

# Teachers' Opinions of Different Methods of Grading in Physical Education (PE)

Vesna Štemberger and Tanja Petrušič

Department of Primary Teacher Education, Faculty of Education, University of Ljubljana

## Abstract

*The Elementary School Act determines the method of grading in school subjects including Physical Education (PE). We wanted to determine opinion of primary school teachers on individual methods of grading in PE in the first and the second triad of the elementary school. We also wanted to find out the differences among teachers who teach in the first and the second triad as well as the differences among the teachers with different length of employment. The sample included 855 primary school teachers. The results showed that teachers mostly agree with the method of grading that is currently valid. As the second most recommended way of grading, the grading with word-grading on a three-level grading scale was proposed for the first as well as the second triad. This method, however, has not been used in Slovenia for a number of years now. Based on the advantages and disadvantages of individual methods of grading we can assume, however, that some teachers have insufficient knowledge of the purpose of grading in PE. It looks like they do not have the accurate information about issues of descriptive grading, too. This could be concerning due to the fact that this kind of grading is compulsory in the first and the second grade of elementary school.*

**Key words:** *descriptive grading; first and second triad; grading with numbers; primary school teacher; word grading.*

## Introduction

Assessment and grading of knowledge are important parts of the educational process and complement each other. Assessment of knowledge is a necessary precondition for grading. Knowledge, however, can be tested instead of graded. Through assessment of knowledge, information about how a pupil reaches the objectives from the curriculums

is collected without the intention to grade knowledge. Grading knowledge, however, is ascertaining and grading to what extent the pupil reached certain objectives and standards of knowledge within the curriculum. Grading is done after presenting the teaching contents and after the assessment of that particular content (Article 3 of *Pravilnik o preverjanju in ocenjevanju znanja ter napredovanju učencev v osnovni šoli*, 2013).

Physical Education (PE) in Slovenia and other European countries is graded in the same way as other school subjects. Only Malta and Norway are the exceptions: there, pupils must participate in PE at the primary level, but they are not formally assessed and graded. Ireland is the next exception where pupils are not tested nor graded at both the primary and the secondary level (it is expected, however, that teachers report to parents about children's progress and cooperation at PE) (Evropska komisija/EACEA/Eurydice, 2013).

In Europe, there are two most spread methods of the assessment and grading of knowledge: formative and summative (Evropska komisija/EACEA/Eurydice, 2013). Characteristics of formative assessment are that it is exercised several times per year and it is primarily intended to acquire individual feedback at time, used in the educational process in order to improve it. Formative assessment consists of the descriptions of pupil achievement. Most often it is used within the educational process itself and not so much after teaching individual contents (Bailey & MacFayden, 2003; Bell & Cowie, 2001; Ginsburg, 2009; Majerič, 2004). Summative grading, on the contrary, is used mostly at the end of individual grading *razdoblje* and upon completion of bigger units that we want to grade. In comparison to formative assessment, it is aimed at the end result, i.e. final exercise of movement. This method summarizes all the achievements of a pupil written in one common grade. From the perspective of the method of grading, formative assessment is richer in contents, as the extent of meeting the objectives is written down in detail. Meanwhile, summative assessment is expressed with the grade on the grading scale (e.g. from one to five or from A to E).

Today, in Slovenia, pupil knowledge (also in the case of PE) in the first and in the second grade of the elementary school is assessed using descriptive grades. From grade three to grade nine, pupil knowledge is graded with numeric grades (one – insufficient, five – excellent), however, in past times there have been quite a few changes. In the school year 1959/60, an experimental introduction of descriptive grading for all subjects (including PE) took place, but at the end of the experiment, it was defined as inappropriate and was abandoned. In 1972, word grading was legally determined within the so-called “educational” subjects (PE, music, art). Grading with words was rated on a three-range grading scale with the grades less successful, successful and very successful. There was no negative grade. These grades also never mattered for the average success of the final certificate. With the introduction of the nine-year elementary school in 2013/14, the methods of grading changed as well. In

the first three grades, all the subjects were graded by descriptive grades. By means of descriptive grading words express how a pupil is progressing with regards to the defined objectives i.e. standards of knowledge in the curricula. A particular grade emphasizes what a pupil can do or knows, what (s)he does not know and what (s)he has to do in order to meet the objectives. From the fourth to the ninth grade of the elementary school, all the subjects were graded by a five-point numeric grade (1 – insufficient, 5 – excellent) (Pravilnik o preverjanju in ocenjevanju znanja ter napredovanju učencev v osnovni šoli, 2008). In the school year 2013/14, however, the method of grading underwent some additional changes: the descriptive grades are used in the first and in the second grade, and the numeric ones from the third to the ninth grade (Pravilnik o preverjanju in ocenjevanju znanja ter napredovanju učencev v osnovni šoli, 2013). Despite the fact that some authors advocate PE without a grade (Kristan, 1992, 2009), this option has never been introduced even as an experiment, therefore in Slovenia there are no studies on the basis of which we could talk about the (in)appropriateness of having PE without a grade. In Europe, there are some cases where PE is not graded, at least not in the lower grades (e.g. Ireland, Malta, Norway); the teachers, however, are required to give feedback on the child's progress to parents and pupils (Evropska komisija/EACEA/Eurydice, 2013).

There were some research studies in Slovenia regarding the opinions on different methods of grading: Z. Harter (1995) researched the opinions of primary school teachers (N=129) of four elementary schools in Ljubljana on grading in PE and discovered that primary school teachers do not support numeric grades in PE. In fact, 11.6% favored word-grade at PE, 39.5% descriptive grade and 26.4% of primary school teachers would not grade in PE at all. The same year Z. Novak (1995), who included 171 primary school teachers into the sample of participants, also performed similar research. She discovered that 0.8% of teachers would grade PE by a numeric grade, 16.9% by word-grade, and 26.3% by a descriptive grade; 14.6% of teachers would not grade PE. Krek, Kovač Šebart, Kožuh, Vogrinc, Peršak, and Volf (2005) conducted their research on a sample of 304 primary school teachers inquiring about the method (in general, not only for PE) teachers would choose if they had the possibility. They discovered that only a little more than half of the teachers would choose descriptive grading, 36.5% would opt for numeric grading while the rest would choose other methods of grading. Vogrinc, Kalin, Krek, Medveš, and Valenčič Zuljan (2011) researched what kind of grading of individual subjects seems appropriate to the teachers who teach from first to third grade, from fourth to sixth grade and from seventh to ninth grade. They discovered that 32.3% of the teachers, who teach in the first triad, support numeric grading of the PE, 62.7% word grading and 5.1% other methods. The teachers of the second triad would grade PE by numeric grade in 44.8%, by word-grade in 53.8% and by other methods 1.4%. Teachers in the final triad support numeric grading of PE in 63.0%, and 36.1% of teachers would use a word-grade while 0.8% of the teachers would use other methods of grading. Only one teacher who teaches in the first triad proposed that PE would not be graded.

Despite the fact that the method of grading is determined by the Elementary School Act (Zakon o osnovni šoli, 1996) and the Act Amending the Elementary School Act (Zakon o spremembah in dopolnitvah Zakona o osnovni šoli, 2011), we wished to determine the opinion of teachers on different methods of grading in PE and the differences in teachers' opinions on different methods of grading in PE. We wanted to ascertain the differences in opinions among teachers who teach in the first and the second triad as well as the differences between the teachers with respect to years of work experience. The years of employment of teachers was united in three categories: the first category consists of teachers with up to three years of employment (6.3%), the second category of the teachers with 4 to 20 years of employment (54.6%) and the third group of the teachers with 21 or more years of employment (39.6%). Years of employment of teachers were divided into three bigger groups that coincide with the teachers' professional development. We used Ryan's model of division of professional development of the teachers (Depolli, 2002) as follows: The first period or the period of ideal notions is a period of a teacher in time of education, the period of ideal notions on the teachers' profession. This period regards the teachers before they start their professional career, therefore this category is not under consideration. The second period or the period of survival is a period when the teacher is engaged mostly in managing the class and keeping track of discipline, acquiring the routine, acquiring self-confidence and trust into one's own abilities and knowledge. This period takes approximately three years after starting teaching. The third period or the period of experience is a period when the teachers' work becomes routine to such an extent that they efficiently control the class and teaching, effectively prepare for teaching, and take themselves and the pupils into consideration. The period lasts approximately up to the half of the teacher's period of employment. The fourth period or the period of repeated susceptibility for the novelties when teachers wish to exit the routine and are ready to accept new challenges, new methods of teaching and test novelties in practice.

## **Methodology**

### ***Participants***

The sample of participants included 855 primary school teachers; they taught in 189 elementary schools throughout Slovenia. The sample included teachers from different regions of Slovenia assuring a representative sample together with the number of the teachers and spread of schools. The research took place from October 2014 to February 2015. The average age of the participant teachers was 40.9 years; the average period of employment was 17.5 years. Furthermore, 67.7% teachers taught in the first triad and 32.3% of the teachers in the second triad. A great majority of the teachers (81.4%) taught PE by themselves; only 18.6% of teachers did not teach PE or taught together with a PE teacher.

