

Evaluation of Physical Education and Sports Candidate Teachers views on Distance Education

ÖZLÜ METİN¹, GEZER HATICE², GEZER ENGIN¹

¹*School of Physical Education and Sports, Kafkas University, TÜRKİYE*

²*Sarkamış Vocational School, Kafkas University, TÜRKİYE*

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to evaluate the views of Physical Education and Sports Candidate Teacher studying in sports education units of universities about Distance Education and to determine the relationship between them.

A total of 148 teacher candidates, 79 (53.40%) female and 69 (46.60%) male, studying in different departments of the Physical Education and Sports School of Kafkas University participated in the study.

IBM SPSS Statistics v22 package program was used in the statistical analysis of the data. The skewness and kurtosis test were used to test the data for normality and it was determined that the data did not have a normal distribution. In order to evaluate whether the data is homogeneous; "Anova-Homogeneity of variance" test was applied and it was determined that the data were not homogeneous.

It was observed that the total score average of the "attitudes towards distance education" of the Physical Education and Sports School students was 103.50±13.02.

When examined in terms of gender, it was determined that the mean score of male students was 105.02±13.41 and that of female students was 102.16± 12.60.

When examined in terms of place of residence, 86 (58.10) students living with their families are 104.44±12.15, students living in student housing/own house 31 (20.90) are 100.70±15.95, 15 (10.10) in dormitories. 105.06±5.16 and lastly 102.37±16.33 points in 16 of the relatives (10.8) households were determined.

When examined in terms of the department, it was found that the 43(49.3) department of Teaching was 102±78, the coaching department was 30(20.30), 103.36±8.15, and finally the 45(30.4) department was found to be 104.75±11.96.

As a result; in the study, in which the opinions of the students studying in the sports education institutions of the universities about Distance Education are evaluated, it is seen that it is similar to the literature and is in an acceptable range.

Keywords: Physical Education and Sports, Candidate Teachers, Distance Education

INTRODUCTION

Distance Learning: One of the main reasons for the emergence of distance education is to provide equal access to education for citizens who do not have the opportunity to receive face-to-face education, due to the inadequacy of physical and financial conditions, and to provide education to the underrepresented and disadvantaged segments of the society.

Developed and developing countries have started to invest significantly in distance education applications (Karataş, 2003; Saykili, 2018).

Looking at the literature, it is seen that many definitions of distance education have been made.

These; distance education makes use of technology in mass education, and it also allows self-learning with individualized education and training activities (Demirel, 2011).

Education can also be defined as a set of activities that support the personal development process and are carried out regularly (Çetin ve diğerleri, 2004).

It is implemented online via remote connections by making use of tools such as "video, sound, graphics, computer, multimedia technology".

Distance Education Models: Distance education is divided into synchronous and asynchronous.

Concurrent Education; Simultaneous education (Synchronous): should continue the education process of educators and students in different physical environments without any delay in communication, and virtual classes, live lessons, audio conferences, video conferences can be given as examples of Simultaneous (Synchronous) communication environments. The simultaneous education model can create similarities with in-class education in formal education (Simonson ve vd., 2015).

Asynchronous (Asynchronous): Students who are not live or in real time are online or attend the lesson at the most convenient time. Example: Individual online, team or whole group work (Midkiff ve DaSilva, 2011).

The technological advantages brought by the age of technology have brought along a new learning model. This model, which continues to gain new meanings and qualities day by day, is expressed as a mixed education model.

Blended learning: It is a learning method that is formed by combining electronic environment, face-to-face learning environment, distance learning and learning environments at their own pace.

This method; It consists of combining the advantageous aspects of internet-based learning (online) and face-to-face traditional learning environment. This method is an approach in which all kinds of technologies are used and traditional and information technologies are blended and formed. In other words, it is a blend of face-to-face education and e-learning applications (Aytaç & Altunçekiç, 2012). When we look at the Basic Concepts Related to Distance Education, Traditional Learning is also defined as "face-to-face learning", although technological opportunities are used in this learning, lessons and practice, it is not completely technology-based and technology supported (Cebaci 2004).

Mobile learning: differs from other types of learning in that it is in constant motion (Sharples et al., 2005), it is a learning and teaching technique that takes place through devices such as tablet computers, smart phones, and wearable computers. (Wyne, 2015).

