Curriculum preferences of physical education teachers in primary schools: differences in length of pedagogical practice
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Abstract

Purpose. Curriculum preferences of physical education (PE) teachers in primary schools differ, depending on educational policy, local guidelines, and particular needs of students (pupils); therefore, the survey objective was aimed at determining the curriculum preferences of PE teachers in primary schools in terms of differences in length of pedagogical practice.

Material and methods. Curriculum preferences of PE teachers in primary schools (survey instrument) was conducted 6 months (January – June, 2022), through the purposive sampling of size (survey group) of 1 300 (100%) PE teachers in primary schools: (i) Pedagogical practice ≥10 years (n = 518, 39.84%); (ii) Pedagogical practice <10 years (n = 782, 60.16%). Descriptive (e.g., percentage frequency, arithmetic mean), inferential (e.g., Pearson’s r, chi-square test) statistics were used to evaluate (e.g., analyze, compare) the data.

Results. Significant differences (0.01, 0.05) between the pedagogical practice ≥10 years (n = 518, 39.84%) and <10 years (n = 782, 60.16%) of PE teachers (n = 1 300, 100%) were as follows: (i) Curriculum preferences of PE teachers ($\chi^2_{(3)} = 77.75, p = 9.35E-17$); (ii) Demanding teaching activity in PE teachers ($\chi^2_{(4)} = 29.34, p = 6.65E-06$); (iii) Undemanding teaching activity in PE teachers ($\chi^2_{(4)} = 30.10, p = 4.68E-06$). No differences (p˃0.05), between the pedagogical practice ≥10 years (n = 518, 39.84%) and <10 years (n = 782, 60.16%) of PE teachers (n = 1 300, 100%), were as follows: (i) Popular teaching activity in PE teachers ($\chi^2_{(4)} = 6.82, p = 0.15$); (ii) Unpopular teaching activity in PE teachers ($\chi^2_{(4)} = 8.78, p = 0.06$).

Conclusions. Curricular reform in Slovak primary schools allows PE teachers autonomy (partial) in selecting the educational content (course) in terms of meeting the specific needs of students and learning environment, in consultation with board of education (school board) in terms of meeting the particular needs of students and learning environment, recognizing the importance of PE teachers’ autonomy and value of tailoring education.

Key words: curriculum preferences, pedagogical practice, physical education teachers, primary schools

© Adamčák Š, Marko M, Izáková A, Bartík P, 2023
https://doi.org/10.58962/HSR.2023.9.3.40-49
Штефан Адамчак, Михаел Марко, Андреа Ізакова, Павол Бартік. Учебные предпочтения учителей физической культуры начальных классов: відмінності тривалості педагогічної практики

Мета. Уподобання учителів фізичного виховання (ФВ) у початкових школах щодо навчальної програми відрізняється залежно від освітньої політики, місцевих правил та освітніх потреб учнів (учнів). Така мета опитування була спрямована на визначення уподобань щодо навчального програм учителів фізкультури початкової школи з точки зору різниці в тривалості педагогічного практики.

Матеріал і методи. Уподобання вчителів фізкультури в початкових школах щодо навчальних програм (інструмент опитування) проводилось протягом 6 місяців (січень – червень 2022 р.) шляхом цільового вибору розміру (група опитування) 1300 (100%) вчителів фізкультури в початкових школах: (i) Педагогічний стаж ≥10 років (n = 518, 39,84%); (ii) Педагогічна практика <10 років (n = 782, 60,16%). Для оцінки (наприклад, аналізу, порівняння) даних використовувався описовий (наприклад, відсоткова частота, середнє арифметичне), інтервенційний (наприклад, г Пірсона, критерій хі-квадрат) статистика.

