

Mustafa Kayihan

Erba¹

Hüseyin Ünlü²

OPINIONS OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS ABOUT LESSONS DURING THE PREPARATION FOR TEACHING³

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine physical education teachers' opinions of lessons during the preparation for teaching. The research group consisted of 242 physical education teachers from 5 different cities during the 2009–2010 education year. The study used a data collection tool developed by Hill and Brodin (2004) by arranged, comprising 25 questions with a five-point response scale. Data analysis used descriptive statistics of arithmetic mean and standard deviation. In addition with according to the obtained data it was used that, frequency and percentage. Of the 25 subject title which was investigated in the questionnaire, generally as very important by the physical education teachers. However some title foremost than the others. According to questions and five different answer selection, many physical education teachers answered as; "very important" to questions about teaching practice (83.5%), knowledge and skills related to sports branches (76%), first aid knowledge (66.9%), training information (58.7%), knowledge of teaching methods (57%), health information (56.2%), communication skills (53.7%), and lesson planning (52.5%). The same fields had the highest scores in terms of the mean values. Examining the survey responses, it was determined that whether the teachers consider the given subject matters to be important in terms of pre-service education according to the requirements of the field.

Key Words: Physical Education Teacher, Preparation for Teaching, Physical Education Teacher Education Program.

BEDEN E TİM Ö RETMENLERİNİN Ö RETMENLERİN K ÖNCESİ HAZIRLIK SÜRECİNDE YER ALAN DERSLERE LİK GÖRÜMLER

ÖZET

Bu araştırmanın amacı; beden e itimi ö retmenlerinin hizmet öncesi e itim sürecindeki derslere ilişkin görüşlerinin tespit edilmesidir. Araştırma grubunu 2009-2010 e itim ö retim yılında 5 farklı ilde görev yapan toplam 242 beden e itimi ö retmeninden oluşmaktadır. Araştırmada veri toplama aracı olarak Hill ve Brodin'in (2004) araştırmada kullandığı 25 soruluk anket formu düzenlenerek kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizinde tanımlayıcı istatistiklerden aritmetik ortalama ve standart sapma tekniklerinden yararlanılmıştır. Bunun yanında elde edilen veriler doğrultusunda frekans ve yüzde dağılımı hesaplamaları yapılmıştır. Elde edilen bulgular doğrultusunda; beden e itimi ö retmenlerinin verilen ankette bulunan 25 konuya ilişkin olarak önemsendiği görülmüştür. Fakat bazı konular diğerlerine göre ön plana çıkmıştır; "çok önemli" seçeneği doğrultusunda alan konuları incelendiğinde; ö retmenlik uygulaması (%83,5), sportif branşlar ile ilgili bilgi ve beceriler (%76), ilkyardım bilgisi (%66,9), antrenman bilgisi (%58,7), ö retim yöntemleri bilgisi (%57), sağlık bilgisi (%56,2), iletişim becerileri (%53,7) ve ders planlama (%52,5) konularının ön plana çıktığı görülmüştür. Bu alanlar %50'nin üzerinde beden e itimi ö retmenleri tarafından çok önemli olarak cevaplanmıştır. Ortalama değerler açısından da ele alındığında da yine adı geçen konuların sırayla en yüksek ortalamalara sahip olduğu görülmüştür. Sonuç olarak, anketteki sorulara verilen yanıtlara göre ö retmenlerin, hizmet öncesi e itimde aldıkları bilgileri, uygulama alanındaki ihtiyaçlarına göre önem derecesine koydukları görülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Beden E itimi Ö retmeni, Ö retmenlik Öncesi E itim, Beden E itimi Ö retim Programı

¹ Aksaray Mehmet Akif Ersoy Elementary School.

² Aksaray University, School of Physical Education and Sports

³ II. Uluslararası Beden E itimi ve Sporda Sosyal Alanlar Kongresinde bildiri olarak sunulmuştur (31 Mayıs – 02 Haziran 2012, Ankara, Türkiye).

INTRODUCTION

Teachers play an important role in a successful education process, and take an active role in all parts of the process, from planning to evaluation.

The most important factor for achieving goals within the education process is teachers and whether they take an efficient role in the process (Locklear et al., 2004). Teachers focus on students in addition to environment and subject matters, and constitute one edge of the triangle (Harrison and Blakemore, 1992).

Generally, education is a process of behavioral change (Ertürk, 1993; Fidan, 1986; Demirel, 2004); therefore, the qualifications and competences of teachers are important in shaping students' conduct; this is especially the case for physical education lessons, which focus on enabling desired behavioral changes through physical activities (Ünlü and Aydos, 2010). Education of qualified physical education teachers is related to the quality and nature of the physical education teacher education programs.