## Questionnaire

Questionnaire was made according to the questionnaire that was prepared by Harter (1995); it was supplemented by questions concerning modern methods of grading. The questionnaire was anonymous with open-ended and closed questions. We can derive the following variables from the questions:

- Basic statistical data on participants.
- Agreement and disagreement with individual method of grading as well as the advantages and disadvantages of individual method of grading.
- Problems in grading in PE.

Data were processed using the statistical package SPSS for Windows, version 21.0. Basic statistical parameters were calculated for all variables. Statistically significant differences between the variables were verified by means of the chi-squared test.

## Results

In continuation, teachers' answers to the question what method of grading in PE they think is the most appropriate for the first and the second triad is presented. Table 1 presents all of the teachers' answers. In Tables 2 and 3 the differences between the teachers concerning the triad they teach in, are presented, while Tables 4 and 5 present the differences with respect to years of employment.

Table 1

*Teachers' opinions on the most appropriate method of grading in PE in individual triads*

Method of grading	The first triad			The second triad		
	Number	Percentage	Valid percentage	Number	Percentage	Valid percentage
Grading with numeric grade (1 – 5)	81	9.5	9.7	411	48.1	49.1
Grading with a word-grade (very successful, successful, less successful)	157	18.4	18.8	257	30.1	30.7
Grading with descriptive grade	486	56.8	58.1	137	16.0	16.4
No grading	113	13.2	13.5	32	3.7	3.8
Altogether (Without missing answers)	837	97.9	100.0	837	97.9	100.0
Missing answers	18	2.1		18	2.1	
Altogether (all participants)	855	100.0		855	100.0	

The results show that 5.9% teachers, teaching in the first triad would grade PE in the first triad by numeric grade, 16.9% by word-grade, 66.0% by descriptive grade; 11.2% would not grade PE at all (see Table 2).

Table 2  
Differences in opinions of teachers in the first and second triad on the method of grading in PE in the first triad

Method of grading	Numeric grade	Count	Triad		Total
			1	2	
			30	37	67
		% within the method of grading	44.8%	55.2%	100.0%
		% within TRIAD	5.9%	15.2%	8.9%
		% of Total	4.0%	4.9%	8.9%
	Word-grade	Count	86	56	142
		% within the method of grading	60.6%	39.4%	100.0%
		% within TRIAD	16.9%	23.0%	18.9%
		% of Total	11.4%	7.4%	18.9%
	Descriptive grade	Count	336	112	448
		% within the method of grading	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within TRIAD	66.0%	46.1%	59.6%
		% of Total	44.7%	14.9%	59.6%
	No grade	Count	57	38	95
		% within the method of grading	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
		% within TRIAD	11.2%	15.6%	12.6%
		% of Total	7.6%	5.1%	12.6%
Total		Count	509	243	752
		% within the method of grading	67.7%	32.3%	100.0%
		% within TRIAD	100,0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	67.7%	32.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	32.895 <sup>a</sup>	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	31.994	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.113	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	752		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.65.

Furthermore, 15.2% teachers, teaching in the second triad would grade PE in the first triad by numeric grade, 23.0% by word-grade, 46.1% by descriptive grade; 15.6% would not grade PE in the first triad (see Table 2).

The highest percentage of teachers would choose descriptive grading as a method of grading in PE; this percentage is even higher among teachers of the first triad. Teachers who teach in an individual triad more often chose the method of grading

that is legally determined for the grade that they teach in – e.g. teachers who teach in the second triad more often chose numeric grading also for the first triad (see Table 2).

The results show that 46.0% teachers, teaching in the first triad would grade PE in the second triad by numeric grade, 30.2% by word-grade, 21.2% by descriptive grade; 2.6% of teachers would not grade PE in the first triad at all (see Table 3).

Table 3

*Differences in opinions of teachers in the first and second triad on the method of grading in PE in the second triad*

Method of grading	Numeric grade	Count	Triad		Total
			1	2	
		Count	232	134	366
		% within the method of grading	63.4%	36.6%	100.0%
		% within TRIAD	46.0%	54.3%	48.7%
		% of Total	30.9%	17.8%	48.7%
	Word-grade	Count	152	81	233
		% within the method of grading	65.2%	34.8%	100.0%
		% within TRIAD	30.2%	32.8%	31.0%
		% of Total	20.2%	10.8%	31.0%
	Descriptive grade	Count	107	20	127
		% within the method of grading	84.3%	15.7%	100.0%
		% within TRIAD	21.2%	8.1%	16.9%
		% of Total	14.2%	2.7%	16.9%
	No grade	Count	13	12	25
		% within the method of grading	52.0%	48.0%	100.0%
		% within TRIAD	2.6%	4.9%	3.3%
		% of Total	1.7%	1.6%	3.3%
	Total	Count	504	247	751
		% within the method of grading	67.1%	32.9%	100.0%
		% within TRIAD	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	67.1%	32.9%	100.0%

## Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.161 <sup>a</sup>	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	24.286	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.429	1	.011
N of Valid Cases	751		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.22.

Furthermore, 54.3% teachers, teaching in the second triad would grade PE in the second triad by numeric grade, 32.8% would grade PE in the second triad by word-grade, 8.1% by descriptive grade; 4.9% would not grade PE (see Table 3).

The highest percentage of teachers would choose numeric grading as a method of grading in PE; this answer was chosen by more teachers in the second triad, which is again expected, due to the fact that PE is graded by numeric grade in the second triad.

The differences among the groups of teachers teaching in the first and second triad (see Tables 2 and 3) occur mostly due to the fact that teachers who teach in the individual triad choose the method that is legally determined by law as the most appropriate method of grading in PE.

In Table 4, differences in teachers' opinions on the most appropriate method of grading in PE with respect to years of employment are presented.

Table 4

*Differences in teachers' opinions on the method of grading in PE in the first triad with respect to years of employment*

			Years of employment			
			4 – 20 years	21 years and more	Total	
Appropriate method of grading	Numeric grade	Count	40	32	72	
		% within the appropriate method	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%	
		% within the years of employment	8.9%	10.2%	9.5%	
			% of Total	5.3%	4.2%	9.5%
	Word-grade	Count	76	69	145	
		% within the appropriate method	52.4%	47.6%	100.0%	
		% within the years of employment	17.0%	22.0%	19.1%	
	Descriptive grade	% of Total	10.0%	9.1%	19.1%	
		Count	272	165	437	
		% within the appropriate method	62.2%	37.8%	100.0%	
			% within the years of employment	60.9%	52.5%	57.4%
			% of Total	35.7%	21.7%	57.4%
No grade	Count	59	48	107		
	% within the appropriate method	55.1%	44.9%	100.0%		
	% within the years of employment	13.2%	15.3%	14.1%		
		% of Total	7.8%	6.3%	14.1%	
Total	Count	447	314	761		
	% within the appropriate method	58.7%	41.3%	100.0%		
	% within the years of employment	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
		% of Total	58.7%	41.3%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.480 <sup>a</sup>	3	.140
Likelihood Ratio	5.465	3	.141
Linear-by-Linear Association	.814	1	.367
N of Valid Cases	761		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 29.71.



Table 5

*Differences in teachers' opinions concerning the method of grading in PE in the second triad with respect to years of employment*

			Years of employment		Total
			4 – 20 years	21 years and more	
Appropriate method of grading	Numeric grade	Count	221	152	373
		% within the appropriate method	59.2%	40.8%	100.0%
		% within the years of employment	50.0%	47.6%	49.0%
		% of Total	29.0%	20.0%	49.0%
	Word-grade	Count	133	106	239
		% within the appropriate method	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
		% within the years of employment	30.1%	33.2%	31.4%
	Descriptive grade	% of Total	17.5%	13.9%	31.4%
		Count	76	43	119
		% within the appropriate method	63.9%	36.1%	100.0%
		% within the years of employment	17.2%	13.5%	15.6%
		% of Total	10.0%	5.7%	15.6%
	No grade	Count	12	18	30
		% within the appropriate method	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
		% within the years of employment	2.7%	5.6%	3.9%
	% of Total	1.6%	2.4%	3.9%	
Total	Count	442	319	761	
	% within the appropriate method	58.1%	41.9%	100.0%	
	% within the years of employment	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	58.1%	41.9%	100.0%	

## Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.454 <sup>a</sup>	3	.092
Likelihood Ratio	6.407	3	.093
Linear-by-Linear Association	.505	1	.477
N of Valid Cases	761		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.58.

<sup>1</sup> In the following analysis only the teachers who are in the second or the third period of professional development are included; only 6.0% of the teachers from the first period of their professional development were included in the research

Regardless of the number of years of employment, the teachers' opinions on the method of grading in an individual educational razdoblje do not differ (see Tables 4 in 5).

Teachers answered the question on the advantages and disadvantages of individual method of grading freely. Their answers were analyzed and the answers similar in contents, were joined in individual categories. In the results, only the categories with more than 10 teachers' answers are presented.

