

CHAPTER IV

TEACHING OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMMES IN SCHOOLS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents findings of the implementation of the Physical Education programme in secondary schools. All data were obtained from responses from administrators and teachers to three separate questionnaires (Appendix E, F and G). The analysis of data was carried out with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) for Windows. The computed data is reported as follows:

- (A) Description of responding schools
- (B) Description of the responding administrators and teachers.
- (C) Usefulness of teaching Physical Education during the pre-service teacher education training programme.
- (D) Staff Training Programme for teachers
- (E) Physical Education committee meeting
- (F) Teaching ability of Physical Education teachers.
- (G) Problems faced by Physical Education teachers.
- (H) Physical Education teachers' perception of class distribution in Physical Education programme.
- (I) Non-human factors in Physical Education programme.
- (J) Facilities for Physical Education and sport in school.
- (K) Administrators' perception of the implementation of Physical Education programme in school

- (L) Physical Education teachers’ perception of the implementation of Physical Education programme in school.
- (M) Factors affecting the implementation of Physical Education programme in secondary school

4.1 Description of the sample schools

Table 4.1
Respondent Distribution According To Category

School Category	Frequency	Percentage
Grade A	201	74.7
Grade B	68	25.3
Total	269	100.0

The 269 schools which constituted the sample were drawn from 1245 schools in Peninsular Malaysia (Table 4.1). There are 74.7 percent Grade A schools and 25.3 percent Grade B schools.

Table 4.2
Respondent Distribution According To Location

Location	Frequency	Percentage
Urban	113	42.0
Rural	156	58.0
Total	269	100.0

Table 4.2 shows the distribution of sample according to location. A total of 113 schools (42.0%) are urban schools and 156 schools (58%) are rural schools.

4.2 Description of the responding administrators and teachers

A total of 2173 respondents constituted the sample. These respondents were 267 principals, 269 senior assistants and 1637 Physical Education teachers from 269 secondary schools in Peninsular Malaysia. Description of the sample is made under several aspects such as personal data, training of teacher in teacher training programme, teaching responsibility and courses attended.

4.2.1 Personal Data

The details in Table 4.3 shows that there were slightly more male (52.9%) than female (47.1%) respondents. This does not reflect the general notion that the teaching profession is dominated by female teachers. By age, the majority of respondents (59.9%) were below 40 years in age. About 76.5% of the Physical Education teachers were below 40 which reflects that the Physical Education teachers are young. In terms of ethnic group, the sample consisted of a majority of Malay teachers (78.9%), followed by Chinese (16.3%), Indian (4.2%) and Others (0.6%).

Table 4.3
Personal Data of the Sample Respondents

Characteristics	Frequency			Total (Percentage)
	Principals	Senior Assistants	P.E. Teachers	
Sex				
Male	166	173	811	1150 (52.9)
Female	101	96	826	1023 (47.1)
Age				
30 years & below	2	3	431	436 (20.1)
30 – 39 years	3	40	821	864 (39.8)
40 – 49 years	112	166	307	585 (26.9)
50 years & above	150	60	78	288 (13.2)
Race				
Malay	211	223	1280	1714 (78.9)
Chinese	52	43	259	354 (16.3)
Indian	3	3	86	92 (4.2)
Others	1	0	12	13 (0.6)
Total	267	269	1637	2173 (100.0)

4.2.2 Education of respondents

In terms of academic qualification, the sample is made-up of 66.6% of graduates and about one-third non-graduates. With regard to professional qualification, about half of the respondents (46.6%) had entered teacher training colleges while the other half had their teacher education in the universities through their Diploma in Education or Degree in Education Programmes.

A large number of teachers (88.3%) were trained in non Physical Education subjects and only a small number (11.7%) were Physical Education majors. This indicates that there is an acute shortage of Physical Education teachers in secondary schools in Peninsular Malaysia.

Table 4.4

Education background of Administrators and Physical Education teachers

Characteristics	Frequency			Total (Percentage)
	Principal	Senior Assistant	P.E. Teacher	
Academic Qualification				
Malaysian Certificate of Education (SPM)	0	0	371	371 (17.1)
Malaysian Higher Cert. of Education (STPM)	0	0	228	228 (10.5)
Diploma	0	0	99	99 (4.6)
First Degree	243	242	891	1376 (63.3)
Masters	24	27	21	72 (3.3)
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)	0	0	1	1 (0.04)
Others			26	26 (1.2)
Professional Qualification				
Certificate of Education	103	86	824	1013 (46.6)
Diploma in Education	152	143	577	872 (40.1)
Degree in Education	11	38	233	282 (13.0)
Others	1	2	3	6 (0.3)
Majors				
Physical & Health Education	2	4	249	255 (11.7)
Languages	115	76	483	674 (31.0)
Art &/or Music	1	3	33	37 (1.7)
Mathematics &/or Science	37	57	284	378 (17.4)
Religious Studies	11	19	52	82 (3.8)
Others	101	110	536	747 (34.4)
Total	267	269	1637	2173 (100.0)

4.2.3 Working Experience of Administrators and Physical Education Teachers

Table 4.5

Working Experience as Principal

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 5 years	119	44.6
5 – 9 years	77	28.8
10 – 14 years	22	8.2
15 – 19 years	28	10.5
20 years and above	21	7.9
Total	267	100.0

Table 4.5 shows that approximately half of the total number of principals have less than five years experience, thus showing that they are new administrators. On the contrary only 7.9 percent of the respondents have 20 or more years of experience.

Table 4.6

Working Experience as Senior Assistant

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 5 years	166	61.7
5 – 9 years	83	30.9
10 – 14 years	10	3.7
15 – 19 years	3	1.1
20 years and above	7	2.6
Total	269	100.0

Similarly, Table 4.6 reveals that the senior assistants are relatively new; 61.7 percent have had less than five years experience as senior assistants. Only 2.6 percent have 20 or more years experience.

Table 4.7**Administrators' Working Experience As Physical Education Teachers**

Characteristics	Administrators		Teachers	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Never	287	53.5	342	20.9
Less than 5 years	198	36.9	787	48.1
5 – 9 years	32	6.0	234	14.3
10 – 14 years	13	2.4	111	6.8
15 – 19 years	1	0.2	102	6.2
20 years and above	5	0.9	61	3.7
Total	536	100.0	1637	100.0

Table 4.7 shows that 46.5 percent of the administrators have experience as Physical Education teachers . However, a majority (36.9%) of them have less than five years experience. As for teachers, 20.9 percent of the teachers have never taught Physical Education before. About half (48.1%) of the total teacher respondents have taught Physical Education for less than 5 years.

Table 4.8**Working Experience As Physical Education Head Teachers**

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Never	1278	78.1
Less than 5 years	241	14.7
5 – 9 years	72	4.4
10 – 14 years	32	1.9
15 – 19 years	11	0.7
20 years and above	3	0.2
Total	1637	100.0

The data in Table 4.8 shows that 78.1 percent of teachers never become head Physical Education teachers. About 20% have less than 10 years of experience.

