

Hanne Herigstad Mong

Assessment of students with disabilities in physical education

A quantitative research on students in upper secondary schools in Norway

Master thesis in Sport Sciences
Department of Physical Education
Norwegian School of Sport Sciences, 2014

Abstract

The purpose of this master thesis was to write a research article concerning assessment of students with a disability in physical education. Part I in this thesis is the supplementary theory and method being used, and part II is the research article. The main goal for this master thesis was to understand how students with a disability were assessed, and how they perceive the assessment process in physical education. It was also of interest to find out if there were differences between the assessments related to students with a disability and for those without a disability. It is based in a Norwegian context, where there is political support to front inclusion in a comprehensive school. Despite this political support for inclusion, little research has examined how teachers attempt to assess students with a disability. The research question for the article was: *How do students with a disability report the assessment in physical education, and are there any differences between student with and without a disability concerning this?*

The research question was answered through an analysis of the responses given to a major questionnaire concerning assessment in physical education. In order to answer the research question, there were developed seven independent sum-variables as a tool to present the empirical results. The variables were *knowledge concerning the competence aims, knowledge about the assessment criteria, engaging students in assessment for learning, feedback, perceived justice, self-reported movement during the lessons and marks in physical education.*

The results showed differences between students with and without disability on how they perceive the assessment. These differences confirm that teachers do not assess all students in the same way, and that teachers seem unfamiliar with how to assess students with a disability. Students with a disability have less knowledge about the assessment criteria, they get less feedback, perceive the assessment as less fair, move less during lessons, and get lower marks than students without a disability. The results show a difference between students with and without a disability, and students with a disability feel less satisfied with the assessment than those without a disability.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	1
ACKNOWLEDGES	4
PART I:	5
SUPPLEMENTARY THEORY AND METHOD	5
1. INTRODUCTION	6
1.1. ASSESSMENT: POLITICAL DOCUMENTS.....	7
1.2. INCLUSION: POLITICAL DOCUMENTS AND LAWS	9
2. EARLIER RESEARCH ON ASSESSMENT	10
3. INCLUSION OF STUDENTS WITH A DISABILITY IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION	13
3.1 DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES ON DISABILITY	13
3.2.1 TEACHERS ATTITUDES TO INCLUSION	15
3.2.2 STUDENTS EXPERIENCE OF INCLUSION IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION.....	16
4. ASSESSMENT AND STUDENTS WITH A DISABILITY	17
5. METHOD	19
5.1 RESEARCH DESIGN	20
5.1.2 Survey.....	20
5.2.3 The objective for the study.....	21
5.2.4 SAMPLE.....	21
5.2.5. QUESTIONNAIRE.....	23
5.3 OPERATIONALISATION OF TEST-VARIABLES	25
5.4 ANALYSIS OF THE EMPIRICAL DATA.....	26
5.5 VALIDITY/ RELIABILITY.....	27
5.6 ETHICS.....	28
REFERENCES:	30
TABLES:	34
PART II: THE RESEARCH ARTICLE	35
1. INTRODUCTION	36
2. METHOD	40
2.1 PARTICIPANTS.....	41
2.2 INSTRUMENT	42
2.3 OPERATIONALIZATION OF THE VARIABLES	42
3. RESULTS	44
3.1. KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING THE COMPETENCE AIMS	44
3.2. KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA.....	44
3.3 ENGAGING STUDENTS IN ASSESSMENT FOR LEARNING	45
3.4. FEEDBACK.....	45
3.5. PERCEIVED FAIRNESS IN THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS	45
3.6. MOVEMENT DURING THE LESSONS	46
3.7. MARKS IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION	46
4. DISCUSSION	46
5. CONCLUSION	53
REFERENCES:	54
TABLES:	57

Acknowledges

May is ending, and also this long year working with my master project. I am grateful to have been given the opportunity to spend a year working with a subject I am interested in, adapted physical activity. The work now is done, and there is no way back.

I will especially thank my main supervisor Øyvind F. Standal. Your knowledge in adapted physical activity has always inspired me to learn more and work with this topic. Thank you for always being available and guidance during the process.

Thank also to Petter Erik Leirhaug, my second supervisor. You have a great knowledge around assessment, and your enthusiasm influences me. Thank also for letting me work with part of your empirical data; this project had never existed without it. Thank you both for believing in my work!

Thank also to mum and dad for always supporting me. You are always there for me, backing me up and telling me “you can do it” despite all my crazy ideas.

Thank also to my brother Eirik, it means a lot to me that you used some of your time in USA to proofread my work.

A special thank to Egersund Zonta who decided to give their scholarship for 2013-2014 to me. Your economic support helped me during this process.

Least, but not last a big thank also to everyone at master -office 2c. This process had never been the same without you. All the lunch-breaks, small-talks and vin-lottery every Friday. You have made this process more fun!

Hanne H. Mong
Oslo, May 2014

Part I:

Supplementary theory and method

1. Introduction

There is a political vision in Norway of inclusion in comprehensive school (St. meld 18, 2010 -2011). The political vision states that children and young people who come from different social and ethnic backgrounds, religions and languages, are united in a comprehensive school providing high quality education and setting high expectations for learning. Inclusion means positive discrimination where schools must consider the ability and qualities of the individual when planning their pedagogy and their organisation (St.meld 18., 2010 -2011). Students have the right to an inclusive, equal and adapted education through their whole education in every subject, including physical education (NOU, 2001:22; St.meld 18, 2010 -2011). Previous research has found that students with a disability are not being included in physical education in an adequate way (Asbjørnslett and Hemmingsson, 2008; Rage, 2011; Svendby, 2013). The challenges are grounded in the construction of the subject through an ideology focusing on sport and performance, where special types of ability, competence and physiques are being valued, which means that students with a disability are often excluded and marginalised (Svendby, 2013). Valuing these elements will also affect the assessment process in the subject. Assessment is a challenging topic, with different understandings of what should be valued in the subject. If it is challenging to assess regular students, how then can students with a disability be assessed, who might not fit into the construction of the subject? How will such students perceive the assessment they receive in physical education?

One reason for studying this subject is my interest in learning more about different perspectives on physical education, especially in relation to students with a disability. My specialisation in adapted physical education has given me an overview of a great amount of research in the field. There are several studies about inclusion, but little research concerns the assessment in physical education (Jonskås, 2010).

A few studies have presented teachers feeling that they lack the knowledge and competence to assess students with a disability in an adequate way (Haycock and Smith, 2010; Smith and Green, 2004). The small amount of research on this topic, which reveals teachers insecurity about assessing students with a disability, shows a need for more research on this topic.

The aim of this study is to understand how students with a disability are assessed, and how they perceive the assessment process in physical education. It is also of interest to find out if there are differences between the assessments related to students with a disability and for those without a disability. Since the data that will be analysed in this study are collected in Norway this study will have a Norwegian perspective.

The research question for this project is:

How do students with a disability report the assessment in physical education, and are there any differences between students with and without a disability concerning this?

The research question will be answered through an analysis of the responses given to a major questionnaire concerning assessment in physical education.

Further on, there will be a presentation of assessment and inclusion through political documents. Then, earlier research on disability and assessment will be presented, ending with a presentation of the method being used and how the analysis in the project has been done.

1.1. Assessment: Political documents

“Education shall contribute to making pupils aware of what they have learned and what they need to learn to satisfy the competence aims. Assessment and guidance shall contribute to strengthening their motivation for further learning”

(Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2006b, p. 4).

This quotation indicates that students have to know the competence aims of education to work out if they satisfy them. Teachers ought to present the competence aims to the students, and remind them several times of the aims during each semester. Assessment should be a motivational part of education, which encourages students to be actively involved in their education so that they can develop, and it should be integrated so that it forms a natural part of their education (St.meld 47, 1995 - 1996; Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2006b).

The Education Act, the National Curriculum and the Learning Poster are documents that include guidelines for student assessment, while the Ministry of Education makes regulations concerning assessment (Opplæringsloven, 1998; Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2006a). The Ministry develops the competence aims and regulations for each subject, including how this type of education should be implemented in the school (Opplæringsloven, § 3, 1998). The Education Act emphasizes that the student is an active part of the education, and the teacher's responsibility is to carry out education in accordance with the curriculum. The Education Act underscores the Ministry's responsibility for defining how education is supposed to be, and it connects the education and assessment to the Ministry's given decisions (Opplæringsloven, §3, 1998).

The Knowledge Promotion (Kunnskapsløftet) was introduced in 2006 as a result of a new approach to practice, which provided a different focus than the curriculum of the 10- year compulsory schooling in Norway. The new practice was based on the view that Norway's disappointing results in international comparative tests (f.x PISA and TIMSS) (Tveit, 2009) and an evaluation of compulsory school showing a lack of learning-orientated feedback culture (Haug, 2003). The Knowledge Promotion signals a modified practice in Norwegian schools, and it has a different focus from the earlier curricula. The new curriculum is based on different competence aims, aims the students have to achieve. Despite this, the plan provides fewer descriptions of either how to organise learning or how to assess students' learning (Tveit, 2009). The conditions for assessment in physical education are presented in the curriculum, with the focus on the overall competence of the student, which provides the basis for the assessment. A good overall competence reflects the ability to participate in different types of activities of varying complexity (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2006a). The assessment should be based on the individual's skills and competence, and the students should not be compared against each other (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2006a).

One of the biggest differences in the curriculum of physical education was that the teacher should no longer include students' effort when making assessments. However, based on the experiences and statements from the academic environment and the practitioners in the field, on 1. August 2012 a new curriculum in physical education was presented. In this, students' effort was once again emphasized as an important element

when assessing students (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2012). The data for this project was collected before the new curriculum was presented (1 August 2012), so the assessment of the participants that is described is based on the curriculum introduced in 2006.

1.2. Inclusion: Political documents and laws

“Adapted education within the community of pupils is a basic premise of the comprehensive school for all. The education shall be adapted so that the pupils can contribute to the community and also experience the joy of mastering tasks and reaching their goals “ (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2006b, p. 6).

The political vision of the Ministry is to emphasise education in a comprehensive school that provides a common basis and gives the individuals the potential to develop their abilities (St.meld. 47, 1995 -1996). Everyone should be included in the local school, and the education has to be adapted to reflect individual differences (Opplæringsloven § 1, 1998). The schools need a fellowship where everyone can be included, feel joy and not be exposed to bullying (St. meld. 18, 2010 -2011).

As mentioned, inclusion is a fundamental belief in the educational politics of Norway (St.meld. 18, 2010 -2011). The inclusive school is based on beliefs and views of human life, which have respect for human rights and the equality between people. In schools, inclusion means considering children’s and youths’ different abilities, both in schools’ organisation and in their pedagogy. Children with different social backgrounds, religions, ethnicity or languages should be united in one school with high quality education and high expectations in relation to learning (St.meld 18, 2010-2011).

Inclusion and adapted education are fundamental political beliefs, which challenges both political decisions and pedagogical practice (Bachman & Haug, 2006). The challenges these beliefs face relate to an unclear definition of the concept and changes to the political content, as different governments with different ideologies might have different understandings of the concept. This can make it difficult to achieve a clear understanding of the concept. An important objection to excessive focus on the political documents is that they focus on the concept in general and do not take the pedagogical and practical issues into consideration. Political documents do not give any practical suggestions for how to identify or work with the concept of inclusion and adapted education. This makes it difficult to understand how to work with it in the classroom

(Bachman & Haug, 2006).

2. Earlier research on assessment

Assessment and evaluation are two of the most important topics in educational research (Dobson, Eggen & Smith, 2009). Both evaluation and assessment include some of the same elements: the collection of documentation, interpretation and analysis of the collected documentation and then initiate steps based on the analyses. These elements happen in the classroom, in this case in the physical education classes (Hay and Penney, 2013). Different from evaluation, the priority of assessment is primarily to focus on the students' learning (Dobson et al., 2009). The focus in this thesis is on students-assessment, so the term "assessment" will be used instead of "evaluation".

Assessment is a process based on the student's individual learning, where the personal progress and learning outcome are formulated in light of the assessment (Dobson et al., 2009). Previously, teachers' practice of assessment often was viewed through the concepts of formative (assessment during the learning process where the student learning is in focus) and summative assessment (assessment at the end of a teaching module with a focus on documenting what the student has learned and achieved) (Bø & Helle, 2008; Dobson et al., 2009). These conceptualizations make up the background for the newer split into assessment for learning and assessment of learning (Dobson et al., 2009). This are argued to show a better connection between assessment and the aspects of learning. Teachers should use formative assessment to give attention to the students learning process, and how to promote their development (Nordahl, 2012). Even though assessment for learning usually will contain both formative and summative assessment strategies, my understanding is that formative assessment is mainly the strategy being used to promote assessment for learning. Therefore, formative assessment and assessment for learning will be used promiscuously in this thesis, since the difference between them is little.

Assessment *for* learning has as its priority to serve the purpose of promoting students' learning, and it is a way to integrate assessment and teaching (Black, Harrison, Lee, Marshall & William, 2003; Engh, 2011). Assessment Reform Group (2002) define assessment as: "A process of seeking and interpreting evidence for use by learners and their teachers to decide where the learners are in their learning, where they need to go

and how best to get there” (p. 2). It describes assessment for learning as a process that should be an integrated and natural part of education. This process is based on the students’ individual learning, and the personal progress and learning outcomes are formulated in light of the assessment (Dobson et al., 2009). Assessment *of* learning happens often at a special point of time and includes marking. This type of assessment seldom includes and focuses on student participation (Dobson et al., 2009).

The assessment should give students and the teacher the competence, skills and experience of how to improve learning and teaching - it should be useful for them both (Nordahl et al., 2012). If the assessment is to be useful, it is important to present the assessment with its motivational intention and ensure that it encourages students to develop and become more active in their own education (Dobson et al., 2009; Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2006b). It should encourage learning and development, and be an integrated and natural part of education (St. meld. 47, 1995 -1996). The focus is the students’ individual learning process, shaped by personal development and the learning outcomes they achieve in the process (Dobson et al., 2009).

