

An Inclusive Physical Education: Teachers' Attitude and Competence in Planning the Lesson

Tomoliyus¹, Sumaryanti², Japhet Ndayisenga³

^{1,2}Faculty of Sport Sciences, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta

³University of Burundi, Institute of Physical Education and Sport

*corresponding author

Faculty of Sport Sciences, Jl. Colombo No. 1, Depok, Sleman, Yogyakarta Special Region 55281, Indonesia.

Email: tomoliyus@uny.ac.id

¹Sumaryanti is a lecturer in the Department of Health and Recreation, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia, with the special expertise in adaptive physical activity and therapy sports. Inside her areas of expertise, she has conducted many researches and developments related to physical activities for students with special needs.

²Tomoliyus is a lecturer in the Department of Sport Training, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, with the special expertise in sport education and sport for health. He has conducted many researches and developments, and also has published many books inside his expertise areas. Outside the academic atmosphere, he chaired the Indonesian Sports Sciences Association (ISSA), and also manages the regional sport offices in Yogyakarta.

³ Japhet Ndayisenga is lecturer at University of Burundi in Institute of Physical Education and Sport, he has conducted many research in physical education and published in International Journal.

This research is aimed at (1) evaluating physical education (PE) teachers' understanding competence in planning the lesson for inclusive PE at primary school, and (2) finding out PE teachers' attitude towards students in inclusive PE instruction at primary school. This study involved 82 inclusive PE teachers and 352 primary school students in Yogyakarta Special Region, Indonesia. The data were collected by using questionnaire and documentation techniques and were analysed by using descriptive-quantitative percentage technique. This research reveals that the PE teachers' understanding competence in planning the lesson is generally good on some aspects, while it is not really good on some others. In addition, PE teachers tend to show positive attitude towards the students on most aspects in the PE instruction, while there is one aspect on which the teachers show less positive attitude.

Keywords: inclusive, physical, education, attitude, competence, lesson

Introduction

In facing the global era in education, educational curriculum in Indonesia has changed from Curriculum 2006 into Curriculum 2013 fulfilling eight national education standards in the country, covering the standard of (1) content, (2) process, (3) graduate's competence, (4) educator and educational personnel, (5) facility and infrastructure, (6) management, (7) cost, and (8) educational assessment. Those standards need to be fulfilled in implementing education referring to the curriculum. Therefore, before conducting the instructional process, teachers need to plan each lesson by arranging a lesson plan. The lesson plan must be synchronized with the process standard which has been established by the Board of National Education Standard 2015 [1]. The process standard deals with the criteria on the implementation of instructional process in a level of education to reach the graduate's competence standard. This process standard includes the following processes: lesson planning, implementation of the instruction, assessment on the learning outcome, and supervision on the instructional process to ensure the effective and efficient learning process. Thus, in relation to the process standard, teachers are expected to be competent in planning the instructional process, implementing the learning process, assessing the learning outcome as a general service in education and in inclusive physical education for primary school students in particular.

Inclusive education at primary school in Indonesia in the recent years has been becoming a very interesting issue in the national education system, and so does the issue of the implementation of inclusive physical education (PE) at primary school [2] in Yogyakarta Special Region, Indonesia. The most frequently-emerged problem in the implementation of inclusive physical education in Yogyakarta Special Region is related to the educational service for students with special needs at school in order to achieve the expected learning outcome. This is due to the fact that the newly-operated inclusive school is actually a common school which was previously designed for educating students with no special needs. Besides, generally, physical education teachers have less special competence to teach physical education in inclusive class, while the available curriculum and facilities are not prepared for providing educational service to students with special needs in inclusive class. Most PE teachers at primary school design the same lesson plan and even implement the same instructional process to both the students in the inclusive class and those common students. However, occasionally, the political practice policy receives less attention from inclusive physical education practitioners, so that some obstacles still emerge in the planning and practical implementation processes.