4.2.4 Teaching Responsibilities

With regard to teaching responsibility, more than half of the Physical Education teachers only teach less than 5 periods of Physical Education per week and a majority of them (85.7%) teach less than 11 periods per week. On the contrary, a majority (85%) of the Physical Education teachers teach 11 periods or more non Physical Education subjects. These details indicate that Physical Education is not considered as a specialist subject. It is often used to supplement the total number of teaching periods, and this reflects that it is a dispensable subject.

Table 4.9

Teaching responsibilities of Physical Education teachers

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Work load per week for Physical Education		
Less than 5 periods	860	52.5
5 – 10 periods	544	33.2
11 – 15 periods	134	8.2
16 – 20 periods	67	4.1
More than 20 periods	32	1.9
Work load per week for other subjects		
No teaching periods	3	0.2
Less than 5 periods	43	2.6
5 – 10 periods	200	12.2
11 – 15 periods	308	18.8
16 – 20 periods	498	30.4
More than 20 periods	585	35.8

4.2.5 Courses attended by Physical Education teachers

This section describes the present status of teachers in terms of attendance in in-service courses since becoming a qualified teacher. Courses attended are sub-divided into courses related to Physical Education and courses related to sport.

4.2.5.1 Physical Education courses

On the average, a large number of teachers (88.6%) had never attended any Physical Education courses since becoming a qualified teacher. Only about three percent of teachers had attended 1 - 2 courses. This does not augur well as the sample schools have only 11.7% of Physical Education teachers majoring in Physical Education.

However, the details indicate that State Education Department and District Education Office and Curriculum Development Centre play major roles in organising such courses for Physical Education teachers. The data in Table 4.10 also shows that other agencies such as the National Sports Council and individual sports associations such as the Malaysian Amateur Athletics Union, the Malaysian Hockey Federation, the Malaysian Basketball Association, the Football Association of Malaysia, The Malaysian Netball Association and the Malaysian Amateur Volleyball Association also play their role in providing training to teachers.

Table 4.10

Physical Education Related Courses Attended By Physical Education Teachers

Course Attendance	Course Organiser									
	Curriculum Development Centre		Teacher Education Division		State Education Department		District Education Office		Other Agencies	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Never attend	1500	91.6	1560	95.3	1294	79.0	1317	80.5	1581	96.6
Attend 1 time	89	5.4	54	3.3	155	9.5	159	9.7	34	2.1
2 times	21	1.3	15	0.9	64	3.9	63	3.8	10	0.6
3 times	13	0.8	3	0.2	52	3.2	37	2.3	2	0.1
4 times	4	0.2	1	0.1	23	1.4	23	1.4	4	0.2
5 times	3	0.2	1	0.1	14	0.9	10	0.6	1	0.1
6 times	4	0.2	-	-	12	0.7	7	0.4	1	0.1
7 times	-	-	-	-	5	0.3	4	0.2	-	-
8 times	-	-	-	-	3	0.2	4	0.2	-	-
10 times	2	0.1	-	-	11	0.7	10	0.6	3	0.2
11 times	-	-	-	-	1	0.1	-	-	-	-
12 times	-	-	1	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.1	-	-
13 times	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.1	-	-
14 times	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.1
15 times	-	-	1	0.1	2	0.1	1	0.1	-	-
18 times	-	-	1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
30 times	1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	1637	100	1637	100	1637	100	1637	100	1637	100

Table 4.10a notes that the in-house training provided by the State and District Education Office is accounted for by approximately one fifth of the responses from the teachers. However, this figure is small if we consider that it is calculated based on years of teaching of the teachers.

Table 4.10a**A comparison of three major organiser of Physical Education courses**

Course attendance	Course organiser					
	State Education Department		District Education Office		Curriculum Development Centre	
	f	%	F	%	f	%
1 – 5	308	18.9	292	17.8	130	7.9
6 – 10	31	1.9	25	1.4	6	0.3
> 10	4	0.3	3	0.3	0	0.0
Total	343	21.1	320	19.5	136	8.2

4.2.5.2 Sport Related Courses

Table 4.11 showed that Physical Education teachers were deprived of sport related courses too. Teachers who never attended any sport related courses ranged from 82.4 % (courses conducted by State Education Departments and District Education Offices) to 97.2% (Curriculum Development Centre). In fact they never attended any courses after being posted to schools. The details once again confirm that the State Education Department and District Education Office play a major role in organising courses. Both agencies conducted 17.6% of the sport related courses for teachers. Teacher Education Division and Curriculum Development Centre played a much smaller role. They respectively organised 2.8% and 2.7% of the sport related courses. The role played by the Curriculum Development Centre is that of providing training to key personnel who will in turn provide training to other teachers at zone or district level. This explains the small percentage of courses provided. Similarly, the Teacher Education Division provided short courses for interested teachers. Non education agencies also play a role in providing training to teachers.

Table 4.11

Sport Related Courses Attended By Physical Education Teachers

Course Attendance	Curriculum Development Centre		Teacher Education Division		State Education Department		District Education Office		Other Agencies	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Never attend	1591	97.2	1590	97.1	1349	82.4	1349	82.4	1506	92.0
Attend 1 time	32	2.0	25	1.5	130	7.9	151	9.2	58	3.5
2 times	10	0.6	14	0.9	64	3.9	48	2.9	31	1.9
3 times	1	0.1	3	0.2	35	2.1	32	2.0	15	0.9
4 times	1	0.1	1	0.1	18	1.1	16	1.0	6	0.4
5 times	-	-	1	0.1	22	1.3	22	1.3	5	0.3
6 times	-	-	1	0.1	4	0.2	7	0.4	5	0.3
7 times	-	-	-	-	1	0.1	1	0.1	2	0.1
8 times	-	-	1	0.1	2	0.1	1	0.1	2	0.1
9 times	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.1	-	-
10 times	2	0.1	-	-	10	0.6	7	0.4	6	0.4
12 times	-	-	-	-	1	0.1	-	-	-	-
15 times	-	-	-	-	1	0.1	2	0.1	-	-
16 times	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.1
20 times	-	-	1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	1637	100	1637	100	1637	100	1637	100	1637	100

4.3 Staff Training For Teachers

Table 4.12

Teachers attendance in Staff Training Programme

Attendance in Staff Training	Frequency			Percentage
	Town	Rural	Total	
Never	367	533	900	55.0
1- 3 times	292	337	629	38.4
4 - 6 times	40	37	77	4.7
> 6 times	12	19	31	1.9
Total	711	926	1637	100.0
Percentage	43.4	56.6	100.0	

Table 4.12 indicates that 55% of the Physical Education teachers never attended any Staff Training programme since becoming a teacher. About one third have attended training between 1 to 3 times. This finding reveals that despite having a majority of non Physical Education majors teaching Physical Education, schools fail to understand the need for staff development in this area. In terms of training by location, the statistics indicated that rural schools had more meetings than the town schools. It seems that more supervision is needed from State Education Department and District Education Office to monitor the staff training programme for Physical Education teachers.