Результати. Достовірні відмінності (0,01, 0,05) між педагогічною практикою ≥10 років (n = 518, 39,84%) та <10 років (n = 782, 60,16%) вчителів фізкультури (n = 1300, 100%) були такими: (i) Уподобання вчителів фізкультури щодо навчальної програми (х2(3) = 77,75, р = 9,35E-17); (ii) Вимогливість до викладацької діяльності учителів фізкультури (х2(4) = 29,34, р = 6,65E-06); (iii) Невимоглива педагогічна діяльність у вчителів фізкультури (х2(4) = 30,10, р = 4,68E-06). Жодних відмінностей (p>0,05) між педагогічною практикою ≥10 років (n = 518, 39,84%) та <10 років (n = 782, 60,16%) вчителів фізкультури (n = 1300, 100%) не виявлено. Наступне: (i) популярна педагогічна активність вчителів фізкультури (х2(4) = 6,82, р = 0,15); (ii) Непопулярна викладацька діяльність у вчителів фізкультури (х2(4) = 8,78, р = 0,06).

Висновки. Реформа навчальної програми в початкових школах Словаччини надає вчителям фізкультури автономію (часткову) у виборі змісту освіти (курсу) з точки зору задоволення конкретних потреб учащихся (учнів) і навчального середовища, за погодженням з освітньою радою (шкільною радою) з точки зору задоволення конкретних потреб студентів і навчального середовища, визнаючи важливість автономії вчителів фізкультури та їхніх індивідуальних особистостей.

Ключові слова: програмні переваги, педагогічна практика, вчителі фізичної культури, початкова школа.
Introduction

Curriculum preferences of physical education (PE) teachers in primary schools differ, depending on educational policy, local guidelines, and particular (specific) needs of students (pupils) [1–2]. School subject of PE plays an important role in curriculum in primary schools, promoting the holistic development in students [3]. Preferences (approach) PE teachers play an important role in shaping students' experiences and outcomes of domain. PE is not just about engaging in sports and physical activity (PA). PE teachers understand the role (important) PE plays in promoting high-quality education [4–5] because of recognizing that PA influences the students' academic performance, concentration, and well-being (overall) [6–9]. PE teachers make use of special approaches, considering the preferences (subjective) and teaching styles (methods). PE teachers lean toward "traditional" approaches, which emphasize sports and games (classic), aiming at cooperation and competition; at the same time, embrace "modern" approaches (dance, yoga), which promote self-expression and well-being (holistic) [10]. Balance between the approaches differs, according to preferences of PE teachers, influenced by interests and experiences.

PE teachers attempt to create inclusive environments in meeting the particular needs of students and by recognizing that students possess distinctive skills, learning styles, and conditions, PE teachers modify the sports (games) and equipment to make certain that students may participate (actively) and experience success. Differentiated instruction, individualized aims and tailored intervention are implemented to provide inclusive environments [11]. PE teachers understand the importance of play, enjoyment, and recognize that incorporating fun, engaging games not only enhances students' motivation, but also instills positive attitudes toward health [12–14].

PE teachers play an essential role in achieving high-quality education [1, 4–5]; in students; therefore, need to develop special competences (ability) [5, 15]. To enhance the ability to deliver effective (high-quality) education, PE teachers look for professional development opportunities. Workshops, conferences, and courses enable PE teachers to update their knowledge, learn teaching styles (new), and gain insight into research and trends in PE. By staying informed and improving the knowledge, PE teachers may better cater to evolving the needs of students [16].

Curriculum preferences of PE teachers are instrumental in shaping students' outcomes and experiences. By recognizing the importance of PE, tailoring activity to needs, and prioritizing play and fun, PE teachers may create environments (inclusion) where students may develop physical skills, social competence, and long-term commitment to health (wellness) [11]. By supporting the curriculum preferences of PE teachers, primary schools may ensure that PE programs are engaging, inclusive, and impactful. Because of many gaps remain in Slovak literature (the best of authors' knowledge), the survey objective was aimed at determining curriculum preferences of PE teachers in primary schools in terms of differences in length of pedagogical practice.