Table 6  
Teachers' arguments for or against numeric grading in PE

Pros			Cons		
	No. of answers	%		No. of answers	%
Accurate criteria of grading. Understandable to parents and pupils. Objective.	160	31.9	It destimulates, it is non-motivational, and especially for pupils who can perform less. It stresses knowledge and the abilities of the pupil instead of pupil's progress.	312	60.2
It means motivation for the pupils.	154	30.7	Parents and pupils receive no feedback on the abilities of the pupil, his/her efforts, achievements and progress.	52	10.0
Numeric grade makes this school subject equal to other subjects.	58	11.6	It classifies the pupils.	39	7.5
Pupils and parents take it more seriously.	47	9.4	Inappropriate for the first triad, because pupils do not understand grades. They are still evolving.	24	4.6
The easiest system of grading for the teacher. Economic concerning time. Quick and transparent.	41	8.2	The essence is not the grade; the essence is preparation of the pupil for living with sports all the time.	20	3.9
Broad range of grading; the grading is more accurate.	28	5.6	Teachers use grades to maintain discipline.	16	3.1
Pupils who are good athletes can improve their average success. At the same time, this can be a good motivation for them in the areas where they are weaker.	13	2.6	It does not tell what a child is capable of and what he is not capable.	16	3.1
TOTAL ANSWERS	501	100.0	Grades are not objective.	15	3.0
			We cannot compare PE with other subjects.	13	2.5
			Skill-based subjects should be relaxed and wanted.	11	2.1
			TOTAL ANSWERS	518	100.0

Table 7  
Teachers' arguments for or against word grading in PE

Pros			Cons		
	No. of answers	%		No. of answers	%
Less stressful for pupils.	133	55.6	It is too general and thus insufficiently accurate, for it is hard to divide the pupils into three groups.	192	40.4
It is easier to assess pupil's abilities and the progress.	26	10.9	Parents and pupils do not acquire feedback on the abilities of pupils, their achievements, efforts, progress...	113	23.8
Simple system of grading for the teacher.	20	8.4	All subjects should be graded equally. It devalues the core subjects.	63	13.3
Parents and children receive good feedback.	17	7.1	Most of the pupils are graded as "successful".	27	5.7
No influence on the final average success.	16	6.7	It is a classification of pupils. It divides pupils into good and bad.	24	5.1
It is easier to divide pupils into three groups.	15	6.3	True knowledge and achievements cannot be graded. It does not show the real picture of mastered knowledge.	22	4.6
Appropriate for the skill-based subjects.	12	5.0	Obsolete method of grading.	19	4.0
TOTAL ANSWERS	239	100.0	Does not motivate pupils.	15	3.1
			TOTAL ANSWERS	475	100.0

Table 8  
Teachers' arguments for or against descriptive grading in PE

Pros			Cons		
	No. of answers	%		No. of answers	%
The most accurate feedback.	284	44.7	Parents and pupils do not understand it.	152	35.1
Appropriate for pupils in the first triad.	140	22.0	The most burdening for the teacher. It takes a lot of time.	110	25.4
We can follow the progress of the pupil. We can express/take into consideration child's effort and his/her attitude towards sports. It appreciates a child as an individual, his/her individual progress, because a child is compared to himself/herself.	116	18.3	Parents and pupils do not take it seriously.	49	11.3
A child is not burdened by the grade.	36	5.7	Serves its own purpose – administration. A lot of writing.	37	8.6
Does not categorize pupils.	30	4.7	Does not permit to write down what a child cannot do.	30	6.9
Continuous making notes and observation of pupils. Individual following of the pupils.	15	2.4	Inappropriate writings (subjectivity, inexperience of the teacher, terminology).	20	4.6
Grade is specific for every individual.	14	2.2	Very thorough and therefore nontransparent.	18	4.2
TOTAL ANSWERS	635	100.0	No motivation among the pupils.	17	3.9
			TOTAL ANSWERS	433	100.0

Table 9  
Teachers' arguments for or against no grading in PE

	Pros		Cons		
	No. of answers	%	No. of answers	%	
For the first triad it would be the most appropriate. Pupils are internally motivated enough; we should teach them a healthy way of life only.	140	78.8	Pupils do not try hard, because they lack motivation. Subject would lose its value.	341	50.5
It is necessary to teach a positive relationship to sports. Children work for themselves, not for the grade.	16	9.0	A pupil and his/her parents do not get feedback on pupil's progress or weaknesses where work is required. There is no monitoring the progress and successfulness of the pupils.	147	21.8
Most of the abilities are inborn and pupil cannot influence them.	12	6.7	PE is also a subject and therefore it must be graded – equally with the other subjects. Subject would not be equal to other subjects.	110	16.3
It is appropriate for the first grade because pupils come from different environments.	10	5.6	Every activity / knowledge must be valued somehow.	54	8
TOTAL ANSWERS	178	100.0	Pupils want grades.	12	1.8
			There would be no discipline Teacher would have no authority.	11	1.6
			TOTAL ANSWERS	675	100.0

## Discussion

Appropriate and correct grading is of high importance in a school system. Regardless of the method of grading (word-grade, numeric grade, descriptive grading) a teacher needs accurate criteria for grading. A teacher must know what, when and how to grade. At the same time, a teacher has to know what kind of knowledge is required for a certain grade.

Despite the fact that in Slovenia word grading was used from 1972 to the 2013-2014 school year, we left a possibility of favoring this alternative in the questionnaire, as we wanted to discover how many teachers would identify such method of grading as obsolete, as it is not a legally determined method of grading anymore. As expected, the biggest number of teachers defines the method of grading in PE (in individual triad), which is currently legally determined, as the best. Surprisingly, a high percentage of teachers propose word grading as an alternative to numeric grading for the second triad even though this method is not used in Slovenia anymore (Table 1). Generally, teachers point out word-grading as the most appropriate method of grading in an individual triad (18.8% in the first and as much as 30.7% in the second triad) immediately after the legally determined method of grading in individual triad (descriptive grading in the first and the second grade, numeric grading from the third grade on). Similar results, which favor the abolished method of grading, were obtained

also by Vogrinc et al. (2011), where the percentage of teachers supporting word-grading is even higher and represents the most frequent choice of possible method of grading in every triad. Teachers believe that word grading is less stressful for pupils in comparison with other methods of grading (Table 7). Other answers in favor of word-grading, given by the teachers, show lack of knowledge about the method of grading, and, indirectly, grading in general (Table 7). A part of the answers is aimed to simplify such method of grading for the teacher (similar is stated also for numeric grading), even though the approach of a teacher to grading should be independent of grading: a teacher must set accurate criteria of grading regardless of the method of grading. Some teachers mention the appropriateness of feedback, which is only possible at the level of information on mutual comparison of pupils. A pupil with the grade “very successful” is probably more successful on the sporting-educational field; possesses greater knowledge as a pupil with the grade “successful”. Such a grade implies no information on what a pupil can and cannot do. Only 19 (4.0%) teachers recognized such method of grading as obsolete (Table 7). The main deficiency of such a method of grading is surely that the three-grade-scale is insufficiently discriminatory. Pupils can be classified at both extreme ends, but the great majority remains in the middle with one grade only. That, however, cannot show all the differences among the pupils. Teachers describe this as one of the main deficiencies. On the one hand, 12 (5.0%) teachers recognize word-grade as a grade that is appropriate for the so-called skill-based subjects (PE, Art and Music). On the other hand, 63 (13.3%) teachers believe that it is necessary to grade all the subjects in the same way: other methods of grading for a subject would mean lessening the value of the subject (Table 7). Equal grading of PE concerning other subjects is very important from the perspective of placement of the subject in the curriculum. A subject that is not graded or is graded differently in comparison to other school subjects is less respected in the eyes of professional public (teachers) and broader public (parents, pupils, policies). It is marked as less important for life and a child’s development as well; other subjects (to the greatest extent Mathematics and Slovene Language) often replace the lessons, which are graded differently; this often happens in the first and in the second triad of the elementary school. At the same time, however, there is a question of whether all these subjects can be graded in the same manner, as some subjects are skill-based, and therefore related to a child’s inborn characteristics and influenced by practicing only very little.

Descriptive grading, as the most appropriate method of grading in the first triad, is advocated by 58.1% of the participant teachers. Meanwhile the percentage of teachers who propose such grading as an appropriate one in the second triad is expectedly lower and represents only 16.4% (Table 1). One of significant advantages of descriptive grading is that it compares a child with himself/herself, describes his/her progress, knowledge, and warns the child of what (s)he is not yet capable. That kind of grading is personalized. Teachers experience it as such (44.7% believe that this is the most accurate feedback, 18.3% believe that it takes a pupil as an individual into consideration, that it considers his/her individual progress). At the same time,

however, they warn that creating such descriptive grade takes too much time (25.4%) (Table 8). The problem that occurs within descriptive grading is multiple. The PE curriculum is set in such a manner that standards of knowledge are written after an individual triad is finished and not after an individual grade is finished. In this manner, the autonomy of a teacher in planning the pedagogic process is greater. At the same time, the advancement of pupils is in accordance with the tempo of their development, adapting the contents to their existing knowledge; a teacher is able to pay attention to physical conditions that are at the disposal to perform the educational process etc. Unfortunately, the very autonomy, desired by the teachers for so long, is related with a number of problems. Teachers are not used to autonomy and cannot plan the educational process in a way that they would be able to adapt the standards of knowledge, which are written at the end of the triad, in a way that these standards could be used as examples at the end of the first grade. Teachers often do not know or do not understand why the standards of knowledge are not written for every grade individually: they understand the latter, what in fact is an advantage, as a disadvantage, a deficiency of the curriculum of the PE. Due to insufficient knowledge and due to various information and directives the teachers get, in practice a pragmatic way has been found: a teacher's grade book, where individual standards of knowledge are written, has become guidance. Often teachers even use some commercial annual teaching lesson plans for individual PE lessons that are on many occasions even not harmonized with the curriculum and even less with the actual status of a particular school (pupil knowledge, pupil characteristics, physical conditions for work etc.). Therefore, it often happens that a descriptive grade is not a reflection of the realistic state; the descriptive grades are too often similar to each other, regardless of which pupil they are written for. Therefore, many parents do not even understand the grades (as much as 35.1% of teachers state that descriptive grades are not understood by parents or by pupils; 11.3% of teachers state that neither parents nor pupils take descriptive grades seriously) (Table 8). Since descriptive grades have been present in the Slovene school system since the introduction of the nine-year elementary school, it is expected that these grades would have been established by now. Despite all that, a number of teachers believe that parents do not even read the grade and that parents would want different methods of grading that would provide better information on their child's knowledge. We can firmly conclude (based on the teachers' answers) that the grade is burdening mostly for a teacher; this is a case because there is insufficient knowledge of such grading and often too many conflicting directives, how such grading should be conducted. This is especially visible in the answers of the teachers that the grade does not enable them to write down what a child does not yet know (6.9% of answers), that the grades are subjective, and that teachers are not familiar with suitable terminology (4.6%) (Table 8).