4.4 Physical Education Committee Meeting

The analysis in Table 4.13 shows that the majority (71.1%) of teachers had attended 1 to 3 Physical Education committee meetings. The small number of meetings indicates that Physical Education teachers have limited chance to meet and discuss problems they

face. When percentages of Physical Education committee meetings of town and rural schools were compared, the results indicated that rural schools teachers met more than their town counterparts.

Table 4.13

Attendance of teachers in Physical Education committee meeting for the year 1997

Attendance in Physical Education Committee Meeting	Frequency			Percentage
	Urban	Rural	Total	
Never	85	118	203	12.4
1 - 3 times	506	658	1164	71.1
4 - 6 times	105	125	230	14.1
> 6 times	15	25	40	2.4
Total	711	926	1637	100.0
Percentage	43.4	56.6	100.0	

Table 4.13 shows that 87.6% of Physical Education committees had meetings. On the contrary, it reveals that 203 schools (12.4%) did not conduct their meetings despite the requirement to do so. In the observation conducted on 118 schools by the Federal Inspectorate of Schools (1994/1995) it was found that at least 51 schools in seven states (Johore, Kedah, Melaka, Kelantan, Pahang, Selangor and Terengganu) defied the order to hold committee meetings; in those schools the committee did not function as required. The Federal Inspectorate of Schools reported that even though the Physical Education head teachers were experienced, they did not play their role as prime movers to develop the Physical Education subject. Minutes from all the meetings held revealed that only routine issues were discussed and there was no effort to improve the performance in the teaching and learning of Physical Education. Some committees did

not prepare minutes of the meeting held, let alone submit them to the administrators.

This observation obviously shows that the monitoring of the committee does not happen even at the school level. As such, measures must be determined to ensure that the Physical Education committee functions as it should; to promote the learning and teaching of Physical Education in schools.

4.5 Teachers' perception of usefulness of teaching of Physical Education during pre-service teacher education training programme.

Table 4.14 shows that only 577 (35.2%) teachers had the opportunity to teach Physical Education during their training in schools through the practical training by the Teacher Education Division.

Table 4.14

Teaching Practice Experience in The Teaching of Physical Education

Physical Education Teaching Practice Experience	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	577	35.2
No	1060	64.8
Total	1637	100.0

The analysis in Table 4.15 shows the response of Physical Education teachers on items pertaining to the usefulness of practical teaching. More than 86% of the sample perceived the experience as useful and it gives them confidence in handling Physical Education classes. About 90% of teachers felt that the teaching practice gives them confidence in managing students in their Physical Education classes. These findings are

similar to those of Clark & Nisbet (1963), Hermanowicz, (1966), Indra Devi (1992), Koh et al. (1987), Mason (1961) and Sarjit Singh et al. (1976).

Table 4.15

Extent of agreement on statements of usefulness of teaching practice

Statements	Extent of Agreement in Percentage				
	SA	A	U	D	SD
Teaching practice gives me confidence in handling physical education classes	24.1	62.0	10.2	2.8	0.9
Teaching practice gives me confidence to manage my students	29.6	59.8	7.4	2.9	0.3

Notes : SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree

4.6 Teaching ability of Physical Education teachers : Perception of Physical Education teachers on their ability to teach

A total of 7 statements listed under teaching ability were given to Physical Education teachers (Appendix G – Question 14). The respondents had to state whether they “strongly agree”, “agree”, “undecided”, “disagree” or “strongly disagree” with the statements. The details in Table 4.16 indicate that 82.4% of the respondents agreed that they can manage their students but only 53.7% of the respondents agreed that they ‘had knowledge to teach Physical Education’, 53.2% ‘can teach games skills’, 57.0% and ‘can detect’ and 55.0% ‘can correct students’ weaknesses’. More importantly 73.6% of the respondents ‘strongly agreed’ and ‘agreed’ that they need to attend Physical Education courses before handling the subject. Similarly 78.8% of the respondents ‘strongly agreed’ and ‘agreed’ that they need exposure through Staff Training Programmes.

The 1994/1995 Federal Inspectorate of Schools Report found that some teachers needed more training. Most of the teaching is teacher centred and there is limited use of visual aids and verbal cues in teaching. In observing 153 teachers it was found their performances left much to be desired as 34.0% of them were rated as 'good', 34.0% as 'average' and 31.4% as 'weak'. The report also showed that teachers with good performances were teachers whose options were Physical Education; they showed interest in teaching Physical Education and were very experienced.

Table 4.16

Extent of agreement on statements of ability to teach Physical Education

Statements	Extent of Agreement in Percentage				
	<i>SA</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>SD</i>
I have knowledge to teach Physical Education	10.8	42.9	16.2	21.3	8.8
I can manage students in my class	18.3	64.1	11.0	4.8	1.8
I can teach games skills	12.0	41.2	21.4	18.4	7.0
I can detect my student' weaknesses	9.7	47.3	26.1	12.9	4.0
I can correct my students' weaknesses	8.7	46.3	27.4	13.4	4.2
I need to attend Physical Education course before handling Physical Education subject	33.6	40.0	9.6	12.0	4.8
I needed exposure on Physical Education through Staff Training Programme	32.9	45.9	9.7	8.9	2.6

Notes : *SA* = Strongly Agree; *A* = Agree; *U* = Undecided; *D* = Disagree; *SD* = Strongly Disagree

4.7 Problems in teaching as perceived by Physical Education teachers

The teachers were given a list of 5 problems that they might face in the teaching of Physical Education and were asked to respond whether the problem was 'very serious', 'serious', 'moderately serious', 'not serious' or 'not serious at all'. The results in Table 4.17 show that 'teaching subject not trained for' as "very serious" (15.7%). These findings concurred with the findings in Table 4.16 that the teachers need to be trained in Physical Education before handling the subject and they need exposure on Physical Education through Staff Training Programme. This was followed by 'lacking in knowledge of subject matter' (7.5%), 'inadequate facilities for the teaching Physical Education' (5.7%), 'unable to plan daily lesson' (4.0%) and 'unable to control class' (2.9%). 'Unable to control class' was ranked last and this directly supported the findings (Table 4.16) that the teachers can manage students in their class.

Table 4.17

Extent of seriousness of problems of teaching Physical Education

Problems	Extent of Seriousness in Percentage				
	<i>VS</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>NS</i>	<i>NAS</i>
Inadequate facilities for the teaching of Physical Education	5.7	14.7	33.7	38.9	7.0
Lacking in knowledge of subject matter	7.5	16.5	31.2	37.4	7.4
Teaching subject not trained for	15.7	22.5	23.7	26.5	11.6
Unable to plan daily lesson	4.0	12.6	24.4	44.5	14.5
Unable to control class	2.9	7.0	13.6	50.2	26.3

Notes : *VS* = Very Serious; *S* = Serious; *MS* = Moderately Serious;
NS = Not Serious; *NAS* = Not At All Serious

'Lacking in knowledge of subject matter' (24% considered it 'very serious' and 'serious') which ranked second also prove that the reason why only about half of the Physical Education teachers agreed that they have knowledge to teach Physical Education as shown in Table 4.16.