Material and methods

Participants

In terms of survey objective, the survey group (convenience sample) consisted of 1,300 (100%) of PE teachers in primary schools of Slovakia, enrolled in EduPage (school system) [17–18], in intervals of 3 weeks, aiming for purposive sampling; in particular, length of pedagogical practice: (i-i) ≥10 years (n = 518, 39.84%); (i-ii) <10 years (n = 782, 60.16%); age: (ii-i) ≥40 years (n = 494, 38%); (ii-ii) <40 years (n = 806, 62%); gender : (iii-i) Male (n = 225, 17.24%); (iii-ii) Female (n = 1,075, 82.76%); career : (iiii-i) Beginner (n = 102; 7.84%); (iiii-ii) Independent (n = 390, 30%); (iiii-iii) Attestation (n = 808, 62.14%) (Tab. 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogical practice (2)</th>
<th>Age (2)</th>
<th>Gender (2)</th>
<th>Career (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥10 years</td>
<td>518; 39.84%</td>
<td>Male 225; 17.24%</td>
<td>Beginner 102; 7.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10 years</td>
<td>782; 60.16%</td>
<td>Female 808; 62.14%</td>
<td>Independent 390; 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥40 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;40 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

PE teachers in primary schools
Study design

Survey instrument (curriculum preferences of PE teachers) was conducted 6 months (January – June, 2022), as a way of determining (e.g., analyze, compare) the curriculum preferences of PE teachers in primary schools in terms of length of pedagogical practice. Being available online at limited time (6 months), the survey instrument was gathering the data of 1 300 (100%) PE teachers in primary schools of ≥10 years (39.84%, n = 518) and <10 years (60.16%, n = 782) of pedagogical practice. Developing the survey instrument simplified the process of evaluating the data, which consisted of 2 sections: (i) Demographic statistics (e.g., pedagogical practice, career, gender, age); (ii) 5 items of survey, consisting of multiple-choice questions: (ii-i) Curriculum preferences of PE teachers in primary schools; (ii-ii) Popular teaching activity of PE teachers; (ii-iii) Unpopular teaching activity of PE teachers; (ii-iv) Demanding teaching activity of PE teachers; (ii-iii) Undemanding teaching activity of PE teachers [1]. Possible criticism (feedback) was not detecting any issues of comparative design and language of survey instrument. Motivation in terms of incentives was not given (unpaid); however, 1 300 (100%) PE teachers in primary schools received personal results afterwards. Survey instrument did not detect any subjective (personal) data (Microsoft Forms) [19–20].

Statistical analysis

Collected data, via debriefing forms of survey instrument, was tabulated in database design, designed for comparative study (single-measure). Responses (incidence) of each item of 1 300 (100%) PE teachers in primary schools were evaluated (comparative analysis) by Tap3 – Gamo, It (Banská Bystrica, Slovakia). After cleaning the available data of 1 300 (100%) PE teachers in primary schools, descriptive (e.g., arithmetic mean, percentage frequency), inferential (e.g., Pearson's r, chi-square test) statistics were used to evaluate the data. When evaluating the differences between 1 300 (100%) PE teachers in primary schools in terms of length of pedagogical practice (≥10 years – n = 517, 39.84%; <10 years – n = 782), chi-square test (p<0.01, 0.05) was used [21]. When measuring the strength of relationship (linear) between 2 variables, Pearson's r was used [22].

Results

Table 2 shows differences (0.01, 0.05) of curriculum preferences between PE teachers (n = 1 300, 100%) in primary schools in terms of length of pedagogical practice – ≥10 years (n = 518, 39.84%) and <10 years (n = 782, 60.16%). Percentage (%) in terms of differences (0.01, 0.05) in length of pedagogical practice (≥10/ <10 years) between 1 300 (100%) PE teachers in primary schools was as follows: (i) As important as... – 50.10% (n = 260)/72.52% (n = 568); (ii) Not teaching – 4.62% (n = 22)/3.96% (n = 30); (iii) Popular subject – 35.78% (n = 185)/15.98% (n = 125); (iii) Unpopular subject – 9.86% (n = 50)/7.84% (n = 62). Difference in % of 1 300 (100%) PE teachers in primary schools in terms of length of pedagogical practice was significant (p<0.01) ($\chi^2 = 77.75$, p = 9.35E-17).

