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Abstract: In this research, 366 students from No. 11 Middle School in Suzhou City, Anhui Province were selected as the research objects, and questionnaires were used to investigate the number, type, items, time, frequency and reasons of students' participation in sports training institutions before and after the double-reduction policy. The results showed that the majority of the student respondents participated in sports training after DRP. A large percentage of the student respondents participated in badminton, basketball, and track and field after DRP. A large percentage of the student respondents spent from Monday to Friday after class time and both weekends in extracurricular sports training. The majority of the student respondents spent 1-2 times a week in off-campus sports training after DRP. A large percentage of the student respondents participated in off-campus sports training after DRP to cultivate their skills, as an exercise to enhance physical fitness, and to gain more friends and socialize.
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1. Introduction

China's test-oriented education system is destined to take academic performance as the most significant criteria for measuring students. From elementary school to high school, achieving better results has become the goal of struggle for students and parents. Other factors such as physical and mental health, social adaptation, team consciousness, etc. often ignore other factors that affect their children's growth. Compared with disciplines such as Chinese, mathematics, foreign languages, etc., education of sports, labor, art, and aesthetics seems pale and weak. China has practiced students' education for decades, but has not changed the training model of students. In July 2021, China promulgated the "Opinions on Further reduction of compulsory education students' family homework and off-campus training burden", put forward the "double reduction" policy of "reducing the burden of student homework and off-school training in the compulsory education stage. With the introduction of relevant documents, the "double reduction" working mechanism has been gradually improved. Low grade sections (primary school 1 and 2nd grades) will no longer arrange homework and set up examinations. Extra-disciplinary training will no longer be approved[1]. Students in the enrollment compulsory education stage will not be allowed. Entertainment time. The introduction of the "double reduction" policy is the need for the development of China in the new era. The deep connotation us to understand and treat from the height of politics[2]. From the inside of the system the fundamental task of man promotes the comprehensive and healthy development of young people.

2. Background of the Study

On July 24, 2021, the General Office of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China the General Office of the State Council jointly released the "Opinions on Further Reduce the burden of compulsory education students' family homework and off-campus training" (hereinafter referred to as "Opinions")[3]. It is pointed out that the "double reduction" policy refers to reducing the total amount of work required for school homework, and reducing the burden on extra-curricular training programs. The purpose of this policy is to improve the quality of overall education, reduce the burden of learning, and protect the health of students. In addition, the policy also aims to reduce the burden and anxiety of reduce social inequality, and further standardize off-campus training." Opinions" pointed out the basic tasks of educational education, student orientation, response concern, and governance according to law. The goal is to steadily advance the comprehensive progress of education.

With the implementation of the "double reduction" policy, local governments will no longer
discipline training institutions for new compulsory education students (primary and secondary school students). Outside-school training based on discipline courses will be banned, including schools in primary and secondary schools such as Chinese, history, geography, mathematics, English, physics, chemistry, and biology\(^4\). For non-disciplinary projects such as sports, art, music, science, technology, etc. local governments will clarify to the corresponding competent authorities and regain their approval system\(^5\).

Subsequently, the four departments such as the Education Department of Anhui Province issued the "Notice on Further Regulating the after-service Works of Primary and Middle School Students", requiring compulsory education schools to carry out after-school services after school from Monday to Friday afternoon, at least 2 hours. In principle, the end time in principle Not earlier than the local normal time, the specific service time is determined by the local area according to the actual situation. At the same time, it was introduced to strictly govern off-school training institutions and ban many unsatisfactory institutions.

3. Research Methods

3.1 Research Locale

The study was conducted in Suzhou City, Suzhou Eleventh Central City Road Campus, investigate and understand data.

3.2 Research Tool

The researcher developed a student questionnaire and two interview guides. The questionnaire is aimed at the quantitative investigation tools of students. The questionnaire includes four aspects; the basic information of the student, participation in the sports training institution before and after, the physical, mental, psychological, and social effect of DRP to students', and satisfaction with sports training institutions. Topic guides are used to interview parents and teachers of sports training institutions. The questionnaires has undergone validation by three Chinese physical education experts to evaluate the effectiveness of the questionnaire.

