

## ❖ PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT

### FEEDBACK AND FORWARD IN LEARNING PEDAGOGY

COJOCARIU VENERA-MIHAELA<sup>1</sup>

#### Abstract

Experience has shown that learning pedagogy is not such an easy task for the students of Physical Education and Sports specialization who opted for teacher training.

#### Research objectives:

1. identifying typical mistakes in solving assessment tasks;
2. presenting/analysing assessment results from the perspective of typical mistakes;
3. formulating interactive ways of overcoming the identified typical mistakes.

**Research content:** The study proposes a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the typical mistakes found in learning pedagogy on the occasion of a summative assessment process. The evaluation sample has been applied to a number of 41 students in the second year of didactic training.

**Conclusions:** We intend, on the basis of the identified typical errors, to illustrate, by means of the “mirror” procedure, interactive ways of overcoming them, the more so as their initial didactic training will continue with specialty and practical training.

**Key words:** initial didactic training, typical mistakes, assessment.

<sup>1</sup>Department of Teacher Training, “Vasile Alecsandri” University of Bacău, ROMANIA  
Received 17.02.2011 / Accepted 14.04.2011

#### 1. Argument and objectives

Every teacher knows that the results of his/her teaching activity are visible and recognized in relation to at least *two indicators* of his/her students' personal as well as professional evolution, both equally important and relevant: *the level of training* of his/her beneficiaries as well as the *learning motivation*, the interest in continuing studies and, implicitly, in maintaining a permanent educational effort.

This is precisely why the assessment process is constantly subjected to a wave of conceptual analyses and definitions, resumed and increasingly approached through the magnifier of theoretical knowledge and school practice to achieve the best possible coverage so that, step by step, the optimization of teaching – learning – assessment is simultaneously achieved.

Assessment seems, for many beginner teachers, an *easy process* (of the type of applying an evaluation test) and a *conclusion* (simple but less desired by students and often associated with overrating stress and

worries) of the teaching – learning process towards which they situate themselves separately, subsequently and finally.

Although initial didactic training courses include, as a self-contained part, the theory and practice of assessment, this (due to issues, volume, number of hours, the students' age and their lack of experience in the field) is difficult to assimilate adequately and wholly and, especially, cannot compensate for the lack of an overall didactic outlook which takes time to form.

Starting from here and in the context of almost 25 years of experience in the field of training activities for the didactic career at the Faculty of Movements, Sports and Health (a practical field par excellence where both specialized training activities as well as assessments are of high practical significance), we have obviously reached such questions as: How should the evaluation tests be conceived for the subject of Pedagogy so as to take into consideration this particularity? Is the current structure of the evaluation test relevant to what these students know and can do?

Do the obtained results tell us significant things concerning their level of didactic training? If yes, what exactly? If not, why not? What decisions should be made on the basis of the results obtained?

These findings and issues were the foundation of setting the following *research objectives*:

1. Establishing a set of skills as aims of the pedagogy course;
2. Achieving the didactic process and the formative assessment in the study of pedagogic subjects in terms of forming/practising the established skills;
3. Insuring the process of summative evaluation by applying a sample of evaluation built from the perspective of the established skills;
4. Analysing the results obtained in terms of the level of acquiring the established skills;
5. Identifying typical mistakes and setting up some interactive ways of overcoming them.

To that effect, as a first step, we have proceeded to the identification and analysis of present specialized bibliographical references on the topic of assessment, particularly its forms and functions. Secondly, we have proceeded to the punctual analysis of the results of the evaluation test (applied during the winter session, February 2010, to a group of 41 students from the Faculty of Movements, Sports and Health) approaching the established skills with a view to identifying typical mistakes and establishing some interactive ways of overcoming them.

We suggest, as a basic meaning of the term, the one provided by Palomba and Banta (1999). According to the mentioned authors, "assessment is the systematic collection, review, and use of information about educational programs undertaken for the purpose of improving student learning and development." And also in agreement with them, we shall claim, in the spirit of our study, that "Educators can meet their responsibility to the public, and to their students, through assessment. The ultimate goal of assessment is continual improvement of student learning".

Numerous professional sites have been posting documents during the last 5 years where both the forms and functions of assessment are analysed and highlighted (C. Worsnop, 2010; D. Huinker, and J. Freckmann, 2009; M. Heritage, 2009; M.K. Burns, 2008; D.G. Wren, 2008; Z.M., Baroudi, 2007; D.J., Nicol, and D. Macfarlane-Dick, 2006; P. Shank, 2005). Based on these, we intend to address in our study a certain way of achieving summative assessment which aims at playing a formative function.

