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ABSTRACT
The study on which this paper is based examined the pedagogical practices of secondary school teachers in teaching Physical Education (PE) in Tanzania. The data from two experienced PE teachers were collected through interview, lesson observation and documentary review and they were analyzed thematically. Findings indicated that PE teachers predominantly use teacher-centred teaching approaches and lecture teaching methods. This teaching approach and methods as used in teaching PE classes did not involve learners and they thus limited students’ mastery and denied them the opportunity to practice the intended skills during and after the lesson. Inadequate facilities and equipment for teaching PE also affected teachers’ pedagogical practices. It was concluded that the teacher-centred teaching approach dominated in most of the observed PE classes. It is recommended that PE teachers be advised to abide by the requirements of the syllabus. They should be given in-service training on how to apply learner centred teaching approach and to use their local environment to improve their pedagogical practices.
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INTRODUCTION
Teachers’ pedagogical practices are the prime benchmarks for effective teaching and learning in the classroom. For the case of PE, teachers’ pedagogical practice involves the ways instructions are given in the teaching and learning situation. According to Kazungu (2016), teachers’ pedagogical practices include topic-specific teaching and learning materials, teaching methodologies, teachers’ role and instructional places.
The teachers’ ability in choosing the topic specific teaching and learning materials is essential for enhancing an effective teaching and learning process in the classroom. The teaching of PE in Tanzanian secondary schools in particular is carried out under inadequate teaching and learning materials (Marwa, 2015 & Kazungu, 2016). In such a situation, the teacher plays a crucial role in deciding how to use the few available resources.

Choosing an appropriate teaching methodology is another essential component of teachers’ pedagogical practice. It involves the choice of the teaching approach and methods that fit for teaching a selected content. According to Huque (2016), there are several teaching approaches including teacher centred, learner centred, content/subject matter centred, dialogic and participatory/constructivist/interactive teaching approaches. Although there are many teaching approaches, the commonly used are traditional and dialogic teaching approaches (Curtis, Brownlee, & Spooner-Lane, 2020, Thomas 2001). According to Grants and Hill (2006), teachers prefer the traditional teaching approach because most teachers believe that this approach is useful for balancing time limitations, resource demands and lack of student self-regulatory skills. The PE syllabus for secondary schools in Tanzania (2005) specifically indicates that teachers have to use participatory teaching approaches in teaching PE in the classroom. Despite the PE syllabus demanding teachers to use participatory teaching approaches in secondary schools, teachers were found to have preferred to use teacher centred teaching approaches dominated by lecture teaching method (Marwa 2015).

Apart from choices of teaching approaches and methods, teachers have the responsibility of preparing schemes of work and lesson plans before going for actual teaching in the classroom. According to Ng’etu (2019), lesson preparation enables teachers to explore, examine, and internalize what and how to teach as well as determine the teaching methodology and teaching materials to be used. In Tanzanian secondary schools, the scheme of work is prepared per term or annually (MoEC, 2005). On the other hand, a lesson plan is prepared per learning unit. In her study, Marwa (2015) observed that only a quarter of interviewed PE teachers in four secondary schools prepared schemes of work, lesson plans and teaching aids. Since Marwa (2015) focused on availability of scheme of work and lesson plan documents, the quality of the content written in the schemes of work and lesson plans remain unknown.
Moreover, teachers are required to deliver the prepared lesson to the students in the classroom. According to Olusanjo (2005), teachers make effective use of selected learning resources, voices, body parts and the ability to demonstrate the skills being taught well and controlling the class during lesson presentation. Teachers are required to indicate the teaching, learning and assessment activities at each stage of their lesson (that is, at introduction, development and consolidation stages). According to Marwa (2015), out of four teachers whose lessons were observed, two demonstrated the skills and linked their lessons with the previous ones and the rest showed poor preparation. Despite the highlights on what teachers should do at the introduction stage of the PE lesson being indicated, it is not known how teachers connect their teaching activities with learning activities as well as assessment tasks in the classroom situation.