Despite the fact that some teachers believe that a numeric grade does not give appropriate feedback in the sense of what a child knows and what (s)he does not know (10.0%), a greater part of the teachers advocates a numeric grade that is objective,

realistic, has clearly defined criteria of grading, is understandable to the parents and the pupils as well, and easier to understand in comparison with other grades (31.9%) (Table 6). With respect to the theory of grading all these characteristics could be attributed to the descriptive grade; these characteristics could not be attributed to the numeric grade, for a number *per se* does not tell what a child can or cannot do. Therefore, we could legitimately doubt in proper grading in PE if teachers cannot understand the fact that each grading must be harmonized with the criteria of the appropriate and just grading. Disadvantages of numeric grading, such as non-informational character of the grade, non-objectivity, unreliability, unhealthy competitiveness among pupils, learning for the grade and not for one's knowledge (according to Kristan, 1992), are recognized by a great number of teachers (e.g. 60.2% of the teachers warns that a grade does not function as a stimulation) (Table 6). More attention needs to be paid to the answers that are in favor of numeric grading: often they show misunderstanding to the essence of PE on one and grading in general on the other hand. Regardless of the method of grading, however, the teacher must have accurate criteria for grading in order to grade appropriately. This is the only way the grade can be objective. It is interesting, though, that 31.9% of teachers believe that numeric grade is more understandable to parents and the pupils (Table 6) in addition to objectivity and accurate criteria of grading. We can assume that the answers derive from the traditional method of grading (numeric) that is well known to the parents from the period of their schooling. A numeric grade itself without clearly defined criteria can only give information on which pupils, basically, achieve objectives at the higher level and which pupils achieve the objectives at the lower level. A numeric grade, however, does not tell what the pupil's knowledge is. In addition, based on teachers' mistakes that occur in the process of grading, we can assume that the same grade does not reflect the same level of knowledge of all the pupils. Moreover, we can claim that the same pupils would probably not receive the same grade for the same presented knowledge by various teachers. The numeric grade is perceived as a motivational source by 30.7% of the teachers (Table 6). We assume that a grade could be motivational (if we exclude the fact that we are speaking about PE), if the range of grades would fluctuate on the entire grading scale (i.e. from 1 to 5). Some analyses show, however, that the average grade at PE is somewhere between the grades 4.0 and 5.0 (Poročilo o delu šole, 2014), which probably cannot be a motivational source, for it is obvious that the grades are clearly concentrated in the direction of the highest value. One of the reasons for the alteration of the so-called core subjects from word grading to numeric grading was the so-called equality of all school subjects. Equality of the subjects, however, cannot be created only by changing the method of grading but also with the method of work within the subject as well as with the attitude towards the subject.

One of the most important intentions of PE is to enable the acquisition of competences that will enable the individual to work with sports throughout their lifetime. Due to the increasingly sedentary way of life today, however, it is necessary

to fill as many pupils as possible with enthusiasm for sports in the first place, and this can probably not happen by grading.

PE without grading is something we have never tried in Slovenia. Therefore, we can only speculate how the educational process would be conducted in this case. We do not even know whether the subject would hold on as a part of a regular and mandatory curriculum. The experience from higher education shows that PE, which was a regular and mandatory part of curriculum at all faculties, has no longer been valued by credits and therefore has not been mandatory since the introduction of Bologna Studies. Therefore, most of the faculties do not perform PE anymore, or perhaps only as optional activities for the students. We can assume that something similar could happen also with the subject in the elementary school: teachers have the same fear, even though to some minor extent (Table 9). In Europe, only Malta, Norway and Ireland perform PE without grading; even there, teachers are obliged to report on the progress of pupils to their parents and to other teachers (Eurydice, 2013). Despite the fact that we have no experience with PE without grading, 78.8% of the teachers agree that in the first triad grading in PE is not necessary (Table 9). As a reason they state inner motivation of the children for cooperation in PE, and their need for recreation which is satisfied within the subject regardless of grading. At the same time, they believe that one of the most important objectives of PE is developing a positive attitude to recreation and sports, which probably cannot be achieved by grading. Only a small number of teachers believe that pupils wish to be graded (1.8%) and that a teacher would have no authority or would have troubles with the authority if there were no grading in PE (Table 9). The latter, above all, should not be connected to grading, because punishing the pupils with giving bad (or even negative) grades is a controversial educational act. As much as half (50.5%) of the answers and explanations, why it is necessary to grade in PE, tend to justify the preservation of the value of the subject (this could diminish if the subject was not graded). It also maintains pupils' efforts, who allegedly would not be motivated anymore if there were no grading (Table 9). In most cases, teachers cannot picture themselves in an educational process that is not concluded by a grade. The biggest problem, one can read from the answers, is that teachers have no feeling that it is possible (and necessary) to monitor the progress of pupils even if the process of grading is not used. They believe that parents would not receive appropriate feedback on the work and progress of the pupils. This can even lead to speculation that at least a part of teachers do not understand the purpose of assessment and grading knowledge: feedback on the achievements and progress of the pupils could be given even without (any) grading. It is important, however, that we have criteria, according to which we can describe the achievements of previously set objectives and standards.

## Conclusions

Law determines the method of grading in an individual educational period. Teachers believe that the methods of grading in PE, determined by law, are professionally the



most appropriate methods of grading. We can see, however, that among teachers there is a lot of misunderstanding of the purpose and peculiarities of different methods of grading. Regardless of the years of work experience, teachers' opinions on the methods of grading in PE in individual triads do not differ. However, there are statistically significant differences in teachers' opinions concerning the method of grading in the individual triad depending on which triad they teach. The teachers appropriately recognize the advantages and disadvantages of individual methods of grading in PE. However, it will be necessary to harmonize the system and the directives in Slovenia, mostly for the descriptive grading in PE, which still depends too much on the understanding of the essence of grading by individual teachers.

The obtained results are important for the understanding of teachers' thinking about different methods of grading in PE. We have also found out the most common mistakes made by teachers when grading in PE. However, we still have to figure out what the effects of different kind of grading on pupils are and most importantly if and how different ways of grading influence pupils' participation in sport.

## References

- Bailey, R., & Macfayden, T. (2003). *Teaching Physical Education 5 – 11*. London: Continuum.
- Bell, B., & Cowie, B. (2001). *Formative assessment and science education*. Dordrecht, Netherland: Kluwer Academic Publisher.
- Depolli, K. (2002). *Delovna preobremenjenost kot izvor z delom povezanega stresa pri učiteljih* [Work overload as the source of work related stress in teachers]. Ljubljana: University of Ljubljana. Faculty of Arts. Department for psychology.
- Evropska komisija /EACEA/Eurydice (2013). *Športna vzgoja in šport v šolah v Evropi* [Physical education and sport at schools in Europe]. Report Eurydice. Luxembourg: Publisher of the European Union. Retrieved from [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic\\_reports/150SL.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/150SL.pdf)
- Ginsburg, P. H. (2009). The challenge of formative assessment in mathematics education: children's minds, teacher's minds. *Human development*, 52, 109 – 128. Retrieved from [http://www.gordoncommission.org/rsc/pdfs/resource\\_file.pdf](http://www.gordoncommission.org/rsc/pdfs/resource_file.pdf) , <https://doi.org/10.1159/000202729>
- Harter, Z. (1995). *Stališča razrednih učiteljev ljubljanskih občin Vič-Rudnik in Šiška do ocenjevanja šolske športne vzgoje* [Opinions of primary teachers of Ljubljana municipalities Vič-Rudnik and Šiška towards assessment of physical education (Diploma thesis)]. Ljubljana: Faculty of Sport.
- Krek, J., Kovač Šebart, M., Kožuh, B., Vogrinc, J., Peršak, M., & Volf, B. (2005). *Med opisom in številko. Rezultati evalvacije zaključnih opisnih ocen (spričeval) prvega in drugega razreda devetletne osnovne šole. Analiza mnenj učiteljev in staršev o ocenjevanju znanja* [Between description and number. Results of the evaluation of closing descriptive assessments (certificates) of first and second class of nine-year primary school. The analysis of opinions of teachers and parents about knowledge assessment]. Ljubljana: Faculty of Education: The Center for study of educational strategies.

