

Structure of sport culture and objective reality

Rachel Clark^{1, a, *}, Wang Lili^{2, b},

¹Flat 1, 123 High Street, Manchester, M1 2AB, UK

²Hunan Normal University College of Physical Education, No. 36 Lushan Road, Changsha City, Hunan Province, 410081, China

a.manchester@clarkemail.uk, b.hunnucpe@changsha.hunan.cn

***Corresponding Author**

Abstract: Structuralism and objective reality has long been outdated for western academic research, but they are necessary parts for the research on domestic sport culture. The paper firstly deeply analyzed some conclusions of objective reality of sport culture. Then it pointed out the orientation, the puzzle of self-properness and indicated its way out. Finally it attempted to outline the tentative profile of structure of sport culture and objective reality from both perspectives of Monism-Pluralism and Parallel-Hierarchic.

Keywords: sport culture, culture structure, objective reality, trinary division, culture theory, the puzzle of self-properness

1. Introduction

At present, an awkward situation is faced by sports culture researchers in China: as sports culture-related research becomes more abundant, its essence becomes increasingly hollow. The study of this topic is facing a severe aesthetic fatigue [1]. Two prescriptions can alleviate the aesthetic fatigue of the research on this topic: seeking novelty and seeking depth. "Seeking novelty" is to prioritize the demand for difference over the demand for uniformity, boldly adopt new theories and new frameworks, break through disciplinary barriers, and create a new situation for sports culture research [2]; "seeking depth" is to make philosophical dialysis of the conclusions of sports culture research, and refine and extend them backwards, to make the research deep and thorough. Both paths exist simultaneously and develop over time.

As for the subjective reality of sports culture, Guo Yuan Bing (2015) innovatively presupposed a psychological structure of sports culture; used a psychological lexicon method to establish an adjective vocabulary library representing sports culture; and then extracted a 6D-12F psychological structure of sports culture through factor analysis [3]. In addition to innovative research, the study of the structure of sports culture urgently needs in-depth research, especially in theoretical depth. Li Yong qin et al. (2007) pointed out that sports culture research lacks logic and depth in basic theory when sorting out the state of domestic sports culture research over four years [4]. In addition to the perspective of subjective reality, the structure of sports culture can also be explored from the perspective of objective reality.

The understanding of subjective reality is to regard the structure of sports culture as a subjective reality constructed by some related social members' personal subjectivity; the criteria for objective reality are more diversified, including the conventional correspondence theory, propositional logical consistency, knowledge usefulness, and knowledge commonality. In view of the aesthetic fatigue of the theme research under the objective reality (mainly the correspondence theory standard), the author first conducts an in-depth analysis of the so-called objective reality conclusions of the sports culture structure; then, makes a holistic analysis of the sports culture structure research from the perspective of self-consistency dilemma under the objective reality; and finally, tentatively proposes a specific concept of the objective reality of the sports culture structure.

2. Sports culture structure reality study

2.1. Pang Pu's "one divided into three doctrine" variation

The tripartite structure of culture (material, institutional, and spiritual) was first developed by Pang Pu (1986) as an application of the dialectical "One Divided into Three" theory to the structure of culture [5]. Since then, the terms material culture, institutional culture, and spiritual culture have been overused in various cultural structure analyses. According to this approach, the structure of sports culture is composed of sports material culture, sports institutional culture, and sports spiritual culture. This ostensibly objective conclusion appears widely and unconditionally in a vast array of literature. Even the so-called campus sports culture structure, red sports culture structure, rural sports culture structure, etc., are also constituted by "×× sports material layer, ×× sports institutional layer, and ×× sports spiritual layer." Conclusions that are not examined in their premises are not credible [6]. Regarding the "one" and the "many," philosophy has always been a matter of dispute. Although Pang Pu's "One Divided into Three" theory has been warmly welcomed, it is also a single point of view. In fact, the academic community has always had ongoing discussions and disputes about the tripartition theory. For example, Xiao Tai Tao (2001) believes that "One Divided into Three" is a phenomenon and not an essential form [7]; Liu Yi Xiang (2002) believes that the tripartition theory is not a universal form of dialectics, but only applicable to the oppositional relationship of formal logic [8]. It can be seen that the tripartite method of culture does not have universal significance. Similarly, the tripartite structure of sports culture is not an objective reality.