The success of inclusive PE instruction is determined by two main factors: teachers' competence [3]; [4]; [5]; [6] and teachers' positive attitude [7]; [8]; [9]. It is a must for a professional teacher to have competence in instructional planning [10]; [11]; [12] and learning outcome assessment conducted through authentic assessment [13]; [14]; [15]; [16]; [17]; [18]. In addition, teachers' attitude towards students in the instructional process are divided into five factors: (1) showing care and kindness/interest; (2) sharing responsibility; (3) being sensitive to accept diversity; (4) improving self-instruction; and (5) encouraging creativity [19]; [20].

Thus, based on the issue of inclusive PE teachers' competence at primary school and some researches related to the issue, the researchers decided to evaluate PE teachers' competence on planning the lesson and their attitude in the inclusive instructional process at primary school in Yogyakarta Special Region. This research is aimed at (1) evaluating physical education (PE) teachers' understanding competence in planning the lesson for inclusive PE at primary school, and (2) finding out PE teachers' attitude towards students in inclusive PE instruction at primary school.

Method

This research employed descriptive quantitative method. The subjects of the study were 82 inclusive PE teachers and 352 students of primary schools located in Yogyakarta Special Region, Indonesia. The samples chosen were 10% of the population, which were established by using random sampling technique. Document and questionnaire techniques were used in collecting the data; document technique was employed to collect the data on the inclusive PE instruction planning, while questionnaire was used to collect the data on the PE teachers' competence in the implementation of the inclusive instructional process and their attitude towards students during the process. The data were then analyzed descriptively using frequency and percentage.

Findings

Data on the result of inclusive PE teachers' competence

The data of inclusive PE teachers' understanding competence in planning the inclusive PE instruction at primary school in Yogyakarta Special Region are presented in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1. Data on inclusive PE teachers' competence in planning the aim, material, instrument, and authentic assessment of the lesson

Dimension	Description	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Total
PE teachers' competence in planning the aim, material, instrument, and authentic assessment of the lesson	Aim of the lesson	14 (17%)	16 (20%)	50 (61%)	2 (2%)	82 (100%)
	Material of the lesson	4 (5%)	12 (14%)	62 (76%)	4 (5%)	82 (100%)
	Instrument of the lesson	0 (0%)	28 (34%)	50 (61%)	4 (5%)	82 (100%)
	Performance assessment (authentic)	0 (0%)	76 (93%)	4 (5%)	2 (2%)	82 (100%)

Based on Table 1, there are 61% PE teachers whose understanding competence in planning the aim of the lesson is categorized as good, 2% are categorized as very good, 20% are categorized as poor, and 17% are categorized as very poor. In addition, 76% of them have good understanding competence in planning the learning material, 5% of them have very good competence, 14% have poor competence, and 5% of them have very poor competence. Further, in terms of planning the instrument of the lesson, 61% of the PE teachers show good understanding competence, 5% show very good understanding competence, 34% show poor competence, and none (0%) shows very poor competence. In terms of planning the performance assessment, 5% of them perform good understanding competence, 2% show very good competence, 76% show poor competence, and none of them (0%) show very poor competence. Therefore, it can be inferred that inclusive PE teachers' understanding competence in terms of planning the aim is 63% good and 37% poor, in terms of planning the lesson material is 81% good and 19% poor, in terms of planning the learning instrument is 66% good and 34% poor, and in terms of planning the authentic assessment is 7% good and 93% poor.

Table2. Data on the inclusive PE teachers' understanding competence in planning the learning approach and method

Dimension	Sub-Dimension	Description	Teachers' Understanding				Total
			Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	
PE teachers' competence in planning the approach and method	Approach	Technique (skill)	2 (2%)	13 (16%)	60 (73%)	7 (9%)	82 (100%)
		Tactical	12 (15%)	64 (78%)	6 (7%)	0 (0%)	82 (100%)
		Character	3 (4%)	77 (94%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	82 (100%)

Method	Demonstration	0 (0%)	16 (20%)	62 (75%)	4 (5%)	82 (100%)
	Problem solving	6 (8%)	70 (85%)	4 (5%)	2 (2%)	82 (100%)

Based on Table 2, there are 9% PE teachers whose understanding competence in planning the lesson using skill approach is categorized as very good, 73% are categorized as good, 13% are categorized as poor, and 2% are categorized as very poor. In addition, none of the PE teachers (0%) have very good understanding competence in planning the lesson using tactical approach, 7% of them have good competence, 78% of them have poor competence, and 15% of them have very poor competence. In terms of planning the lesson using character approach, none of them (0%) show very good understanding competence, 2% of them show good competence, 94% of them show poor competence, and 3% of them show very poor competence.