- Kristan, S. (1992). *Ocenjevanje šolske športne vzgoje: da ali ne?* [Assessment of physical education: yes or no?]. Ljubljana: Institute of the Republic of Slovenia for educational system and sport.
- Kristan, S. (2009). *Pogledi na šport 1 – Šolska športna vzgoja in njeno ocenjevanje*. [Points of view on sport 1 – School physical education and its grading.] University of Ljubljana: Faculty of Sport. Institute for sport.
- Majerič, M. (2004). *Analiza modelov ocenjevanja športnih znanj pri športni vzgoji* [The analysis of models of assessment of sport knowledges in physical education]. Ljubljana: Faculty of Sport.
- Novak, Z. (1995). *Stališča razrednih učiteljev ljubljanskih občin Vič-Rudnik in Šiška do ocenjevanja šolske športne vzgoje* [Opinions of primary teachers of Ljubljana municipalities Vič-Rudnik and Šiška towards assessment of physical education] (Diploma thesis). Ljubljana: Faculty of Sport.
- Poročilo o delu šole [Report on the work of the school]. (2014). Retrieved from [www.os-sturje.si/files/2014/06/POROČILO-2013-14.pdf](http://www.os-sturje.si/files/2014/06/POROČILO-2013-14.pdf)
- Pravilnik o preverjanju in ocenjevanju znanja ter napredovanju učencev v osnovni šoli*. [Regulations on verification and assessment of knowledge and progress of pupils in primary school] (2008). Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia. No 73/2008 from 18<sup>th</sup> July 2008.
- Regulations on verification and assessment of knowledge and progress of pupils in primary school* (2013). Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia. No 52/2013 from 21<sup>st</sup> June 2013.
- Razdevšek Pučko, C. (1999). *Opisno ocenjevanje* [Descriptive assessment]. Ljubljana: Faculty of Education.
- Vogrinc, J., Kalin, J., Krek, J., Medveš, Z., & Valenčič Zuljan, M. (2011). *Sistemske vidike preverjanja in ocenjevanja znanja v osnovni šoli* [Systemic points of view of verification and assessment of knowledge in primary school]. Ljubljana: Teaching institute.
- Zakon o osnovni šoli* [Elementary School Act] (1996). Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia. No 12/1996 from 29<sup>th</sup> February 1996
- Zakon o spremembah in dopolnitvah Zakona o osnovni šoli* [Law on changes and supplementations of Elementary School Act] (2011). Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia. No 87/2011 from 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2011.

---

**Vesna Štemberger**

Department of Primary Teacher Education, Faculty of Education,  
University of Ljubljana

Kardeljeva pl. 16, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

[Vesna.stemberger@pef.uni-lj.si](mailto:Vesna.stemberger@pef.uni-lj.si)

**Tanja Petrušič**

Department of Primary Teacher Education, Faculty of Education,  
University of Ljubljana

Kardeljeva pl. 16, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

[Tanja.petrusic@pef.uni-lj.si](mailto:Tanja.petrusic@pef.uni-lj.si)

# Mišljenje učitelja o različitim načinima ocjenjivanja u Tjelesnoj i zdravstvenoj kulturi

## Sažetak

*Način ocjenjivanja svih školskih predmeta propisan je Zakonom o osnovnoj školi. Željeli smo utvrditi kakvo je mišljenje učitelja o pojedinim načinima ocjenjivanja Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture u prvom i drugom trogodištu osnovne škole. Željeli smo saznati kakve su razlike u mišljenju između učitelja koji poučavaju u prvom odnosno u drugom trogodištu i učitelja s različitim radnim stažem. U uzorak je bilo uključeno 855 učitelja. Učitelji uglavnom prihvaćaju trenutno važeći način ocjenjivanja, a kao drugi najčešće predložen način ocjenjivanja su, i za prvo i za drugo trogodište, predložili ocjenjivanje riječima na trostupanjskoj skali, koje se u Sloveniji već dugo ne primjenjuje. Na osnovi navođenja prednosti i slabosti pojedinih načina ocjenjivanja možemo zaključiti da neki učitelji nemaju dovoljno znanja o namjeni ocjenjivanja Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture. Također imaju suprotne informacije o namjeni i načinu opisnog ocjenjivanja Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture, što je, s obzirom na to da je taj način ocjenjivanja obavezan u prvom i drugom razredu, velik problem.*

**Ključne riječi:** brojčano ocjenjivanje; ocjenjivanje riječima; opisno ocjenjivanje; prvo i drugo trogodište; učitelji.

## Uvod

Provjeravanje i ocjenjivanje znanja predstavljaju važan dio odgojno-obrazovnog procesa i međusobno se dopunjuju. Provjeravanje znanja obavezan je preduvjet ocjenjivanja, ali znanje možemo provjeriti i bez ocjenjivanja. Provjerom znanja prikupljaju se informacije o tome kako učenik postiže ciljeve odnosno standarde znanja iz nastavnog plana i nije isto što i ocjenjivanje znanja. Ocjenjivanje znanja je utvrđivanje i vrednovanje mjere u kojoj učenik, u skladu s nastavnim planom, postiže određene ciljeve, odnosno standarde znanja. Ocjenjivanje se obavlja nakon završenog nastavnog plana i nakon završene provjere znanja iz nekog sadržaja (3. član Pravilnika o prevjeravanju i ocjenjivanju znanja te napredovanju učenika u osnovnoj školi).

Tjelesna i zdravstvena kultura se u Sloveniji i u ostalim europskim državama ocjenjuje na isti način kao i ostali školski predmeti. Iznimku čine Malta i Norveška u kojima učenici na primarnom stupnju školovanja moraju sudjelovati na satu Tjelesne i

zdravstvene kulture, ali ih se formalno ne provjerava i ne ocjenjuju, zatim Irska, u kojoj se učenike ne provjerava i ne ocjenjuju ni na primarnom ni na nižem sekundarnom stupnju školovanja (očekuje se da učitelj roditelje obavještava o napretku i suradnji djece u Tjelesnoj i zdravstvenoj kulturi) (Europska komisija/EACEA/Eurydice, 2013).

U Europi su najčešća dva načina provjeravanja i ocjenjivanja znanja: formativno i sumativno (Europska komisija/EACEA/Eurydice, 2013). Formativno se izvodi više puta u školskoj godini, i ponajprije je namijenjeno dobivanju tekućih povratnih informacija, koje upotrebljavamo u odgojno-obrazovnom procesu za korigiranje pedagoškog procesa. Formativno provjeravanje u pravilu je kvalitativno i sadrži opise učeničkih postignuća. Najčešće se upotrebljava između samog pedagoškog procesa i ne nakon završene obrade pojedinog sadržaja (Bailey i Macfayden, 2003; Bell i Cowie, 2001; Ginsburg, 2009; Majerič, 2004). Sumativno ocjenjivanje upotrebljavamo nakon završetka pojedinog ocjenjivačkog razdoblja, odnosno na kraju većih cjelina koje želimo ocijeniti. Više je usmjereno na konačni rezultat, odnosno na konačnu izvedbu gibanja. Na takav se način prikupljaju svi rezultati učenika i dobiva ukupna ocjena. Ako promatramo način ocjenjivanja, formativno provjeravanje ima bogatiji sadržaj, jer se opširno bilježi postizanje ciljeva. Sumativno ocjenjivanje izraženo je samo ocjenom (npr. od 1 do 5 ili od A do E).

U Sloveniji se danas znanje učenika (također u Tjelesnoj i zdravstvenoj kulturi) u prvom i drugom razredu osnovne škole ocjenjuje opisnom ocjenom, a od trećeg do devetog razreda brojčanom ocjenom (1 – nedovoljno, 5 – odlično). U povijesti se mnogo toga mijenjalo. U školskoj godini 1959./60. počelo je eksperimentalno uvođenje opisnog ocjenjivanja za sve predmete (također za Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu), ali je do kraja eksperimenta bilo označeno kao neodgovarajuće i zbog toga odbačeno (Razdevšek Pučko, 1999). Godine 1972. bilo je uvedeno ocjenjivanje riječima za tzv. odgojne predmete (Tjelesna i zdravstvena kultura). Ocjenjivanje riječima odvijalo se na trostupanjskoj tabeli s ocjenama manje uspješno, uspješno i vrlo uspješno. Negativne ocjene nije bilo, a ocjena se nikada nije računavala u ukupan školski uspjeh učenika. Uvođenjem devetogodišnje osnovne škole promijenio se i način ocjenjivanja, koji je vrijedio do 2013./14. U prva tri razreda svi su se predmeti ocjenjivali opisnim ocjenama. Kod opisnog ocjenjivanja riječima se izražava kako učenik napreduje s obzirom na utvrđene ciljeve, tj. standarde znanja s obzirom na nastavni plan. U ocjeni je sadržano ono što učenik zna ili može, ono što još ne zna i šta mora učiniti da bi postigao ciljeve. Od četvrtog do devetog razreda osnovne škole svi su se predmeti ocjenjivali petostupanjskom brojčanom ocjenom (1 – nedovoljno, 5 – izvrsno) (Pravilnik o provjeravanju i ocjenjivanju znanja te napredovanja učenika u osnovnoj školi, 2008.). Sa školskom godinom 2013./14. način ocjenjivanja ponovno se promijenio. Tako se opisnim ocjenama ocjenjuje u prvom i drugom razredu, a brojčanom ocjenom od trećeg do devetog razreda (Pravilnik o provjeravanju i ocjenjivanju znanja te napredovanju učenika u osnovnoj školi, 2013.). Iako neki autori smatraju da se Tjelesna i zdravstvena kultura ne bi trebala ocjenjivati brojčanim

ocjenama (Kristan, 1992; Kristan, 2009), ta mogućnost u školama u Sloveniji nije bila nikada ni probno uvedena, zbog čega nema studije na temelju koje bi se moglo govoriti o (ne)primjernosti ocjenjivanja u predmetu Tjelesna i zdravstvena kultura. U Europi postoji nekoliko država u kojima se napredovanje iz predmeta Tjelesna i zdravstvena kultura u nižim razredima ne ocjenjuje (npr. Irska, Malta, Norveška), ali su učitelji roditeljima i učenicima dužni dati povratne informacije o učenikovu napretku (Europska komisija/EACEA/Eurydice, 2013).