Nevertheless, the arbitrary conclusion that regards the tripartite structure of sports culture as an objective reality is rampant in all kinds of research. Engels, when analyzing the reasons for the emergence of German vulgar materialism after the 1840s, pointed out that the metaphysical method "was theoretically destroyed by Kant, especially Hegel, but due to inertia and the lack of another simple method, it has been able to continue to exist in practice"[9]. The existence and proliferation of the "×× sports culture" tripartite structure (material, institutional, and spiritual) is also one of the manifestations of vulgar materialism. The sports academic community must have the courage to resist such simple and crude thinking, break the arbitrary and ignorant, and improve the level of theoretical discernment.

2.2. The fallacy of cultural theories

Cultural theories are fraught with fallacies, which to some extent interfere with the objective reality research of the structure of sports culture, among which cultural status theory is the first to be implicated. For instance, when Marxism offers a materialistic understanding of industrial society, culture is seen as a derivative superstructure built on a decisive economic base, leading to accusations that Marx held an anti-cultural stance [10]. This has resulted in the study of the structure of sports culture being squeezed into the non-material category, where objective reality no longer exists. It is when culture is endowed with the status of a social fact, such as Durkheim's theory of cultural facts and Williams's cultural materialism, that the premise and presupposition for the objective reality category of the structure of sports culture are established.

Dualism is another reason that mired the objective reality research of the structure of sports culture. The essence of the dualistic opposition model is the deeply rooted binary thinking in the West, a tradition questioned by Lévi-Strauss in the field of culture. "Nature" typically describes phenomena that arise spontaneously, while "culture" describes the provisions of acquired humanities. However, the incest taboo transcends the distinction between the two: it is both natural and cultural. Binary thinking is powerless in the face of this. In concrete research and practical fields, the issue of the structure of sports culture is also repeatedly discussed and questioned. Research on sports culture needs to break the dualistic way of thinking and urgently seek an integrated or balanced way of thinking, which remains to be examined.

Additionally, the inherent dilemmas of cultural structuralism keep the study of the structure of sports culture going in circles. Cultural structuralism is like a Beethoven quartet; no matter who understands or performs this already composed piece of music, there is always a standard, unchanging normal pattern to this piece, a viewpoint also known as the "objectivist view of culture" (correspondence theory) [11]. Despite this, structuralism, due to its synchronic presupposition, underestimates the dynamic changes in culture. Similarly, the structure of sports culture cannot remain the same. In this sense, any structuralism

that is anti-historicist or anti-genealogical is enamored with the claim of an absolute beginning, ultimately endowing a non-temporal logic. Furthermore, the objective reality paradigm of the structure of sports culture is also criticized for cultural Eurocentrism.

3. The Self-consistency dilemma of objective reality

3.1. Manifestations of the Self-consistency dilemma

The essence of the self-consistency dilemma lies in the ontological presupposition of the contraction of the domain, the absolute claim in theoretical construction, and the one-sided focus on rational construction [12]. The study of the objective reality of the structure of sports culture is predicated on the claim of scientific rationality. It assumes that the structure of sports culture exists independently of subjective will and can be recognized through empirical paths. In actual research, many issues have arisen, such as the contraction of content and function, the opposition between scientific rationality and humanistic rationality, and the ambivalent attitude towards the promotion or rejection of formal logic. In other words, the study of the objective reality of the structure of sports culture lacks legitimacy in theoretical presupposition, theoretical purpose, and the actual research process, facing a self-consistency dilemma.

Firstly, it is difficult to distinguish between the broad sense of sports culture and physical culture, sports culture, and the objects and systems related to sports [13]. The narrow definition of sports culture is confined to the subjective thinking and value level, which is not compatible with objective reality. Secondly, the structure of sports culture is confused with superficial forms. Structure transcends form, yet the structure of sports culture is confused with the tripartite form similar to sports culture. In addition, the way to obtain the structure of sports culture has "bloomed flowers that do not bear fruit." This is because the research methods in the study of the structure of sports culture have not been able to break through the barriers of disciplines, and the research methods are limited to some simple theoretical analyses [2]. Therefore, the study of the objective reality of the structure of sports culture shows a collapse of rationality in ontology, epistemology, and methodology.