According to Hattie (2009), the teacher’s responsibility is to actively help the student understand where he or she is in the learning process, and how to move further on. Both Engh (2011) and the Education Act (Opplæringslova, § 3, 1998) have emphasised the importance of giving students a descriptive assessment, with a description of the degree to which they have reached the competence aims, and/or what to work on to reach them. If the self-assessment is to have an effect, it is important the students know the competence aims so they can work out if they have reached them (Engh, 2011).

Hay and Penney (2013) discuss how the assessment can promote lifelong learning in physical education. They mean that the curriculum, pedagogy and assessment are directed towards a process of learning. These factors should be connected to create a good learning situation. Despite this, it seems like the assessment in physical education is limited by various traditional structures and systems like testing and the focus on sports, which still are controlling the assessment. According to Hay and Penney (2013) the subject needs teachers that look beyond these structures. If the assessment handles these structures and gets a more pedagogical focus, it is easier to promote and support learning through assessment. The pedagogic are important in the assessment since its focus can impact the assessment (Hay and Penney, 2013).

According to Vinje (2008) three out of four physical education teachers in upper secondary school do not give their students information on their status concerning the competence aims they have to reach. Their argument is that there are too many competence aims in the subject, and the number of teaching hours is too small. Teachers also find it difficult to define criteria for the assessment that are clear enough (Engvik, 2010). The competence aims of the curriculum are broad, and teachers ought to develop these aims so it is easier to make an assessment (Engvik, 2010). Many teachers assess the students based on degree of achievement of goals and create descriptions based on what has to be done to accomplish the task. To assess the achievement of goals, there should be some descriptors and criteria identifying their achievement. The descriptors should describe competences on different levels in relation to the competence aim and each criterion ought to be a description of what is required for a specific type of work or task (Engvik, 2010).

López-Pastor, Kirk, Lorente-Catalán, MacPhail and MacDonald (2013) conducted a review of international literature concerning assessment in physical education. They state that assessment is the most fraught and difficult part of teaching physical education, particularly since examinable forms of the subject first appeared after 1950. In the beginning, assessment was straightforward and its focus was on the drill and exercise forms of physical education. Even though many of the curricula do not focus on assessment based on tests, together with subjective assessment, this has traditionally been the most popular approach to assessment. Subjective assessment is based on judgement of student's efforts, participation and behaviour during physical education (López - Pastor et al., 2013). In Norway, the physical testing of students became more prevalent than it had earlier been with the introduction of knowledge promotion, even if the curriculum did not have any regulations for this type of testing. It is important that if physical testing is used, this has to be justified by the competence aims in the curriculum and must be in connection with the students' learning (Engvik, 2010; Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2013).

Recently, alternative forms of assessment have had a bigger influence in the assessment process. These forms often have more of an educational focus than the traditional forms of assessment *of learning* (López-Pastor et al., 2013). Alternative forms differ from the more traditionally ones by involving the students actively in the assessment process.

The focus has moved from assessment based on teaching towards assessment based on the students' learning. Both Engvik (2010) and López- Pastor et al. (2013) have presented authentic assessment as an alternative form of assessment. Authentic assessment is developed to secure reliable and valid confirmation of competence, and it encourages students to use their skills in "real world" situations, activities and contexts (Engvik, 2010; López-Pastor et al., 2013). The student shows competence through performing specific sports, dances or outdoor activities in the same way as though in the real world. This type of assessment demands that the teacher has an understanding of the different areas of the curriculum and how to assess them (Engvik, 2010).

According to Mintah (2003) and Hay and Penney (2009) authentic assessment places values on achieving quality learning outcomes, encouraging students to be further involved in the learning process and increasing their interest and motivation in the subject. Hay and Penney (2009) are concerned with the relationship between the learning content and context and how they connect with the world beyond the classroom. If the assessment should work as further learning, it is important that the assessment connects with situations outside the classroom. Engvik (2010) also presented achievement assessment. This form of assessment gives the student the possibility of making use of competences in different settings in a considered way. The teacher creates different learning situations where the student has time to develop the competence before it is assessed. Both authentic and achievement assessment give students the possibility of participating in their own assessment for learning (Engvik, 2010). In this form of assessment the students must be familiar with the assessment criterion to use them as guidance.

3. Inclusion of students with a disability in physical education

3.1 Different perspectives on disability

Traditionally, there have been two different paradigms for how to understand disability; the medical and the social paradigm (Grue, 2004). The medical paradigm understands disability as a disease or injury. It focuses on the characteristics of the individual that make that person different from the majority, in other words, it focuses on the deficits (Tøssebro, 2010). The disease or deficit is looked at as an individual characteristic, which only can be fixed with medical treatment or rehabilitation (Tøssebro, 2010). The

social paradigm focuses on the community more than the individual because the community are organised in a way that generate a disability for some people with a particular biological composition (Grue, 2004). Many of the problems people with a disability face are generated by social arrangements, rather than by their own physical limitations (Shakespeare, 2006). The ideology of this model is that disability has everything to do with social barriers, and nothing to do with individual impairment. The benefits are that it shifts attention from individuals and their physical or mental deficits, to the ways in which society includes and excludes them (Shakespeare, 2006).

One of the fundamental concepts in the social model is the distinction between impairment and disability (Shakespeare, 2006; Tøssebro, 2010). This distinction is difficult to translate into Norwegian since the word *funksjonshemmet* covers them both. The NOU:22 (2001) tries to make a similar distinction in Norwegian by using the words *funksjonsnedsettelse* and *funksjonshemmet*. The former is similar to the definition of impairment: “the functional limitations within the individual caused by physical, mental or sensory impairment” (Shakespeare, 2006 p. 14); the latter is similar to the definition of disability: “the loss or limitation of opportunities to take part in the normal life of the community” (Shakespeare, 2006 p. 14). The reason for make a sharp distinction between these concepts is to split the relational and individual perspectives concerning disability (NOU, 2001).

Another distinction concerns what language to use when talking about the people this involves. Is it best to refer to disabled people or people with a disability? The social model prefers disabled people because this paradigm has an understanding of the individual being disabled by society (Shakespeare, 2006). The phrase “people with disabilities” is unacceptable to the social model since it implies that disabilities are the deficits of the individual, which can be seen as adopted from the medical model. When using this phrase many people do so because they try to be respectful and supportive of disability rights. They try to share the common humanity that disabled people share. This distinction in terminology can be challenging, but according to Shakespeare (2006), “while terminology is important, it is not as important as underlying values” (p. 33). Further on in this paper, I choose to use the terminology of “people/students with a disability”, because I think it is important to take care of the human perspective of individuals, and for me this terminology is more positive.

Shakespeare (2006) acknowledged an interactional approach in relation to disability. The interactional approach is based on a relational model developed in the Nordic countries (Shakespeare, 2006; Tøssebro, 2010). Shakespeare (2006) sees disability as an interaction between the individual and different structural factors. This approach embodies a holistic understanding, an understanding of the person as a whole, focusing on both body and mind (Shakespeare, 2006). Shakespeare considers that the experience of a person with a disability results from the relationship between factors intrinsic to the individual and extrinsic factors from a wider context. This model works as a balance between the medical and the social approach: it also makes space for personal attitudes and motivation, which often is a neglected aspect of disability. We can also recognise this way of understanding disability in the International Classification of Function, Disability and Health (ICF, Internasjonal klassifikasjon av funksjon, funksjonshemming og helse, 2003). The individual human functions and disability must be understood as dynamic interactions between health conditions and different contextual factors.

3.2.1 Teachers attitudes to inclusion

Teachers' attitudes concerning disability are often characterised by their experience and educational knowledge around disability, and some studies estimate that teachers need to receive more education in working with students with a disability (Obrusnikova, 2008; Rizzo, 1984; Rizzo & Kirkendal, 1995). The findings concerning teachers' attitudes to the inclusion of students with a disability in physical education show that they can be both positive and negative. If the attitudes are positive, teachers often have the knowledge, experience and education that make them comfortable to work with students with a disability. The negative attitudes towards students with a disability are often based on little experience with disability and a feeling of not having enough competence and education concerning disability. The lack of experience and competence makes teachers feel unprepared for adapting their teaching to the great diversity of this group of students (Rizzo, 1984).

Based on the literature (Rizzo, 1984; Tripp, French & Sherill, 1995), it seems that teachers and peers have different opinions concerning which type of disabilities they would prefer to include in physical education. Physical education teachers have more positive attitudes towards the inclusion of students with learning difficulties than those

with physical disabilities (Rizzo, 1984; Obrusnikova, 2008). This is the opposite from regular teachers and special educators, who have more favourable attitudes toward those with physical disabilities. This is probably based on physical education's focus on motor skills, and that teaching students with learning disabilities is more similar to teaching students without disabilities. The teachers do not have to adapt the activities of students with learning disabilities in the same way that they have to when teaching students with physical disabilities (Rizzo, 1984). On the other hand, it seems that peers have more positive attitudes towards students with a physical disability than those with learning or mental disability (Tripp et al., 1995).

According to Hodge, Ammah, Casebolt, LaMaster and O'Sullivan (2004) teachers have a positive attitude to inclusion as a philosophy, but experienced it as a challenge in their everyday practice. This was based on their experiences of not feeling prepared enough, and of lack of knowledge on how to adapt the education for those with a disability. The participants in Hodge et al. (2004) required more courses or education on this subject, which is similar to the findings of quantitative research on the topic (Rizzo, 1984; Rizzo & Kirkendal, 1995; Obrusnikova, 2008).

3.2.2 Students experience of inclusion in physical education

Goodwin and Watkinson (2000) found that students with a disability often have both good and bad days in physical education. The good days were revealed through a sense of belonging, participation in manageable activities and a feeling of being socially included in the fellowship of the class. Bad days were distinguished by social exclusion, not being included in the activity or the fellowship, and missing a sense of adaptation to the activities. Sometimes the teacher also told the participants their competences are insufficient to allow them be a part of the activities. They want to be included in physical education, but often felt limited by the teacher (Goodwin & Watkinson, 2000). Asbjørnslett and Hemmingsson (2008) also pointed out that students with a disability often want to be included in physical education. The participants pointed out that being a part of the social climate in class and interacting with their peers were more important for them than always having to do the same activities as the rest of the class. Students with a disability are often familiar with their limitations, and feel frustrated when the

teacher is not able to adapt the education to these conditions (Asbjørnslett & Hemmingsson, 2008).

According to Obrusnikova et al. (2010), if students with a disability are to be included it is important they feel socially accepted by the peers. A study by Place and Hodge (2001) found that students with a disability are not always socially interacting with their peers. The students with a disability were physically part of the class, but were excluded socially. Researchers found that in obtaining a positive inclusion, it is important that teachers plan for social inclusion and fellowship for all the participants in the class (Place & Hodge, 2001).

4. Assessment and students with a disability

Based on Jonskås report (2010), and taking account of a literature search in the Norwegian Bibsys database, there is much research available on different aspects of assessment in physical education and there is also quite a considerable amount of research on adapted physical education, at least at the master's level. However, there is little or nothing concerning the assessment of students with disability in physical education. A further search in the database ERIC and SPORTDiscus confirmed this. In both databases the words "assessment", "physical education" and "disability/disabilities" were used. The search yielded results, but few matched my interests in the subject: they either related to assessment of the physical activity level of disabled students, or different aspects of the subject - adapted physical activity.

As mentioned earlier, inclusion has developed to be an important political topic in the Western parts of Europe (Haycock & Smith, 2010). The inclusion of students with a disability in physical education is often used to address a social-political understanding of inclusion as being possible and that it can be done through all types of subjects (Haycock & Smith, 2010). Despite the political support for inclusion, there is less research examining teachers' attempts to assess students with a disability based on the physical education curriculum (Haycock & Smith, 2010). The aim of Haycock and Smith's (2010) study was to research the teachers' perspective on how students with a disability were assessed in relation to the curriculum in physical education, and whether teachers managed to assess these students in the same manner as students without a

disability. The participants in this research had experience of assessment in physical education, but nevertheless they perceived the criteria in the curriculum as inadequate and inappropriate for assessing students with a disability. The participants felt that the curriculum was based on sports, with a focus on skills, competence and competition. They thought this focus made it difficult to assess students with a disability who do not always have the ability to participate in every aspect of the subject (Haycock & Smith, 2010). They also thought the focus in the curriculum, which was based on the sports ideology that influences the subject, made it difficult to include students with a disability or other special needs (Haycock & Smith, 2010).

Smith and Green (2004) also discussed how adequate the curriculum is in relation to assessing students with a disability. The participants in this research felt the criteria are not suitable for assessing people with disabilities, and that the criteria were more exclusive than inclusive for many of the pupils. Teachers often wanted to include the disabled students but did not because they were not familiar with how to go about this (Smith & Green, 2004). Both Smith and Green (2004) and Haycock and Smith (2010) referred to the ideological aspect of physical education in this assessment discussion. Most of the teachers participating in their studies had an ideology or philosophy about physical education based on sport (often team games). Teachers have an idea that the important part of the subject is sport, and that students should develop skills and competences that will make them better at the sports being presented in physical education (Haycock and Smith, 2010; Smith and Green, 2004). This philosophy comes into conflict with the government's focus on inclusion. According to Haycock and Smith (2010), it will be difficult to assess students with a disability when teachers have different thoughts about what is important in the subject.

In her PhD thesis, Svendby (2013) examined how children and youths with rare forms of disability experience physical education. The participants had an understanding that the main focus of the subject is physical activity, and several of them emphasised running and team sports as activities that are commonplace in the subject. In a class where these activities are regular, students with disabilities will have few opportunities to show their physical competences and skills (Svendby, 2013). In a similar way to Smith and Green (2004), also Svendby (2013) proclaimed physical education as a traditional subject where the main focus is sport, competition and skills. The

participants in Svendby (2013) experienced being excluded from the class, based on a feeling of not fitting in with the construction of physical education. It also looks as though the challenges around inclusion escalate higher up in the education system you get (Svendby, 2013).