Distance Learning: Distance learning in computer environment is a learning method in which instructors and students are separated from each other in terms of distance or time. This learning activity is usually supported by communication technologies such as television, video, computer, internet or e-mail (Wyne, 2015).

Computer-based learning: is defined as a teaching method in which technology is used as a learning environment, that strengthens the teaching process and student motivation, that the student can benefit from according to his/her own learning speed and can apply self-learning principles. (Şahin, Yıldırım, 1999). Web-Based learning, WWW, is a teaching environment that is easily accessible, can support flexible storage and display options, can provide an easy, highly powerful publishing format, and can include hypermedia elements (Oliver, Herrington and Omari, 1999).

Technology-Based Learning: is traditional learning that takes place in the classroom by making use of electronic technology. In technology-supported learning, learning content such as electronic libraries and databases are used. (Cebeci, 2004).

Considering the benefits of these education models, everyone has the opportunity to participate in the education, Creates a real-time discussion and brainstorming environment, can receive instant feedback, The student can participate in the lesson and discussions as they wish, The student is less isolated because he is in the group and eliminates the necessity of place and place. (Midkiff ve DaSilva, 2011; Taylor, 2002). Its limitations are not the only educational tool, and education should not be considered as a tool either. Because e-learning may not be able to meet all the needs of the development of institutions. This learning requires a strong technological infrastructure against technological obstacles and failure (Özgöl vd., 2017) The absence of an environment similar to the school and classroom environment affects the socialization of students (Güven, 2017).

MATERIAL AND METHOD

Universe Sample: The universe of the research consists of pre-service teachers studying in the 3rd and 4th grades of different departments of the School of Physical Education and Sports of Kafkas University.

Its sample is; the sample consists of 148 students, 69 (46.6%) female and 79 (53.4) male, studying at the School of Physical Education and Sports of Kafkas University, selected by random sampling method.

Data collection tool: Personal Information Form: Participants were given a personal information form developed by the researchers, which included questions about the participant's age, gender, department, marital status, class, income, and where they lived.

Attitude Scale towards Distance Education: The Attitude towards Distance Education scale developed by Kışla (2016) was used to determine the opinions of the teacher candidates participating in the study about Distance Education. The scale is a 5-point Likert type scale.

The scale used to determine the attitudes of the students participating in the research towards distance education is a one-dimensional scale with 35 items. While the highest score that can be obtained from the scale is 175, the lowest score is 35.

A high score from the scale indicates that the individual's attitude towards distance education is more positive, while a low score indicates that the individual has a negative attitude towards distance education. In the score calculation, 16 items are scored in the opposite direction as they contain negative statements.

The high Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient (0.89) of the scale showed that the items were consistent with each other, while the results of EFA and CFA proved the validity of the scale.

Analysis of Data: Portable IBM SPSS Statistics v22 package program was used to analyze the obtained data. In order to find out whether the data has a normal distribution, the single sample "Kolmogorov-Smirnov" test was used and it was determined that the data did not have a normal distribution. Then, "Anova-Homogeneity of variance" test was applied to evaluate whether the data were homogeneous and it was determined that the data were not homogeneous. And finally, the skewness and kurtosis coefficients were examined with the "Skewness and Kurtosis" tests and it was decided that the distribution was not normal.

After this first examination, the non-parametric test method was used in the statistical analysis of the data, and in order to determine the relationship between students' attitudes towards distance education and their socio-demographic variables, the "Mann Whitney U" test was used in two-group comparisons and the "Kruskal Wallis-H" test in three or more group comparisons" test was applied.

RESULTS

Table 1 gives the distribution of the subjects participating in the study according to their socio-demographic characteristics. Of the participants, 79 (53.4%) were male and 69 (46.6%) were female students. While 76.4% (n=113) of the study group

consisted of young people between the ages of 22-25, 14.2% (n=21) consisted of young people between the ages of 18-21.

