

A PERSON-CENTERED, TAXONOMY-BASED MODEL FOR DEVELOPING THE MORAL-AESTHETIC CULTURE OF FUTURE PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

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

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22881419>

Introduction and Relevance

The professional effectiveness of a physical education teacher depends not only on subject-specific competence but also on the teacher's own moral conduct and aesthetic expressiveness, which directly influence learners through personal example. Humanistic educational theory has long argued that learning is most effective when it engages the whole person and responds to individual needs and values rather than imposing uniform, externally directed content [1].

However, the development of moral-aesthetic culture among pre-service physical education teachers through such a person-centered approach remains an under-researched area, with existing university practice relying largely on reproductive, verbally oriented methods that take little account of students' individual value orientations, motivation and aesthetic sensibility.

This gap is particularly significant for physical education, a field in which the teacher's embodied conduct—movement, speech, and behaviour in competitive and cooperative situations—constitutes a continuous, visible model for learners.

Against this background, the present study sought to design a theoretically grounded, personalized pedagogical model capable of systematically developing future physical education teachers' moral-aesthetic culture across its cognitive, affective and behavioural dimensions.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to design and theoretically justify a pedagogical model for developing the moral-aesthetic culture of future physical education teachers on a person-centered basis, integrating a systematic taxonomy of learning objectives with an individualized trajectory of student development.

Methods

The model was developed through analysis and synthesis of pedagogical and psychological literature on humanistic and person-centered education [1], the theory of aesthetic experience [2], and the classical taxonomy of educational objectives across the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains [3–5]. The model was structured around two integrated components.

Component 1: A taxonomy-based system of learning objectives. Following the classical three-domain taxonomy, cognitive, affective and psychomotor levels of moral-aesthetic development were defined specifically for physical education teacher training: from knowledge of moral and aesthetic norms, through their comprehension and application in teaching practice, to their analysis, synthesis and independent evaluation; from initial awareness of ethical and aesthetic values, through active engagement, to their stable internalization as a professional value system; and from observation of ethically and aesthetically expressive movement, through guided and independent practice, to confident, automatized professional conduct.

Component 2: An individual development trajectory. A four-stage cyclical trajectory—diagnosis, goal-setting, implementation and reflection—was designed to personalize the pace and content of each student's development. At the diagnostic stage, a student's initial level of moral-aesthetic development is assessed through questionnaires, observation, interviews and self-analysis.

At the goal-setting stage, the student formulates personal development goals according to SMART criteria, in consultation with the instructor. At the implementation stage, the student engages in personalized cognitive, practical and creative activities, including independent study, video-analysis of one's own conduct, and participation in dramatized sports scenarios. At the reflection stage, the student evaluates progress through self-analysis, expert feedback and comparison of “before” and “after” recordings, before formulating new goals for the next developmental cycle.

Results

The resulting model links each taxonomy level to concrete instructional tasks and assessment criteria suitable for general pedagogy courses (“Theory and History of Pedagogy”, “Pedagogical Skill”, “Pedagogical Technologies”), while the individual development trajectory operationalizes the taxonomy through personalized goal-setting, practical and creative activity, and structured reflective self-assessment. Five pedagogical affordances of the trajectory were identified: it ensures an individualized approach responsive to each student's needs; it develops moral self-awareness by linking personal goals to social and professional values; it enriches students' aesthetic outlook, extending to movement, speech and cultural conduct in sport; it builds self-management competence, as students learn to plan, monitor and analyse their own activity; and it strengthens professional motivation, as students come to see their future profession as consonant with their personal value system.

The model's scientific novelty lies in the systematic integration of these two components—a taxonomy of learning objectives and a personalized development trajectory—specifically for the moral-aesthetic preparation of physical education teachers, a professional group whose own embodied conduct constitutes a direct pedagogical influence on learners. Its practical significance lies in providing higher education instructors with concrete criteria, diagnostic tools and stage-by-stage guidance that can be incorporated into existing general pedagogy courses without requiring a separate curriculum.

Conclusion

The proposed model provides higher education institutions with a theoretically grounded, personalized instrument for strengthening the ethical and aesthetic dimensions of physical education teacher training. Its empirical effectiveness was subsequently confirmed through a three-stage pedagogical experiment involving 450 students at three universities, in which the experimental group—taught using the model—showed statistically significant and substantially greater gains in moral-aesthetic culture than the control group, as reported in a companion study [6].

Keywords: person-centered approach; moral-aesthetic culture; Bloom's taxonomy; pedagogical model; individual development trajectory; 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. Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York: Minton, Balch & Company.
3. 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.
4. Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masia, B. B. (1964). *Taxonomy of educational objectives. Handbook II: Affective domain*. New York: David McKay.
5. Simpson, E. J. (1972). *The classification of educational objectives in the psychomotor domain*. Washington, DC: Gryphon House.
6. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Education”, No. O‘RQ-637, 23 September 2020.
7. Yo‘ldoshev, J. G., & Usmonov, S. A. (2004). *Fundamentals of pedagogical technology [Pedagogik texnologiya asoslari]*. Tashkent.