Apart from lesson presentations, teachers are supposed to evaluate their lessons to see whether the intended learning objectives were achieved (MoEC, 2005). Although the syllabus directs teachers to evaluate the lesson immediately after the lesson, there is limited data on whether PE teachers evaluate their lessons timely and appropriately. Generally, there is a lacuna of research on teachers’ pedagogical practices in teaching PE. In filling that gap, the study on which this paper is based sought to examine the pedagogical practices employed in teaching PE in Tanzanian secondary schools. The objective of this paper is, therefore, to examine teachers’ pedagogical practices regarding lesson preparation, delivery, assessment and evaluation in teaching PE in Tanzanian secondary schools.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The study on which this paper is based adopted and modified the combination of Thomas (2013) and Alexander (2001) conceptual frameworks. Thomas (2013) compared teachers’ beliefs and pedagogical practices in teaching PE in secondary schools. His focus was on the teacher centred and learner centred teaching approaches. Although Thomas’ research framework is a useful one for understanding teachers’ practices, it is limited when analyzing diverse pedagogical practices that go beyond teacher centred and learner centred teaching approaches. It provides little explanation about teaching approaches such as content centred, dialogic and participatory teaching approaches. To fill such a gap, the action-based framework was adopted. The action-based
framework is composed of three analytical concepts: frame, form and act (Alexander 2001). The frame is the immediate context in which the act of teaching is set. It constitutes element such as space, student organization, time, curriculum and habits. Form encompasses the way the lesson is carried out in the class. The act of teaching encompasses tasks, activities, interaction and judgements in the class. The combination of Thomas (2013) and Alexander (2001) conceptual frameworks, guide the researcher to investigate the selection of the teaching approach, lesson preparation, the act of teaching/lesson delivery, lesson assessment and classroom environment as elements of pedagogical practices.

METHODOLOGY
The study adopted a qualitative research approach and descriptive case study research design to come up with an in-depth examination of teachers’ pedagogical practices in teaching PE lessons in two secondary schools in Dar es Salaam region. The two schools were purposively selected by virtue of their experiences in offering PE lessons for more than five years. One teacher from each secondary school was purposively selected by virtue of their experiences in teaching PE for more than two years.

The data were collected through interviews, classroom observation and documentary review. Classroom observations were conducted during the lesson time. The scheme of work and lesson plan documents collected from PE teachers were reviewed. Face to face interviews with selected teachers were done in school compounds. Data were analysed thematically. After transcribing the data, the researcher familiarized himself with the data, coded, generated and reviewed the themes identified. In addition, enumerative information was summarised in tables, boxes and figures.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
The findings from the study are organized in terms of teaching approaches, lesson preparation and lesson presentation, lesson evaluation and classroom environment.

a) Teaching approaches
The findings from classroom observation indicated that PE teachers used teacher centered approaches in delivering classroom instructions. During classroom observation, the researcher noted the following situation:

Teacher A introduced a new topic without exploiting students’ experiences from their surroundings. He dominated most of the talk in the class by mentioning the objectives of the lesson, explaining the content of the topic and asking a few oral questions to the students. Then, he read notes from his mobile phone and jotted down some points on the board. Afterwards, he asked a few oral questions again. He specifically asked leading questions that emphasized the content written on the chalkboard. Moreover, the teacher neither made a lesson assessment nor a summary during the lesson.

The observation made while teacher B was teaching PE revealed the following:

Teacher B opted for group discussion as a teaching method. He introduced the lesson without linking it with the previous lesson and even to students’ experiences. He assigned the task for group discussion. Each group comprised five to six members. Then, the teacher instructed each group to discuss the assigned task for 20 minutes and present it in front of the whole class. Those tasks required students to discuss the meaning of terms and procedures for executing skills in a Handball game. He provided no feedback to students about the presented classroom discussion and lastly, he ended the lesson without summarizing it.

From the above two observations, the following can be deduced. First, teachers dominated most of the conversations by instructing content of the lesson and thus. Students were left as implementers of teachers’ instructions. This is a characteristic of the teacher centred teaching approach, which provides little space for learners to be engaged actively into a lesson. Second, there was lack of linkage between environment/experiences with the lesson taught and effective learning. This limits the development of skills and the competence relevant to the learner. Third, feedback is the essential part of the lesson, thus it was not funny, if certain students brought their ideas to the class.

