South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation, 2017, 39(3): 163 – 177.
Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Navorsing in Liggaamlike Opvoedkunde en Ontspanning, 2017, 39(3): 163 – 177.
ISBN: 0379-9069

NEEDS AND CHALLENGES OF FOUNDATION PHASE LIFE SKILLS TEACHERS IN DELIVERING PHYSICAL EDUCATION: JACK OF ALL TRADES AND MASTER OF NONE?

Leoni C.E. STROEBEL[1], Johnnie HAY[2], Hermanus J. BLOEMHOFF[3]
[1] *School of Social Sciences and Language Education, Faculty of Education, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, Rep. of South Africa*
[2] *School of Education Studies, Faculty of Education Sciences, North-West University, Potchefstroom, Rep. of South Africa*
[3] *Department of Exercise and Sport Sciences, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, Rep. of South Africa*

ABSTRACT

In the current national Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS), Physical Education (PE) is located in the subject Life Skills (LS), which comprises four subject areas in the Foundation Phase (Grade R-3). Although the foundation for lifelong participation in physical activity is established in early childhood years, the decline of PE and deteriorating health of children indicate a disparity regarding the delivery of PE. The aim of the study was to determine the needs and challenges of LS teachers with specific focus on effective implementation and delivery of PE in the Foundation Phase in selected primary schools in the Free State Province. Primary schools (n=100) were randomly selected, from which 94 FP teachers returned questionnaires. The data were analysed descriptively using absolute and relative frequencies. SAS Version 9.3 TS Level 1M2 was employed for all the statistical analyses. The most challenging issues revealed were a lack of qualified PE teachers and resources, a need for assistance with assessment, learners with special needs and in-service training. The DBE (Department of Basic Education) should prioritise the training of LS teachers, with specific reference to PE, by collaborating with Higher Education Institutions to provide standardised in-service teacher training.

Keywords: Life Skills; Physical Education; Foundation phase; Teacher training; Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS); Department of Basic Education; Higher Education institutions.

INTRODUCTION

Curriculum change in South Africa (SA) is an exhaustive topic, and the repeated changes carry the burden of mostly negative connotations. Generally, the impact it has had on the education system, the teachers and the learners is of great concern and has been explored in detail, specifically with regard to the implications for Physical Education (PE) (Rooth, 2005; Christiaans, 2006; Prinsloo, 2007; Van Deventer, 2008; Van Deventer, 2009; Van Deventer, 2012). Since 1997, a succession of changes and revisions to the curriculum took place, in an attempt to overcome the curricular divisions of the past (DBE, 2011a). Subsequently, in 2009

the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statements (CAPS) were published for each subject in the NCS (DBE, 2011a). In the CAPS for Grades R to 3 (Foundation Phase), the study area known as Life Skills (LS) aims at guiding and preparing learners for life and its possibilities, including equipping learners for meaningful and successful living in a rapidly changing and transforming society (DBE, 2011a).

The purpose of LS is to develop learners through a range of diverse, but interrelated study areas: Beginning Knowledge, Personal and Social Well-being, Physical Education and Creative Arts. LS has been organised as such to ensure that the foundational skills, values and concepts of early childhood development and the subjects offered in the subsequent grades are imparted and established in Grades R-3 (DBE, 2011a). Furthermore, the CAPS document for LS states that the subject is vital for the holistic development of the young child, as it concerns itself with the integration of social, personal, intellectual, emotional and physical growth of learners (DBE, 2011a). Since the curriculum dictates what and how teaching and learning should take place, it has an unequivocal effect on all domains of the school, such as the management, the classroom, the extramural programme, the teachers and the establishment as a whole.

However, with curriculum changes come challenges, and in the ideal setting, policy implementation should equal policy development. The UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation) guidelines for quality PE, states that national strategies "should address the significant gaps between policy rhetoric and actual implementation to ensure legislation on PE provision is being applied consistently" (UNESCO, 2015:47). As in South Africa, New Zealand experienced a series of consecutive changes to the national curriculum since 1990, followed by ongoing reviews and revisions (Petrie & Hunter, 2011). Petrie and Hunter (2011:332) further elaborate that the challenges of new policy initiatives appeared to have teachers "paralysed by policy". In addition, the limited professional development opportunities contributed to teachers not having support to "make sense of what they were to teach" (Petrie & Hunter, 2011:332). Likewise, in South Africa, the reality of implementing policy seems to be challenging, particularly with regard to the LS teacher who is instrumental in putting the curriculum into practice. Jacobs (2011) argues that the theory of CAPS and the practice thereof are far removed from each other, which results in ineffectiveness and negative attitudes by both learners and teachers. The authors concur and argue that unrealistic expectations from LS teachers may be one of the main contributing factors to this negative environment.