Similarly, the ranking of problems that were considered 'serious' remain the same. 'Unable to control class' was considered not serious and not at all serious (76.5%) demonstrated that the teachers are experienced enough to cope with their students.

The problem in teaching Physical Education is exacerbated by the constant changing list of Physical Education teachers. As Physical Education is considered a marginal subject, its period is often used to make up the total number of teaching periods. This situation coupled with the lack of in-house training does not help to inculcate interest in teachers who more often than not lack adequate experience in teaching Physical Education.

4.8 Physical Education teachers' perception of class distribution in Physical Education programme.

The analyses in Table 4.18 show that Physical Education classes were given to teachers without considering their qualification (75.2% responded 'never', 'rarely' and 'occasionally') and their interest towards Physical Education (72.7 % responded 'never', 'rarely' and 'occasionally'). In fact 55.7 % (responses as 'frequently' and 'always') of the respondents agreed that Physical Education classes were given to teachers in order to make up the number of teaching periods. This shows that

administrators consider Physical Education less important than the other subjects.

Table 4.18

**Extent of occurrence in the class distribution practice of
Physical Education classes**

Class Distribution Practice	Extent of Occurrence In Percentage				
	<i>N</i>	<i>RLY</i>	<i>OLY</i>	<i>FLY</i>	<i>AL</i>
Class given based on discussion with administrators	28.8	17.0	24.9	18.7	10.5
Class given based on interest	33.7	17.0	22.0	17.8	9.5
Class given based on Physical Education qualification	43.7	14.8	16.7	14.5	10.3
Class given without teacher's knowledge	31.6	17.7	22.5	16.1	12.0
Class given to make-up the number of teaching periods	15.9	10.0	18.4	25.5	30.2

Notes : *N* = *Never*; *RLY* = *Rarely*; *OLY* = *Occasionally*;
FLY = *Frequently*; *AL* = *Always*

The data in Table 4.18 also reveals that administrators did not practice consensus in allocating Physical Education classes (70.9% responded as 'never', 'rarely' and 'occasionally'). However, 71.8% (responses as 'never', 'rarely' and 'occasionally') of the teachers admitted that they had no prior knowledge about being assigned Physical Education classes by administrators. This situation is revealed in a local study (Normar Ali, 1998) where 95.5% of Physical Education teachers were appointed by the principals and only 4.5% of the teachers really applied to teach the subject.

4.9 Administrators and Physical Education teachers' perception of non-human factors in Physical Education programme.

The analyses of responses on 6 statements regarding non-human factors (Appendix E – Question 13; Appendix F – Question 11 and Appendix G – Question 19) are shown in Table 4.19 (p.175), Table 4.20 (p.176) and Table 4.21(p.177). Overall results (Table 4.19) indicate that facilities and equipment for Physical Education were inadequate (49.2% and 46.5% of respondents 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree' respectively). This is supported by inadequate financial allocation : 46.1 % disagreed and strongly disagreed on the statement “financial allocation for Physical Education is adequate”. This result is consistent with the newspaper report (The Star 31.7.1999, p.1 & 3) that the per capita grant for Physical Education facilities had not increased despite the rising costs of maintaining and managing schools.

However, Federal Inspectorate of Schools differed on the issue of inadequacy of facilities. In their 1994/1995 report, they reported that the inadequacy of facilities may be due to lack of planning for use of facilities and equipment. Often different classes converge together and use the same facilities and equipment, thus creating an artificial shortage. The report also revealed that there was no timetable for facilities usage.

The results in Table 4.19 also indicate that only 20.2% of the respondents agreed that Physical Education books in the school library are suitable while 44.6% disagreed.

However, Table 4.19 also reveals trends which are quite worrisome. It reveals that a third of respondents gave their response as “undecided” on statements such as “financial allocation for Physical Education is adequate” (31.2%), ‘Physical Education

reference books in the school library are adequate' (30.1%), 'Physical Education reference book are suitable' (35.2%) and 'Physical Education reference books in national language in the library are adequate' (35.2%). These findings might indicate that many respondents have no knowledge of the financial allocation and reference books available to them. This conclusion is further substantiated by findings in Table 4.21 (p.177) where Physical Education teachers were undecided on adequacy of financial allocation (38.2%), on adequacy of books in school libraries (32.3%), on suitability of reference books (37.8%) and on the adequacy of books in the national language (38.0%).

A more convincing finding was found when data of the administrators were analysed. The findings show that the administrators (Table 4.20, p.176) disagreed and strongly disagreed on the adequacy of facilities (63.6%), on the adequacy of financial allocation (69.4%), on adequacy of equipment (69.4%) and on suitability of reference books in the school library (55.8%). The percentages are consistent with the findings listed in Table 4.22 (p.178) & Table 4.23 (p.180).

Table 4.19

Extent of agreement on statements of non-human factors as perceived by both administrators and Physical Education teachers (N = 2173)

Statements	Extent of Agreement in Percentage				
	<i>SA</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>SD</i>
The facilities for Physical Education class are adequate	6.3	31.3	13.2	40.9	8.3
Financial allocation for Physical Education is adequate	3.9	18.8	31.2	37.1	9.0
Equipment for Physical Education class is adequate	4.9	33.2	15.4	39.2	7.3
Physical Education reference books in the school library are adequate	3.6	29.3	30.1	33.0	4.0
Physical Education reference books are suitable	2.0	18.2	35.2	40.9	3.7
The Physical Education reference books in national language in the library are adequate	3.6	27.8	35.2	30.2	3.2

Notes : *SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree*

Table 4.20

**Extent of agreement on statements of non-human factors as
perceived by administrators (N = 536)**

Statements	Extent of Agreement in Percentage				
	SA	A	U	D	SD
The facilities for Physical Education class are adequate	6.8	23.5	6.1	49.9	13.7
Financial allocation for Physical Education is adequate	2.3	19.0	9.3	51.6	17.8
Equipment for Physical Education class is adequate	1.9	23.4	11.3	51.8	11.6
Physical Education reference books in the school library are adequate	1.9	32.3	23.0	38.4	4.4
Physical Education reference books are suitable	1.7	16.0	26.5	50.8	5.0
The Physical Education reference books in national language in the library are adequate	2.9	33.0	26.8	34.1	3.2

*Notes : SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Disagree;
SD = Strongly Disagree*

Table 4.21

Extent of agreement on statements of non-human factors as perceived
by Physical Education teachers (N = 1637)

Statements	Extent of Agreement in Percentage				
	SA	A	U	D	SD
The facilities for Physical Education class are adequate	6.2	33.8	15.5	37.9	6.6
Financial allocation for Physical Education is adequate	4.4	18.8	38.2	32.4	6.2
Equipment for Physical Education class is adequate	5.9	36.3	16.8	35.1	5.9
Physical Education reference books in the school library are adequate	4.2	28.3	32.3	31.3	3.9
Physical Education reference books are suitable	2.1	18.9	37.8	37.8	3.4
The Physical Education reference books in national language in the library are adequate	3.8	26.1	38.0	28.9	3.2

Notes : SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Disagree;
SD = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.21 revealed that the same trend as compared to the results of Table 4.20. In addition, Table 4.20 indicated that very much higher percentages of 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree' were demonstrated by administrators.

