



TEACHING STRATEGIES OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS IN DISTANCE LEARNING MODALITY IN SAN PEDRO DISTRICT

¹Jan Karlo P. Rasco, ²Freddie S. Javiña

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to determine the Teaching Strategies of Physical Education Teachers in Distance Learning Modality in the District of San Pedro, School Year 2020-2021. Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions: (1) What is status of faculty profile in terms of: age, sex, gender and grade level? (2) What is the level of teaching strategies of Physical Education teachers in terms of: Lecture, Discussion and Performance test? (3) What is the level of distance learning modality in terms of: Synchronous/Asynchronous and Modular? (4) Is there any significant effect of the faculty profile on the distance learning modality? (5) Is there a significant effect of the teaching strategies on the distance learning modality?

The descriptive method of research was utilized in this study. The questionnaire was given to fifty-five (55) respondents who are Physical Education teachers in the District of San Pedro selected through simple random sampling technique. The questionnaire composed of three (3) parts such as Faculty Profile, Teaching Strategies of PE Teachers on the Distance Learning Modality, and Distance Learning Modality.

Based on findings of this study in terms of Age "31-40 years old" has the highest frequency of twenty two (22), In terms of Sex "Female" has the highest frequency of forty-seven (47), In terms of Gender "Feminine" has the highest frequency of forty-eight (48), In terms of Program "Elementary" has the highest frequency of thirty-five (35).

The Level of teaching strategies of Physical Education teachers in terms of Lectures, Discussions, and Performance task have an over-all mean of 4.17, 4.22, and 4.44 respectively with a verbal interpretation of "Very High".

The Level of distance learning modality in terms of Synchronous, Asynchronous, and Modular have an overall mean of 4.27, 4.06, and 4.93 respectively with a verbal interpretation of "Very High".

The Significant effect of the faculty profile on the Distance Learning Modalities have adjusted R-square indicates that 73.46% of the variation in the distance learning modalities to the faculty profile is explained by their Asynchronous, Synchronous and Modular Learning. The F-value of 50.826 is significant having a p-value of 0.0000.

INTRODUCTION

The Novel Corona virus of 2019 has changed the Philippine Educational System as we knew it. The Pandemic forced the closure of schools in all levels. Education in the Philippines has changed dramatically giving little preparations to students, parents, teachers and the system itself. Resulting to the rise of Distance learning, wherein teaching is done remotely and on digital platform, modular modality and blended learning modality.

With the sudden change, many are wondering whether the adoption of Distance Learning can substitute the face to face learning and as to how that change would impact the educational system in the Philippines. The transition from face to face classes to Distance learning send shockwaves to Filipino students, parents, teachers and all concerned with education.

The Government, through the Department of Education has rushed in to adopt learning modalities to cater the Distance Learning. The Department of Education implemented the distance learning approach wherein the students will choose the learning modality they see fit like Modular, Synchronous, or Asynchronous and Blended learning.

The Department of Education implemented the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (BE-LCP), which seeks to ensure that students' learning processes even amidst disasters such as natural calamities, storms, fires, and pandemics. This plan overcomes obstacles created by the disasters through innovative means of teaching and learning, keeping students on track with their courses (DepEd-IATF, 2020).

In addition to Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (BE-LCP), the Department of Education also imposed guidelines on the use of the



Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELC). This shall serve as a primary reference of all schools, schools division, and Regional Offices in determining and implementing a learning delivery approach that is suited to the local context and diversity of learners while adapting to the challenges caused by the covid 19 pandemic (DepEd Memo No. 89, 2020).

In the Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), the Commission on Higher Education was given academic freedom and should implement available distance learning, e-learning, and other alternative modes of delivery to students. Likewise, Higher Education Institutions HEIs were advised to continue the deployment of available flexible learning and other alternative modes of delivery in place of on-campus learning. (CHED, 2020).

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

According to Mortiz et al., (2019), the first generation of Distance Education was formed in the period from 1728 to 1970 and was characterized by the use of postal correspondence and printed materials containing exercises and tasks.

Because of the COVID 19 Pandemic our education system changes in an instant and we have to embrace the principles of distance learning whether we are ready or not. Different countries worldwide have introduced various answers during the pandemic to continue the education process - the introduction of distance learning. These are online learning platforms such as google, TV broadcasts, guidelines, resources, video lectures, and online channels that were introduced (UNESCO, 2020).

