



THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ATTITUDES OF SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENT TOWARDS THE SCHOOL SUBJECT PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORTS AND KINESTHETIC INTELLIGENCE

Hatami Omid¹,

Savaş Seyfi²

¹Gazi University,

Educational Science Institute, Turkey

²Gazi University,

Faculty of Physical Education and Sports, Turkey

Abstract:

The purpose of this research is to examine the relationship between the attitudes of secondary school students towards the school subject Physical Education and Sports and kinesthetic intelligence. The study was carried out in the Maragheh province of Iran, Tabriz. In 2015-2016 academic year a total of 324 students (149 girls and 175 boys) in Middle School (Tarbiyat Middle School - Nuredanesh Middle School - Sama Middle School - Sadrossaadat Middle School - Rahe Zeyneb Middle School) participated in the. In order to evaluate the attitudes of the students, the Physical Education Lesson Attitude Scale created by of Mehmet GÜLLÜ and Mehmet GÜÇLÜ was used by the students (Güllü ve Güçlü, 2009). The Multiple Intelligence Observation Form in Dr. Ziya Selçuk's Multiple Intelligence Applications book and also the Form Of Identifying Multiple Intelligence Fields and Evaluation were utilized in this research. It is a 5 - Likert type and consists of 8 subsections belonging to intelligence types in Multiple Intelligences Theory. The kinesthetic intelligence form consists of 10 questions. Data were analyzed using the SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) statistical package program.

Keywords: school sports, physical education teacher, school and sport, the scope of view

1. Introduction

Education is, in general, the process of raising people for specific purposes and one's personality evolves in this process. This transformation takes place through knowledge, skills, attitudes and values acquired during the training process (Sonmez, 2007, p5). Today, schools constitute the most important part of the education. The school subject Physical Education and Sports is the main source of the youth growth which aims at

physical, mental, social and emotional development. This school subject offers conscious and planned activities that are seen as an integral part of general education. It is of utmost importance that physical education courses, which are an integral part of education, are developed in line with the expectations of the individual and society. Physical education programs not only enable to work in school, but also it improves living and learning conditions in the society. In addition, physical education has an impact on the individual's contribution to physical, mental, emotional and social development. (Turğut A., 2014)

In addition, with physical education lessons, individual feel competent in their ability in motor skills, in other words, it is possible to develop basic movements such as running, climbing, self-balancing self, leaping, rolling. As a result, physical education classes, through changes in activity related behaviors, enables body control, coordination and development of the nervous-muscular system also provide mental and psychological harmony. (Turğut A, 2014). According to Demirel et al. (2006), physical education and sport are two concepts that complement each other and are inseparable. It is explicitly stated that developing and strengthening physical and mental health is one of the main purposes of the school subject Physical Education and Sports. Moreover, this subject is an important factor in activating one's unexplored features and creativity. Attitude as a word was first used by Herbert Spencer in 1862 to express the individual's mental state. This concept was also studied by Lange in 1888 in laboratory studies. Later it has become a subject that has been explored and discussed by psychologists and sociologists. This research and discussions have led to the birth of the science of social psychology (Güllü M., Güçlü M. (2009).

Attitudes play an important role in directing human behavior, but they depend on the value and belief system. For this reason, it is very important that the attitudes of the individuals are positive or negative. Negative attitudes negatively affect the future life of the individual. For this reason, if people's opinions about a subject, its environment and activities are known in advance, behaviors can be predicted and corrected.

How the human mind works, how it develops and how it can be measured has been explored by scientists and philosophers from different disciplines for many years. Also many intelligence theories, measurement techniques and tools have been developed. In the past, it was accepted that intelligence was fixed and could not be changed and that it was an inherent feature that remained static throughout a lifetime. However, today's studies suggest that it is possible to improve the mental capacity of people at any age and level of intelligence (Küçükahmet, 2006).