From this point of view, identifying *typical mistakes* that occur during the process of solving the evaluation test becomes a key point. We shall demonstrate that analysing them and insuring interactive and interdisciplinary ways of overcoming

them (by drawing on the study of the subjects' didactics and the subjects' pedagogic practice) may be steps in the process of professional and personal development (by covering the stages of awareness, involvement, operationalization, correction, development).

## 2. Skills and their summative/formative assessment

We have discovered, in a number of online studies, a new aspect of pedagogic approaches: what we call, with a good aim of proceeding to accurate conceptual delimitations, *assessment forms* (formative and summative) is analysed as representing *assessment functions* (C. Worsnop, 2010; Functions of evaluation, 2009; The Functions of Assessment, 2009; What is a Formative Assessment?, 2008). This re-orientation of the term was led by M. Scriven (1967) who coined the concepts of formative and summative assessment in the context of curriculum assessment. To suggest the best distinction between them, we may appeal to a comparison belonging to Bob Stake, (apud (Functions of evaluation, 2009) according to whom "When the cook tastes the soup, that's formative; when the guests taste the soup, that's summative." Subsequently, most of the approaches have increased the size of the function at the expense of the form of assessment.

As a support to our idea from the beginning of the study according to which assessment should highlight the students' *level of training* and should stimulate the *learning motivation*, we should also mention the distinction made by the Assessment Reform Group (1999, apud Why develop thinking and assessment for learning in the classroom, 2009) between *assessing learning* and *assessment for learning* described in the following words: "A clear distinction should be made between *assessment of learning* for the purpose of grading and reporting, which has its own well-established procedure, and *assessment for learning*, which calls for different priorities, new procedures and new commitment." In essence, assessment for learning is finding out where a learner is (A), knowing and making explicit where the learner needs to get to (B) and most importantly showing the learner *how* to get there. It is essential that the *learner* takes action in order to reach B.



This approach opens broad opportunities for highlighting the complementarity of assessment forms and for supporting the possibilities of achieving its functions in a relatively simultaneous way.

In fact, the way of analysing and approaching the evaluation test and its results will support the idea

that “All assessments can be summative (i.e., have the potential to serve a summative function), but only some have the additional capability of serving formative functions.” (apud What is a Formative Assessment?, 2008) Agreeing with this viewpoint, we reckon that these definitions suggest that, unlike what Bloom described, an assessment activity need not be embedded within day-to-day instructional activities and provide immediate feedback in order to serve a formative function. Instead, various types of assessments can serve formative functions if they identify and provide information that is effectively used to correct learning deficiencies (idem). On this ground, we will further use the term of “*summative/formative assessment*” and we shall demonstrate the way in which a summative assessment test can enrich itself with an additional formative quantum.

To carry out our study we have established, at the beginning of the 1<sup>st</sup> semester of the 2009 – 2010 academic year, a set of 6 skills that we have reckoned as fundamental and relevant to the pedagogic training of our students. The entire didactic process in terms of both course and seminar was carried out to the effect of their training. Also, the formative assessment conducted during the entire duration of the 1<sup>st</sup> semester aimed at the same skills and the mark thus obtained had a 50% share of the final mark (calculated as the arithmetic mean between the mark from the formative assessment and the mark from the exam). The summative/formative assessment from the exam session of February 2010 also focused upon the same skills. The test consisted in 6 items, with 90 points and 10 points ex officio and lasted for 2 hours.

The skills which represented our area of interest, the corresponding items as well as the percentages given within the evaluation test are the following:

1. C1: The ability to identify the truth value of pedagogic statements

I1: Determine, by circling, the truth or false value of the following statements: ;

P1: 16.67% (15 points);

2. C2: The ability to integrate notions

I2: Fill in the right side of the table with notions of a wider sphere than the given ones: ;

P2: 18.89% (17 points);

3. C3: The ability to materialize in/correlate with the didactic practice

I3: Illustrate, in the following table, the required aspects: ;

P3: 14.44% (13 points);

4. C4: Ability of abstractization/generalization

I4: Identify the pedagogic concept corresponding to the statements below for each separate case:

P4: 16.67% (15 points);

5. C5: The ability to identify mistakes and use pedagogic language in short statements

I5: Identify and underline the pedagogic mistake/mistakes in each of the following statements. Rephrase them so that they are correct: ;

P5: 22.22% (20 points);

6. C6: The ability to use pedagogic language in building a professional demonstration

I6: Analyse briefly, at your choice, one of the didactic methods you have studied (definition, explanation, strong points, restrictions). Give three examples of integrating them in specialty lessons;

P6: 11.11% (10 points)

As one can see, it has been built on the basis of *respecting the didactic principles*, particularly four of them, the ones regarding the formative nature of assessment, insuring the connection between theory and practice, systematization and continuity, and accessibility.

