International Journal of Educational Review, Law & Social Sciences (IJERLAS)

International Journal of Educational Review, Law And Social Sciences (IJERLAS Journal) | ISSN (e): 2808-487X
Volumes 5 No. 6 (2025)

ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION IN PROMOTING PHYSICAL FITNESS IN SCHOOLS

Junaid Hamid Bhat[1], Dr Vijay Kumar[2]
[1]**Ph.D Research Scholar**, Department of Physical education Choudhury Charan Singh University Meerut
[2]**Assistant Professor**, Department of Physical education Choudhury Charan Singh University Meerut
Email: Junaidbhat03166@gmail.com[1], drvijaykumar96@gmail.com[2]

Received	: 01 September 2025	Published	: 25 October 2025
Revised	: 15 September 2025	DOI	: https://doi.org/10.54443/ijerlas.v5i6.4298
Accepted	: 10 October 2025	Link Publish	: https://radjapublika.com/index.php/IJERLAS

Abstract

The importance of physical education (PE) in fostering holistic development among students is widely recognized; however, the degree to which PE curricula are effectively implemented remains a critical concern in many educational systems. This study assesses the effectiveness of physical education curriculum implementation in promoting physical fitness in schools. Using a mixed-method approach, the research analyzes the relationship between curriculum design, teacher preparedness, instructional methods, and student fitness outcomes. Data were collected from 200 students and 25 PE teachers across government and private schools. The findings reveal that effective curriculum implementation characterized by structured lesson plans, adequate facilities, and trained teachers positively correlates with improved physical fitness levels among students. The study concludes that periodic curriculum evaluation, professional development for PE teachers, and enhanced infrastructure are essential for maximizing the benefits of physical education in school environments.

Keywords: ***Physical Education, Curriculum Implementation, Physical Fitness, School Education, Teacher Training, Holistic Development***

Introduction

Physical education (PE) has long been seen as an important part of the school curriculum because it helps students' physical health and their social, emotional, and mental health. The main goal of physical education is to teach students the knowledge, skills, and attitudes they need to stay healthy by being active on a regular basis. In a time when kids and teens are becoming more sedentary, dependent on technology, and having more health problems like obesity and heart disease, the importance of a well-planned and well-implemented PE curriculum cannot be overstated. Schools are in a unique position to shape people's health habits for the rest of their lives, and the PE curriculum is a big part of teaching these habits from a young age. Even though everyone agrees that physical education is important, the programs in schools don't always work well or are very good. In a lot of schools, PE is seen as a less important subject than math, science, and language arts. It gets less time, attention, and resources than these subjects. Because of this lack of attention, there are gaps between the planned curriculum (as set up by educational authorities) and the curriculum that is actually taught in classrooms and on playgrounds. Problems like not enough infrastructure, teachers who aren't trained, busy schedules, and not enough help from administrators often make it hard to teach PE lessons well. As a result, a lot of students don't get the chance to improve their physical fitness and motor skills. So, the physical education curriculum does more than just give students chances to play sports or work out. It includes a structured framework that combines learning about theory, improving practical skills, and changing behavior. A good curriculum should try to improve overall health literacy, cardiovascular endurance, muscular strength, flexibility, and coordination. More importantly, good implementation makes sure that students not only take part in activities but also understand why they are important and keep being active after school. To do this, you need to plan lessons well, teach in a way that is appropriate for the age group, check on their fitness progress, and use motivating teaching methods that work for all students, no matter their skill level or gender. In developing countries like India, it is especially hard to do

physical education well. Even though national education policies say that physical education should be a required subject, the way it is taught varies a lot from one region or type of school to another. Government schools often have problems with not enough space, not enough resources, and not enough trained physical education teachers. Private schools, on the other hand, may put more emphasis on academic success than on physical development. This difference in fitness levels among students is a problem because it raises questions about the overall quality and fairness of how PE is taught. Because of these problems, it is important to check how well the PE curriculum is being used to see if schools are meeting their goals of improving students' physical fitness and overall development. Assessing the extent of curriculum adherence, instructional quality, student engagement, and resource availability yields insights into the actual efficacy of physical education programs in educational institutions. Additionally, comprehending teachers' viewpoints and recognizing obstacles to curriculum implementation can guide policymakers, educators, and administrators in effecting data-driven enhancements. The current study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of the physical education curriculum in schools and its impact on enhancing students' physical fitness. The research seeks to identify patterns, strengths, and weaknesses in current practices by examining both quantitative measures of student fitness and qualitative feedback from teachers. The study aims to offer practical suggestions for improving the quality and consistency of physical education in schools, making sure that the curriculum does what it is supposed to do: help students become physically fit, active, and health-conscious citizens.

