國立體育大學102學年度研究所博士班入學考試試題

系所:體育研究所　　組別:運動教育組

科目:運動教育學專業學科文獻評論（本試題共 18 頁）

※注意：1答案一律寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分

2請核對試卷、准考證號碼與座位號碼三者是否相符。

3試卷『彌封處』不得污損、破壞。

4行動電話或呼叫器等通訊器材不得隨身攜帶，並且關機。

5請以中文作答。請橫書。

本卷共 100 分

請就本試題所附的原創性論文論述之：

1. 本文的研究目的與問題爲何？研究方法是否可以有效解決本研究問題？在方法學上有何可再精進之處？30%
2. 請論述本文研究主題之近期的研究發展情形爲何？目前的研究重要發現爲何？30%
3. 本文的研究成果在運動教育學之理論面和教學現場上有何重要貢獻？20%
4. 就教師專業而言，本文在體育師資培育上的啓示爲何？20%

Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 2010, 29, 21-37

An Examination of the Responsibility Model in a New Zealand Secondary School Physical Education Program

Barrie Gordon
Victoria University

This study examined a six-month implementation of the Responsibility Model in a New Zealand secondary school. Data were collected through interviews, observations and student self-assessments. The implementation was found to be successful in developing positive, supportive and well-behaved classes in physical education. The majority of students developed a greater understanding of personal and social responsibility and became more personally and socially responsible in class. For most students, however, this understanding was firmly associated with physical education and they generally showed little understanding of the potential for the transfer of learning to other contexts.

Keywords: adolescence, physical education, teaching

The belief that participation in physical activity will help in the development of "good character" has a long and consistent history. Examples of this belief in practice include the introduction of games such as cricket and rugby football into the English public school system (Redman, 1988) and the development of the concept of "Muscular Christianity" by the nineteenth century Christian Church (Meller, 1977). Contemporary writers continue to champion physical activity-based programs as a potential means of developing "good character" and of helping alleviate society's problems (Collingwood, 1997; Laker, 2000). While acknowledging the potential of physical activity based programs, these writers generally consider that for programs to be successful in achieving positive social development they need to offer more than simply participation. To achieve positive results programs need to clearly identify positive social development as a major priority and be carefully structured to maximize the possibility that will happen (Salter, 1999; Shields & Bredemeier, 2001; Tinning, 1993).

The author is with Victoria University—Education, Wellington, New Zealand.

The Responsibility Model [1]

This study concerns one such approach, the Responsibility Model (RM), developed with the explicit intention of teaching students to become more personally and socially responsible (Hellison, 2003b; Hellison & Martinek, 2006). Integral to the RM are five goals, goals that are often described as levels of responsibility. The five goals/levels are identified as respect; participation and effort; self-direction; caring; and transfer [of learning] outside the gym. The first goal, respect, relates to the development of respect for the rights and feelings of others. While students may not be participating fully, they can demonstrate respect by not interfering with the teacher's teaching or the student's learning. Participation and effort concerns the responsibility to make an effort to participate fully in learning including times when the going is tough. Self-direction involves students demonstrating that they can take responsibility for their own learning, set goals and work independently. The goal of caring involves students helping, genuinely caring about and being sensitive and responsive to others. Caring behavior may include taking a leadership role that will contribute to the class's welfare. The final goal of transfer outside the gym involves students taking their learning around personal and social responsibility and implementing this learning in other contexts.

As a means toward achieving these goals the RM has a five-stage teaching structure. The first stage, counseling time, involves teachers spending time with individuals within their classes to develop positive relationships. The second stage, an awareness talk, describes an activity at the start of each lesson whereby time is spent to refocus the students on the goals of the RM. The third stage, activity time, relates to the physical activity part of the lesson, the time that addresses teaching and learning around the physical education curriculum. During this time it is important that the pedagogical approaches selected are appropriate for achieving the goals of the RM. Toward the end of the lesson a group meeting occurs where the students, as a group, have the opportunity to discuss events that have occurred in class. The lesson concludes with reflection time, a time when individual students are asked to reflect on their own behavior in relation to the goals of the RM.

