



Journal Homepage: - www.journalijar.com

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)

Article DOI: 10.21474/IJAR01/13250

DOI URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/13250>



RESEARCH ARTICLE

EVALUATION OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMMERS' BY PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER'S

Iqbal Dar and Sangeeta Gupta

Department of Physical Education, Shri Venkateshwara University UP.

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History

Received: 05 June 2021

Final Accepted: 09 July 2021

Published: August 2021

Key words:-

Teacher Effectiveness, Physical
Education, Time Management,
Elementary School

Abstract

The aim of this study is to examine the opinions of physical education teachers from both Government and private elementary and high schools on their own in-service training programmes. 1000 physical education teachers in Kulgam district of Jammu Kashmir were selected for this study. The questionnaire was developed which include two parts were applied to the participants. Descriptive statistics was used for the data analysis. Analysis was performed by SPSS software. Findings, obtained during research, are as follows: There is an insufficiency in terms of providing the willing participation to the in-service training programmes. Specific attention was directed to the translation of theoretical concepts into practical and applicable tools. There is a fundamental and principal insufficiency about the timing, conditions of the place and educational materials of the inservice training programmes. There are some problems about the trainers' proficiency of teaching the subjects and adult education. There is an insufficiency related to evaluation of programme and success in in-service trainings in which physical education teachers participate. As a result there seems to be an insufficient level of in-service training activities for meeting the needs and expectations of physical education teachers. The in-service teacher training programme is a successful first step in improving the expertise of PE teachers to start and develop higher quality and more motivating assessment practices. Nevertheless, in order to generate durable change within daily PE practice, follow-up training sessions or counselling methods (e.g. through communities of practice) are essential to overcome implementation barriers. Development, adjustment and future directions for assessment are discussed

Copy Right, IJAR, 2021,. All rights reserved.

Introduction:-

Class management includes a wide variety of operations by the physical education teacher, such as taking into account the safety of the students when planning the lesson, taking attendance, distributing and collecting equipment, regrouping students and gaining their attention. Teacher is also responsible to ensure that time is not lost in the transition from one activity to another, during students' entering and leaving the playground or gym, and during the demonstration of the skills or instruction provision (Olivia & Pawless, 2001). Time management is an important procedure in teaching physical

Corresponding Author:- Iqbal Dar

Address:- Department of Physical Education, Shri Venkateshwara University UP.

education in a learning oriented environment (Duke, 1979). However, ineffective time management can lead students to minimize active participation with subsequent negative impact on their attitudes towards physical activity (Silverman & Scrabis, 2004). Physical education management is defined as the time spent to organization and transition actions, throughout the lesson, and it has been related to student achievement and learning, and to teacher effectiveness as well (Siedentop, Herkovitz & Rink, 1984).

Since quality PE is characterised by the mutually related fundamental dimensions of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment (Penney et al., 2009), PE programmes would certainly benefit from the development of continuing professional development (CPD) on the topic of assessment.

Moreover, the way in which students are assessed can considerably affect students' motivation to move and learn (Johnson et al., 2011; Maes et al., 2016), which is crucially important in the context of PE as it aims to stimulate students to adopt a physically active lifestyle. In order to address this issue, the present study, which is part of a larger research programme on student assessment and motivation in PE (STAM), aimed at systematically developing, providing and evaluating a professional in-service teacher training programme that focused not only on providing teachers with up-to-date knowledge and skills on assessment, but also specifically linked assessment to enhancing students' motivation for physical education.