### 3. Several aspects of forming pedagogical skills

The quantitative and qualitative analysis that we have applied to the evaluation test's results has led us towards emphasizing the following outcomes:

C1: The ability to identify the truth value of pedagogic statements

I1: Determine, by circling, the truth or false value of the following statements: ;

P1: 16.67% (15 points);

1. 509 points have been obtained out of a *maximum* total of 615 points, respectively, an average of 12.41 points have been obtained out of a *maximum* total of 15 points per item, meaning that the degree of achieving C1 is 82.76%;

2. The lowest score, namely 9 points, obtained by 2 students (4.87%), also represents the lowest level of acquiring the ability (60%) and the highest level, 14 points, obtained by 4 students (9.75%), highlights the highest level of acquiring it (93.33%);

3. There is no score lower than 9 points, no student got the maximum score;

4. The most numerous performances of students for this item were those which got 12 points, a total of 13 students (31.70%) together with those of 13 points, a total of 12 students (29.26%), that is, in all, 25 students have achieved 60.97%, which insures the group's overall high level of acquiring the skill (82.76%);

5. The 4 students who obtained the highest score (14 points) made just one mistake each when considering the statement “Problematization is one of the most acknowledged heuristic methods” as being false;

6. And the 2 students who obtained the lowest score (9 points) have made the same mistake;

7. Analysing all the evaluation tests, we have found that this mistake was a typical one, a number of 30 students having made the same mistake and only 11 of them having chosen the correct version, that is, obtained an average of 0.26 points per item, the lowest of the 15;

8. The second typical mistake that we have identified concerns the statement "Practical tests assess the students' ability to explain certain theoretical knowledge, their practical skills and abilities" as true;

9. Only 16 students assessed the statement as false, the other 25 students being mistaken, assessing the statement as true and obtaining an average of 0.39 points per item;

10. What is interesting is the fact that the 2 typical mistakes that were found were made according to some reversed logic (choosing false when true should have been chosen and vice-versa);

11. In terms of their origin, whereas the first one looks rather like a language mistake (probably due to lack of acquiring the term heuristic), the second one seems to have been caused by lack of attention, by ignoring the first part of the demonstration in the statement and focusing only on the second part which could have made, by itself, the statement to be true.

C2: Ability to integrate notions

I2: Fill in the right side of the table with notions of a wider sphere than the given ones ;

P2: 18.89% (17 points);

1. 446 points have been obtained out of a maximum total of 697, namely, an average of 10.87 points has been obtained out of a maximum total of 17 points per item, meaning that the degree of achieving C2 is 62.19%;

2. The lowest score, namely 7 points, obtained by 3 students (7.31%), also represents the lowest degree of acquiring the skill (41.17%) and the highest level, 14 points, obtained by 1 student (2.435%), highlights the highest level of acquiring it (82.35%);

3. There is no score lower than 7 points, no student has obtained the maximum score;

4. The most numerous performances of students for this item have been the ones of 13 points, a total of 6 students (14.63%) together with those of 11 points, also 6 students (14.63%), that is, 12 students have achieved 29.26%, which also insures the group's second degree of acquiring the skill (62.19%);

5. The student who got the highest score (14 points) made two mistakes, when integrating the notions of "didactic methods" and "generation 2", and by leaving an empty space at another notion (the assessment function).

