

1 **This is a post-print version of the paper published:**

2 **Abós, Á.,** Sevil, J., Julián, J. A., Abarca-Sos, A., & García-González, L. (2017).

3 Improving predisposition towards Physical Education through the situational motivation

4 of students. *European Physical Education Review*, 23(4), 444-460.

5 <http://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X16654390>.

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

POST-PRINT VERSION

1 **Improving students' predisposition towards physical education by optimizing their**
2 **motivational processes in an acrosport unit**

3
4 **Abstract**

5 Grounded in Self-Determination Theory and Achievement Goal Theory, this quasi-
6 experimental study evaluated the effectiveness of a teaching intervention programme to
7 improve predisposition towards physical education based on developing a task-oriented
8 motivational climate and supporting basic psychological needs. The final sample
9 consisted of 35 secondary education students, aged 15 to 17 (M age = 15.35, SD =
10 0.49), divided into two groups: control ($n = 15$) and experimental ($n = 20$). The
11 intervention programme was applied in the experimental group to 12 acrosport unit
12 lessons based on motivational strategies by means of TARGET areas. Firstly, the
13 experimental group obtained significantly higher values in perceived support of the
14 basic psychological needs and in the perceived task-oriented motivational climate in the
15 acrosport unit. Secondly, this intervention was effective in generating a significant
16 increase in predisposition towards physical education in the experimental group.
17 Noteworthy is the need to generate interventions in different content areas that may
18 improve students' predisposition towards physical education, which could contribute to
19 them adopting a more active lifestyle.

20

1 **Keywords**

- 2 Self-determination theory, achievement goal theory, teaching intervention, basic
3 psychological needs, predisposition, adolescents

POST-PRINT VERSION

Introduction

1
2 Despite the considerable amount of evidence that shows how important it is for
3 adolescents to perform physical activity (PA) on a regular basis, there are studies that
4 point out that this population group does not engage sufficiently in moderate to vigorous
5 PA to improve their health (Hallal et al., 2012). For this reason, the school environment,
6 and more specifically physical education (PE), is considered to be an ideal context that
7 can positively impact children's PA behaviour, and promote lifelong activity habits and
8 prosocial values (Holt et al., 2012). Consequently, to study this topic, two motivational
9 theories have been widely addressed in the PE context: self-determination theory (SDT)
10 (Deci and Ryan, 1985) and achievement goal theory (AGT) (Nicholls, 1989). According
11 to a substantial body of research in PE contexts, variables derived from these two
12 frameworks could be integrated (see Duda, 2013; Soini et al., 2014) to achieve a better
13 understanding of motivational outcomes.

14 Grounded in SDT (Deci and Ryan, 1985), different authors have highlighted the figure
15 of the teacher as a key element to have an impact on the degree of satisfaction of
16 students' basic psychological needs (BPN) (i.e. autonomy, competence and relatedness)
17 (Aelterman et al., 2014). In addition, SDT (Deci and Ryan, 1985) considers motivation
18 as a continuum that includes the following regulations, going from the highest to the
19 lowest level of self-determination: intrinsic motivation, based on the interest and
20 enjoyment produced by carrying out the activity itself; extrinsic motivation, which

1 corresponds to behaviours executed in order to achieve results that are outside the
2 activity itself; and amotivation, relating to the lack of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

3 Different studies conducted with adolescents in a PE contexts have shown that higher
4 levels of self-determined motivation (i.e. intrinsic motivation, integrated regulation and
5 identified regulation) (Sánchez-Oliva et al., 2014) are associated with positive and more
6 adaptive cognitive (e.g. academic performance) (Ntoumanis and Standage, 2009),
7 affective (e.g. well-being) (Standage et al., 2012) and behavioural (e.g. engagement in
8 PA) (Moreno et al., 2010) consequences. Conversely, the least self-determined
9 motivation levels (i.e. introjected regulation, external regulation and amotivation) are
10 negatively related to these outcomes, creating less adaptive behavioural patterns (e.g.
11 oppositional defiance) (Haerens et al., 2015).

12 Several studies show that the use of multi-dimensional teaching intervention
13 programmes (i.e. support of the three BPN), can improve the satisfaction of three BPN
14 (Aelterman et al., 2014). In this sense, support of autonomy implies that teachers allow
15 students to make decisions and be guided by their motivations. Support of competence
16 refers to teachers' behaviour that optimizes the perceived ability of their students.
17 Finally, support of relatedness means that the teacher favours the formation of
18 heterogeneous groups of students to help them become integrated in their group and
19 with their classmates (Stroet et al., 2013).

1 Consistent with SDT (Deci and Ryan, 1985), AGT (Nicholls, 1989) proposes that the
2 motivational climate (i.e. situational factors that refer to the context in which the
3 activity takes place and that can be decisive for students' optimal involvement)
4 generated by the PE teacher can also be considered as a decisive social factor for
5 developing the variables integrated in SDT (see Braithwaite et al., 2011; Duda, 2013).
6 Some authors (e.g. Duda and Hall, 2001) have discussed the need to assess the role of
7 different motivational strategies traditionally used by PE teachers to modify
8 motivational climate. Try to surpass oneself, assume mistakes as part of the learning
9 process, be interested in learning new things or make progress in one' own skills are
10 some characteristics that are perceived in the task-oriented motivational climate. By
11 contrast, compete against classmates, compare the results with those of other or give
12 excessive importance to be more successful in the tasks than all other students are some
13 characteristics that are appreciated in the ego-oriented motivational climate. In this
14 regard, different strategies related to TARGET areas developed by Ames (1992) can be
15 very useful to manipulate the motivational climate of the classroom, managing to
16 develop optimal learning atmospheres (Gray et al., 2009). These dimensions refer to the
17 elements of design and teaching skills that teachers can modify both before and during
18 their lessons:

- 19 Task area: design a variety of activities and objectives adapted to students'
20 specific needs and level.

- 1 Authority area: create opportunities for students to make decisions.
- 2 Recognition area: distribution of positive feedback and rewards.
- 3 Grouping area: student learning groups are varied, mixed and heterogeneous.
- 4 Evaluation area: criteria focused on the process and effort of the students and not
- 5 exclusively on the end results.
- 6 Time area: appropriateness and relevance of the child's own learning priorities
- 7 and pacing.

8 In turn, some intervention studies in PE, based on the TARGET areas, have increased

9 the perceived task-oriented motivational climate (Almolda et al., 2014; Hastie et al.,

10 2014; Sevil et al., 2015) and positive consequences such as enjoyment (Almolda et al.,

11 2014; Sevil et al., 2015), effort (Wallhead and Ntoumanis 2004) and predisposition

12 towards PE (Gray et al., 2009). From a practical perspective, the results found by

13 Barkoukis and Hagger (2013) imply that the application of interventions, such as

14 TARGET areas, may be effective in fostering adaptive motivational responses in terms

15 of participation in PA both in school (i.e. PE) and out of school (i.e. leisure-time). Thus,

16 PE teachers can generate an optimal motivational climate (i.e. support of the BPN and

17 task-oriented motivational climate through TARGET areas) in their interventions,

18 creating achievement contexts that get their students involved in personal improvement

19 and effort, thus being able to trigger positive and more adaptive consequences, such as

20 predisposition towards PA outside the school context (Cecchini et al., 2014).