2. Review of Literature

The literature on physical education curriculum and its impact on student fitness outcomes emphasizes the interplay between curriculum design, teacher competence, institutional support, and learner engagement. The following studies provide valuable insights into how the implementation of PE curricula affects students' physical fitness, participation levels, and overall development.

1. Bailey et al. (2013) Bailey and associates performed a comprehensive analysis of the educational advantages linked to physical education and interscholastic sports. Their research indicated that efficacious physical education programs enhance not only physical well-being but also cognitive, emotional, and social development. The authors said that the quality of the curriculum and the teacher's knowledge are the most important things that affect how well a program works. Schools that used structured and inclusive PE curricula saw improvements in students' physical skills, motivation, and behavior in the classroom. This study establishes the fundamental understanding that curriculum implementation is pivotal in attaining comprehensive educational outcomes.

2. Hardman and Green (2011). Hardman and Green looked at how different countries around the world put physical education policies into action. They looked at 126 countries. Their research showed that there is a big difference between what the curriculum says and what teachers actually do in the classroom, especially in developing countries. They discovered that inadequate facilities, a shortage of qualified instructors, and ineffective policy oversight were the main obstacles. The authors determined that policy enforcement and accountability are essential for the effective implementation of the PE curriculum. Their findings underscore the necessity for systematic oversight to guarantee that curriculum objectives are effectively translated into tangible enhancements in physical activity and fitness.

3. Sallis and McKenzie (1991). Sallis and McKenzie examined the correlation between school physical education and public health outcomes. They suggested that schools have a key role in encouraging people to stay active for the rest of their lives. The research indicated that students participating in well-structured physical education programs exhibited markedly elevated levels of daily physical activity and diminished risks of obesity and sedentary behavior. The authors contended that the efficacy of physical education in attaining health outcomes is predominantly contingent upon the quality and consistency of curriculum implementation. Their research substantiates the concept that physical education functions as a prophylactic against the onset of lifestyle-related diseases in adolescents.

4. Pate et al. (2006). Pate and associates examined the correlation between curriculum structure and student fitness levels in American educational institutions. They used quantitative fitness tests to find that students who took part in PE programs that focused on aerobic, muscular, and flexibility training did better on national fitness tests. The study showed that schools with trained PE specialists and good facilities did much better. The authors determined that an effectively executed physical education curriculum not only improves fitness results but also deepens students' comprehension of health-related fitness principles.

5. Kirk and Tinning (2007). Kirk and Tinning concentrated on the pedagogical aspects of physical education curriculum implementation. Their qualitative research examined the impact of various teaching models such as the sport education model, cooperative learning, and fitness education on student motivation and engagement. The study showed that teachers who used a variety of student-centered teaching methods got more students to participate and helped them learn new skills. The authors stressed that the success of a curriculum depends on both how the content is designed and how it is taught. This shows how important it is for teachers to keep learning and growing.

6. Kumar (2018). Kumar examined the difficulties of implementing physical education curricula in secondary schools within an Indian context. The study employed surveys and interviews with 50 physical education teachers, identifying the main challenges as insufficient infrastructure, restricted class time, and insufficient administrative support. Also, a lot of teachers didn't have access to new training materials or tools for assessing fitness. Kumar found that even though national education policies require PE to be part of the curriculum, it is not always done in practice. He called for stronger institutional frameworks and more money to be spent on PE infrastructure.

7. UNESCO (2015). UNESCO's worldwide report on Quality Physical Education (QPE) gave advice on how to make and judge good PE programs. The report stressed that good PE should encourage everyone to participate, improve their skills, stay active for life, and have fun while doing it. It suggested that assessment systems, teacher training, and gender equality be included in the curriculum. UNESCO's framework is a standard for judging how well a curriculum works, and many countries have used it as a guide for making changes to their education systems.

8. Chen and Liu (2020). Chen and Liu performed an empirical study in Chinese middle schools to evaluate the impact of teacher competence on the efficacy of physical education curriculum implementation. Their results showed that there was a strong link between teachers' teaching skills, motivation, and students' physical performance levels. Schools that put money into professional development workshops and teaching methods based on skills saw bigger gains in students' endurance, flexibility, and motor coordination. The study found that the quality of the teacher is a key factor in turning curriculum goals into measurable fitness results.

3. Objectives of the Study

1. To evaluate the extent of implementation of the physical education curriculum in schools.
2. To assess the relationship between curriculum implementation and students' physical fitness levels.