As mentioned earlier, a culture exists in physical education of using tests even though the curriculum is not focused on this form of assessment (López-Pastor et al., 2013). Svendby (2013) perceives this culture of testing as a form of assessment. Often it is physical characteristics such as strength and endurance that are being tested, and also whether the movements are being performed in the right way. These types of tests measure specific standards based on the norms and requirements of competitive sport. This supports the traditional masculine values based on the Olympic ideal of “higher, stronger, faster”. According to Hay and Penney (2013), when some parts of the subject are being assessed and others are not, this is a clear message about what is being valued in the subject. Students with a disability will, according to Svendby (2013), have only a slight possibility of realising an identity of competence in physical education when it will not be possible for them to manage many of the tests that are used. This gives them a feeling of being excluded, and they become demoralised about their participation in the subject (Svendby, 2013). According to Hay and Penney (2013) this focus on specific elements being difficult for them to manage might give them an intuition concerning that their competence is not being valued.

A discussion about how the criteria in the curriculum are suitable for assessing students with a disability does not exist in a Norwegian educational context – but it is needed. More research on the assessment process in physical education will help make a discussion like this more evidence-based, which is a reason for wanting to research this topic. The aim of my study will be to make a contribution to ensuring the criteria in the curriculum are able to assess disabled students in a positive way.

5. Method

In scientific research there are different methodological decisions the researcher must consider. In this section the relevant methodological considerations and choices for this project will be introduced. There will be a presentation of quantitative research, and

then descriptive research and surveys in particular. In the end some ethical issues that must be taken into account will be discussed.

There are two main types of scientific research, qualitative and quantitative research (Ringdal, 2013). The biggest difference is that qualitative research present the results through text and quantitative research through numbers and statistics (Ringdal, 2013). The main reason for choosing the quantitative methodology for this project is that this can help answer the research question. The project is also a part of a bigger project where the data already are collected; the results are statistical and the numbers of subjects participating in the project are too many for a qualitative project.

5.1 Research design

Thomas, Nelson and Silverman (2011) referred to five different types of research: analytical, descriptive, experimental, qualitative and mixed methods. This project is a descriptive research which produces information based on groups of people or different already existing phenomenon (Fink 1995). Thomas et al. (2011) referred to it as "a type of research that attempts to describe the status of the study's focus" (p. 19). As the aim of descriptive research is to describe the status of the study's focus: causality is therefore of no interest in this type of research (Thomas et al. 2011). Another aspect of descriptive research is describing the characteristics of a set of cases, but it can also be interested in the causes of phenomenon or in making comparisons of different cases (De Vaus, 1991).

5.1.2 Survey

The survey is the most common technique in descriptive research, often with a cross-sectional design (De Vaus 1991; Fink, 1995; Hassmén & Hassmén 2008; Ringdal, 2013; Thomas et al., 2011). Payne and Payne (2004) referred to it as "...cross-sectional studies that collect data only once and in one short period..." (Payne and Payne 2004, p. 143). A study with a cross-sectional design describes the different relations in present time; the past and the future are of no interest. Cross-sectional studies provide possibilities for statistical descriptions of the population (Ringdal, 2013). In relation to this project, the survey presents a cross-section of how students with a disability report assessment in physical education.

The survey is not a specific technique of collecting information; it can take the form of a questionnaire, interview or normative survey (De Vaus 1991; Fink, 1995; Thomas et al., 2011). Thomas et al. (2011) and Fink (1995) have presented the different elements that are important in conducting a good survey. Thomas et al. (2011) referred to these elements as determining the objectives, delimiting the sample, constructing the questionnaire, conducting the pilot study, writing the cover letter, sending the questionnaire, following up and analysing the results, and preparing the report.

5.2.3 The objective for the study

In order to construct a good survey it is important that the objectives are specified and well worked out. It is also important to clarify any parts of the objective that may be ambiguous or inaccurate (De Vaus, 1991). A specific and precise objective will make it easier to find the information needed for the specific research question (De Vaus, 1991). The objective of the study is defined through the research question, and can be derived from reviews, other surveys or experts on the subject (De Vaus, 1991). As mentioned earlier the objective of this study is to understand how students with a disability are being assessed, and describe how they perceive the assessment in physical education.

This project is based on a survey conducted as a part of a larger project with the aim of looking into and developing the assessment practice at the participating schools. This research is a PhD project at the Department of Physical Education at Norwegian School of Sport Science (NSSS), entitled “Assessment for learning in physical education”. The purpose of this PhD project is to examine different perceptions and experiences concerning the content, assessment and learning during physical education. One item in the questionnaire asked participants if they had a disease or disability that made it difficult for them to participate in physical education in a conventional way. The students that answered “Yes” to this question are the participants in my study.

5.2.4 Sample

Determining the sample is an important part of preparing for the survey (Thomas et al., 2011). Researchers often have in mind the population they want to include, and it should comprise persons who can provide the answers needed to enable the survey to achieve its objectives. Since it is not effective to examine the whole population, it is necessary to delimit a sample based on the population (Thomas et al., 2011).

The population in my research will be all the students with a disability in upper secondary schools in Norway that participate in physical education. The sample and participants will be students answering “Yes” to the question; *Do you have any disability or chronic disease that makes it difficult to participate in (parts of) physical education the way it is organised at your school?*¹ There are 256 students reporting having a disability/disease that makes the participation difficult. The question does not ask in what way they have a disability, or what type of disability/disease they have. The response students’ give on this question will be based on their subjective feelings that participation is more difficult because of the disability/disease that they might have. Some students answer “Yes” to this question; however, other students with the same condition might answer no if they do not feel that it impacts their participation in physical education. This might be based on the physical function the student has, or maybe even on their skills or interest in physical education.

The sample in this project is based on the sample in the mentioned PhD project at NSSS. The sample can be defined by convenience sampling, which suits the purposes of the study and is convenient (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007). In this project the schools are located in the areas where the researcher lives and works; it is convenient for the researcher to involve schools from these areas. The students are from six different schools, three of the schools located on the west coast of Norway, and the other three in the Oslo area. The representativeness of the sampling will be influenced by this not being probability sampling, which might make it difficult to generalise the results (Gall et al., 2007). Despite this, the sample included a relatively large number of subjects from upper secondary schools in Norway, and the answers tell us something about the experience of assessment in physical education from over 1500 Norwegian students. Since the sample is based on the PhD sample, the difficulties concerning the generalisation also influence this sampling.

The sample in this project included more than 250 students who reported having a disability or disease, which is a relatively large number of participants with such a condition. According to a report from Statistics Norway, *Funksjonshemmede i Europa* (Svalund, 2004), 15% of people between 16 and 66 years reported having a disability.

¹ My translation from Norwegian. In Norwegian: Har du noen funksjonshemming eller sykdom som gjør det vanskelig å delta i (deler av) kroppsøvingfaget slik det blir drevet ved din skole?

The numbers of subjects in my sample constituted 17% of the whole population. These numbers illustrate that the size of the sample are in proportion to the number of persons with a disability in the rest of society. Whether the sample is representative or not, the results from the analyses will describe how this group of students perceive assessment in physical education. Based on these statistics, the sample resembles a national sample of all the students with a disability, but it can only say something about the six schools included in the probability sampling. Despite this, there is nothing indicating that these six schools are very different from other schools, so the findings here might well be similar to other schools.

The research question in this project is not only interested in how students with a disability perceive the assessment, but also if there are any difference between students with and without a disability concerning assessment in physical education. In order to establish whether the sample of students with a disability responds differently to the questions than students without a disability, a comparison group was included in the project. This group comprised students answering “No” to the question concerning disability. The results in these two groups were matched in order to look for differences.

5.2.5. Questionnaire

The questionnaire is the most common survey technique (Thomas et al., 2011). The respondent either answers the questions in writing on paper, or as an electronic internet-based questionnaire. If the respondents are from a large geographical area it is normal to use an internet-based questionnaire (Thomas et al., 2011). As this is the case in this project, an electronic internet-based questionnaire was the most appropriate.

When using a questionnaire the researcher collects information through questions rather than observing the behaviour of the respondents (Thomas et al., 2011). The information collected must be useful and support the objectives of the survey, if not the questions do not need to be included in the questionnaire (Thomas et al., 2011). Gall et al. (2007) presents the rules that are important when constructing questionnaire items. The first thing is the need for clear language, so the items have the same meaning to all respondents. Another rule is not to use items with more than one idea - more ideas will make it difficult to understand what the question is actually asking about (Gall et al., 2007). Avoiding negative items, and technical language and jargon are also important

when constructing questionnaires (Gall et al., 2007). Since the participants in this survey are youths, it is particularly important to avoid technical language and use a language that is clear and easy to understand (Gall et al., 2007).

The questions can be formulated as open-ended or closed questions (Fink, 1995; Thomas et al., 2011). Open-ended questions give the respondents the permission to answer the questions in their own words (Fink, 1995). Closed questions are more difficult to construct than open-ended, but it is easier to analyse the answers (Thomas et al., 2011) as this type of questions is looking for a particular answer and is often used in large surveys with many respondents (Fink, 1995). Closed questions often come in the form of a ranking, scaled items or categorical responses (Thomas et al., 2011). The questions in the questionnaire used in this project are mostly closed questions with a mix of ranking, scaled items and categorical responses. With questions based on ranking the respondent must place responses in a ranked order based on defined criteria. Questions with a categorical response often give the respondents just two choices, which may be “Yes” or “No” / “Agree or “Disagree”. The most frequent type of question is scaled items where the respondents have to choose between, say, five different responses (Thomas et al., 2011).

The questionnaire used in this project was developed to capture a broad picture of the students' views of physical education with a focus on assessment practice. As mentioned earlier, this questionnaire was not especially developed to investigate students with a disability; it was more of a background interest. Part of the questionnaire also focused on students' backgrounds and participation in physical activities outside school. A way of questioning previously used in Sweden (cf. Larsson & Redelius, 2004; Redelius & Hay, 2012) was used as the basis for this development and was transformed to fit the Norwegian school's context, the theory of assessment for learning and the internet-based survey format. The questionnaire was piloted with three different physical education classes (67 students), which only led to minor modifications to a few questions. The final questionnaire was internet-based, had 205 variables and took 15 to 20 minutes to answer. The empirical part of the study was conducted during 2011 and 2012. Even though the questionnaire was internet-based, the main researcher himself often visited the classroom and presented the survey in order to increase the response rate. He told the students the significance of the project and why

it was important to answer the questions as correctly as possible. His visits might have helped the students to understand the meaning of the project and improved the response rates.

5.3 Operationalisation of test-variables

Not all questions in the questionnaire were relevant or important in enabling the research question in this project to be answered, seven test-variables were developed based on different items in the questionnaire². The dependent variable in this project is “Do you have any disability or chronic disease that makes it difficult to participate in physical education the way it is organised at your school?”. This variable was checked with seven other independent variables based on different items in the questionnaire concerning different subjects from the operationalization, presented in Table 1. Three of these variables were single- item variables, and four of them were different constructs based on several of the items from the questionnaire.

² See appendix 3 for a presentation of a translated version of the included items.

Table 1 Independent variables and items/questions used from survey

Independent variables	Items/questions
1. Knowledge concerning the competence aims	-Are you familiar with the competence aims in physical education?
2. Knowledge about the assessment criteria Cronbach's alpha = .739	- I know what it takes to get the different mark. - I know what to do to get a better mark. - At our school, the competence aims form the assessment.
3. Engaging students in assessment for learning Cronbach's alpha = .714	-The physical education teacher has explained "assessment for learning". - Assessment is more about what to learn than about the mark. - The students assess each other. - I am allowed to assess my self. - Approximately how many times have you been included in the assessment of your own work/efforts? - Self-assessment is being used systematically.
4. Perceived feedback Cronbach's alpha = .743	- I get help when I need it. - I receive feedback as to where I stand in the learning process. - The teacher is good to motivating and involving the students. - I know what I need to do to get a better mark
5. Perceived fairness of the assessment process Cronbach's alpha = .857	- I get the mark I deserve. - I am happy with my mark in physical education. - I participate in physical education only to get a mark.
6. Self-reported movement during the lessons	- How much do you move during physical education?
7. Marks in physical education	- Which mark did you get at the last semester assessment?

5.4 Analysis of the empirical data

The statistical program SPSS was used to analyse the empirical data. This process started with a descriptive use of SPSS where the focus was to get an overview of the empirical data in order to look for interesting connections that could help answer the research question. The connections found were investigated more closely and the items that could be discussed together were combined in a construct. The internal consistency of these constructs was checked with Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Cronbach's alpha is a generalised reliability coefficient that is often used for estimating

the reliability of standardised tests (Thomas et. al, 2011). It is important to check internal consistency to ascertain whether the different item all measure the same underlying construct (Pallant, 2013). If the reliability is good, the coefficient should be above 7. When all the constructs were defined and the reliability was checked, a new independent sum- variable based on the different items included in the construct were made. The sum- variables, plus the variables that only included one variable, were tested with a chi- square or independent t-test to check for significant differences between students with or without disability, with a significant level below .05. According to Thomas et. al (2011) the independent t-test is frequently used to determine if two samples differ from each other, it was therefore useful to investigate if there was a difference between students with/without a disability.

5.5 Validity/ reliability

In quantitative research it is an expectation that the measurements are valid and reliable. Validity and reliability are linked to the quality of the measurements in the study (Thomas et al., 2011). Validity is concerned with whether the measurements include what the research actually wants to measure and whether they are accurate (Fink, 1995; Ringdal, 2013). There are different types of validity: face, content, construct and criterion validity (Thomas et al., 2011). In this study face and construct validity will impact the measurements. Face validity refers to how the measurement appears; does the questionnaire have the right questions to answer the research question, and are the questions easy enough for the youths participating in the study to understand (Fink, 1995)? Construct validity refers in this case to the degree to which the questionnaire measures the hypothetical construct; in this case, the way the questionnaire gives answers concerning the assessment of students with a disability (Thomas et al., 2011).

