

PEDAGOGICAL EFFECTIVENESS OF A PERSON-CENTERED MODEL FOR THE MORAL-AESTHETIC EDUCATION OF FUTURE PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS: EXPERIMENTAL FINDINGS**Salokhiddin R. Qodirov**

*Professor, Department of Individual Combat Sports, Faculty of Sports Activity, Urgench State University named after Abu Rayhan Beruniy, Uzbekistan
e-mail: [qodirovsalohiddin118@gmail.com]*

Relevance

The moral-aesthetic culture of a physical education teacher is widely regarded as an integral component of professional competence, since the teacher's own ethical conduct and aesthetic expressiveness exert a direct educational influence on learners through personal example. Traditional approaches to moral-aesthetic education in teacher training institutions tend to rely on verbal, reproductive methods that give insufficient weight to students' individual value orientations, motivation and personal characteristics—an emphasis that runs counter to person-centered educational theory, which holds that meaningful, lasting learning occurs when instruction responds to the learner's own needs, values and experience [1]. This gap motivated the design and empirical testing of a person-centered pedagogical model specifically for the moral-aesthetic preparation of future physical education teachers.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine, through a controlled pedagogical experiment, the practical effectiveness of a person-centered pedagogical model and staged technology for developing the moral-aesthetic culture of future physical education teachers, in comparison with traditional instruction.

The following hypothesis was tested: if the process of moral-aesthetic education is organized on the basis of a person-centered pedagogical model, implemented through a staged technology (diagnosis → cognitive-theoretical → practical-activity → reflection) together with interactive methods—discussion, case study, role play, analysis of moral dilemmas, and the use of works of art—then students' moral-aesthetic culture will develop at a significantly higher rate than in a control group taught by traditional means.

Methods

A three-stage pedagogical experiment (ascertaining, formative, control) was conducted between 2023 and 2025 at three Uzbek higher education institutions—Urgench State University, Bukhara State University and Navoi State Pedagogical Institute—on the basis of the “Pedagogy and

Psychology”, “Primary Education and Sports-Educational Work” and “Preschool Education” degree programmes. A total of 450 students participated, divided into an experimental group (EG, $n=225$) and a control group (CG, $n=225$) of comparable composition by age, sex and field of study.

Students' moral-aesthetic culture was assessed against three criteria derived from the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains of the classical taxonomy of educational objectives [2–4]: a cognitive criterion (knowledge and understanding of moral-aesthetic norms), a motivational-value criterion (attitudes and values), and a practical-activity criterion (behaviour and conduct). For each criterion, students were classified into high, medium or low levels of development using knowledge tests, a Likert-scale value-orientation questionnaire, behavioural observation sheets, expert assessment, and analysis of reflective diaries and essays. At the ascertaining stage, the equivalence of the two groups was established; at the formative stage, the proposed model was implemented in the experimental group only, through the staged technology and interactive methods described above, while the control group continued with the standard curriculum; at the control stage, repeated diagnostics were conducted and initial and final indicators were compared. Data were analysed using Pearson's χ^2 test ($\alpha=0.05$, degrees of freedom $f=2$, critical value $\chi^2_{crit}=5.99$).

Results

At the ascertaining stage, the experimental and control groups showed closely comparable indicators, and the calculated value ($\chi^2_{emp} \approx 0.16$) was well below the critical value of 5.99, confirming that the groups were statistically equivalent at the outset and providing a sound basis for subsequent comparison.

Following implementation of the model in the experimental group, the control stage revealed a marked divergence between the groups. The share of students at the high level rose from 17.8% to 41.3% (+23.5 percentage points) in the experimental group, compared with a rise from 16.9% to 21.3% (+4.4 percentage points) in the control group—a rate of growth roughly 5.3 times higher in the experimental group. Correspondingly, the share of students at the low level fell from 38.6% to 10.2% in the experimental group, against a smaller decline from 40.4% to 30.2% in the control group. The overall χ^2_{emp} value at the control stage was 36.61, substantially exceeding the critical value of 5.99 (and also exceeding the $\alpha=0.01$ critical value of 9.21), so that H_0 was rejected in favour of H_1 : the difference between the groups was statistically significant at both the 95% and 99% confidence levels. χ^2 values calculated separately for each of the three criteria (cognitive, motivational-value, practical-activity) ranged from 35.07 to 38.11, all well above the critical

value, confirming the robustness of the result across every dimension of moral-aesthetic culture assessed. The net effectiveness gain attributable to the model, measured as the difference between the two groups' rates of improvement, was 19.1 percentage points.

Conclusion

The findings confirm the study's hypothesis: a person-centered pedagogical model, implemented through a staged technology and interactive methods, produces a significantly greater pedagogical effect on future physical education teachers' moral-aesthetic culture than traditional, predominantly verbal forms of instruction. Together with the theoretical model on which it is based [5], this experimental evidence supports the wider implementation of person-centered approaches in the professional training of physical education teachers.

Keywords: person-centered approach; moral-aesthetic education; pedagogical experiment; Pearson's χ^2 test; physical education teacher education.

References

- [1] Rogers, C. R. (1969). *Freedom to learn: A view of what education might become*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- [2] Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York: Longman.
- [3] Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masia, B. B. (1964). *Taxonomy of educational objectives. Handbook II: Affective domain*. New York: David McKay.
- [4] Simpson, E. J. (1972). *The classification of educational objectives in the psychomotor domain*. Washington, DC: Gryphon House.
- [5] Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Education", No. O'RQ-637, 23 September 2020.