

VALUE ORIENTATION PROFILE OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS IN MADHYA PRADESH.

Mr. Aswin Raj V, Research scholar.

Dr. Brij Kishore Prasad , Associate Professor.

Lakshmbai National Institute of Physical Education, Gwalior.

ABSTRACT

The paper describes the value orientation profile of physical education teachers confronting the education of children in Central Indian state of Madhya Pradesh. In Addition, the Impact of Gender and Year of Experience on teachers Value Orientation was examined. The Value Orientation Inventory Short Form (VOI-SF), developed by Catherin D. Ennis and her colleagues was used to collect data from two hundred fifty (n=250) physical education teachers of different districts of Madhya Pradesh. Descriptive statistics were used to compute all the five Value Orientations. Independent sample t test were used to compare between the scores of gender and years of experience. Study indicates that teachers give high priority to Disciplinary Mastery and Learning Process followed by Self Actualization, Ecological Integration and Social Constructive respectively. There is no significant difference based on gender to any value orientation where as significant difference were identified in Ecological Integration based on years of experience at 0.05 level of significance.

Keywords: Physical Education, Value Orientation, Gender and Experience.

INTRODUCTION

Despite the curriculum guide's official articulation of the formal physical education material, guidelines frequently fail to convey the intricacy of the teaching process (Ennis, 1992). This situation showcases the importance of physical education teacher's decision making skills. (Behets & Vergauwen, 2004) states that the curriculum provides a theoretical framework about the content to be taught but keeping the characteristics of students and school environment teacher are given a lot of freedom in modifying it. Therefore, the curriculum decisions are made according to physical education teachers education believes or value orientation. The physical education teacher's priority for one or more various philosophical perspectives called as value orientations. It shaped and filtered their beliefs and actions regarding objectives, content, pedagogy, and evaluation (Curtner-Smith et al., 2018). Value orientations integrate teacher's explicit and tacit beliefs about students and context with their knowledge of the physical education subject matter. Five educational value orientations have been postulated to influence content selection and the extent to which students master specific knowledge and performance goals in physical education: Disciplinary Mastery, self-actualization, learning process, social reconstruction and ecological integration.

Disciplinary Mastery (DM) is the most conventional method of curriculum development. By applying this method, educators examine the essential ideas in their specialized fields and create curriculum that support students in grasping these ideas. Since the beginning of physical education curriculum development, disciplinary mastery has dominated value orientation (Lee, 2015). **Learning Process (LP)** approach to curriculum development is predicated on the fundamental tenet that learning style matters just as much as content knowledge. From this vantage point, the methods through which information is produced in every major subject area have emerged as crucial curricular issues. The need of developing the process skills for ongoing learning increased when it was realized that the knowledge explosion had made it impossible for the school curriculum to cover all crucial product knowledge (Kilpatrick, 1918). **Self actualization (SA)** aimed at the development of personal agency and self-direction. It is the responsibility of each student to determine their own objectives, to cultivate their individuality, and to direct their own learning. Individual brilliance is promoted by this values-based approach. Be the best version of yourself that you can be. Experiences that are geared towards a particular curriculum aim to push each individual to grow, to go beyond limits, to surpass past constraints, and to acquire fresh perspectives on themselves (Hellison, 1985). **Ecological integration (EI)** the development of an integrated, whole person within a specific setting is the aim of the educator. This perspective holds that humankind is best understood in terms of its biological interactions with the natural world and its possible effects on other living things. Schools are tasked with providing equal consideration to the requirements of the individual and the community. The curriculum aims to create a distinct human being, whose legitimacy as an individual can only be established in a society that is internationally interdependent (Dewey, 1916). **Social Reconstruction (SR)** highlighting the students' ability to be change agents and their increased understanding of societal problems. Students are being prepared to improve their cooperative behavior, leadership, teamwork, respect, and care for others (Apple, 1985).