As mentioned earlier, reliability is also linked to the quality of the study and if the stability of the measures yields constant results (Sapsford, 2007). The results must be consistent, and if the results are not reliable they cannot be considered valid (Thomas et al. 2011). Thomas et al. (2011) said that establishing reliability is easier than establishing validity. Different ways of establishing reliability are the stability and equivalence method (Grønmo, 2004; Thomas et al., 2011). The stability method concerns the degree of correlation between data collected on different days, which are measured by the test –retest method. With the test -retest method the test is repeated

later the same day, or some days after the first test. If the results are equal, the reliability is good. The equivalence method is different from the stability method, and is based on the correlation between different data collections over the same period of time (Grønmo, 2004; Thomas et al., 2011). The equivalence method can also be useful when there are different items included in different scales: a high reliability means high correlation between the items included (Grønmo, 2004). In this project the reliability was checked with Cronbach's alpha coefficient, an equivalence method for checking the internal consistency of scores. The reliability of the constructs had a high coefficient, which describes the solid reliability of the empirical data that was being used.

The questionnaire for this project is valid and reliable; it gives good answers concerning the assessment process in physical education. The language and questions are easy to understand, which help's student answer the questions in the way the researcher requires. I also think the questions are well formulated and ask for important items relevant to the objective of the study; assessment in physical education. Despite this, the participants were not asked to answer the research question, but their answers on the questions enabled me as a researcher to answer the research question. The questionnaire was developed specially to research assessment in physical education in upper secondary schools in Norway. All the participants said they had a disability that made the participation difficult for them; because of this they fitted the sample.

5.6 Ethics

Ethics is learning about and practise morality, about rights and wrongs, and in research the norms of scientific practice (Ringdal, 2013). It is important to protect people participating in research (Thomas et al., 2011). The researcher has the responsibility to avoid participants being harmed in any way and to ensure that participation does not become a burden for the participants (Ringdal, 2013). The participants also have to give their consent to being a part of the research (appendix 1). The sample for this project were drawn from students at upper secondary schools, and some of them were, from a juridical point of view, too young to give this consent on their own (Backe-Hansen & Frønes, 2012). The Act on Medical and Health Research of 2010 states that youths over 16 years can give this consent themselves, but the parents have to be informed about the project (Regjeringen, 2010). With regard to this survey, the researcher or a teacher presented his research to the students through reading a letter to them (Appendix 1).

This letter covered information on the project's aim and methods, and providing information about the questionnaire. It also informed the students of their right to be anonymous and of the confidentiality of the data. It also told them that the participation is voluntary, and they are free to quit at any time. When the students log in online to the survey, they confirmed being informed about the research project and that they are willing to participate in it.

All research projects in Norway involving the use of personal information have to seek approval from the Norwegian Social Sciences Service (*NSD; Personvernombudet for forskning, n.d.*). As mentioned earlier, the project "Assessment for learning in physical education" has already received the approval from the NSD, and since my empirical data are a part of this larger project, there is no need to do this again.

When doing research on exposed groups, the researcher has a special responsibility to protect the interest of the group through the whole process. In developing this type of research it is important to emphasize the information given to the participants and the consent they get. Despite this, it is important to also investigate these groups since they can give new and important information to the community concerning their situation and experience (Den nasjonale forskningsetiske komite for samfunnsvitenskap og humaniora, 2006).

As a researcher, different ethical aspects concerning the publication of the research must be taken into account while doing the research (Thomas et al., 2011). Plagiarism of others' research, falsification and fabrication of data are unacceptable. It is unethical and it will have severe consequences for the cheating researcher. There are ethical aspects also in the presentation of the data. You must present all the statistics – omitting statistics that may give another answer than the one you want is also unacceptable (Thomas et al., 2011) as it is unethical and will give the reader a false perspective of the results. It is important to wait until all analyses are finished before presenting the results. Every source you have cited has to be listed in the reference list (Thomas et al., 2011).

References:

Asbjørnslett, M. & Hemmingsson, H. (2008) Participation at school as experienced by teenagers with physical disabilities. *Scandinavian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 15, 153 -161.

Assessment Reform Group (2002) *Assessment for learning -10 principles. Research-based principles to guide classroom practice*, Assessment Reform Group. Retrived 13.05.2014 from http://assessmentreformgroup.files.wordpress.com/2012/01/10principles_english.pdf

Backe-Hansen, E. & I. Frønes (2012). *Metoder og perspektiver i barne- og ungdomsforskning*. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.

Bachman, K. & Haug, P. (2006) *Forskning om tilpasset opplæring* (Forskningsrapport nr 62), Høgskulen i Volda: Møreforskning

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B. & Wiliam, D. (2003) *Assessment for learning – Putting it into practice*, Open Press University

Bø, I. & L. Helle (2013). *Pedagogisk ordbok: praktisk oppslagsverk i pedagogikk, psykologi og sosiologi*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Den nasjonale forskninsetiske komite for samfunnsvitenskap og humaniora (2006) *Forskningsetiske retningslinjer for samfunnsvitenskap, humaniora, juss og teologi: Trådt i kraft mars 2006*. Retrived 08.mai.2014 fra: <https://www.etikkom.no/Forskningsetikk/Etiske-retningslinjer/Samfunnsvitenskap-jus-og-humaniora/>

De Vaus, D. A. (1991). *Surveys in social research*, UCI Press.

Dobson, S., Eggen A., Smith, K. (2009). *Vurdering, prinsipper og praksis*. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.

Engh, K.R. (2011) *Vurdering for læring i skolen: på vei mot en bærekraftig vurderingskultur*. Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget.

Engvik, G. (2010) Elevvurdering i kroppsøving- noen utfordringer. In Dobson and Engh, *Vurdering for læring i fag* (p. 201-213) Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget.

Fink, A. (1995). *The survey handbook*, Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

Gall, M. D., Gall, J.P. & Borg, W.R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Goodwin, D.L. & Watkinson, E.J (2000) Inclusive physical education from the persepective of students with physical disabilities. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 17, 144 -160.

Grue, L. (2004) *Funksjonshemmet er bare et ord*. Oslo: Abstrakt forlag

- Grønmo, S. (2004). *Samfunnsvitenskapelige metoder*. Bergen, Fagbokforlaget
- Hassmén, N. & Hassmén, P. (2008) *Idrottsvetenskapliga forskningsmetoder*, Stockholm.
- Hattie, J. (2009) *Visible learning - a synthesis of over 800 meta - analyses relating to achievement*. New York: Routledge
- Haug, P. (2003) *Evaluering av Reform 97. Sluttrapport frå styret for Program for evaluering av Reform 97*. Oslo: Norsk forskningsråd.
- Hay, P. & Penney, D. (2009) Proposing conditions for assessment efficacy in physical education. *European, Physical Education Review* 15(3): 389-405.
- Hay, P. & Penney D. (2013) *Assessment in Physicale Education: a sociocultural perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Haycock, D. and A. Smith (2010). "Inadequate and inappropriate?; The assessment og young disabled people and pupils with special educational needs in National Curriculum Physical Education." *European Physical Education Review* 16(3): 17.
- Hodge, S. R., Ammah, J. O. A, Casebolt, K., LaMaster, K., & O'Sullivan, M. (2004). High school general physical education teacher's behavior and beliefs associated with inclusion. *Sport, Education and Society*, 9, 395- 419.
- ICF: Internasjonal klassifikasjon av funksjon, funksjonshemming og helse* (2003). Sosial- og helse direktoratet.
- Jonskås, K. (2010). *En kunnskapsoversikt over FOU-arbeid innen kroppsøvingfaget i Norge fra Januar 1978–Desember 2010*. Oslo: Norwegian School of Sport Sciences.
- Larsson, H. & Redelius, K. (Dds.) (2004). *Mellan nytta och nöje: bilder av ämnet idrott och hälsa*. Stockholm: Idrottshögskolan GIH.
- López-Pastor, V. M., Kirk, D., Lorente Catalán, E., MacPhail, A. & MacDonald, D. (2013). Alternative assessment in physical education: A review of international literature. *Sport, Education and Society* 18(1), 57-76.
- Mintah, J. K. (2003) Authentic assessment in physical education: Prevalence of use and perceived impact on students self-concept, motivation, and skill achievement. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 7(3), 161 -174.
- Nordahl, T, Kostøl, A., Sunnevåg, A.K., Aasen, A.M., Løken, G., Dobson, S. & Kundsmon, H. (2012) *Dette vet vi om vurderingspraksis*. Oslo: Gyldendal Akademiske forlag
- NOU 2001:22 (2001) *Fra bruker til borger: En strategi for nedbygging av funksjonshemmende barrierer*. Oslo: Statens forvaltningstjeneste.

- Obrusnikova, I. (2008). Physical educators' beliefs about teaching children with disabilities. *Perceptual and Motor skills*. 106, 637-644.
- Obrusnikova, I., Block, M. & Dillon, S. (2010) Children's beliefs toward cooperative playing with peers with disabilities in physical education. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*. 20, 230- 245.
- Opplæringslova. (1998). *Lov om grunnskolen og den videregående opplæringa: Trådt i kraft 01. August, 1999, sist endret 01.01.2014*. Retrived 10 April 2014 from: <http://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1998-07-17-61>
- Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill.
- Payne, G. & Payne, J. (2004). *Key concepts in social research*. London: SAGE.
- Place, K. & Hogde, S. R. (2001). Social inclusion of students with physical disabilities in general physical education: A behavioral analysis. *Adapted physical Activity Quarterly*. 18, 389 - 404.
- Rage, I. (2011) "*Disse to har tilpasset opplæring som alle andre barn*": en kvalitativ studie av inkludering og tilpasset opplæring i kroppsøving. Master's thesis. Oslo: Norwegian School of Sports Sciences.
- Redelius, K. & Hay, P. (2012). Student views on criterion-referenced assessment and grading in Swedish physical education. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, 17(2), 211-225.
- Regjeringen (2010). Helseforskningsloven. H.-o. omsorgsdepartementet. Oslo, Helse- og omsorgsdepartementet.
- Ringdal, K. (2013). *Enhet og mangfold - samfunnsvitenskapelig forskning og kvantitative metoder*, Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Rizzo, T. (1984) Attitudes of physical educators toward teaching handicapped pupils, *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 1, 267-274.
- Rizzo, T. & Kirkendall, D. (1995) Teaching students with mild disabilities: What affects attitudes of future physical educators. *Adapted physical activity quarterly*, 12, 205 -216.
- Sapsford, R. (2007). *Survey research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Shakespeare, T. (2006). *Disability Rights and Wrongs*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, A. & Green, K. (2004). Including pupils with special educational needs in secondary school physical education: A sociological analysis of teachers views. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 25 (5) ,593-607.

Stortingsmelding 18 (St.meld). (2010-2011) *Læring og fellesskap*. Kunnskapsdepartementet.

Stortingsmelding 47 (St.meld.). (1995-1996) *Om elevvurdering, skolebasert vurdering og nasjonalt vurderingsystem*. Kunnskapsdepartementet.

Svalund, J. (2004). *Funksjonshemmede i Europa*. Oslo: Statistisk sentralbyrå. 18(2004)nr 1: p. 34-41.

Svendby, E.B (2013). "*Jeg kan og jeg vil, men jeg passer visst ikke inn*" - en narrativ studie om barn og unges erfaringer med kroppsøvingfaget når de har en sjelden diagnose (fysisk funksjonshemming), PhD Thesis, Oslo: Norwegian School of Sport Sciences.

Thomas, J. R., Nelson, J.K., & Silverman, S.J. (2011). *Research methods in physical activity*. Champaign, Il: Human Kinetics.

Tripp, A., French, R. & Sherill, C. (1995) Contact theory and attitudes of children in physical education programs toward peers with disabilities. *Adapted physical activity Quarterly*. 12, 323-332.

Tveit, S. (2009). Educational assessment in Norway: A time of change. In C, Wyatt-Smith and J. Cumming (Eds.) *Educational Assessment in the 21st Century - connecting theory and practice*. Dordrecht: Springer. p. 227-243.

Tøssebro, J. (2010). *Hva er funksjonshemming*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Utdanningsdirektoratet (2006a). National Curriculum for Knowledge Promotion in Primary and Secondary Education and Training. Oslo: Kunnskapsdepartementet.

Utdanningsdirektoratet (2006b). *Prinsipp for opplæringen*. Oslo: Kunnskapsdepartementet. Retrived 01. May 2014 from: <http://www.udir.no/Lareplaner/Kunnskapsloftet/Prinsipp-for-opplaringa/>

Utdanningsdirektoratet (2012). Informasjon om endringer i faget kroppsøving i grunnskolen og videregående opplæring. Utdanningsdirektoratet. Oslo, Utdanningsdirektoratet. Retrived 15. May.2014 from: www.udir.no/Regelverk/Rundskriv/2012/Udir82012-Informasjon-om-endringer-i-faget-kroppsoving-i-grunnskolen-og-videregaende-opplaring/

Utdanningsdirektoratet (2013) *Veiledning til læreplan i kroppsøving*. Oslo: Utdanningsdirektoratet. Retrived 15.may.2014 from: <http://www.udir.no/Lareplaner/Veiledninger-til-lareplaner/Revidert-2013/Veiledning-til-revidert-lareplan-i-kroppsoving/>

Vinje, E. (2008). *Vurdering i kroppsøving*. Nøtterøy: Ped Media

Tables:

Table 1: Test-variables and items/questions used from the survey..... s. 26

Part II: The research article

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this article is to understand how students with a disability are assessed in physical education, how they perceive the assessment and if there are any differences between students with and without a disability concerning this. The study has a quantitative methodology, using survey and a questionnaire as the method to collect the data. Based on the descriptive statistics there were developed seven test-variables, which were tested with an independent t- test. The results show several differences between students with and without a disability. Students with a disability had less knowledge than student without a disability concerning assessment criteria in physical education. These students also perceived the assessment as less fair than students without a disability. It seems like teachers are unfamiliar with how to assess students with a disability, and students with a disability perceive the assessment in a more negative way than students without a disability.

