



Priority values survey in different men's sports

UDC 159.9:796.01+159.922.1 (045)



T.F. Vostroknutova¹

PhD, Associate Professor **S.I. Vostroknutov**¹

PhD, Associate Professor **M.G. Savelyeva**¹

¹Udmurt State University, Izhevsk

Corresponding author: vostroknutova.tf@mail.ru

Abstract

Objective of the study was to survey and analyze priority values specific for different men's sports.

Methods and structure of the study. We sampled for the survey three groups of athletes (n=90) representing the following men's sports: Group 1 (G1): martial artists (n=30); Group 2 (G2): cyclists (n=30); and Group 3 (G3): fitness club members (n=30). The priority values of the sample were rated by the M. Rokeach Human Values survey method [4], with the test data processed by the rank distribution analysis to obtain terminal/ goal values. To obtain significant survey data, we requested the sample to rank the presently relevant "real" values, and then the desired "ideal" values. We provisionally grouped the 18 priority values ranks into (1) priority values module: ranks 1 to 6; (2) neutral values module: ranks 7 to 12; and (3) rejected values module: ranks 13 to 18.

Results and conclusion. Our survey and analysis of the sport-specific priority values in a few men's sports give grounds for the following conclusions:

- Two types of the M. Rokeach rank distribution for "real" and "ideal" priority values were found beneficial for the individual priority values differentiation and analyzing purposes;
- The modular priority value structure in three sports groups was found virtually identical that may be interpreted as indicative of the similar social and vocational worldviews with the set of specific, private, interpersonal and activity values; and
- Rankings of the values in transition from the real to ideal ones were found to change towards the private life related values, including the adaptive ones.

Keywords: *athletes' priority values, values system, value orientations, values, terminal/ goal values.*

Background. Modern societies give a growing priority to values viewed as a kind of integrator with the fundamental function of a consolidation factor – since the common values accepted by a social majority heavily contribute to the communal integrity and stability; and this holds true for the ongoing social structuring process in Russia.

In the psychological domain, priority values appear directly correlated with volitional processes, with a special role played by their regulatory function in the needs, goals and motivations formation process. Priority values determine the individual actions and behaviors and the worldviews on the whole, which is particularly relevant nowadays. Priority values also shape

up the individual practical attitudes to reality including conscious positioning in the interpersonal relations, social environments and self-esteem domain [2].

Objective of the study was to survey and analyze priority values specific for different men's sports.

Methods and structure of the study. We sampled for the survey three groups of athletes (n=90) representing the following men's sports: Group 1 (G1): martial artists (n=30); Group 2 (G2): cyclists (n=30); and Group 3 (G3): fitness club members (n=30). The priority values of the sample were rated by the M. Rokeach Human Values survey method [4], with the test data processed by the rank distribution analysis to obtain terminal/ goal values. To obtain meaning-



ful survey data, we requested the sample to rank the presently relevant “real” values, and then the desired “ideal” values. We provisionally grouped the 18 priority values ranks into (1) priority values module: ranks 1 to 6; (2) neutral values module: ranks 7 to 12; and (3) rejected values module: ranks 13 to 18.

Results and discussion. The study found the following priority values in every sports group: interesting job, happy family life, and health; and the following rejected values: entertainment, beauty of nature and arts, other people’s happiness, and creativity.

Further priority values analysis found the following intergroup differences. Martial artists of G1 complemented the above priority values by public recognition – that was ranked among the rejected values by G2 and G3. Cycling G2 was found to rank self-confidence on top of the priority values set; whilst G3 preferred freedom and active life (ranked among neutral and rejected values by the other two groups). Note that the intergroup differences were rated statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) by the Mann-Whitney U-test.