6. The three students who got the lowest score (7 points) have, among their mistakes, the ones previously emphasized;

7. Analysing all the evaluation tests, we have found that the notional integration mistake for the concept of "didactic methods" is a typical error, a number of 39 students having made this mistake and only 2 of them

having integrated it correctly, that is, obtained an integration average of 0.04, lowest of the 17;

8. The second typical mistake that we have identified concerns the integration of the notion of "assessment function";

9. Only 16 students have integrated the concept correctly, the other 25 students having made the operation wrongly, obtaining an average of 0.39 points per statement;

C3: The ability to materialize in/correlate with the didactic practice

I3: Illustrate, in the following table, the required aspects ;

P3: 14.44% (13 points);

1. 306.5 have been obtained out of a maximum total of 533 points, namely, an average of 7.47 has been obtained out of a maximum total of 13 points per item, meaning that the degree of achieving C3 is 57.49%;

2. The lowest score, 4 points, obtained by 2 students (4.87%), also expresses the lowest degree of acquiring the skill (30.76%) and the highest score, 11.25 points, obtained by 1 student (2.43%), highlights the highest degree of acquiring it (86.53%);

3. There is no score lower than 4 points, no student got the maximum score;

4. The most numerous performances of students obtained for this item were the ones of 8 points, a total of 9 students (21.95%);

5. The student who got the highest score (11.25 points) has made one mistake (in illustrating the notion of "forms of planning") and partially exemplified a concept once (2 links of a specialty lesson);

6. The two students who got the lowest score (4 points) also have the previously mentioned error among theirs;

7. Analysing the tests, we have found that the two exemplification errors previously mentioned do not express typical mistakes but, on the contrary, the percentage of correct solutions is high, 82.92% for both concepts, 34 of the students having managed to make an adequate illustration;

8. The only typical mistake that was found concerns the exemplification of "2 questions of controversy";

9. A number of 24 students have incorrectly exemplified the concept, obtaining an average of 0.41 points per item;

10. In terms of its origin, there may be the assumption that, due to the particularity of the field for which initial training is provided, this type of task is further away from the students' background and their school experience.

C4: Ability of abstractization/generalization

I4: Identify the pedagogic concept corresponding to the statements below for each separate case:

P4: 16.67% (15 points);

1. 342 points have been obtained out of a maximum total of 615 points, namely, an average of 8.34 points has been obtained out of a maximum total of 15 points per item, meaning that the degree of achieving C4 is 55.60%;

2. The lowest score, namely *4.5 points*, obtained by *1 student (2.43%)*, also expresses the lowest degree of acquiring the skill (*30%*) and the highest degree, *12 points*, also obtained by *1 student (2.43%)*, highlights the highest degree of acquiring it (*80%*);
  3. There is no score lower than 4.5 points, no student got the maximum score;
  4. The most numerous performances of students for this item were the ones of *9.5 points*, a total of *6 students (14.63%)* together with the ones of *8 points*, a total of *5 students (12.19%)*, meaning that 11 students have achieved 26.82%;
  5. The student with the highest score (12 points) made *two mistakes*, by incorrectly abstracting case 2 “Throughout this lesson, the most important ideas of the chapter are updated, organized, applied and noted schematically” and case 11 “By watching the teacher perform and by trying it themselves, with their own hands, students understand much better”, and by partially generalizing other 2 cases (cases 14 and 15);
  6. The student with the lowest score (4.5 points) has incorrectly abstracted all the 4 cases mentioned above, too;
  7. Analysing all the evaluation tests, we have found that out of the 4 cases susceptible of being typical errors previously identified, only one is in this situation and that is case 11. A number of *37 students (90.24%)* have made mistakes in the generalization and abstraction process and only *4 of them (9.76%)* have chosen the correct version, obtaining a case average of *0.09 points*, the smallest of them being 15;
  8. The way of solving the other 3 cases does not show typical mistakes, but, on the contrary, the percentage of correct solutions is high, as follows: case 2.58, 53%, 24 of the students managed to do a correct abstraction; cases 14 and 15, similarly, 90.24%, only 4 students having made mistakes;
  9. Concerning the origin of the mistake, one may reckon, based on reading and analysing the solutions provided by students, that the exercise of abstraction and generalization has to be resumed and consolidated. Most of the solutions are the result of insufficient analysis, either due to conceptual errors or to various partial and superficial approaches;
- C5: The ability to identify mistakes and use pedagogic language in short statements
- I5: Identify and underline the pedagogic mistake/mistakes in each of the following statements. Rephrase them so that they are correct: ;
- P5: 22.22% (20 points);
1. 217.75 have been obtained out of a *maximum* total of 820 points, namely, an average of *5.31* has been obtained out of a maximum total of *20 points* per item, meaning that the degree of achieving C5 is 26.55%;
  2. The lowest score, namely *1 point*, obtained by *1 student (2.43%)*, also expresses the lowest level of acquiring the skill (*5%*) and the highest score, *14.5 points*, also obtained by *1 student (2.43%)*, highlights the highest degree of acquiring it (*72.5%*);
  3. There is no score lower than 1 point, no student got the maximum score;
  4. One cannot reckon that there is a part of students who managed to mark a significant accumulation of points, these being dispersed throughout the entire interval from 1 point to 14.5 with 3 frequencies at the highest;
  5. The student who got the highest score (*14.5 points*) made mistakes either in identifying only partially the errors in the given statements (cases 3, 4, 5, 9), or in rephrasing only partially correct the wrong statements (cases 3, 4, 5, 6, 9);
  6. And the student who got the lowest score (1 point) partially rephrased the statement in case 1, having worked nothing for the others, neither by underlining nor by rephrasing;
  7. In order to be able to formulate conclusions concerning the obtained results, we shall approach the 2 different tasks of the item, namely *underlining errors in the text* and *rephrasing correctly the statements*;
  8. As far as *underlining errors in the text* is concerned, the analysis of evaluation tests has shown that there is a statement whose errors have been identified with a 100% accuracy (statement 1) (“In gymnasium classes story-telling, as an alternative to explanations, is used for a clearer presentation of knowledge and to attract students”). There are, accordingly, 2 statements, number 6 and 9, whose errors have been least identified through underlining (14.63%, respectively 26.82%) (statement 6 “The curricular model of planning is focused on contents, indicating exactly what should be learned during the training-educational process and is essentially different from the model of planning by instalment”; statement 9 “There is a didactic method which has long been considered ‘the golden rule of didactics’ and which can be used only in recapitulation lessons”);
  9. Therefore, one may reckon that the *degree of correct identification of errors by text underlining* is a *good one*, the arithmetic mean of the group being, from this point of view, 64%;
  10. One cannot say the same about the ability of correctly rephrasing statements where there is a great gap between two means of dealing with the task: that of non-respondents and that of respondents;
  11. Specifically, there are *statements with a very high level of non-respondents* (statements 6 and 9, where 37 students, namely 90.24%, failed) but also a *statement with a low level of non-respondents* (statement 1, where only 3 students, representing 7.31% of the group succeeded). These data are fully in agreement with the result previously presented in the sub-item h, emphasizing which are the statements perceived as being the simplest and which are those regarded as having the highest degree of difficulty;
  12. At the level of the group, *the arithmetic mean of non-respondents* for item 5 is *high*, 51.72%, meaning that more than half the students did not know how to rephrase correctly although a large number of these,