2. Method

2.1 System and Sampling

The system of the research was formed by all the students in the secondary school in the Maragheh district of Iran. The sample was formed from 324 students, including

students from 5 middle schools in the Maragheh district in the spring semester of 2016-2017 education. These students were selected by simple random sampling. These names of the schools are:

1. Rahe Zeyneb middle school;
2. Sadrossaadat;
3. Sama;
4. Tarbiyat;
5. Nuredanesh.

2.2 Data Collection Techniques

In this research, survey technique will be applied as a data collection technique. The first part of the questionnaire consists of 10 questions including personal information and characteristics of the students. The second part consists of 35 questions on physical education lesson attitude scale for students in secondary education. The third part consists of the multiple intelligence observation forms that identifies the physical / kinesthetic intelligence composed of 10 questions.

3. Results

In this section, findings were analyzed according to each sub-problem and presented in table form where detailed explanations were given.

A. What is the state of differentiation of the attitudes of the students to the school subject physical education and sports by gender?

Table 1: The state of differentiation of physical intelligence of students according to their gender

	Gender	N	Average	Deviation	T	P
Attitudes towards Physical Education Class	Female	149	3,35	0,27	,350	0,629
	Male	175	3,34	0,22		
Kinesthetic Intelligence Level	Female	149	3,67	0,56	,271	,787
	Male	175	3,69	0,66		

Quarter	First quarter	Second quarter	Third quarter	Fourth quarter	Total scores
Employee's satisfaction scores					
Frequency	12	10	8	10	40
Percent	30%	25%	20%	25%	100

In the Table 1 independent samples T test was applied according to gender scores of attitudes towards physical education and sports according to gender. As the test results were [$p > .05$] it was determined that the attitudes of students to physical education did not differ according to gender.

When we look at Table 1, we can conclude that the average scores of kinesthetic intelligence of males and females are a little higher in males. In the table independent samples T test was applied according to gender scores of kinesthetic intelligence. As the test results were $[p > .05]$, it was determined that the kinesthetic intelligence of the students did not differ according to gender with 95% confidence.

B. What is the state of differentiation of the attitudes of the students to the physical education and sports courses according to the class levels?

Table 2: The state of differentiation of the physical intelligence of the students according to the class level

	Class Level	N	Average	Std. Deviation	F	P
Attitudes towards Physical Education Class	Grade 6	104	3,39	3,39	2,639	,073
	Grade 7	136	3,32	0,26		
	Grade 8	84	3,33	0,24		
Kinesthetic Intelligence Level	Grade 6	104	3,77	0,55	2,185	,114
	Grade 7	136	3,66	0,66		
	Grade 8	84	3,59	0,62		

According to Table 2, the average score of the 6th grade was higher among the attitudes of the students to the physical education and sports lessons according to their class levels. The attitudes of students to physical education and sports lesson by class level according to these results tested by one-way ANOVA $[p > .05]$ do not show any differentiation.

We see in Table 2 that the average score of the 6th grade was higher among the attitudes of the students to physical education and sports lesson according by class levels. Tested by one-way ANOVA $[p > .05]$, results do not show any differentiation.

C. What is the state of differentiation of the attitudes of the students to the physical education and sports courses according to income status?

Table 3: The state of differentiation of the attitudes of the students to the physical education and sports courses according to income status

Income Status	N	Average	Std. deviation	F	P
700-1000	97	121,3505	17,42	1,383	,248
1001-1500	95	118,8947	17,06	1,383	,248
1501-2000	61	125,0349	18,67	1,383	,248
2001 ve üstü	71	123,8054	18,89	1,383	,248

The attitudes of those with income between 700-1000 TL and 1001-1500 TL towards physical education are significantly lower than those with income levels between 1501-2000 TL and 2001 TL and above. One-Way ANOVA test was applied and according to the test results $[\text{.248} > .05]$, it was determined that the attitudes of the students to the physical education lesson did not differ according to their income status.