3.3 Sampling Method

In the autumn semester of 2022, there were a total of 712 students in the 7th grade, 961 in the 8th grade, 850 in 9th grade students. The researcher aimed for a total of 366 students who were purposively selected to answer the survey instrument. The total number of students is \(N = 2523\), the sample quantity is \(n = n + (1 + n*e*e) = 346\) to ensure that the final recovery of the survey reaches 346 copies, and the actual survey will expand the sample volume to \(n = 366\).

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 The Situation Before The DRP

4.1.1 Number

Table 1 Student Respondents’ Participation in Off-Campus Training Institutions Before the Double Reduction Policy (DRP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Before DRP</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, have no time.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, economic reasons.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, no interest.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, heavy study load.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, unnecessary.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, incomprehension.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, personal reasons.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>366</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that two-hundred-ninety-two (292) or about 79.8% of the student respondents
participated in off-campus institutions before the double reduction policy (DRP). Twenty-three (23) or about 6.3% did not participate in off-campus institutions before DRP because they had no time. Five (5) or about 1.4% did not participate in off-campus institutions before DRP because of economic reasons. Eight (8) or about 2.2% did not participate in off-campus institutions before DRP because they had no interest in it. One (1) or about 0.3% did not participate in off-campus institutions before DRP because of heavy study load. Eighteen (18) or about 4.9% did not participate in off-campus institutions before DRP because for them, it is unnecessary. Three (3) or about 0.8% did not participate in off-campus institutions before DRP because of incomprehension. And, sixteen (16) or about 4.4% of the student respondents did not participate in off-campus institutions before DRP because of personal reasons. This goes to show that the majority of the student respondents participated in off-campus institutions before DRP.

4.1.2 Type

Table 2 Type of Off-Campus Training Institutions the Student Respondents Participated In Before the Double Reduction Policy (DRP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Off-Campus Training Institution</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Want to Disclose</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>366</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that fifteen (15) or about 4.1% of the student respondents participate in discipline training before DRP. One-hundred-fifteen (115) or about 31.4% participated in art training before DRP. Eighteen (18) or about 4.9% participated in technology training before DRP. One-hundred-twenty-eight (128) or 35.0% participated in sports training before DRP. Sixteen (16) or about 4.4% participated in other training before DRP. And, seventy-four (74) or about 20.2% of the student respondents did not want to disclose the training they participated in before DRP. This conveys that the majority of the student respondents participated in sports training.

4.1.3 Projects

Table 3 Projects the Student Respondents Participated in in Off-Campus Training Before the Double Reduction Policy (DRP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-Campus Training</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table Tennis</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Arts</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Field</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumping Rope</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Skating</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Music)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Dance)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Fine Arts)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Piano)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Want to Disclose</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that one-hundred-fifty-three (153) or about 41.8% of the student respondents participated in table tennis. One-seventy-four (174) or about 47.5% participated in badminton. Eighty-five (85) or about 23.2% participated in tennis. Two-hundred-twenty-eight (228) or about 62.3% participated in basketball. One-hundred-forty-seven (147) or about 40.2% participated in football. One-hundred-twenty-nine (129) or about 35.3% participated in volleyball.
One-hundred-eighty (180) or about 49.2% participated in martial arts. One-hundred-thirty-four (134) or about 36.6% participated in track and field. Ninety-five (95) or about 25.9% participated in gymnastics. One-hundred-thirty-nine (139) or 38.0% participated in swimming. Ninety-two (92) or about 25.1% participated in jumping rope. Seventy-four (74) or about 20.2% participated in fencing. Ninety-six (96) or about 26.2% participated in roller skating. One-hundred thirty-nine (139) or 38.0% participated in music. One-hundred-six (106) or 29.0% participated in dance. Seventy-eight (78) or about 21.3% participated in fine arts. Ninety-one (91) or about 24.9% participated in piano. And, nineteen (19) or about 5.2% of the student respondents did not want to disclose the off-campus training they participated in. This suggests that a large percentage of the student respondents participated in basketball, martial arts, and badminton.

