

Development of Didactic Support for the Preparation of Future Physical Education Teachers for Innovative Activities in the Field of Women's Sport Education

Rustamov Dostonbek Jamshid ugli

Researcher of Tashkent State University of Economics,
Tashkent, Uzbekistan

E-mail address: rustamovdostonbek@tsue.uz

Abstract. *This article deals with the important points of life women's sport education. The health of women's is the main goal of every country. The development of women's sport is the future of our country.*

Keywords: Information technologies, educators and researchers, new methods, networks and tools, communication.

Introduction

It is widely acknowledged amongst today's educators that teachers' roles have changed dramatically since the last century. In recent years, we have witnessed rapid social and cultural changes in girls' sport, phenomenal advances in communication and information technologies, as well as the introduction of the Internet within schools. These factors have contributed to shape the teaching and operating cultures of schools and created shifts in our expectations of the physical learning environment. They have affected teachers, educators and researchers the world over. These miniature revolutions have given rise to an urgent need for a new generation of facilities to cater for 21st century teaching and learning needs.

This paper presents the conclusions of a study carried out in collaboration with schools in six European countries over a three-year period and explores what tomorrow's physical learning environments will be like the girls' sport. The study, which stemmed from a project entitled Forum for the Future and which was funded by the Finnish National Board of Education (FNBE), was designed to contribute to the quality of education and to promote new methods, networks and tools, both locally and globally. It required students to answer questionnaires and work in simulation laboratories. The concept of "learning environment" will become increasingly significant as schools of the future become centres of lifelong learning. "Learning environment" is a term used liberally in educational discourse because of the emerging use of information technologies for educational purposes on the one hand, and the constructivist concept of knowledge and learning on the other and is in harmony with the environment; and one that encourages social participation, providing a healthy, comfortable, safe, secure and stimulating setting for its occupants".

In its narrowest sense, the girls' sport a physical learning environment is seen as a conventional classroom and, in its widest sense, as a combination of formal and informal education systems where learning takes place both inside and outside of schools (Manninen et al., 2007). Manninen criticised traditional school teaching for conveying too much theoretical information and for preventing in-depth learning. He claims that inert knowledge is relevant for exams but not for real-world problems. This idea is posing new challenges and exerting pressure to bring about changes in physical learning environments.

The concept of the physical learning environment with respect to physical structures relates to spaces, equipment and tools within the school. Lehtinen (1997, p. 21) suggests that the concept has evolved into an even more complex structure that includes teaching equipment, sources of information and events outside of schools, where students can take part in the learning process both directly and virtually. The term evolved as a result of the recent changes taking place in pedagogy, whereby actual learning has been transposed outside of schools thanks to developments in communication and information technology. Internet has already brought about significant changes in schools. Both the immense quantity of information available and easy access to social networks have weakened the link between schools and learning and therefore modified the traditional teacher-student scenario. The learning process is becoming more co-operative, changing the teacher into a learner too. Manninen (2007, p. 27) categorises learning according to five different contexts: physical, local, social, technological and didactic.

The basic structure of teaching spaces does not seem to have evolved much over the past century. This fact inspired the research team to investigate the reason why, despite the recent changes in pedagogy and the widespread use of information technology inside classrooms and school spaces, the physical learning environment has not yet changed in keeping with this evolution. In order to plan and construct effective physical learning environments, not only technical specifications need to be elaborated; qualitative aspects also need to be considered (Nuikkinen 2009, p. 64).

The concept of “quality design” has become critical the world over. It relates to school construction and, more particularly, defining a quality physical learning environment, measuring it and analysing the results (OECD, 2006). With regard to quality criteria for school building and design, the key actors are students; requirements are determined by specific age groups, in conjunction with societal needs and regulations relating to usability and safety (Heitor, 2005).

It has been demonstrated that international comparisons of education can be achieved through comprehensive quality management and quality criteria. The results of the study highlighted several key factors relating to a quality physical learning environment, namely the relevance for school users of the teaching space as a whole as well as their specific needs in relation to furniture and equipment. It showed that the physical learning environment is pivotal to users’ desire to develop the school’s operational environment as well as their need to renew its operational culture. The more meaningful and challenging the operational environment is, the more the user is willing to improve the physical learning environment.

The needs of teachers, head-teachers and students call for practical solutions, and these too have an impact on it. When physical learning environments offer resources and possibilities that support new teaching methods and learning goals, schools are much more prompt to change their operational culture. In other words, they are important when developing school operational culture, as well as work environments. Despite the differences within education systems, the basic principles of using physical learning environments and the concepts behind ideal teaching spaces are very similar.

The study’s findings indicate that pressure for change in teaching and learning is felt at the national level. Consequently, the expectations for physical learning environments do not differ significantly between countries. Moreover, today’s well-educated and committed teachers offer a largely unharnessed resource for planning and implementing future learning environments.

References:

1. Dudek, M. (2000), *Architecture of Schools: The New Learning Environments*, Architectural Press, Oxford, p. xiv.
2. Evagorou, M. et al. (2009).
3. “An Investigation of the Potential of Interactive Simulations for Developing System Thinking Skills in Elementary School: A Case Study with Fifth-Graders and Sixth-Graders”, *International Journal of Science Education*, Vol. 31, Issue 5, pp. 356.
4. Finnish National Board of Education (2008), *Perusopetuksen laatukriteerit. Opetusministeriön väliraportti*, Helsinki University Print, Helsinki.
5. Heidegger, M. (2000).
6. Oleminen ja aika, translated into Finnish by R. Kupiainen, *Vastapaino*, Tampere, pp. 33-34, 80, 84.
7. Heitor, T. (2005).
8. “Potential problems and challenges in defining international design principles for school”, *Evaluating Quality in Educational Facilities*, pp. 48,
9. OECD/PEB, www.oecd.org/edu/facilities/evaluatingquality. Lehtinen, E. (1997).
10. *Verkkopedagogiikka*, Edita, Helsinki.
11. Manninen, A. et al. (2007),
12. *Oppimista tukevat ympäristöt. Johdatus oppimisympäristöajatteluun*, Opetushallitus, Helsinki.
13. Marton, F. and S. Booth (1997).
14. *Learning and Awareness*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, New Jersey, p. 13.
15. Abdurakhmanova, G., Shayusupova, N., Irmatova, A., & Rustamov, D. (2020). The role of the digital economy in the development of the human capital market. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(7), 8043–8051. <https://doi.org/10.37200/IJPR/V24I7/PR270779>
16. Jamshido’g’li, R. D., Rakhmonjon Zokirjono’g’li, O., & Kholdorovna, R. F. (2020). Changes in market relations in the period of market economy and their classification. *South Asian Journal of Marketing & Management Research*, 10(4), 120. <https://doi.org/10.5958/2249-877x.2020.00020.x>
17. Xidirberdiyevich, A. E., Ilkhomovich, S. E., Azizbek, K., & Dostonbek, R. (2020). Investment activities of insurance companies: The role of insurance companies in the financial market. *Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems*, 12(6 Special Issue), 719–725. <https://doi.org/10.5373/JARDCS/V12SP6/SP20201086>