Intertwined throughout the structure are a number of strong philosophical beliefs or convictions about teaching and learning. These beliefs are conceptualized by Hellison (2003a) as four themes—Integration, Transfer, Empowerment and Teacher-Student Relationships. The first theme concerns the need for an obvious integration of the levels and strategies of the RM into the physical activity part of the lesson. It is important that learning about personal and social responsibility is seen by participants to be an integral part of the lesson, rather than being an extra to the "real lesson". Transfer is concerned with the transfer of learning about responsibility to contexts outside of the physical education classroom. The teacher needs to provide opportunities that stimulate students to consider this transfer. During reflection time, for example, students can be asked to think about how responsible their behavior has been in other classes or at home. The empowerment of students refers to the transfer of control and power from the teacher to the students. This transfer gives students not only the opportunity to make decisions but also to experience the consequences of their decision-making. The final theme, teacher/student relationships, concerns the need for teachers to establish positive and respectful relationships with their students. For this to occur, teachers must recognize and

respect the individuality, strengths, opinions and capacity for decision-making of each program participant (Hellison, 2003a; Hellison & Walsh, 2002).

Readers wishing to obtain a deeper understanding of the RM will find valuable information in a number of Hellison's publications (e.g., Hellison, 2003a, 2003b).

Previous Research

While the RM is often associated with at-risk and/or under-served youth it was originally developed for, and has a long association with, school physical education (Gordon, 2007; Hellison & Martinek, 2006; Mrugala, 2002). For many physical education teachers the RM is considered to be a viable and effective pedagogical approach to the teaching of their subject. This acceptance has not eventuated because of strong research support for the model in practice, but rather through the experiences of teachers using the model in their classrooms, observation of other teachers and through word of mouth. The acceptance of new approaches to teaching in this way is not unusual, with the process often being referred to as "teacher tested" (Siedentop, 2002).

While acknowledging the reality of the "teacher tested" status of the RM, the limited research support to date has prompted concerns about the validity of claims of the model's success (Newton, Sanderg, & Watson, 2001). The extent to which research on the model in the physical education context has been disseminated to date is limited; with a particular shortage of research that examines implementations by classroom teachers rather than by outside lecturers/teachers (Li, Wright, Rukavina, & Pickering, 2008; Wright & Burton, 2008).

Concerns about a lack of research directly applicable to teaching and learning in physical education are not restricted to the RM, however, but are symptomatic of a wider movement away from research in practice (Lawson, 2007; Ward & Doutis, 1999). Macdonald et al. (2002), in their discussion on contemporary research in physical education, expressed their concerns when they wrote "… in physical education pedagogy research today … we desperately need to find ways to instruct children, prepare teachers, and assess physical education programs in schools, while many [researchers] in the pedagogical research community pursue quite different interests" (p. 137).

This study was designed to go some way toward addressing a number of these limitations by choosing to examine an implementation of the RM in a normal physical education program within a public school, and where the classes are being taught by a full-time member of the physical education staff. The study was focused on examining the reality of the RM in practice and investigating the teaching and learning that occurred from the perspectives of both the teacher and the students.

An examination of the range of methodologies typically used in research on the model established that there was a predominance of descriptive case study research and a lack of research utilizing other methodologies (Compagnone, 1995; Georgiadis, 1992; Martinek, Schilling, & Johnson, 1999). This predominance of case study research suggests that there is a need for the RM to be examined through a wider range of methodologies. This suggestion is not to challenge the veracity of the epistemologies underpinning the previous research or to suggest that there is a "best way" of verifying the worth of the RM. It is, however, an acknowledgment

that alternative approaches to examining the RM offer different viewpoints that have the potential to strengthen our understandings of the RM in practice.

Ethics

An ethics application was submitted to, and approved by, the Massey University College of Education Ethics Committee. This application gave due consideration to the ethical implications raised by the research, including the issues of confidentiality, anonymity and the need to protect participants from physical or psychological harm. All participants received a letter of information and were asked to sign a permission slip giving their informed consent.

Research Design

This study involved a mixed methodology combining case study and quasi-experimental research methods. When making the decision to use mixed methods the researcher was cognizant of the varying views held by writers, particularly concerning using methods derived from different epistemologies. While this article does not enter this debate the contested nature of the discussion is acknowledged.