D. What is the differentiation of kinesthetic intelligence of students according to income?

Table 4: The differentiation of kinesthetic intelligence of students according to income

Income Status	N	Average	Std. deviation	F	P
700-1000	97	27,927	5,509	0,455	,714
1001-1500	95	27,305	5,674	0,455	,714
1501-2000	61	27,031	4,984	0,455	,714
2001 ve üstü	71	27,626	5,440	0,455	,714

According to Table 4, the level of income status and the average scores of the students' kinesthetic intelligence are very close to each other. One-Way ANOVA test was applied according to the income status scores of the kinesthetic intelligence of the Tabloda students. Test results [$.714 > .05$] showed that there was no change in the students' kinesthetic intelligence according to their income status with 95% confidence

E. Is there a meaningful difference between attitudes towards physical education and sports lessons and kinesthetic intelligence levels according to the sports field in which secondary education students are interested in?

To see whether there was a meaningful difference between attitudes of secondary students towards physical education and sports lesson by sports field and their kinesthetic intelligence level, a one-way analysis of variance test was applied. The results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: The difference between attitudes towards physical education and sports lessons and kinesthetic intelligence levels according to the sports field in which secondary education students

		N	Mean	Std. deviation	F	P
Attitudes towards physical education and sports lesson	Football	92	3,35	0,23	,735	,554
	Basketball	24	3,28	0,28		
	Handball	32	3,34	0,30		
	Volleyball	11	3,36	0,26		
	Swimming	40	3,35	0,22		
	Other	41	3,39	0,25		
Kinesthetic intelligence level	Football	92	3,72	0,64	,617	,687
	Basketball	24	3,67	0,45		
	Handball	32	3,73	0,67		
	Volleyball	11	3,86	0,59		
	Swimming	40	3,74	0,57		
	Other	41	3,57	0,52		

There was no statistically significant difference between the attitudes of the physical education and sports courses and the kinesthetic intelligence level averages ($p > 0.05$).

F. Is there a meaningful difference between attitudes towards physical education and sports lessons and kinesthetic intelligence levels according to the persons who are involved in secondary school education?

According to the people who have encouraged secondary school students to sports they are interested a One-way ANOVA was used .The aim was to determine whether there was a significant difference between attitudes towards physical education and sports lessons and kinesthetic intelligence levels. Results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: The difference between attitudes towards physical education and sports lessons and kinesthetic intelligence levels according to the persons who are involved in secondary school education

		N	Average	Std. deviation	F	P
Attitudes towards physical education and sports lesson	Mother / father	64	3,35	0,27	,385	1,018
	Brother / sister	129	3,36	0,22		
	Physical Education Teacher	24	3,36	0,23		
	Coach	102	3,31	0,26		
Kinesthetic intelligence level	Mother / father	64	3,67	0,58	,604	,613
	Brother / sister	129	3,63	0,71		
	Physical Education Teacher	24	3,68	0,60		
	Coach	102	3,74	0,53		

There was no significant difference between the average of attitudes towards physical education and sports course and the average of kinesthetic intelligence level ($p > 0.05$).

G. Is there a meaningful difference between attitudes towards physical education and sports lessons and levels of kinesthetic intelligence according to whether or not secondary school students’ family members engage in sports?

The families of secondary school students’ attitudes towards physical education and sports lessons and their kinesthetic intelligence levels depending on whether they do sport or not were tested (Table 7). Independent samples were tested by t test.

Table 7: The difference between attitudes towards physical education and sports lessons and levels of kinesthetic intelligence according to whether or not secondary school students’ family members engage in sports

Does anybody do sports in your family?		N	Mean	Std. deviation	T	P
Attitude towards physical education	Yes	155	3,31	0,23	-2,573	,011*
	No	169	3,38	0,25		
Kinesthetic intelligence level	Yes	155	3,34	0,25	-3,846	,000*
	No	169	3,54	0,64		

* $p < 0.05$

There was a significant difference between the families of Secondary school students' attitudes towards physical education and sports lessons and their kinesthetic intelligence levels depending on whether they do sport or not ($p < 0.05$).

H. Is there a meaningful difference between secondary education students 'attitudes towards physical education and sports lessons and kinesthetic intelligence levels according to mothers' educational status?

One-way ANOVA was used to test whether there was a significant difference between secondary school students 'attitudes towards physical education and sports lessons and kinesthetic intelligence levels according to their mothers' educational status (see Table 8.)