Moreover, the findings from the interview with teachers indicated that learner centred teaching approach was used by some teachers while others used mixed teaching approaches. In narrating the teaching approach, teacher B had this to say:
I like to use the learner centered teaching approach in the classroom because it allows students to discuss. I often assign them tasks to discuss, and then, I correct those tasks where they made mistakes. If time allows, I assign them more tasks to discuss. Then, I conclude the lesson and assign students to collect equipment in case we are in the field of play (Teacher B, interview 2021).

In contrast, teacher A had this to say:

Often, I use mixed teaching approaches in teaching my PE students. Here I mean both the teacher-centred and participatory teaching approaches are employed. In fact, I always use mixed teaching approaches because they engage students in the lessons and allow me to make right decisions on how to teach a particular class if the learning situation has changed (Teacher A, interview, 2021).

Furthermore, findings from interviews with teachers indicate that teachers’ use learner centred teaching approach in the classroom since it encourages student engagement in the lesson and reduces student boredom. In elaborating the rationale for using the learner centred approach, teacher B explained:

I use the learner centred teaching approach because if I do everything in the classroom, students get bored. If I explain everything from A-Z for 40 minutes or 80 minutes, I am sure students will be bored (Teacher B, interview 2021).

This extract indicates that teachers use the learner centred teaching approach since it allows students to talk more and less bored in PE classroom during the lesson.

Generally, finding revealed variation between what teachers narrate in an interview and what they practise in the classroom. Teachers preach the use of the learner centred teaching approach theoretically but they use the teacher centred teaching approach in the classroom when teaching PE lessons. Teachers dominate PE lessons in the classrooms. As a result, most of the conversations in the class and the lesson is not linked with learners’ experiences. Furthermore, teachers provide no feedback to students. According to the conceptual framework, teachers have to select and use the teaching approach that engages students in the lesson. Thomas (2001) and Marwa (2015) found that the teacher centred teaching approach is the dominant teaching approach used in teaching PE.
Teachers used the teacher centred teaching approach when the class size is large or when time is inadequate. Ravitz Becker and Wong (2000) observed that in the transmission teaching approach, students will learn facts, concepts and will understand by absorbing the content of their teachers’ explanation or reading explanation from the text and answering related questions.’ However, the findings are in line with the PE syllabus for secondary education in Tanzania (2005) which requires teachers to use participatory teaching approaches. Nevertheless, teachers may have mentioned the use of the learner centred teaching approach during the interview as a means of protecting themselves from being sued against not using participatory teaching approach in teaching PE as stipulated in the syllabus.

b) Lesson preparation

In examining the teachers’ lesson preparation, the researcher found that the schemes of work and lesson plans were prepared from January up to July 2021. The findings from the observed documents indicated three things: some subject content was skipped, there was unequal distribution of time and mismatch between teachers’ activities and learning activities. From their schemes of work, the researcher noted the following:

In writing the general objective for the ball game, a topic taught to Form three students, teacher B wrote ‘to develop moral standard and behaviour over games and sports’ instead of writing to develop ability of students to take precautionary safety measures in ball games. Furthermore, teacher B wrote nine specific objectives instead of 37 for ball games and six for Track and Field events instead of 67 events as indicated in the syllabus. Additionally, he allotted 37 hours instead of 36 hours for ball games and 9 hours instead of 36 hours for Track and Field events. In ball games, more time was allocated to volleyball games. That was contrary to the time indicated in the syllabus.

In volleyball game, a lesson taught in Form Three on 14th April 2021, teacher B wrote the following on the teacher’s activities at presentation of new knowledge stage of lesson ‘to guide students to execute movement and care of facilities and equipment’ and learning activity as ‘students to respond to participate in activities.’

The running event lesson taught to Form Three on 10th February 2021, teacher A, at introduction stage of the lesson, wrote teacher’s activities as ‘to guide students to know the position in short and long-distance races’ and student’s activity as ‘student to listen carefully about the new lesson today.’
From the above two excerpts, it was revealed that PE teachers wrote specific objectives in their lesson plan documents without considering the element of specificity and attainability. Teachers also skipped some content in their lesson plans. Some topics of interest to teachers were allotted more time than the time indicated in the syllabus. In addition, there was a mismatch between learning activities and teacher’s activities in some lessons. As shown in the above extracts, the action verb ‘execution’ does not match the action verb ‘participate’. In the same vein, the use of action verb ‘know’ does not match with the action verb ‘listen’.