According to Crawford et al., (2020), Responses like community lockdown and community quarantine in several countries have led students and teachers to study and work from home which led to the delivery of online learning platforms such as google classrooms, moodle cloud, and other online learning resources. However, the implementation of online learning posed different risks, problems, and challenges to both the teachers and students, especially in higher education institutions (HEIs) (Bao, 2020).

The 21st century has brought changes to education - changes that include greater distance learning options for middle and high school students.

While distance learning has been around for a century, the progressive ways in which students can select and complete virtual courses through the internet in nearly every secondary content area are increasing.

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted to determine the Teaching Strategies of Physical Education Teachers in Distance Learning Modality in the District of San Pedro, School Year 2020-2021.

This study used a descriptive type of research. This method is the most widely used research design as indicated by theses, dissertations, and research reports of research institutions. In educational research, the most commonly used descriptive methodology is the survey, as when the researcher summarizes the characteristics (abilities, preferences, behaviors, and so on.) of individuals or groups or the physical environment of schools (Veroy, 2013).

The purpose of descriptive research is to examine a phenomenon that is occurring at a specific place and time. This research design was used to describe the Effectiveness of Distance Learning in Teaching Physical Education in the District of San Pedro, School Year 2020-2021.

The sample population of this study was fifty-five (55) participants Teaching Physical Education. They were selected through simple random sampling, specifically systematic random sampling since the respondents were coming from San Pedro District.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter presents the findings of the study and their corresponding analysis together with the interpretation of the statistical treatment of data, all statistical treatments are presented in graphical form for easy interpretation of the results.

Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Table 1 shows the level of teaching strategies of Physical Education teachers in terms of Lecture. All item indicators got a verbal interpretation of high to very high, as disclosed by the overall mean of 4.17 and supported with standard deviation value of 0.693.



Table 1. Level of teaching strategies of Physical Education teachers in terms of Lecture

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
I make a PowerPoint presentation for every online class	4.11	0.74	Often
I use interactive lectures in my classes	4.13	0.64	Often
Presentation is appealing to the eye because it contains clip art & designs.	4.20	0.70	Always
There is motivational activity presented before the discussion.	4.25	0.73	Always
The presentation is attractive to the eye because it uses animations.	4.18	0.67	Often
Overall Mean = 4.17			
Standard Deviation = 0.693			
Verbal Interpretation = High			

Legend:

Scale	Range	Remarks	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.20-5.00	Always	Very High
4	3.40-4.19	Often	High
3	2.60-3.39	Sometimes	Moderately High
2	1.80-2.59	Rarely	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Never	Very Low

Table 2 shows the level of teaching strategies of Physical Education teachers in terms of Discussion was generally very high. All item indicators got a

verbal interpretation of high to very high, as disclosed by the overall mean of 4.22 and supported with standard deviation value of 0.607.

Table 2. Level of teaching strategies of Physical Education teachers in terms of Discussion

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
I conduct a live discussion for the synchronous classes	4.15	0.59	Often
I required the students to participate in the learning delivery during online classes	4.22	0.60	Always
I call some students to read, explain and react to the lessons to make sure that they are participating attentively in our lesson	4.25	0.58	Always
I call all the name of the students every time I check the attendance before each online classes	4.25	0.67	Always
The online discussion is brief and comprehensive	4.22	0.60	Always
Overall Mean = 4.22			
Standard Deviation = 0.607			
Verbal Interpretation = Very High			

Legend:

Scale	Range	Remarks	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.20-5.00	Always	Very High
4	3.40-4.19	Often	High
3	2.60-3.39	Sometimes	Moderately High
2	1.80-2.59	Rarely	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Never	Very Low

Table 3 shows the level of teaching strategies of Physical Education teachers in terms of Performance Task. All item indicators got a verbal interpretation of

very high, as disclosed by the overall mean of 4.44 and supported with standard deviation value of 0.559.



Table 3. Level of teaching strategies of Physical Education teachers in terms of Performance Task

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
I make clear instructions on how to perform the task effectively	4.53	0.54	Always
I make sure that the performance task given to the students are aligned with their competencies	4.45	0.54	Always
I prepare separate performance task for the synchronous, asynchronous and modular classes	4.27	0.56	Always
Performance task of the students is easy to accomplish	4.42	0.57	Always
The safety of the students are the primary consideration whenever they perform the tasks.	4.53	0.57	Always
Overall Mean = 4.44			
Standard Deviation = 0.559			
Verbal Interpretation = Very High			

Legend:

Scale	Range	Remarks	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.20-5.00	Always	Very High
4	3.40-4.19	Often	High
3	2.60-3.39	Sometimes	Moderately High
2	1.80-2.59	Rarely	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Never	Very Low

Table 4 shows the level of distance learning modality in terms of Asynchronous. All item indicators got a verbal interpretation of *high*, as disclosed by the

overall mean of 4.06 and supported with a standard deviation value of 0.788.

