODOLOGY

There was a sample of 505 students from Split (school fo economics, civil engineering, chemical engineering, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, shipbuilding, higher nautical, philosophy), with physical education teaching organised. Students were age of 19–22, and without expressing differences in social array. Both, a female (260), and male (245) students were analised together, because of information completivity, and the fact is that latent characteristics were higher congruent (6). Students of pre-school training, physical education and army education schools were excluded from sample; because of understandable peculiarities. Variables for student attitude estimation of PHE were formed to describe almost complete metodics and didactics system:

- 1 – EIAT estimation of individual activity in teaching process
- 2 – CPCF contents of Physical culture in the sstudents free time
- 3 – PEPC possibilities of expression in physical culture
- 4 – QTAS general quality of teaching environment
- 5 – QOEQ quality of equipment
- 6 – QSMS judge of social material support
- 7 – JTEX teacher as expert
- 8 – JTEP judge of a teacher as a good pedagogue
- 9 – JTGC teachers general culture information level
- 10 – SPOO support of PHE in other school obligations
- 11 – SPWP transfer of PHE values in future working process
- 12 – SETH everyday training habits forming
- 13 – TEDP educational task of PHE
- 14 – TSOP judge of social quality of PHE
- 15 – THHQ health-hygienic qualities of PHE
- 16 – SPEC sport and PHE qualities comparison
- 17 – OPEC comparison of PHE and other school teachings
- 18 – AONM attitude of numeric mark
- 19 – AODM attitude of descriptive mark
- 20 – APCS activity of School physical culture society
- 21 – HPOS hours in physical activities out of the school

All treated questions were in 7 grade scale form. The answers absolutely in agreement with individual problem, were graduated as maximum in the preliminary procedures. That means all variables were with a positive metric orientation. Presented sport disciplines (as a criterion of the group identification) represents almost total offer in treated milieu. Result interpretation was made on the basis of differencess of groups inn attitude variables. For differences identification, a clasic multivariate discriminant analysis was done, and a univariate analysis of variance, too.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Although 26 groups of students were analysed, in 21 variable, in multidimensional array only one significant discriminant function was derived. This is unexpectedly only for a moment, but shows us, that in the student groups powerful attitude generators are existed. Original variable projections on discriminant function (Table 1) almost all are on the significant level. And are positive, which confirms a theory of a steady attitude generators derived from preferences about sport disciplines. Canonical discriminant coefficient is middle height, which represents steady support for conclusion makings. Groups are different, of course, and on the basis of centroids we can generally register 3 subgroups of preferences:

- I – basketball, gymnastics, athletics, football, body building
- II – alpinism, yachting, karate, waterpolo, weight lifting, judo parachute jumping, rowing, archery, bowling, rugby, diving, chess, rhythmic, motoring, bicycling
- III – swimming, tennis, volleyball, handball, table tennis

In the first group obviously are classified students with inclination for sports which are given most frequently in education process. Conclusion is that choice is primarily educationally determined. The second subgroup activities seems to unite two main characteristics. They are technical and technological supply as one and other is a personality – conative mechanism manifestations which results with self-dominance and maybe with aggressivity. Mostly the individual sports are present, and problem situations solvent is connected with object manipulations. A complex latent risks are present too, and a fatal errors are extremely expensive. We can easily recognise a cluster of conventionally »female« known sports, in the third subgroup, which are treated as »not so heavy« or strenuous and with some esthetic note. Structure of discriminant function shows us, meanwhile, that those differences are principally produced from two sources. First and most important is individual, personal judge about physical activity. Highest saturations are HPOS, APCS, SETH, PEPC, CPCF which means that only valid way is to educate entities in independently free time organisation in Physical culture. Secondary all other attitudes are expressed. Students are interesting in self wishes accomplishing, in the first place, and in affirmation which can be realised by sport. Seems to be that environment inclines toward patriarchal relations which explains minor participation of women in sport. Self activity in moving needs satisfaction is very important and specially because of social array spreading. Educational and pedagogical influence of teacher is reduced, and is growing up a complexity of outside influences problem, which may cause an offered values variations. It is possible that inappropriate control may result in accidental choices, which are not necessarily suitable with individual capabilities, depending of short-time surroundings ambitions. Student attitude differences nature in this experiment, seems possible to explain exactly the value system which is to be conflicted with education system and even the individual needs and interests. It is necessary to invest labour and time for better integration the sport in Physical culture on the whole, and for scientific validation of sport activities in keeping with mesologic, medicine, psycho-social, health aspects primarily.