Keywords:

Assessment, physical education, disability, Norway.

1. Introduction

Inclusion has developed into an important political topic in the Western Europe. Every student – independent of their individual conditions has the right to an education in the local community together with peers (Haycock & Smith, 2010). Also, in Norway education in a comprehensive school is a political vision of the government's (St. meld. 47, 1995-1996). Education should provide a common basis for all, and give every person the potential to develop his or her abilities through the pedagogy and organisation of the school, regardless of the differences between individuals. An inclusive school is grounded in the beliefs about the value of human life, respect for human rights and equality between the individuals (St. meld. 18, 2010-2011). Just as there is a political support for promoting educational inclusion, there is also clear support for promoting inclusion through subjects such as physical education (Haycock & Smith, 2010). However, it seems the political support for inclusion is difficult to recognise in the subject of physical education, and there are different challenges to making inclusion successful (Fitzgerald and Kirk, 2009; Haycock & Smith, 2010).

Research indicates that students with a disability want to be included in physical education. Most important for them is being a part of the social environment, more important than always doing the same activities as rest of the class (Asbjørnslett & Hemmingsson, 2008). According to Goodwin and Watkinson (2000) students with a disability separate the days with physical education into good and bad days. The good ones are revealed by a sense of belonging and being socially included, and the bad ones are distinguished by a sense of socially exclusion and that activities have not been adapted to them (Goodwin & Watkinson, 2000). According to earlier research, teachers struggle to adapt their education to fit all types of students, and to assess students with a disability in the same way as students without a disability (Asbjørnslett & Hemmingsson, 2008; Goodwin & Watkinson, 2000; Haycock & Smith, 2010; Smith and Green, 2004; Svendby, 2013).

Assessment is one of the most important topics in educational research (Dobson, Eggen & Smith, 2011). Previously, teachers' practice of assessment often was viewed through the concepts of formative (assessment during the learning process where the student learning is in focus) and summative assessment (assessment at the end of a teaching module with a focus on documenting what the student has learned and achieved) (Bø & Helle, 2008; Dobson et al., 2009). These conceptualizations make up the background for the newer split into assessment for learning and assessment of learning (Dobson et al., 2009). Assessment for learning has as its priority to serve the purpose of promoting students' learning, and it is a way to integrate assessment and teaching (Black, Harrison, Lee, Marshall & William, 2003; Engh, 2010). Assessment Reform Group (2002) define assessment as: "A process of seeking and interpreting evidence for use by learners and their teachers to decide where the learners are in their learning, where they need to go and how best to get there (p. 2)". It describes assessment for learning as a process that should be an integrated and natural part of education. This process is based on the students' individual learning, and the personal progress and learning outcomes are formulated in light of the assessment (Dobson et al., 2009).

According to Hattie (2009) the teachers' responsibility is to actively help the student by drawing attention to where he/she is in the learning process, and to how the student can move further on. Both Engh (2011) and the Education Act (Opplæringslova, § 3, 1998) have emphasised the importance of giving students a descriptive assessment, with a description of the degree to which they have reached the competence aims and/or what

to work on to reach them. If the assessment is to have an effect, it is important that students know the competence aims to work out if they have reached them (Engh, 2011). Involving students in their own learning process make them familiar with how they learn, what they learn and how to develop further. According to Hattie (2009) this has a big effect on students' learning. Formative assessment can be a way of giving the students feedback on where they are in the learning process and what they have to do to develop further (Tveit, 2009).

The Knowledge Promotion was introduced in 2006 as a result of a new approach to practice; it presented a modified practice for use in Norwegian schools (Tveit, 2009). This new curriculum has fewer descriptions of how to organise and how to assess the learning than the previously curriculum for the 10-year compulsory school in Norway and is based on different competence aims that the students have to reach (Tveit, 2009). These aims are a description of what the students have to learn and what teachers have to implement in their teaching (Dale & Wærnes, 2006; Imsen, 2006). In physical education the curriculum focuses on the students' overall competence in the subject, and requires that the students should not be compared against each other during the assessment (Dale & Wærnes, 2006; Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2006).

López-Pastor, Kirk, Lorente-Catalán, MacPhail and MacDonald (2013) have conducted a review of international literature concerning assessment in physical education. In the beginning assessment was straightforward and the focus was on the drilling and exercising forms of physical education. Even though the curricula did not focus on testing, this has traditionally been one of the most used approaches to assessment. Recently, the use of alternative forms of assessment, including assessment for learning, has increased in physical education (López-Pastor et al., 2013). Sientop and Tannehill (2000) have argued that alternative assessment differs from the tools that are traditionally used in physical education as it involves the students more actively in the assessment process. The greater interest in the different methods of alternative assessment is moving the focus from assessment based on teaching towards assessment based on the students' learning (López-Pastor et al., 2013). Despite this, the increase is far from regular and integrated, and physical educators must be more innovative in letting the assessment become integrated to the same extent as it is in other subjects (López-Pastor et al., 2013).

Despite the political support for inclusion, less research has examined how teachers' attempts to assess students with a disability are based on the curriculum in physical education (Haycock & Smith, 2010). Few studies have investigated the assessment aspect in physical education according to the needs of students with a disability (Haycock & Smith, 2010; Smith & Green, 2004). Haycock and Smith (2010) were interested in the teacher perspective of how students with a disability were assessed in relation to the curriculum in physical education. The participants perceived that the criteria in the curriculum were inadequate and inappropriate for assessing students with a disability. Smith and Green (2004) also found the curriculum to be unsuitable for assessing students with a disability. They felt the criteria in the curriculum were more exclusive than inclusive for many of the pupils. Although teachers wanted to include students with a disability, they did not do so because they were unfamiliar with how to do it (Smith & Green, 2004).

Earlier research (Rizzo, 1984; Obrusnikova, Block and Dillon, 2010) has found that teachers in physical education often feel they lack the knowledge and competence to adapt the education to fit students with a disability. Their attitudes towards students with a disability often reflect their knowledge and competence on inclusion (Rizzo, 1984). If they have positive attitudes towards inclusion, they most likely have good knowledge and competence on the subject, but the opposite is true if they have negative attitudes. Their knowledge and attitudes will impact on how they work with students with a disability (Rizzo, 1984).

In the research of Smith and Green (2004) and Haycock and Smith (2010) they refer to the ideological aspect of physical education in the assessment discussion. According to Green (2000) ideology means different ideas about and how to understand physical education. Most of the participants in Haycock and Smith (2010) and Smith and Green (2004) describe an ideology in physical education that is based on sport (often team games). Teachers have an idea that the important part of the subject is sport and that the students should develop skills and competences to become better at sports, with these being presented through physical education (Haycock & Smith, 2010; Smith and Green, 2004). Also the students participating in Svendby's (2013) study had an understanding that the main focus in the subject is physical activity, and several of them emphasised running and team-sports as activities that are widespread in the subject. In a class where these activities are recurrent, students with a disability will have fewer opportunities to

show their physical competence and skills (Svendby, 2013). This ideology and focus on skills and competence will come into conflict with the government's focus on inclusion. As Haycock and Smith (2010) stated, it will be difficult to assess students with a disability when teachers have various thoughts about what is important in the subject. The participants in Svendby's (2013) study experiences a sense of being excluded from the class; this was based on a feeling that they did not fit into the construction of physical education.

Even though the curriculum is not focused on testing, a culture exists of using tests during assessment in physical education (López-Pastor et. al, 2013; Svendby, 2013). Often it is the physical characteristics of strength and endurance that are being tested, and also whether movement is being performed in the right way. These types of tests measures specific standards based on the norms and requirements of competitive sports and they support the traditional masculine values that are based on the Olympic ideal of "higher, stronger, faster". Students with a disability will according to Svendby (2013) have few possibilities for achieving an identity of competence in physical education since they will not find it possible to manage many of the tests. This gives these students a feeling of being excluded, and they are demoralised by their participation in the subject (Svendby, 2013).

As mentioned earlier, there is little research interested in assessment according to the needs of students with a disability. As the research has revealed, this is a difficult subject for teachers and it needs more research. This project is relevant since it investigates the subject in a Norwegian context, and it differs from the other research in its interest in how the students, rather than the teachers, perceive the assessment. The aim of the project is to understand how disabled students are being assessed, and how they experience the assessment process in physical education. The research question in this paper is: *How do students with a disability report their assessment in physical education, and are there any differences between students with and without a disability concerning this?*

2. Method

This project is based on a survey conducted as a part of a larger project, the aim of which is to examine students' perceptions and experiences concerning content,

assessment and learning during physical education. An electronic internet-based questionnaire was developed, pretested and utilised to collect the students' experience of assessment in physical education (appendix 2). The questionnaire was submitted to and approved by the *Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste* (Norwegian Social Science Service). The empirical part was conducted during 2011 and 2012 in an ordinary lesson at the students' schools.

2.1 Participants

The analyses in this project are based on the already mentioned survey of 1486 students at six upper secondary schools in Norway. The six upper secondary schools were recruited by convenience sampling (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007). Three of the schools were located in the area around Oslo, and the other three in the western part of Norway. The sample and participants in this project will be the students answering "Yes" on the question: *Do you have any disability or disease that makes it difficult to participate in (parts of) physical education in the way it is organised at your school?*

Table 1 presents demographic information about the participants.

Table 1 Demographic information about the participants

Demographic data		
	Students with a disability	Students without a disability
Boys	83 (20.6%)	668 (79.4%)
Girls	173 (12.9 %)	562 (87.1%)
Born and raised in Norway	77%	78%
Adopted, raised in Norway	3.5 %	2.5%
Immigrant	9.4 %	11.4%
Immigrant children	10.2 %	8 %
Mother has higher education	48.8%	47.9%
Mother has upper secondary education	27.7%	26.4 %
Mother has primary and secondary education	10.9%	8.3 %
Father has higher education	45.7 %	43.4 %
Father has upper secondary education	30.9 %	31.5 %
Father has primary and secondary education	8.6 %	7.7 %

This table show that even though the number of participants in these two groups differs, there are not very big differences between the profiles of the two groups when the demographic information is considered.

2.2 Instrument

A questionnaire was developed to capture a broad picture of the students' views of physical education with a focus on assessment practice. The questionnaire also contained a part focusing on each student's background and participation in physical activity outside school. A previously used form of questioning from Sweden (cf. Larsson & Redelius, 2004; Redelius & Hay, 2012) was used; it was based on the assessment for learning theory, and was changed to fit the Norwegian school context. The questionnaire was piloted on three different physical education classes (67 students). The piloting only led to minor modifications to a few questions. The final questionnaire was internet-based, had 205 variables, and took 15 - 20 minutes to answer.

2.3 Operationalization of the variables

SPSS was used to analyse the empirical data, beginning with a descriptive focus to obtain an overview of the empirical data in order to look for interesting connections that could help answering the research question. These connections were investigated more closely, and the items that could be discussed together were combined in a construct and developed into a new sum-variable. There were developed seven independent variables, three of these variables were single- items variables, and 4 of them were constructs based on different items from the questionnaire³. The different independent variables are *knowledge concerning the competence aims*, *knowledge about the assessment criteria*, *engaging students in assessment for learning*, *feedback*, *perceived justice*, *self-reported movement during the lessons* and *marks in physical education*. Table 2 present all of the seven independent variables.

³ See appendix 3 for a presentation of a translated version of the included items.

Table 2 Independent variables and items/questions used from the survey

Independent variables	Items/questions
1. Knowledge concerning the competence aims	- Are you familiar with the competence aims in physical education?
2. Knowledge about the assessment criteria Cronbach's alpha = .739	- I know what it takes to get the different marks. - I know what to do to get a better mark. - At our school, the competence aims form the assessment.
3. Engaging students in assessment for learning Cronbach's alpha = .714	-The physical education teacher has explained "assessment for learning". - Assessment is more about what to learn than about the marks. - The students assess each other. - I am allowed to assess myself. - Approximately how many times have you been included in the assessment of your own work/efforts. - Self-assessment is being used systematically.
4. Perceived feedback Cronbach's alpha = .743	- I get help when I need it. - I receive feedback as to where I stand in the learning process. - The teacher is good at motivating and involving the students. - I know what I need to do to get a better mark.
5. Perceived justice of the assessment process Cronbach's alpha =.857	- I get the mark I deserve. - I am happy with my mark in physical education. - I participate in physical education only to get a mark.
6. Self-reported movement during the lessons	- How much do you move during physical education?
7. Marks in physical education	- Which mark did you get at the last semester assessment?

The internal consistency between the items included in the constructs was checked by means of Cronbachs' alpha coefficient: to ensure internal consistency Cronbachs' alpha coefficient should be above .7, which the different constructs achieved (Pallant, 2013; Thomas, Nelson and Silverman, 2011).

The sum-variables, plus the independent variables that only included one item, were tested with an independent t-test or chi-square to check for any significant differences between students with and without a disability on these variables.

3. Results

Table 3 present the result of the chi-square and independent t-test. Group 1 are students answering “Yes” to the question concerning disability, and group 2 are those answering “No” to the same question.