Table 1. Distribution of Physical Education and Sports School Students by Socio-Demographical Characteristics

Variable	Group	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Female	69	46,6
	Male	79	53,4
	Total	148	100,0
Age	18-21	21	14,2
	22-25	113	76,4
	26 and over	14	9,5
	Total	148	100,0
Marital status	Married	8	5,4
	Single	140	94,6
	Total	148	100,0
Department	Teaching	73	49,3
	Coaching	30	20,3
	Management	45	30,4
	Total	148	100,0
Class	3rd grade	75	50,7
	4th Grade	73	49,3
	Total	148	100,0
Income	500-1000	33	22,3
	1100-1600	38	25,7
	1700-2200	42	28,4
	2500 and over	35	23,6
	Total	148	100,0
living place	With family	86	58,1
	Student house	31	20,9
	In the dormitory	15	10,1
	Relative House	16	10,8
	Total	148	100,0

73 (49.3%) of the students study in the physical education and sports teaching department, 45 (20.3%) in the sports management department, and 30 (20.3%) in the coaching education department. While 75 (50.7) of the students participating in the study are studying in the third grade, 73 (49.3) are studying in the fourth grade. When the students are examined in terms of the places they live; While 86 (58.1) of them stated that they lived with them, the others stated that they lived in a student house, dormitory and relatives house.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of the Mean Scores of the Attitudes towards Distance Education Scale

Distance Education Attitude Scale	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
	148	103,50	13,02718	51,00	161,00

Table 2 shows the distribution of the scores of physical education and sports school students from the attitude scale towards distance education. It was observed that the mean score of "Attitude towards distance education" of Physical Education and Sports School students was 103.50±13.02.

Table 3. The Mann Whitney-U Test Conducted to Determine Whether the Mean Scores of the School of Physical Education and Sports Students' Attitudes Towards Distance Education Differ According to the Variables of "Gender, Marital Status, and Class"

Variable	Group	N	Mean Rank	Sum Rank	U	P
Gender	Female	69	63,17	4990,50	1830,500	,001*
	Male	79	87,47	6035,50		
	Total	148				
Marital status	Marriage	8	86,44	691,50	464,500	,417
	Single	140	73,82	10334,50		
	Total	148				
Class	3. Class	75	75,25	5643,50	2861,500	,830
	4. Class	73	73,73	5382,50		
	Total	148				

*p<0.05

Table 3 shows the results of the Mann Whitney-U test, which was conducted to determine whether the scores of the Attitude

towards Distance Education scale differ according to the gender, marital status and grade of education of physical education and sports school students.

As a result of the examination; The difference between the mean rank of the groups was found to be statistically significant in terms of the "gender" variable ($u=1830,500$ $p<.05$). In other words, male students view distance education more positively than female students.

In terms of the total scores of the Attitude towards Distance Education scale and the variable of marital status and the class studied; No statistically significant difference was found according to the gender variable.

Table 4. The Kruskal Wallis-H Test Conducted to Determine whether the Mean Scores of the School of Physical Education and Sports Students' Attitudes towards Distance Education Differ According to the Variable of "Age, Department, Income and Place of Residence"

Variable	Group	N	Mean Rank	S D	Chi-Square	P	Differences
Age	18-21	21	56,79	2	7,138	,028	1-3*
	22-25	113	75,14				
	26 and over	14	95,93				
	Total	148					
Department	Teaching	73	80,36	2	2,808	,246	
	Coaching	30	66,80				
	Management	45	70,13				
	Total	148					
Income	500-1000	33	70,79	3	2,085	,555	
	1100-1600	38	81,96				
	1700-2200	42	75,55				
	2500 and over	35	68,64				
	Total	148					
Living Place	With Family	86	75,72	3	,535	,911	
	Student House	31	76,08				
	In the Dormitory	15	70,10				
	Relative House	16	69,00				
	Total	148					

* $p<0.05$

Table 4 shows the Kruskal Wallis-H Test, which calculates the relationship between physical education and sports school students' age, department studied, income and place of residence, and their attitudes towards distance education.

As a result of the examination, a statistically significant difference was found between the ages of the students and their attitudes towards distance education in terms of the age variable ($x^2=7,138$ $p<.05$).

It has been determined that this difference is in the age group of 26 and over and the age group of 18-21. In other words; it is seen that university students in the age group of 26 and over find distance education more beneficial than students in the age group of 18-21.

No statistically significant difference was found regarding the attitude towards distance education in terms of department studied, income and place of residence.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

As a result of the study, a significant difference was found between distance education attitudes and gender ($p>0.05$).