Since the curriculum changes took place in SA, the teacher of LS had to transform virtually overnight. The LS and Life Orientation (LO) teacher had to become a master in a multi-faceted subject that expects him or her to be a skilled, competent educator in a variety of areas such as Social and Natural Sciences (Beginning Knowledge), Psychology and Sociology (Personal and Social well-being), the Fine Arts (Creative Arts) and Human Movement Science (Physical Education). LO is the equivalent of LS in the Senior and FET phases. The collective aim of the four study areas within LS is comprehensive and equally significant (DBE, 2011a:8). Moreover, every study area is encumbered with specific aims, content, concepts and skills. According to the CAPS for the Foundation Phase (FP) (DBE, 2011a:8), a brief account of the concepts and skills relating to the four study areas are presented here. With regard to *Beginning Knowledge*, key concepts that are covered have been drawn from the Social Sciences, Natural

Sciences and Technology. Scientific process skills and technological process skills are also incorporated. The study area of *Personal and Social Well-being* contains the topics of social health, emotional health, relationships with other people and the environment, as well as values and attitudes. *Creative Arts* is structured around two parallel and complementary streams – Visual Art and Performing Arts. *Physical Education* (*PE*) encompasses the development of the learners' gross and fine motor skills and perceptual development. The focus is on play, movement and games that contribute to the advancement of positive attitudes and values. The emphasis is on physical growth, development, recreation and play (DBE, 2011a:8). The challenges with regard to the delivery of PE will be clarified.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION AS A STUDY AREA IN LIFE SKILLS

The Healthy Active Kids South Africa (HAKSA) Report accounts that less than two-thirds of children participate in weekly PE classes and more than a third of 10-year-olds (34%) do not have PE during the week in urban primary schools (Discovery Vitality, 2014). According to Pangrazi (2007), the pursuit of a lasting physically active and healthy lifestyle originates in the PE class. Similarly, the international guidelines developed by UNESCO provide a framework for policy-makers to ensure Quality PE. PE is regarded as the "entry-point for lifelong participation in physical activity" (UNESCO, 2015:6). Hence, the school is the only environment where all children have the opportunity to develop fundamental movement skills, which are considered the building blocks for the learning of sport-specific skills (Balyi *et al*., 2013). Concurrently, early childhood is a very important phase for motor development, when children develop an increased awareness and understanding of the body as a vehicle for movement and acquire movement skills (Pangrazi, 2007). In 2001, Margaret Whitehead introduced the term "physically literate individual", which underlines the notion that said individual are able to understand and "read" the physical environment and respond to it with appropriate and confident movement (Whitehead, 2001:131). Additionally, Gallahue and Oznum (2006) emphasise that a wide assortment of movement experiences provides children with a wealth of information on which to base their perceptions of themselves and the world. Furthermore, physical and motor development makes a significant contribution to learners' social, personal and emotional development, which makes it integral to their holistic development (ICSSPE, 2010; DBE, 2011a).

PE might be regarded as one of the 'best investments' for physical activity, but if not implemented, children will certainly not attain the benefits (Discovery Vitality, 2014). Therefore, to ensure the achievement of the full benefits, the requirements of public investment, a supportive environment and high quality programme delivery are proposed in accordance with the UNESCO guidelines for quality PE (UNESCO, 2015). Following on, The International Council for Sport Science and Physical Education (ICSSPE, 2010) and the United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP, 2013) ultimately strive to reverse the decline of PE and sport (ICSSPE, 2010), not only because it affords "the most effective and inclusive means of providing all children … with the skills, attitudes, knowledge and understanding for lifelong participation in physical activity and sport" (Green, 2008:226), but also for the gains sports bring in terms of development and peace programmes (UNOSDP, 2013).

Van Deventer has done extensive research into the state and status of PE, teachers' perspectives and the implementation of LS and LO, since the curriculum changes came into effect (Van Deventer, 2008, 2009, 2011, 2012). He concludes that PE is at a critical junction in South Africa, and changes need to be made at grassroots level (Van Deventer, 2011). A number of researchers share the sentiment of Van Deventer (Rooth, 2005; Christiaans, 2006; Prinsloo, 2007; Van der Merwe, 2011; Cleophas, 2014) and agree that support is needed, especially with regard to unqualified teachers, lack of facilities and implementation of the curriculum. Accordingly, Morgan and Bourke (2005) concur that insufficient teacher training and unqualified staff has a detrimental influence on the quality of PE offerings. It is, therefore, obvious that the LS teacher has to face complex and diverse challenges. The question involuntarily arises: Is this Life Skills teacher a 'jack of all trades and a master of none'?

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The aim of this study was to determine the challenges and needs of in-service LS teachers concerning the effective implementation and deliverance of the subject area PE in the Foundation Phase in selected primary schools in the Free State. The input of in-service teachers is essential to provide insight into the general and specific needs, as they have first-hand knowledge and experience of the challenges that accompany the implementation of the CAPS in LS on a daily basis.

METHODOLOGY

Research design

Quantitative and qualitative data captured by a questionnaire typify the research design as a survey.

Sample

Primary schools (n =100) (20 schools per district from the five districts) were randomly selected by using the official address list of the Free State Department of Education (FSDoE), which is available on their public website (FSDoE, 2015). The FSDoE, as well as the principal of each school, granted permission to conduct the research. The principal or head of the Life Skills Department at each school nominated and requested a LS teacher to complete the questionnaire.