In Turkey, education programs for physical education teachers started in Istanbul in 1926, and education activities for physical education teachers were conducted within the Faculty of Education of Gazi University in 1933, within Faculties of Education in 1967–1982, and within sports academies such as the Faculties of Education in Ankara, in 1974. Physical education training was unified with Faculties of Education and sports academies in 1981, and continued within the Faculties of Education at universities. As of 1992, these training activities have been conducted within Physical Education and Sports Schools of universities (Bilge, 1986; Güven, 1996; Karaküçük, 1986; Mirzeolu, 2003). Today, physical education teacher education studies continue within the Schools of Physical Education, Faculties of Education, and Schools of Sport Science and Technology. Physical education teacher

education studies have adopted different subject matters, programs, periods, and lessons since 1926.

In 2006, greater flexibility was introduced to pre-service education programs, including physical education; the proportion of field and field education lessons, teaching profession lessons, and of general culture lessons was determined to be 50–60%, 25–30% and 15–20%, respectively (YÖK, 2007).

Physical education teacher education programs of other countries, e.g., the US Physical Education Teacher Education Program, consist of relevant art lessons, field lessons, professional lessons, observation and field experience, and an internship with an experienced teacher (Hill and Brodin 2004).

Hayes et al. (2008) stated the required terms for teaching to be general knowledge, professional knowledge, practical knowledge, teaching knowledge, and topic knowledge. According to Kay (2004), topic knowledge was the knowledge of the subject matter and the focus placed on the student by the teachers.

Strand (1992) criticized physical education teacher training in terms of field knowledge and professional practices, and suggested that the programs should be more efficient and adequate in order to educate more effective teachers. In another study, Beeth and Adadan (2006) examined the effects of pre-service education on prospective teachers, and found that teachers expressed anxiety regarding their performance, despite the lessons they had taken. Hayes et al. (2008) examined the kinds of knowledge relevant to physical education teacher training, and suggested that fundamental knowledge was the most important.

McCaugtry et al. (2004), Hill and Brodin (2004), and Zeichner (2010) stated the importance of practice in addition to academic knowledge in physical education teacher education. Collier and Herbert 2004

conducted a comprehensive analysis of undergraduate curricula in order to address the question, “*How can you provide physical education teachers with a higher quality education?*”; their findings indicated that teachers should receive a well-supported and practically efficient education .

All the above-mentioned studies indicated that the quality of pre-service education of physical education teachers is important to subsequent success. This raises the question of how best to structure the training and qualification process for physical education teachers. Training qualified physical education teachers is only possible via an appropriate program. Identifying which of the lessons within such a program are more important is also considered to be of great importance, in that it contributes to the quality of the education process.

A review of the literature found no previous studies on the evaluation of lessons within the physical education teacher training programs in Turkey. Therefore, the present study examined the opinions of physical education teachers on the importance of the lessons within pre-service training programs.

METHOD

Research Model

The present research was conducted using the screening model, as it aimed to determine the opinions of physical education teachers on their pre-service educations.

Study Group

The study group consisted of 242 physical education teachers working in five different provinces (Aksaray, Kırşehir, Ni de, Osmaniye and Samsun) during the 2009–2010 academic year (130 male, 54%; 112 female 46%).

Data Collection Tool

The questionnaire used by Hill and Brodin (2004) was adapted to Turkish and applied to the study group upon receiving the opinion of an expert. The questionnaire consisted of 25 questions, each assessed via a 5-point response scale: 1. Unimportant, 2. Little important, 3. Slightly important, 4. Important, and 5. Very important.

Data Analysis

Data was analyzed using SPSS (version 17.0). Data were analyzed using supplementary statistics arithmetic mean and standard deviation techniques, and frequency and percentage distributions.

FINDINGS

This section presents the frequency, percentage, and means values derived from the questionnaire responses.

Table 1 summarizes the opinions of physical education teachers regarding the importance of the lessons they took during pre-service training.

As shown in Table 1, participants responded “Very important” when asked about the significance of teaching practice (83.5%), knowledge and skills regarding sports branches (76%), knowledge of first aid (66.9%), training knowledge (58.7%), knowledge of teaching methods (%57), knowledge of health (56.%), communication skills (53.7%), and lesson planning (52.5%).

Lesson contents were regarded as “Important” in terms of: assessment knowledge (47.1%), knowledge of anatomy (44.6%) and knowledge of physiology (44.2%).