U Sloveniji je o temi različitih načina ocjenjivanja provedeno nekoliko istraživanja. Z. Harter (1995) je proučavala stavove učitelja o ocjenjivanju Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture (N=129) u četiri ljubljanske osnovne škole. Ustanovila je da učitelji ne podupiru brojčano ocjenjivanje Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture; 11,6% učitelja se kod Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture zauzimalo za ocjenu riječima, 39,5% za opisnu ocjenu, 26,4% učitelja Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu ne bi ocjenjivalo. Iste je godine slično istraživanje provela Z. Novak (1995), koja je u uzorak uključila 171 učitelja. Ustanovila je da bi 0,8% učitelja Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu ocjenjivalo brojčanom ocjenom, 16,9% ocjenom riječima, 26,3% opisnom ocjenom, međutim 14,6% učitelja Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu ne bi ocjenjivalo. Krek, Kovač Šebart, Kožuh, Vogrinc, Peršak i Volf (2005) su na uzorku od 304 učitelja istraživali koji bi način ocjenjivanja (ne samo za Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu) učitelji izabrali kad bi imali mogućnost izbora. Ustanovili su da bi nešto više od pola učitelja izabralo opisno ocjenjivanje, 36,5% brojčano ocjenjivanje, a da bi ostali izabrali druge načine ocjenjivanja. Vogrinc, Kalin, Krek, Medveš i Valenčič Zuljan (2011) su istraživali koji se način ocjenjivanja pojedinih predmeta učiteljima koji poučavaju od 1. do 3. razreda, od 4. do 6. razreda i od 7. do 9. razreda čini primjeren. Ustanovili su da 32,2% učitelja koji poučavaju u prvom trogodištu podupire brojčano ocjenjivanje Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture, 62,7% ocjenjivanje riječima i 5,1% druge načine ocjenjivanja. 4,8% učitelja drugog trogodišta bi Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu ocjenjivalo brojčanom ocjenom, 53,8% ocjenom riječima, a 1,4% na druge načine. U posljednjem trogodištu 63,0% učitelja podupire brojčanu ocjenu Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture. Ocjenjivanje riječima bi za Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu izabralo 36,1% učitelja, međutim 0,8% učitelja bi izabralo druge načine ocjenjivanja. Tek jedan učitelj, koji poučava u prvom trogodištu, je kao prijedlog zapisao, da Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu ne bi ocjenjivao.

Unatoč tome što je način ocjenjivanja određen Zakonom o osnovnoj školi (1996) i Zakonom o izmjenama i dopunama Zakona o osnovnoj školi (2011), željeli smo utvrditi kakvo je mišljenje učitelja o različitim načinima ocjenjivanja Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture. Željeli smo utvrditi razlike u mišljenjima među učiteljima koji poučavaju u prvom odnosno u drugom trogodištu i razlike među učitelji s različitim radnim stažem. Radni staž učitelja podijelili smo u tri kategorije. U prvoj kategoriji bili su učitelji s do tri godine radnog staža (6,3%), u drugoj kategoriji učitelji s 4 do 20 godina radnog staža (54,6%), a u trećoj učitelji s 21 i više godina radnog staža (39,6%).

Radni staž učitelja podijelili smo u tri veće skupine koje se podudaraju s učiteljevim profesionalnim razvojem. Koristili smo se Ryanovim model podjele profesionalnog razvoja učitelja (Depoli, 2002), i to:

1. razdoblje ili razdoblje idealnog predstavljanja. To je razdoblje učitelja za vrijeme studija, razdoblje idealističkih shvaćanja učiteljskog zanimanja. To razdoblje odnosi se na učitelje prije početka profesionalne karijere. Tih učitelja (studenata) u uzorku mjerenja nema, zbog čega ta kategorija nije uračunata.
2. razdoblje ili razdoblje prilagodbe je razdoblje u kojem se učitelj bavi upravljanjem razredom i održavanjem discipline, dobivanjem rutine, dobivanjem samopouzdanja, vjerom u svoje sposobnosti i znanje. Traje negdje do otprilike tri godine od početka rada.
3. razdoblje ili razdoblje iskustva je razdoblje u kojem je učiteljev rad rutiniran do te mjere da vješto nadgleda razred i predavanje, da se vješto priprema za predavanje, da cijeni sebe i učenike. Razdoblje traje približno do pola radnog staža.
4. razdoblje ili razdoblje ponovne osjetljivosti za inovacije je vrijeme kada se učitelji žele na neki način izdvojiti iz rutine i kada su spremni prihvatiti nove izazove, nove načine poučavanja i kada inovacije testiraju u praksi.

## **Metodologija rada**

### ***Uzorak ispitanika***

U uzorak je bilo uključeno 855 učitelja iz 189 osnovnih škola u Sloveniji. Bili su uključeni učitelji iz svih slovenskih regija, što zajedno s brojem učitelja i s obzirom na udaljenost škola jamči reprezentativnost uzorka. Istraživanje se odvijalo od listopada 2014. do veljače 2015. godine. Prosječna dob anketiranih učitelja bila je 40,9 godina, prosječna radna dob 17,5 godina. 67,7% učitelja poučavalo je u prvom trogodištu, 32,3 učitelja u drugom trogodištu. Velika većina učitelja (81,4%) sama poučava Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu, tek 18,6% Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu ne poučava ili je poučava zajedno s učiteljem Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture.

### ***Upitnik***

Preuzet je upitnik koji je pripremila Harter (1995) i dopunjen pitanjima koja se odnose na modernizaciju načina ocjenjivanja. Upitnik je bio anoniman, s pitanjima otvorenog i zatvorenog tipa. Iz upitnika možemo izdvojiti sljedeće varijable:

- Osnovni statistički podaci o anketiranima
- Slaganje odnosno neslaganje s pojedinim načinom ocjenjivanja i prednosti odnosno slabosti pojedinog načina ocjenjivanja
- Teškoće kod ocjenjivanja Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture.

Podatci su bili obrađeni statističkim paketom SPSS za Windows, verzija 21.0. Osnovni statistički parametri bili su izračunati za sve varijable. Statistički značajne razlike između varijabli bile su ovrjere uz pomoć hi-kvadrat testa.

## Rezultati

Učitelji su trebali odgovoriti na pitanje o najprikladnijem ocjenjivanju tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture u prvoj i drugoj trijadi. U tablici 1 odgovori su svih učitelja. U tablicama 2 i 3 odgovori su učitelja u odnosu na trijadu u kojoj poučavaju. U tablicama 4. i 5. odgovori su učitelja u odnosu na radni staž.

### Tablica 1, 2 i 3

5,9% učitelja koji poučavaju u prvom trogodištu bi Ttjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu u prvom trogodištu ocjenjivalo brojčanom ocjenom, njih 16,9% ocjenom riječima, a njih 11,2% Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu ne bi ocjenjivalo (Tablica 2.).

15,2% učitelja koji poučavaju u drugom trogodištu bi Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu u prvom trogodištu ocjenjivalo brojčanom ocjenom, 23,0% ocjenom riječima, 46,1% opisnom ocjenom, a 15,6% Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu ne bi ocjenjivalo (Tablica 2.).

Najveći broj učitelja, osobito učitelja prvog trogodišta, bi za prvo trogodište odabrao opisno ocjenjivanje kao način ocjenjivanja Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture. Učitelji koji poučavaju u pojedinom trogodištu češće su izabrali način ocjenjivanja koji je inače propisan za razred u kojem poučavaju – npr. učitelji koji poučavaju u drugom trogodištu češće su izbirali brojčano ocjenjivanje također za prvo trogodište (Tablica 2.).

46,0% učitelja koji poučavaju u prvom trogodištu bi Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu u drugom trogodištu ocjenjivalo brojčanom ocjenom, 30,2% ocjenom riječima, 21,2% opisnom ocjenom, a 2,6% učitelja Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu u prvom trogodištu ne bi ocjenjivalo (Tablica 3.).