Ethics and approval

Approval was obtained from the Ethics Board of the Faculty of Education, University of the Free State (UFS-EDU-2014-037). The participants were treated in accordance with the ethical guidelines outlined by the Ethics Board of the Faculty of Education. The principals of the selected schools completed an informed consent form and distributed an informed consent form and questionnaire to an appropriate teacher in the FP for completion. Inclusion criteria included that teachers must be in service, currently teaching LS and/or PE in the Free State Province (FP). No restrictive or excluding criteria regarding gender, ethnicity, socio-economic level or educational level were applicable.

Procedures

Initially, the methodology entailed that teachers in LS would be contacted via a letter distributed by the Subject Advisors of the five districts in the Free State. Assistance with coordination and distribution of the letters of information and consent forms would have been requested at focus-group meetings with subject advisors. It was assumed that the subject advisors would be in the best position to distribute the questionnaires, as they visit the schools on a regular basis. However, due to copious challenges encountered with the subject advisors, such as time constraints, demanding programmes, budget cuts, transport issues and availability, a new distribution system was implemented. The researcher personally distributed the information and consent letters, as well as a copy of the FSDoE permission memo and the questionnaires. Questionnaires were collected personally from the schools on a communicated schedule, which gave the teachers sufficient time to complete the questionnaires. Of the 100 schools selected, 94 FP teachers responded.

Questionnaire

The instrument used in this study was a modification of the questionnaire designed by Van Deventer (2008) and used in numerous related studies during 2009-2012 to assess the situation in schools regarding the implementation of the LS and LO curriculum and Outcome-Based Education (OBE) (Van Deventer, 2008, 2009, 2011, 2012). Permission was granted from Van Deventer (10 December 2013) to use and adapt the questionnaire with regard to the curriculum-related questions. All questions concerning OBE were adapted to refer to the CAPS document.

The questionnaires consisted of four sections. The first section related to *demographic information,* which mostly focused on the school and the community served. The main section of the questionnaire related to the *curriculum,* in which various elements with regard to the execution of CAPS were addressed. The third section dealt with *extramural activities* with the focus on the available facilities and the sporting activities presented at the school. In the fourth section, *general issues concomitant to the major problems encountered in the implementation of LS* were addressed (Van Deventer, 2008).

Statistical and qualitative analysis

Clindata International in Bloemfontein performed the statistical calculations. Results from the questionnaires were analysed descriptively using absolute and relative frequencies. Comparisons to test for associations of ordinal variables between districts or school classification (urban/rural) were done using a Chi-squared test. SAS Version 9.3 TS Level 1M2 (SAS, 2014) was used for all the statistical analyses. The teachers' responses to open-ended items were analysed qualitatively and complemented the statistical findings.

RESULTS

Demographic information

Responses were received from all 20 schools (100% response rate) in the Fezile Dabi, Motheo and Thabo Mofutsanyana Districts, 15 schools (75% response rate) in the Lejweleputswa District and 19 schools (95% response rate) in the Xhariep District, resulting in a sample size of 94 schools (overall response rate of 94%). The schools served mostly the Black communities

(89.1%), followed by the White (8.7%) and Coloured communities (2.2%). Of the 87 teachers who classified their schools, approximately half (44 [50.6%]) labelled their school as rural and the other half considered their schools (43 [49.4%]) as urban. Most schools ranged from 500-999 learners (42.4%), followed by 1000+ learners (32.6%), 100-499 learners (20.7%) and <100 learners (4.3%).

Curriculum

Responses were comparable across the five districts. No statistically significant differences were found between the responses of urban and rural schools. All teachers who responded (n=89) indicated that LS were presented at their school, but only 30.3% indicated that their schools had qualified PE teachers to do so. The teachers who responded (n=93) (98.9%) indicated that they understood the principles of NCS–CAPS. They received the knowledge regarding the principles of the NCS–CAPS curriculum through departmental in-service training (90.3%) and from Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) (4.3%). A small percentage (6.4%) of the teachers received training at both HEIs and during departmental in-service training.

The perception of the teachers of the *importance* that the schools attached to LS according to a five-point Likert-type scale, where a rating of 1 indicated not important and a rating of 5 very important, was that the majority of teachers (73.6%) rated LS as important and very important. With regard to the assessment of movement content in PE (n=91), 23.1% indicated that they could not assess PE. The dominant reasons forwarded were lack of knowledge regarding portfolios (76.1%), rubric development (100%) and movement matrix development (76.1%).

Resources to present LS were only available in 47.8% of the schools who responded (n=90). The majority of schools (37.7%) did not have access to computer-assisted learning; 36.6% lacked learning material; and 25.5% schools required textbooks. In the "other" category of the question, 16% of the schools indicated that they also lacked facilities, equipment and apparatus to present PE classes.

The existence of *team planning* sessions was significantly different between rural and urban schools. Significantly ($p<0.05$) more teachers in urban schools (93%) had planning sessions conducted than in rural schools (71.4%). Reasons forwarded for the lack of team planning sessions were that there was only one teacher in the grade, only one class per grade, or only one teacher in the FP.