Lesson contents that were regarded as “Slightly important” were as follows: sports law (36%) and physical education and sports history (30.2). The options “Little important” and “Unimportant” were rarely chosen or not chosen at all for many types of lesson contents.

Table 1. The opinions of physical education teachers on the importance of lesson content within pre-service training.

Lesson Contents	Unimportant 1		Little Important 2		Slightly Important 3		Important 4		Very Important 5	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Teaching practice,	1	0.4	---	---	6	2.5	33	13.6	202	83.5
2. Lesson planning (planning for teaching)	1	0.4	8	3.3	11	4.5	95	39.3	127	52.5
3. Knowledge of physiology	2	0.8	13	5.4	57	23.6	107	44.2	63	26
4. Knowledge of teaching methods	---	---	2	0.8	20	8.3	82	33.9	138	57
5. Knowledge of anatomy	---	---	20	8.3	50	20.7	108	44.6	64	26.4
6. Knowledge and skills regarding sports branches (football, volleyball, basketball...)	1	0.4	---	---	12	5	45	18.6	184	76
7. Knowledge and skills regarding physical fitness	---	---	4	1.7	22	9.1	101	41.7	115	47.5
8. Motor development	---	---	4	1.7	35	14.5	91	37.6	112	46.3
9. Knowledge of curriculum development for physical education lessons	---	---	10	4.1	32	13.2	91	37.6	109	45
10. Knowledge of health	---	---	3	1.2	26	10.7	77	31.8	136	56.2
11. Knowledge of physical education and sports for people with disabilities	3	1.2	12	5	51	21.1	98	40.5	78	32.2
12. Knowledge of first aid (CPR)	1	0.4	4	1.7	11	4.5	64	26.4	162	66.9
13. Knowledge of class management and organization during physical education lessons	1	0.4	3	1.2	24	9.9	94	38.8	120	49.6
14. Knowledge of physical education and sports history	4	1.7	37	15.3	73	30.2	97	40.1	31	12.8
15. Knowledge and skills regarding physical fitness and performance tests	1	0.4	10	4.1	52	21.5	102	42.1	77	31.8
16. Assessment knowledge	2	0.8	10	4.1	46	19	114	47.1	70	28.9
17. Grading knowledge and practices	3	1.2	12	5	51	21.1	100	41.3	76	31.4
18. Sports law	13	5.4	35	14.5	87	36	83	34.3	24	9.9
19. Communication skills	5	2.1	10	4.1	29	12	68	28.1	130	53.7
20. Knowledge and skills regarding the correlation of physical education and motor skills with other lessons	3	1.2	9	3.7	44	18.2	107	44.2	79	32.6
21. Training knowledge	---	---	4	1.7	27	11.2	69	28.5	142	58.7
22. Knowledge and skills regarding instructional technologies and teaching materials	3	1.2	4	1.7	30	12.4	103	42.6	102	42.1
23. Knowledge regarding nutrition in sports	1	0.4	6	2.5	36	14.9	98	40.5	101	41.7
24. Knowledge and skills regarding research techniques	---	---	14	5.8	65	26.9	109	45	54	22.3
25. Knowledge and skills regarding management and organization in sports	7	2.9	6	2.5	47	19.4	93	38.4	89	36.8

Mean response categories regarding the content of lessons within the physical education teacher education program are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Mean response category expressed by physical education teachers with regard to the lesson content of pre-service training.

Lesson Contents	N	\bar{X}	SD
1. Teaching practice,	242	4.79	0.511
2. Lesson planning (planning for teaching)	242	4.40	0.762
3. Knowledge of physiology	242	3.89	0.881
4. Knowledge of teaching methods	242	4.47	0.682
5. Knowledge of anatomy	242	3.89	0.890
6. Knowledge and skills regarding sports branches (football, volleyball, basketball...)	242	4.69	0.600
7. Knowledge and skills regarding physical fitness	242	4.35	0.714
8. Motor development	242	4.28	0.771
9. Knowledge of curriculum for the physical education lesson	242	4.23	0.833
10. Knowledge of health	242	4.42	0.732
11. Knowledge of physical education and sports for people with disabilities	242	3.97	0.919
12. Knowledge of first aid (CPR)	242	4.57	0.696
13. Knowledge of class management and organization during physical education lessons	242	4.35	0.744
14. Knowledge of physical education and sports history	242	3.47	.0956
15. Knowledge and skills regarding physical fitness and performance tests	242	4.00	0.859
16. Assessment knowledge	242	3.99	0.849
17. Grading knowledge and practices	242	3.96	0.914
18. Sports law	242	3.28	1.009
19. Communication skills	242	4.27	0.968
20. Knowledge and skills regarding the correlation of physical education and motor skills with other lessons	242	4.03	0.877
21. Training knowledge	242	4.44	0.755
22. Knowledge and skills regarding instructional technologies and teaching materials	242	4.22	0.821
23. Knowledge regarding nutrition in sports	242	4.20	0.813
24. Knowledge and skills regarding research techniques	242	3.83	0.836
25. Knowledge and skills regarding management and organization in sports	242	4.03	0.961