54,3% učitelja koji poučavaju u drugom trogodištu bi Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu ocjenjivalo brojčanom ocjenom. 32,8% bi Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu u drugom trogodištu ocjenjivalo ocjenom riječima, a 4,9% Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu ne bi ocjenjivalo (Tablica 3.).

Najveći broj učitelja, osobito učitelja drugog trogodišta, bi Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu u drugom trogodištu ocjenjivao brojčanom ocjenom, što je očekivano jer se Tjelesna i zdravstvena kultura u drugom trogodištu ocjenjuje brojčanom ocjenom.

Do razlika među grupama učitelja koji poučavaju u prvom odnosno u drugom trogodištu (vidi Tablice 2. i 3.) dolazi u prvom redu zbog toga što učitelji koji poučavaju u pojedinom trogodištu kao najbolji način ocjenjivanja biraju onaj koji je propisan zakonom.

U tablici 4. prikazane su razlike u mišljenju učitelja o najpogodnijem načinu ocjenjivanja Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture s obzirom na *radni staž*.

### Tablica 4 i 5

Bez obzira na trajanje radnog staža mišljenja učitelja o načinu ocjenjivanja u pojedinom odgojno-obrazovnom razdoblju se ne razlikuju (vidi Tablice 4. i 5.).

Učitelji su na pitanje o prednostima odnosno slabostima pojedinog načina ocjenjivanja odgovarali jednostavno. Tematski smo slične odgovore povezali u posebne

kategorije. U rezultatima su prikazane samo kategorije s više od 10 odgovora učitelja (vidi Tablice 6., 7., 8. i 9.).

Tablica 6, 7, 8 i 9

## Rasprava

Jedan od važnih kriterija napredovanje u viši razred, tj. na viši stupanja obrazovanja jest školska ocjena. Zbog toga je odgovarajuće i pravilno ocjenjivanje vrlo važno. Bez obzira na način ocjenjivanja (ocjenjivanje riječima, brojčano, opisno ocjenjivanje) učitelj treba imati izrađene precizne kriterije ocjenjivanja. Mora znati kada i na koji će način ocjenjivati, kao što treba znati i kakvo se znanje zahtijeva za određenu ocjenu.

Iako smo u Sloveniji ocjenjivanje riječima u predmetu Tjelesna i zdravstvena kultura imali od 1972. do školske godine 2013./14. željeli smo saznati koliko bi učitelja takav način ocjenjivanja prepoznalo kao zastarjeli, ne više važeći način ocjenjivanja. Očekivano je najveći broj učitelja za način ocjenjivanja u predmetu Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture u pojedinom trogodištu smatrao onaj koji je trenutno u skladu s važećim zakonom. Ipak iznenađuje visok broj učitelja koji kao alternativu brojčanom ocjenjivanju za drugu trijadu predlažu ocjenjivanje riječima koje se u Sloveniji više ne primjenjuje (Tablica 1.). Učitelji u prvom i drugom razredu opisno ocjenjivanje, a od trećeg razreda dalje brojčano ocjenjivanje, u skladu sa zakonom, smatraju najprihvatljivijim načinom ocjenjivanja ocjenjivanje riječima (18,8% u prvom i 30,7% u drugom trogodištu). Slične rezultate je dobio također Vogrinc sa suradnicima (2011), a postotak učitelja koji podupiru ocjenjivanje riječima još je veći i u svakom trogodištu također predstavlja najčešći izbor mogućeg načina ocjenjivanja. Učitelji ocjenjivanje riječima smatraju najmanje stresnim za učenike u usporedbi s drugim načinima ocjenjivanja (Tablica 7.). Ostali odgovori, koje učitelji navode u korist ocjenjivanju riječima, pokazuju nepoznavanje tog načina ocjenjivanja, posredno, ali i ocjenjivanja općenito (Tablica 7.). Dio odgovora pokazuje veću jednostavnost tog načina ocjenjivanja za učitelja (slično navode također za brojčano ocjenjivanje), premda bi pristup učitelja ocjenjivanju trebao biti neovisan o načinu ocjenjivanja. Učitelj treba imati postavljene precizne kriterije ocjenjivanja, neovisno o načinu ocjenjivanja. Nekoliko učitelja tako govori o tome da ocjenjivanje riječima daje odgovarajuće povratne informacije. Učenik koji ima ocjenu „vrlo uspješno“ vjerojatno je ima više znanja u Tjelesnoj i zdravstvenoj kulturi od učenika s ocjenom „uspješno“, a nikako vrsta ocjena sama po sebi ne nosi nikakve informacije o tome što učenik zna, a što ne zna. Tek 19 (4,0%) učitelja je taj način ocjenjivanja prepoznalo kao zastario način ocjenjivanja (Tablica 7.). Glavni nedostatak tog načina ocjenjivanja sigurno je u tome što je trostupanjska tablica ocjenjivanja premalo diskriminatorsna. Učenike možemo razvrstati na oba krajnja pola, a velika većina ostaje u sredini, sa samo jednom ocjenom, koja ne može pokazati sve razlike među učenicima. To kao glavni nedostatak ocjenjivanja riječima opisuju također učitelji. Dok 12 (5,0%) učitelja prepoznaje ocjenjivanje riječima kao ocjenjivanje koje je prikladno za tzv. odgojne predmete



(Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu, Likovni odgoj, Glazbeni odgoj), 63 (13,3%) učitelja smatra da je potrebno sve predmete ocjenjivati na isti način, jer bi drugačijim načinom ocjenjivanja predmet izgubio na važnosti i bio obezvrijeđen (Tablica 7.). Izjednačenje ocjenjivanja Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture s ocjenjivanjem kod drugih predmeta je s obzirom na egzistenciju predmeta u kurikulum osnovne škole veoma važno. Predmet koji nije ocjenjen, ili se ocjenjuje drukčije od ostalih školskih predmeta, u očima stručne javnosti (učitelji) i šire javnosti (roditelji, učenici, politika) uživa manji ugled, tretira se kao manje važan za život i za dječji razvoj, ima manje nastavnih sati i često otpada na račun drugih predmeta (u prvom redu na račun matematike i materinskog jezika), što se često događa u prvom i drugom trogodištu osnovne škole. Istodobno se postavlja pitanje možemo li sve predmete ocjenjivati na isti način, jer su kod nekih predmeta važne vještine koje su često povezane sa sposobnostima koje su urođene.

Opisno ocjenjivanje kao najprikladniji način ocjenjivanja u prvom trogodištu predlaže 58,1% anketiranih učitelja, međutim postotak je učitelja koji ocjenjivanje te vrste kao odgovarajuće predlaže i u drugom trogodištu očekivano niži i predstavlja tek 16,4% (tablica 1). Jedna važna prednost opisne ocjene jest da uspoređuje dijete samo sa sobom, opisuje njegov napredak, njegovo znanje, upozorava što dijete još ne zna i daje realnu ocjenu koja je individualizirana. Kao takvu je doživljavaju i učitelji (44,7% njih misli da je to najpreciznija povratna informacija, 18,3% smatra da takva ocjena uvažava učenika kao pojedinca, da uvažava njegov napredak), premda istodobno upozorava na to da oblikovanje opisne ocjene zahtijeva previše vremena (25,4%) (Tablica 8.). Problem koji se javlja kod opisnog ocjenjivanja višeslojan je. Nastavni plan za Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu zacrtan je tako da su standardi znanja upisani po zaključenoj trijadi, a ne po zaključenom razredu. Time se postiže veća autonomija učitelja kod zacrtavanja pedagoškog procesa. Istodobno omogućuje napredovanje učenika u skladu s brzinom njegova razvoja, prilagođavanje programa njegovu predznanju, učitelj može uzimati u obzir materijalne uvjete koji su mu na raspolaganju za izvođenje pedagoškog procesa i sl. Nažalost upravo autonomija koju učitelji s jedne strane toliko žele u tom primjeru donosi gomilu problema, jer učitelji ne znaju planirati pedagoški proces da bi znali prilagoditi standarde znanja zapisane na kraju trogodišta tako da bi ih mogli upotrijebiti, npr. na kraju prvog razreda. Učitelji često također ne znaju i ne razumiju zašto standardi znanja nisu zapisani za svaki razred posebno i ono što je prednost shvaćaju kao slabost nastavnog plana za Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu. Zbog nedostatka znanja i zbog različitih informacija i usmjerenja koje učitelji dobivaju o ocjenjivanju u praksi je situacija drugačija. Često učitelji upotrebljavaju komercijalne godišnje nastavne pripreme i pripreme za pojedini sat Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture, koji često nisu usklađeni ni s nastavnim planom, a još manje sa stvarnim stanjem u pojedinoj školi (znanje učenika, materijalni uvjeti za rad i sl.). Zato se često zbiva da opisna ocjena nije odraz stvarnog znanja, nego su ocjene međusobno slične, bez obzira na to kojem su učeniku namijenjene. Zato ih mnogo roditelja ne razumije (35,1% učitelja navodi da opisne ocjene ne razumiju ni roditelji

ni učenici, 11,3% učitelja navodi da ocjene ni roditelji ni učenici ne uzimaju ozbiljno) (Tablica 8.). S obzirom na to da je opisno ocjenjivanje u slovenskom školskom sustvu prisutno od uvođenja devetogodišnje osnovne škole, očekivali bi se da do danas poteškoća ne bi trebalo biti, ali unatoč svemu tome nekoliko učitelja misli da roditelji ocjene uopće ne pročitaju i da roditelji žele način ocjenjivanja koji bi im donio više informacija o dječjem znanju. Iz odgovora učitelja možemo vrlo uvjerljivo zaključiti da je ocjena otežavajuća u prvom redu za učitelja, i to najviše zbog nedostatka znanja o toj vrsti ocjenjivanja te često suprotstavljenih ideja o tome kakvo bi ocjenjivanje općenito trebalo biti. To se posebno odražava u odgovorima učitelja da ocjena ne dopušta zapise, što dijete ne zna (6,9% odgovora), da su ocjene subjektivne i da učitelji ne poznaju odgovarajuću terminologije (4,6%) (Tablica 8.).

