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김 지태
연세대학교

국문초록

본 연구의 목적은 7주 동안의 놀이 지향적 체육지도 프로그램이 인지장애 아동의 멀리뛰기 동작에 어떠한 영향을 미치는지를 조사하는 것이었다. 본 연구의 참가자는 특수학교에 다니는 4-7세 사이의 인지장애 아동 34명이었다. 본 연구는 현장실험(field experiment) 연구로서 사전검사(1주), 중계(7주), 사후검사(1주)로 구분되었다. 사전검사와 사후검사는 멀리뛰기 동작을 평가하기 위하여 대근운동능력검사(Test of Gross Motor Development-2; TGMD-2)와 미시간 대학의 기초 동작기술단계 특성(Motor Performance Study; MPS)을 사용하였다. 7주간의 중계 기간 동안에는 2개의 그룹을 학교별로 구분하여, 첫 번째 집단(School A)의 아동들은 주 3회, 1회당 15분 동안 놀이 지향적 지도를 받았으며, 두 번째 집단(School B)의 아동들은 같은 기간 동안 어떠한 지도도 받지 않았다. 독립표본 t-검정 결과에 의하면, 사전검사에서는 두 집단의 TGMD-2와 MPS 점수에 유의한 차이가 없었으나, 사후검사에서는 두 집단의 TGMD-2와 MPS 점수에 유의한 차이를 보였다. 또한 대응표본 t-검정 결과에 의하면, School A에 있는 아동들은 사전검사와 사후검사 사이의 TGMD-2와 MPS 점수에 유의한 차이를 보였으나, School B에 있는 아동은 유의한 차이가 없었다. 그러므로 본 연구의 결과를 통해 놀이 지향적 체육지도 프로그램은 인지장애 아동의 멀리뛰기 동작을 향상시키는데 효과적이라고 결론지을 수 있었다.
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I. Introduction

Movement activities performed by young children involve and rely upon the use of fundamental motor skills (NASPE, 2002; Payne & Isaacs, 2002). It is important for physical education teachers to recognize the effectiveness of various instructional programs and select those that will allow each student to learn fundamental motor skills as effectively and completely as possible (Ignico, 1994; Payne & Isaacs, 2002).

Although there may be many effective and meaningful ways to help children with disabilities learn fundamental motor skills, two basic types of teaching methods are generally used in physical education programs for young children with disabilities. Those are, physical education instruction programs generally tend toward either a teacher-centered program of direct instruction or toward a student-centered program of indirect instruction. Much of the recent research has compared the relative effectiveness of direct and indirect instruction programs for young children with disabilities, and has examined the advantages and disadvantages of each teaching method.

According to the explanation given by Rich (2000), direct instruction is based on a teacher’s control of instruction and close supervision of student work. Also, the teacher can give the student direct cueing and feedback regarding the student’s error or, as they need, information regarding lesson content. Ainsworth and Fox (1989) reported that direct instruction may be less time-consuming in early stages than indirect instruction. They proposed that direct instruction has produced good results in low-achieving students, such as those with severe disabilities. Similarly, Hickson, Blackman, and Reis (1995) stated that direct behaviorally oriented instruction is the method of choice at more profound levels of mental retardation. However, in spite of these advantages, some researchers (Bricker & Cripe, 1992; Linder, 1993) reported some criticisms of this teaching method for children, such as overly strict behavior management, limited freedom to explore the environment, and difficulty in maintaining class control.

On the other hand, Rich (2000) pointed out that indirect instruction permits children to take an active role in the learning process through experimentation and self-discovery. Therefore, children explore their environment on their own terms and have fun and learn through play. Ainsworth and Fox (1989) proposed that indirect styles are most beneficial for high-functioning adapted physical education students, preschoolers, or those learning basic motor skills. However, the indirect instruction approach also has been criticized. Criticisms include relative lack of structure, the great amount of time required for students to show progress, and the absence of an absolute outcome (Ainsworth & Fox, 1989; Bricker & Cripe, 1992).

Therefore, some researchers (Cole, Dale, Mills, & Jenkins, 1993; Cole, Mills, & Sale, 1989) have indicated that neither teaching method has a distinct advantage, and have suggested that both teaching methods improve performance to approximately the same extent. As a result, some researchers (Block & Davis, 1996; Hanline & Fox, 1993; Ignico, 1994;