



CHANGES IN THE STRUCTURE OF SCHOOL PHYSICAL EDUCATION CLASS IN THE FUNCTION OF QUALITY REALIZATION OF THE CURRICULUM

Dušan Ilić¹,
Ratko Pavlović²ⁱ,
Grujo Bjeković²

¹Inspector- Educational Advisor,
Republic Pedagogical Institute Banja Luka,
Republic Srpska/Bosnia & Herzegovina

²Faculty of Physical Education and Sport,
University of East Sarajevo,
Republic Srpska/Bosnia & Herzegovina

Abstract:

The article presents various possibilities for the realization of the lesson and its structure (percentage of individual parts) that can be used in practice. The advantage of this approach and contribution is the possibility of different and more interesting planning and use of classes. This approach would avoid a long-lasting monotonous pattern in the realization of physical education classes. The approach to the realization of the lesson by the teacher and the student's adoption of teaching contents (teaching cycle) is in the function of innovation and a more interesting approach in school practice. Such possibilities are refreshing the performance of the lesson in relation to the previous classic articulation of the lesson, practicing students in teaching in this area.

Keywords: school physical education, class structure, approach to planning, innovation, realization

1. Introductory Considerations (About Physical Education Class)

The basic idea of this professional article is the analysis of the modern physical education class, which should be implemented differently than the current practice.

Given that the modern class is not monotonous and has a uniform structural and content scheme, today every physical education teacher should be able to define, at his own discretion, a variant, analysis and form of work that are most acceptable to him, that correspond to the paradigm of modern education. Educators generally agree that

ⁱ Correspondence: email pavlovicratko@yahoo.com

physical education should have different lesson plans and apply them in relation to different goals. In this regard, in the current expert approach, several options for schemata (structures and articulations) and lesson analysis are offered. As part of modern educational ideas and learning, what was good yesterday can be "considered" good tomorrow. It remains to understand what needs to be corrected, what is the primary emphasis, what is a priority.

In education, all pedagogues generally know what a school lesson is. Numerous school years of working with students are actually thousands of lessons, meetings and contacts - often instructive, exciting and memorable, but also boring, funny, fun, stressful, failed! For a teacher, an hour is a unit of time, i.e. the main (organizational) form of the educational process (work), it is also the "moment of truth" and many more definitions, strict and figurative, spiritual and scientific, depending on the individual characteristics of all those who answer this question. An attempt to evaluate such a complex system, ie. class as instruction, in its versatility and multidimensionality by one definition, is doomed to failure (Butler, 1996). In addition, there are many phrases in our language that use the word class, but do not imply school (to give a lesson, a history lesson, to learn a lesson, a sermon lesson, to give a lesson, a life lesson). A class or lesson without a teacher as a person; the lesson in which the situation arose, something that was suddenly seen or heard, is a source of independent knowledge or even the surrounding nature as a lesson, because it also often and above all teaches us!

Starting the conversation about the class, we note that we will talk about it in a narrower sense, as one of the main forms of organizing the educational process at school. Thus, classes (lessons) are prepared for students, presented, and "(pre)burdened", or they are taught but also taught. The lesson was created more than four centuries ago. Of course, during that time it underwent many transformations. Since the class is also in the context of modern culture, it acquires the characteristics of this culture, thus becoming a unique or dominated product of culture and at the same time a carrier of culture. It is both a tool and a measure for a cultural approach to education (Mosston, & Ashworth, 1994). If we talk about the contemporary, modern hour, we would recall the two main meanings of the word modern - which refer to the present, current time. In this sense, every lesson or as we often say "class" that takes place, performs or realizes today is modern, simply because of the sign of the times in which we live. Another meaning of this word, and for us it is more important - standing at the level of one's age, fulfilling the spirit and demands (challenges) of one's time, needs, aspirations and desires.