Bahar (2014), Yenilmez et al. (2017), Aras (2019), Kanbak (2021), Ergenekon (2021), and Çetin (2021), in their study, significant differences were observed between the statistics of 'By Gender Variable' and these findings showed parallelism with our study.

It has been observed that male students have higher distance education scores, and male students have a positive attitude towards technology and computers, as they can participate in their daily work whenever and wherever they want, compared to women.

In the studies conducted by Kirali and Alci (2016), Schifter (2002), Çavuşoğlu and Acar (2020), Sarıkaya (2021) and Demir (2013), no statistically significant difference was found according to the 'Gender Variable'. In the formation of these findings, it is thought that women benefit less from information technology.

As a result of our study, a significant difference was found between distance education attitudes and age variables ($p>0.05$). Kanbak (2021) found a statistically significant difference in his study on the E-learning scale ($p<0.05$).

Gökbulut (2021), Çavuşoğlu and Acar (2020) and Yakar & Yıldırım Yakar (2021) found no significant difference between distance education attitudes and age variables ($p>0.05$).

As a result of the study, no significant difference was found between distance education attitudes and marital status ($p>0.05$).

Aras (2019) in his study on Academic Staff Working in Sports Education Institutions and Students receiving Sports Education, is similar to our study in terms of the marital status variable of Kılınç (2015) research group. It is thought that the reason for the differences between marital status and distance education attitudes is because the research group has thoughts about family life and university education.

Chinnanon (1985) in his study and Höçük (2011) in his comparative research on distance education and traditional education stated that marital status has different effects on distance education and traditional education. (eril)

As a result of the study, no significant difference was found between the distance education attitudes and the department variable ($p>0.05$). There was no statistically significant difference in the E-learning scale, which is the sub-dimension of Kanbak (2011)'s study, and there was a parallelism with our study, and it was observed that students' attitudes towards distance education were more negative ($p>0.05$).

Ergenekon (2021), Kanbak (2011), Çavuşoğlu and Acar (2020), Genç (2020), Fidan (2016) and Başar et al. (2019) found a statistically significant difference in students' views on the department variable, and it is thought that this is due to the differences in the curriculum of the departments students study ($p<0.05$).

As a result of our study, no significant difference was found between the distance education attitudes and the class variable ($p>0.05$).

Arıkan & Şahbudak, 2020; Bayram et al., 2019 studies show parallelism with our study and it is thought that the reason for this is that the difference between the classes is not high and the students give close reactions to each other.

As a result of our study, no significant difference was found between the distance education attitudes and the income status variable. ($p>0,05$).

Yahşi and Kırkıç, in their study in 2020, in which they examined the Attitudes of Teachers towards Distance Education in the Distance Education Process, are in parallel with our research and it is thought that the attitude towards distance education generally increases as the income level improves.

REFERENCES

- Altıparmak, Mahinur (2011). "E-Öğrenme ve Uzaktan Eğitimde Açık Kaynak Kodlu Öğrenme Yönetim Sistemleri", Malatya: Akademik Bilişim'11- XIII. Akademik Bilişim Konferansı Bildirileri Kitabı, ss.319-327.
- Demirel, Ö. (2011), Eğitimde Yeni Yönelimler: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Saykili, A. (2018). Distance education: Definitions, generations, key concepts and future directions. International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research, 5(1), 2-17.