Findings from the reviewed lesson plan documents revealed three observations. First, teachers prepared lesson plans occasionally. The frequency of prepared lesson plans for Forms Three and Four for teacher A from AZ Secondary school and teacher B from JU secondary school since January to July 2021 were counted and computed. The results were shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1: The frequency of PE lesson plan prepared since January to July 2021](image)

As shown in Figure 1, PE teachers prepared lesson plans occasionally. The highest frequency was five and the lowest frequency was two per term. The frequencies shown in Figure 1 were against 37 lessons per term as indicated in the PE syllabus for secondary school.

Second, the ‘competency’ written in some of the reviewed lesson plans did not reflect the tasks shown in their lesson objectives. In reviewing the lesson plan documents, the researcher noted:
In the lesson plan documents prepared for form three, teacher B wrote ‘competency’ as ‘to develop moral standards and behaviour’ while the appropriate formulation was ‘to show the ability of students to take precautionary safety measures in Hand ball game’ (Form three lesson taught on 25th March, 2021).

Teacher A also wrote competency as, ‘to demonstrate knowledge on the value of and apply fundamental skills in specific physical exercise, game and sports (Form two lesson, 21st March, 2021). The appropriate formulation could be read as ‘the student should show the ability to describe precautionary safety measures in Netball game’. In another lesson, the same teacher wrote competency as ‘to demonstrate interest to participate regularly in competitive games and sports’ (Form Four lesson, 2nd July, 2021). This could be written as ‘the student should demonstrate the ability to describe types of field events.

The above extracts indicated that the ‘competency’ shown in each of the mentioned lessons did not reflect the objectives in terms of tasks that students should accomplish in the classroom. The competencies lacked specification of the tasks that teachers should expect students to demonstrate when teaching in the classroom.

Third, the lesson objectives written in the reviewed lesson plans were too general. They had no specific tasks that a student should perform in the classroom. In reviewing the lesson plan, the researcher noted that:

In a volleyball lesson taught on 18th January 2021 to Form Three students, teacher B wrote the general objective as ‘to develop moral standards behaviour over a game and sports’ while writing general objectives was expected to communicate or capture the whole topic on volleyball.

On lesson taught to Form Three on 6th March, 2021, teacher A wrote general objective as ‘students should know the distance in running i.e. short, middle and long distance’ instead of formulating the objective in accordance with the topic is long distance running.

The above extract indicates that the lesson objectives written in the lesson plan did not match with the specific topics that students should accomplish during a lesson. Apart from the general objectives, some specific objectives indicated no specific tasks that students should perform during the lessons. The review of the specific lesson objectives indicated that:
In a lesson taught in Form Three, on long distance, teacher A wrote the specific objective that read ‘After 80 minutes, every student should be able to explain and practice the middle, short and long distances.’

The foregoing quote revealed that all running events were included in a single written specific objective. Some of the mentioned running distances were not even in the syllabus for Form Three. The PE syllabus (2005) for Form Three required students to execute skills in positioning, takeoff, acceleration and finishing skills in long distance running events.

Fourth, the findings indicated that there was a mismatch between teacher and learner’s activities in the lesson plan documents. The lesson plan documents were reviewed and the following were noted:

Teacher B wrote teacher’s activities at an introductory stage of the Handball lesson for Form Three students as ‘to guide discussion on safety measures in Handball’ and learner’s activities as ‘to respond to questions asked by the teacher’. In the reinforcement, reflection and consolidation stages of the lesson, the teacher wrote nothing about the tasks that the teacher should do that would make students discuss and present. At the consolidation stage, the teacher did not show any task that indicates lesson conclusion.