Moreover, in planning the lesson using demonstration method, 5% of them have very good understanding competence, 75% of them have good competence, 20% of them have poor competence, and none of them (0%) have very poor competence. In terms of planning the lesson using problem-solving method, only 2% of them show very good understanding competence, 5% of them show good competence, 85% of them show poor competence, and 8% of them show very poor competence. Thus, it is concluded that inclusive PE teachers' understanding competence in terms of planning the lesson using skill approach is 82% good and 18% poor, in terms of planning the lesson using tactical approach is 6% good and 94% poor, and in terms of planning the lesson using character approach is 2% good and 98% poor. On the other hand, their understanding competence in terms of planning the lesson using demonstration method is 80% good and 20% poor, in terms of planning the lesson using problem-solving method is 93% poor and 7% good.

Data on inclusive PE teachers' attitude in the instructional process

The data on the inclusive PE teachers' attitude in the instructional process at primary school in Yogyakarta Special Region are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Data on the inclusive PE teachers' attitude towards students in the lesson

Dimension	Indicator	Negative		Positive		Total
		Very Negative	Negative	Positive	Very Positive	
Attitude	Showing care	35 (10%)	135 (36%)	175 (49%)	17 (5%)	352 (100%)

Being responsible	2 (2%)	10 (12%)	62 (76%)	8 (10%)	352 (100%)
Being sensitive to accept diversity	4 (5%)	18 (22%)	55 (67%)	5 (6%)	352 (100%)
Improving individual instruction	6 (7%)	16 (20%)	54 (66%)	6 (7%)	352 (100%)
Encouraging creativity	8 (10%)	32 (69%)	36 (14%)	6 (7%)	352 (100%)

Based on the result of descriptive statistics analysis in Table 3, in the aspect of showing care during the learning process, 49% of PE teachers show positive attitude towards students, 5% of them show very positive attitude, 36% of them show negative attitude, and 10% show very negative attitude. In terms of responsibility towards students during the lesson, 76% of the teachers have positive attitude, 10% have very positive attitude, while 12% of them are less responsible to the students during the lesson (showing negative attitude), and 2% of them show very negative attitude. In addition, 67% of the PE teachers show positive attitude on the aspect of sensitivity in accepting diversity during the lesson, and 6% show very positive attitude, while 22% of them are less sensitive in accepting the diversity, and 5% are not sensitive (showing very negative attitude).

In terms of improving students' instruction during the learning process, 66% of the PE teachers show positive attitude and 7% show very positive attitude. On the other hand, 27% of them show less attitude in improving students' self-instruction, and 7% of them do not improve students' self-instruction. In the aspect of encouraging students' creativity in the learning process, 14% of the PE teachers show positive attitude, 7% of them show very positive attitude, while 69% of them less encourage students' creativity (showing negative attitude), and 10% of them do not encourage students' attitude.

Therefore, it can be inferred that 54% of the PE teachers show caring attitude towards students, while 46% of them do not show it. There are 86% PE teachers who show positive attitude in being responsible towards students during the lesson, while 14% of them show negative attitude. Moreover, 73% of the PE teachers show positive attitude in accepting students' diversity during the learning process, while 17% of them show negative attitude. In terms of improving students' self-instruction in the learning process, 73% of the PE teachers show positive attitude, while 17% of them show negative attitude. In addition, in terms of encouraging students' creativity during the learning process, 21% of the PE teachers show positive attitude, while 79% of them show negative attitude.