In this study, there is, firstly, an examination of two classes that were taught physical education based on the RM using a case study approach. The lack of research on the RM, when taught by regular teachers in normal secondary school physical education programs, makes this examination both relevant and of interest to physical education teachers. A quasi-experimental methodology was included in the research design with the introduction of two comparison classes. In an effort to control for issues of internal validity all four classes were selected from the same year group and academic stream, were taught by the same teacher, and received the same research scrutiny.

Participants

This study was situated in a small rural secondary school in New Zealand, a South Pacific country of four million people. The school roll consisted of 493 students of whom 53% were female and 47% were male. Four classes, two from Year-9 (13 and 14 years of age) and two from Year-10, (14 and 15 years of age) were selected for the study. The teacher chose the Year-9 (9RM) and the Year-10 (10RM) class that she perceived to be the most difficult, to be taught physical education based on the RM. This was a subjective decision based on her judgment of the quality of the relationships among students, the general behavior of the classes and her perception of the class's engagement with learning in physical education. Both Year-9 classes (9RM and 9CO) had 18 students while the Year-10 RM class (10RM) had 28 students and the Year-10 comparison class (10CO) had 29 students. All four classes were coeducational and continued with the timetabled curriculum for the year. The topics covered during the six month period of the implementation included dance, gymnastics, touch rugby and minor games. The only major modification to the standard curriculum was the introduction of a Sport Education module in touch rugby for 10RM toward the end of the school year. All classes received two one-hour classes of physical education per week.

The teacher, Sarah (pseudonym), was a young teacher in her third year of her first teaching position. Sarah was introduced to the RM during her university studies and had implemented the model with a physical education class the previous year. This experience led to her approaching the researcher for help in introducing a more extensive implementation. Sarah had a philosophical affinity to the RM and felt comfortable with many of its underpinning beliefs.

Data Sources

A variety of data were collected throughout the study. Sarah, who taught all four classes, was interviewed eight times in total. These interviews ranged in length from twenty minutes to an hour and all were allowed to continue until they reached their natural conclusion. The first two interviews occurred during the initial planning stage. During the implementation Sarah was interviewed monthly until the final month (December) when two interviews were completed.

For the student interviews Sarah, using purposeful sampling (Bloor, Frankland, Thomas, & Robson, 2001) selected twenty-four students, six from each of the four classes, to be interviewed. In line with the principle of maximum variation (Seidman, 1998) students were selected in accordance with her perception of their attitude to, and behavior in, physical education and the school generally. Two of the selected students from each class struggled to behave in physical education and were often in trouble at school; two were selected as representing average students; the final two students were selected as students with positive attitudes who generally behaved well in class and around the school. The students were interviewed on three occasions, once each in August, October and December. At the beginning of each interview students were reminded that the information they gave was confidential and would not be shared with the teacher. Students were interviewed in groups of four in a warm, quiet room in the school administration building and all interviews were recorded on a small visible audiotape machine.

This study wished to examine the realities of the RM when implemented by a regular physical education teacher within their normal teaching practice. The observer (researcher) therefore acted as a nonparticipant in the belief that this would offer a more authentic examination of the model in this context. All four classes were observed on a regular basis (49 observations in total).

The reflection sheets, completed at the conclusion of the study, asked all students from the four classes to reflect on what they considered the physical education program had been attempting to teach and what they felt they had learned from the program. Students were also asked to reflect on their behavior in class. The reflection sheets were distributed and collected in during the initial stages of a physical education lesson. Students were supplied with pens and given as much time as they needed to fill in the forms. Once they had completed the form, students were asked to remain sitting until all members of the class had completed the process.

Data Analysis

The predominant epistemology that informed the analysis of data was that of constructionism. This epistemological orientation has a number of implications in

regards to interpretation and the development of understanding. These implications are considered in the discussion section.

The analysis of the interviews required the construction of categories in which to assign substantive comments (Gillham, 2000). The development of these categories occurred in two stages. The first occurred early in the data analysis with the establishment of eight major headings. These initial headings were developed from a combination of the initial analysis of data and assumed areas of interest. The second stage involved the identification of additional categories that emerged during the process of data analysis. It was from this process that the main themes and understandings were generated. The analysis of the reflection sheets also involved the development of categories from the data. Written notes were kept of all class observations. These notes were used to authenticate the implementation of the RM and to establish that a clear pedagogical differentiation between the RM classes and the comparison classes had occurred. The descriptions of key incidents recorded during the observations were analyzed to identify common themes and understandings which were used to gain a greater understanding of the processes that occurred during the implementation.