In total, 64.8% (n=88) of the schools made *provision for learners* with learning barriers and special needs. A dissimilar list of learning barriers and special needs was identified by the teachers, ranging from the physically disabled, such as learners in wheelchairs and learners with walking frames or limping (19.3%), intellectually disabled (6.8%), eyesight problems (5.6%), hearing disabilities (4.5%), epilepsy (3.4%), speech impairment (1.1%), hyperactivity (1.1%), muscular dystrophy (1.1%) to those with Down syndrome (1.1%), a genetic disorder. In addition, neurodevelopmental disorders, such as autism (1.1 %) and Asperger syndrome (1.1%) were specified also. It is interesting to note that fewer teachers listed learning barriers and special needs like obesity (4.5%), eye-hand coordination (4.4%), low muscle tone (2.2%) and balance (2.2%). The disconcerting issue is that learners with special needs require

particular support and assistance. Only 33.7% of the schools had teachers with special needs qualifications employed.

Almost all the teachers (96.6%) (n=88) indicated that an in-service training workshop would be useful to address their needs. In the open-ended section of the question, the LS teachers' responses confirmed the pronounced need for training with regard to new developments within LS (programme planning, content and presentation ideas). They indicated that school holidays (33.7%), the beginning of the year (22.8%) and any time after school hours (12%) would be an appropriate time for in-service training.

Extramural activities

Most of the schools offered netball, athletics and soccer as a sport (98.9%), followed by cricket (79.7%) and volleyball (66.9%). at some of the schools Rugby (59%), modern dancing (54.5%) and tennis (52.9%) were offered. In response to indicate "other" extramural sport at schools, they specified cross-country, table tennis, jukskei, biathlon and chess (8.5%) and indigenous games such as dibeke, morabaraba and rope skipping (3.1%).

In general, facilities and equipment to present PE and sport were insufficient. Only 22.2% of the schools had sufficient facilities. Most schools (84.0%) had an open space outside, 60.5% had a netball court, 44.4% had a soccer field and 30.7% had a hall. Other facilities only occurred in less than 30% of the schools. Of those schools that did not have adequate facilities themselves, 86.2% used the facilities of other schools, 70% used community centres, 66.7% had scholars practise on their own and 45.5% made use of clubs.

General issues

Regarding the implementation of LS, the major problems encountered by schools are the lack of experts in LS (73.6%), sources (61.3%), subject material (59.7%), computers (59.7%) and time (45.3%). Furthermore, they regarded assessment (51.5 %) as a major problem. In an open-ended question where teachers could specify other major problems regarding the implementation of LS, other than a few comments regarding time constraints (5.5%) and administration overload (5.5%), 22.2% of responses confirmed that training is a necessity. Moreover, again they specified facilities and space (33.3%), although a previous question addressed this issue.

In response to an open-ended question where teachers were asked if they had any further comments regarding the presentation and implementation of PE in the FP, teachers (54.2%) clearly utilised the opportunity to share their thoughts and emphasise their concerns and problems. The responses varied from affirmative annotations to adversarial remarks.

Affirmative annotations

- Benefits of PE, affect the development of the child, positive outcomes and virtuous values and attitudes (23.9%);
- Requests for PE to be a stand-alone subject (5.5%);
- Importance of PE as subject (5.5%).

Adversarial remarks

- Lack of facilities, resources, playgrounds and space (22.1%);
- Lack of time (5.5%);
- Transport problems (1.8%);
- Motivation for teachers (1.8%);
- Information of competitions (1.8%);
- Safety concerns (1.8%).

Appeals for trained and qualified teachers for effective delivery were accentuated (23.9%) and assistance with regard to assessment was noted (5.5%) as well.

DISCUSSION

The selected sample of primary schools in the Free State was regarded as inclusive by representing previously disadvantaged, as well as former Model C schools. Although the schools classified themselves as urban or rural, it should be mentioned again that this was the perception of the teachers. There seems to be confusion regarding the classification of urban and rural schools. According to Mr. Frans Kok, Head of the Education Management Information System (EMIS) in the FSDoE, no specific definition or document exists to distinguish between urban and rural schools (Kok, 2016). Therefore, the teachers' view of whether the school is in an urban or rural area is an acceptable classification for the purpose of this research.

The majority of teachers (73.6%) rated LS as an important/very important subject. Similarly, teachers' annotations in an open-ended question regarding the presentation and implementation of PE emphasised that the PE study area of LS is considered as equally important. Teachers made comments such as, "it is a very important part of our education, gross motor skills must be well developed"; "physical education is important because it helps the child to develop mentally and physically"; "physical education help the learners to develop their body and mind". This is encouraging, as it portrays that teachers believe that PE holds benefits for a healthy, active lifestyle and the development of mainly gross motor skills and good values, attitudes and behaviour. This finding also relates to that of Rooth (2005), Christiaans (2006), Van Deventer and Van Niekerk, (2009) and Van Deventer (2012).