Table 4.22**Facilities for Physical Education and sport in sample secondary schools (N = 268 schools)**

Facilities	No. of facilities	Frequency	Percentage
Badminton Court	0	116	43.3
	1	94	35.1
	2	38	14.2
	3	13	4.8
	4	5	1.9
	5	2	0.7
Basketball Court	0	151	56.3
	1	104	38.8
	2	10	3.7
	3	1	0.4
	4	2	0.7
Football Field	0	61	22.8
	1	202	75.4
	2	5	1.8
Hockey Field	0	150	56.0
	1	113	42.1
	2	5	1.9
Netball Court	0	65	24.3
	1	172	64.2
	2	28	10.4
	3	1	0.4
	4	2	0.7
Olympic Handball Court	0	227	84.7
	1	37	13.8
	2	3	1.1
	4	1	0.4
Sepak Takraw Court	0	81	30.2
	1	138	51.5
	2	34	12.7
	3	9	3.4
	4	4	1.5
	5	1	0.4
	6	1	0.4

Volleyball Court	0	76	28.3
	1	169	63.1
	2	22	8.2
	4	1	0.4
Multipurpose Court	0	187	69.8
	1	79	29.5
	2	2	0.7
Multipurpose Hall	0	190	70.9
	1	78	29.1
Multipurpose Field	0	150	56.0
	1	117	43.6
	2	1	0.4
Other Facilities	0	239	89.2
	1	23	8.6
	2	5	1.8
	3	1	0.4

4.10 Facilities for Physical Education and sport in school

The analysis of the responses to Physical Education and sport facilities is given in Table 4.22. Generally, 53% of the secondary schools have no badminton court, basketball court, netball court, sepak takraw court, olympic handball court, volleyball court, football field, hockey field, multipurpose court, multipurpose field, multipurpose hall and other facilities like tennis court. Further analysis which was shown in Table 4.23 reveal that the top five facilities in the majority of schools were football fields (77.2%), netball courts (75.7%), volleyball courts (71.6%), sepak takraw courts (69.8%) and badminton courts (56.7%).

Table 4.23

Ranking of Physical Education and sport facilities in sample schools

Facilities	Percentage of school Having the facilities	Rank
Football field	77.2	1
Netball court	75.7	2
Volleyball court	71.6	3
Sepak takraw court	69.8	4
Badminton court	56.7	5
Hockey field	44.0	6
Multipurpose field	44.0	6
Basketball court	43.7	8
Multipurpose court	30.2	9
Multipurpose hall	29.1	10
Olympic handball court	15.3	11
Other facilities	10.8	12

4.11 Administrators' perception of the implementation of Physical Education programme in school

The analyses of the responses to items pertaining to the implementation of the Physical Education programme in schools are given in Table 4.24 (p.181) and Table 4.25 (p.182). The findings in Table 4.24 noted that 72.7% of administrators '*frequently*' and '*always*' assign teachers to teach Physical Education. However, the data also reveal that 72.3 % of the principals '*frequently*' and '*always*' delegate this duty to assign teachers to the senior assistants. This is consistent with the findings in Table 4.25 that 82.6 percent of senior assistants '*frequently*' and '*always*' carry out the duty of assigning teachers to teach Physical Education as compared to 62.1 percent that of principals.

As shown in Table 4.24, 74.4% of the administrators admitted that they '*frequently*' and '*always*' use certain criteria to make the decision as to who should teach

Table 4.24

Extent of occurrence in the administration of Physical Education programme as perceived by administrators

Statement	Extent of Occurrence in Percentage				
	<i>N</i>	<i>RLY</i>	<i>OLY</i>	<i>FLY</i>	<i>AL</i>
I allocate teachers to teach Physical Education (n = 513)	4.3	7.6	15.4	38.2	34.5
I delegate the power of allocating Physical Education teacher to senior assistant (n = 253)	2.8	7.1	17.8	47.0	25.3
I use certain criteria to decide on Physical Education teachers (n = 521)	1.7	5.6	18.2	46.5	28.0
I observe the teaching of Physical Education teachers (n = 521)	1.7	11.5	37.6	41.9	7.3
I delegate the power to evaluate teachers' teaching to the senior assistant (n = 254)	2.0	4.3	28.7	48.8	16.2
I allow Physical Education period to be used for teaching other subjects (n = 522)	34.9	36.9	23.6	4.0	0.6
I organise Staff Development Programme for Physical Education teachers (n = 518)	24.1	28.8	33.6	11.8	1.7
I discuss with teachers before allocating teaching duty (n = 267)	2.3	7.1	18.7	50.9	21.0
I use Physical Education periods to make-up the total number of teaching periods (n = 265)	22.3	19.2	34.3	16.6	7.6

Notes : *N* = Never; *RLY* = Rarely; *OLY* = Occasionally; *FLY* = Frequently; *AL* = Always

Table 4. 25

Extent of occurrence in the administration of Physical Education programme by administrators :
A comparison between principals and senior assistants

Statement	Extent of Occurrence in Percentage									
	<i>N</i>		<i>RLY</i>		<i>OLY</i>		<i>FLY</i>		<i>AL</i>	
	P	SA	P	SA	P	SA	P	SA	P	SA
I allocate teachers to teach Physical Education (n = 513)	6.0	2.6	11.7	3.8	20.2	10.9	31.5	44.5	30.6	38.1
I delegate the power of allocating Physical Education teacher to senior assistant (n = 253)	2.8	n.a	7.1	n.a	17.8	n.a	47.0	n.a	25.3	n.a
I use certain criteria to decide on Physical Education teachers (n = 521)	2.0	1.5	7.1	4.1	21.3	14.9	42.7	50.0	26.5	29.5
I observe the teaching of Physical Education Teachers (n = 521)	1.6	1.9	10.3	12.7	37.5	37.7	40.3	43.3	10.3	4.5
I delegate the power to evaluate teachers' teaching to senior assistant (n = 254)	2.0	n.a	4.3	n.a	28.7	n.a	48.8	n.a	16.1	n.a
I allow Physical Education period to be used in teaching other subjects (n = 522)	29.8	39.7	43.9	30.3	22.0	25.1	3.1	4.9	1.2	0.0
I organise Staff Development Programme for Physical Education Teachers (n = 518)	18.7	29.3	31.3	26.3	36.1	31.2	12.3	11.3	1.6	1.9
I discuss with teachers before allocating teaching duty (n = 267)	n.a	2.2	n.a	7.1	n.a	18.7	n.a	50.9	n.a	21.0
I use Physical Education periods to make-up the total number of teaching periods (n = 265)	n.a	22.3	n.a	19.2	n.a	34.3	n.a	16.6	n.a	7.5

Notes : *N* = Never; *RLY* = Rarely; *OLY* = Occasionally; *FLY* = Frequently; *AL* = Always
P = Principal; SA = Senior Assistant n.a = no question is provided (for principals/senior assistants)

Physical Education. When a comparison is made, Table 4.25 (p.182) revealed that 69.2 percent of principals and 79.5 percent of senior assistants '*frequently*' and '*always*' use certain criteria to choose Physical Education teachers. These findings are not convincing and inconsistent with the findings in Table 4.18 (p.172). In Table 4.18 teachers perceived 58.5 percent of administrators '*never*' and '*rarely*' assigned teachers based on their Physical Education qualifications and 50.7% '*never*' and '*rarely*' consider teachers interest.