1 In line with SDT (Deci and Ryan, 1985) and AGT (Nicholls, 1989), predisposition
2 towards PA is understood as a consequence of the interaction of factors that increase the
3 probability of young people engaging in PA (Belton et al., 2014; Welk, 1999). In this
4 sense, predisposing factors such as cognitive attitude (i.e. benefits of participating in
5 PE) and affective attitude (i.e. interest in PE), self-efficacy (i.e. perceived success when
6 carrying out PE), enjoyment (i.e. liking of PE) and perceived competence (i.e. feeling of
7 ability to carry out PA) have been described as being responsible for adherence to
8 engagement in PA (Belton et al., 2014; Hilland et al., 2009). Likewise, the same
9 predisposing factors can be extrapolated to the PE context (Hilland et al., 2009). More
10 specifically, students who have greater predisposition towards PE are more likely to
11 continue engaging in PA outside school (Hilland et al., 2009).

12 Based on the Hierarchical Model of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation (HMIEM)
13 proposed by Vallerand (1997), social factors (e.g. support of the BPN and motivational
14 climate) trigger the more self-determined motivation levels and the consequences in the
15 different action contexts (e.g. predisposition towards PE and PA) (Belton et al., 2014;
16 Hilland et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2012). Therefore, within the educational environment,
17 the situational level is understood when a student is motivated towards a specific
18 activity or a content area (e.g. make a choreographic sequence or develop an acrosport
19 unit in PE). The contextual level focuses on motivation and their consequences towards
20 one or several curricular subjects (e.g. PE, Mathematics, Languages, etc). Finally, the

1 global level is associated with motivation transferred outside the school environment, in
2 other contexts of the students during their leisure time (e.g. motivation towards PA,
3 making a sport as extracurricular activity and following an active lifestyle) (Vallerand,
4 1997).

5 Furthermore, this model indicates that these levels (i.e. situational, contextual and
6 global) are strongly related to each other, and that a modification of the motivational
7 variables (i.e. motivational climate, support of the BPN or self-determined motivation)
8 in one of them (e.g. situational level) may have effects on the next level up (e.g.
9 contextual level) or vice versa (Vallerand, 1997). Thus, this model further emphasizes
10 the role of PE teachers in getting their students to develop more active lifestyles. In this
11 sense, a student who develops more self-determined levels of motivation and more
12 positive experiences in a certain PE activity, lesson or teaching unit, is more likely to
13 engage in that activity again outside the school context (Belton et al., 2014; Barkoukis
14 and Hagger, 2013; Hilland et al., 2009). The consequences triggered in the students will
15 not only be at a motivation situational level, but the motivation could also be extended
16 to a contextual level, acquiring a positive predisposition towards PE, which could lead
17 to greater adherence to engagement in PA.

18 Based on the theoretical frameworks, evidence and previous studies, the application of
19 teaching intervention programmes in different teaching units that support both the
20 motivational climate (e.g. Hastie et al., 2014) and the BPN (e.g. Amado et al., 2014),

1 seems to be crucial to develop less explored variables such as predisposition towards PE
2 at contextual level. There are very few studies in PE that, applying an intervention
3 programme, have measured two hierarchical levels of motivation. To our knowledge,
4 there is only one study to date (see Moreno et al., 2010) that has analysed the effects of
5 an intervention programme on two different motivational levels: in the same teaching
6 unit (i.e. traditional games) and at contextual level (i.e. PE). However, the intervention
7 programme developed by Moreno et al. (2010) was based only on autonomy support.
8 Therefore, the main novelty of our research is the implementation of an intervention
9 programme based on task-oriented motivational climate and support of the three BPN
10 with the aim of increasing predisposition towards PE at contextual level. Furthermore,
11 to our knowledge, no intervention studies have examined the effects of manipulating the
12 task-oriented motivational climate and support of the three BPN in increasing
13 predisposition towards PE. Thus, this study tries to show the scientific community the
14 effect on predisposition towards PE produced by an intervention carried out in a specific
15 teaching unit.

16 The objectives of this study were: (a) assess the effectiveness of the application of a
17 series of strategies based on TARGET areas to generate perceived task-oriented
18 motivational climate and perceived support of the BPN; and (b) assess the effect of this
19 intervention programme on predisposition towards PE. The first hypothesis postulates
20 that the strategies developed in the intervention programme, applied in the acrosport

1 unit, will generate greater perceived support of the BPN and a greater perceived task-
2 oriented motivational climate in the experimental group. The second hypothesis
3 proposes that the intervention programme applied in this acrosport unit, based on
4 support of BPN and task-oriented motivational climate, will generate an increase in the
5 five factors of predisposition towards PE (i.e. cognitive attitude, affective attitude, self-
6 efficacy, enjoyment, perceived competence) in the experimental group.

7

8 **Methods**

9 *Participants*

10 A total of 41 Spanish students belonging to two different fourth-year secondary
11 education classes from the same school initially participated in the study. These students
12 were divided by the high school into two classes following standard criteria (i.e. age,
13 gender, class size, school achievement, and students with special needs) at the
14 beginning of the academic course. Class A was comprised of 22 students (11 boys and
15 11 girls) whilst class B was comprised of 19 students (10 boys and nine girls). One of
16 the classes (i.e. class A) was randomly assigned as the control group. After applying the
17 inclusion criteria (i.e. attendance to 10 of the 12 acrosport unit lessons and completion
18 of all questionnaires relating to the study variables) six students were eliminated from
19 the final sample: three students were injured and three did not attend the minimum of 10
20 sessions. Consequently, the final sample was reduced to 35 students (16 boys and 19

1 girls), with ages varying between 15 and 17 years old (M age = 15.37, SD = 0.49).
2 Finally, the control group (n = 20) was comprised of 10 boys and 10 girls (M age =
3 15.35, SD = 0.49), whilst the experimental group (n =15) was comprised of six boys and
4 nine girls (M age = 15.40, SD = 0.51). The acrosport unit was given by two different
5 male PE teachers with the same training in Sport and Exercise Science, and with
6 experience at high school level. Before starting the study, neither of the PE teachers had
7 any knowledge of the theories and motivational strategies.

8 ***Research design***

9 A quasi-experimental design was used with non-equivalent control group (Campbell
10 and Stanley, 1966). The independent variable was the intervention programme
11 implemented in the experimental group, based on teaching strategies geared towards the
12 development of a task-oriented motivational climate and support of the BPN. The
13 TARGET areas proposed by Ames (1992) were used as reference to apply these
14 teaching strategies.