Teacher A in one of the lessons at presentation stage, wrote teacher’s activities as ‘to guide demonstration of … and student activities as ‘students in small groups to discuss…

In the two extracts above, the action verbs related to teachers’ activities did not match with the learners’ activities. The action verbs ‘demonstrate’ and ‘discussion’ do not match with each other. Demonstration requires the teacher to show while discussion requires the students to share ideas with teachers or with their fellow students. In this case, therefore, the action verbs in teacher’s activities did not match with those in learners’ activities. These findings imply that teachers ignored to link teachers’ activities with learners’ activities. Lack of connectivity between teachers’ activities and learners’ activities at each stage of the lesson influence assessment and evaluation process because it is difficult for teachers to know what students are supposed to do exactly and the extent to students have achieved the expectations.

Findings from the lesson plan documents further indicated that teachers did not fill assessment column in some of their lesson plans. The tasks written in the assessment column also did not match with teaching and
learning activities. In reviewing the lesson plan documents, the researcher noted the following:

The assessment section of the lesson plan contained no action verbs that could reflect the task given to students. However, it only required student’s ability to participate in group discussion (Teacher B, Lesson plan, 2021).

The assessment content was too simple. For example, the question ‘Is the student able to listen carefully?’ was too simplistic. In this case, listening was neither in the teacher’s activities nor in the learning activities in the lesson plans. Besides, it is not measurable (Teacher A’s lesson plan, 2021).

The above excerpts indicated that the PE teachers in those two schools never bothered to link the lesson assessment tasks to their teaching activities and learners’ activities in the lesson plans. This implies that teachers faced difficulties in conducting assessment during the lesson since the right action verbs in their assessment plans lacked connection with their planned teaching and learning activities.

Generally, the findings revealed that some teachers in secondary schools pay less attention to PE lesson preparation. They prepare lesson plans occasionally, write learning competency and objectives inappropriately as well as sometimes they skip important parts of the content indicated in the syllabus when preparing their lessons. These practices are contrary to the requirements of the PE syllabus for secondary schools (2005), which requires teachers to prepare clear and attainable lesson objectives. According to the conceptual framework adopted, teachers’ preparation includes selection of teaching approach as well as setting lesson objectives, resources and teaching and learning activities as well as assessment activities. Lack of prepared lesson plan documents provides little evidence on whether teachers fulfil their commitments in the class or otherwise.

**Lesson presentation**

The findings about lesson presentation were confined to learning activities, lesson linkage, interaction, and assessment at various stages of the lesson as described in the following subsections.

**i) Learning Activities**

Findings from classroom observations indicated that writing notes, listening, skill execution, and responding to teachers’ questions were the
prevalent learning activities performed in PE lessons. In all the lessons observed in the classroom, each of the learning activities was counted and its frequencies were computed. The results were as shown in Figure 2.

![Learning Activities Observed in Form Three PE Lessons](source.png)

**Figure 2: Learning Activities Observed in Form Three PE Lessons**
Source: Classroom observation data (July, 2021).

As shown in Figure 2, listening had high frequency since teachers frequently explained the subject content when in the class. This was followed by writing notes where students took notes when the teacher was talking or when writing on the chalkboard. For practical lesson, the dominant learning activity was execution of skill that required students to follow procedures demonstrated by their teachers. Additionally, responding to teachers’ questions occurred more frequently since teachers asked oral questions that required students to provide either single answer or short explanations.

**ii) Lesson linkage**
The findings from classroom observation indicated that teachers did not link their lessons with either previous lessons or students’ life experiences. During the classroom observation in PE lessons taught by teachers A and B, the following were observed in schools AZ and JU.

Yesterday during remedial class, we discussed the introduction to handball, is it? That is a new sub-topic. It is sub-topic under the topic of Ball game. Our topic is called (Teacher’s pause) handball (Teacher B, classroom observation, 2021).
As a Form One, you have to know the topics that are taught in PE. The first one is the concept of PE, the second one is… and last eight are on recreation and outdoor activities (Teacher listed and wrote all Form One topics on the chalkboard) (Teacher A, classroom observation, 2021).

In the above two excerpts, teachers did not link their lessons with either the previous lessons or life experiences. In this case, teachers dominated the introduction of lesson by either listing subtopics to be accomplished or directly explaining the meaning of terms to the students. This entails that students were mere listeners and remained passive.