Table 1: RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS

Wilks lambda = .272  
 DF1=525 DF2 = 7483  
 F=1.1988 P = .0019

	Structure	Analysis of variance		Centroids
		F	P	
1. EIAT	.308	1.623	.030	SWIMMI -.35
2. CPCF	.411	1.841	.009	BASKET .60
3. PEPC	.524	1.948	.005	TENIS -.24
4. QTAS	.345	1.820	.010	ATLETI .20
5. QOEQ	.240	1.230	.206	FOOTBA .12
6. QSMS	.044	.799	.746	ALPINI -.06
7. JTEX	.248	1.286	.162	GYMNAS .42
8. JTEP	.257	1.980	.004	YACHTI -.05
9. JTGC	.398	1.766	.013	VOLEYB -.27
10. SPOO	.333	1.556	.043	MOTORI -.11
11. SPWP	.290	1.426	.084	HANBA -.12
12. SETH	.524	1.883	.007	TABLET -.22
13. TEDP	.373	1.257	.183	KARATE .08
14. TSOP	.384	1.510	.055	WATERP -.05
15. THHQ	.314	.999	.533	WEIGHT -.04
16. SPEC	.065	1.305	.149	PARACH .00
17. OPEC	.244	.864	.657	BODYBU .13
18. AONM	.407	1.790	.012	BICYCL -.12
19. AODM	.082	1.054	.394	JUDO -.03
20. APCS	.546	2.114	.002	ROWING .04
21. HPOS	.619	2.474	.000	ARCHER -.02
				BOWLIN .01
				RUGBY .06
				DIVING .01
				CHESS -.04
				RHYTHM .03

## DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION SIGNIFICANCE;

R	R2	ROOT	LAMBDA	HI	DF	P
.455	.207	.260	.793	625.42	525	.010

## CONCLUSION

Conclusion is very simple: Let us be health and heappy! Let us choose what we need and what we like!

## LITERATURE

1. HALL, C.S., Lindzey G. 1978. Theories of personality. John W. and Sons. New York.
2. HOŠEK, A. 1972. Utjecaj strukture ličnosti na stupanj angažiranosti u sportu i stavove prema sportu kod maloljetnih delikvenata I. Kineziologija. 2 (2) : 59-78.
3. HOŠEK, A. 1973. Utjecaj strukture ličnosti na stupanj angažiranosti u sportu i stavove prema sportu kod maloljetnih delikvenata II. Kineziologija. 3 (1) : 107-116.
4. HOŠEK, A., Petrović, K., Momirović K., Horga, S. 1982. Povezanost sportske aktivnosti sa nekim činiocima koji utječu na proces socijalizacije. Kineziologija. 13 (1-2) : 99-102.
5. HOŠEK, M.A. 1979. Utjecaj socioloških karakteristika na motoričke sposobnosti. Kineziologija. 9 (1-2) : 107-124.
6. KOSINAC, Z., Bonacin, D. 1986. Model stavova i interesa subjekata obuhvaćenih naslovom tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture. SFK Split. Split.
7. KVAŠČEV, R. 1983. Razvijanje kreativnog ponašanja ličnosti. Svjetlost. Sarajevo.
8. LAYMAN, E. 1984. Doprinos igre i sporta nacionalnom zdravlju ed. Kane, J.E.: Psihologija i sport. Nolit. Beograd.
9. SAKSIDA, S., Petrović, K. 1972. Teoretični model socialne stratifikacije. Teorija in praksa. 9 (1) 1407-1419.