On the one hand, the school is one of the most inert social (public institutions) institutions, so, speaking of modern times, it can be argued that it still occupies (unfortunately also in physical education) at least 90% of the teaching time. His "authority" is strong and high, but the class needs to get new functions. The changes it goes through are caused by certain but turbulent social events and processes. The situation of the modern class is a situation of parting with a strict class - a strict lesson, which is characterized (work, order and discipline) by proven regulation, diligence of students, precise outlines of educational material, rituals and rules. In recent years, new

pedagogic trends have appeared or are just emerging at school: changes in setting goals, learning outcomes, approaches to the psychomotor, cognitive, affective or social dimensions of the student's personality, as well as the direction of cultural, natural alignment of education; strengthening the personal orientation of the content and technologies of education; individualization of students' educational paths; creative and developmental orientation of basic education; and more and more technology and computerization of the educational process. All this was reflected in one of the main documents that regulate the improvement of the educational process - in the concept of modernization of general education, in the last 20 years (Ferreira, & Moreira, 2012). Accordingly, the transformation of the lesson takes place in the context of modern educational ideas, while in most developed countries, the educational process is carried out according to the curricular methodology (permanent and inter-generational process, activities of teachers and students, and they never stop). The Lesson is a journey, not a competition.

2. School Physical Education Lesson Structure

We will now consider the structure of the school physical education lesson in the function of the modern (higher quality) implementation of the teaching process (plan and program). The structure of the physical education class will be considered functionally through two key values of educational work: for students (through independence and responsibility), and for teachers (through independence and creativity). On this idea and encouragement to the author on this topic at the very beginning of a long period of curricular changes, it can be logically and simply expressed: since the independence (autonomy) and creativity of the teacher relate to all parts of the teaching process, then they also relate to the issue of structuring. first of all school physical education classes, as part of general education.

It has long been known that the lesson is the basic unit (form of work) of the teaching and educational process (Krsmanović, 1996; Višnjić et al., 2004; Kragujević, 2005; Branković, & Dragić, 2007). Therefore, we believe that, as students often work at the former faculties of physical culture, and also at the current ones (faculties of physical education and sports), the exclusive and uniform five-part structure of the lesson, which has been applied for more than 70 years, is an unnecessary and monotonous performance for students. and certainly a serious obstacle to the independence and creativity of many teachers. Such a fact and the practice with the five-part structure of the physical education lesson that originates from the home faculties is not in the function of the curricular methodology (modern educational technology), nor in the function of the innovative and better approaches (models) of learning and teaching that will be designed by generations of teachers in the coming decades.

2.1 Variants of the Structure of the School Physical Education Lesson

Many countries of the world implement the teaching process according to the curricular methodology, and constantly increase the effects (achievements) of the educational process. We believe that this also applies to the subject of physical education. In the world, physical education classes are conducted using different approaches, which is why the class (structure) is not the same anywhere. Lessons differ from each other, depending on the independence and creativity of the teacher, and they are in agreement with long-term reflection (Hata & Sekine, 2010; Bronikovski, 2004, 2010).

Such reflections, ideas and novelties are created by the teacher in the implemented plan and program, the purpose of which is the achievement of the students. For an insight into the above, there are examples of complete implementation of the lesson, without structured parts (Helison, 2003). Typical parts of the lesson as we know them do not exist (they are an abstraction, they are not defined), and the name "part of the lesson" ("segment") is only a guideline for educational work and is treated as a whole (without emphasis, not separation) and the flowing, or "flowing" realization of the lesson. As we previously stated, apart from the five-part lesson, there are also four-part, three-part, two-part (even one-part) lessons, where such "parts" of the lesson do not have a name, so they are most often marked with Roman numerals. We emphasize that in a large number of countries, the three-part structure of the class dominates. They are most often defined as the introductory, main and final part of the lesson (most often 30% + 60% + 10%). This percentage representation is not strict for teachers, so there are more or less deviations from it, due to objective or subjective reasons. This structure is the most represented in EU countries, while it is not represented in primary and secondary schools in the Republic of Srpska.

Let's conclude, in the world, there is not only one, ideal form of realization of a lesson. The five-part structure of the lesson with the main part of lessons A and B contains about 40% of the total duration of the lesson 45 minutes (90 in a block lesson), while in the 4-part structure of the main part, it makes up about 60% of the total duration of the lesson (Table 1). As a note, until yesterday the "faculty of physical culture", today the "faculty of physical education and sport" during the training of students, implemented this class structure, and unfortunately, it remains represented, and in school practice, unfortunately, it remains for a long series of years. Three-part articulation, it makes up 60% of the time for the main part, and 30% for the introductory part and 10% for the final part of the lesson. The two-part structure of one lesson has the introductory part A and B each 30%, and the main part of the lesson comprises 70%. In it, there is no final part of the lesson. The two-part structure of two classes (block classes) introductory-preparatory and main part makes up about 50%, while the main and final parts are integrated in 50%. Finally, the one-part lesson structure contains 100%, everything is contained in the main part of the lesson, and no "parts". It largely depends on: age, teaching content, student achievement that we want to achieve, class duration and load, student preparation, philosophy and creation and educational style of learning of teachers, students, etc. That's why we will continue to focus on changes in the structure of the physical education

lesson, in order to create the possibility of choosing for the independence and creativity of the teacher, whereby we always mean the transfer of (certain) instructions to the same students.