Table 8: The difference between secondary education students 'attitudes towards physical education and sports lessons and kinesthetic intelligence levels according to mothers' educational status

		N	Mean	Std. deviation	F	P
Attitudes towards physical education and sports lesson	Illiterate	96	3,33	0,26	,779	,565
	Literate	98	3,36	0,25		
	Primary school	54	3,31	0,27		
	Middle school	51	3,35	0,20		
	High school	11	3,29	0,14		
	Undergraduate	14	3,43	0,22		
Kinesthetic intelligence level	Illiterate	96	3,59	0,60	2,179	,056
	Literate	98	3,75	0,61		
	Primary school	54	3,69	0,57		
	Middle school	51	3,75	0,68		
	High school	11	3,21	0,57		
	Undergraduate	14	3,82	0,66		

According to the educational status of the mothers of the secondary school students, there was no significant difference between the attitudes of the physical education and sports courses and the mean of kinesthetic intelligence level ($p > 0.05$).

I. Is there a meaningful difference between secondary school students' attitudes towards physical education and sports lessons and kinesthetic intelligence levels according to the educational status of their fathers?

The results of the one-way analysis of variance were tested for the presence of a significant difference between secondary school students' attitudes towards physical education and sports lessons and kinesthetic intelligence levels according to the educational status of their fathers (Table 9)

Table 9: The difference between secondary school students' attitudes towards physical education and sports lessons and kinesthetic intelligence levels according to the educational status of their fathers

		N	Mean	Std. deviation	F	P
Attitudes towards physical education and sports lesson	Illiterate	73	3,35	0,23	,307	,908
	Literate	105	3,35	0,28		
	Primary school	76	3,34	0,23		
	Middle school	48	3,36	0,20		
	High school	7	3,30	0,26		
	Undergraduate	15	3,28	0,27		

*p<0.05

		N	Mean	Std. deviation	F	P
Kinesthetic intelligence level	Illiterate	73	3,60	0,68	1,012	,411
	Literate	105	3,74	0,61		
	Primary school	76	3,75	0,65		
	Middle school	48	3,56	0,62		
	High school	7	3,69	0,86		
	Undergraduate	15	3,63	0,50		

*p<0.05

There was no significant difference between the attitudes of physical education and sports course and the average of kinesthetic intelligence level ($p > 0.05$) according to the educational status of parents of secondary school students.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

In this study, Pearson correlation coefficient was used to investigate whether there is a significant relationship between the attitudes of secondary school students towards physical education and sports lesson and kinesthetic intelligence levels. There was a positive mean moderate correlation between the attitudes of secondary education students towards physical education and sports lessons and kinesthetic intelligence levels ($p < 0.05$). In other words, kinesthetic intelligence levels increase as the attitudes of secondary students to physical education and sports lessons increase. Namely, as the attitudes of secondary students towards physical education and sports decrease, kinesthetic intelligence levels also decreases.

Güllü and Korucu (2005) stated that the attitudes of the students to the physical education lesson were generally positive when they examined the opinions of the primary education second graders.

Tasmektepligil, Yılmaz, Imamoğlu, Kılıçgil, (2006) found that students generally liked the lesson. Erkmen et al. (2006) intended to determine the attitudes of private elementary schools students to physical education and sports lessons using different variables. This study found that physical education and sports lessons given in private elementary schools are considered important for the students and their attitudes and opinions towards this course are positive.

In the study carried out by Sisko and Demirhan, primary school and highschool girls and boys were asked to determine their attitudes towards physical education and sports lessons. This study showed that there was a significant difference between the attitude scores of male and female students and the average scores of female students were found to be lower. It is thought that girls behave less extrovertly because of sociocultural reasons and this causes them to do sport less.

Tasgın and Tekin (2009) found that male students' attitudes towards physical education lessons were generally more positive than their female counterparts. According to Koca and Demirhan (2004), the attitude scores of males differed significantly according to the attitude scores of females. Wersch, Trew and Turner (1992) state that the girls in the 11-14 age group have a higher level of interest in physical education than men. These studies show similarity to our findings.