15 The dependent study variables were assessed to evaluate the effectiveness of the
16 intervention at the end of the acrosport unit. These acrosport unit variables were
17 perceived support of the BPN (i.e. autonomy support, competence support and
18 relatedness support) and perceived motivational climate (i.e. task-oriented motivational
19 climate: pursuit of progress by pupils and promotion of learning by teacher; ego-
20 oriented motivational climate: pursuit of comparison by pupils, worries about mistakes;

1 and promotion of comparison by the teacher). No pre-test measurement of these
2 acrosport unit variables was conducted because the students had no previous experience
3 in the PE context in this content area. The students' lack of practice in this content area
4 may be due to several reasons. Firstly, acrosport is not a very common unit within
5 school teaching programmes in Spain, due to teachers' lack of training, knowledge and
6 experience in artistic activities, which often leads to them being excluded from the
7 syllabus (Robles et al., 2013). Secondly, artistic activities, such as acrosport are not too
8 common among teenagers in PA outside school, as there is a prevalence of other
9 activities such as football or basketball (Chillón et al., 2002).

10 On the other hand, the dependent variable, predisposition towards PE (cognitive
11 attitude, affective attitude, self-efficacy, enjoyment and perceived competence) was
12 used to measure the effects at contextual level (i.e. PE subject). Possible differences
13 between groups were assessed in the pre-test on predisposition towards PE in order to
14 ensure group equality before the intervention. Likewise, to assess possible changes in
15 predisposition towards PE, a post-test was conducted after the unit, analysing within-
16 group differences (see Figure 1).

17 ***Instruments***

18 *Perceived Motivational Climate Scale (PMCS)*. The PMCS developed by Biddle et al.
19 (1995) was used, translated into Spanish and adapted by Gutiérrez et al. (2011). This
20 instrument, which was adapted by modifying the initial sentence to the acrosport

1 content, contained the following heading: “In my acrosport unit lessons...”, followed by
2 19 items divided into five factors: five items for the perceived pursuit of progress by
3 pupils (e.g. “The pupils learn new things and feel pleased”), four items for the perceived
4 promotion of learning by teacher (e.g. “The PE teacher is pleased when each pupil
5 learns something new”), three items for the perceived pursuit of comparison by pupils
6 (e.g. “Pupils try to do better than one another”), four items for perceived worries about
7 mistakes (e.g. “The pupils worry about making mistakes”) and three items for the
8 perceived promotion of comparison by the teacher (e.g. “The PE teacher only bothers
9 with those who do well in sport”). The reliability analysis reflected Cronbach’s alpha
10 values of .81 for the perceived pursuit of progress by pupils, .88 for the perceived
11 promotion of learning by the teacher, .82 for the perceived pursuit of comparison by
12 pupils, .68 for perceived worries about mistakes, and .68 for the perceived promotion of
13 comparison by the teacher.

14 *Questionnaire to Assess Support of Basic Psychological Needs (Spanish acronym*
15 *CANPB)*. The CANPB validated to PE (Sánchez-Oliva et al., 2013) was used. The
16 introductory question was adapted to the acrosport unit: “In the acrosport lessons, the
17 PE teacher...”. The CANPB is comprised of 12 items grouped into three factors (four
18 items per factor): perceived autonomy support (e.g. “Often asks us about our
19 preferences with respect to the activities we carry out”), perceived competence support
20 (e.g. “Offers us activities based on our skill level”) and perceived relatedness support

1 (e.g. “Encourages positive interactions among all pupils”). The reliability analysis
2 showed Cronbach’s alpha values of .68 for perceived autonomy support, .68 for
3 perceived competence support, and .77 for perceived relatedness support.

4 *Physical Education Predisposition Scale (PEPS)*. The PEPS (Hilland et al., 2009),
5 translated into Spanish, was used, following the usual procedures (Hambleton, 2005),
6 including the forward-translation and back-translation method. It is comprised of 18
7 items grouped into five factors: three items measure cognitive attitude (e.g. “The things
8 that I learn in PE seem important to me”), four items measure affective attitude (e.g.
9 “The things I learn in PE make the subject pleasant”), three items for self-efficacy (e.g.
10 “I have sufficient confidence to participate in PE”), five items for enjoyment (e.g. “I
11 enjoy doing PE”) and three items for perceived competence (e.g. “I am quite skilful in
12 PE”). The questionnaire was preceded by the heading “In the PE subject...”. Before
13 starting the intervention study, as pilot test, the factorial validity of the questionnaire
14 was tested with a sample of 138 secondary school students of the same characteristics.
15 To this end, a confirmatory factorial analysis (CFA) was performed, testing the same
16 theoretical model presented in the validation study by Hilland et al. (2009). The results
17 of the CFA indicated a good adjustment of the data for a five-factor structure (i.e.
18 cognitive attitude, affective attitude, self-efficacy, enjoyment and perceived
19 competence) through the different adjustment indices assessed ($\chi^2 = 204.36$, $p < .001$;
20 $\chi^2/g.l. = 1.63$; RMSEA = .07; SRMR = .06; CFI = .95; TLI = .94). The reliability

1 analysis of the study sample, both in the pre-test and in the post-test, obtained
2 Cronbach's alpha values in each variable of .77 and .74 for cognitive attitude, .87 and
3 .85 for affective attitude, .79 and .61 for self-efficacy, .87 and .89 for enjoyment, and
4 .85 and .90 for perceived competence, respectively.

5 In the case of the factors that obtained reliability of under .70, internal consistency may
6 be accepted due to the small number of items that comprise the factor (Hair et al.,
7 1998). The response format used in each one of the measurement instruments was
8 indicated on a Likert scale of 1-5, where (1) corresponded to totally disagree and (5)
9 corresponded to totally agree with the formulation of the question.

10 ***Procedure***

11 Insofar as the ethical standards are concerned, the guidelines of the Ethics Review
12 Committee of a University were followed. Written informed consent was obtained from
13 parents or tutors, and from the school management, due to the participants being under .
14 The guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki (2008) were followed with respect to
15 consent, confidentiality and anonymous nature of the responses.

16 Two PE teachers participated simultaneously in the study. Before starting the study, the
17 teacher that delivered the intervention programme in the experimental group underwent
18 60-hours of training following the guidelines explained below and indicated by
19 Braithwaite et al. (2011) in order to guarantee that the subsequent intervention
20 programme was correctly implemented. The experimental teacher training was

1 developed by a group of experts in didactics and motivation in PE comprised of three
2 male university teachers. Two of the group members had extensive teaching experience
3 in the PE context, having carried out numerous acrosport interventions and similar
4 content areas with high school students. Thus, to implement these interventions, they
5 had conscientiously designed motivational strategies based on TARGET areas in order
6 to create a task-oriented motivational climate that integrated support of the three BPN.
7 Moreover, one of them was responsible for developing the PE curriculum of the new
8 education law in the region where the acrosport unit was applied. This meant that he
9 had in-depth knowledge of the skills and goals to be attained by the students. Finally, a
10 third expert had published articles in scientific journals referring to similar interventions
11 based on the application of TARGET areas to generate a task-oriented motivational
12 climate that supported the BPN. This expert also has a broad knowledge of the
13 theoretical framework of motivation in PE.