Table 2
Curriculum preferences of PE teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogical practice</th>
<th>≥10 years</th>
<th>&lt;10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not teaching</td>
<td>22; 4.62%</td>
<td>28; 3.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular subject</td>
<td>186; 35.78%</td>
<td>124; 15.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpopular subject</td>
<td>50; 9.86%</td>
<td>62; 7.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As important as...</td>
<td>260; 50.10%</td>
<td>568; 72.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square test</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 77.75$, p = 9.35E-17**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $\chi^2$ – chi-square test; ** – p<0.01

Un-popular teaching activity of 1 300 (100%) PE teachers in primary schools in terms of length of pedagogical practice shows Table 3. Differences (0.01, 0.05) in length of pedagogical practice (≥10/ <10 years) between 1 300 (100%) PE teachers in primary schools in terms of un-/ popular teaching activity (i/ ii) were as follows: (i-i) Athletics, Gymnastics – 12.20% (n = 62)/9.45% (n = 74); (ii-i) Dance – 39.65% (n = 205)/40.92% (n = 320); (ii-ii) Games – 14.30% (n = 75)/11.90% (n = 94); (ii-iii) Health, Fitness – 22.60% (n = 116)/28.38% (n = 222); (i-iiii) Outdoor, Adventure – 11.25% (n = 60)/9.35% (n = 72); (ii-iiii) Athletics, Gymnastics – 20.90% (n = 108)/19.44% (n = 152); (ii-iii) Dance – 14.90% (n = 78)/14.20% (n = 112); (ii-iii) Games – 48.15% (n = 250)/54.48% (n = 424); (ii-iii) Health, Fitness – 4.25% (n = 22)/3.08% (n = 24); (ii-iiii) Outdoor, Adventure – 11.80% (n = 60)/8.80% (n = 70). There were no differences (0.05) in length of pedagogical practice (≥10 years/ <10 years) between 1 300 (100%) PE teachers in primary schools in terms of
popular ($\chi^2_{(4)} = 6.82, p = 0.15$) and unpopular ($\chi^2_{(4)} = 8.78, p = 0.06$) teaching activity (Tab. 3). Pearson’s $r$ of 518 (39.84%) PE teachers in primary schools (≥10 years) between un-/ popular teaching activity was weak, negative ($r = -0.286$) (Tab. 5) and dependence of <10 years of pedagogical practice of 782 (60.16%) PE teachers in primary schools between un-/ popular teaching activity was moderate, negative ($r = -0.365$) (Tab. 6).

Un-/ popular teaching activity of PE teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Pedagogical practice</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥10 years</td>
<td>&lt;10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics, Gymnastics</td>
<td>108; 20.90%</td>
<td>152; 19.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor, Adventure</td>
<td>60; 11.80%</td>
<td>70; 8.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Fitness</td>
<td>22; 4.25%</td>
<td>24; 3.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>250; 48.15%</td>
<td>424; 54.48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>78; 14.90%</td>
<td>112; 14.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square test</td>
<td>$\chi^2_{(4)} = 6.82$, $p = 0.15$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unpopular teaching activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Pedagogical practice</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥10 years</td>
<td>&lt;10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics, Gymnastics</td>
<td>62; 12.20%</td>
<td>74; 9.45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor, Adventure</td>
<td>60; 11.25%</td>
<td>72; 9.35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Fitness</td>
<td>116; 22.60%</td>
<td>222; 28.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>75; 14.30%</td>
<td>94;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>205; 39.65%</td>
<td>320; 40.92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square test</td>
<td>$\chi^2_{(4)} = 8.78$, $p = 0.06$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $\chi^2$ – chi-square test