The value orientations that are content-focused are discipline mastery and the learning process, where as Self Actualization, Ecological Integration and Social Construction are effective value orientation (Capel, 2016). The Teachers teaching Physical Education at tribal schools in Central India may or may not be from any tribal community. So their curriculum decision making may vary from person to person because of their educational beliefs. According to (Pajares, 1992) Beliefs are statements that people hold to be true, and they can be acquired throughout life either implicitly or overtly. In order to make sense of teaching and eventually negotiate the teaching role, (student) PE teachers use their experiences with PE throughout the course of their education, which have a significant impact on how they develop their attitudes about teaching Sports (Matanin & Collier, 2003). As there is no proper evaluation procedure followed to examine how the physical education curriculum and instruction are carried out in tribal schools the only method to understand what is happening in the ground level is by evaluating the teachers value orientation priority with which we can assume what is taught and to what extend it is learned by the student

METHODOLOGY

A group of 250 physical education teachers from schools of Madhya Pradesh have participated in the study. Teachers with minimum 3 years of experience were randomly selected irrespective of their age. Samples were collected from refresher course held at Lakshmibai National Institute of Physical Education, Gwalior, from which 100 teachers were randomly selected (70 male and 30 female) for the study and rest of the samples were collected from different parts of the state (100male and 50 female). For the administration of the study, The VOI-SF was distributed among the randomly selected samples.

The instructions were written in the front page of the inventory and verbal explanation was given to avoid ambiguity The Value Orientation Inventory Short-Form (VOI-SF)(Chen et al., 1997) is a 50 item Pencil and Pen questionnaire. These items are grouped into 10 sets of 5 statements, with each item representing one of the five value orientation. A teachers filling the VOI-SF has to rank order each of the five statement within each set according to his/her priority (5=high priority; 1= low priority). The inventory simulates what teachers must do when they make real educational decisions; hence forced-choice style is used to prevent an item's rank from being used again inside the same set after it has been assigned. A teacher typically has a maximum of three high or low priority orientations (Curtner-Smith & Meek, 2000). The score for each value orientation is calculated by summing the rankings for the items within each orientation across the 10 sets. Thus, each teacher completing the VOI-SF produces five scores (i.e. one for each value orientation) which range between 10 and 50.

Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) were then computed for each value orientation across the whole sample. With the help of (Curtner-Smith & Meek, 2000) the number and percentage of teachers who demonstrated high, neutral and low priorities for each value orientation were computed. . Each of the five value orientations was used to classify teachers using a standard deviation of 0.6. Scores that are 0.6 standard deviations above or below the mean indicate a high priority, 0.6 standard deviations below the mean indicate a low priority, and scores that are 0.6 standard deviations or less from the mean are considered neutral. In addition, t test was applied in (a) male and female teachers; (b) teachers with 1–7 years of experience and teachers with 8 or more years of experience. The level of significance was set at 0.05.

RESULTS

Table No. 1
Descriptive Statistics Along With Physical Education Teachers High, Neutral, Low Priorities for Each Value Orientation

Priority for each value orientation		Mean	SD	No	Percentage
DM	HIGH	31.22	4.90	85	34.00
	NEUTRAL			90	36.00
	LOW			75	30.00
LP	HIGH	31.30	4.98	85	34.00
	NEUTRAL			95	38.00
	LOW			70	28.00
SA	HIGH	29.76	5.13	90	36.00
	NEUTRAL			115	46.00
	LOW			45	18.00
EI	HIGH	29.72	4.65	85	34.00
	NEUTRAL			105	42.00
	LOW			60	24.00
SR	HIGH	28.00	4.92	90	36.00
	NEUTRAL			85	34.00
	LOW			75	30.00

Table No.01 shows the Descriptive Statistics of Disciplinary Mastery (M=31.22, SD=4.90), Learning Process (M=31.30, SD=4.98), Self-Actualization (M=29.76, SD=5.13), Ecological Integration (M=29.72 SD=4.65), Social Reconstruction (M=28.00, SD=4.92). It also states that 64% (N=32) have given consistent priority (i.e. high or low) on Disciplinary Mastery, 62% (N=31) on Learning Process, 54% (N=27) on Self Actualization, 58% (N=29) on Ecological Integration and 66% (N=33) on Social Construction. It also states that Self Actualization and Social Reconstruction are the Value Orientations that the majority of teachers given as high priority. However, Disciplinary Mastery and Social Reconstruction was the Value Orientation for which most teachers gave low priority. Self- Actualization was value orientation were low priority was given by least number of teachers; Self Actualization is also the orientation with most number of teachers with neutral priority.

Table No. 2
Comparison of Each Value Orientations On The Basis of Gender

Variables	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T	df	Sig.(2 tailed)
	F	Sig.			
DM	0.150	0.904	0.612	248	0.541
LP	3.614	0.058	0.488	248	0.626
SA	0.065	0.799	1.141	248	0.255
EI	0.717	0.398	0.821	248	0.413
SR	2.403	0.122	0.559	248	0.576

*Significant at 0.05 level of significance

Table NO.02 shows that the t value of Value Orientations; Disciplinary Mastery (0.541), Learning Process (0.626), Self Actualization (0.255), Ecological Integration (0.413) and Social Construction (0.576) at 48 Degree Of Freedom. None of the Value Orientations have any Significant Difference on the basis of Gender of the Physical Education Teachers.