14 The 60-hours of training was divided into three phases. In a first phase, lasting for 20
15 hours, the teacher received specific training in motivational theories (i.e. SDT and
16 AGT) and strategies, associated with the theoretical knowledge about TARGET areas
17 (i.e. task, authority, recognition, grouping, evaluation and time; Ames, 1992) and
18 support of BPN. Other points addressed during this phase included an explanation of the
19 constructs of the two theoretical frameworks, benefits of placing emphasis on
20 developing a task-oriented motivational climate and support of the BPN, and

1 importance of not adopting a motivational climate ego. Likewise, practical lessons in
2 acrosport were given to learn how to implement different teaching intervention
3 strategies. In the second phase, lasting for another 20 hours, the same group of experts
4 in didactics and motivation in PE drew up the unit to be carried out, together with the
5 experimental group teacher. The strategies to be applied in each session were designed
6 during this phase. Different teaching videos and curricular material were also prepared
7 to facilitate the implementation of all teaching strategies (e.g. assessment tool, music,
8 notebook of acrosport figures...). Moreover, a set of videos with different PE content
9 areas was analysed to recognise and effectively differentiate educational intervention
10 strategies. Finally, in the third phase, the experimental group teacher met with the
11 members of the group of experts twice a week to review the development of the 12
12 acrosport unit sessions, to re-focus and implement the intervention strategies in the most
13 efficient manner. This phase lasted for 20 hours.

14 The unit was integrated into the PE teachers' curricular programme. In the first lesson,
15 it was verified that none of the students had procedural knowledge or experience of this
16 unit. To this end, students answered the following questions: "What is acrosport?"
17 "Have you ever done acrosport?". The unit was divided into four learning situations that
18 became increasingly more difficult, with the ultimate goal of preparing a group
19 choreographic sequence with music support. Moreover, at least one motivational
20 strategy within each one of the TARGET dimensions (i.e. task, authority, recognition,

1 grouping, evaluation and time) was implemented in each of the lessons that made up the
2 acrosport unit. The intervention was supervised by the same group of experts in PE
3 didactics in order to verify compliance with the design and teaching behaviours related
4 to the training programme. Both the teacher from the experimental group and the
5 teacher from the control group used a methodology based on the tactical games model
6 (TGM) (see O’Leary 2014). However, the control group teacher had no knowledge of
7 the theories and motivational strategies, so that the only difference was the intervention
8 programme based on TARGET areas. The control group followed a similar structure
9 that included 12 acrosport unit lessons. Moreover, the control group also prepared a
10 group choreographic sequence as the final reference situation to end the acrosport unit
11 with an artistic goal.

12 The study was carried out during the second term of the school year, and at the same
13 time in both groups. There were 12 lessons in all, and two were given each week, each
14 one lasting for 55 minutes. To compile the research data, three different measurements
15 were carried out, two at contextual level and one in an acrosport unit. Firstly, the
16 contextual pre-test (i.e. predisposition toward PE) was performed during the lesson prior
17 to the acrosport unit. Secondly, the acrosport-related measures (i.e. perceived support of
18 the BPN and perceived motivational climate) were carried out at the end of the last
19 lesson of the content unit. Finally, the contextual post-test (i.e. predisposition toward
20 PE) was performed two weeks after the end of the acrosport unit (see Figure 1).

1 Approximately 10 to 15 minutes were given over to completing data depending on the
2 compilation (i.e. 10 minutes for contextual measures and 15 minutes for acrosport unit
3 measures). This was done in the classroom, in an optimal working environment, and
4 with the presence of the researcher to clarify any possible doubts that might have
5 created confusion. The PE teacher was not present in order not to influence the students'
6 answers.

7
8 'INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE'

10 ***Intervention***

11 The independent variable of the study was the teaching intervention programme. The
12 intervention programme was adapted to the current curricular programme of the high
13 school PE department, which envisaged the development of an acrosport unit. Acrosport
14 is an acrobatic sport performed in groups, combining human pyramids, acrobatic jumps
15 and choreographic elements. As a teaching unit, acrosport has valuable characteristics
16 (e.g. cooperation, teamwork, knowledge of their own limitations and skills, and
17 understanding of classmates characteristics) for application in PE. Thus, the ultimate
18 goal of the acrosport unit proposed in this research was to create a choreographic
19 sequence in a group, providing an artistic component to the content. This programme,
20 applied to the experimental group, was based on the following guidelines related to the

1 TARGET areas (Ames, 1992), which were designed to support the students' BPN and
2 generate a task-oriented climate:

3 Task area: emphasis was placed on informing student about the objectives they
4 had to achieved, so the teacher pointed out the objectives proposed before each
5 lesson. In addition, the teacher implemented a wide variety of activities and
6 images related to acrosport throughout the unit. This variety of didactic elements
7 helped students create the choreographic sequence in groups.

8 Authority area: the aim was to involve all individuals in the decisions, letting
9 them choose, among other things, the weighting of the different sections in the
10 appraisal, the assessment method or the delivery dates for the different projects.
11 Furthermore, in order to place emphasis on autonomy support, the PE teacher
12 progressively passed on the decision-making responsibility to the students,
13 allowing them to choose the warm-up and cool-down tasks, the groups, clothing
14 and music for the final choreographic sequence.

15 Recognition area: comparison between students and working groups was
16 avoided at all times. In addition, the teacher gave positive (e.g. "You are making
17 a great effort, congrats") and cognitive-interrogative feedback (e.g. "What figure
18 could be improved to achieve a better choreographic sequence?") to both
19 individual students and to working groups.

- 1 □ Grouping area: students were distributed in a flexible and heterogeneous way,
2 assigning different random groups during the first lessons, varying the number
3 of members and the composition. Later on, they were given responsibility to
4 establish stable working groups, according to their own criteria, to prepare the
5 acrosport choreographic sequence in the final lessons, thus trying to encourage
6 relatedness support.
- 7 □ Evaluation area: each student was evaluated individually in order to verify their
8 progression, and provide specific and adapted information about the learning
9 process. Furthermore, the effort and progress of each working group were
10 assessed, avoiding comparisons. Moreover, students could choose the
11 percentage of each element to be assessed (i.e. individual work and group work,
12 attitude and choreographic sequence) within a range previously established by
13 the teacher. They also carried out a self-assessment of progress and the final
14 choreographic sequence, and they were able to discuss and compare the final
15 score with that assigned by the teacher.
- 16 □ Time area: an adequate time was established for progress, and each working
17 group established its own learning pace. Students were provided with a folder
18 with acrosport images that progressively increased in difficulty, for this to
19 represent a personal and group challenge to be achieved, in order to support
20 perceived competence.