Motivation and assessment in PE

One theory that delineates how students' motivation and related outcomes in PE are affected is self-determination theory (SDT; Deci and Ryan, 2000). SDT suggests that teachers can nurture students' three basic psychological needs: the need for competence (the capacity to effectively interact with the environment), autonomy (experiencing a sense of volition and psychological freedom) and relatedness (experiencing connectedness and intimacy with others) in PE by teaching in a well-structured, autonomy-supportive and relatedness-supportive way (Ntoumanis, 2001; Ryan and Deci, 2007; Van den Berghe et al., 2012). As a consequence, various favourable outcomes could be expected from students in whom these needs are supported, such as better skill development, better quality motivation to be physically active both within (Aelterman et al., 2012) and outside the context of PE (Haerens et al., 2010) and higher intentions to be physically active outside the classroom (Cheon et al., 2012; Van den Berghe et al., 2012). On the other hand, frustrating these basic psychological needs (i.e. through controlling teaching styles) has been found to diminish student motivation in PE (De Meyer et al., 2014; Haerens et al., 2015). In particular, assessment risks undermining students' needs. For instance, traditional grading practices in PE are often employed as 'a point-in-time grading' (Hay, 2006; Hay and Penney, 2009). As a result, these moments of assessment are perceived by students as either pass or fail, rendering it a moment of high stakes assessment, which could lead to feelings of anxiety and incompetence in (less skilled) students (Krijgsman et al., 2016; Maes et al., 2016). In addition, student performances are often compared to standardised norms or to the performances of classmates (Johnson et al., 2011), which could also be especially detrimental for feelings of competence of locomotory less gifted students (Beltran-Carrillo et al., 2012). Furthermore, students are rarely involved in the assessment process (Borghouts et al., 2016), thereby decreasing feelings of autonomy in PE. Feelings of relatedness are possibly frustrated through assessment situations that are emotionally unsafe (e.g. performing a somersault in front of the class, or being assessed on a group dance while the rest of the class watches).

Fortunately, assessment in PE also provides promising possibilities for increasing students' basic psychological needs. Such practices, however, are rarely deliberately employed (Georgakis and Wilson, 2012; Hay, 2006). By adopting the principles of Assessment for Learning (AfL) (Black and Wiliam, 2009; Hay, 2006; Wiliam, 2011), for instance by integrating feed-up, feedback and feed forward in lessons, teachers can provide more structure to the students (Hattie and Timperley, 2007), which has been related to increased feelings of competence (Jang et al., 2010). Feed-up implies that the learning objectives, assessment methods and criteria have been communicated and are clear to students at the beginning of a unit, semester, etc. Feedback then informs students on what progress they have made in their learning process. Subsequently, feed forward shows students what further improvements need to be made to advance their progress towards the desired learning outcomes. Additionally, feelings of competence can be enhanced by taking into account student differences through differentiation in the assessment (e.g. by using adaptive assessment methods).

Furthermore, since student involvement and provision of choice are generally low within current assessment practices (Borghouts et al., 2016) it is assumed that feelings of autonomy can be enhanced by allowing and stimulating a more active role in the planning and delivery of assessment. One way to actively involve students in

the assessment process is through peer- and self- assessment (Black and Wiliam, 2009). Through peer- and self- assessment students become owners of their own learning, which has been related to increased autonomous motivation (Black and Wiliam, 2009) and increased self-regulation and achievement (Harris and Brown, 2013). Another approach could be to involve students within the construction of the assessment criteria or the moment of assessment. Furthermore, to positively impact on students' feelings of relatedness it seems beneficial to try and provide an emotionally safe assessment environment (e.g. not being assessed in front of the whole class).

Methods:-

Recently, Aelterman et al. (2013) have proposed a framework that allows for the systematic development of theory-based CPD programmes in PE. In our study we adopted a similar iterative

Research design of provision, evaluation and revision, while closely collaborating with PE teachers in the field. 1000 physical education teachers in Kulgam district of Jammu Kashmir were selected for this study. The questionnaire was developed which include two parts were applied to the participants. Descriptive statistics was used for the data analysis. Analysis was performed by SPSS software. Findings, obtained during research, are as follows: There is an insufficiency in terms of providing the willing participation to the in-service training programmes. There is a fundamental and principal insufficiency about the timing, conditions of the place and educational materials of the inservice training programmes.

Results:-

In order to provide a comprehensive view, questionnaire and focus group results will be alternately described. Overall, participants highly valued the training programme, with an average rating of 8.2 (+0.56) on a 10-point scale that did not significantly change across the three training sessions.

Focus group data revealed that participants acknowledged the difficulties surrounding assessment practices as well as a perceived inability to make meaningful changes. However, the programme provided them with much food for thought and was deemed a good starting point to begin to make alterations in their daily PE practice.

In particular, teachers appreciated the theoretical depth that was provided while the practical application within the context of PE always remained at the forefront. The various sections of the training programme are evaluated in more detail below.