Table 3 Results of the chi-square and independent t-test

<u>Test-variables</u>	<u>Mean</u>		<u>Chi-square/P-value</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	
	Group 1	Group 2		Group 1	Group 2
Knowledge concerning the competence aims			Chi-square = .478		
Knowledge about the assessment criteria	9.24	9.68	P-value = .028	2.96	2.82
Engaging students in assessment for learning	14.12	14.34	P-value = .486	4.55	4.22
Feedback	11.69	12.52	P-value = .001	3.5	3.75
Perceived fairness of the assessment process	9.40	10.40	P-value = .001	3.52	3.57
Movement during the lessons	3.46	3.74	P-value = .001	.862	.588
Marks in physical education	4.09	4.35	P-value = .001	.983	1.194

3.1. Knowledge concerning the competence aims

For this construct no significant difference (chi-square =.478) was measured between students with and without a disability. A more descriptive analysis of the results shows that neither of these two groups reported good knowledge concerning the competence aims. In both groups almost 40% of the students responded that they were not familiar with the competence aims in physical education, and approximately 14% of the students were familiar with the competence aims because they had read them on their own. These numbers tell us that more than 50% of the participants’ reports to not having been introduced to the competence aims through the teacher.

3.2. Knowledge about the assessment criteria

This construct is made up of three different questionnaire variables (see Table 2). An independent t-test of the new variable revealed that there was a significant difference

between how students with and without a disability answered this question (p-value = .028). In examining the descriptive statistics we found that students with a disability reported having less knowledge about the assessment criteria than students without a disability (mean = 9.2422/9.6870). Less than 20% of the students with a disability were familiar with the criteria for assessment in physical education, and 13% of the students reported not knowing them at all.

3.3 Engaging students in assessment for learning

Five different items are included in this new construct (see Table 2), and an independent t-test of the new variable found no significant difference (p-value = .486) concerning how much the students are engaged in the assessment process or their experience with assessment for learning. At a general level it looks as though the students are not being engaged in the assessment process: almost 75% of the students with a disability reported never or just once being included in the assessment process. This indicates that students had not experienced being engaged by teachers in the assessment process.

3.4. Feedback

This construct is made up by four underlying items (Table 2). When the new variable of *feedback* was tested with an independent t-test, the p value = .001 showed a significant difference between students with and without a disability. A closer look at the more descriptive statistics mean scores (11.69/12.52) and standard deviation scores (3.5/3.76) shows that students with a disability reported getting less feedback from the teacher in relation to their personal development in the subject than students without a disability. The statistics on this construct show that there is a difference between how students with and without a disability perceived the feedback in relation to the assessment process: 65% of the students with a disability reported that they had never or only once had feedback from the teacher concerning how to improve their grade in physical education. The majority of the participants were interested in receiving more feedback from the teacher about their participation in the subject. The most regular form of feedback seems to be teachers talking to students during the lessons.

3.5. Perceived fairness in the assessment process

Three underlying items (Table 2) are included in this new construct concerning fairness in the assessment process. The independent t-test of this new construct shows that there is a significant difference between the groups of students with and without a disability in relation to how they experienced fairness during the assessment process in physical

education (p-value = .001). The mean and standard deviation (mean =9.40/10.40, std. dev. = 3.52/3.57) indicates that students with a disability perceived the assessment process as less fair than students without a disability.

3.6. Movement during the lessons

This construct is based on only one item. Two-thirds of students with a disability reported moving a lot during the lessons. The remaining third of students reported not moving at all or that they participated in the lessons but they did not move a lot. The independent t-test of this variable as an independent variable found a significant difference between students with and without a disability (p-value = .001). The mean and standard deviation indicates that students with a disability reported to moving less during the lessons than students without a disability.

3.7. Marks in physical education

The independent t-test on this item also gives a p-value that reveals a significant difference between students with and without a disability (p-value = .001). The means and standards deviations of these two different groups (mean = 4.09/4.35, std. dev. = .983/1.194) indicates that students with a disability reported getting lower marks in physical education than students without a disability reports. It also seems that the higher marks they get, the more satisfied they are with their grade, which also applies to the students with a disability. Looking at the descriptive statistics from the students with a disability, boys get better marks in PE than the girls.

4. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate how students with a disability perceive assessment in physical education and if there are differences between students with and without disability concerning this issue. The sampling in this project was based on the question “Do you have a disability that makes it difficult to participate in (parts of) physical education in the way it is organised at your school?”. This question does not ask about which disability the student has, and the response is based on their subjective opinion. The fact that the answer is based on a subjective view it is most likely that the students answer this question correctly. Further on it is difficult to say whether it was a disadvantage to not know the types of disability they had, but students with a disability are a heterogeneous group of individuals, and therefore there always will be differences when grouping persons with a disability. Despite this, the advantage with a quantitative

study is that it gives a general picture of the students' assessment situation that is broader than a qualitative research could give.

The results concerning students' knowledge of the competence aims of the physical education curriculum found no significant difference between students with and without a disability, but the descriptive statistics showed that students, with disability or not, have little knowledge of the competence aims. This is similar to findings reported by Sandvik, Engvik, Fjørtoft, Langseth, Aaslid, Mordal og Buland (2012), who found that teachers in physical education admit not being good enough at defining the aims for students' learning (Sandvik et al., 2012). As described earlier, it is important to involve students in the assessment so they can work out their own learning process (Hattie, 2009). A descriptive assessment will give the students an understanding of where they are according to the competence aims, but it will make little sense if they are not familiar with the competence aims (Engh, 2011; Nordahl et al., 2012). Based on this, if teachers do not inform the students about the competence aims, the opportunity for students to follow their own learning process will decrease.

An interesting finding is the significant difference concerning the criteria for assessment, where students with a disability have less knowledge about the assessment criteria than students without a disability. Less than 20% of students with a disability reported being familiar with the assessment criteria in physical education. According to Dobson et al. (2009) and a report from the Storting (St.meld 47, 1995-1996) it is important that students know the criteria for assessment since it works as a motivator for them. The criteria for assessment should be based on the competence aims, which are the same both for students with and without a disability (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2006).

Haycock and Smith (2010) found that teachers experience the assessment criteria as inadequate for assessing students with a disability. This experience was based on the prevalent focus on sport and valuing special types of abilities and skills, which made it difficult to assess students with a disability in an adequate way. This type of activities could also be more difficult to manage for students with a disability and therefore difficult to perform the activities in a standard way (Svendby, 2013). The focus on sport also come into conflict with the main focus of adapted physical activity; that is, to adapt

the activity or the environment so the individuals can perform the activity in their own way, despite the limitations (Hutzler, 2007). If the teachers in Norway have the same experience of the assessment criteria to be inadequate as teachers in England have (Haycock and Smith, 2010), then it is understandable that teachers not inform the students of these criteria and that the students in this project report to not know the assessment criteria.

Earlier research (Obrusnikova et al., 2010; Rizzo, 1984) found that teachers often feel a lack of knowledge on how to adapt their education to fit students with a disability. This lack of knowledge might impact on the way they interact with students with a disability. Furthermore, students with a disability have the same right to know the assessment criteria as those without a disability: therefore, there is every reason to inform students with a disability about the assessment criteria. Since it appears that the subject can be difficult to participate in for students with a disability, it might be extra important to include them in the assessment process and give them the opportunity to communicate with the teacher about which criteria that are manageable for them and their own participation in the subject.

According to Dobson et al. (2009) teachers use assessment for learning to plan the next step in the learning process and in education. In this project, the students had little knowledge of assessment for learning, and the results from this study suggest that this type of assessment is not being regularly employed in physical education. The results report a low level of students' engagement during the assessment process, and the findings show no significant difference between students with and without a disability. These findings are similar to those of Lopez-Pastor et al. (2013) who found that assessment for learning is not as regular in physical education as it is in other subjects. Even if assessment for learning has increased in several subjects, it seems that this is not the reality in physical education (López-Pastor et al., 2013). The results in this project present an assessment situation that is holding on to traditional methods of assessment instead of implementing alternatives that include the students more. Traditional forms of assessment are testing of physical skills, often based on a teaching plan focusing on drilling and exercise (López-Pastor et al., 2013). If teachers just hold on to the traditional forms of assessment, it will be difficult to introduce these alternative forms into the subject. Furthermore, if students are aware of assessment for learning in

subjects other than physical education they will also be aware that assessment in physical education is different from other subjects.

Svendby (2013) also found that engaging students in physical education assessment was not as regular as in other subjects. Furthermore, if the participants were not being engaged in the teaching, it was because their disability limited their participation. Since students with a disability often are experts on their own situation (Asbjørnslett & Hemmingsson, 2008; Svendby, 2013), and teachers admit to be unsecure on how to assess these students (Haycock & Smith, 2010), probably assessment for learning and to engage the students more in the assessment process would give a better learning process for the students.

Our project indicates that students with disabilities get significantly less feedback on the learning process from their teachers than students without disabilities. In addition, the study has also shown that both groups of students reported low levels of assessment for learning. According to Tveit (2009), formative assessment which is a method to promote assessment for learning, can give students an understanding of where they are in the learning process and be a way of providing feedback. The problem in physical education is that teachers do not manage to integrate the formative assessment into their own teaching (Sandvik et al., 2012). Furthermore, research has also shown that assessment criteria in general are quite unclear (Engvik, 2010; Vinje, 2008). If we accept that physical education is practiced in manner that makes it more difficult for pupils with disabilities to fit in (Haycock & Smith, 2010; Smith & Green, 2004; Svendby, 2013) then we can begin to understand why students with disabilities feel that they get little feedback on assessment for learning, because these pupils do not necessarily fit well into the official grading criteria as they have been formulated in relation to traditional sports and team games.

The findings concerning perceived fairness in the assessment process reveal a significant difference between students with and without a disability, as students with a disability reported lower levels of perceived justice than students without a disability. As seen in Table 2, this construct is based on different questions about their perception of the mark they obtained in the previous semester. Smith and Green (2004) also mentioned that teachers have challenges with assessing students with a disability. The

insecurity they perceive might influence the mark they give their students. The questionnaire in this research included a question asking if they had individual and adapted teaching for parts of the subject: 40% of the students with a disability reported having had this, which is less than half the students with a reported disability. If more of the students had received an individually adapted education the students might have perceived it as more fair.

Students' perception of the assessment process as not being fair might be connected to the fact that the higher mark they obtain, the more content they are with the mark. According to Hay and Penney (2013) students who receive higher marks consider themselves to be more able than those lower-ability students who receive lower marks. Since students with a disability significantly get lower marks than those without a disability it is then understandable if they feel that their abilities are not appreciated in the subject.

Of the students who report having a disability, two-thirds reported nearly always participating in the lessons and moving a lot. The remaining third reported not participating in the lessons, or they participated but did not move. In this study, students with a disability reported less movement during the lessons than students without a disability, and the difference between the groups was significant. If more students with a disability received an individual and adapted education, this would probably impact positively upon the opportunities for them to move more during the lessons.

One of the challenges with the test-variable concerning movement is that the findings are based on participants' subjective feeling about how much they moved during physical education. A subjective measurement of physical activity has more limitations than objective measurements with accelerometers (Thomas, Nelson & Silverman, 2011). Accelerometers give a more precise measurement and data, and give a more accurate measurement of the actual movement than a response to a question can give (Thomas et. al., 2011). This will influence the validity of this variable, and if tested with an accelerometer the findings might be different.

The marks in physical education were also investigated in this project. The results showed a significant difference between students with and without a disability, meaning that students with a disability obtained significantly lower marks than students without a

disability. The descriptive statistics also showed that boys get better marks than girls. Similar to Smith and Green (2004) and Svendby (2013), also Redelius, Fagrell and Larsson (2009) considered that being strong, fast, active and a good leader is an important aspect in physical education in relation to the marking. Because some activities are more common among boys, this makes it easier for them to get a good mark than for girls. In this way, it seems that physical education is a subject that favours boys and students without a disability. Since the results in this project also found boys getting better marks than girls, it seems like also for students with a disability physical education is a subject that favours boys.

A disability can make it difficult for students to participate in various types of activities, and, furthermore it can influence their skills and competence. Why do students with a disability have less knowledge to the competence aims, perceive the assessment as less fair, get less feedback, move less and get lower grades in physical education than students without a disability? The project presented here cannot provide clear answers to these questions, but it might be connected to teachers feeling they lack knowledge on how to include and assess students with a disability (Obrusnikova, 2010; Rizzo, 1984; Smith and Green, 2004). This lack of knowledge is reflected in their attitudes and how they understand disability (Rizzo, 1984). According to Rage (2011), teachers' attitudes to inclusion implicitly refer to how they understand disability. Teachers with negative attitudes to inclusion often have a medical understanding of disability, and those with positive attitudes seem to have a social understanding of disability (Rage, 2011). If the differences between students with and without a disability are based on teachers' negative attitudes to students' disabilities, then teachers might also have a medical understanding of disability. With a medical understanding the focus is on the characteristics that make the person with a disability different from the mass, and often on what they cannot do (Tøssebro, 2010). The focus on what they cannot do, gives a negative emphasis, and if it is the way teachers understand disability, then it is understandable why the students feel the education is not adapted to them.

Earlier research has also showed that it seems like teachers have different ways of grading their students. Svennberg, Meckbach and Redelius (2014) found that teachers often refer to their "gut-feeling" when grading their students. Annerstedt and Larsson (2010) found that teachers have often internalised what mark they will give certain

students based on conditions other than skills and knowledge, focusing more on criteria such as effort, participation and behaviour. Redelius, Fagrell and Larsson (2009) researched what teachers in physical education believe are the goal of the subject, what are the important knowledge and the criteria for assessment. They found that in physical education there are other abilities being valued than the ones to be found in the curriculum. It seems like the subject is more about to be (performing the activities well) and to do (being disciplined, friendly and thinking the subject is fun), and less about what the students have to know (Redelius, Fagrell & Larsson, 2009). Furthermore, the subjects focus on to do and to be might define that the important part of the subject is to move and how you behave. It values abilities that can be challenging for students with a disability. If we accept this internalised marking and focusing on different elements than the curriculum, then it is understandable why students with a disability get significantly lower grades and perceive the assessment as less fair than students without a disability (Annerstedt and Larsson, 2010; Rizzo, 1984; Smith and Green, 2004; Svendby, 2013).