64%, had managed to correctly identify and underline the errors. It results that at least 5 students (12.30%) who, although having correctly identified the errors in the statements, do not know how to construct their correct form, do not have the knowledge or language needed to complete the task;

13. By reference to students who did complete the task, we noticed that their percentage is 48.28%, a percent that we regard as *low*, taking into consideration that it represents less than half the students;

14. The presentation of identified typical errors will be done in reference to the number of answers given by students. One can notice that there are statements where *the weight of wrong answers* is expressed by a *relatively low percentage* (statement 1, 7.89%; statement 8, 12.5%; statement 7, 14.81%; statement 4, 15%);

15. Unlike these, there is a series of statements where *error percentage is high*, as in the case of statements 6, 75% and 9, 50%;

16. In terms of received answers on the whole, the *percentage of wrong answers is 27.42%*;

17. This result in itself may not seem too weak but, in fact, we regard it as *very worrying*, especially by reference to the percentage of non-respondents;

18. Corroborated, the 2 categories of results reveal the fact that whereas more than half the students (51.72%) do not know how to solve the situation, even more than a quarter (27.42%) of the respondents (48, 28%) do it wrongly. This actually means that 5 out of 20 students give wrong answers;

19. The overall number of answers comprised 41 *mistakes*. This may look as a very good result in itself (an average of one mistake per paper!) but, in fact, this number of mistakes should be related to the number of respondents, namely 20. In this context, the result doubles and we get an average of 2 *mistakes per paper* plus the large number of non-respondents (21);

20. Among the identified errors, most of them are in tests 3 and 8, 6 *errors each*, and tests 5 and 14, 5 *errors each*. Accordingly, there is a number of 8 tests where only one mistake has been identified;

21. *The greatest number of errors, 6, representing 14,63%*, was found for statement 3 “Doing homework is a highly efficient form of group organization and means, in pedagogic language, achieving performance” ;

22. *The lowest number of errors, 2, representing 4.87%*, was found for statements 8 (“Measuring is one of the most important didactic principles”) and 9 (“There is a didactic method which has long been regarded as ‘the golden rule of didactics’ and which can only be used in recapitulation lessons”);