Table 4. Level of distance learning modality in terms of Asynchronous

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
I make a schedule of google meet that is amenable to all the students	4.18	0.70	Often
I record my lectures so that the students will be able to watch my lecture on the time they wish	4.11	0.81	Often
I check all the activities on the same day after all the students have answered the google form	4.00	0.77	Often
I encourage all the students to participate in the discussion by giving their feedback about the lesson.	4.02	0.76	Often
Overall Mean = 4.06			
Standard Deviation = 0.788			
Verbal Interpretation = Very High			

Legend:

Scale	Range	Remarks	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.20-5.00	Always	Very High
4	3.40-4.19	Often	High
3	2.60-3.39	Sometimes	Moderately High
2	1.80-2.59	Rarely	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Never	Very Low

Table 5 shows the level of distance learning modality in terms of Synchronous. All item indicators got a verbal interpretation of *very high*, as disclosed by

the overall mean of 4.27 and supported with standard deviation value of 0.673.



Table 5. Level of distance learning modality in terms of Synchronous

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
I use a free and user-friendly application such as google meet and the like	4.29	0.71	Always
I check attendance every day during online classes	4.31	0.69	Always
I encourage the students to actively participate in the online discussion	4.20	0.65	Always
I make sure that all the lessons are aligned with the learning competencies of the students.	4.33	0.64	Always
I conduct a short quiz after each google class to assess if the students acquired the expected learning outcomes.	4.22	0.69	Always
Overall Mean = 4.27			
Standard Deviation = 0.673			
Verbal Interpretation = Very High			

Legend:

Scale	Range	Remarks	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.20-5.00	Always	Very High
4	3.40-4.19	Often	High
3	2.60-3.39	Sometimes	Moderately High
2	1.80-2.59	Rarely	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Never	Very Low

Table 6 shows the level of distance learning modality in terms of Modular. All item indicators got a verbal interpretation of *very high*, as disclosed by the

overall mean of 4.93 and supported with standard deviation value of 0.351.

Table 6. Significant effect of the faculty profile on the Distance Learning Modalities.

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
<i>I made a self-learning module is easy to understand</i>	4.87	0.43	Always
<i>I double-check the content of the module and see to it that the instructions given are clear and correct</i>	4.96	0.27	Always
<i>The module content is in accordance with the learning competence of the students.</i>	4.96	0.27	Always
<i>I collect and check the module on a weekly basis</i>	4.91	0.44	Always
<i>I check the module regularly and update the students on their progress</i>	4.95	0.30	Always
Overall Mean = 4.93			
Standard Deviation = 0.351			
Verbal Interpretation = Very High			

Legend:

Scale	Range	Remarks	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.20-5.00	Always	Very High
4	3.40-4.19	Often	High
3	2.60-3.39	Sometimes	Moderately High
2	1.80-2.59	Rarely	Low
1	1.00-1.79	Never	Very Low

Table 7 revealed that the *Distance Learning Modalities* had an effect on faculty profile. The beta coefficient indicates that for every standard deviation unit increase in *Asynchronous and Modular Learning*, there is a corresponding unit increase in the faculty's Age and Sex. The t-value of *Asynchronous and*

Modular Learning is significant having a p-value of less than 0.05 level of significance.

The adjusted R-square indicates that 73.46% of the variation in the distance learning modalities to the faculty profile is explained by their *Asynchronous, Synchronous and Modular Learning*. The F-value of 50.826 is significant having a p-value of 0.0000.



This means that the faculty's profile to the distance learning modalities was influenced by age and sex. Based on the data, it is shown that there is "no significant effect of the faculty profile on the Distance Learning Modalities" at 0.05 level of significance. It

shows that the null hypothesis stating that "There is no significant effect of the faculty profile on the Distance Learning Modalities" is accepted, it can be inferred that there is "no significant" effect between them.