Processes Used to Authenticate the Pedagogical Approaches Used

When examining a pedagogical model it is important to establish that the application of the model in practice showed fidelity to the model in theory. At present there is no validated instrument available that can be used for this purpose for the RM. In this study three sources of data, classroom observations and teacher and student interviews, were used to establish this fidelity in relation to how the RM classes were taught. The data established that the RM classes followed the suggested RM lesson format (Hellison, 2003b) on all but a few occasions and that three of the four themes identified as needing to be present in RM programs, teacher-student relationships, integration of the RM with curriculum teaching and student empowerment were all present in the RM classes. The fourth theme, transfer, was present but did not receive the same emphasis as the other three. During interviews students made constant reference to both the structure and the intent of the model. These comments showed a developing understanding of the RM and gave a clear indication that it was an overt part of the physical education program.

These data were also used to confirm that a clear pedagogical difference occurred in the teaching of the comparison classes. It was clear that the comparison classes were taught physical education in a program that was not based on the philosophy underpinning the RM and did not involve any of the structure integral to the RM.

Findings

The findings for this study are presented in six sections: student learning in relation to personal and social responsibility; student engagement with the physical education curriculum; classroom behavior; transfer of learning; teacher perceptions; and transferability of findings.

Student Learning in Relation to Personal and Social Responsibility

The analysis of students' comments on what they considered that they had learned in physical education during the six-month implementation period identified that there were distinct differences between the students in the RM classes and those in the comparison classes at both Year-9 and Year-10 levels. At Year-9 the eighteen students from 9RM gave a total of 35 comments (see Table 1) which showed an equal spread between sport and fitness and responsibility related outcomes. This would indicate that the program for 9RM was successful in achieving the twin goals (Hellison, 2003b) of learning associated with the traditional outcomes from physical activity programs and the goals related to personal and social responsibility. The students in 9CO in contrast considered that their learning was predominantly around sport and fitness with only six comments being related to learning about responsibility.

A comparison between the two Year-10 classes showed an even greater difference in emphasis (see Table 2). In 10 RM a high number (88%) of comments were related to learning around personal and social responsibility and little comment was made of learning related to sport and fitness. The results for 10CO show a reversal of this with sport and fitness (87%) being seen as the predominant area of learning.

Table 1 Students' Comments on Learning in Physical Education

	9RM		9CO	
Comments related to	**Number of comments**	**% of total comments**	**Number of comments**	**% of total comments**
Sport or fitness	15	43%	28	77%
Personal responsibility	10	29%	0	0%
Social responsibility	9	26%	6	16%

Table 2 Students' Comments on Learning in Physical Education

	10RM		10CO	
Comments related to	**Number of comments**	**% of total comments**	**Number of comments**	**% of total comments**
Sport or fitness	3	6%	48	87%
Personal responsibility	20	40%	0	0%
Social responsibility	24	48%	2	4%

Student Engagement with the Physical Education Curriculum

An important factor when considering the introduction of the RM into school physical education is the impact on students' engagement with the physical education curriculum. From Sarah's perspective, students' levels of engagement in the physical education curriculum, for the two RM classes, improved from early in the implementation. This improvement continued until, by the end of the program, her judgment was that both RM classes were engaged in physical education at an exceptional level:

> The engagement in the RM classes was certainly improved and this was often initiated by the students. They were quickly on task and also had the ability to stay on task for a longer period of time [than the comparison classes]. This is I suppose because I was not having to interrupt often for reasons of management rather than of teaching and coaching.

One incident that clearly demonstrated the degree of engagement students had in physical education occurred when it was announced that, due to industrial action, school was to be cancelled on the following Wednesday. Sarah reported that the students were very disappointed and were attempting to organize physical education for that day. While the lesson did not eventuate, due to the canceling of the school buses, the students' attempt to organize class for a day on which they did not have to be at school demonstrated an unexpected level of commitment to and engagement in the physical education program.