Theoretical section

Participants expressed their enthusiasm about the discussion as a starting point for the training programme. They immediately felt immersed in the topic, which prompted them to critically review their own assessment practices. For some participants this process already started after completing the preceding questionnaire that led up to the discussion.

Scores on the theoretical section were generally high and did not significantly change across the three training sessions. One exception was essentiality, which consistently scored somewhat lower than the other aspects of appreciation during all training sessions. Focus group data from the first training session further revealed that some participants found the theory, especially SDT, to be quite complex, which they related in part to the fact that it was new for them. For example, since SDT consists of various sub-theories, such as basic needs theory and cognitive evaluation theory (Ryan and Deci, 2000), some participants had trouble understanding the relationships between concepts such as basic needs and motivational quality. Despite our attempt to enhance the practicality and applicability of SDT in a PE context in the two following training sessions, by using more and better PE-related examples, essentiality scores did not significantly improve over time. Interestingly, focus group data revealed that teachers were unaware of some important goals as stated in the national curriculum, such as adapting assessment to the abilities of the student and taking supporting skills into account in the assessment (e.g. organising, refereeing and coaching).

Practical section

Participants were generally very positive about the practical assignments that took place in the gymnasium. All aspects scored >4 on a five-point Likert scale except for innovation, which scored a little below 4. Scores did not significantly change over the course of the three training sessions. Essentiality even scored >4.5 over all three

training sessions, indicating that participants highly valued the practical application of theoretical concepts on assessment and motivation. The MAMC toolbox was also well received, with participants especially praising the conversion of important theoretical constructs into daily PE practice, insights for implementation as well as the flexibility to employ the instrument within various PE subjects. Participants found the first practical assignment (adapting an existing assessment situation) useful and instructive and indicated that the four assessment situations in the gymnasium closely resembled the difficulties they experienced in their own teaching practice. Presenting and discussing the findings of each group afterwards and receiving feedback from the trainers were also deemed insightful, although some participants wanted to spend more time on the group discussion afterwards.

Generally, participants favoured ending the training programme while reflecting on its content with their direct colleagues. However, time constraints, especially in the third training session, kept them from coming to a well thought out and coherent consensus. It was also mentioned that discussing changes with only two to four member of the PE department present was not as effective as it could be.

In addition, although the PE teachers found the training programme to be an excellent starting point, they also pointed out that they needed extended guidance when making changes at their schools. Suggestions were made for a longer training programme, follow-up training sessions and continual coaching.

Discussion:-

A challenge within assessment is to nurture rather than frustrate students' needs for competence, autonomy and relatedness (Krijgsman et al., 2016; Maes et al., 2016). In addition, assessment has been identified to be amongst the most challenging aspects within the PE profession (Lo'pez-Pastor et al., 2012). In an attempt to address these issues we systematically developed, provided and evaluated a professional in-service teacher training programme that focused not only on providing teachers with up-to-date knowledge and skills on assessment, but also specifically linked assessment to enhancing students' basic psychological needs. Given the need for professional development programmes to bridge the gap between contemporary educational research and the daily practice of teaching (Vanderlinde and Van Braak, 2010), the training programme was systematically developed in close collaboration with PE teachers.

Conclusions:-

From the study it was concluded that there is a fundamental and principal insufficiency about the timing, conditions of the place and educational materials of the inservice training programmes. There are some problems about the trainers' proficiency of teaching the subjects and adult education. There is a insufficiency related to evaluation of programme and success in in-service trainings in which physical education teachers participate. As a result there seems to be an insufficient level of in-service training activities for meeting the needs and expectations of physical education teachers.

The in-service teacher training programme is a successful first step in improving the expertise of PE teachers to start and develop higher quality and more motivating assessment practices. Nevertheless, in order to generate durable change within daily PE practice, follow-up training sessions or counselling methods (e.g. through communities of practice) are essential to overcome implementation barriers. The training programme in this study could be an important first step to improving PE teachers' expertise on motivating assessment practices.

Conflict of interest

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References:-

1. Aelterman N, Vansteenkiste M, Van Keer H, et al. (2012) Students' objectively measured physical activity levels and engagement as a function of between-class and between-student differences in motivation toward physical education. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology* 34: 457–480.
2. Aelterman N, Vansteenkiste M, Van Keer H, et al. (2013) Development and evaluation of a training on need-supportive teaching in physical education: Qualitative and quantitative findings. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 29: 64–75.