**iii) Interaction**

The findings from classroom observations indicated that the main types of interaction that occurred in the PE lessons were teacher-class interaction followed by teacher-group interaction. The ways teachers interacted in Form Three class are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Section of PE Lesson indicating interaction in the classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The conversations in Table 1 show that teacher - class interactions dominated in the PE classroom. Teachers talked more and gave instructions of the content to the whole class (episodes 3-5 and 203 -205) asked questions (Episodes 5 and 208) and monitored class activities and disciplinary cases. The teacher asked leading questions (episodes 5 and 206), which attracted chorus answers, and complete questions that required individual student to answer. Teachers also provided no appropriate feedback on whether students’ responses were correct or incorrect. Instead, they repeated the students’ responses (episodes 7 and 208). The conversation shown in Table 1 implied the use of direct teaching approach in the class.
iv) Lesson Assessment

The findings from lesson observations indicated that teachers asked questions that led to single answers more frequently and less on questions that led to individual explanations. In a similar vein, the assessment columns in the lesson plans were not filled in some lessons observed and those filled did not contain the action verbs that could link them with the given learning activities. In checking the lesson plan documents, the researcher noted that assessment column was incomplete as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Sampled sections of Teachers A and B Lesson plan (January –July 2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Teaching activity</th>
<th>Learning activity</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>To guide students in small groups to discuss various techniques, service set up</td>
<td>To discuss in groups about various techniques</td>
<td>Learners participated effectively in group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Planning and organization of competitive physical activity</td>
<td>To guide students to identify the type of physical activity to be performed'</td>
<td>Students to respond on how to identify the type of fixture</td>
<td>Student to listen and take notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Running event</td>
<td>Demonstrating how to make running short, middle- and long-distance races</td>
<td>To make a small group and discuss about short, middle- and long-distance races</td>
<td>…………………………….</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2021)

As shown in Table 2, the assessment tasks shown do not match with the teaching and learning activities. In Volleyball, the ‘group discussion’ written in the teaching and learning activities column does not match with ‘learner’s participation in group discussion’ written in the assessment column. In handball, the ‘identification’ written in the teacher’s and learning activity columns also does not match with ‘student listening’ written in the assessment column of a lesson plan. These findings imply that teachers lacked awareness on how to link the tasks in the assessment column with tasks in the teaching and learning activity column of the lesson plan documents. These findings, therefore, are in contrast with Tannehill’s (2001) argument that the tasks to be measured should be the same as tasks to be taught and learned.
Findings from interviews revealed that teachers assessed students for preparing them to pass the final examination. On student’s success in the classroom, teachers explained how they examined their students. Teachers B said:

To me, there are two ways of assessing student’s success; through examination or performance in a practical session. Through examination, we observe students’ success by looking at his/her score in an examination and on performance in a practical session. We observe how students achieved in particular sports’ competition. You see directly and conclude that a student is good in executing particular skills in a chosen game (Interview with teacher B, July 2021).

Teacher A also said:

A successful student is confident, ready to sit for examination at any time regardless of whether it is set by school, district or region. He/she is ready all the time to sit for any form of examination including tests and quizzes (Interview with teacher A, July, 2021).

The two excerpts above showed that, students passing an examination could increase their confidence and readiness to sit for national examination. On this basis, student’s achievement is judged based on good performance in their final examination done at the end of study period.

These findings imply that assessment was inappropriately done contrary to the way it is directed by PE syllabus for secondary schools. The syllabus requires teachers to ensure that the ‘assessment item takes into consideration a wide variety of outcomes based on the need to achieve general and individual level of competencies. In general, the syllabus shows assessment for learning but as revealed in this study teachers viewed assessment as passing the final examination.

Generally, findings revealed that listening to teachers’ explanations, writing notes and skills execution were the prevalent learning tasks that teachers used in teaching PE. Teachers did not link their lessons with either previous lesson or student’s life experiences. The prevalent interaction was teacher class interaction whereby the teacher talked more and gave instructions on the content to be given to the whole class and to search for feedback through oral questions. Teachers asked questions that led to single answers rather than explanations. Teachers pay less attention in filling the assessment column in the lesson plan. In the filled ones, the
assessment tasks do not reflect the teaching and learning activities. Teachers elaborated that the main purpose of assessment was to prepare students for final examinations. According to the PE syllabus for secondary school (2005), teachers are directed to conduct assessments at each stage of the lesson. Contrary to the PE syllabus requirement, teachers view lesson assessment as tool for preparing students for their final examination. The examination-oriented assessment limits student creativity and ability to solve real life problems and encourages teachers to teach for the examination instead of teaching for competencies and skills.