According to Table 2, lesson contents were rated highly with regard to skills related to teaching practice (\bar{x} =4,79), knowledge of first aid (\bar{x} =4,57), lesson planning (\bar{x} =4.40) and sports branches (\bar{x} =4.69). Moreover, skills regarding sports law

(\bar{x} =3.28), assessment knowledge (\bar{x} =3.99), research techniques (\bar{x} =3.83) and knowledge of physical education and sports history (\bar{x} =3.47) were regarded as being less important than other lesson contents.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results showed that physical education teachers gave importance to all of the 25 subjects in the questionnaire. However, some of them were considered to be of greater importance than others. Lesson contents related to teaching practice, lesson planning, knowledge of teaching methods, knowledge and skills regarding sports branches, knowledge of health, knowledge of first aid (CPR), communication skills and training knowledge were considered to be very important by more than 50% of survey respondents. Other lesson contents, except for sports law, were considered to be important; while most of the teachers regarded sports law as being slightly important for their role.

The results of the present study support those reported by Hill and Brodin (2004), who also reported that sports law was regarded as the least important lesson content. This indicated that physical education teachers did not have sufficient knowledge of sports law and the issue was not given due importance. "...teachers did not consider sports law to be relevant for their education". Ishee (2005) stated that the results of Hill and Brodin are not given due importance, which constitutes a serious problem regarding sports law and the issue itself.

A study conducted in Turkey (İrin and Cesur, 2008) examined the relationship between the successes trainee physical education teachers when teaching practice lessons and field and professional lessons, and determined a significant relationship between teaching practice and undergraduate lessons. Moreover, McCaugtry et al. (2004) suggested that practice was more important than lesson content. In the present study, 83.5% of respondents regarded teaching practice as being very important. This result supports the findings of previous studies in the literature. High levels of importance attributed to curriculum areas such as

lesson planning, knowledge of teaching methods, knowledge and skills regarding sports branches, and knowledge of health and first aid also indicated that teachers often require these types of knowledge and skills.

Another important issue was that teachers considering teaching practice to be very important did not have the same opinion regarding knowledge of the curriculum, which is a highly relevant subject matter in this regard. Only 45% of the teachers considered knowledge of the curriculum to be very important. However, sufficient knowledge of the curriculum is quite important for conducting a lesson. This finding suggested that only 45% of the teachers follow the curriculum and conduct their lessons accordingly. A similar finding was also reported by Zeichner (2010), who identified inconsistencies between academic education and practical application. Curtner – Smith (2001) examined the adaptation periods of new physical education teachers, how they conduct their lessons, and the problems they encounter. It was found that they apply the pre-service education they received without any changes, thus encountering serious constraints and problems in practice. The findings of the present study did not support this situation. Curtner – Smith (2001) reported constraints and problems while applying academic knowledge to practical lessons. However, a teacher who received a good academic education in teaching methods and techniques, concentrated on this issue, and used a qualified educator as a model is considered not to encounter any problems in this regard. In the present study, almost all teachers considered teaching methods and techniques to be either very important (57%) or important (33%). It is notable that none of the respondents considered this issue to be unimportant.

As a result, the most important factor determining teachers' opinions on the

importance of lesson content was found to be the extent and way in which they use the knowledge acquired during their pre-service education during practice. According to the questionnaire responses, teachers evaluated the knowledge they acquired during their pre-service training in accordance with their practical needs. The results suggest that new methods should be developed for applying pre-service lessons, which address the problems encountered by teachers during practical application. Moreover, more effective and comprehensive training

should be offered regarding knowledge of the curriculum, where and how such knowledge is to be used; and that pre-service education should be consistent with the policies and aims of the Ministry of Education. The issue of why sports law is not given due importance should be addressed. The importance of sports law should not be underestimated just because it is seldom used, and relevant training of sufficient quality should be provided in order to increase the importance of the matter.