3. ALOCO (2013) Landelijk opleidingsprofiel leraar lichamelijke opvoeding eerste graad [National guidelines on educating physical education teachers]. Zevenaar: De Productiemannen.
4. Armour K, Makopoulou K and Chambers F (2012) Progression in physical education teachers' career-long professional learning: Conceptual and practical concerns. *European Physical Education Review* 18(1): 62–77.
5. Armour KM (2010) The physical education profession and its professional responsibility ... or ... why '12 weeks paid holiday' will never be enough. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy* 15(1): 1–13.
6. Armour KM and Makopoulou K (2012) Great expectations: Teacher learning in a national professional development programme. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 28(3): 336–346.
7. Armour KM and Yelling M (2007) Effective professional development for physical education teachers: The role of informal, collaborative learning. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* 26(2): 177–200.
8. Bechtel PA and O'Sullivan MM (2006) Effective professional development—What we now know. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* 25(4): 363–378.
9. Beltran-Carrillo VJ, Devis-Devis J, Peiro-Velert C, et al. (2012) When physical activity participation promotes inactivity: Negative experiences of Spanish adolescents in physical education and sport. *Youth and Society* 44(1): 3–27
10. Black P and Wiliam D (2009) Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability* 21(1): 5–31.
11. Borghouts L, Slingerland M and Haerens L (2016) Assessment quality and practices in secondary PE in the Netherlands. Manuscript submitted.
12. Borko H (2004) Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher* 33(8): 3–15.
13. Brinke ten G, Brouwer B, Houthoff D, et al. (2007) Concretisering van de kerndoelen Bewegen en Sport [Elaboration of the national goals for movement and sport]. *Jan Luiting Fonds* 1–28.
14. Cheon SH, Reeve J and Moon IS (2012) Experimentally based, longitudinally designed, teacher-focused intervention to help physical education teachers be more autonomy supportive toward their students. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology* 34(3): 365–396.
15. Clarke D and Hollingsworth H (2002) Elaborating a model of teacher professional growth. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 18: 947–967.
17. Deci EL and Ryan RM (2000) The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological inquiry* 11(4): 227–268.
19. De Meyer J, Tallir IB, Soenens B, et al. (2014) Does observed controlling teaching behavior relate to students' motivation in physical education? *Journal of Educational Psychology* 106(2): 541–554.
21. Dudley P (2014) *Lesson Study: A Handbook*. Available at: www.lessonstudy.co.uk (accessed 19 December 2015).
23. Dudley P (2015) *Lesson Study: Professional Learning for Our Time*. Abingdon: Routledge.
24. Duke, D. L. (1979). *Classroom management: The seventy eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
25. Gallahue DL and Donnelly FC (2003) Assessing progress: Motor, fitness, and physical activity assessment. 4th edition In: Gallahue DL and Donnelly FC (eds) *Developmental Physical Education for All Children*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, pp. 282–313.
26. Garet SM, Porter AC, Desimone L, et al. (2007) What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal* 38(4): 915–945.
27. Georgakis S and Wilson R (2012) Australian physical education and school sport: An exploration into contemporary assessment. *Asian Journal of Exercise and Sports Science* 9(1): 37–52.
28. Goodyear VA, Casey A and Kirk D (2013) Physical education teachers' use of practitioner inquiry: Effective, enjoyable and relevant professional learning. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education* 4(1): 19–33.
29. Greenbaum TL (1997) *The Handbook for Focus Group Research*. 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
30. Guskey TR and Yoon KS (2009) What works in professional development? *Phi Delta Kappan* (March) 90(7): 495–502.
32. Haerens L, Aelterman N, Vansteenkiste M, et al. (2015) Do perceived autonomy-supportive and controlling teaching relate to physical education students' motivational experiences through unique pathways? Distinguishing between the bright and dark side of motivation. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 16: 26–36.
34. Haerens L, Kirk D, Cardon G, et al. (2010) Motivational profiles for secondary school physical education and