According to Svendby (2013) and Smith and Green (2004) physical education is a traditional subject struggling to develop from the already established norms. It seems that the main focus of the subject is being actively involved, with an ideology focusing on sports (Haycock & Smith, 2011; Green, 2000; Smith and Green, 2004; Svendby, 2013). This ideology is difficult to reunite with the government's political vision around inclusion, and teachers describe the ideology as a contrast to the prevalent focus on inclusion and find it difficult to work with them both (Smith & Green, 2004). Teachers in Smith and Green (2004) and Haycock and Smith (2010) wish to include students with a disability in the subject, but experience the ideology in the subject making it difficult to assess them in a common way. The subjects' ideology and how it is being practised will influence assessment in physical education. If we accept that physical education is a traditional subject focusing on competition and sport and are willing to understand how teachers impact on the assessment, then we can begin to understand why the assessment process in physical education does not manage to follow the same development as other subjects.

Knowing how this ideology impacts the subject and if we accept it, several of the significant differences in this project makes more sense. This ideology and focus on sports makes it difficult for students with a disability to participate in all the activities in

the subject, and this can impact how much they move and also which mark they get. If physical education teachers wish to include students with a disability more, the assessment practice can be a way of creating a more inclusive subject. Assessment for learning emphasizes personal development, and makes the students more involved in their own learning and assessment.

5. Conclusion

Several elements of the assessment process have been included in this research. These findings show some significant differences on several of the test-variables between students with and without a disability in relation to physical education on several elements. These differences confirm that teachers do not assess all their students in the same way, and it seems that teachers are unfamiliar with how to assess students with a disability in a way that is common across all students. Students with a disability move less, and get lower marks than students without a disability. The result being presented in this project show that there is a difference between students with and without a disability concerning the assessment process, and students with a disability feel less satisfied than those without a disability.

Future research in Norway can be to investigate the teacher perspective on the assessment of students with a disability, focusing on how teachers understand the curriculum. It would also be interesting to investigate more practical aspects of this topic. An action research project on assessment for learning were the researcher works together with teachers to develop a culture on assessment for learning in physical education would be interesting.

References:

- Annerstedt, C. & Larsson, S. (2010) "I have my own picture of what the demands are." Grading in Swedish PEH- Problems of validity, comparability and fairness *European Physical Education Review*, 16(2), 97-115
- Asbjørnslett, M. & Hemmingsson, H. (2008) Participation at school as experienced by teenagers with physical disabilities. *Scandinavian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 15,153-161.
- Assessment Reform Group (2002) *Assessment for learning -10 principles. Research-based principles to guide classroom practice*, Assessment Reform Group. Retrived 13.05.2014 from http://assessmentreformgroup.files.wordpress.com/2012/01/10principles_english.pdf
- Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B. & Wiliam, D. (2003) *Assessment for learning – Putting it into practice*, Open Press University
- Bø, I. & L. Helle (2013). *Pedagogisk ordbok: praktisk oppslagsverk i pedagogikk, psykologi og sosiologi*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Dale, E.J. & Wærnes, J.I (2006) *Vurdering i en elevaktiv skole*, Universitetsforlaget, Oslo
- Dobson, S., Eggen, A. & Smith, K. (2011) *Vurdering, prinsipper og praksis*, Gyldendal akademiske, Oslo.
- Engh, K.R. (2010) Vurdering for læring. Hva og hvorfor? In Dobson & Engh (Eds.) *Vurdering for læring i fag*. Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget.
- Engh, K.R. (2011) *Vurdering for læring i fag: på vei mot en bærekraftig vurderingskultur*. Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget.
- Engvik, G. (2010) Elevvurdering i kroppsøving- noen utfordringer. In Dobson & Engh (Eds.) *Vurdering for læring i fag*. Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget.
- Fitzgerald, H & Kirk, D. (2009) Physical education as a normalizing practice: Is there a space for disability sport? In H. Fitzgerald (Ed.) *Disability and Youth Sport*, London: Routledge.
- Gall, M. D., J. P. Gall & Borg, W.R. (2007). *Educational research: an introduction*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Goodwin, D. L. & Watkinson, E.J (2000): Inclusive physical education from the persepective of students with physical disabilities. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 17, 144-160.
- Green, K. (2000): Exploring the everyday "philosophies" of physical education teachers from a sociological perspective. *Sport, Education and Society*, 5:2, 109-129.

- Hattie, J. (2009) *Visible learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. London: Routledge.
- Hay, P. & Penney, D. (2013) *Assessment in Physical Education: a sociocultural perspective*. London: Routledge
- Haycock, D. & Smith, A. (2010). Inadequate and inappropriate?; The assessment of young disabled people and pupils with special educational needs in National Curriculum Physical Education. *European Physical Education Review* 16(3) 17.
- Hutzler, Y. (2007). A systematic ecological model for adapting physical activities: Theoretical foundations and practical examples. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly* 24: 287 - 304.
- Imsen, G. (2006) *Lærerens verden – innføring i generell didaktikk*, Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.
- Larsson, H. & Redelius, K. (Eds.) (2004). *Mellan nytta och nöje: bilder av ämnet idrott och hälsa*. Stockholm: Idrottshögskolan GIH.
- López-Pastor, V. M., Kirk, D., Lorente-Catalán, E., MacPhail, A. & MacDonald, D. (2013). Alternative assessment in physical education: a review of international literature. *Sport, Education and Society* 18(1) 57-76.
- Nordahl, T, Kostøl, A., Sunnevåg, A.K., Aasen, A.M., Løken, G., Dobson, S., Kundsmoen, H. (2012) *Dette vet vi om vurderingspraksis*, Oslo: Gyldendal Akademiske forlag
- Obrusnikova, I., Block, M. & Dillon, S. (2010). Children's beliefs toward cooperative playing with peers with disabilities in physical education. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 20, 230 -245.
- Opplæringslova (1998) *Lov om grunnskolen og den videregående opplæringa: Trådt i kraft 01. August, 1999, sist endret 01.01.2014*. Retrived 10.april 2014 from <http://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1998-07-17-61>
- Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill.
- Rage, I. (2011) *"Disse to har tilpasset opplæring som alle andre barn": en kvalitativ studie av inkludering og tilpasset opplæring i kroppsøving*. Master's thesis. Oslo: Norwegian School of Sports Sciences.
- Redelius, K., Fagrell, B. & Larsson, H. (2009) Symbolic capital in physical education and health: To be, to do or to know? That is the gendered question. *Sport, Education and Society*, 14 (2), 245 - 260.
- Redelius, K. & Hay, P. (2012). Student views on criterion-referenced assessment and grading in Swedish physical education. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, 17(2), 211- 225

- Rizzo, T. (1984) Attitudes of physical educators toward teaching handicapped pupils, *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 1, 267 -274
- Smith, A. & Green, K. (2004). Including pupils with special educational needs in secondary school physical education: A sociological analysis of teachers views. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 25 (5) ,593-607.
- Sandvik, L. V., Engvik, G., Fjørtoft, H., Langseth, I. D., Aaslid, B.E., Mordal, S. & Buland, T. (2012). *Vurdering i skolen. Intensjoner og forståelser. Delrapport 1 fra prosjektet Forskning på individuell vurdering i skolen*, NTNU Skole- og læringsforskning
- Siedentop, D & Tannehill, D. (2000). *Developing teaching skills in physical education*. Mountain View, California: Mayfield Publications.
- Stortingsmelding 18 (St.meld) (2010 -2011) *Læring og fellesskap*, Oslo: Kunnskapsdepartementet.
- Stortingsmelding 47 (St.meld.). (1995-1996). *Om elevvurdering, skolebasert vurdering og nasjonalt vurderingssystem*, Oslo: Kunnskapsdepartementet
- Svendby, E. B. (2013). "Jeg kan og jeg vil, men jeg passer visst ikke inn" - en narrativ studie om barn og unges erfaringer med kroppsøvingsslaget når de har en sjelden diagnose (fysisk funksjonshemming), PhD Thesis. Oslo: Norwegian School of Sport Science.
- Svennberg, L., Mackbach, J. & Redelius, K. (2014). Exploring PE teachers "gut feelings": An attempt to verbalise and discuss teachers internalised grading criteria. *European Physical Education Review*, 20(2), 199 -214.
- Thomas, J.R., Nelson, S. J. & Silverman, S. J. (2011). *Research methods in physical activity*, Champaign II: Human Kinetics
- Tveit, S. (2009). Educational assessment in Norway: A time of change. In C. Wyatt-Smith & J. Cumming (Eds.) *Educational Assessment in the 21st Century - connecting theory and practice*. Dordrecht: Springer. P. 227-243.
- Tøssebro, J. (2010). *Hva er funksjonshemming*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Utdanningsdirektoratet (2006). *National Curriculum for Knowledge Promotion in Primary and Secondary Education and Training*. Oslo: Kunnskapsdepartementet.
- Vinje, E. (2008). *Vurdering i kroppsøving*. Nøtterøy: Ped Media

Tables:

Table 1: Demographic information about the participants.....s. 43

Table 2: Test-variables and items/questions used from the survey.....s. 45

Table 3: Results of the chi-square and independent t-test.....s. 46

Appendix list

Appendix 1: Request for participation in the survey

Appendix 2: Questionnaire

Appendix 3: Translation over used items

Invitasjon til spørreundersøkelse for elever i
prosjektet “vurdering for læring i kroppsøving?”

Les hele teksten på dette arket for elevene før de
logger inn på nettstedet <https://resp.nsd.no> ved hjelp
av tildelt innloggingsID og PINkode.

Appendix 1



Forespørsel om deltaking i spørreundersøkelse i forbindelse med forskningsprosjektet ”Vurdering for læring i kroppsøving?”

I arbeidet med min doktorgrad studerer jeg læring og vurdering i kroppsøving ved flere videregående skoler. Skolen du er elev ved er en av skolene som har sagt seg villig til å være med i prosjektet. Prosjektet består blant annet av gruppeintervju med lærere som underviser i kroppsøving og en nettbasert spørreundersøkelse blant alle elever ved skolene.

Hensikten med spørreundersøkelsen er å få fram ulike oppfatninger og erfaringer med innhold, vurdering og læring i kroppsøving. Spørsmålene handler om hva dere gjør og opplever i kroppsøving, hva dere forventes å lære i faget og hvordan vurderingen foregår. Du skal svare ut fra dine opplevelser med faget på din skole. I tillegg vil du få noen spørsmål om din bakgrunn og aktivitet på fritida.

Alle opplysninger som samles inn vil bli behandlet konfidensielt. Både skole og enkeltpersoner anonymiseres ved formidling/rapportering av resultater. Spørsmåls kategorier med svar fra mindre enn fem elever vil grupperes slik at de ikke kan knyttes til den enkelte skole. Fullstendig anonymisering vil gjøres etter eventuelle oppfølgingsstudier, senest i 2020. Prosjektet er godkjent av Personvernombudet for forskning, Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste A/S.

Det er frivillig å være med og du har mulighet til å trekke deg når som helst underveis, uten å måtte begrunne dette nærmere. Dersom du trekker deg vil alle innsamlede data om deg slettes.

Ved å logge inn og svare på undersøkelsen bekrefter du å ha mottatt denne informasjonen om forskningsprosjektet *Vurdering for læring i kroppsøving?* og at du er villig til å delta i spørreundersøkelsen.

Med vennlig hilsen
Petter Erik Leirhaug
Stipendiat ved Norges idrettshøgskole

Appendix 2

Les dette før du starter:

Du skal nå ha fått opplest en forespørsel om å delta i denne spørreundersøkelsen om kroppsøvingsfaget, der hensikten er å undersøke ulike oppfatninger og erfaringer med innhold, vurdering og læring i kroppsøving. Ved å klikke deg videre bekrefter du å ha mottatt denne informasjonen og at du er villig til å delta.

Hele undersøkelsen består av 32 hovedspørsmål. Det tar omtrent 20 minutter å gjennomføre undersøkelsen.

Det er viktig for resultatet at du svarer så ærlig og godt som mulig. Du skal svare ut fra dine opplevelser med kroppsøvingsfaget på din skole. Husk at ingen svar er mer riktige enn andre og ingen får vite hva du har svart.

Lykke til!

Hvor ofte har du i løpet av det siste året i kroppøving eller på aktivitetsdager hatt disse aktivitetene?

	Aldri hatt	1-2 ganger	3-4 ganger	5-10 ganger	Mer enn 10 ganger
Dans du selv er med på å lage	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Egentrening	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Rugby	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Basketball	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Volleyball	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Rekkertspill (f. eks. badminton, tennis)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fotball	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Handball	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Innebandy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tester (av ulike slag)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Friluftsliv (f.eks. tur i skogen, matlaging ute)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Styrketrening med vekter/treningsapparater	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Friidrett (f. eks. lengehopp, høyde, baneløp, kulestøt)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Orientering	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Og noen aktiviteter til: Hvor ofte har du i løpet av det siste året hatt disse?

	Aldri hatt	1-2 ganger	3-4 ganger	5-10 ganger	Mer enn 10 ganger
Leik (og annen bevegelsesmoro)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Svømming	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Klatring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Padling i kano/kajakk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Turn/akrobatikk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Trampoline eller trampett	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Aerobic og andre former for musikkmosjon	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kampsport (f. eks. judo, karate, capoeira)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Norsk folkedans (f. eks. reinlender, polka, halling)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dans fra andre kulturer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Skigåing – langrenn, tur eller skileik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ski, snøbrett, eller liknende i alpinbakke	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Skøyter/isspill	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Intervalltrening for utholdenhet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Yoga, Pilates, massasje eller liknende avspenningstrening	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Har dere hatt undervisning der kroppøving har vært slått sammen med andre fag (tverrfaglig undervisning)?