23. The analysis of errors occurring at item 5 highlight the existence of *the first typical error*: mistaking retention for achieving performance in doing homework (all the 6 students who were mistaken about this statement made the same confusion);

24. *The second typical mistake* that we have identified consists in accepting the fact that doing homework is a form of group organization, namely, not correcting the fact that it is an individual form;

25. 5 out of the 6 students who were wrong concerning this statement accepted the statement as being correct and one of them substituted “group organization” with “frontal organization”, generating yet another incorrect statement which means that the error margin is highest in this case, too;

26. *The third typical mistake* that we have identified consists in not recognising the principle which underlies a recapitulation activity and ignoring the error from the last part of statement 5, implicitly not correcting it adequately: “When the teacher makes a recapitulation at the end of one chapter, s/he obeys the principle of intuition and mainly works alone”. All the 5 students who made this mistake worked in the same way;

27. *The fourth typical mistake* that we have identified consists in not correcting the syntagm “practical test for assessing knowledge” for 4 students out of the 5 who were mistaken in statement 2;

28. Concerning their origin, we may reckon that at least the first three of them may be due to the relative gap between the task and the particularities of the field of physical education.

C6: The ability to use pedagogic language in building a professional demonstration

I6: Analyse briefly, at your choice, one of the didactic methods you have studied (definition, explanation, strong points, restrictions). Give three examples of integrating them in specialty lessons;

P6: 11.11% (10 points)

1. 88 *points* have been obtained out of a maximum total of 410 *points*, namely an average of 2.14 has been obtained out of a maximum total of 10 *points* per item, meaning that the degree of achieving C6 is 21.46%;

2. The lowest score, namely 1 *point*, obtained by 5 *students* (12.19%), also represents the lowest level of acquiring the skill (10%) and the highest score, 8 *points*, obtained by 1 *student* (2.43%), highlights the highest level of acquiring it (80%);

3. There is no score lower than 1 point, no student got the maximum score;

4. The most numerous performances of students for this item were the ones with 2 *points*, a total of 16 *students* (39.02%);

5. The student who got the highest score (8 *points*) uses a correct, yet incomplete, discourse, but has no mistakes;

6. 4 out of the 5 students who obtained the lowest score (1 *point*) use a correct, yet infantile, discourse, but have

no mistakes, whereas one of them made one mistake, that of identifying the “method” with the “process”;

7. There is a quite large number of non-respondent students (7, that is, 17.07%) and also 2 students (4.87%) who, although started the analysis, did not obtain any score, who sum up 21.94%, almost a quarter of the students, which confirms the quite low degree of achieving C6;

8. Analysing all the assessment tests of respondents, we have counted a number of 12 mistakes, meaning less than half an error per student (0.37);

9. Though the result is apparently good, in fact it must be correlated to the large number of those who did not get any points at all (9, that is, 21.95%), and to the large number of only started or scarcely developed analyses (24 tests, 58.53%), the probability of producing mistakes being very small due to the rather short text;

10. Analysing all the evaluation tests of the respondents, we have found that there is one single case where we have identified 2 errors in the text, while in the others there was only one mistake per test;

11. 9 (75%) out of the 12 mistakes concern the identification of the “method” with the “process” in defining/analysing the selected methods (for example: Observation is the process ...). In two tests (16.67%), the mistake which occurs refers to identifying the “object” with the “objective” and in one single case (8.33%) the “method” is mistaken for the “principle”;

12. Based on these results, one may reckon that there is one single typical mistake, the first of the previously analysed. The cause may be a general one related to the particularities of young people’s language, specifically, a certain type of abbreviating statements by omitting the proximal genre and passing directly to specific difference in building definitions.

### Conclusions

Such an *analysis and self-reflection exercise* concerning the way in which we assess our students is *needed, significantly useful* and could extend and amplify its effects if it were carried out *systematically* and *in teams* by all the specialists who ensure the teachers’ training for the various didactic specializations.