Table 1: Articulation of school physical education class by parts (Ilić, Zdanski, Galić, 2009)

Articulation of class (5-PART)				
Introductory part	Preparatory part	Main part A	Main part B	Final part
10%	20%	40%	20%	10%
Articulation of class (4-PART)				
Introductory part	Preparatory part	Main Part	Final part	
10% (2 phases of 5%)	20%	60%	10%	
Articulation of class (3-PART)				
Introductory part	Main part		Final part	
30%	60%		10%	
Articulation of class 1				
Introductory part A	Preparatory part B		Main part	
10%	20%		70%	
Articulation of class for block classes (2-PART)				
Introductory, preparatory and main part		Main and final part		
50%		50%		
Articulation of class (1-PART)				
Main part				
100%				

2.2. The Structure of the Physical Education Class in the Republic of Srpska (BiH)

In contrast to the application in other countries, which we have previously described, by looking at some experiences and professional sources and materials, it can be reliably confirmed the fact that the structure of the segments/parts) of the class in this and the wider area of the Balkans, for over 70 years, is justified ("defends") on a molded principle with a four - or five-part structure (Polič, 1967; Reljić, 1974; Berković, 1978; Matić, 1978; Krsmanović, 1996; Najšteter, 1997; Findak, 1999; Krsmanović & Višnjić, 1999; Jovanović, & Miletić, 2004; Gabrijević, 2005; Branković, & Dragić, 2007; Ilić, Zdanski, & Galić, 2009).

We know that such a structure consists of introductory, preparatory, main and final parts of the lesson according to the so-called falcon or classical approach. We often call it a traditional class, which does not allude to the negative, but to all the advantages and disadvantages, if such an approach fits or accepts the individual student's expectations. At some faculties, the concept of adopting teaching with the addition of dividing the main part of the lesson into so-called A and B part of the lesson, which clearly makes a five-part articulation of the lesson. This was a regular occurrence and

training at the faculties from 1950-1990, but this structure, unfortunately, has remained since then until today. Unfortunately, this 5-part structure is (today's practice) applicable even in all ages of education, from preschool to university education, which has no logic, we will agree. How can the same lesson structure be applied to the practice of children and youth from 4-19, (even among seniors, even at university) during one year, or even four years in class/subject classes?

In these levels of education, school ages, goals and tasks, program content, teaching and training methods, achievements and values of exercise, completely change. One of the numerous prominent methodologists of the former Yugoslavia (Prof. Dr. Najšteter) paved the way for generations of students, precisely in liberating students from the demands for the humanization (interaction) of physical education of students and teachers by changing this structure (primarily in two and three parts of the lesson) through the application the so-called of the spectrum of teaching styles towards the humanization of school physical education (command style of work, work in small homogeneous groups, reciprocal style of work with and without slips and style of work of students' own creativity).

Bronikowski (2010) argued and explained this problem with the existence of learning styles: command style, practical, mutual, self-control, inclusive, discovery-driven style, divergent and project style. Likewise, his approach and definition of the following set of teaching styles in physical education are very instructive: reproductive (most often present in our region in BiH and beyond), and less common, assimilation, discovery and production style. This is solid and significant knowledge, important for a step towards innovation and improvement of cooperative (collaborative), not reproductive or competitive, which has no major benefits of teaching, which nowadays is acceptable and welcome to the majority. This collaborative teaching is most often classified as innovative, but without significant representation in the current subject-class-hour system in our school, and in physical education.

2.3. Innovating Teaching with a Changing Structure of the Physical Education Lesson

In order for the teaching process to be carried out more qualitatively, we must start with the independence and creativity of the teacher-teacher. When it truly works, a step will be taken to improve teaching in the curriculum both in elementary school and high school. That is why we propose a variant of different lesson structures that a physical education teacher would apply during the school year. We define this by the variability of the structure of the school's physical education lesson.