Un-/ demanding teaching activity of 1 300 (100%) PE teachers in primary schools in terms of length of pedagogical practice shows Table 4. Differences (0.01, 0.05) in length of pedagogical practice (≥10/ <10 years) between 1 300 (100%) PE teachers in primary schools in terms of un-/ demanding teaching activity (i/ ii) were as follows: (i-i) Athletics, Gymnastics – 30.55% (n = 158)/ 39.78% (n = 310); (i-ii) Dance – 13.75% (n = 70)/ 9.44% (n = 74); (i-iii) Games – 27.85% (n = 145)/ 21.10% (n = 165); (i-iii) Health, Fitness – 7.15% (n = 38)/ 3.58% (n = 28); (i-iii) Outdoor, Adventure – 20.70% (n = 106)/ 26.10% (n = 204); (ii-i) Athletics, Gymnastics – 12.95% (n = 68)/ 6.40% (n = 50); (ii-ii) Dance – 29.02% (n = 150)/ 30.95% (n = 242); (ii-iii) Games – 16.45% (n = 85)/ 13.95 % (n = 110); (ii-iii) Health, Fitness – 31.34% (n = 162)/ 41.68% (n = 325); (ii-iii) Outdoor, Adventure – 12.24% (n = 52)/ 7.02% (n = 55) (Tab. 4). There were differences (0.01, 0.05) in length of pedagogical practice (≥10 years/ <10 years) between 1 300 (100%) PE teachers in primary schools in terms of demanding ($\chi^2_{(4)} = 29.34; p = 6.65E-06$) and undemanding ($\chi^2_{(4)} = 30.10$, $p = 4.68E-06$) teaching activity. Dependence of ≥10 years (pedagogical practice) of 518 (39.84%) PE teachers in primary schools was moderate negative ($r = -0.388$, popular/ demanding), strong, positive ($r = 0.700$, popular/ undemanding; $r = 0.808$, unpopular/ demanding), and strong, negative ($r = -0.628$, unpopular/ undemanding; $r = -0.835$, unpopular/ demanding) (Tab. 5). Pearson’s $r$ of 782 (60.16%) PE teachers in primary schools (˂10 years of pedagogical practice) between un-/ demanding teaching activity was strong, negative ($r = -0.928$), weak, positive ($r = 0.258$, popular/ undemanding), moderate, negative ($r = -0.384$, popular/ demanding), strong, negative ($r = -0.706$, unpopular/ undemanding), and strong, positive ($r = 0.838$, unpopular/ demanding) (Tab. 6).

Un-/ demanding teaching activity of PE teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Pedagogical practice</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥10 years</td>
<td>&lt;10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics, Gymnastics</td>
<td>158; 30.55%</td>
<td>310; 39.78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor, Adventure</td>
<td>106; 20.70%</td>
<td>204; 26.10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Fitness</td>
<td>38; 7.15%</td>
<td>28; 3.58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>145; 27.85%</td>
<td>165; 21.10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>70; 13.75%</td>
<td>74; 9.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square test</td>
<td>$\chi^2_{(4)} = 30.10$, $p = 4.68E-06$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Pedagogical practice ≥10 years of PE teachers (Pearson’s r)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.286</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.388</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>-0.628</td>
<td>-0.835</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1 – popular teaching activity; 2 – unpopular teaching activity; 3 – demanding teaching activity; 4 – undemanding teaching activity

Table 6
Pedagogical practice <10 years of PE teachers (Pearson’s r)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.365</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.384</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>-0.706</td>
<td>-0.928</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1 – popular teaching activity; 2 – unpopular teaching activity; 3 – demanding teaching activity; 4 – undemanding teaching activity