On the whole, the results of the study are summarized in Table 1:

C	Points	Weight within the test	Achievement percentage	Minimum score	Maximum score	Typical errors
C1	15	16.67	82.76 %	9	14	2
C2	17	18.89	62.19 %	7	14	2

C3	13	14.44	57.49 %	4	11.25	1
C4	15	16.67	55.60 %	4.5	12	1
C5	20	22.22	26.55 %	1	14.5	4
C6	10	11,11	21.46 %	1	8	1
	90	100	51%	26	85.75	11

Table 1

Based on this, we may draw several *conclusions*:

1. *The percentage of acquiring the skills drops from the first item (82.76%) to the last (21.46%), as the items aim at more complex skills and propose tasks more difficult to complete;*

2. *The most developed (82.76%) is C1, namely “The ability to determine the truth value of pedagogic statements” and the least highlighted are C5 (26.55%), “The ability to identify errors and use pedagogic language in short statements” and C6 (21.46%), “The ability to use pedagogic language in building professional demonstrations”;*

3. Taking into consideration the fact that the two skills have in common *the development, mastery and use of pedagogic language* and had, together, 33.33% of the test (that is, a third of what has been assessed) we may reckon that this is the weak point of the students’ training, obviously correlated to *the lack of field knowledge*, emphasized by the great percentage of non-respondents for the last two tasks, as has been shown throughout the analysis;

4. The systematization of typical error is contained in Table 2:

C1	2	1. “Problematization is one of the best-known heuristic methods” (F); 2. “Practical tests assess the students’ ability of explaining certain theoretical information, their practical abilities and skills” (A) (wrong choices);
C2	2	1. “didactic methods” (incorrect integration); 2. “assessment function” (incorrect integration);
C3	1	1. failure to illustrate “2 questions of controversy”
C4	1	1. “Watching the way in which the teacher performs and trying it with their own hands, students understand much better” (wrong generalization and abstractization)
C5	4	1. mistaking retention for achieving performance in doing homework;

		2. agreeing with the fact that doing homework is a form of group organization, namely, not correcting the fact that it is actually an individual form; 3. not recognizing the principle which underlies a recapitulation activity and not recognizing the fact that it is a frontal or group activity and not predominantly individual; 4. mistaking the “practical assessment test” for one assessing knowledge
C6	1	1. identifying the “method” with the “process”

Table 2

5. The 11 typical errors integrated in the process of forming pedagogic competences may be corrected by a continuous and interdisciplinary effort, from the perspective of the subjects of D.P.P.D. which students are going to attend to after completing the Pedagogy course, especially through the Didactics of the subject and the Pedagogy practice;

6. This fact is even more likely as the 6 skills aimed at can be developed in all subjects of study integrated to the didactic training and assessed in all exams, including those for obtaining a full job as a teacher and those for obtaining didactic degrees;

7. We further offer several suggestions for correcting and reducing their weight, in integrated modalities that may aim at all or only some of them:

1. For the didactics of the subject: systematizations and illustrations of didactic methods integrable to the class of Physical Education; the method of the double-entry diary for correlating lesson events (generally) to those of the physical education lesson; comparative approaches to individual, group and frontal organization; exercises in heuristic conversation with questions of controversy or with distinguishing these from other categories of questions; brainstorming exercises for correct definitions; the game of antonyms (heuristic-algorithmic; summative assessment – formative assessment; assessing knowledge – assessing skills and abilities; passive – active; individual – frontal;

2. For pedagogic practice: observing and identifying the methods the teacher uses during the lesson, followed by a brief theoretical characterization of the process (definition, classification, particularities, value, restrictions); the analysis of some lesson sequences, focused on a certain pedagogic aspect (the principles obeyed, the methods used, the integrated and used means, the performed event of the lesson, the type of assessment used); writing a 5-minute essay at the end of the practice day to emphasize the strategies used, the

activities of the lesson, the achievement of performance; the fractional achievement of a lesson plan (the complete planning of only one link) and analysing it within the practice group, together with the mentor; drawing out versions of planning for links of the lesson, presenting and discussing them; identifying and analysing the typical errors occurred during the didactic planning process, in preparing sample lessons.  
8. As one can see, all the suggestions we have provided may contribute, on the one hand, to *correcting typical errors* identified and analysed in our study and, obviously, to *increasing* our students' *quality of didactic training*.

The difficulty aspects of learning pedagogy and of training for the didactic career can be diminished by a comprehensive practical-applicative, continuous and interdisciplinary approach, by unification and convergence of the efforts of teachers involved in this field of academic training.

Approaches related to knowing students, their theoretical and practical background, their intellectual and motivational dimension, respecting them and making training available are as important as in the pre-academic education if not even more important, considering the fact that we are in the field of training trainers.