Since only 30.3% of schools indicated that their schools had qualified PE teachers, teacher training seems crucial. The Departmental in-service training was performed mainly by FSDoE, while Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) only featured in a few (10%) of the cases. The finding corroborates that of Van Deventer (2009) and Van Deventer and Van Niekerk (2009) that a minority of teachers had exposure to training at HEIs. The restructuring of higher education and phasing out of teacher training colleges at the turn of the century, accompanied by a rationalisation process, contributed to a loss of nearly 16 000 educators, of which the majority were teachers with vital skills and experience (Jansen & Taylor 2003). Hence, the succeeding period positioned PE as a discipline under pressure at HEIs, and the training of

teachers in the principles of OBE was done mainly via the various Provincial Departments of Education and not at HEIs (Van der Merwe, 2011).

Incidentally, the results with regard to assessment seemed to be contradictory in relation to the number of qualified teachers. Although 69.7% teachers are not qualified, the majority (76.9%) indicated that they knew how to assess movement content. On the other hand, 23.1% who responded negatively in terms of assessment provided reasons in relation to portfolios, rubrics and movement matrix and other reasons. The 'other' responses accentuated that assessment in PE is more complicated than assumed, as one teacher explained, "We are not so sure about rubrics we are using, we will be happy if we can get some help". Another teacher stated, "But still not sure we doing it correct because we are not trained as PE teachers to cater for all, no matter the barrier". Another response indicated that it is a problem to assess physically disabled learners, and another pointed out that there is "totally no in-depth knowledge of the learning area".

In general, the belief was that facilities and equipment to present PE and sport are insufficient. This finding relates to studies done by Van Deventer (2008, 2009, 2012). In a study by Van Deventer (2008) at Western Cape High schools, 56% of LO teachers indicated a lack of sufficient facilities. The bleak picture in terms of demand (for delivery of PE) and supply (the equipment needed for effective delivery), is emphasised by the following comment of a teacher: "Schools have to purchase their own apparatus. The Department of Basic Education wants schools to present PE, but does not even have the money for stationery or their own photocopy machines." However, the DBE Action Plan 2014 indicates the facilitation of the implementation of PE in schools (DBE, 2009; DBE, 2011b). At the 2014 *South African Sport and Recreation Conference* (SASRECON, 6-8 October 2014), Gert Oosthuizen, the Deputy Minister of Sport, emphasised the importance of accessibility of PE and sports at school for all children in South Africa in his keynote address (Oosthuizen, 2014). Keeping in mind that the DBE regards this as a matter of importance, Walter (2014) reports in her study of promoting physical activity in disadvantaged schools in Port Elizabeth, SA.

Many historically disadvantaged schools lack the basic resources for sport, making it very difficult for teachers (many of whom are not suitably qualified) to do anything meaningful in relation to PE. Notwithstanding, Du Toit and Van Der Merwe (2014) contend that the lack of equipment and apparatus cannot be used as an excuse for failing to present the required PE periods. Although all schools do not have the necessary facilities, apparatus or equipment to implement or present physical activities, it is recommended by Du Toit and Van Der Merwe (2014) that teachers improvise and create equipment and apparatus from waste material to utilise during PE periods. This would also serve as an opportunity to integrate PE with the other study areas of LS.

Most schools (64.8%)(n=88) claimed to be inclusive in providing for learners with learning barriers and special needs in PE, ranging from hyperactivity to severe physical disabilities, as well as hearing disorders, Down syndrome, autism, and muscular dystrophy. However, 66.3% (n=73) of schools indicated that they did not have teachers with qualifications to deal with learners with special needs. According to the Policy on Screening, Identification, assessment and support (DBE, 2014) barriers to learning and development may include chronic health

conditions. Therefore, it could be the reason why teachers (4.5%) listed obesity as a learning barrier. Furthermore, some teachers also perceived eye-hand coordination (4.4%), low muscle tone (2.2%) and balance (2.2%) as learning barriers, which they specified accordingly.

The results indicated that 96.6% (n=88) of teachers would find an in-service training workshop useful. The need for reinforcing capacity regarding new developments within PE (programme planning, content and presentation ideas) is clearly illustrated. This finding corresponds with the findings of Rooth (2005), Christiaans (2006), Van Deventer (2008), Van Deventer and Van Niekerk (2009) and Van Deventer (2012). The earnestness to engage in further education and training was clear in retorts, such as "any time of the year", "whole year", "all year round, but we need to vary the activities according to different seasons", "beginning of each term (first week before re-opening)" and "as soon as possible".