As Whitehead said: All efforts of logical construction should be used to demonstrate the self-evident basic truths about the nature of things and their interrelationships. Logical proof starts from the premise, and the premise is based on evidence [14]. In other words, both the legitimacy of construction and the clarity of argumentation are indispensable; otherwise, the theory will inevitably fall into a self-consistency dilemma. The dual weakness of the objective reality of the structure of sports culture in presupposition construction and argumentation directly leads to the current innate deficiencies and acquired disorders shown in the research on this topic, thereby causing the theme that should have inspired great research value to suffer from aesthetic fatigue. Therefore, this theme should start from the self-consistency dilemma and seek a way out and redemption.

3.2. Ways out of the Self-consistency dilemma

In terms of theoretical presuppositions, the implementation of the objective reality paradigm of the structure of sports culture must consistently clarify the self-evident logical starting point and build a legitimate theory from it. Structuralism is a trend of thought in the humanities that emerged in the French intellectual community in the 1960s, in opposition to phenomenology and existentialism. To be precise, structuralism is mainly a method, without the determination of subjectivity or objectivity [15]. The structure of sports culture can have an objective structure as well as a subjective structure; the two are not in conflict and complement each other to approach the "truth" of the structure of sports culture. The presupposition of the objective reality of the structure of sports culture refers to the objective ontology in philosophy or Durkheim's social facts in sociology. Clarifying this point is key to getting out of the self-consistency dilemma.

In terms of research methods, the objective reality paradigm of the structure of sports culture must boldly break through disciplinary barriers and free itself from the constraints of over-reliance on a single method. Specifically, on the one hand, it is necessary to continue to refine textual methods, and on the other hand, it is necessary to conduct multidisciplinary thinking research. The sports academic community, to achieve this, especially needs to enhance the cultural identity, academic literacy, and ideological

concepts of the research subjects. As for the historical dimension of the structure of sports culture, the structuralist method presupposes synchronicity, ignoring diachronicity. The evolution of the structure of sports culture can be suspended, and other frameworks can be used to regulate it.

It should be emphasized that the objective reality of the structure of sports culture cannot be measured solely by the "correspondence theory" of truth. In addition to the "correspondence theory" of truth, the objectivity of knowledge can also be measured by the logical consistency between propositions, the usefulness of knowledge, and the public utility of knowledge, especially in the humanities and social sciences [16]. The objectivity of the structure of sports culture knowledge is mainly measured by the logical consistency between propositions and the public utility of knowledge. To get out of the self-consistency dilemma of the research on the objective reality of the structure of sports culture, it is necessary to integrate various cultural rationalities among multiple propositions, seek the dimensions of common value demands of various rationalities, and the academic paradigms that are mutually integrated within sports culture, thereby actively seeking its own self-consistency that conforms to objective reality.

4. Obj. real. sports cult. struct. concept.

4.1. Monolithic structure vs. pluralistic structure

Within the category of correspondence theory of objective reality, monolithic structure and pluralistic structure are competitive concepts. Within the scope of the other three standards, they can be compatible and simultaneously compliant with social forms. Taking Durkheim's division between classical society and modern society as an example, the form of cohesion in classical society is based on the similarity of beliefs and sentiments. The so-called "similarity of beliefs and sentiments" is a monolithic culture [17]. In modern society, this similarity is greatly reduced, and monolithic culture transitions to a pluralistic culture. Additionally, conservatism and liberalism have significantly different understandings of cultural structure. Under conservative thought, monism is superior to pluralism. Liberal thought, on the other hand, is more inclined to accept the diversity of culture.

Similarly, the choice between a monolithic and pluralistic structure in the structure of sports culture is not a simple matter of instant decision. If we follow the "correspondence theory" of subject and object, the monolithic or pluralistic structure of sports culture involves issues of right and wrong. However, under the standards of logical consistency between propositions, the usefulness of knowledge, and the public utility of knowledge, the objective reality of the structure of sports culture is not a choice of uniqueness. If we consider the social form, there are obviously significant differences between ancient sports culture structure and modern sports structure. If conservatism and liberalism are also taken into account, the choice between monolithic or pluralistic in sports culture will add more variables. Therefore, the conceptualization of the objective reality of the structure of sports culture must not be simplified, otherwise, it will fall into the error of vulgar materialism.