1 **Data analysis**

2 Univariate normality (i.e. Kolmogorov-Smirnov test) and multivariate normality (i.e.
3 Mardia's multivariate kurtosis) were checked, indicating the need to use parametric
4 statistics. Homogeneity between the control group and experimental group was checked
5 by Levene's test ($p > .05$). Afterwards, the reliability analysis of the items was performed,
6 with Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Later on, the descriptive analyses of all the variables
7 included in the study (M and SD) were performed. Firstly, a one-way MANOVA for the
8 contextual pre-test variables (i.e. five predisposition factors) was conducted to ensure no
9 initial differences between groups, before starting the intervention programme. In order
10 to evaluate the first hypothesis of the study, two one-way MANOVAS were carried out
11 (Group; experimental/control) in the acrosport unit variables (i.e. the first one for
12 perceived support of the BPN; and the second one for perceived motivational climate).
13 To verify the second hypothesis, a two-factor MANOVA (Group x Time) was used,
14 with repeated measures (RM) on one factor (Time, pre-test/post-test). The different
15 analyses were performed using the statistical software SPSS 20.0.

16 **Results**

17 Results showed no initial differences between groups (experimental *vs.* control) in the
18 predisposition variables pre-test (Wilks' Lambda = .904; $F(5, 29) = 0.616$; $p = .689$; η^2_p
19 = .096). Secondly, related to the first hypothesis in an acrosport unit, one one-way
20 MANOVA (Group) was performed with the variables of perceived support of the BPN

1 and another one-way MANOVA (Group) with the perceived motivational climate. A
2 main effect was obtained on the different BPN support variables at the end of the unit
3 (Wilks' Lambda = .514; $F(3, 31) = 9.76$; $p < .001$; $\eta^2_p = .486$). The analysis of
4 differences comparing both groups (see Table 1) reflects significant differences, with
5 higher values in the experimental group in the perceived support of the three BPN.
6 Related to perceived motivational climate, a main effect was obtained at the end of the
7 acrossport unit (Wilks' Lambda = .594; $F(5, 29) = 3.96$; $p = .007$; $\eta^2_p = .406$). The
8 differences analysis (Table 1) showed significant higher values in the experimental
9 group in the factor of perceived pursuit of progress by pupils (i.e. perceived task-
10 oriented motivational climate) and significantly lower values in the experimental group
11 in the factor of perceived promotion of comparison by the teacher (i.e. perceived ego-
12 oriented climate).

13
14 'INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE'

15
16 The second hypothesis, related to predisposition towards PE, was tested through a two-
17 factor MANOVA (Group x Time). Results indicated an interaction effect (Group x
18 Time) in predisposition towards PE with an important effect size (Wilks' Lambda =
19 .635; $F(5, 29) = 3.33$; $p = .017$; $\eta^2_p = .365$). The analysis of within-group differences of
20 the experimental group (Table 2), reflects significant increases in the five factors

1 regarding predisposition towards PE (i.e. cognitive attitude, affective attitude, self-
2 efficacy, enjoyment and perceived competence). In the control group, no significant
3 increases were shown (Table 2), reflecting a significant decrease in the factor related to
4 enjoyment in PE.

5

6 'INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE'

7

8

Discussion

9 Based on the postulates of SDT (Deci and Ryan, 1985) and AGT (Nicholls, 1989), the
10 objective of the research was to evaluate the effectiveness of a teaching intervention
11 programme to improve predisposition towards PE based on developing a task-oriented
12 motivational climate and supporting the BPN. The first hypothesis was that the
13 strategies developed in the intervention programme in acrosport unit would generate
14 greater perceived support of the BPN and a greater task-oriented climate in the
15 experimental group. The results reflected significant differences, with higher values in
16 the experimental group in the perceived support of the three BPN. These results are in
17 line with other studies in the field of PE, which have shown the importance of the
18 teacher supporting the BPN due to the association of this variable with the satisfaction
19 of the three BPN (Sánchez-Oliva et al., 2014). Other authors have only found
20 significant differences in autonomy following a multi-dimensional intervention

1 programme in dance lessons (Amado et al., 2014), as well as relatedness after an
2 intervention in different curricular activities (i.e. badminton, table tennis, softball and
3 basketball) (Tessier et al., 2010). In this sense, a meta-analysis comprised of 22 PE
4 intervention studies (Braithwaite et al., 2011) showed that the time (e.g. from one day to
5 seven months), the curricular content (e.g. football, basketball, hockey, volleyball) and
6 the components (e.g. application of one, several or all TARGET areas) may explain the
7 different effects of the interventions, from one study to another. Thus, the duration of
8 the intervention programme and the supervision of the development of the unit may
9 have mediated in the results obtained, highlighting the effectiveness of the motivational
10 strategies to support the BPN.

11 In this line, experimental studies in PE showed that a teaching intervention based on
12 autonomy support had a positive relationship, not only with perceived autonomy, but
13 also with perceived competence and with relatedness (González-Cutre et al., 2014;
14 Leptokaridou et al., 2014). On the other hand, Julián et al. (2014) established that one of
15 the key aspects for students to perceive competence is to provide sufficient practise time
16 to improve their individual and group skills. Preparing a choreographic sequence
17 requires considerable time. Therefore, the 12 lessons appear to be sufficient, following
18 the number of lessons proposed by Braithwaite et al. (2011) for adequate learning.
19 Finally, the effectiveness of relatedness support may have been due to the application of

1 different groupings during the entire unit, maintaining their structure long enough for
2 integration and interpersonal relationships to be good (Tessier et al., 2010).

3 With respect to the perceived motivational climate variable, the results showed the
4 effectiveness of this intervention in the acrosport unit with significantly higher values in
5 the experimental group in one perceived task-oriented climate factor and significantly
6 lower values in one perceived ego-oriented climate factor. These findings are in line
7 with other results obtained following the development and implementation of the
8 TARGET areas in a corporal expression content area (e.g. Sevil et al., 2015). Thus, the
9 use of the TARGET areas may generate a task-oriented climate and support of the BPN
10 in PE lessons, as occurred in recent studies in other curricular activities (i.e.
11 orienteering, basketball, handball) (Almolda et al., 2014; Hastie et al., 2014). These
12 research studies have obtained significantly higher values in variables included in these
13 two social cognitive theories (e.g. Almolda-Tomás et al., 2014; Gray et al., 2009; Hastie
14 et al., 2014). Similarly, Cecchini et al. (2014) found significant differences in social-
15 contextual factors concerning the motivational climate, following an intervention for
16 which they implemented strategies based on TARGET areas in a PE context.