Lesson Evaluation
The findings from the reviewed lesson plan documents from the two PE teachers indicated that the statement of the lesson evaluation was too general. It lacked connection with specific objectives as well as the teaching and learning activities done in the classroom. The common phrases in the observed lesson plans were ‘The lesson was understood’ (Teacher B, lesson plan, July 2021) and ‘A larger percentage of the class understood the lesson because they participated in the lesson’ (Teacher A, lesson plan, July 2021).

When teachers were asked to clarify on the purpose of lesson evaluation, they explained that the purpose of lesson evaluation is to identify the level of students’ understanding of the lesson in a classroom. In elaborating the purpose of lesson evaluation, teachers said the following:

Teacher B said:

I sometimes evaluated the lesson after completing teaching lesson in the classroom. As you asked me about the purpose of evaluating my lessons, I think the purpose is to find out the extent to which students have understood the lesson. At the end of the lesson, I have to show the percentage of students who understood the lesson well. For instance, I can write that a certain percentage (let us say 60, 80 or 90) of students understood the lesson well. Then I recommended that for those 10% who showed little understanding of the lesson I will help them during remedial class hours or in the next coming lesson (Teacher B, interview July 2021).

Teacher A added that:

Yah! You cannot end the lesson without showing whether the lesson was understood or not. I as a PE teacher, have to say the purpose of lesson evaluation is to show how much students have understood the lesson.
Usually, I write lesson evaluation, just after the lesson to show areas of the lessons to which students have shown some signs of difficulties (Teacher A, interview, July 2021).

The two excerpts above indicate that teachers evaluated lessons for the purpose of identifying the level of students’ understanding of the lesson. They frequently use percentage of students who understood the lesson as a yardstick for judging the level of students’ understanding. Higher percentages mean high level of understanding (Excerpt 1). The area of difficulties noted during the lesson is another indicator that the teacher used in the classroom (excerpt 2). These findings imply that teachers evaluate lessons without identifying whether the intended objectives written in their lesson plan were achieved or not.

When teachers were asked how they measured the level of their students’ understanding when teaching in the classroom, they said that it was through asking students oral questions whereby correct answers from students were judged as indicator for students’ understanding. On elaborating students understanding of a lesson, teacher A said:

I discovered that 60% of the class understood the lesson. They responded well to my questions. They mentioned correct answers, though not all of them responded, but the majority answered my questions correctly. Even in class presentation, most of the students understood the lesson. Yah, for this, I am sure (Teacher A, July 2021).

The above quote indicated that the teacher used oral questions to test students’ level of understanding. This implies that teachers mixed lesson evaluation with lesson assessment. Oral questions are one of the tools for assessing the lesson. Lesson assessment always shows the indicators for lesson evaluation. This means teachers have to collect all evidence on whether the intended lesson tasks had been accomplished or not.

When teachers were probed to describe the criteria used to evaluate PE lessons, they responded that they used test, quizzes and examinations. On the criteria used for lesson evaluation, one of PE teacher explained:

I use tests to assess if students in a class have understood this topic. I want to know how much students understood the lesson well. I use examination as means to observe if 80% of the students in my class understood lesson (Teacher B, Post class interview, July 2021).

The excerpt above indicates that teachers use examinations to test students’ understanding of the lesson. Although teachers mentioned
examination as a tool for assessing the level of their students understanding of the lesson, in actual lesson session, the examination is difficult to apply due to limited time.

Generally, findings revealed that PE teachers show little attention on the best way to write lesson evaluation in their lesson plan documents. The sampled lesson evaluation statements lacked a link with lesson objectives and lesson assessment. The common phrases in the observed lesson plans included “understanding of the lesson” expressed either in percentage or number of students in the class. The findings further revealed that the purpose of lesson evaluation to teachers was to test students’ understanding of a given lesson. According to conceptual framework, teachers should develop lesson evaluation from the results of lesson assessment done at every stage of the lesson. Teachers in this study mentioned correct responses of oral questions as a tool for lesson evaluation rather than lesson assessment. In addition, tests, quizzes and examinations are used as the criteria for lesson evaluation. On this basis, teachers interchangeably use lesson evaluation with lesson assessment. Additionally, teachers interchangeably use lesson evaluation with evaluation of the programme whereby the former is always done immediately after the teaching of the lesson and the latter is always done after certain specific time such as mid or end of the term.