About 72 percent of school principals said that they '*frequently*' and '*always*' had discussions with teachers before assigning them to teach Physical Education. This finding is not consistent with teachers' perception (Table 4.18) that only 29.2 percent of administrators '*frequently*' and '*always*' held discussions while 45.8 percent '*never*' and '*rarely*' held discussions. This is strongly supported by Normar Ali's (1998) research that 93.2% of Physical Education teachers were appointed by administrators and forced to teach the subject.

On staff development, Table 4.24 (p.181) reveals that 52.9 percent of administrators '*never*' and '*rarely*' organised courses for Physical Education teachers. This is supported by the findings in Table 4.25 which show that 13.9 percent of principals and 13.2 percent of senior assistants '*frequently*' and '*always*' do so. These findings convincingly demonstrated the low priority provided by administrators to the training of Physical Education teachers. This is consistent with the perceptions of teachers (Table 4.26, p.187) that 66.5 percent of administrators '*never*' and '*rarely*' organise staff development courses for Physical Education teachers.

A majority of administrators (71.9%) '*never*' and '*rarely*' allowed Physical Education classes to be used to teach other subjects. However teachers' perceived (Table 4.26, p.187) only 45.9 percent of administrators '*never*' and '*rarely*' allowed Physical Education classes to be used for other academic subjects.

Table 4.24 shows some results on the issue of administrators using Physical Education periods to add up to the number of a teacher's work load. Results revealed that 22.3 percent of administrators '*never*' and 19.2 percent '*rarely*' do so, while 24.1% of administrators '*frequently*' and '*always*' do it. This is supported by Normar Ali (1998) who found that 82.4% of Physical Education teachers taught less than 6 periods per week. This clearly confirmed the notion that Physical Education periods are used to make up the total number of teaching periods which often average to 26 periods weekly per teacher.

When we compare the responses of the principals and senior assistants on the teacher allocation (Table 4.25, p.182), it was found that 62.1 percent of the principals and 82.6 percent of senior assistants '*frequently*' and '*always*' (Table 4.25) assign teachers to teach Physical Education. The lower percentage for principals explained the delegation of task by the principals to senior assistants. In fact the senior assistant is the person responsible for the school time table, thus he makes the decision on the subject each teacher should teaches. In terms of observing the teaching of Physical Education, 50.6 percent of principals and 47.8 percent senior assistants '*frequently*' and '*always*' do so. The higher percentage for principals showed that they give priority to teacher evaluation.

Table 4.25 (p.182) also reveals that 73.7 percent of principals and 70.0 percent of senior assistants '*never*' and '*rarely*' allowed Physical Education periods to be used in teaching other subjects. This is consistent with the fact that only 4.3 percent of principals '*frequently*' and '*always*' allowed that to happen. Similarly, only 4.9 percent of senior assistants '*frequently*' allowed the same to happen.

On staff development programme, Table 4.25 reveals that 86.1 percent of principals and 86.8 percent senior assistants '*never*', '*rarely*' and '*occasionally*' organise staff development programme for teachers. These findings showed that staff development programme for Physical Education teachers is not an important element in secondary schools despite having a majority of unqualified teachers to teach Physical Education.

As noted in Table 4.25 Physical Education teachers were observed by principals and senior assistants. However, only 50.6% of principals and 47.8% of senior assistants did so '*frequently*' and '*always*'. Nevertheless the Federal Inspectorate of Schools reported (1994/1995) that most of the observations were informal and a majority of the principals failed to write reports of their observations.

4.12 Physical Education teachers' perceptions of the implementation of Physical Education programme in school

Table 4.26 (p.187) reveals teachers' perceptions on the implementation of Physical Education programme in school. It was found that only 41.9 percent of the administrators '*frequently*' and '*always*' assumed that Physical Education is important.

This is supported by the fact that only 31.5 percent of the administrators '*frequently*' and '*always*' had discussions with teachers before assigning them to teach Physical Education. Similarly, it was noted that 83.3 percent of administrators '*never*', '*rarely*' and '*occasionally*' discuss with teachers on factors affecting the teaching and learning of Physical Education. The data in the same table also show that low status was accorded to Physical Education by the administrators as it revealed that 91.9 percent of administrators '*never*', '*rarely*' and '*occasionally*' organise staff development programmes.

On facilities for Physical Education, Table 4.26 (p.187) shows that 44.5 percent of administrators '*frequently*' and '*always*' provide adequate facilities for the teaching of Physical Education. This is consistent with the findings in Section 4.10 (p. 172) that generally 53% of the secondary schools have no basic physical facilities for Physical Education and sports.

As shown in Table 4.26, 78.0 percent of the administrators '*never*', '*rarely*' and '*occasionally*' observe teaching of Physical Education. However, it is heartening to note that 82.4 percent of administrators '*never*', '*rarely*' and '*occasionally*' allow Physical Education class to be used for the teaching of other academic subjects.

Table 4.26

Extent of occurrence in the administration of Physical Education programme as perceived by teachers (N = 1637)

Statement	Extent of Occurrence in Percentage				
	<i>N</i>	<i>RLY</i>	<i>OLY</i>	<i>FLY</i>	<i>AL</i>
Administrators have discussion before deciding Physical Education teachers	26.0	18.9	23.6	18.8	12.7
Administrators assume that Physical Education is important	10.7	19.0	28.4	23.9	18.0
Administrators allow Physical Education class to be used for other subjects	26.3	19.6	36.5	11.6	6.0
Administrators observe teaching	14.8	22.8	40.4	16.7	5.3
Administrators provide adequate facilities for Physical Education	4.8	18.7	32.0	31.9	12.6
Administrators organise Staff Development Training Course for Physical Education	40.0	26.5	25.3	6.8	1.4
Administrators discuss with teachers concerning factors affecting the teaching and learning of Physical Education	24.6	25.8	32.9	13.2	3.6

Notes : *N* = Never; *RLY* = Rarely; *OLY* = Occasionally; *FLY* = Frequently; *AL* = Always

4.13 Factors that affect the implementation of Physical Education in secondary schools.

This section looks at factors which affect the implementation of the Physical Education programme. The factors in this study are as follows:

1. Human Factors

1.1 Teacher

- a. Teaching ability of Physical Education teachers
- b. Problem of teaching Physical Education
- c. Physical Education class allocation
- d. Physical Education teachers' perceptions on the implementation of the Physical Education programme

1.2 Administrators

- a. Principals & senior assistants perception of Physical Education implementation

2. Non-human factors

Means and standard deviations are used to explain the problems arising from factors stated above. The analyses are based on responses toward the statements in three different questionnaires (Appendixes E, F & G). The interpretation of mean is shown in Table 4.27 (p.187).