17 Following the HMIEM (Vallerand, 1997), the second objective proposed at contextual
18 level was to evaluate the effectiveness of an acrosport unit intervention programme on
19 predisposition towards PE. The respective hypothesis postulated was that the
20 intervention programme applied in an acrosport unit, based on support of the BPN and

1 task-oriented climate (through implementation of TARGET areas), would generate an
2 increase in the five factors of predisposition towards PE (i.e. cognitive attitude, affective
3 attitude, self-efficacy, enjoyment, perceived competence). The results showed
4 significant increases within the experimental group in all factors of predisposition
5 towards PE. Moreover, the enjoyment of students from the control group in PE
6 significantly decreased, thus confirming the hypothesis initially established. These
7 results are consistent with previous studies in the field of PE. For instance, a study
8 carried out by Sevil et al. (2016) found a positive relationship between perceived
9 support of the three BPN and predisposition of students towards different curricular
10 content areas (i.e. futsal, acrosport and rugby). Consequently, these findings reinforce
11 the importance of the PE teacher due to the association between support of the BPN in
12 different teaching units and predisposition towards the subject of PE. Furthermore,
13 cognitive attitude, affective attitude, self-efficacy and perceived competence could be
14 decisive and positive factors that could, to a certain extent, increase engagement in PA
15 outside the school context (Van der Horst et al., 2007), reinforcing the importance of the
16 results obtained.

17 Thus, after evaluating the results obtained in the experimental group, the significant
18 increase of the cognitive attitude factor must be highlighted. In agreement with Hilland
19 et al. (2009), the experimental intervention carried out in the acrosport unit could
20 produce a positive change in perceived PE of the students. With regard to all other

1 predisposition factors (i.e. affective attitude, self-efficacy, enjoyment and perceived
2 competence), the results of the analysis were similar to the cognitive attitude factor.
3 This could mean that if students like PE and enjoy doing it, and they also perceive
4 themselves as being self-efficient and competent, they could get further involved in the
5 subject (Hilland et al., 2009). Moreover, they could also, to a certain extent, transfer
6 these positive perceptions towards PE to other similar contexts or to higher levels
7 established in the Vallerand model (1997). The existing relationship between some of
8 the factors that make up predisposition towards PE (i.e. cognitive attitude, affective
9 attitude, self-efficacy and perceived competence) and the levels of engagement in PA
10 (Van der Horst et al., 2007) highlight the possibility of increasing predisposition
11 towards PE as a possible method that could promote PA. However, these results should
12 be interpreted with caution because the relationship between predisposition towards PE
13 and predisposition towards PA are still inconclusive. In a study conducted by
14 Fairclough et al. (2012) with female teenagers, no significant relationship was found
15 between perceived PE worth (i.e. cognitive attitude) and predisposition towards PA. In
16 contrast, they found a positive correlation between perceived PE ability (i.e. affective
17 attitude, self-efficacy and perceived competence) and PA. In this sense, it seems that
18 more research to clarify these relationships is needed.

19 Reinforcing the results of our research, Moreno et al., (2010) found similar outcomes.
20 After applying an intervention programme in a teaching unit based on autonomy

1 support, they found higher values in the autonomy of students in that teaching unit and
2 in PE. In another research, González-Cutre et al. (2014) showed the existing
3 relationship between the autonomy support perceived by the students in the PE lessons
4 and the promotion of active and healthy habits to carry out PA outside the school
5 context. Thus, PE could become an effective resource to provide adolescents the
6 knowledge, skills and attitudes, which facilitate their adherence to PA (Dauenhauer and
7 Keating, 2011). Additionally, the PE teachers behaviour in the classroom becomes an
8 important factor in their students' degree of engagement in PE lessons. In consequence,
9 their attitude in classroom also could have a certain relationship with adolescent use free
10 time (Barkoukis and Hagger, 2013; González-Cutre et al., 2014; Haerens et al., 2015).
11 Finally, some limitations as well as perspectives and opportunities for future studies
12 must be highlighted. Firstly, one limitation of the study was carrying out a single post-
13 intervention measurement of the acrosport unit variables (i.e. perceived support of the
14 BPN and perceived motivational climate). Consequently, future research should include
15 a pre-test of all motivational variables measured at different levels. Secondly, the
16 sample used in the control and experimental groups was not very extensive and,
17 therefore, the results obtained should be verified on a larger sample to ratify the
18 promising effect of the intervention. Thirdly, due to the final goal of the unit (i.e.
19 corporal expression) the students' gender could have been assessed as a second
20 independent variable or covariate. Thus, future studies should include gender and an

1 increase in control. Fourthly, the group of experts checked the implementation of the
2 intervention programme and strategies used in the control group, but they did not use
3 any systematic recording. Future studies should incorporate observational methodology
4 to compare the two teachers with certainty and increase internal validity. Another
5 possibility could be to establish this study in different units, designing specific
6 interventions for each type of content area in the PE subject. On the other hand, it would
7 be interesting, in future studies, to evaluate the “dark side” of the motivational
8 processes, adding variables such as thwarting and frustration of the BPN to verify their
9 influence on students’ predisposition towards PE. Finally, the limited number of
10 intervention studies that include predisposition towards the PE variable has made it
11 difficult to compare and discuss the results obtained. Therefore, knowing that there is a
12 relationship between this variable and the time engaged in PA outside the classroom,
13 future research to study this is considered important, with a view to establishing solid
14 associations between the teaching task in PE lessons and the adoption by students of a
15 more active lifestyle.

17 **Conclusions**

18 Several conclusions can be drawn from this study. Firstly, it is important to develop an
19 optimal learning environment, which supports the task-oriented motivational climate
20 and the three BPN. In particular, the results obtained show the importance of integrating

1 support of the three BPN during teaching units like acrosport, as this may increase the
2 predisposition of students towards PE. Thus, the study shows how this type of
3 intervention could allow students to identify the value of the PE subject. This could help
4 them understand some benefits of PA and facilitate its incorporation into their lifestyles.
5 Furthermore, the effects that have occurred in the acrosport unit may produce positive
6 consequences at contextual level; in other words, the manipulation of the teaching
7 intervention in the acrosport unit may generate greater predisposition towards PE at
8 contextual level. Thus, it is necessary to educate future teachers in theories and
9 motivational strategies like TARGET areas that can be applied in each content area, in
10 order for them to become agents who promote PE and active lifestyles in children and
11 adolescents.

13 **Acknowledgements**

14 We would like to acknowledge all external participants who have made it possible to
15 conduct this intervention study. Firstly, we acknowledge the expert team for their
16 collaboration. Secondly, we acknowledge the PE teacher who developed the
17 intervention. Finally, we would like to acknowledge the participation of all students
18 who made up the study population.

19 **Conflict of interest**

20 None declared.

1 **Funding**

2 This work was supported by a grant from the Government of Aragón and the European
3 Social Fund.

4

5

References

6 Aelterman N, Vansteenkiste M, Van den Berghe, et al. (2014) Fostering a need-
7 supportive teaching style: intervention effects on physical education teachers'
8 beliefs and teaching behaviors. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology* 36(6):
9 595-609.

10 Almolda-Tomás FJ, Sevil-Serrano J, Julián-Clemente J, et al. (2014) Application of
11 teaching strategies for improving students' situational motivation in Physical
12 Education. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology* 12(2):
13 391-418.