36. its relationship to the adoption of a physically active lifestyle among university students. *European Physical Education Review* 16(2): 117–139.
37. Harris LR and Brown GTL (2013) Opportunities and obstacles to consider when using peer- and self-assessment to improve student learning: Case studies into teachers' implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 36(C): 101–111.
39. Hattie J and Timperley H (2007) The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research* 77(1): 81–112.
40. Hay P (2006) Assessment for learning in physical education. In: Kirk D, Macdonald D, and O'Sullivan M (eds) *The Handbook of Physical Education*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 312–325.
41. Hay P and Penney D (2009) Proposing conditions for assessment efficacy in physical education. *European Physical Education Review* 15(3): 389–405.
42. Jang H, Reeve J and Deci EL (2010) Engaging students in learning activities: It is not autonomy support or structure but autonomy support and structure. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 102(3): 588–600
43. Johnson TG, Prusak KA, Pennington T, et al. (2011) The effects of the type of skill test, choice, and gender on the situational motivation of physical education students. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* 30(3): 281–295.
44. Kirk D (2010) *Physical Education Futures*. London: Routledge.
45. Krijgsman C, Maes J, Borghouts L, et al. (2016) Motivational experiences as a function of grading in physical education: A self-determination theory perspective. Manuscript submitted.
46. Lieberman A and Pointer Mace D (2009) Making practice public: Teacher learning in the 21st century. *Journal of Teacher Education* 61(1–2): 77–88.
47. Lo'pez-Pastor VM, Kirk D, Lorente-Catala'n E, et al. (2012) Alternative assessment in physical education: A review of international literature. *Sport, Education and Society* 18(1): 57–76.
48. Maes J, Krijgsman C, Cardon G, et al. (2016) How does assessment for learning in physical education relate to students' motivation, perceived competence and level of fear? Manuscript submitted.
49. Melograno VJ (2007) Grading and report cards for standards-based physical education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance* 78(6): 45–53.
51. Merrill MD (2002) First principles of instruction. *Educational Technology Research and Development* 50(3): 43–59.
53. Miles MB, Huberman MA and Saldana J (2014) *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook Third Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications.
55. Morgan DL and Krueger RA (1998) *Moderating Focus Groups (Focus Group Kit 4)*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
57. Ni' Chro' ini'n D and Cosgrave C (2012) Implementing formative assessment in primary physical education: Teacher perspectives and experiences. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy* 18(2): 219–233.
58. Ntoumanis N (2001) A self-determination approach to the understanding of motivation in physical education. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 71(2): 225–242.
59. O'Sullivan M and Deglau D (2006) Principles of professional development. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* 25(4): 441–449.
60. Olivia, P., & Pawless, G. (2001). *Supervision for today's schools* (6th ed.). New York: Jon Wiley & Sons.
61. Penney D, Brooker R, Hay P, et al. (2009) Curriculum, pedagogy and assessment: Three message systems of schooling and dimensions of quality physical education. *Sport, Education and Society* 14(4): 421–442.
62. Redelius K and Hay PJ (2012) Student views on criterion-referenced assessment and grading in Swedish physical education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy* 17(2): 211–225.
63. Ryan RM and Deci EL (2000) Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist* 55(1): 68–78.
64. Ryan RM and Deci EL (2007) Active human nature: Self-determination theory and the promotion and maintenance of sport, exercise and health. In: *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-determination in Exercise and Sport*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers, pp. 1–34.
65. Van den Berghe L, Vansteenkiste M, Cardon G, et al. (2012) Research on self-determination in physical education: Key findings and proposals for future research. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy* 19(1): 97–121.
66. Siedentop, D.; Herkovitz, J., & Rink, J. (1984). *Elementary physical education methods*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
67. Silverman, S., & Scrabis, K.A. (2004). A review of research on instructional theory in physical education 2002-2003. *International Journal of Physical Education*, 41, 4-12.

68. Vanderlinde R and Van Braak J (2010) The gap between educational research and practice: Views of teachers, school leaders, intermediaries and researchers. *British Educational Research Journal* 36(2): 299–316.
69. Villegas-Reimers E (2004) Teacher professional development: An international review of the literature.
70. UNESCO: International Institute for Educational Planning pp. 1–197. Available at: <http://www.cndwebzine>.
71. Wiliam D (2011) What is assessment for learning? *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 37(1): 3–14.