Classroom Environment
The classroom environment delineates four wall room or play ground where teaching of PE lessons take place. Findings from teachers’ interviews concerning availability and condition of playgrounds indicated that there was shortage of playgrounds for some sports and poor state of the available playgrounds in secondary schools. Teacher B in elaborating availability and state of playgrounds in secondary schools had this to say:

Our handball court is not good. You can bounce a ball on hard surface. The dribbling could have been good if our court had hard surface. But you could see the ball going this way and that way since our court is full of sand. Ok, let us continue, the students will learn slowly (Teacher B, post class interview, July 2021).

Teacher A also had this to say:

For sure, playgrounds for games like Basketball and Volleyball are challenging in this school. Our school has no well-constructed Basketball court. So, we hire from one higher education institution (Name concealed). It takes half an hour
until our students arrive to the playground and after the game, they go back to school late. Sometimes, they miss some other lessons that follow after PE sessions (Teacher A, post class interview, July, 2021).

The above quote indicates that the condition of playground was not conducive for practical lessons. Every open space in school compounds is almost a built area (excerpt 2). Teachers in curbing shortage of sports facilities hire sports facilities from nearby education institution but they consume more time as they walk from their school to another education institution to search for best playgrounds.

Generally, findings revealed the shortage and poor condition of playgrounds in secondary schools. Open spaces around schools used for new building structures. Shortage of and poor conditions of playgrounds likely limit appropriate demonstration and performance of sports skills during PE lessons. These findings, therefore, concur with Tarigan, Priyono and Rahajo (2018) who found that there were insufficient facilities and infrastructure for teaching PE in Paschal secondary schools in Hanoi, Vietnam. For teachers to facilitate the teaching of PE in such a situation, they are encouraged to be creative and innovative.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the objectives, it is pertinent to conclude that PE teachers did not follow the directives given by the PE syllabus for secondary schools (2005). The findings from interviews revealed that teachers preach the student-centred teaching approach theoretically but practically they use the teacher centred teaching approach when teaching in the classroom. The dominant teaching method was lecture. The dominant teachers’ activities were explanation and oral questions and very few demonstrations. The students’ prevalent activities were writing notes, listening, answering oral questions as well as practising unguided sports activities. The assessment in the classroom is not focused and most of the questions asked questions aimed at making students prepare for the final examination rather than mastery of skills. Teachers also prepared their schemes of work and lesson plan documents occasionally.

Moreover, teachers do not link their current lessons with their previous ones or life experiences when teaching in the classroom. During lessons, the common interaction was teacher class interaction and teacher group interaction. In addition, the poor condition of sports facilities in school
compounds affects teachers’ pedagogical practices. Generally, there are poor teachers’ pedagogical practices in teaching PE in secondary schools in Tanzania.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Based on study findings, it is recommended that:

a) Teachers should improve their pedagogical practices by abiding by the requirements of the syllabus and making effective use of their local environment. They have to take time to recall and improve the essential elements of their pedagogical practices.

b) In order to improve teachers’ pedagogical practices, the teaching facilities including playgrounds for various sports should be built in all schools offering PE.

c) The quality assurance officers should pay attention to the quality of lesson preparation documents, lesson presentation and evaluation. They should pay special attention to appropriate lesson objectives, teaching/learning and assessment activities as well as lesson evaluation. Teachers’ choices on teaching approaches should tie with those recommended in the syllabus for PE, that is, the student-centred teaching approaches.

d) Teachers should put emphasis on the use of the student/learner centred teaching approaches in the classroom. In each lesson, teachers should develop skills on how to include learners learning diversity into their respective lessons.

e) Training is needed for PE teachers to acquaint them with competence-based curriculum (CBC) in order to use appropriate pedagogical practices needed for imparting PE competencies to students.
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