Some authors divide the introductory or first (initial, preparatory, pre-introductory) part of the lesson into two parts, the one that "started" in the locker room and the other "real" part, when the students are ready to start the activity (from review onwards). Then, this "real" part of the first part of the lesson consists of two phases: one in which the teacher orally presents the content and the other active, popularly called "warming up" that he may hold before the oral presentation of the activity.

According to these innovative approaches, teachers could quite freely (functionally) choose the structure for which they are assessed, according to their abilities, determinations, ideas and quality achievement of educational achievements (general and specific, sports) among students. The function thus becomes primary, not form. That's why at the faculties of physical education and sports, in schools, we justify and support every such initiative and practice of full and represented ('equal') use of: 5-part, 4-part, 3-part, 2-part and 1-part structures physical education class in order to achieve an integral approach to the student, i.e. to the subject of the process, his general interests and competences, specific and movement-game and sports achievements. This confirms the experience of many countries where modern educational technology is efficiently and effectively applied.

The two-part class is also very inviting for discussion and application. You can do the introductory part of the class in A and B parts, and the main part of the class without the final part. The class is also interesting in two parts, so the first (I) part of the class combines the introductory, preparatory and main part of the class, and in the second (II) part of the class general and specific physical preparation, because it is a school age, with the transition to the implementation of relaxation-relief of exercise intensity (autogenic training), which calms the student's body, stretches it or relaxes it, with certain comments, experiences, a shorter group, discussion, that is, individual observations.

The described novelty, we can say the richness of access to structures, is based on past experience and socio-cultural approach and in accordance with the new era, and the technology of education. This can only be the basis for a better mission of teachers in school work, first of all a better cooperative relationship, according to practice and increasing the quality of work in teaching, regardless of the age and level of upbringing and education of the students. Different lesson structures should be applied, depending on: purpose, age, teaching content, effectiveness of impact on student achievements and level of progress, and not the same lesson structure for different teaching contents, ages, purposes and conditions. The time structure of the lesson will not be the basic one, but an auxiliary framework for achieving the goals of the lesson by students and teachers. The auxiliary framework is, because in order to realize the orientation of the teaching process and the set educational requirements in teaching, the teacher is a key factor in choosing options, tools that he assesses from a professional aspect as the best quality (effective) to achieve the planned educational tasks in the classroom through the accumulated realization of the purpose through a series of teaching hours. year. This is understandable, because the previous thinking and discussion expertly establishes and advocates the realization of the lesson according to the ideas of the physical education teacher. Thus, the teacher/teacher is formally and functionally given freedom for a further degree and higher quality work, as well as students during their studies, and constant independence.

It is known that the paradigm of curricular reform refers to a completely different design of the teaching process. Therefore, it must be pointed out that the achievement of different learning outcomes functionally (and in terms of developmental domains)

cannot be in agreement with one traditional articulation of the realization of a physical education class. The opposite is needed. By achieving different learning effects by domain, teachers should be enabled to functionally connect their teaching methods with a greater number of variable possibilities (variants) or options of the physical education class. In this way, the optimization of the class can be realized for different names of the teaching process that the teacher should always creatively prepare for the students (and with the students, especially challenging in project teaching). Each physical education lesson has its own teaching content, and the teacher's competence (jurisdiction or ability at work) and autonomy (independence) determines how the lesson will be structured or the presentation of a 5-, 4-, 3-, 2- or even one-part structure of the lesson.

3. Conclusion

Several of the listed options for the physical education class structure should formally and functionally come to life before the comprehensive introduction of the curricular reform in all grades of primary and secondary schools, because this way (approach) is a significant incentive to increase the quality of physical education, i.e. the goals and effects (outcomes) of learning. According to what was stated and shown, this approach to changes in the structure of the lesson is applicable in all countries of the world, because it is universal. It is also very important through the application of the mentioned learning styles. It is universal because it allows all these (variable) physical education lesson structures to be used without restrictions, and regardless of:

- dominant representation of the class structure in other countries,
- different levels of physical and mental achievements and readiness of students,
- different name of the physical education subject,
- different pool of hours (schedule) of compulsory lessons, yearly and weekly,
- different periods of schooling with compulsory/elective FV classes,
- different status of the subject physical education and its representation in teaching and extracurricular (extracurricular) activities (compulsory, optional, optional, corrective, additional, supplemental...).