Discussion

Attitude is an important factor in physical education (PE) learning process. Attitude, as a factor inseparable from human's life, can cause tendency to perform certain behavior towards the object being confronted [20]. In other words, attitude is a deep feeling of an individual towards certain object; the feeling can be either positive or negative, and either encouraging or discouraging [21]; [22]. The result of this research shows that, according to the students' perception, PE teachers have generally shown positive attitude towards students during PE learning process, especially in the aspects of care, accepting diversity, and improving individual instruction, while the teachers' attitude in encouraging students' creativity is generally negative. By showing positive attitude to the students, they will get more opportunities to learn together, develop their potentials, and get maximum educational treatment during the learning process [23]. On the other hand, unsupportive (negative) attitude shown by the teachers indicates low expectation towards the students in the learning process [24].

Physical Education teachers' competence on planning the lesson is one of the crucial factors in PE instructional process to achieve success in improving students' potentials. The result of the research indicates that the competence of inclusive class PE teachers in planning the aim, material, instrument, and learning model with skill approach is in 'good' category, while their competence in planning the authentic assessment, and learning model using both problem-solving method and tactical method is in 'poor' category. This is in line with the opinions of [10], [11], [12] which state that a professional teacher has to be competent on planning the lesson/instruction. Besides, [13]; [14]; [15]; [16]; [17]; [18] insist that a teacher has to be able to plan the authentic assessment of students' learning outcome. Therefore, the competence of inclusive-class PE teachers at primary schools in Yogyakarta needs to be improved, especially their competence in planning the authentic assessment, and planning the learning model using both tactical approach and problem-solving method.

Conclusion

Based on the afore-mentioned findings and discussion, it is concluded that: The inclusive PE teachers' competence in planning the aim of the learning is 63% good, in planning the learning material is 81% good, in planning the learning instrument is 66% good, and their competence in planning the authentic assessment is 93% poor. Besides, in planning the instructional process, they tend to employ skill approach more rather than the tactical or character approaches, and they also tend to use demonstration method rather than using problem-solving method.

The inclusive PE teachers' attitude of care towards students in the learning process is 54% positive, their responsibility towards students is 86% positive, their sensitivity in accepting diversity is 73% positive, their attitude of improving students' individual instruction is 73%

positive, and their attitude of encouraging students' creativity is 21% positive while the rest 79% of them show negative attitude.

Acknowledgment

This work has been supported by Faculty of Sport Science of Yogyakarta State University and Department of Education and Sports of Yogyakarta Special Region.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

- [1].Horne, Phyllis E., and Vianne Timmons. 2009. "Making It Work: Teachers' Perspectives on Inclusion." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 13 (3): 273–86. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110701433964>.
- [2].Sunardi. 2009. *Issues and Problems on Implementation of Inclusive Education for Disable Children in Indonesia*. Tsukuba: CRICED - University of Tsukuba.
- [3].Avramidis, Elias, Phil Bayliss, and Robert Burden. 2000. "A Survey into Mainstream Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Inclusion of Children with Special Educational Needs in the Ordinary School in One Local Education Authority." *Educational Psychology* 20 (2): 191–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713663717>.
- [4].Block, Martin E., and Terry L. Rizzo. 1995. "Attitudes and Attributes of Physical Educators Associated with Teaching Individuals with Severe and Profound Disabilities." *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps* 20 (1): 80–87.
- [5].Folsom-Meek, Sherry L., and Terry L. Rizzo. 2002. "Validating the Physical Educators' Attitude Toward Teaching Individuals with Disabilities III (PEATID III) Survey for Future Professionals." *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly* 19 (2): 141–54. <https://doi.org/10.1123/apaq.19.2.141>.
- [6].Cicek, Volkan. 2013. "Effective Use of Lesson Plans to Enhance Education." *International Journal of Economy, Management and Social Sciences* 2 (6): 334–41.
- [7].Dart, Gareth. 2007. "Provision for Learners with Special Educational Needs in Botswana: A Situational Analysis." *International Journal of Special Education* 22 (2): 56–66.