### 4.1.4 Time

**Table 4 Time the Student Respondents Spent in Extracurricular Sports Training Before the Double Reduction Policy (DRP).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Spent in Extracurricular Sports Training</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter/Summer Vacation</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Holidays</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Want to Disclose</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows that two-hundred-thirty-three (233) or about 63.7% of the student respondents spent Monday to Friday in extracurricular sports training. Eighty-two (82) or about 22.4% spent the weekends in extracurricular sports training. One-hundred-fifty-three (153) or about 41.8% spent winter/summer vacation in extracurricular sports training. Seventy-eight (78) or 21.3% spent the other holidays in extracurricular sports training. And, nineteen (19) or about 5.2% of the student respondents did not want to disclose the time they spent in extracurricular sports training. This indicates that a large percentage of the student respondents spent Monday to Friday and winter/summer vacation in extracurricular sports training.

### 4.1.5 Frequency

**Table 5 Student Respondents’ Participation in Off-Campus Sports Training Before the Double Reduction Policy (DRP).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Participation in Off-Campus Sports Training Before the DRP</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a week</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times a week</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 times a week</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 4 times a week</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Want to Disclose</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that eighty-eight (88) or 24.0% of the student respondents participated in off-campus sports training less than once a week before the DRP. One-hundred-sixty-five (165) or about 45.1% participated in off-campus sports training 1-2 times a week before the DRP. Twenty-one (21) or about 5.7% participated in off-campus sports training 3-4 times a week before the DRP. Eighteen (18) or about 4.9% participated in off-campus sports training more than 4 times a week before the DRP. And, seventy-four (74) or about 20.1% of the student respondents did not want to disclose how frequent they participated in off-campus sports training before the DRP. This exhibits that the majority of the student respondents participated in off-campus sports training 1-2 times a week before the DRP.

### 4.1.6 Reasons

Table 6 shows that two-hundred-seventy-four (274) or about 74.9% of the student respondents participated in off-campus sports training before DRP to cultivate their skills. Two-hundred-fifteen (215) or about 58.7% participated in off-campus sports training before DRP as a hobby during spare time. One-hundred-ninety-seven (197) or about 53.8% participated in off-campus sports training before DRP as training for professional career and competition. Three-hundred-thirteen (313) or about 85.5% participated in off-campus sports training before DRP as exercise to enhance physical fitness. One-hundred-thirty (130) or about 35.6% participated in off-campus sports training before DRP as preparation for sports in middle school entrance examination. One-hundred-seventy-three (173) or about 47.3% participated in off-campus sports training before DRP to gain more friends and socialize.
And, twenty-five (25) or about 6.8% of the student respondents participated in off-campus sports training before DRP because of other reasons. This conveys that a large percentage of the student respondents participated in off-campus sports training before DRP as exercise to enhance physical fitness, to cultivate their skills, and as a hobby during spare time.

**Table 6 Reasons of the Student Respondents for Participating in Off-Campus Sports Training Before the Double Reduction Policy (DRP).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Participating in Off-Campus Sports Training Before DRP</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultivate my skills</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobby during spare time</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for professional career and competition</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise to enhance physical fitness</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for sports in middle school entrance examination</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain more friends and socialize</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.2 The Situation After The DRP**

**4.2.1 Number**

**Table 7 Participation of Student Respondents in Off-Campus Training Institutions After the Double Reduction Policy (DRP).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in Off-Campus Training Institutions After DRP</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, have no time.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, economic reasons.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, no interest.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, without reason.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, unnecessary.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, personal reasons.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, be affected by policy.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, great pressure on study</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, institutional closure.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, practice on your own.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows that two-hundred-eighty-nine (289) or 79.0% of the student respondents participated in off-campus training institutions after DRP. Twenty-one (21) or about 5.7% did not participate in off-campus training institutions after DRP because they had not time. Five (5) or about 1.4% did not participate in off-campus training institutions after DRP because of economic reasons. Five (5) or about 1.4% did not participate in off-campus training institutions after DRP because they had no interest. Twenty (20) or about 5.5% did not participate in off-campus training institutions after DRP without any reason. Fifteen (15) or about 4.1% did not participate in off-campus training institutions after DRP because it is unnecessary. One (1) or about 0.3% did not participate in off-campus training institutions after DRP because of personal reasons. Two (2) or about 0.5% did not participate in off-campus training institutions after DRP because they are affected by policy. Three (3) or about 0.8% did not participate in off-campus training institutions after DRP because of great pressure on study. Two (2) or about 0.5% did not participate in off-campus training institutions after DRP because of institutional closure. And, three (3) or about 0.8% of the student respondents did not participate in off-campus training institutions after DRP because they can practice on their own. This presents that the majority of the student respondents participated in off-campus training institutions after DRP.