REFERENCES

1. Beeth, M.E., Adadan, E. "The Influences of University-Based Coursework on Field Experience" *Journal of Science Teacher Education*. 17.pp.103–120, 2006.
2. Bilge, N. [Türkiye'de Beden E itimi Ö retmeninin Yeti tirilmesi] Ministry of Culture publishing. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara, 1988.
3. Collier, D., Herbert, F. "Undergraduate Physical Education Teacher Preparation: What Practitioners Tell Us?" *Physical Educator Spring*. 61. 2. pp.102-112, 2004.
4. Curtner – Smith, M.D. "The Occupational Socialization of a First-Year Physical Education Teacher with a Teaching Orientation" *Sport, Education and Society*. 6. 1, pp. 81–105, 2001.
5. Çelikten, M., Anal, M., Yeni, Y. "Ö retmenlik mesle i ve özellikleri" *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*. 19. 2. pp. 207-237, 2005.
6. Demirel, Ö. *Kuramdan Uygulamaya E itimde Program Geli tirme*, Pegema Yayıncılık, Ankara, 2004.
7. Ergün, M. *Atatürk Devri Türk E itimi*, Ocak yayınları, Ankara, 1997.
8. Ertürk, S. *E itimde program geli tirme*. Meteksan Matbaacılık, Ankara, 1993.
9. Fidan, N. *Okullarda Ö renme ve Ö retmen*, Yelkentepe Yayınları, Ankara, 1986.
10. Güven, Ö. "Türkiye'de cumhuriyet Döneminde Beden E itimi ve Spor Ö retmeni Yeti tiren Okulların Okulların E itimini Hazırlayıcı Çalışmalar" *Beden E itimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*. 1. 2, s. 70-82, 1996
11. Harrison, J., M., Blakemore, C., L. *Instructional strategies for secondary school physical education (3rd edn)*. Wm. C. Brown Publishers (Dubuque, IA) (1992)
12. Hayes, S., Capel, S., Catene, W., Cook, P. "An examination of knowledge prioritisation in secondary physical education teacher education courses" *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 24. pp.330–342, 2008.
13. Hill, G., Brodin, K.L. "Physical education teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of university coursework in preparation for teaching, *Physical Educator*" *ProQuest Educational Journals*. 61.2, 2004.
14. Ishee, J., H. "Physical education teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of university coursework in preparation for teaching" *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*. 76. 6, 2005.
15. Karaca, E. "E itimde kalite aray ları ve e itim fakültelerinin yeniden yapılandırılması" *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*,.21. pp.61 – 81, 2008.
16. Karaküçük, S. *Beden E itimi Ö retmeninin E itimi*, Gazi Üniversitesi E itim Fakültesi Yayını, Ankara, 1989.
17. Kavak, Y., Aydın A., Altun, A.S. *Ö retmen Yeti tirme ve E itim Fakülteleri (1982 – 2007)*, Yüksek Ö retim Kurumu, Ankara, 2007.
18. Kavcar, C. "Cumhuriyet döneminde dal ö retmeni yeti tirme" *Ankara Üniversitesi, E itim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*. 35. 1-2. 2002.
19. Kay, W. "Are mentors and students talking the same language?" *British Journal of Teaching Physical Education*. Autumn. pp.19–22, 2004.
20. Locklear, C., D., Davis, M., L., Covington, V., M. "Do university centers produce comparable teacher education candidates?" *Community College Review Journals*. 36. 3, 2009.
21. McCaughtry, N., Sofo, S., Rovegno, I., Curtner – Smith, M.D. "Learning to teach sport education: misunderstandings, pedagogical difficulties, and resistance" *European Physical Education Review*. 10. pp.135-155, 2004.
22. Mirzeolu, D. *Spor Bilimlerinin E itimsel (Pedagojik) Temelleri*. Spor Bilimlerine Giriş. Mirzeolu, N. (Ed.), Ba ırgan Yayımevi, Ankara, 2003.
23. İrin, E.F., Cesur, K. "Beden e itimi ö retmen adaylarının alan bilgisi ve ö retmenlik meslek dersleri ile ö retmenlik uygulaması dersi ba arıları arasındaki ili ki" *S.Ü. BES Bilim Dergisi*. 1.10, 2008.
24. Strand, B. N. A "Descriptive profile of teacher preparation practices in physical education teacher education" *Physical Educator*. 49. 2.pp. 104 -109, 1992.
25. Ünlü, H., Aydos, L. "Beden E itimi Ö retmenlerinin Yeterlikleri Üzerine Bir Derleme" *Milli E itim*. 187. s. 172-192, 2010
26. Tyler, W.R. *Basic Principles of curriculum development and instruction*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1950.
27. Zeichner, K. "Rethinking the Connections between Campus Courses and Field Experiences in College- and University-Based Teacher Education" *Journal of Teacher Education*. 61(1-2). 89–99, 2009.