14 Amado D, Del Villar F, Leo FM, et al. (2014) Effect of a multi-dimensional
15 intervention programme on the motivation of physical education students. *PLoS*
16 *ONE* 9(1): e85275.

17 Ames C (1992) Achievement goals, motivational climate, and motivational processes.
18 In: Roberts GC (ed.), *Motivation in sport and exercise*. Champaign, IL: Human
19 Kinetics. pp. 161-176.

- 1 Barkoukis V and Hagger M (2013) The trans-contextual model: perceived learning and
2 performance motivational climates as analogues of perceived autonomy
3 support. *European Journal of Psychology Education* 28: 353-372.
- 4 Belton S, Wesley O, Meegan S, et al. (2014) Youth-physical activity towards health:
5 Evidence and background to the development of the Y-PATH physical activity
6 intervention for adolescents. *BMC Public Health* 14(1): 122-134.
- 7 Biddle SJ, Cury F, Goudas M, et al. (1995) Development of scales to measure perceived
8 physical education class climate: A cross-national project. *British Journal of*
9 *Educational Psychology* 65(3): 341-358.
- 10 Braithwaite R, Spray CM and Warburton VE (2011) Motivational climate interventions
11 in physical education: A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 12(6):
12 628-638.
- 13 Cecchini JA, Fernández-Río J and Méndez-Giménez A (2014) Effects of Epstein's
14 TARGET on adolescents' intentions to be physically active and leisure-time
15 physical activity. *Health Educational Research* 29(3): 485-490.
- 16 Chillón P, Delgado M, Tercedor P, et al. (2002) Actividad físico-deportiva en escolares
17 adolescentes. *Revista Retos. Nuevas Tendencias en Educación Física, Deporte y*
18 *Recreación* 3: 5-12.

- 1 Dauenhauer B and Keating XD (2011) The influence of physical education on physical
2 activity levels of urban elementary students. *Research Quarterly for Exercise*
3 *and Sport* 82(3): 512-520.
- 4 Deci EL and Ryan RM (1985) *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human*
5 *behaviour*. New York: Plenum Press.
- 6 Declaration of Helsinki. World Medical Association. Available from:
7 <http://www.wma.net/es/30publications/10policies/b3/17c.pdf>
- 8 Duda JL (2013) Introduction to the special issue on the PAPA project. *International*
9 *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology* 11(4): 307-310.
- 10 Duda JL, and Hall H (2001) Achievement goal theory in sport. Recent extensions and
11 future directions. In: Singer R Janelle C and Hausenblas H (Eds.), *Handbook of*
12 *research in sport psychology (2nd ed)*. New York: John Wiley y Sons, Inc. pp
13 417-443.
- 14 Fairclough SJ, Hilland TA, Ridgers ND et al. (2012) «Am I able? Is it worth it?»
15 Adolescent girls' motivational predispositions to school physical education:
16 Associations with health-enhancing physical activity.' *European Physical*
17 *Education Review* 18(2): 147-158.
- 18 González-Cutre D, Sicilia A, Beas-Jiménez M, et al. (2014) Broadening the trans-
19 contextual model of motivation: A study with Spanish adolescents.
20 *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports* 24(4): 306-319.

- 1 Gray S, Sproule J and Morgan K (2009) Teaching team invasion games and
2 motivational climate. *European Physical Education Review* 15(1): 65-89.
- 3 Gutiérrez M, Ruiz LM and López E (2011) Clima motivacional en Educación Física:
4 concordancia entre las percepciones de los alumnos y las de sus profesores.
5 *Revista de Psicología del Deporte* 20(2): 321-335.
- 6 Haerens L, Aelterman N, Vansteenkiste M, et al. (2015) Do perceived autonomy-
7 supportive and controlling teaching relate to physical education students'
8 motivational experiences through unique pathways? Distinguishing between the
9 bright and dark side of motivation. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 16(3): 26-
10 36.
- 11 Hair JF, Anderson RE, Tatham RL, et al. (1998) *Multivariate Data Analysis. Upper*
12 *Saddle River. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.*
- 13 Hallal PC, Andersen LB, Bull FC, et al. (2012) Global physical activity levels:
14 surveillance progress, pitfalls, and prospects. *Lancet* 380(9838): 247-257.
- 15 Hambleton RK (2005) Issues, designs and technical guidelines for adapting tests into
16 multiple languages and cultures. In Hambleton RK, Merenda PF and Spielberger
17 SD (eds.), *Adapting educational and psychological tests for cross-cultural*
18 *assessment*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. pp. 3-38.

- 1 Hastie P, Sinelnikov O, Wallhead T, et al. (2014) Perceived and actual motivational
2 climate of a mastery-involving sport education. *European Physical Education*
3 *Review* 20(2): 215-228.
- 4 Hilland TA, Stratton G, Vinson D, et al. (2009) The physical education predisposition
5 scale: Preliminary development and validation. *Journal of Sports Sciences*
6 27(14): 1555-1563.
- 7 Holt NL, Sehn ZL, Spence JC, et al. (2012) Physical education and sport programs at an
8 inner city school: Exploring possibilities for positive youth development.
9 *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy* 17: 97-113.
- 10 Julián JA., Cervelló E, Del Villar F, et al. (2014) *Estrategias didácticas para la*
11 *enseñanza de la Educación Física*. Madrid: Síntesis.
- 12 Leptokaridou ET, Vlachopoulos SP and Papaioannou AG (2014) Experimental
13 longitudinal test of the influence of autonomy-supportive teaching on motivation
14 for participation in elementary school physical education. *Educational*
15 *Psychology* (ahead-of-print): 1-22.
- 16 Moreno JA, Gómez A and Cervelló E (2010) Un estudio del efecto de la cesión de
17 autonomía en la motivación sobre las clases de educación física. *Motricidad*.
18 *European Journal of Human Movement* 24: 1-21.
- 19 Nicholls J (1989) *The Competitive Ethos and Democratic Education*. Cambridge MA:
20 Harvard University Press.

- 1 Ntoumanis N and Standage M (2009) Motivation in physical education classes: A self-
2 determination theory perspective. *Theory and Research in Education* 7(2): 194–
3 202.
- 4 O’Leary N (2014) Learning informally to use teaching games for understanding: the
5 experiences of a recently qualified teacher. *European Physical Education*
6 *Review* 20(3): 367-384.
- 7 Robles J, Abad MT, Castillo E, et al. (2013) Factores que condicionan la presencia de la
8 expresión corporal en la enseñanza secundaria según el profesorado de
9 educación física. *Revista Retos. Nuevas tendencias en Educación Física,*
10 *Deporte y Recreación* 24: 171-175.
- 11 Sánchez-Oliva D, Leo F, Amado D, et al. (2013) Desarrollo y validación del
12 cuestionario de apoyo a las necesidades psicológicas básicas en educación física.
13 *Motricidad: European Journal of Human Movement* 30: 53-71.
- 14 Sánchez-Oliva D, Sánchez-Miguel PA, Leo FM, et al. (2014) Physical education
15 lessons and physical activity intentions within spanish secondary schools: A
16 self-determination perspective. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* 33:
17 232-249.
- 18 Sevil J, Abós Á, Aibar A, et al. (2015) Gender and corporal expression activity in
19 physical education: Effect of an intervention on students’ motivational
20 processes. *European Physical Education Review* :1-18.