Furthermore, the priority values were grouped into the following eight modules: (1) Specific values: health, happy family life, friends, financial security; (2) Abstract values: progress, creativity, freedom, cognition; (3) Personal: entertainment, friends, health, love, happy family life; (4) Professional success: interesting job, cognition, creativity, productive life, active life; (5) Interpersonal (IP): happiness of other people, public recognition, friends, family life; (6) Individual values: financial security, freedom, active life, health, entertainment, creativity; (7) Active values: freedom, active life, productive life, interesting job; and (8) Passive values: self-confidence, cognition, common wisdom, and beauty of nature and arts.

The survey data classified by the above 8 priority values modules were used to make the sport-specific

psychological profiles. Table hereunder gives the average modular priority values ranks for the sports groups.

The above data give grounds for the following general conclusions on the sport-specific real priority values (with the intergroup differences tested meaningful at $p < 0.05$): (1) The priority values structure (distribution of the modular priority values by ranks in every group) was found virtually identical for the three groups; (2) The sample was found to prioritize the specific values, personal life values, interpersonal relations values and active values; (3) The groups differed in the analysis of three priority value modules in the following aspects: G1 prioritized the interpersonal values; G2 passive values; and G3 active values. These results can unlikely be interpreted unambiguously, albeit the priority value ranks in the groups definitely tend to be sports-specific, i.e. dictated by the sports standards.

Next stage of the study was designed to rank the ‘ideal’ terminal values to analyze, among other things, the empirical differences between the “real” and “ideal” values sets [3].

The transition from the “real” to “ideal” values was associated with the following changes: G1 showed a drop (devaluation of subjective significance) of the public recognition from 8.3 to 10.4 in the average ranking; and growth of financial security from 9.0 to 7.3. G2 showed drops in value of interesting job from 8.4 to 10.2 in the average ranking, and cognition from 9.0 to 10.4; with a simultaneous growth of the financial security from 9.4 to 7.3. And G3 was tested with a growth of the financial security rank from 9.9 to 5.8 and drops in friendship (7.8 to 9.5) and freedom (8.5 to 10.2) rankings. On the whole, the “ideal” values system of the three groups showed a higher contribution of the financial security versus the “real” values set.

Table 1. Sport-specific modular priority values with the average group ranks: real values

Module	G1	Rank	G2	Rank	G3	Rank
1	Specific	4,0	Specific	5,5	Specific	5,3
2	Personal	5,4	Active	6,0	Personal	6,6
3	Interpersonal	7,5	Personal	6,8	Passive	7,6
4	Active	9,5	Professional success	8,4	Interpersonal	10,3
5	Individual	10,0	Interpersonal	9,3	Individual	10,4
6	Professional success	10,0	Abstract	9,5	Active	10,5
7	Passive	11,6	Individual	10,0	Professional success	10,9
8	Abstract	12	Passive	11,8	Abstract	11,3



Therefore the focused psychological tests found the sample giving preference to a financially secure life, happy family and love. Of special interest was the finding that the "ideal" values set of the athletic sample was free of the professional values as such being apparently driven by the job-related motivations only with exclusively functional aspects lacking the vocational ones.

Conclusion. Our survey and analysis of the sport-specific priority values in a few men's sports give grounds for the following conclusions:

– Two types of the M. Rokeach rank distribution for "real" and "ideal" priority values were found beneficial for the individual priority values differentiation and analyzing purposes;

– The modular priority value structure in three sports groups was found virtually identical that may be interpreted as indicative of the similar social and vocational worldviews with the set of specific, private, interpersonal and activity values; and

– Rankings of the values in transition from the real to ideal ones were found to change towards the private life related values, including the adaptive ones.

References

1. Vostroknutova T.F. Structure of value preferences of students of classical university [Electronic resource] *Kazanskiy pedagogicheskiy zhurnal*. 2009. No. 11/12. pp. 129-134.
2. Klimov E.A. Psychology of professional self-determination. Moscow: Akademiya publ., 2004. 304 p.
3. Leontiev D.A. Sense psychology: nature, structure, dynamics. Moscow: Smysl publ., 2007, 512 p.
4. Greben N.F. Psychological tests for professionals. Minsk: Sovremennaya Shkola publ. 2007. 496 p.