Table No. 3
Comparison of Each Value Orientations On The Basis of Years of Experience

Variables	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T	df	Sig.(2-tailed)
	F	Sig.			
DM	4.876	0.683	2.035	248	0.053
LP	0.194	0.660	0.456	248	0.649
SA	0.504	0.478	0.568	248	0.571
EI	0.129	0.720	2.710	248	0.030*
SR	0.451	0.514	0.648	248	0.517

*Significant at 0.05 level of significance

Table No.03 shows that the t value of value orientation; Disciplinary Mastery (0.053), Learning Process (0.649), Self Actualization (0.571), Ecological Integration (0.030) and Social Construction (0.517) at 48 degree of freedom. Learning Process and ecological integrations indicates that there is a significant difference among these value orientations of teachers with respect to their years of experience.

DISCUSSION

In all the studies that have conducted using Value Orientation Inventory-1 (Ennis & Hooper, 1988), Value Orientation Inventory-2 (Ennis & Chen, 1993) or Value Orientation Inventory Short-Form (Chen et al., 1997) shows that Physical Education teachers have multiple perspectives on their teaching goals and displayed significantly different value orientation priority. All the teachers who are working in schools gave comparatively average high priority for disciplinary mastery and learning process followed by self-actualization, ecological integration and social reconstruct with lowest priority. Further, the result of the study indicates that there is a variability in the high, medium and low for each value orientation given by physical education teacher where social reconstruction and self actualization gave high priority by 36% of the sample size, disciplinary mastery and self actualization given the low priority with a percentage of thirty(30). Further, 46% shows neutral priority for self actualization which is highest among all the five value orientations. Likewise, the percentage of physical education teachers who gave value orientations neutral priority was greater than that of those who gave this high and low priority.

According to teacher's characteristics, gender was the component selected for the study. The result states that there is no significant difference between male and female teachers in terms of how important different value orientations were to them. Majority of studies (Banville et al., 2002; Behets & Vergauwen, 2004; Curtner-Smith & Meek, 2000; Ennis & Chen, 1995; Ennis & Zhu, 1991; Sisman & Ok, 2012) that took gender into account concluded with similar conclusion. Whereas, A study on Taiwanese teachers discovered that men showed a stronger inclination towards disciplinary mastery and the learning process, while women placed a higher emphasis on social responsibility (Liu & Silverman, 2006). In a particular study, it was found that male preservice teachers who underwent training in Britain exhibited a greater emphasis on the learning process compared to their female counterparts (Capel, 2016).

Significant differences between experience levels (i.e., those with more than ten years' experience and those with less) were identified. More experienced teachers have been shown significant difference in the disciplinary mastery and ecological integration. This result conflicts with that of Ennis and her colleagues (Ennis & Chen, 1995; Ennis & Zhu, 1991) who developed the questionnaire, along with other studies (Banville et al., 2002; Behets & Vergauwen, 2004; Curtner-Smith & Meek, 2000) conducted based on this tool. The influence of value orientations on teachers in different educational contexts, as well as the varying interests and motivations of students in physical education classes, can indeed be affected by various factors.

In schools of Madhya Pradesh, teachers' beliefs often shift towards a holistic approach to teaching physical education as they gain more experience. This shift may be influenced by the cultural and community values prevalent in tribal contexts, which emphasize a more comprehensive and interconnected approach to education. Teachers in these schools may prioritize incorporating indigenous sports and activities into the physical education curriculum, as these activities hold cultural significance and are more appealing to students. On the other hand, primary school students generally tend to be more active and engaged in physical education compared to secondary school students. To address the decline in motivation among secondary school students, teachers often focus on creating a fun and inclusive learning environment that encourages active participation. By incorporating enjoyable and stimulating activities, teachers can help sustain students' interest and promote their engagement in physical education.

However, it's important to note that these observations may not universally apply to all contexts. Cultural background, individual preferences, and specific school environments can greatly influence both student interests and teacher approaches to physical education. Different studies and research may provide additional insights into the motivations and behaviors of students and teachers in specific educational settings. Ultimately, understanding the diverse factors that shape students' interests and teachers' approaches can help inform the development of effective physical education programs that cater to the needs and preferences of all learners.