Table 4.27
Interpretation of problem based on mean

Mean	Interpretation of problem
1.00 – 2.33	Minor problem
2.34 – 3.66	Normal problem
3.67 – 5.00	Major problem

(Sources: 1. Amin Mohd. Rashid (1990). *The problems of teaching Islamic Education: A study of the subject teacher perception in primary*, M.Ed.. thesis: National University of Malaysia;
 2. Jamil Ahmad (1992). *A Study of The Constraints In The Implementation of KBSM Science In Secondary Schools In The State of Kedah Darul Aman*, M.Ed.. thesis: National University of Malaysia.

Table 4.27 shows the interpretation of problem based on means of statements concerned. Mean of 1.00 to 2.33 is interpreted as minor problem which is rarely encountered by teachers. A mean of 2.34 to 3.66 relates to normal problem which is faced by teachers on a daily basis but can be overcome by the teachers concerned. A mean of 3.67 to 5.00 refers to major problem which is considered a burden to the teachers and they find it difficult to overcome. All the problem statements which will be discussed later, are based on the interpretation of mean as tabulated in Table 4.27 .

Table 4.28

Mean, Standard Deviation and Problem Level in Relation to the Non-human Factor (N = 2157)

Problem Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Problem Level
Financial allocation for Physical Education is not adequate	2.71	1.00	Normal Problem
The references books in the school library are not suitable	2.74	0.87	Normal Problem
Facilities for Physical Education classes are not adequate	2.86	1.14	Normal Problem
Equipment for Physical Education classes are not adequate	2.89	1.10	Normal Problem
The reference books in the school library are not sufficient for the students	2.95	0.96	Normal Problem
Reference books in Bahasa Malaysia at the library are not adequate	2.98	0.92	Normal Problem

Table 4.28 shows the mean, standard deviation and problem level of non-human factors in the implementation of Physical Education in schools. The mean reveals that all the problems relating to non-human factors are normal. However, it is a fact that reference books in Bahasa Malaysia are insufficient. It seems that financial allocation is not a problem in implementing Physical Education programmes in schools. This predicament did not echo the sentiment of secondary school principals as quoted by a principal in a local newspaper :

Schools no longer get allocations for upkeep of sports facilities such as fields and game halls and as a result, some schools are unable to maintain them (Sunday Times, 8.2.98, p.7)

Table 4.29

**Mean, Standard Deviation and Problem Level in Relation To
The Allocation of Physical Education Classes (N=1637)**

Problem Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Problem Level
It was given as a filler to make up the total number of periods taught	2.56	1.42	Normal Problem
It was not determined after a discussion with the administrators	3.35	1.35	Normal Problem
It was given to me without my knowledge	3.41	1.39	Normal Problem
It was not given based on my interest	3.48	1.36	Normal Problem
It was not given to me based on my Physical Education qualification	3.67	1.42	Major Problem

Table 4.29 shows the mean values and standard deviations of problem levels in the allocation of Physical Education classes. It was found that the problems are normal problems except one. The major problem is the allocation of Physical Education classes without giving due consideration to teachers qualification (mean=3.67). Other problems "*It was not determined after a discussion with the administrators*" (mean=3.35), "*It was given to me without my knowledge*" (mean=3.41) and

"It was not given based on my interest" (mean=3.48) all exceeded the mid-value of 3. These indicate that a trend towards a major problem. Most secondary schools in Malaysia face the problem of inadequately trained Physical Education teachers. The shortage of indoor facilities forces the schedule of Physical Education classes to be in the first and second periods of a regular teaching day. These consequently increase the need for more Physical Education teachers and subsequently forcing administrators to use other teachers to teach Physical Education despite being aware of the fact they would be ineffective Physical Education teachers.

Table 4.30

Mean, Standard Deviation and Problem Level in Relation To Teachers' Ability To Teach (N = 1637)

Problem Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Problem Level
I need exposure through in-house training	2.03	1.01	Minor Problem
I cannot manage the students in my class	2.08	0.80	Minor Problem
I need to attend Physical Education course before handling the subject	2.14	1.15	Minor Problem
I cannot detect my students' weaknesses	2.54	0.97	Normal Problem
I cannot correct my students' weaknesses	2.58	0.97	Normal Problem
I do not have adequate knowledge to teach Physical Education	2.74	1.17	Normal Problem
I cannot teach game skills	3.33	1.12	Normal Problem

The means in Table 4.30 (p.192) reveal that the need for more exposure to handle the problem of managing students and the need to attend courses are minor problems which need no special attention. However, the ability to detect students' weaknesses, the ability to correct students' weaknesses, the adequacy of knowledge in Physical Education and the ability to teach games skills are normal problems. The high mean for 'ability to detect' (mean = 2.54) and 'ability to correct' (mean = 2.58) should also be given some consideration. On close scrutiny of the mean, it is worth looking at the ability to teach game skills (mean=3.33) because its value exceeds that of the mid-value 3. It may be suggested that teachers assigned to teach Physical Education must at least be proficient in game skills.

Table 4.31

Mean, Standard Deviation and Problem Level in Relation To Teaching Problems (N = 1637)

Problem Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Problem Level
Not trained in subject taught (Physical Education)	2.96	1.26	Normal Problem
Lack in knowledge of subject matter	3.21	1.04	Normal Problem
Facilities for teaching the subject are inadequate	3.27	0.99	Normal Problem
Unable to plan daily lessons	3.53	1.02	Normal Problem
Unable to control class	3.90	0.96	Major Problem

Table 4.31 (p.193) reveals that the major problem for Physical Education teachers is the inability to control the class (mean=3.90). Other problems are normal problems but the values of the four problem statements which are approximately 3 and above strongly suggest that they contribute substantially to the effectiveness of the teaching of Physical Education. These problems should be addressed with more frequent in-house training. As such a better leadership for staff development programmes should be provided by administrators of secondary schools.

In fact, the high mean value for 'unable to control class' (mean=3.90) should also be viewed in the context of classes with large enrolment in government aided schools. A normal class has an enrolment of 45 to 50 pupils and this could be the reason why teachers encountered the above mentioned problem. Smaller class units should be used to help the non Physical Education majors. This would allow some time for the untrained teachers to improve on the teaching of Physical Education rather than spending time on managing the students' discipline.