Frantz (2008) argues that in order to assist schools to implement PE successfully, teachers should be provided with appropriate training opportunities. Accordingly, The Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa (DBE & HET, 2011), emphasises the importance of teachers acquiring the knowledge and competence to interpret and utilise teaching resources and learner support materials. To address these issues, development opportunities for practising teachers were proposed in order to provide support to develop knowledge and practices that will enable them to implement the curriculum more successfully (DBE & HET, 2011). Hardman (2010) agrees with this viewpoint regarding in-service training/further professional development, and accentuates that it should address properly pedagogical and didactical developments in order to enhance the PE experience of children. Notwithstanding, Morgan and Hansen (2013) point out that factors, such as reduced time to implement meaningful lessons, insufficient equipment and low levels of expertise and confidence have led to current PE programmes being pronounced by teachers as inadequate in achieving key syllabus outcomes. Balyi *et al.* (2013) concur that skilled, qualified and active teachers should support participants during all stages of their development. As Green (2008:207) points out, "central to teaching are the teachers themselves". This implies a consideration of the capacity of educators to deliver PE and the re-skilling of educators where it deems appropriate, as suggested by numerous studies (Van Deventer, 2001, 2008, 2012; Rooth, 2005; Christiaans, 2006; Du Toit *et al.*, 2007; Van Deventer & Van Niekerk, 2009).

One of the major problems encountered by schools with the implementation of LS is the lack of experts in LS (73.6%; n=72). The need for training was highlighted emphatically in responses, such as "not experts trained in PE"; "we need training, capacitation, motivation and encouragement from experts"; "a trained and knowledgeable person (qualified) who is eager to do the work". Based on the aforementioned, the legal liability of the teacher who presents PE needs serious consideration to prevent the consequences of negligence in the case of injury (Rossouw & Keet, 2011; Van der Merwe, 2011). Therefore, in all probability, teachers who do not meet the requirements, will avoid situations where they are at risk to be found negligent, adding to the number of reasons to circumvent the PE class (Himberg *et al*., 2003). Notwithstanding, the opportunities for physical activity should not be jeopardised by the lack of safety procedures. Principally, it should be a priority. A general comments section afforded the opportunity for teachers to elaborate on the issues of implementation and presentation of PE in the FP. Although encouraging commentaries were made, conflicting statements

outweighed the positive in terms of the lack of facilities, resources and safety concerns, such as the following comment from a teacher:

> If or when the school has sufficient facilities, educators may be more interested in physical education. The open space that the school is full of stones and if that space can be used to build the multi-court, it would bring a lot of difference in this school.

Subsequently, UNESCO calls for the development of quality PE programmes, supported by teacher training and the allocation of sufficient resources (CIGEPS, 2011). Moreover, the 2015 UNESCO Guidelines serve as benchmark for quality PE provision and teacher training, and it clearly states that PE teachers' training should include "appropriate preparation for delivering programmes that contribute to health objectives, a strong theoretical basis and a skill-set to work with a range of individuals" (UNESCO, 2015:50). Lambert (2014) proposes capacity development in order to match policy. The best way for the Government to promote physical activity for children is to prioritise the implementation of PE in schools, which implies the training and support of educators (Lambert, 2014) and further training in the form of workshops and conferences (Perry *et al*., 2012). In addition, Du Toit *et al*. (2007) maintain that addressing practical and didactical improvising skills in PE seems to be vital. Even in the general comment section of the questionnaire, the recurring theme appeared to be appeals for trained and qualified teachers to deliver the subject efficiently. As one teacher summarised, "Because of not having a qualified person to do physical education, our learners are not exposed to different sporting codes and a less number is participating in sports."

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this study, it is evident that LS teachers face numerous challenges on a daily basis with regard to the implementation of the diverse LS curriculum, and in particular with the delivery of PE. The absence of qualified teachers, the lack of facilities and equipment to present PE, and the need for assistance to teach PE to learners with special needs and learning barriers became apparent. The findings highlight that the majority of teachers affirmed a need for in-service training to learn more about new developments in PE with regard to programme planning, content and presentation ideas. Hence, this led to questions regarding the extent to which teachers are adequately and appropriately equipped and supported to implement the CAPS for PE in LS effectively.

The results clearly show that facilities and equipment to present PE remain a problem. This can be addressed by including improvising strategies and innovative approaches in workshops to support teachers who lack sufficient space and equipment, until the DBE can provide in this need. Therefore, the authors support the proposal of Van Deventer and Van Niekerk (2009) that in-service training should include short courses. However, to achieve better results, the practical nature of PE should be considered when the duration of such courses are decided (Van Deventer & Van Niekerk, 2009; Van der Merwe, 2011). Van Deventer (2012) further suggested that the frequency of short courses should receive attention by following up said courses with refresher workshops. Furthermore, international studies pursued in New Zealand and Scotland on similar issues warn against pitfalls of continuous professional development courses. Petrie (2011) cautioned that these opportunities should cater for different pedagogical approaches and consider contextual relevance. In a study by Jess *et al*. (2011:195), they argue for developing a

"richer and more extensive repertoire of pedagogical strategies" in teaching PE. It should be noted, however, that although the previous studies offer valued insight, the dissimilar context to the unique situation in South Africa, especially with regard to the cessation in training of teachers delivering PE, should be considered.

It is strongly recommended that further investigation into the most effective approach for short courses and workshops should concentrate on ensuring that qualified, skilled, experienced instructors who are knowledgeable in pedagogical and didactical principles of PE present these training opportunities. Future research should also focus on the preparation of available space, improvisation of apparatus and application of safety principles for the practical presentation of PE.