CONCLUSION

This study has highlighted the variability in how teachers perceive their teaching goals, with distinct differences among value orientations. In schools, teachers' priorities align more towards disciplinary mastery, learning processes, and self-actualization, while assigning relatively lower importance to ecological integration and social reconstruction. Recognizing the dynamic interplay between cultural influences, individual preferences, and school environments, it becomes evident that effective physical education strategies need to be adaptable and context-specific. For instance, integrating indigenous sports and activities could enhance students' engagement, aligning with their cultural context. Meanwhile, addressing the declining motivation among secondary school students might require fostering an inclusive and enjoyable learning atmosphere that resonates with their evolving interests.

It is essential to remember that these insights are not universally applicable but offer valuable considerations for shaping meaningful physical education programs. By delving into the intricate interactions between teacher perspectives, student motivations, and educational contexts, educators and policymakers can craft tailored approaches that empower students, optimize engagement, and facilitate holistic development in physical education. Further research should continue to refine our understanding of these dynamics and contribute to the ongoing enhancement of physical education strategies worldwide.

REFERENCE

- Apple, M. W. (1985). *Education and Power*. Routledge & Kegan Paul Inc.
- Banville, D., Desrosiers, P., & Genet-Volet, Y. (2002). Comparison of value orientations of Quebec and American teachers: A cultural difference? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(4), 469–482. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(02\)00010-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(02)00010-0)
- Behets, D., & Vergauwen, L. (2004). Value Orientations of Elementary and Secondary Physical Education Teachers in Flanders. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 75(2), 156–164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2004.10609147>
- Capel, S. (2016). Value orientations of student physical education teachers learning to teach on school-based initial teacher education courses in England. *European Physical Education Review*, 22(2), 167–184. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X15596984>
- Chen, A., Ennis, C. D., & Loftus, S. (1997). Refining the value orientation inventory. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 68(4), 352–356.
- Curtner-Smith, M. D., Baxter, D. S., & May, L. K. (2018). The Legacy and Influence of Catherine D. Ennis's Value Orientations Research. *Kinesiology Review*, 7(3), 211–217. <https://doi.org/10.1123/kr.2018-0027>

- Curtner-Smith, M. D., & Meek, G. A. (2000). Teachers' Value Orientations and Their Compatibility with the National Curriculum for Physical Education. *European Physical Education Review*, 6(1), 27–45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X000061004>
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Education and democracy*. New York: Macmillan.
- Ennis, C. D. (1992). The Influence of Value Orientations in Curriculum Decision Making. *Quest*, 44(3), 317–329. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.1992.10484058>
- Ennis, C. D., & Chen, A. (1993). Domain Specifications and Content Representativeness of the Revised Value Orientation Inventory. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 64(4), 436–446. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.1993.10607597>
- Ennis, C. D., & Chen, A. (1995). Teachers' Value Orientations in Urban and Rural School Settings. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 66(1), 41–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.1995.10607654>
- Ennis, C. D., & Hooper, L. M. (1988). Development of an instrument for assessing educational value orientations. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 20(3), 277–280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027880200308>
- Ennis, C. D., & Zhu, W. (1991). Value Orientations: A Description of Teachers' Goals for Student Learning. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 62(1), 33–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.1991.10607516>
- Hellison, D. R. (1985). *Goals and Strategies for Teaching Physical Education*. Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc.
- Kilpatrick, W. H. (1918). The Project Method. *Teachers College Record*, 19(4), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811801900404>
- lee, heesu. (2015). *Preservice Physical Education Teacher's Value Orientations across the Student Teaching Semester*.
- Liu, H.-Y., & Silverman, S. (2006). The value profile of physical education teachers in Taiwan, ROC. *Sport, Education and Society*, 11(2), 173–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573320600640694>
- Matanin, M., & Collier, C. (2003). Longitudinal Analysis of Preservice Teachers' Beliefs about Teaching Physical Education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 22(2), 153–168. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.22.2.153>
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' Beliefs and Educational Research: Cleaning Up a Messy Construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307–332. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543062003307>
- Sisman, G. T., & Ok, A. (2012). Value Orientations of the Teaching Certificate Program Students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 2130–2134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.441>
- Upmanyu, M. C. (2016). *The Tribal Education in India, Status, Challenges and Issues*. 3(6), 7.