- Ja
 Nei
 Vet ikke

Kjenner du kompetansemålene i kroppsøving? (sett et kryss der det passer best)

- Nei, de er jeg ukjent med
- Ja, jeg har lest dem på egen hånd
- Ja, læreren har gått gjennom dem
- Ja, jeg har lest dem og læreren har gått gjennom dem
- Ja, vi arbeider stadig med kompetansemålene

Hvor viktig mener du kroppsøving er i forhold til de andre fagene på skolen?

- Mindre viktig enn andre fag
- Like viktig som andre fag
- Viktigere enn andre fag

Hvor mye betyr følgende for vurderingen i kroppsøving ved din skole?

	1 Betyr ikke noe	2	3	4	5 Betyr svært mye
God utholdenhet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Å være fysisk sterk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teoriprøver	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Innsats i timene	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lite fravær	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kompetanse i friluftsliv	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gode ferdigheter i ballspill	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gode ferdigheter i dans	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
At du er god i en enkelt idrett	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Å dusje	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Å vise framgang (f. eks. i styrke, utholdenhet og ferdighet)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Å trene på fritida	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Plan for egentrening	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gjennomføring av egentrening	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Måloppnåelse (kompetansemål)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
At du er bedre enn andre elever i idrettene/aktivitetene	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gode prestasjoner i konkurranseidrett (utenfor skolen)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Hvilken karakter fikk du i kroppsøving ved siste halvårsvurdering?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- Fikk ikke karakter

Hvor godt passer disse påstandene med din oppfatning av karakterer og vurdering i kroppsøving?

	1 Helt uenig	2	3	4	5 Helt enig
Kroppsøvingslærer samtaler med meg om karakteren	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg synes jeg får den karakter jeg fortjener	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
For å få god karakter må jeg gjøre det bra på tester	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Elevene er med og vurderer hverandre	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg er fornøgd med kroppsøvingkarakteren min	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kroppsøvingslæreren gir rettferdige karakterer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg deltar i kroppsøving bare for å få karakter	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vurdering handler mer om hva jeg skal lære enn om karakter	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jenter har lettere for å få god karakter i kroppsøving	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kroppsøvingslærerne på skolen bruker karakterene likt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg vet hva som kreves for å få de ulike karakterene	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kroppsøvingslæreren har forklart om vurdering for læring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg får være med å vurdere meg selv	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg vet hva jeg må gjøre for å få bedre karakter	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg kunne fått bedre karakter i en annen klassegruppe	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ved vår skole er kompetansemålene grunnlaget for vurdering i kroppsøving	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Har du i enkelttimer eller deler av kroppsøvingsfaget hatt undervisning eller eget opplegg som har vært spesielt tilrettelagt for deg?

- Ja
 Nei

Har du noen funksjonshemming eller sykdom som gjør det vanskelig å delta i (deler av) kroppsøvingsfaget slik det blir drevet ved din skole?

- Ja
 Nei

Hvordan passer disse påstandene med din selvopfatning?

	1 Helt uenig	2	3	4	5 Helt enig
Jeg trives godt på skolen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg opplever ofte mestring i kroppsøving	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg har gode venner i klassen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg er fornøyd med kroppen min	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg er fornøyd med mine prestasjoner i kroppsøving	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Det er greit å skifte og dusje på skolen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg føler meg ofte utrygg i kroppsøving	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg prøver å vise god orden og oppførsel	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg er i dårlig fysisk form og blir fort sliten	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg er generelt skolelei	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg er motivert for å trene og lære nye ferdigheter	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kroppsøving er det dårligste faget mitt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg trives best i kroppsøving når vi arbeider/trener individuelt eller i par	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg liker å vise meg fram i kroppsøving	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg liker å trene/stå på så jeg blir skikkelig fysisk sliten	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg ønsker å ha en mer aktiv livsstil enn jeg har	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Hvor godt passer disse påstandene med din oppfatning av kroppsøvingsfaget?

	1 Helt uenig	2	3	4	5 Helt enig
Jeg lærer meg hva som skjer i kroppen ved oppvarming	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg forbedrer mine ferdigheter i ulike idretter	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg lærer meg å samarbeide med andre	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg lærer ikke noe nytt i kroppsøving	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg får avkopling fra det vanlige skolearbeidet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg har det gøy i nesten alle timene	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Noen elever i klassen deltar nesten aldri i timene	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg skulle helst sluppet å være med	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg synes det er kjekt når vi deler inn lag	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg lærer hvordan fysisk aktivitet kan påvirke helsa	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg blir aldri sliten i timene	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg lærer å planlegge trening og trene på egen hånd	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teori i kroppsøving er unødvendig	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg gjør så godt jeg kan i kroppsøvingstimene	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg synes vi skulle hatt flere timer kroppsøving	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg lærer hvordan lage bål og mat ute	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg lærer om kosthold og helse	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg lærer om idrettsskader og førstehjelp	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg lærer ulike danser	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg lærer fair play	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Omtrent hvor mange ganger i dette skoleåret har dere i kroppsøving snakket om kompetansemålene?

- Aldri
- 1 gang
- Ca. 2-4 ganger
- Ca. 5-10 ganger
- Over 10 ganger

Omtrent hvor mange ganger i dette skoleåret har du vært med å vurdert ditt eget arbeid i kroppsøving?

- Aldri
- 1 gang
- Ca. 2-4 ganger
- Ca. 5-10 ganger
- Over 10 ganger

Omtrent hvor mange ganger så langt i dette skoleåret har du fått tilbakemelding fra lærer om hva du må gjøre for å forbedre kompetansen din i faget?

- Aldri
 1 gang
 Ca. 2-4 ganger
 Ca. 5-10 ganger
 Over 10 ganger

På hvilke måter får du tilbakemelding fra kroppsøvingslærer?

(Her kan du sette flere kryss).

- Tilbakemelding underveis i timene, ved at lærer hjelper til fysisk/viser meg
 Tilbakemelding underveis i timene, ved at lærer gir muntlige råd og tips til hva jeg bør prøve/gjøre/trene vider på
 Tilbakemelding i på forhånd avtalt samtale
 Tilbakemelding i samtale der lærer tar deg til side i en time
 Tilbakemelding på eget skjema for tilbakemelding
 Tilbakemelding på Fronter / itslearning
 Tilbakemelding på andre måter

Hvor godt passer disse påstandene med din oppfatning av undervisningen i kroppsøving?

	1 Helt uenig	2	3	4	5 Helt enig
Jeg får hjelp når jeg trenger det	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vi har skriftlig prøve en gang i halvåret	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vi har ballspill nesten hver time	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vi følger utdelte periodeplaner	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Det er mye bråk og uorden i kroppsøvingstimene	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg får tilbakemeldinger om hvor jeg er i læreprosessen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg blir ofte nødt til å gjøre ting jeg ikke liker	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Læreren har god oversikt over hva jeg kan og ikke kan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vi har for mye dans	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vi har for mye friluftsliv	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg får ofte støtte og hjelp av mine medelever	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg blir motivert til å trene og være aktiv i hverdagen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Innholdet i timene er lite variert	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Det er for lite hard trening i kroppsøvingstimene	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lærer forskjellsbehandler elever	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lærer deltar selv ofte i idrettene/aktivitetene	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lærer er flink til å motivere og engasjere elevene	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vi har aldri hjemmearbeid (leksjer) i kroppsøving	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Egenvurdering brukes systematisk (trenger ikke være ofte)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Alle elevene er i aktivitet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Hvilket kjønn er kroppsøvlingslæreren din?

- Kvinne
 - Mann
 - Har flere lærere, begge kjønn
-

Hvilken oppvekstbakgrunn har du?

- Jeg er født og oppvokst i Norge
 - Jeg er adoptert, oppvokst i Norge
 - Jeg har innvandringsbakgrunn (født i annet land)
 - Jeg har innvandringsbakgrunn (født i Norge, mine foreldre/foresatte innvandret)
-

Hva er din mors høyeste utdanning?

- Høyskole/universitet
 - Videregående
 - Grunnskole
 - Vet ikke
-

Hva er din fars høyeste utdanning?

- Høyskole/universitet
 - Videregående
 - Grunnskole
 - Vet ikke
-

Hvor ofte har du i snitt per uke drevet med følgende treningsaktivitet i løpet av de 12 siste måneder?

	Aldri	Under 1 gang p/uke	1 gang p/uke	Flere ganger p/uke
Utholdenhetsidrett (feks løp, sykling, langrenn, svømming)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lag-/ballidretter (feks squash, håndball, fotball, ishockey)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Styrkeidrett (feks bryting, vekttrening)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kampsport (feks judo, karate, taekwondo)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tekniske idretter (feks ridning, alpint, telemark, friidrett, snowboard, golf, rullebrett/skøyter)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Risikoidrett (feks elvepadling, fjellklatring, paragliding)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Treningssenter (feks spinning, saltrening, apparatsal)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dans (feks hip-hop, ballett, leikarring, salsa)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Hvor ofte, i en normal uke, er du sammenhengende fysisk aktiv med trening, rask gange, dans, idrett eller annen aktivitet i mer enn en 1/2-time?

- Hver dag
 - 5-6 dager per uke
 - 3-4 dager per uke
 - 1-2 dager per uke
 - Veldig sjelden
-

Konkurrerer du i idrett, dans eller lignende? Både individuelle konkurranser og der du deltar på et lag teller med.

- Ja
 Nei

Hvor mange ganger totalt har du i løpet av de siste 12 måneder gjort disse friluftaktivitetene på fritida (ikke med skolen)?

	Aldri	1 gang	2-5 ganger	Mer enn 5 ganger
Tursykling (utenfor offentlig vei/tettbygd strøk)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fottur i skog og mark	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fottur i fjellet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Klatring/buldring ute	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Padling i kano/kajakk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tur med overnatting i telt eller under åpen himmel	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ferskvannsfiske	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sjøfiske	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jakt	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bading (i sjø/elv/på kysten)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Plukking av sopp eller bær (bær- eller sopptur)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Skøyter utendørs (på tur eller som leik)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Skitur og/eller "frikjøring" på snø	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ridetur i skog og mark eller fjell	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Svar ja eller nei ut fra om du har gjort dette siden du begynte på videregående.

	Ja	Nei
Jeg har planlagt og gjennomført oppvarming	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg har planlagt og gjennomført oppvarming flere ganger	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg har vært med på å planlegge og gjennomføre tur ut i naturen	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg har øvd på førstehjelp som er vanlig ved idrettsskader	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg har vært ute og brukt naturen som matkilde	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg har øvd på å kunne demonstrere og bruke gode arbeidsteknikker og arbeidsstillinger	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg har fylt ut skriftlig egenvurdering i kroppsøving (på papir eller data)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg har hatt samtale med kroppsøvingslærer der jeg fikk tilbakemelding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg har vært med og vurdert medelever i kroppsøving	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg har brukt rekneknnskaper (matematikk) i arbeid med kroppsøving	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg har brukt digitale verktøy (feks PC, pulsklokke) i arbeid med kroppsøving	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jeg har fått vurderinger som har ført til at jeg har skjerpet meg faglig	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Gjør en vurdering av hvor godt du klarer deg i/mestrer aktivitetene nedenfor.

	1 Kan ikke/aldri prøvd	2	3	4	5 Mestrer godt
Dans du selv er med på å lage	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Volleyball	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Basketball	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Innebandy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Håndball	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fotball	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Egentrening	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tester (av ulike slag)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Friluftsliv (f.eks. tur i skogen, matlaging ute)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Styrketrening med vekter/treningsapparater	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Friidrett (f. eks. lengehopp, høyde, baneløp, kulestøt)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Orientering	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Turn/akrobatikk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Norsk folkedans (f. eks. reinlender, polka, halling)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Skigåing – langrenn, tur eller skileik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ski, snøbrett, eller liknende i alpinbakke	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Skøyter/isspill	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Noe du til slutt vil si om kroppøving?

Ordet fritt

Tusen takk for at du svarte på undersøkelsen!

Appendix 3

Norske originaler	Engelsk versjon
Kjenner du kompetansemålene i kroppsøving?	Are you familiar with the competence aims in physical education?
Jeg vet hva som kreves for å få de ulike karakterene.	I know what it takes to get the different mark.
Jeg vet hva jeg må gjøre for å få bedre karakter.	I know what to do to get a better mark.
Ved vår skole er kompetansemålene grunnlaget for vurdering i kroppsøving.	At our school, the competence aims form the assessment.
Kroppsøvingslæreren har forklart om vurdering for læring.	The physical education teacher has explained "assessment for learning".
Vurdering handler mer om hva jeg skal lære enn om karakter.	Assessment is more about what to learn than about the mark.
Elevene er med å vurderer hverandre.	The students assess each other.
Jeg får være med å vurdere meg selv.	I am allowed to assess myself.
Omtrent hvor mange ganger i dette skoleåret har du vært med å vurdere ditt eget arbeid i kroppsøving.	Approximately how many times have you been included in the assessment of your own work/efforts.
Egenvurdering brukes systematisk.	Self-assessment is being used systematically.
Jeg får hjelp når jeg trenger det.	I get help when I need it.
Jeg får tilbakemeldinger om hvor jeg er i læreprosessen.	I receive feedback as to where I stand in the learning process.
Lærer er flink til å motivere og engasjere elevene.	The teacher is good at motivating and involving the students.
Jeg vet hva jeg må gjøre for å få bedre karakter.	I know what I need to do to get a better mark.
Jeg synes jeg får den karakteren jeg fortjener.	I get the mark I deserve.
Jeg er fornøyd med kroppsøvingskaracteren min.	I am happy with my mark in physical education.
Jeg deltar i kroppsøving bare for å få karakter.	I participate in physical education only to get a grade.
Hvor mye beveger du deg i kroppsøvingstimen?	How much do you move during physical education?
Hvilken karakter fikk du i kroppsøving ved siste halvårsvurdering?	Which mark did you get at the last semester assessment?

