

Differences Between the Achieved Results of the Numerical and Descriptive Evaluated Female Students in the High Schools

Viktor Mitrevski

Differences Between the Achieved Results of the Numerical and Descriptive Evaluated Female Students in the High Schools: The number of the female students involved in this research was 90 numerical evaluated and 92 descriptive evaluated or total 182 female students at the age of 15-16 years who regularly attended the sport and sport's activities schooling in their high schools. In the analysis of the results there were 5 indicators of three sport's disciplines. The achievement's and grade's difference during the research were with multi-variance and univariate analysis of variance (MANOVA, ANOVA).

Key words: grade, achievement, students, numerical, descriptive, evaluation.

INTRODUCTION

One of the hardest parts in the educational process and system is the evaluation. Because there is not one universal evaluating criterion a need is arisen to be found different evaluating criteria without a qualified promptness of the professors. Because of that there are a lot of different evaluation of the appraisal of the students' achievement, knowledge and qualification. The absence of the evaluating standard whatever it is descriptive or numerical is a problem in the educational process.

Our research subject was the female students who regularly attend the sport and sport's activities schooling during the school year 2007/2008. This research's aim was to find the differences between the achievements of the students of the first and second year in the high schools who were appraised by descriptive and numerical grades.

WORKING METHODS

The research is realized by two sub-examples of females students in which the first one was contained of 90 female students numerical appraise, and the second contained 92 female students who were descriptive appraised during the school year, or totally 182 students who regularly attend the schooling.

In the analysis of the results there were 5 indicators of three sport's disciplines: athletics (high start), gymnastics, and basketball. The achievement's and grade's difference during the research were with multi-variance and univariate analysis of variant (MANOVA, ANOVA).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

From the inspection of the Table 1 where there are results from the multi-variance analysis of variance (MANOVA) there is estimated that there are significant differences among the students' achievements of 0, 05. At the base of the gained results of Wilk's Lambda is 0, 93 and with Rao's F approximately 2.70 and the degree of the freedom Df1 = 5.00 and Df2 = 176.00 there is difference of Q = 0.00 (plevel = .00).

Table 1
Multi-variance analysis of the variance between the descriptive and numerical appraised students

Wilks' Lambda	Rao's R	df 1	df 2	p-level
0,928665	2,703863	5	176	0,022144

According to the univariate analysis (ANOVA) of the variance we can see a significant difference at a level of 0.05. Between the others variables there are not noticed another differences.

From these results we can say that the worst results have those students with *jumping over buck* (in sport) and the best results have the students with the *high start*.

Table 2
Univariate analysis of the variance between the descriptive and numerical appraised students

grade	group	X	SD	F	p-level
High start	I gr	4,30	1,146	0,0895	0,7651
	II gr	4,34	0,722		
forward somersault	I gr	4,04	4,044	0,0895	0,7651
	II gr	4,17	4,174		
Jumping over buck	I gr	3,60	1,475	5,0771	0,0255
	II gr	3,15	1,230		
leading A ball	I gr	4,07	0,776	0,1581	0,6913
	II gr	4,11	0,832		
Throwing the ball in the basket wheel	I gr	3,84	0,935	3,1200	0,0790
	II gr	4,07	0,742		

CONCLUSIONS

During the research are noticed significant differences between the numerical and descriptive evaluation of the students:

- in this research there are visible different results of the female students achievements between their numerical and descriptive grades;
- there are no significant differences expect in the jumping over a buck (in sport);
- the best results are achieved in the athletics and the bad in the gymnastics.

LITERATURE

- [1]. Арсић, М. (1996). *Како не оцењивати ученике*. Крагуевац: Весић.
- [2]. Bala, G. (1986). *Logicke osnove metoda za analizu podataka iz istrazivanja u fizičkoj kulturi*. Novi Sad: Sava Muncan.
- [3]. Бабијак, Ј. (1986). Оцењивање моторних способности деце. *Физичка култура*, (Титоград), (1), 59.
- [4]. Filipovic, S. N. (1988). *Didaktika*. Sarajevo: Svetlost – OOUR Zavod za udzbenike i nastavna sredstva.
- [5]. Гонтарев, С., Глигоров, С. и Георгиев, Г. (2001). Ставот на ученичките од прва година опфатени со програмата „фаре“ кон спортот и спортските активности и влијанието на некои социолошки фактори врз нивното формирање. *Физичка култура* (Скопје), (1-2), 40-42.
- [6]. Голубина, Ѓ. и Петковски, Р. (1995). *Пат до објективно оценување*. Скопје: Просветен работник.
- [7]. Клиначаров, И. (2001). *Оптимална поставеност на наставата по физичко и здравствено воспитување во основното образование во Република Македонија*. Докторска дисертација, Скопје: Универзитет „Св. Кирил и Методиј“, Факултет за физичка култура.
- [8]. Majeric, M. (2004). *Analiza modelov ocenivanja sportnih znanj pri sportni vzgoji*. Doktorska disertacija, Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani, Fakulteta za sport.
- [9]. Митревски, Ѓ. (2002). *Физичко воспитување*. Скопје: Работнички универзитет - Кочо Рацин.
- [10]. Митревски, В. (2009). *Критериуми за оценување во наставата по спорт и спортски активности*. Магистерски труд, Скопје: Универзитет „Св. Кирил и Методиј“, Факултет за физичка култура.

- [11]. Поповски, К. (1996). *Современи сфаќања за проверувањето и оценувањето на постигнатите резултати*. Скопје: Мис.
- [12]. Rokita, A. (2001). Interes za sportske aktivnosti učenika prvih razreda srednje škole u razdoblju od 1995. do 2001. godine, *Kineziologija*, 37, (1), 99-105.
- [13]. Саити, Б. (2007). *Оценувањето на моторичките способности како прилог на општата оценка по физичко и здравствено образование за учениците од I-IV одделение во РМ*. Докторска дисертација, Скопје: Универзитет „Св.Кирил и Методиј“, Факултет за физичка култура.
- [14]. Симовски, А. (1974). Во што треба да се усогласиме при оценувањето во физичкото воспитување, *Физичка култура*. (Скопје), (3), 53-65.

For contacts:

Mr. Sci. Viktor Mitrevski, Demir Hisar, Republic of Macedonia, GSM: +389 70 269 252, e-mail: mitrevski_viktor@yahoo.com

Докладът е рецензиран.