Table 7. Significant effect of the faculty profile on the Distance Learning Modalities

	Age	Beta	t-value	p-value	Analysis
<i>Asynchronous</i>		-1.096	-4.561	0.000	Significant
<i>Synchronous</i>		-0.245	-0.951	0.346	Not Significant
<i>Modular</i>		0.536	2.323	0.024	Significant
Sex					
<i>Asynchronous</i>		-0.450	-2.733	0.009	Significant
<i>Synchronous</i>		0.159	0.898	0.373	Not Significant
<i>Modular</i>		0.342	2.161	0.035	Significant
Gender					
<i>Asynchronous</i>		-0.394	-2.444	0.018	Significant
<i>Synchronous</i>		0.139	0.803	0.426	Not Significant
<i>Modular</i>		0.299	1.933	0.059	Not Significant
Program					
<i>Asynchronous</i>		-0.293	-1.583	0.119	Not Significant
<i>Synchronous</i>		-0.258	-1.297	0.200	Not Significant
<i>Modular</i>		0.164	0.925	0.359	Not Significant

Adjusted R-Square: 0.7346

F-value: 50.826

Sig.: 0.0000

Table 8 revealed that the Distance Learning Modalities had an effect on Teaching Strategies. The beta coefficient indicates that for every standard deviation unit increase in *Asynchronous* and *Synchronous*, there is a corresponding unit increase in the teaching strategy's lecture and discussion. The t-value of *Asynchronous* and *Synchronous* is significant having a p-value of less than 0.05 level of significance.

The adjusted R-square indicates that 97.44% of the variation in the distance learning modalities to the teaching strategy is explained by their

Asynchronous, *Synchronous* and *Modular Learning*. The F-value of 686.58 is significant having a p-value of 0.0000.

This means that the teaching strategy to the distance learning modalities was influenced by lecture and discussion. Based on the data, it is shown that there is "no significant effect of the teaching strategies on the Distance Learning Modalities" at 0.05 level of significance. It shows that the null hypothesis stating that "There is no significant effect of the teaching strategies on the Distance Learning Modalities" is



accepted, it can be inferred that there is “no significant” effect between them.

Table 8. Significant effect of the teaching strategies on the distance learning modality

Lecture	Beta	t-value	p-value	Analysis
<i>Asynchronous</i>	0.534	8.671	0.000	Significant
<i>Synchronous</i>	0.459	6.929	0.000	Significant
<i>Modular</i>	-0.200	-3.378	0.001	Significant
Discussion				
<i>Asynchronous</i>	0.472	5.127	0.000	Significant
<i>Synchronous</i>	0.348	3.518	0.001	Significant
<i>Modular</i>	-0.078	-0.878	0.384	Not Significant
Performance Task				
<i>Asynchronous</i>	0.061	0.507	0.614	Not Significant
<i>Synchronous</i>	0.603	4.673	0.000	Significant
<i>Modular</i>	0.200	1.738	0.088	Not Significant

Adjusted R-Square: 0.9744
 F-value: 686.58
 Sig.: 0.0000

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher therefore concludes that: 1) The hypothesis stating that “*There is no significant effect of the faculty profile on the Distance Learning Modalities*” is accepted, it can be inferred that there is “no significant” effect between them. 2) The hypothesis stating that “*There is no significant effect of the teaching strategies on the Distance Learning Modalities*” is accepted, it can be inferred that there is “no significant” effect between them.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations were given:

1. The Teachers may continue to cope up with the changes made by distance learning to Physical Education and must continue to learn new things especially in the field of technology to jive with the needs of the learners.
2. Teachers may attend training and seminars about different distance learning modalities.

3. For future researchers who will conduct a related study on a larger scale, some variables not included in this research may be considered.

REFERENCES BOOKS

1. DANIELSON, J., PREAST, V., BENDER, H., HASSALL, L., 2013. *Is the effectiveness of lecture capture related to teaching approach or content type? Computers and Education, Volume 72, 2014, Pages 121-*
2. GARDNER, H., 2011. *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences. Basic books.*
3. MOTRIZ, R., 2013. *The Journal of Physical Education. UNESP. Rio Claro, SP, Brazil*

E-JOURNALS

1. AKHMETOVA, D., VORONTSOVA, L., and MOROZOVA, I. G., 2013. *The experience of a distance learning organization in a private higher educational institution in the Republic of Tatarastan (Russia): From idea to realization. International Review of Research in Open & Distance Learning,*



14(3). DOI:10.19173/irrodl.v14i3.1428
Retrieved from April 2021.