References

1. Aracı, H. (2006). *Okullarda beden eğitimi*. Ankara: Nobel, s.46.
2. Bümen, N. T. (2005). *Okulda çoklu zekâ kuramı*. Ankara: Pegem A.
3. Demirel, Ö. (Ed.). (2007). *Eğitimde yeni yönelimler*. Ankara: Pegem A.
4. Ermiş, E. (2013). *Spor ve çoklu zekâ*. Samsun: Etüt.
5. Gardner, H. (2004). *Zihin çerçeveleri*. İstanbul: Alfa.
6. Gardner, H. (2013). *Çoklu zekâ yeni ufuklar*. İstanbul: Optimist
7. Güllü, M., & Tekin, M. (2009). Spor lisesi öğrencileri ile genel lise öğrencilerinin çoklu zekâ alanlarının karşılaştırılması. *Niğde Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(3), 247-258.
8. Saban, A. (2002). *Çoklu zekâ teorisi ve eğitim*. Ankara: Nobel.
9. Saban, A. (2010). *Çoklu zekâ kuramı ve türk eğitim sistemine yansması*. Ankara: Nobel.
10. Selçuk, Z., Kayılı, H., & Okut, L. (2003). *Çoklu zekâ uygulamaları*. Ankara: Nobel.
11. Yavuz, K. E. (2004). *Eğitim ve öğretimde çoklu zekâ teorisi ve uygulamaları*. Ankara: Ceceli.
12. Yetim, A. (2011). *Sosyoloji ve spor*. Ankara: Berikan.
13. Açak, M. (2005) *Beden eğitimi öğretmeninin el kitabı*. İstanbul: Morpa kültür yayınları
14. Çamlıyer, H. Mavi, H. F. Daşdan, E. N. ve Çamlıyer, H. (2006). *Beden eğitimi dersi uygulamalarında öğretim stil ve yaklaşımlarının çoklu zekâ kuramına ilişkin kullanımı*. 4. Ulusal Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Sempozyumu. 10-11 Haziran. Bursa. 54-65.
15. Demirci, A. (2008) *İlköğretimde beden eğitimi dersi etkinlikleri (4-8. Sınıflar yeni öğretim programı)*. Ankara: Nobel yayın dağıtım.
16. Demirci, A. (2006) *İlköğretimde beden eğitimi uygulamaları*. İstanbul: Değişim yayınları.
17. Demirel, Ö.,Başbay, A.ve Erdem, E. (2006). *Eğitimde çoklu zekâ kuram ve uygulama*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