4. Karataş, Serçin (2003). "Yüz Yüze ve Uzaktan Eğitimde Öğrenme Deneyimlerinin Eşitliği", Eğitim Bilimleri ve Uygulama Dergisi, Cilt: 2, Sayı: 3, ss. 91-104.
5. Simonson, M., Smaldino, S., & Zvacek, S. (2015). Teaching and learning at a distance. Foundations of distance education (Sixth Edit). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
6. Midkiff, S. P. ve Dasiva, L. A. Leveraging the Web for Synchronous Versus Asynchronous Distance Learning. (www.shockandawe.us/mscis/313/Midkiff.pdf 2012).
7. Sharples, M., Taylor, J., & Vavoula, G. (2005). Theory of Mobile Learning. In Proceedings of mLearn Conference. Cape Town: Proceedings of mLearn.
8. Wyne, M. (2015). Merging mobile learning into traditional education. The International Conference on E-Learning in the Workplace (s. 2013-2016). New York: Workplace.
9. Şahin, T.Y. ve Yıldırım, S. (1999). Öğretim teknolojisi ve materyal geliştirme. Ankara: Anı Yayınları.
10. Oliver, R., Herrington, J. ve Omari, A. (1996) Creating Effective Instructional Materials for the World Wide.
11. Cebeci, Z. (2004). Türkiye Ulusal E-Üniversitesi için Bir Model Çalışması. Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitü Dergisi, 2 (13), 75.
12. Özgöl, M., Sarıkaya, İ., & Öztürk, M. (2017). Örgün Eğitimde Uzaktan Eğitim Uygulamalarına İlişkin Öğrenci ve Öğretim Elemanı Değerlendirmeleri. Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi, 294-304.
13. Aras, E. (2019). Spor eğitimi kurumlarında görev yapan akademik personelin uzaktan eğitime yönelik görüşleri: nitel bir çalışma. Yüksek Lisans Tezi.
14. Kanbak, M 2019. Spor Bilimleri Fakülteleri ve Beden Eğitimi Spor Yükseköğretimlerinde Okuyan Öğrencilerin Uzaktan Eğitime Yönelik Görüşlerinin Araştırılması. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Kilis
15. Ergenekon B, 2021. Covid-19 Salgını Sürecinde Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Bölümleri Öğrencilerinin Uzaktan Eğitime Yönelik Tutumlarının İncelenmesi Güneydoğu Anadolu Bölgesi Örneği. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Muş.
16. Yenilmez, K., M. Turğut, ve M. Z. Balbağ, (2017). Öğretmen adaylarının uzaktan eğitime yönelik tutumlarının bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 19(2), 91-107.
17. Yakar, L., & Yıldırım Yakar, Z. (2021). Eğitim Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Uzaktan Eğitime Karşı Tutumlarının ve E-Öğrenmeye Hazır Bulunuşluklarının İncelenmesi. Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 1 (17), 1-21.
18. Çetin, İ. (2021). Spor bilimleri fakültesi öğrencilerinin internet temelli uzaktan eğitime yönelik görüşlerinin mutluluk düzeylerine etkisinin incelenmesi (Master's thesis, Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).
19. Çavuşoğlu, G., & Kürşat, A. C. A. R. Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Uzaktan Eğitime Yönelik Görüşleri İle Yaşam Boyu Öğrenme Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişki. Spor Ve Performans Araştırmaları Dergisi, 11(3), 207-220.
20. Sarıkaya, M. Pandemi Sürecinde Uzaktan Eğitime İlişkin Müzik Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı Öğrencilerinin Görüşleri. Güzel Sanatlar Enstitüsü Dergisi, 27(46), 92-100.
21. Schifter, C. (2002). Perception differences about participating in distance education. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 5(1), 1-14.
22. Demir M. 2013. Eğitim Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin E-öğrenme Araçlarını Kabul Düzeylerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. Yüksek lisans Tezi, Sakarya; Sakarya üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü,
23. Kıraili, F. N., & Alci, B. (2016). Üniversite öğrencilerinin uzaktan eğitim algısına ilişkin görüşleri. İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Dergisi, 55-83.
24. Kılınç M. 2015. Uzaktan eğitim uygulamalarının etkililiği üzerine bir araştırma. Doktora Tezi, Malatya. İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü,
25. HÖÇÜK, S. Y., & KUTLU, Ö. T. D. (2011). Ankara üniversitesi uzaktan eğitim programına katılan öğrencilerin akademik başarılarını etkileyen faktörler (Doctoral dissertation, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Ölçme ve Değerlendirme Anabilim Dalı).
26. Chinnanon, S. (1985). Multi-Media Distance Education: A Study of Factors Affecting the Educational Achievement of Adult Participants in the Radio Correspondence Project in Thailand. Dissertation Abstracts International, A (Humanities and Social Sciences). 46(4).
27. Yahşi, Ö., & Kırkiç, K. A. Uzaktan Eğitim Sürecinde Öğretmenlerin Uzaktan Eğitime Yönelik Tutumlarının İncelenmesi. Turkish Studies, 15, 5.