Table 4.32

**Mean, Standard Deviation and Problem Level in Relation To
The Perception of Physical Education Teachers Toward The
Implementation of Physical Education Programme (N = 1637)**

Problem Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Problem Level
Administrators do not provide adequate facilities for Physical Education	2.71	1.06	Normal Problem
Administrators do not consider Physical Education important	2.81	1.24	Normal Problem
Administrators did not observe teachers teaching	3.25	1.07	Normal Problem
Administrators do not discuss with teachers before assigning teachers to teach P.E.	3.27	1.36	Normal Problem
Administrators allow Physical Education periods to be used for other subjects	3.49	1.17	Normal Problem
Administrators did not discuss with teachers regarding factors affecting the teaching and learning of Physical Education	3.54	1.10	Normal Problem
Administrators did not organise in-house training for Physical Education	3.97	1.03	Major Problem

Table 4.32 lists “*Administrators did not organise in-house training for Physical Education*” as the major problem (mean = 3.97). This finding is consistent with the finding in Table 4.25 (p.182) that only 13.9% of principals and 13.2% of senior assistants agreed that they organised staff development programmes ‘*frequently*’ and ‘*always*’. This is substantiated by the fact that 85% of the respondents are teachers whose option is not Physical Education. Other normal problems which are worth mentioning

are “*Administrators did not discuss with teachers regarding factors affecting the teaching and learning of Physical Education*” (mean=3.54); “*Administrators allow Physical Education periods to be used for other subjects*” (mean=3.49).” *Administrators do not discuss with teachers before assigning teachers*” (mean=3.27), “*Administrators did not observe teachers' teaching*” (mean=3.25). These normal problems should be reviewed in order to make the teaching and learning of Physical Education a meaningful one.

The data in Table 4.33 (p.195) shows the mean, standard deviation and problem level of the perception of administrators (principals and senior assistants) toward the implementation of the Physical Education programme. Generally the perception of administrators revealed that the problems relating to the implementation of the Physical Education programme in schools are not serious. However, there is a major problem when administrators allow Physical Education periods to be used for other subjects (mean=4.02). This is not consistent with the findings of administrators who denied (70 percent of responses were ‘*never*’ and ‘*rarely*’) that they allowed Physical Education classes to be used by other subjects (Table 4.26, p.185). Similarly, the problem of in-house training should not be ignored (mean=3.62) even though it is listed as a normal problem. The situation where Physical Education periods are used for other subjects (mean=3.32) should be given due attention to ensure that the status quo of Physical Education in school is maintained.

Table 4.33

**Mean, Standard Deviation and Problem Level in Relation To
The Perception of Administrators Toward Implementation
of Physical Education Programme**

Problem Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Problem Level
I did not assign teachers to teach Physical Education (n=513)	2.09	1.09	Minor Problem
I did not use criteria to decide on Physical Education teachers (n=521)	2.12	1.64	Minor Problem
I empower the senior assistant to assign teachers (n = 253)	2.15	0.97	Minor Problem
I did not discuss with teachers before assigning them to teach Physical Education (n=267)	2.19	0.92	Minor Problem
I empower the senior assistant and head teacher to evaluate teachers (n=254)	2.27	0.85	Minor Problem
I did not observe my teachers teaching Physical Education (n=521)	2.59	0.85	Normal Problem
I use Physical Education periods to make up the total number of teaching periods for teachers (n=265)	3.32	1.21	Normal Problem
I did not organise in-house courses for Physical Education teachers (n=518)	3.62	1.03	Normal Problem
I allow Physical Education periods to be used for other subjects (n=522)	4.02	0.89	Major Problem

	WEAR21	WEAR22	WEAR23	WEAR24	WEAR25	WEAR26	WEAR27	WEAR28	WEAR29	WEAR30
ATTITUDE	.6392**	.4067**	.6029**	.4511**	.6427**	.6160**	.7201**	.6281**	.3657**	.4714**
WEAR01	.3981**	.0513	.1853	.1854	.3130**	.3554**	.3423**	.2624	-.0052	.3570**
WEAR02	.5035**	.1482	.4771**	.1629	.3261**	.4571**	.4078**	.3696**	.1312	.3894**
WEAR03	.1397	.1977	.3486**	.2472	.2365	.1973	.1934	.3213**	.1807	.0249
WEAR04	.3274**	.1758	.2073	.1648	.3417**	.3007**	.4877**	.2740**	.1793	.1595
WEAR05	.3708**	.1618	.1487	.3213**	.2715**	.3489**	.3549**	.2706**	-.0126	.3514**
WEAR06	.5271**	.3116**	.5064**	.3211**	.4534**	.5152**	.4926**	.4201**	.2504	.3655**
WEAR07	.3751**	.2114	.4570**	.1800	.4483**	.3316**	.4740**	.3470**	.1756	.1983
WEAR08	.3231**	.2753**	.4822**	.2179	.2843**	.3173**	.3989**	.3281**	.2443	.2198
WEAR09	.1184	.2637	.3487**	.1061	.2393	.1858	.2894**	.2397	.0289	.1210
WEAR10	.4448**	.1243	.3725**	.1962	.4725**	.4906**	.6252**	.4450**	.1225	.1902
WEAR11	.4573**	.2746**	.5264**	.3469**	.4253**	.3880**	.4265**	.4435**	.4091**	.4281**
WEAR12	.4611**	.3485**	.4346**	.2513	.2807**	.3206**	.4047**	.3150**	.4120**	.2611
WEAR13	.2235	.1511	.0977	.0820	.2536	.1952	.3023**	.2926**	.0171	.1891
WEAR14	.3981**	.2126	.3022**	.3030**	.3198**	.3937**	.4834**	.4176**	.0885	.2382
WEAR15	.2335	.1821	.2181	.3077**	.3525**	.1934	.2520*	.3569**	.2241	.1975
WEAR16	.4394**	.0839	.1799	.0778	.4265**	.2019	.3906**	.0909	.0424	.3993**
WEAR17	.0806	.1847	.2601*	.1749	.1023	.1935	.1491	.3134**	.3490**	.0151
WEAR18	.2672	.1164	.4641**	.0702	.3812**	.2366	.3868**	.2282	.3019**	.1263
WEAR19	.1661	.1726	.1933	.0796	.3302**	.2303*	.3332**	.1736	.0140	.0453
WEAR20	.3166**	.3320**	.4164**	.3174**	.2808**	.2478	.3607**	.5013**	.3340**	.0686
WEAR21	1.0000	.0512	.3796**	.0242	.4644**	.4068**	.5719**	.2515	.2847**	.4398**
WEAR22	.0512	1.0000	.4145**	.3532**	.2054	.0787	.1805	.4193**	.3111**	-.0108
WEAR23	.3796**	.4145**	1.0000	.1983	.3521**	.1901	.3291**	.4477**	.2284	.1988
WEAR24	.0242	.3532**	.1983	1.0000	.2514	.3561**	.1839	.2802**	.2518*	.0839
WEAR25	.4644**	.2054	.3521**	.2514	1.0000	.3577**	.4281**	.3458**	.2566*	.4524**
WEAR26	.4068**	.0787	.3561**	.3561**	.3577**	1.0000	.5911**	.3179**	.1475	.3060**
WEAR27	.5719**	.4193**	.4477**	.4281**	.4281**	.5911**	1.0000	.4306**	.1646	.3091**
WEAR28	.2515	.2802**	.4477**	.2802**	.3458**	.3179**	.4306**	1.0000	.3325**	.1971
WEAR29	.2847**	.3111**	.2284*	.2518*	.2566*	.1475	.1646	.3325**	1.0000	.0949
WEAR30	.4398**	-.0108	.1988	.0839	.4524**	.3060**	.3091**	.1971	.0949	1.0000

* - signif. LE .05 ** - signif. LE .01 (2-tailed)