Sarah did not identify a similar level of engagement from the two comparison classes observing that their level of engagement remained relatively consistent. This judgment was supported by the classroom observations which concluded that while the comparison classes showed reasonable levels of engagement, these levels remained basically unchanged throughout the implementation period.

Classroom Behavior

The impact of the RM on student behavior is an area that has received some research interest. A number of studies have identified that programs based on the RM have produced an improvement in the behavior of the students, and that teachers have generally reported an improvement in the "feel" of their classes (Buchanan, 2001; Cutforth, 2000; Georgiadis, 1990; Hastie & Buchanan, 2000). In some cases, the wish to improve classroom behavior has been the prime motivation for teachers introducing the RM into practice (Mrugala, 2002). The managing of children in class is a pragmatic concern for many teachers and the impact of the RM on student behavior is a prime determinant on whether teachers would consider the model to be successful.

In this study, Sarah first identified an improvement in classroom behavior with the RM classes during the first interview four weeks into the implementation. These changes included fewer incidents of minor conflict with individual students and an increased tendency for students to be responsible for equipment. These improvements had led to a better atmosphere in the class and the degree of change in such a short time had been both a surprise and a source of some excitement for her. This improvement in behavior continued until the end of

the implementation when Sarah described both RM classes as being extremely well behaved. The observation notes supported Sarah's judgment of continuing improvement and identified that on a number of occasions the students' behavior was excellent with a sense of positive purpose that was noteworthy. Sarah also identified an improvement in the behavior of the comparison classes but was very clear that it was not of the same magnitude as that of the RM classes.

As part of the reflection sheet, completed at the end of the year, students in all four classes were asked about their behavior in physical education. When asked whether the program had impacted positively on the way they thought about their behavior in class, a clear majority of students (25/33) in the RM classes felt that it had. When students from the comparison classes were asked whether their behavior in physical education had changed, 27 of 44 reported that their behavior had improved. Students in all four classes were also given the opportunity to give a written comment about whether participating in physical education had led to a change in their behavior. Table 3 presents a selection of comments indicative of those supplied by the students.

The students' comments showed a fundamental difference between the students in the RM classes and the comparison classes. The comments from the former tended to show more global thinking with comments around such areas as self-control, thinking about behavior and being more responsible. The comments from students in the comparison classes appeared more pragmatic and more closely related to the practicalities of the physical education classroom.

It is, of course, difficult to equate better behavior with specific learning about personal and social responsibility. What can be said, however, is that the belief that better behavior occurred in the two RM classes was supported by the professional judgment of Sarah, comments from the students, and observations over a six-month period. That the implementation of the RM was a factor in these changes is supported by both the consistent results from previous research and the absence of an equivalent improvement in behavior in the two comparison classes in this study.

Table 3 Students' Written Comments on Behavior in Class

Class	Comments
RM classes	It made me behave better without supervision.
	Yes it made me realize how I should act and speak.
	Yes I have more self control and I don't get frustrated real bad any more.
	No not really . . . hell no.
Comparison classes	Yes it has because I have been participating more.
	No I have been reasonable all year.
	I don't think so because everything I do I seem to get wrong.
	Yes because we have done funner (sic) sport that interests me.

Transfer of Learning

The degree to which learning about personal and social responsibility is transferred to other contexts is an important outcome for the model. The goal of transfer of learning was added to the RM after the realization developed that this was the underlying reason for its creation (Hellison, 2003a). Research on the RM has reported a divergence of results in the area of transfer of learning with some studies (Cummings, 1997; Hellison & Wright, 2003) finding strong evidence of this occurring, while others found either weaker or no evidence (Hellison & Walsh, 2002).

For the vast majority of students involved in this study no indication was given that they considered that their learning in physical education was applicable in other contexts. In the final interview, students were asked if they had used what they had learned in physical education in other classes or outside the school. One answer was representative of many others:

> No … cause it doesn't work in other classes because we don't have a choice what we learn, it's different in PE you are running around having a good time but in other classes you are sticking to the routine.

Two students from 10RM were very clear, however, that the learning had had an impact at home and at work. For one the RM had influenced him in a number of areas:

> Yeah and outside of school and everything. I mean, everything you can do can go back to that [the RM]. Everything in life really. At work you can say, Oh yeah. I didn't really work that good. So the next time I try harder.