Lastly, in order to assist the LS teacher to meet the demands for effective implementation of CAPS, collaboration between the DBE and HEIs to provide standardised in-service teacher training in PE throughout the Provinces should be explored. At present, the expectations with regard to the LS teacher are questionable. Serious consideration needs to be given to the idealistic expectations with regard to the 'full package' of in-service LS teachers. They should be tutored, nurtured and supported to deliver attainable objectives of the curriculum**.**

In conclusion, to reap the benefits of PE, particularly in terms of the health and physical activity perspective, the impact in the Foundation Phase is essential; therefore, the voice of the teacher should be heard. The outcry is loud and clear. They need to be empowered in the pursuit of proficient delivery of quality PE. If not, the question will remain, is the LS teacher a 'jack of all trades and master of none'?

Acknowledgement

The authors wish to thank the LS teachers and principals of the Primary schools in the Free State who participated in the study. CATHSSETA (Culture, Arts, Tourism, Hospitality, Sport Sector Education and Training Authority) supported this research.

REFERENCES

BALYI, I.; WAY, R. & HIGGS, C. (2013). *Long-term athlete development.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

CHRISTIAANS, D.J. (2006). *Empowering teachers to implement the Life Orientation learning area in the Senior Phase of the General Education and Training Band*. Unpublished MEd thesis. Stellenbosch, South Africa: Stellenbosch University.

CIGEPS (Intergovernmental Committee for Physical Education and Sport) (2011). Plenary Session. CIGEPS/2011/Doc.6. "International Position Statement and UNESCO Support Statement on Physical Education", pp.1-5. 23 May 2011, Paris, UNESCO Headquarters. Hyperlink: [http://en.unesco.org/events/plenary-session-intergovernmental-committee-physical-education-and-sport-cigeps]. Retrieved on 6 March 2014.

CLEOPHAS, F.J. (2014). A historical-political perspective on Physical Education in South Africa during the period 1990-1999. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation,* 36(1): 11-27.

DBE (Department of Basic Education) (2009). *Report of the task team for the review of the implementation of the National Curriculum Statement*. Pretoria, South Africa: Department of Basic Education.

DBE (Department of Basic Education) (2011a). "*National Curriculum Statement: Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement. Foundation Phase"*. Department of Basic Education, Pretoria: Department of Basic Education. Hyperlink: [www.education.gov.za]. Retrieved on 26 February 2013.

DBE (Department of Basic Education) (2011b). *Memorandum of Understanding between the DBE and SRSA on an integrated school sport framework.* Pretoria, South Africa: Department of Basic Education.

DBE (Department of Basic Education) (2014). *Policy on screening, identification, assessment and support*. Pretoria, South Africa: Department of Basic Education.

DBE (Department of Basic Education) & HET (Higher Education and Training) (2011). "Integrated strategic planning framework for teacher education and development in South Africa (2011-2025)". Hyperlink: [http://www.education.gov.za]. Retrieved on 26 February 2013.

DISCOVERY VITALITY (2014). "Healthy Active Kids Report Card (HAKSA)". Discovery. Hyperlink: [https://www.discovery.co.za/discovery.co.za/web/linkedcontent/pdfs/vitality/parenting/healthyactivekidsreportcard2014.pdf]. Retrieved on 8 October 2014.

DU TOIT, D. & VAN DER MERWE, N. (2014). Physical Education. In M. Nel (Ed.), *Life Orientation for South African teachers* (pp. 382-408). Pretoria, South Africa: Van Schaik.

DU TOIT, D.; VAN DER MERWE, N. & ROSSOUW, J.P. (2007). Return of Physical Education to the curriculum: Problems and challenges facing schools in South African communities. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 13(3): 241-253.

FRANTZ, J.M. (2008). Introducing physical education into schools: The view of teachers and learners. *Journal of Community and Health Sciences*, 3(2): 39-43.

FSDoE (Free State Department of Education) (2015). "FSDoE schools address list: Alphabetical per district 2015". Address list_AllSchools-1.pdf.12 March 2015. Hyperlink: [http://www.fsdoe.fs.gov.za]. Retrieved on 2 April 2015.

GALLAHUE, D.L. & OZNUM, J.C. (2006). *Understanding motor development: Infants, children, adolescents, adults* (6th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw- Hill.

GREEN, K. (2008). *Understanding physical education.* London, UK: Sage.

HARDMAN, K. (2010). "W(h)ither Physical Education? The future ain't what it used to be! Ljubljana". Unpublished paper. Hyperlink: [http:///w3.restana.lu/apep/docs/CC/Hardman_ Luxembourg1.pdf]. Retrieved on 7 May 2014.

HIMBERG, C.; HUTCHINSON, G.E. & ROUSSEL, J.M. (2003). *Teaching Secondary Physical Education: Preparing adolescents to be active for life.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

ICSSPE (International Council for Sport Science and Physical Education. (2010). "International Position Statement on Physical Education". Hyperlink: [https://www.icsspe.org]. Retrieved on 20 March 2013.