In light of this, the objective reality standard of the structure of sports culture can choose the standard of logical consistency between propositions or the public utility of knowledge, adopt a framework perspective, and propose a monolithic structure of sports culture to ensure the logical consistency of knowledge propositions in presupposition and evidence. For example, from the perspective of the classical age of the origin of sports, the physical culture structure of the structure of sports culture; from the modern theory of the origin of sports culture, the habitual structure of the structure of sports culture. Proposing a pluralistic structure of the objective reality of sports culture seems to be seen as a great progress, thus breeding a paradox: the construction of sports culture should not overly pursue uniformity but should let it be highly pluralistic. It can be seen that the current topic is not without problems to study, but there are too many issues to explore.

4.2. Hierarchical structure vs. parallel structure

The theoretical perspective of structuralism places the structural patterns of things at the forefront, with structure taking precedence over substance. Structuralists seek to uncover the inherent connections and relational patterns within things. Hierarchical structures and parallel patterns are the two main types of structures explored by modern structuralism. A hierarchical structure arranges the elements of a thing

according to their levels, creating several layers; a parallel structure has no level differences, and the contribution rates among elements are allowed to vary. A hierarchical structure can contain parallel structures within it, but the reverse is not feasible. These two types of structures can be combined to form very complex variations. Of course, the structures of things are far from limited to just these two types. Unlike natural facts, conclusions about social facts with exceptionally complex structures are relatively rare.

The structure of sports culture refers to the relatively stable combination state and composition method formed by the interaction of human sports cultural characteristics [18]. Currently, some studies have described parallel structures of specific sports cultural phenomena, such as the structural system of college sports culture described by Bo Huimin and Xie Jun (2004) [19], and the analysis of rural sports culture structure by Xiao Wei and Ma Yongming (2012) [20]. Yan Tian min et al. (2014), on the other hand, believe that sports culture is a nested structure that combines hierarchical and parallel structures [21]. In summary, conclusions that make parallel structure judgments still remain at the stage of the "One Divided into Three Doctrine" variation, while the nested model of hierarchical and parallel structures is relatively more rational.

In conclusion, the objective reality of the structure of sports culture should not be confined to the standard of correspondence between subject and object. Parallel structures or hierarchical structures are mainly measured by the logical consistency between propositions, the usefulness of knowledge, and the public utility of knowledge. The obtained structure, if logically presupposed and argued, can be considered as an understanding of the objective reality of the structure of sports culture. However, any commitment to outline cultural research in detail is incomplete and potentially controversial [22]. Sports culture involves all levels and fields of society, reflecting the characteristics of interdisciplinary and cross-domain. Attempting to outline the objective reality of the structure of sports culture is incomplete and quite controversial.

5. Conclusion

The objective reality research model is one of the traditional social analysis models, deeply rooted as the mainstream research paradigm in the sport's academic community. Research on the structure of sports culture under the objective reality paradigm aims to obtain relationships within or between sports cultures. Here, sports culture is studied not only as a natural fact but also as a social fact. Research methods are mainly constrained by principles of objectivity, repeatability, and precision. This paradigm is, on a macro level, related to an optimistic philosophy that views sports culture as omnipotent and benevolent; on a meso-level, related to static assumptions about sports society; and on a micro level, related to the monotonization of methodology and research techniques.

The main danger of the objective reality research stance on sports structure is that the constructed structure of sports culture is seen as an autonomous entity, endowed with "behavioral capabilities" like a real actor, thereby reifying the concept of structure. It disregards the practical experience of sports cultural actors, failing to consider the issue of structure generation. The complexity of social facts is reduced to a set of universal principles, known as "simplistic materialism." However, the details of social behavior cannot be simply reduced, so research on the objective reality of sports culture structure cannot be completed in one go. The standards of objective reality are diverse, so research on the objective reality of sports culture structure also needs to use multiple paradigms for convergent research.