- 1 Sevil J, Abós Á, Lanaspá E, et al. (2016) Importancia del apoyo a las necesidades
2 psicológicas básicas en la predisposición hacia diferentes contenidos en
3 Educación Física. *Retos, Nuevas tendencias en Educación Física, Deporte y*
4 *Recreación* 29: 3-8.
- 5 Soini M, Liukkonen J, Watt A, et al. (2014) Factorial Validity and Internal Consistency
6 of the Motivational Climate in Physical Education Scale. *Journal of Sports*
7 *Science and Medicine* 13: 137-144.
- 8 Standage M, Gillison FB, Ntoumanis N, et al. (2012) Predicting students' physical
9 activity and health-related well-being: A prospective cross-domain investigation
10 of motivation across school physical education and exercise settings. *Journal of*
11 *Sport and Exercise Psychology* 34(1): 37-60.
- 12 Stroet K, Opdenakker, MC and Minnaert A (2013) Effects of need supportive teaching
13 on early adolescents' motivation and engagement: A review of the literature.
14 *Education Research Review* 9: 65-87.
- 15 Tessier D, Sarrazin P and Ntoumanis N (2010) The effect of an intervention to improve
16 newly qualified teachers' interpersonal style, students motivation and
17 psychological need satisfaction in sport-based physical education. *Contemporary*
18 *Educational Psychology* 35(4): 242-253.

- 1 Vallerand RJ (1997) Toward a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.
2 In: Zanna MP (ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. New York:
3 Academic Press, pp. 271-360.
- 4 Van der Horst K, Paw M, Twisk JW, et al. (2007) A brief review on correlates of
5 physical activity and sedentariness in youth. *Medicine and Science in Sports and
6 Exercise* 39(8): 1241-1250.
- 7 Welk GJ (1999) The Youth Physical Activity Promotion Model: A conceptual bridge
8 between theory and practice. *Quest* 51(1): 5-23.
- 9 Zhang T, Solmon, MA and Gu X (2012) The role of teachers' support in predicting
10 students' motivation and achievement outcomes in Physical Education. *Journal
11 of Teaching in Physical Education* 31: 329-343.

13 **Author biographies**

14 **Ángel Abós** is a PhD student in Education in the Faculty of Health and Sport Sciences
15 at the University of Zaragoza, Spain. He is currently doing his doctoral thesis, which
16 examines the importance of basic psychological needs support from teachers to explain
17 psychological need satisfaction, motivation for teaching, engagement and burnout.

18
19 **Javier Sevil** is a PhD student in Education in the Faculty of Health and Sport Sciences
20 at the University of Zaragoza, Spain. He is currently doing his doctoral thesis, which

1 analyzes the effects of a school-based intervention focused in autonomy support from
2 PE teachers, parents and peers on the motivation and positive behaviors in physical
3 education lessons and physical activity levels of adolescents.

4
5 **José Antonio Julián** is Professor in in the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities at
6 the University of Zaragoza, Spain. His research focuses on the promotion of adolescent
7 physical activity and motivation in physical education.

8
9 **Alberto Abarca** is Professor in the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities at the
10 University of Zaragoza, Spain. His research focus on the promotion of adolescent and
11 university students physical activity and objective assessment of their physical activity
12 patterns

13
14 **Luis García-González** is Professor in the Faculty of Health and Sport Sciences at the
15 University of Zaragoza, Spain. His research focuses on motivation in physical education
16 and sport context.

17
18




Figure 1. Design and research measures.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and differences analysis of the acrosport unit variables after the intervention programme.

Groups	Experimental group		Control group		Contrast between groups						
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Mean Diff.	Standard error	F _(1,33)	<i>p</i>	η_p^2	95% CI differences	
Study variables										LL	UL
Perceived autonomy support	3.70	0.51	2.88	0.43	.825	.158	27.16	<.001	.451	.503	1.147
Perceived competence support	3.75	0.59	3.10	0.40	.650	.167	15.08	<.001	.314	.309	.991
Perceived relatedness support	3.87	0.54	3.10	0.49	.767	.176	18.93	<.001	.365	.408	1.125
Perceived pursuit of progress by pupils	3.44	0.80	3.03	0.37	.410	.202	4.11	.051	.111	-.001	.821
Perceived promotion of learning by teacher	3.97	1.01	3.65	0.43	.317	.252	1.58	.217	.046	-.195	.829
Perceived pursuit of comparison by pupils	3.08	1.16	3.37	0.54	-.278	.293	0.90	.350	.026	-.874	.319
Perceived worries about mistakes	3.00	0.70	2.83	0.66	.175	.231	0.57	.455	.017	-.296	.646
Perceived promotion of comparison by the teacher	2.38	0.58	2.93	0.67	-.556	.216	6.06	.015	.167	-.995	-.116

Note: Diff = Difference; CI = Confidence interval; LL = Lower limit; UL = Upper Limit

1 **Table 2.** Descriptive statistics and analysis of within-group differences of
 2 predisposition towards physical education.

Study variables	Groups	Pre-test		Post-test		Contrast experimental group						
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Mean Diff.	Standard error	F (1,33)	<i>p</i>	η_p^2	95% CI differences	
											LL	UL
Cognitive attitude	Exp	2.64	0.71	3.24	0.71	-.600	.181	11.03	.002	.251	-.967	-.233
	Cont	2.95	0.64	2.97	0.54	-.017	.156	0.01	.916	.000	-.335	.302
Affective attitude	Exp	3.27	0.48	3.52	0.59	.250	.106	5.56	.024	.144	-.466	-.034
	Cont	3.45	0.57	3.34	0.55	.133	.092	1.50	.229	.044	-.074	.299
Self-efficacy	Exp	3.53	0.74	3.82	0.16	-.289	.143	4.10	.051	.111	-.579	.001
	Cont	3.87	0.59	3.68	0.54	.183	.124	2.20	.147	.063	-.068	.435
Enjoyment	Exp	3.67	0.82	4.11	0.74	-.440	.179	6.06	.019	.155	-.803	-.077
	Cont	3.96	0.58	3.59	0.56	.370	.155	5.71	.023	.148	.055	.685
Perceived competence	Exp	3.36	0.76	3.71	0.82	-.356	.134	7.08	.012	.177	-.627	-.084
	Cont	3.77	0.68	3.65	0.56	.117	.116	1.01	.321	.030	-.119	.352

3 **Note:** Exp = Experimental Group; Cont = Control Group; Diff = Difference; CI = Confidence interval;
 4 LL = Lower limit; UL = Upper Limit

5
 6
 7
 8

POST-PRINT VERSION