Discussion

In some primary schools, PE teachers may occupy "marginal roles" [1, 23]; however, 61.31% (n = 798) of 1 300 (100%) PE teachers in primary schools considered PE as important as other subjects (p< 0.01). 169 (80.47%) out of 210 (100%) Slovak PE teachers in secondary schools (e.g., vocational school, grammar school) considered PE as important as other subjects and 17% (n = 36) of them considered PE more important [24]. 75% of teachers in Romania considered PE as important portion of educational system [25]. It’s important to note that the extent of role (teachers) may differ, in accordance with school, region. Primary schools often face the challenges of balancing the curriculum (sometimes rigid) that prioritizes academic subjects (core); in particular, mathematics, language arts, and science. Croatian teachers considered academic subjects (3.42/ 4) more important than PE; however, PE was in 4th place, which made it close to academic subjects, compared to artistic (e.g., music, art) [26]. As a result, there is limited time allocated to PE classes, leading to shorter classes durations and/or fewer sessions/week. Prevailing emphasis on academic achievement and standardized testing is leading to marginalization of PE. With schools under pressure to excel in academic rankings, subjects like PE often receive less priority; therefore, PE suffers from limited resources (low budgets). Inadequate financing for equipment and facilities, and professional development opportunities hamper the ability of PE teachers in providing high-quality education [27]. Without proper resources, PE classes may lack variety and innovation, hindering students' (pupils) physical development (overall). Limited support from school administrators and staff may reinforce the perception that PE is of lesser importance, further marginalizing the role of PE teachers [28].

Games (activity) play an important part in curriculum of PE, offering students an enjoyable (fun) and engaging way to participate in PA [29]. Incorporating "traditional" games into PE classes may be an effective alternative strategy in promoting PA. According to 50.82% (n = 660) of 1 300 (100%) PE teachers in primary schools, games were popular teaching activity (p>0.05). "Traditional" games often involve active movements (e.g., running, jumping). By incorporating games into PE classes, students are encouraged to be active, while having fun. This may help increase the overall fitness levels, develop fundamental motor skills, and improve coordination and agility [30]. PE teachers may have inadequate experience of dance and lack confidence when it comes to teaching dance. PE teachers often receive training and education that focuses more on sports rather than dance. Their coursework and professional development opportunities may not cover education in dance, leaving them with limited knowledge and experience in this specific area [31]. As a result, 40.28% (n = 524) of 1 300 (100%) PE teachers in primary schools considered activity of dance as unpopular teaching activity (p>0.05). Teaching dance requires certain levels of comfort and confidence in one's movement abilities. Some PE teachers may have personal reservations (insecurities) about their dancing skills, which may impact their willingness and confidence in teaching dance.

The survey objective was aimed at determining the curriculum preferences of PE teachers in primary schools in terms of differences in length of pedagogical practice and one of the main challenges lies within the contextual differences between educational systems, policies, and cultural backgrounds across countries. Each educational system has its unique curriculum frameworks, priorities, and instructional approaches; therefore,
comparing curriculum preferences from one country to another may not yield directly applicable or comparable results. It is essential to consider the specific context in which the survey was conducted and factors that may influence curriculum preferences in that particular setting. While direct comparisons may be quite challenging, understanding underlying principles, theories, and research from foreign literature may provide many insights and inform curriculum development and implementation practices. By acknowledging the interconnectedness of theory and practice, researchers and practitioners may explore how theoretical concepts (perceptions) from foreign literature may be applied and integrated into their own educational contexts. This may help bridge the gap between research and practice, while facilitating the development of effective and contextually relevant curriculum preferences of PE in primary schools.

Conclusions

Curricular reform in Slovak primary schools allows PE teachers autonomy (partial) in selecting the educational content (course) in terms of meeting the specific needs of students and learning environment, in consultation with board of education (school board) in terms of meeting the particular needs of students and learning environment, recognizing the importance of PE teachers' autonomy and value of tailoring education. PE teachers in primary schools may be autonomy (partial) at special times (i.e., sections, tasks); therefore, may create improvements (0.01, 0.05) in students' motivation (intrinsic), specific needs, and PA (guidelines). More autonomous are PE teachers in primary schools, more passionate/active are students in classes; therefore, we consider it significant to dedicate more attention to dance (29.98%, n = 390) and health, fitness (36.50%, n = 475) (p˂0.01) in terms of training in future of PE teachers in primary schools.
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