4. Hypotheses

1. There is a significant relationship between the level of PE curriculum implementation and students' physical fitness outcomes.
2. The effectiveness of PE curriculum implementation varies between government and private schools.

5. Methodology

The present study adopted a **mixed-method research design** to comprehensively assess the effectiveness of physical education (PE) curriculum implementation in promoting physical fitness among school students. It combined **quantitative fitness assessments** with **qualitative insights** from teachers to ensure a holistic understanding of the issue. The research was both **descriptive and analytical**, aimed at identifying current practices, challenges, and outcomes of PE curriculum implementation. The study involved a sample of **200 students (aged 12–16 years)** and **25 physical education teachers** drawn from **ten schools** five government and five private selected through a **stratified random sampling technique** to ensure balanced representation. Data collection employed three key instruments: (1) a **standardized fitness test battery** including a 600-meter run, sit-up test, sit-and-reach test, and BMI calculation to evaluate endurance, muscular strength, flexibility, and general health; (2) a **structured questionnaire** for teachers focusing on curriculum delivery, instructional time, facilities, and training, validated with a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.87 to ensure reliability; and (3) **semi-structured interviews** with selected PE teachers to capture in-depth perceptions and contextual factors influencing curriculum execution. Data collection was carried out after obtaining necessary permissions and ethical approvals, ensuring participant confidentiality and voluntary participation. Quantitative data were analyzed using **SPSS software (version 26)** through descriptive statistics, Chi-square tests, and t-tests to determine the relationship between curriculum implementation and student fitness outcomes, while qualitative data were examined using **thematic analysis** to identify patterns related to implementation barriers, teacher preparedness, and infrastructural adequacy.

6. Results and Analysis

This section presents the findings of the study, structured around the key areas of curriculum implementation, student physical fitness outcomes, teacher perceptions, and differences between school types. Both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed to assess how effectively the physical education (PE) curriculum is implemented and how it influences physical fitness among students.

Table 1: Distribution of Physical Fitness Scores by Student Age Group

Age Group	600m Run (sec)	Sit-ups (count)	Flexibility (cm)	BMI (average)
12–14 years (n = 120)	155	27	24	22.5
15–16 years (n = 80)	150	29	25	22.1

Source: Computed from Primary Data

This table compares the physical fitness scores of two age groups: 12–14 years and 15–16 years. The results indicate that older students (15–16 years) performed marginally better across all fitness parameters. Their average time in the 600m run was faster (150 sec vs. 155 sec), and they achieved higher counts in sit-ups (29 vs. 27) and greater flexibility (25 cm vs. 24 cm). Additionally, the older group had a slightly lower average BMI (22.1) compared to the younger group (22.5), suggesting better overall body composition. These findings suggest that physical maturity and longer exposure to physical education programs may positively influence fitness outcomes.

Table 2: Curriculum Implementation Scores by School

School ID	School Type	Implementation Score	Implementation Level
School 1	Government	65	Partial
School 2	Government	60	Partial
School 3	Government	70	Partial
School 4	Government	55	Partial
School 5	Government	85	Full
School 6	Private	90	Full
School 7	Private	88	Full
School 8	Private	75	Partial
School 9	Private	80	Full
School 10	Private	70	Partial

Source: Computed from Primary Data

Table 2 presents the curriculum implementation scores and levels across 10 sampled schools, both government and private. Schools with scores above 80 were classified as having "Full" implementation, while those scoring between 50 and 80 were categorized under "Partial" implementation. The data reveals that private schools generally outperformed government schools in curriculum implementation, with four out of five private schools achieving full implementation, compared to only one government school. This disparity highlights a possible gap in infrastructure, administrative support, or prioritization of physical education between the two types of institutions.

Table 3: Teacher Training Levels and Curriculum Implementation Effectiveness

Training Level	Number of Teachers	Mean Implementation Score	Mean Student Fitness Score
Certified (Specialized PE Training)	10	85	78
General (Basic Training)	10	70	65
Untrained	5	60	55

Source: Computed from Primary Data

This table analyzes the impact of PE teacher training levels on both curriculum implementation and student fitness outcomes. Teachers with specialized PE training ("Certified") had the highest mean implementation score (85) and correspondingly, their students achieved the highest mean fitness score (78). Teachers with only general training had lower implementation (70) and fitness scores (65), while untrained teachers scored the lowest in both categories. This pattern strongly supports the third hypothesis—that teacher qualifications significantly influence the effectiveness of PE curriculum delivery and student fitness development.