**4.2.2 Type**

Table 8 shows that eighteen (18) or about 4.9% of the student respondents participated in discipline training after DRP. One-hundred-four (104) or about 28.4% participated in art training after DRP. Seventeen (17) or about 4.6% participated in technology training after DRP. One-hundred-forty-four (144) or about 39.3% participated in sports training after DRP. Six (6) or about 1.6% participated in...
other trainings after DRP. And, seventy-seven (77) or 21.0% of the student respondents did not participate in any training after DRP. This shows that the majority of the student respondents participated in sports training after DRP.

Table 8 Type of Off-Campus Training Institutions They Participated In after the Double Reduction Policy (DRP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Off-Campus Training Institutions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 Projects

Table 9 Projects the Student Respondents Participated in in Off-Campus Sports Training After the Double Reduction Policy (DRP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table Tennis</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Arts</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Field</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumping Rope</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Skating</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows that one-hundred-twenty-one (121) or about 33.1% of the student respondents participated in table tennis after DRP. One-hundred-eighty-three (183) or 50.0% participated in badminton after DRP. One-hundred-forty (140) or about 38.3% participated in basketball after DRP. Ninety-six (96) or about 26.2% participated in football after DRP. Ninety-nine (99) or 27.0% participated in volleyball after DRP. Ninety-five (95) or 26.0% participated in martial arts after DRP. One-hundred-thirty-one (131) or about 35.8% participated in track and field after DRP. One-hundred-thirteen (112) or about 30.9% participated in gymnastics after DRP. One-hundred-one (101) or about 27.6% participated in swimming after DRP. Fifty-nine (59) or about 16.1% participated in jumping rope after DRP. Thirty-eight (38) or about 10.4% participated in fencing after DRP. Thirty-five (35) or about 9.6% participated in roller skating after DRP. And, sixteen (16) or about 4.4% of the student respondents participated in other projects after DRP. This reveals that a large percentage of the student respondents participated in badminton, basketball, and track and field after DRP.

4.2.4 Time

Table 10 Time the Student Respondents Spent in Extracurricular Sports Training After the Double Reduction Policy (DRP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Spent in Extracurricular Sports Training</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Monday to Friday after class time</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both weekends</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter and summer vacation</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other holidays</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 shows that one-hundred-forty-one (141) or about 38.5% of the student respondents spent
from Monday to Friday after class time in extracurricular sports training. One-hundred-eight (108) or about 29.5% spent both weekends in extracurricular sports training. Forty-seven (47) or about 12.8% spent winter and summer vacations in extracurricular sports training. Seventy (70) or about 19.1% spent other holidays in extracurricular sports training. And, forty-eight (48) or about 13.1% of the student respondents did not spend time in extracurricular sports training. This goes to show that a large percentage of the student respondents spent from Monday to Friday after class time and both weekends in extracurricular sports training.

4.2.5 Frequency

Table 11 Frequency of the Student Respondents’ Participation in Off-Campus Sports Training After the Double Reduction Policy (DRP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in Off-Campus Sports Training After DRP</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a week</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times a week</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 times a week</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 4 times a week</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows that ninety-six (96) or about 26.2% of the student respondents spent less than once a week in off-campus sports training after DRP. One-hundred-thirty-nine (139) or 38.0% spent 1-2 times a week in off-campus sports training after DRP. Thirty-five (35) or about 9.6% spent 3-4 times a week in off-campus sports training after DRP. Nineteen (19) or about 5.2% spent more than 4 times a week in off-campus sports training after DRP. And, seventy-seven (77) or 21.0% of the student respondents did not participate in off-campus sports training after DRP. This demonstrates that the majority of the student respondents spent 1-2 times a week in off-campus sports training after DRP.