Even if the conclusions drawn from this paradigm can be criticized, research on the objective reality of sports culture inevitably faces the criticism of instrumental rationality and dualism. However, different paradigms of research are incommensurable. Overcoming the dilemma of self-consistency within objective reality, achieving diachronic consistency within the framework, and being refined and profound within the discourse can also be seen as an accumulation and contribution to the knowledge of the structure of sports culture. Seeking perfection is not the attitude of scientific evaluation. Adopting an open attitude and re-launching sports culture research with a mindset of seeking novelty and depth may naturally resolve aesthetic fatigue. As long as we can truly expand and implement the cultural turn, the new future of sports research is not far off.

6. References

- [1] Yang Yun, Zou Yuling. Philosophical Critique of Pan-Sports Culture Research [J]. Journal of Beijing Sport University, 2014(1): 52-57.
- [2] Guo Yuan Bing, Qi Chang Zhu. Preliminary Exploration of the Theoretical Structure of Sports Culture Psychology: Possibilities and Limits [J]. Journal of Ningbo University (Humanities and Social Sciences Edition), 2013(5): 124-127.
- [3] Guo Yuan Bing. The Fitness of Sports Culture Psychological Structure and Adolescents' Healthy Personality [D]. Wuhan: Wuhan Sports University, 2015.
- [4] Li Yong qin, Liu Gang, Zheng Guohua. Progress in Sports Culture Research in China in Recent Four Years [J]. Journal of Beijing Sport University, 2007(9): 1172-1175.
- [5] Pang Pu. Cultural Structure and Modern China [J]. Chinese Social Science, 1986(5): 81-98.
- [6] Guo Yuan Bing, Qi Chang Zhu. Clarifying Presuppositions and Defining Boundaries — A Critique of the Presuppositions in Sports Psychology Research [J]. Journal of Beijing Sport University, 2014(7): 87-90.
- [7] Xiao Tai Tao. On Several Academic Issues Related to "One Divided into Three" [J]. Journal of Southeast University (Philosophy and Social Science Edition), 2001(1): 23-26.
- [8] Liu Yi Xiang. Ten Doubts about "Outline of the Theory of Tripartition" — A Discussion with Mr. Pang Pu [J]. Tang du Journal, 2002(3): 16-17.
- [9] Marx. Selected Works of Marx and Engels: Volume Two [C]. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 1995.
- [10] Philip Smith. An Introduction to Cultural Theory [M]. Translated by Zhang Kun. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2008.
- [11] Liu Min Zhong. On Cultural Patterns [J]. Learning and Exploration, 1989(Z1): 11-20.
- [12] Han Cai ying. On the Basic Approach to Dissolving the Self-consistency Dilemma of Philosophy — From the Perspective of Integrating Structural and Historical Cultural Rationality [J]. Journal of North University of China (Social Science Edition), 2015(3): 1-6.
- [13] Cheng Zhi li. Preliminary Exploration of Sports Culture [J]. Journal of Shanghai University of Sport, 1987(3): 15-20.
- [14] Whitehead. Modes of Thought [M]. Translated by Han Dong hui, Li Hong. Beijing: Hua Xia Publishing House, 1999.
- [15] Du Sheng feng. What is "Structuralism"? [J]. Philosophical Research, 1988(10):67-73.
- [16] Lin Jian Cheng. On the Internal Relationship between the Objectivity and Sociality of Knowledge [J]. Journal of Luoyang Normal University, 2003(3): 5-7.
- [17] Cao Wen Biao. From Monism to Pluralism — An Interpretation of Functionalist Social Theory on Cultural Evolution [J]. Journal of Jiangsu Administrative Institute, 2006(3): 36-41.
- [18] Yi Jian dong. Introduction to Sports Culture [M]. Taipei: Wen Jin Publishing Co., Ltd., 1998.
- [19] Bo Huimin, Xie Jun. The Structure, Function, and Transformation of College Sports Culture [J]. Journal of Shanghai University of Sport, 2004(4): 79-82.
- [20] Xiao Wei, Ma Yongming. Research on the Structure of Rural Sports Culture [J]. Sports Culture Guide, 2012(9): 12-15.
- [21] Yan Tian min, Gao Jian, Wang Liu, et al. Preliminary Exploration of Sports Culture Patterns [J]. Journal of Capital University of Physical Education, 2014(2): 101-105.
- [22] Liu Ningning, Yang Na. Review and Prospect of Sports Culture Research in China [J]. Journal of Beijing Sport University, 2015(10): 7-13.