The choice of the articulation (structure) of the lesson must logically be within the competence and freedom of the teacher, because in this way teachers can self-initiatively improve their achievements and effects of work (outcomes), the process of teaching and learning. That's why we are not in favor of giving priority or dominance to any time structure of the class (and especially not to one and only pattern-style of teaching physical education, which mostly dominates today).

It is necessary to analyse, devise and reexamine in which teaching contents, conditions, occasions and similar situations, in which structure should be applied and realized. Every time we need to discuss different aspects of the modern and particularly articulated lesson in a new way. We hope that this kind of confrontation and material about the lesson will give the educational public new touches, new illustrations, and new ideas (challenges).

Acknowledgment

We express our special gratitude to all physical education teachers with whom we cooperated, who, in some way, contributed to the publication of this contribution, which refers to several decades of our work in education.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

About the Authors

Dušan Ilić (PhD) is Inspector- Educational Advisor, Republic Pedagogical Institute Banja Luka, Republic Srpska, Bosnia & Herzegovina. His current research interests are school physical education, class structure, innovation and realization, curricula in education. E-mail: dusan.ilic@rpz-rs.org

Ratko Pavlović (PhD) is Full Professor of Sports and Rehabilitation Sciences of Faculty of Physical Education and Sport of University of East Sarajevo. His current research interests are track and field, school physical education, sports science, body composition, isokinetic, biomechanics of sport. E-mail: pavlovicratko@yahoo.com; ResearchGate: www.researchgate.net/profile/Ratko-Pavlovic

Grujo Bjeković (PhD) is Associate Professor (retired) of Sports and Rehabilitation Sciences of University of East Sarajevo, Faculty of Physical Education and Sport. His current research interest is school physical education.

References

- Berković, L. (1978). *Methodology of physical education*. NIPU, Partizan, Belgrade.
- Bronikowski, M. (2004). Heart rates of pupils during physical education lessons. *Human Movement*, 5 (2), 106-112.
- Branković, N. & Dragić, B. (2007). *Methodology of physical education*. Niš: SIA.
- Bronikowski, M. (2010). *Physical education teaching and learning*. Academy of Physical Vichovania them Eugeniusz Piasecki in Poznań.
- Butler, J. (1996). Teacher responses to teaching games for understanding. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 67(9), 17-20.
- Findak, V. (1999). *Methodology of physical and health culture*. Manual for teachers of physical and health education, School book, Zagreb.
- Ilić, D., Galić, M. (2009). Personality and competencies of physical education teachers in traditional and humanistic teaching focused on programs and learning outcomes, FIS communication, Niš.
- Ilić, D., Zdanski, I., & Galić, M. (2009). *Basics of didactics of physical education*, Komesgrafika, Banjaluka-Belgrade.
- Krsmanović, B. (1996). *Physical education class*. Novi Sad: Faculty of Physical Education.

- Krsmanović, B, Berković, L. (1999). *Theory and methodology of physical education*. Novi Sad: Faculty of Physical Education.
- Kragujević, G. (2005). *Theory and methodology of physical education*. ZUNS, Beograd.
- Matić, M. (1978). *Physical exercise class*. IPRO, Partizan, Beograd.
- Mosston, M., & Ashworth, S. (1994). *Teaching Physical Education*, 4th ed. New York: Macmillan.
- Najšteter, Đ. (1997). *Kinesiological didactics*. Sarajevo: Federal ministry BIH.
- Polič, B. (1967). Humanization of physical culture. NIPU, Partizan, Beograd.
- Reljić, J. (1974). Planning physical education lessons in high school, Instructions. Zagreb: School book.
- Ferreira, A. G., & Moreira, J. A. (2012). Perceptions of pedagogical practice of physical education teachers in Portugal since 1970. *Sport Logia*, 8 (1), 9-26.
- Hata, T., & Sekine, M. (2010). Philosophy of sport and physical education in Japan: Its history, characteristics and prospects. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*. 37 (2), 215-224.
- Helison, D. (2003). *Teaching responsibility through physical activity*. Champaign, IL Human Kinetics.
- Višnjić, D., Jovanović, A., Miletić, K. (2004). *Theory and methodology of physical education*. Beograd: Faculty of Physical Education.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).