Table 4: Statistical Significance of Fitness Outcomes by Curriculum Implementation

Fitness Parameter	Chi-square Value	p-value	Significance
600m Run	12.45	0.002	Significant
Sit-ups	10.32	0.006	Significant
Flexibility	9.87	0.008	Significant
BMI	8.54	0.012	Significant

Source: Computed from Primary Data

Table 4 displays the results of Chi-square tests conducted to assess the relationship between curriculum implementation levels and individual fitness outcomes. All four fitness parameters (600m run, sit-ups, flexibility, and BMI) showed statistically significant relationships with implementation levels, as all p-values were below the 0.05 threshold. The strongest association was found with the 600m run (p = 0.002), indicating that endurance is particularly sensitive to differences in PE delivery. These results validate the first hypothesis and provide empirical support that better implementation of the PE curriculum leads to improved fitness among students.

Table 5: Gender-Based Comparison of Physical Fitness Outcomes

Gender	600m Run (sec)	Sit-ups (count)	Flexibility (cm)	BMI (average)
Male (n = 100)	148	30	23	22.3
Female (n = 100)	158	26	26	22.6

Source: Computed from Primary Data

Table 5 explores differences in physical fitness outcomes between male and female students. Male students performed better in the 600m run (148 sec vs. 158 sec) and sit-ups (30 vs. 26), indicating superior cardiovascular endurance and core strength. Conversely, female students outperformed males in flexibility (26 cm vs. 23 cm), consistent with known gender differences in joint and muscle elasticity. BMI values were relatively close, with females averaging slightly higher (22.6 vs. 22.3). These findings suggest that while male students may excel in strength and endurance, female students show advantages in flexibility, reinforcing the importance of a diverse and inclusive PE curriculum that supports multiple dimensions of fitness.

7. Discussion

The findings affirm that the degree of curriculum implementation directly influences student fitness outcomes. Schools with structured Physical Education schedules, trained teachers, and adequate facilities produced students with superior physical fitness levels, as evidenced by better performance in endurance, strength, and flexibility tests. These results align with prior research by Pate et al. (2006) and Bailey et al. (2013), which highlighted the link between curriculum quality and student health outcomes. However, barriers such as limited infrastructure, insufficient teacher training, and the undervaluation of Physical Education as an academic subject undermine implementation quality. These challenges are particularly pronounced in government schools, where resource constraints are more significant. The findings underscore the need for educational policy reform to prioritize PE as a core subject, ensuring it receives adequate time, resources, and institutional support.The qualitative insights from teacher interviews further highlight the importance of professional development. Teachers expressed a desire for training in modern fitness pedagogies, suggesting that ongoing education could enhance their ability to deliver the curriculum effectively. Addressing these barriers requires a multi-faceted approach, including policy reinforcement, infrastructure investment, and teacher empowerment.

8. Conclusion

This study concludes that effective implementation of the physical education curriculum is pivotal in promoting physical fitness among students. Schools with well-trained teachers, sufficient time allocation, and adequate infrastructure achieve better fitness outcomes, contributing to students' overall health and well-being. To maximize the benefits of PE, educational systems must address implementation gaps through regular monitoring, professional development, and resource allocation. Strengthening Physical Education curriculum implementation not only enhances physical health but also fosters social and emotional growth, aligning with global educational goals for holistic learning. By prioritizing Physical Education, schools can cultivate a culture of lifelong physical activity, preparing students for healthier and more balanced lives.

REFERENCES

- Bailey, R., Armour, K., Kirk, D., Jess, M., Pickup, I., & Sandford, R. (2013). The educational benefits claimed for physical education and school sport: An academic review. Research Papers in Education, 18(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267152032000048576
- Chen, A., & Liu, X. (2020). The impact of teacher competence on physical education curriculum implementation in Chinese middle schools.
- Hardman, K., & Green, K. (2011). Contemporary issues in physical education: International perspectives. Meyer & Meyer Sport.Kirk, D., & Tinning, R. (2007). Pedagogy, curriculum, and culture in physical education.
- Kumar, S. (2018). Physical education in Indian schools: Challenges and opportunities. Indian Journal of Education and Psychology, 56(2), 122–130.
- Pate, R. R., O'Neill, J. R., & McIver, K. L. (2006). Physical activity and health: Does physical education matter? Quest, 58(1), 60–70. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2006.10491870
- Sallis, J. F., & McKenzie, T. L. (1991). Physical education's role in public health. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 62(2), 124–137.
- UNESCO. (2015). Quality physical education (QPE): Guidelines for policy-makers. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.