- [8].Downs, Peter, and Trevor Williams. 1994. “Student Attitudes Toward Integration of People with Disabilities in Activity Settings: A European Comparison.” *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly* 11 (1): 32–43. <https://doi.org/10.1123/apaq.11.1.32>.
- [9].Hutzler, Yeshayahu (Shayke), Sima Zach, and Ofra Gafni. 2005. “Physical Education Students’ Attitudes and Self-Perceptions Towards the Needs in Regular Classes.” *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 20 (3): 309–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856250500156038>.
- [10].Saker, Tarek, and Nabil Kerfes. 2014. “Analysis of the Objectives of Physical Education in Schools in Algeria and Their Perception by Teachers and Students.” *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport* 2 (3): 37–48. <https://doi.org/10.14486/IJSCS166>.
- [11].Spooner, Fred, Joshua N. Baker, Amber A. Harris, Lynn Ahlgrim-Delzell, and Diane M. Browder. 2007. “Effects of Training in Universal Design for Learning on Lesson Plan Development.” *Remedial and Special Education* 28 (2): 108–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07419325070280020101>.
- [12].Yulianti, Kartika. 2015. “The New Curriculum Implementation in Indonesia: A Study in Two Primary Schools.” *International Journal about Parents in Education* 9 (1): 157–68. <http://www.ernape.net/ejournal/index.php/IJPE/article/view/317>.
- [13].Birenbaum, Menucha. 2007. “Evaluating the Assessment: Sources of Evidence for Quality Assurance.” *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 33 (1): 29–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.STUEDUC.2007.01.004>.
- [14].Gulikers, Judith T. M., Theo J. Bastiaens, and Paul A. Kirschner. 2004. “A Five-Dimensional Framework for Authentic Assessment.” *Educational Technology Research and Development* 52 (3): 67–86. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02504676>.
- [15].Baartman, Liesbeth K.J., Theo J. Bastiaens, Paul A Kirschner, and Cees P.M. van der Vleuten. 2006. “The Wheel of Competency Assessment: Presenting Quality Criteria for Competency Assessment Programs.” *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 32 (2): 153–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.STUEDUC.2006.04.006>.
- [16].Dierick, Sabine, and Filip Dochy. 2001. “New Lines in Edumetrics: New Forms of Assessment Lead to New Assessment Criteria.” *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 27 (4): 307–29. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-491X\(01\)00032-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-491X(01)00032-3).
- [17].Grainger, Peter, Ken Purnell, and Reyna Zipf. 2008. “Judging Quality through Substantive Conversations between Markers.” *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 33 (2): 133–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930601125681>.

- [18].Kaslow, Nadine J., Nancy J. Rubin, Muriel J. Bebeau, Irene W. Leigh, James W. Lichtenberg, Paul D. Nelson, Sanford M. Portnoy, and I. Leon Smith. 2007. “Guiding Principles and Recommendations for the Assessment of Competence.” *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 38 (5): 441–51. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.38.5.441>.
- [19].Gourneau, Bonni. 2012. “Five Attitudes of Effective Teachers: Implications for Teacher Training.” *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* 19 (4): 113–23.
- [20].Memisevic, Haris, and Saudin Hodzic. 2011. “Teachers’ Attitudes towards Inclusion of Students with Intellectual Disability in Bosnia and Herzegovina.” *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 15 (7): 699–710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110903184001>.
- [21].Fishbein, Martin, and Icek Ajzen. 2005. *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Sydney: Addison Wesley.
- [22].Berkowitz, L. 2002. *Social Psychology*. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- [23].Olson, Jennifer Marie. 2003. “Special Education and General Education Teacher Attitudes towards Inclusion.” Wisconsin-Stout.
- [24].Elliott, Steven. 2008. “The Effect of Teachers’ Attitude toward Inclusion on the Practice and Success Levels of Children with and without Disabilities in Physical Education.” *International Journal of Special Education* 23 (3): 48–55.