2. ANNE-METTE, N., PETERSEN, A.K., and BALLE, S.H., 2018. Factors Influencing E-Learning and Blended Learning in Relation to Learning Outcome, Student Satisfaction and Engagement, ISSN 1479-4403 retrieved from www.ejel.org
3. AYERS, S. F., and HOUSNER, L. D., 2008. A descriptive analysis of undergraduate PETE programs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 27(1),51–67. Retrieved from <https://www.a-descriptive-analysis-undergraduate.pdf>
4. BARBER, W., King, S. and BUCHANAN, S., 2015. Problem Based Learning and Authentic Assessment in Digital Pedagogy: Embracing the Role of Collaborative Communities. *The Electronic Journal of E-Learning*, 13(2), pp. 59

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

1. ABDUL, Z. A. I. and SALMAN M. H., 2013. The impact of educational modules according to the strategy (SWOM) in the academic achievement of a substance methods of teaching physical education the students third stage-the College of Basic Education. *Karbala Magazine of Physical Edu. Sciences*, 2(3), 184-204.
2. ALLY, M., and FHY, P., 2012. Using students' learning styles to provide support in distance education. Paper presented at 18th Annual Conference on Distance Teaching and Learning, Madison, Wisconsin, August 14-16.
3. BAXTER, J.A., AND HAYCOCK, J., 2014. International review of research in open and distance learning. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*.
4. BLACKMORE, CL. AND HARRISSON M., 2010. *Instructional Strategies for Secondary School Physical Education*, London: Longman Group limited. Limited, 1992.
5. CAMPOS, N., NOGAL, M., CALIZ, C., AND JUAN, A.A., 2020. Simulation-based education (SE) refers to the use of simulation software, tools, and serious games to enrich the teaching and learning processes.
6. CHOI, B., 2016. How people learn in an asynchronous online learning environment: The relationships between graduate students' learning strategies and learning.
7. DAVIS, N., and FERDIG, R.E., 2009. Editorial: What is special about teacher education for virtual schooling? *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 17(4), 425-435.
8. GORSKY, P., and CASPI, A., 2005. Dialogue: A theoretical framework for distance education

instructional systems. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 36(2), 137-144.

INTERNET SOURCES

1. BALCI, O., DEATER-DECKARD, K., and NORTON, A., 2013. Challenges in teaching modeling and simulation online. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Winter Simulation Conference: Simulation: Making Decisions in a Complex World*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WSC.2013.6721718>(pp. 3568–3575). New Jersey. IEEE Press. Retrieved from April 2021.
2. CHIERO, R., BEARE, P., MARSHALL, J., and TORGERSON, C., 2015. Evaluating the effectiveness of e-learning in teacher preparation. *Educational Media International*, 52(3), pp. 188–200. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/09523987.2015.1075101>
3. CHOE, R. C., SCURIC, Z., ESHKOL, E., CRUSER, S., ARNDT, A., COX, R., TOMA, S. P., SHAPIRO, P., GREG BARNES, M.L.F., and Crosbie, S.H., 2019. Student Satisfaction and Learning Outcomes in Asynchronous Online Lecture Videos, <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.18-08-0171> Retrieved from <https://www.lifescied.org/doi/10.1187/cbe.18-08-0171>
4. CROWE, A., DIRKS, C., and WENDEROTH, M.P., 2008. *Biology in bloom: implementing Bloom's taxonomy to enhance student learning in biology*. *CBE Life Sci. Educ.* 7: 368
5. FARASHAHI, M., and TAJEDDIN, M., 2018. Effectiveness of teaching methods in business education: A comparison study on the learning outcomes of lectures, case studies and simulations *The International Journal of Management Education* Volume 16, Issue 1, March 2018, Pages 131-142
6. FINKELSTEIN, J., 2006. *Learning in real time: Synchronous teaching and learning online*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
7. FISHBURNE, S., 2015. "Teaching Strategies, I" Retrieved from <https://www.facinghistory.org/resource-library/teaching-strategies>
8. FRANCESCUCCI, A., and Rohani, L., 2018. Exclusively Synchronous Online (VIRI) Learning: The Impact on Student Performance and Engagement Outcomes <https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475318818864>
9. FRIESTAD-TATE, J., SCHUBERT, C., and MCCOY, C., 2014. Understanding Modular Learning Developing A Strategic Plan to Embrace Change
10. GARRISON, R., 2014. Theoretical challenges for distance education in the 21st century: A shift from structural to transactional issues. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 1(1), 1-17 Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/content/v1.1/randy.pdf>



11. Lancellotti, M., Thomas, S., and Kohli, C., 2016. *Online video modules for improvement in student learning. Journal of Education for Business*, 91(1), pp. 19–22. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2015.1108281>