15. Saban, A. (2005). *Çoklu zekâ teorisi ve eğitim*. 5. Baskı. Nobel Yayın.
16. Saban, A. (2009). *Öğrenme Öğretme Süreci*. 5. Baskı. Ankara: Nobel Yayın.
17. Vural, B. (Editör). (2005). *Öğrenci merkezli eğitim ve çoklu zekâ*. 3. Baskı. İstanbul: Hayat yayıncılık.
18. Aracı, H. (1999). "Okullarda Beden Eğitimi". Bağırhan Yayınevi, Ankara.
19. Çamlıyer, H., Mavi F, Dasdan, N.E. ve Çamlıyer, H. (2005). "Beden Eğitimi Dersi Uygulamalarında Öğretim Stil ve Yaklaşımlarının Çoklu Zekâ Kuramına İlişkin Kullanımı", 4. Ulusal Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Sempozyumu, 10-11 Haziran 2005, Bursa.
20. Duman S., Önal N.A., ve Taşgın Ö. (2003). "Özel Öğretim Sınıflarında Beden Eğitimi Dersi Öğretim Programının Öğretmen Görüşleri ile Değerlendirilmesi", 3. Ulusal Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Olimpik Eğitim ve Spor Kültürü Sempozyumu, Tayyare Kültür Merkezi, Bursa Ofset Tesisleri, 23-24 Mayıs 2003, Bursa.
21. Özyigit, C. (1991). "Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmeninin Bugünkü Eğitim Sistemi içindeki Yeri ve Önemi". 1. Eğitim Kurumlarında Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Sempozyumu (19-21 Aralık 1991 İzmir), İzmir, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Okul içi Beden Eğitimi Spor ve İzcilik Dairesi Başkanlığı, Milli Eğitim Basımevi 1992. 77-82.
22. Piaget J. (1964). "Development and Learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching", 2, 176-186.
23. Tuğrul B., Duran E. (2003). "Her Çocuk Başarılı Olmak İçin Bir Şansa Sahiptir: Zekanın Çok Boyutluluğu Çoklu Zeka Kuramı", Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 24: 224-233.
24. Yavaş, M. ve İlhan, A. (1997). "Beden Eğitimi ve Sporda Özel Öğretim Yöntemleri", Bursa Melisa Matbaacılık, 2. Baskı.
25. Baysal, A. C., Tekarslan, E. (1996). *Davranış Bilimleri*. (2. Baskı). İstanbul: Avcıol Basım Yayın.
26. Baysal, A. C. (1981). *Sosyal ve Örgütsel Psikolojide Tutumlar*. İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi.
27. Demirhan, G., Altay, F. (2001). *Lise Birinci Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Beden Eğitimi ve Spora İlişkin Tutum Ölçeği II*. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri ve Teknolojisi Yüksekokulu. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*. Cilt 12, sayı GÜNEY, S. (1998). *Davranış Bilimleri ve Yönetim Psikolojisi Terimler Sözlüğü*. Ankara: Ocak Yayınları
28. İnceoğlu, M. (2000). *Tutum Algı İletişim*. Ankara: Verso Yayıncılık
29. Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1999). *Yeni İnsan ve İnsanlar*. İstanbul: Evrim Yayınevi
30. Ülgen, G. (1995). *Eğitim Psikolojisi: Birey ve Öğrenme*. Ankara: Bilim Yayıncılık
31. Çamlıyer, H., Mavi, H.F., Daşdan, E.N. ve Çamlıyer, H. (2005). *Beden eğitimi dersi uygulamalarında öğretim stil ve yaklaşımlarının çoklu zeka kuramına ilişkin 138 kullanımı*. Bursa: 4. Ulusal Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Sempozyumu, 10-11 Haziran.

32. Holođlu, O.G. (2006). İlköđretim İkinci Kademedede Öđrenim Gören Kız Öđrencilerin Beden Eğitimi Dersine Karşı Tutumları. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Bursa:Uludađ Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
33. Lazear, D. (2000). The Intelligent Curriculum. New York: Zephyr Press.
34. BaŞbay A. Çoklu Zekâ Kuramına Göre Eğitimi Programları ve Sınıf içi Etkinliklerin İncelenmesi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2000.
35. Katz J, Miranda P, Auerbach S. Instructional Strategies and Educational Outcomes for Students with Development Disabilities in Inclusive "Multiple Intelligences" and Typical Inclusive Classroom, Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities. International Journal of Special Education. 2002; 27 (4): 227-238.
36. Küçükahmet L. Öđretim İlke ve Yöntemleri. Ankara, Nobel Yayınları. 2006.
37. Temiz N. Çoklu Zeka Kuramı Okulda ve Sınıfta. Ankara, Nobel Yayın Dađıtım. 2007.
38. Özgüven, İ.E. (1994). Psikolojik Testler. Ankara: Yeni Dođuş Matbaası.
39. Özyiđit, C. (1991). Eğitimi Kurumlarında Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Sempozyumu, Bildiriler, Paneller, Tartışmalar. T.C. Milli Eğitimi Bakanlığı Okul İçi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor İzcilik Dairesi Başkanlığı: İzmir, Milli Eğitimi Basımevi. 78.
40. Şişko, M., Demirhan, G. (2002). İlköđretim okulları ve liselerde öđrenim gören kız ve erkek öđrencilerin beden eğitimi ve spor dersine iliŞkin tutumları.Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitimi Fakültesi Dergisi, 23, 205-210.
41. Vural, B. (2004). Öđrenci Merkezli Eğitimi ve Çoklu Zeka. İstanbul: Hayat Yayıncılık.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).