

INPLASY

Mapping the Landscape of Pedagogical Models in Physical Education: An Umbrella Review

INPLASY202420072

doi: 10.37766/inplasy2024.2.0072

Received: 18 February 2024

Published: 18 February 2024

Zhang, JL¹; Soh, KM²; Mohd Anuar, MA³; Xiao, WS⁴; Bai, XR⁵.

Corresponding author:

Junlong zhang

zhangjunlong2413@gmail.com

Author Affiliation:

Department of Sports Studies,
Faculty of Education Studies,
University Putra Malaysia.

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Support - A Project Supported by the Scientific Research Fund of Zhejiang Provincial Education Department (Grant No. Y202351082). Huzhou City 2023 Philosophy and Social Science planning project (Grant No. 23hzghy050).

Review Stage at time of this submission - Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria.

Conflicts of interest - None declared.

INPLASY registration number: INPLASY202420072

Amendments - This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 18 February 2024 and was last updated on 18 February 2024.

INTRODUCTION

Review question / Objective 1. What is the background and scope of research on pedagogical models? 2. Which pedagogical models have been most systematically reviewed? 3. Where do the strengths of these pedagogical models lie? 4. What weaknesses in instructional effectiveness have been identified? 5. Where are the research gaps?

Condition being studied In recent years, there has been more and more research on systematic evaluation based on teaching models. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct a higher-level synthesis of the existing review evidence to comprehensively identify the background, strengths, weaknesses, and gaps of the physical education teaching model.

METHODS

Search strategy Web of Science, SCOPUS, EBSCOhost, PubMed, PsycINFO, and PsycARTICLES.

Participant or population Students of all ages.

Intervention Pedagogical models.

Comparator Pedagogical models.

Study designs to be included Systematic review.

Eligibility criteria Inclusion Criteria: Full-text articles published and written in English; Studies conducted in the context of physical education; Participants are students. Exclusion criteria: Non-scientific evaluation studies; Review studies not

focused on the implementation of teaching models.

Information sources Databases: Web of Science, SCOPUS, EBSCOhost, PubMed, PsycINFO, and PsycARTICLES.

Main outcome(s) 31 systematic review studies (before February 17, 2024).

Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis Using the Assessing the Methodological Quality of Systematic Reviews (AMSTAR-2) tool (Shea et al. 2017).

Strategy of data synthesis Two independent authors independently gathered information from each potentially eligible study.

Subgroup analysis Not applicable.

Sensitivity analysis Not applicable.

Language restriction Only English.

Country(ies) involved China; Malaysia.

Keywords Pedagogical Model; learning outcomes; motor; cognitive; affective; social.

Contributions of each author

Author 1 - Junlong zhang.

Email: zhangjunlong2413@gmail.com

Author 2 - Geok Soh Kim.

Email: kims@upm.edu.my

Author 3 - Mohd Anuar Mohd Ashraff.

Email: mohdsafiee@upm.edu.my

Author 4 - Wensheng Xiao.

Email: xiaowensheng33@gmail.com

Author 5 - Xiaorong Bai.

Email: 03219@zjhu.edu.cn