4.2.6 Reason

Table 12 Reasons of the Student Respondents for Participating in Off-Campus Sports Training After the Double Reduction Policy (DRP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Participating in Off-Campus Sports Training After DRP</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultivate my skills</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my hobby during spare time</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for professional career and competition</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an exercise to enhance physical fitness</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a preparation for sports in middle school entrance examination</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain more friends and socialize</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 shows that two-hundred-thirteen (213) or about 58.2% of the student respondents participated in off-campus sports training after DRP to cultivate their skills. One-hundred-thirty-six (136) or about 37.2% participated in off-campus sports training after DRP as a hobby during their spare time. One-hundred-forty-five (145) or about 39.6% participated in off-campus sports training after DRP as training for professional career and competition. Two-hundred-sixty (260) or 71.0% participated in off-campus sports training after DRP as an exercise to enhance physical fitness. Ninety-eight (98) or about 26.8% participated in off-campus sports training after DRP as a preparation for sports in middle school entrance examination. Two-hundred-forty-one (241) or about 65.9% participated in off-campus sports training after DRP to gain more friends and socialize. One-hundred-thirty-four (134) or about 36.6% participated in off-campus sports training after DRP for other reasons. And, one-hundred-four (104) or about 28.4% of the student respondents did not provide reasons because they did not participate in off-campus sports training after DRP. This suggests that a large percentage of the student respondents participated in off-campus sports training after DRP to cultivate their skills, as an exercise to enhance physical fitness, and to gain more friends and socialize.
5. Conclusions

In conclusion, majority of the student respondents are grade two female students. Additionally, the majority of the student respondents participated in off-campus institutions before the double reduction policy (DRP).

Also, the majority of the student respondents participated in sports training. Furthermore, a large percentage of the student respondents participated in basketball, martial arts, and badminton.

Moreover, a large percentage of the student respondents participated in off-campus institutions before the DRP. Besides this, the majority of the student respondents participated in off-campus sports training 1-2 times a week before the DRP.

What is more, a large percentage of the student respondents participated in off-campus sports training before DRP as exercise to enhance physical fitness, to cultivate their skills, and as a hobby during spare time.

Along with these data, the majority of the student respondents participated in off-campus training institutions after DRP. Correspondingly, the majority of the student respondents participated in sports training after DRP.

Even more, a large percentage of the student respondents participated in badminton, basketball, and track and field after DRP.

Additionally, a large percentage of the student respondents spent from Monday to Friday after class time and both weekends in extracurricular sports training.

Furthermore, the majority of the student respondents spent 1-2 times a week in off-campus training after DRP.

Moreover, a large percentage of the student respondents participated in off-campus sports training after DRP to cultivate their skills, as an exercise to enhance physical fitness, and to gain more friends and socialize.

6. Recommendations

Hence, it is recommended for school administrators, school heads, and supervisors that to improve the training institutions based on the impacts of the Double Reduction Policy (DRP).

6.1 Enhance and Diversify Extracurricular Sports Training Opportunities

Given the majority of students' participation in off-campus sports training both before and after the implementation of the double reduction policy (DRP), it is important for school administrators to provide a wide range of sports options within the school curriculum. This can include partnering with local sports clubs, organizing intra-school sports competitions, and offering a variety of sports activities that cater to the interests and preferences of students[6].

6.2 Develop Long-term Sports Training Programs

As a large percentage of students participate in sports such as basketball, martial arts, and badminton, it is crucial for administrators to establish long-term sports training programs that allow students to cultivate their skills and pursue their interests. These programs can include regular training sessions, coaching support, and opportunities for students to participate in competitive events at both intra-school and inter-school levels[7].

6.3 Optimize Scheduling of Extracurricular Activities

Considering that students spend a significant amount of time in extracurricular sports training, it is essential to ensure a balanced schedule that allows them to effectively manage their academic and
sports commitments. School administrators should work towards creating a timetable that accommodates both academic instruction and extracurricular activities, taking into account the students' well-being and avoiding excessive workload.
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