JACOBS, A. (2011). Life Orientation as experienced by learners: A qualitative study in the North-West Province. *South African Journal of Education*, 31(2): 212-223.

JANSEN, J. & TAYLOR, N. (2003). Educational change in South Africa 1994-2003: Case studies in large-scale education reform. *Country studies: Education Reform and Management Publication Series*, 11(1): 31.

JESS, M.; ATENCIO, M., & THORBURN, M. (2011). Complexity theory: Supporting curriculum and pedagogy developments in Scottish physical education. *Sport, Education and Society,* 16(2): 179-199.

KOK, F. (2016). Telephone interview with the Head of Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) of Free State Department of Education, Bloemfontein, on 2 February 2016 at 16:00.

LAMBERT, V. (2014). *Physical Education, physical activity and health*. Keynote address at South African Sport and Recreation Conference (SASRECON 2014), 6-8 October 2014, North-West University, Potchefstroom.

MORGAN, P. & BOURKE, S. (2005). An investigation of pre-service and primary school teachers' perspectives of PE teaching confidence and PE teacher education. *ACHPER Healthy Lifestyles Journal*, 52(1): 7-13.

MORGAN, P. & HANSEN, V. (2013). Classroom teachers' perceptions of the impact of barriers to teaching Physical Education on the quality of Physical Education programs. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport,* 79(4): 506-516.

OOSTHUIZEN, G. (2014). Opening and keynote address at South African Sport and Recreation Conference (SASRECON 2014), 6-8 October 2014, North-West University, Potchefstroom, South Africa.

PANGRAZI, R. (2007). *Dynamic physical education for elementary school children*. San Francisco, CA: Pearson.

PERRY, H.; MOHANGI, M.K.; FERREIRA, R. & MOKGADI, M. (2012). Teachers' understanding and implementation of the National Curriculum for Physical development in the reception year. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation,* 34(1): 123-136.

PETRIE, K.C. (2011). An enduring issue: Who should teach physical education in New Zealand primary schools? *New Zealand Physical Educator,* 44(1): 12-17.

PETRIE, K.C. & HUNTER, L. [lisahunter] (2011). Primary teachers, policy, and physical education. *European Physical Education Review,* 17(3): 325-339.

PRINSLOO, E. (2007). Implementation of Life Orientation programmes in the new curriculum in South African schools: Perceptions of principals and life orientation teachers. *South African Journal of Education,* 27(1): 155-170.

ROOTH, E. (2005). An investigation of the status and practice of Life Orientation in South African schools. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Bellville, South Africa: University of the Western Cape.

ROSSOUW, J.P. & KEET, W. (2011). "Delictual ability of the school sports coach: A security matter". *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal,* 6(14). Hyperlink: [http://www.ajol.info/index.php/pelj/article/view/73007]. Retrieved on 16 February 2015.

SAS INSTITUTE (2014). IMSTAT Procedure (Analytics). Cary, NC: SAS (Statistical Analysis System) Institute Inc.

UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation). (2015). "Quality physical education: Guidelines for policy-makers". Hyperlink: [http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002311/231101E.pdf.]. Retrieved on 6 January 2016.

UNOSDP (United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace) (2013). "UNOSDP Annual Report 2012". Hyperlink: [www.un.org]. Retrieved on 14 January 2014.

VAN DER MERWE, N. (2011). Evaluering van die herimplementering van Liggaamlike Opvoeding in Suid-Afrikaanse skole (*trans*.: Evaluation of the re-implementation of Physical Education in South African schools). Unpublished PhD dissertation. Potchefstroom, South Africa: North-West University.

VAN DEVENTER, K.J. (2008). Physical Education in Grades 10 and 11: A survey of selected Western Cape high schools in South Africa. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance,* 14(4): 373-387.

VAN DEVENTER, K.J. (2009). Life Orientation in the intermediate phase (Grades 4-6): A survey in selected Western Cape primary schools, South Africa. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance,* 15(3): 459-475.

VAN DEVENTER, K.J. (2011). The state and status of Physical Education in selected primary schools in four South African provinces: A survey. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance,* 17(4:2): 824-841.

VAN DEVENTER, K.J. (2012). School Physical Education in four South African provinces: A survey. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation,* 34(1): 153-166.

VAN DEVENTER, K.J. (2013). Personal interview with Dr. K.J. van Deventer (University of Stellenbosch) on 10 December 2013, Cape Town. [Recording in possession of author]

VAN DEVENTER, K.J. & VAN NIEKERK, E. (2009). Life Orientation in the Foundation Phase (Grades R-3): A survey in selected Western Cape primary schools. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation,* 31(2): 147-162.

WALTER, C.M. (2014). Promoting physical activity: A low cost intervention programme for disadvantaged schools in Port Elizabeth, South Africa. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance,* 20(2:1): 357-371.

WHITEHEAD, M. (2001). The concept of Physical Literacy. *European Journal of Physical Education,* 6(2): 127-138.

Corresponding author: Mrs Leoni C E Stroebel; **Email:** stroebellce@ufs.ac.za

(*Subject editor: Dr Francois Cleophas*)