#### REFERENCES

- BAROUDI, Z., M., 2007**, *Formative Assessment: Definition, Elements and Role in Instructional Practice* in Post-Script: Postgraduate Journal of Education Research, Vol. 8(1), August 2007, pp. 37-48, [http://www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au/research/resources/student\\_res/postscriptfiles/vol8/Ziad\\_Baroudi.pdf](http://www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au/research/resources/student_res/postscriptfiles/vol8/Ziad_Baroudi.pdf), 29 Mar. 2010;
- BURNS, M., K., 2008**, *What is Formative Evaluation?* <http://www.cehd.umn.edu/reading/documents/FAQ/FormativeEval.pdf>, 23 Mar. 2010;
- HERITAGE, M., 2009**, *Knowing What To Do Next: The Hard Part of Formative Assessment*, Paper presented at the Association of Educational Assessment – Europe, Tenth Annual Conference, November 5-7, 2009, Valletta, Malta, [http://www.aea-europe.net/userfiles/p9%20Heritage\\_Knowing%20What%20to%20do%20Next.doc](http://www.aea-europe.net/userfiles/p9%20Heritage_Knowing%20What%20to%20do%20Next.doc), 28 Mar. 2010;
- HUINKER, D. & FRECKMANN, J., 2009**, *Linking Principles of Formative Assessment to Classroom Practice*, in Wisconsin Teacher of Mathematics, Spring 2009, [http://www4.uwm.edu/Org/mmp/PDFs/Yr7\\_PD Fs/formative-assessment-huinker-freckman09.pdf](http://www4.uwm.edu/Org/mmp/PDFs/Yr7_PD Fs/formative-assessment-huinker-freckman09.pdf), 26 Mar. 2010;

- NICOL, D., J. , MACFARLANE-DICK, D., 2006**, *Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice*, in *Studies in Higher Education* (2006), Vol 31(2), 199-218, [http://tltt.strath.ac.uk/REAP/public/Resources/DN\\_SHE\\_Final.pdf](http://tltt.strath.ac.uk/REAP/public/Resources/DN_SHE_Final.pdf), 2 Apr. 2010;
- PALOMBA, C., A., BANTA, T., W., 1999**, *Assessment Essentials: Planning, Implementing, and Improving Assessment* in Higher Education, Jossey-Bass Publishers: San Francisco;
- SCRIVEN, M., 1967**, *Formative and Summative Evaluation*, p. 41-43, <http://www.hcirn.com/atoz/atozf/formeval.php>, 30 Mar. 2010;
- SHANK, P., 2005**, *Avoiding Assessment Mistakes That Compromise Competence and Quality* in The eLearning Guild's, Learning Solutions, Practical Applications of Technology for Learning, e-Magazine, [http://www.learningpeaks.com/pshank\\_assessmistakes.pdf](http://www.learningpeaks.com/pshank_assessmistakes.pdf), 28 Mar. 2010;
- WORSNOP, C., 2010**, *Types of Assessment*, [http://www.mediaawareness.ca/english/resources/educational/teaching\\_backgrounders/media\\_literacy/types\\_of\\_assessment.cfm](http://www.mediaawareness.ca/english/resources/educational/teaching_backgrounders/media_literacy/types_of_assessment.cfm), 22 Mar. 2010;
- WREN, D., G., 2008**, *Using formative Assessment to increase Learning*, Report from the Department of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment, Number 1, November 6, 2008, [http://www.vbschools.com/accountability/research\\_briefs/ResearchBriefFormAssmtFinal.pdf](http://www.vbschools.com/accountability/research_briefs/ResearchBriefFormAssmtFinal.pdf), 24 Mar. 2010;
- XXX, 2009**, *Functions of evaluation*, [http://www.evalguide.ethz.ch/eval\\_general/functions\\_of\\_evaluation\\_EN](http://www.evalguide.ethz.ch/eval_general/functions_of_evaluation_EN), accesat în 1.IV.2010;
- XXX, 2009**, *The Functions of Assessment*, <http://serc.carleton.edu/introgeo/assessment/function.html>, 21 Mar. 2010;
- XXX, 2009**, *Why develop thinking and assessment for learning in the classroom*, <http://wales.gov.uk/docs/dcells/publications/100301whydeven.doc>, 30 Apr. 2010;
- XXX, 2008**, *What is a Formative Assessment?* în *Educational Measurement Research Bulletin*, Issue 5/2008, [http://www.pearsonedmeasurement.com/bulletin/Formative%20Assessment\\_Bulletin.pdf](http://www.pearsonedmeasurement.com/bulletin/Formative%20Assessment_Bulletin.pdf), 25 Mar. 2010;