Iako dio učitelja misli da brojčana ocjena ne daje odgovarajuće povratne informacije u smislu toga što dijete zna ili ne zna (10,0%), veći dio učitelja brojčanu ocjenu smatra ocjenom koja je objektivna, realna, ima jasno postavljene kriterije ocjenjivanja, razumljiva je roditeljima i učenicima i lakše razumljiva u odnosu na druge ocjene (31,9%) (Tablica 6.). U pogledu teorije ocjenjivanja sva bi se ta obilježja mogla pripisati opisnoj ocjeni, a nikako brojčanoj, jer sama brojka ne govori ništa o tome što konkretno dijete zna i može. Zato možemo opravdano sumnjati u korektno ocjenjivanje u nastavnom predmetu Tjelesnoj i zdravstvenoj kulturi ako učitelji ne prepoznaju činjenice da svako ocjenjivanje mora biti pravilno i pravedno. Slabosti brojčanog ocjenjivanja, npr. neinformativnost ocjene, neobjektivnost, nesigurnost, nezdravo natjecanje među učenicima, učenje za ocjenu, a ne za znanje (po Kristan, 1992) prepoznaje velik postotak učitelja (npr. 60,2% učitelja upozorava na to da ocjena ne djeluje stimulativno) (Tablica 6.). Veću pozornost treba pridati odgovorima koji govore u korist brojčanom ocjenjivanju, jer često pokazuju nerazumijevanje postojanja Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture na jednoj i ocjenjivanja na drugoj strani. Bez obzira na način ocjenjivanja učitelj za ocjenjivanje mora imati sastavljene precizne kriterije u skladu s kojima ocjenjuje. Tek tako ocjena može biti relativno pouzdana. Zanimljivo je da 31,9% učitelja brojčanoj ocjeni osim objektivnosti i preciznih kriterija ocjenjivanja također pripisuje veću razumljivost za roditelje i učenike (Tablica 6.). Smatramo da odgovori izvire iz tradicionalnog načina ocjenjivanja (brojčano), koje roditelji poznaju iz vremena svoga školovanja. Brojčana ocjena sama po sebi, bez jasno utvrđenih kriterija, može samo dati informaciju o tome tko od učenika načelno postiže ciljeve na višem, a tko na nižem nivou. Brojčana ocjena ne javlja kakvo je znanje učenika. Zbog učiteljevih pogrešaka može se pretpostaviti da ista ocjena neće biti odraz iste razine znanja svih učenika. Može se čak tvrditi da isti učenik od različitih učitelja za pokazano isto znanje neće biti ocijenjen istom ocjenom. Kao motivacijsko sredstvo brojčanu ocjenu doživljava 30,7% učitelja (Tablica 6.). Predviđamo da bi ocjena bila motivacijsko sredstvo (ako izuzmemo činjenicu da govorimo o Tjelesnoj i zdravstvenoj kulturi) kad bi se raspon ocjena kretao na cjelokupnoj ocjenjivačkoj skali (dakle od 1 do 5). Analize kažu da je prosječna ocjena kod Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture negdje među ocjenama

4.0 i 5.0 ([www.os-sturje.si/files/2014/06/POROČILO-2013-14.pdf](http://www.os-sturje.si/files/2014/06/POROČILO-2013-14.pdf)), što vjerojatno ne može biti motivacijsko sredstvo, jer je očito da su ocjene vrlo visoke. Jedan od razloga za promjenu načina ocjenjivanja tzv. odgojnih predmeta iz ocjenjivanja riječima na brojčano ocjenjivanje bila je jednakovrijednost svih školskih predmeta. Jednakovrijednost predmeta dugoročno ne možemo dostizati samo promjenom načina ocjenjivanja, nego ponajprije načinom rada i poučavanja predmeta, kao i odnosom prema predmetu.

Jedan od glavnih ciljeva Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture jest omogućiti stjecanje kompetencija koje će pojedincu omogućiti doživotno bavljenje sportom. Zbog sve više sjedilačkog načina života danas je sve više djece potrebno najprije oduševiti za bavljenje sportom, što se vjerojatno ne može postići ocjenjivanjem.

Tjelesna i zdravstvena kultura bez ocjene je nešto što u Sloveniji nikada nije provedeno pa se samo može predviđati. Ne znamo ni to bi li se predmet održao kao dio redovitih i obveznih nastavnih predmeta, jer iskustva u području visokog obrazovanja kažu da predmet sport, koji je bio redovan i obavezan nastavni predmet na svim fakultetima, uvođenjem bolonjskog načina studiranja više nije obavezan. Zbog toga se na većini fakulteta više i ne izvodi, ili se izvodi tek kao izborni predmet. Možemo predvidjeti da bi se slično moglo dogoditi i u osnovnoj školi, što kao bojazan izražavaju i učitelji, premda u manjoj mjeri (Tablica 9.). Od europskih država tek Malta, Norveška i Irska izvode Tjelesnu i zdravstvenu kulturu bez ocjenjivanja. U tim su zemljama učitelji o napretku učenika dužni izvještavati njihove roditelje i ostale učitelje (Eurydice, 2013). Iako u osnovnoj školi nemamo iskustva nastave Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture bez ocjene, 78,8% učitelja se slaže da u prvom trogodištu ocjena iz Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture nije potrebna (Tablica 9.). Kao razlog navode unutrašnju motivaciju djece za suradnju u nastavi Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture i njihovu potrebu za gibanje, koju ostvaruju bez obzira na to je li predmet ocijenjen ili nije. Istodobno misle da je jedan od važnijih ciljeva Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture odgajanje pozitivnog odnosa prema gibanju i sportu, što ocjenom vjerojatno ne bismo postigli. Samo malen dio učitelja misli da učenici žele ocjenjivanje (1,8%) i da učitelj neocjenjivanjem u Tjelesnoj i zdravstvenoj kulturi ne bi imao autoritet, odnosno da bi imao teškoće s disciplinom (Tablica 9.), iako disciplina/nedisciplina ne bi smjela biti povezana s ocjenjivanjem jer je kažnjavanje učenika davanjem slabih (ili čak negativnih) ocjena pedagoški sporno. Tek polovina (50,5%) odgovora odnosno pojašnjenja razloga zbog kojih je u predmetu Tjelesna i zdravstvena kultura ocjenjivanje potrebno ide u smjeru gubitka vrijednosti predmeta ako predmet ne bi bio ocijenjen i u smjeru smanjenja truda učenika, jer bez ocjenjivanja možda ne bi bili motivirani za suradnju (Tablica 9.). Učitelji najčešće nisu uočili problem pedagoškog procesa koji ne završava ocjenom. Najveća teškoća, koja se očitava iz odgovora, jest da učitelji nemaju osjećaja da je napredak učenika moguće i potrebno pratiti bez ocjenjivanja. Mišljenja su da ni roditelji, ni učenici bez ocjenjivanja ne bi dobili odgovarajuće povratne informacije o radu i napretku učenika. To navodi na misao da barem dio učitelja ne razumije

namjene provjeravanja i ocjenjivanja znanja, jer je povratne informacije o dostignuću i napretku učenika također moguće proslijediti bez (bilo kakvog) ocjenjivanja.

## **Zaključak**

Način ocjenjivanja u pojedinom odgojno-obrazovnom razdoblju utvrđen je zakonom. Učitelji zakonom utvrđene načine ocjenjivanja Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture prepoznaju kao stručno najkvalitetnije načine ocjenjivanja. Možemo utvrditi da se među učiteljima pojavljuje previše pogrešnog razumijevanja namjene i posebnosti različitih vrsta ocjenjivanja. Bez obzira na radni staž učitelja njihovo se mišljenje s obzirom na način ocjenjivanja Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture u pojedinom trogodištu ne razlikuju, a pojavljuju se statistički značajne razlike u mišljenju učitelja o načinu ocjenjivanja u pojedinom trogodištu, s obzirom na to u kojem trogodištu poučavaju. Učitelji prepoznaje prednosti i slabosti pojedinih načina ocjenjivanja Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture. Dobiveni rezultati važni su za razumijevanje razmišljanja učitelja o različitim metodama ocjenjivanja Tjelesne i zdravstvene kulture. Također možemo otkriti i najčešće pogreške koje učitelji čine prilikom ocjenjivanja. Potrebno je otkriti kakvi su učinci različitih vrsta ocjenjivanja na učenike i još važnije, kako različiti načini ocjenjivanja utječu na sudjelovanje učenika u sportu.