A second student also believed that the RM had changed her behavior at home and commented:

> It's like, I don't think about the posters but I think about what's on them. Yeah, they're in my, they're in your brain … Sounds a bit weird but I don't know how to explain it. Yeah, they've got stuck in your brain.

The majority of student comments would suggest, however, that despite the stated intensions of Sarah to address transfer, and the integral place that transfer has in the RM, few students were cognizant of the connection between what they were learning in physical education and its applicability to other contexts.

While the study was interested in the students' understanding of transfer, there was also interest in the behavior of the classes in their other subjects as a potential indication of a transfer of learning in practice. Of particular interest was the behavior of 10RM, who, while they demonstrated improved behavior in physical education, had simultaneously been displaying steadily deteriorating behavior in their other classes. The students readily accepted that this was occurring with one comment offering a possible insight into the reasons: "Yeah. I think it's the way we get taught in PE. It's more, more like they're giving us more responsibility and in other classes we're treated like we're little kids." It should be noted that the experiences of 10RM were not paralleled by 9RM who did not have similar problems.

Teacher Perceptions

For Sarah, the implementation of the model led to a reaffirming of her beliefs about the importance of a humanistic classroom and of the need for teacher–student relationships to be based on mutual respect. In her final interview, when discussing what she thought the RM brought to her teaching, she commented "what it brought to my teaching is the development of positive relationships within my class." It is interesting to note that Sarah did not experience a similar improvement in teacher-student relationships with students in the two comparison classes. This lack of improvement was noted:

> By the end of the year my relationship with the non RM [comparison] classes had developed no more than at the start and possibly I was a little frustrated with this lack of progress in comparison to the RM classes.

Many of the teachers and leaders involved in previous studies involving the RM commented that it was a pedagogical approach that they would use in their future practice (Cutforth, 1997; Martinek et al., 1999; Parker & Hellison, 2001). Sarah reported similar sentiments. In her final interview, when asked what she felt about the RM as a pedagogical approach to teaching physical education, her reply left little doubt of her feelings: "Absolutely, powerful, in fact the question is by not teaching the RM are you knowingly withholding the opportunity to succeed [for the students]."

Transferability of Findings

Transferability is concerned with the degree to which the understandings generated from qualitative research can be generalized to other contexts. While many would argue that the transferability of results is not the intention of case study research, this issue becomes important where, as is the case with research on the RM, the results from case study research may be taken as encouragement to introduce the model into other contexts.

In this study, two methods were used to address the issue of transferability. The first was based on the comparative method which considers that where a number of case studies, over a period of time and at different sites, reported similar outcomes, this justified the belief that the findings can be generalized to other similar contexts (Silverman, 2000; Yin, 1994). Previous research had identified a number of learning outcomes in relation to the RM (Buchanan, 2001; Mrugala, 2002) and this study attempted to establish whether these were replicated when the RM was implemented into a secondary school physical education program.

The second method used to address transferability was the inclusion of the two comparison classes. It was anticipated that comparing and contrasting the outcomes from previous research on the RM with those from the RM classes and the comparison classes would contribute toward an understanding of the impact of the RM in physical education classes and on the issue of transferability.

When comparing the outcomes from previous research (Table 4), it is clear that a number of outcomes were replicated in the RM classes and that these outcomes did not occur in the two comparison classes. These included outcomes of specific importance in the school context, outcomes such as improved student

behavior, improved engagement with the curriculum, better student relationships and improvements in the ability of students to be self-directed in their learning. While these results cannot be considered to establish causation, they do offer a degree of support for those who believe that the outcomes identified in previous research are transferable to the school physical education context.

Table 4 Summary of Comparative Research Findings

Findings from previous research	Findings from RM classes	Findings from comparison classes
Improvements in participants:	Improvements in participants:	No improvements in participants:
Self-control	Self-control	Self-control
Self-direction	Self-direction	Self-direction
Helping others	Helping others	Helping others
Participants generally positive toward the opportunities to make decisions for themselves	Students generally positive toward the opportunities to make decisions for themselves	No comments received about opportunities to make decisions for themselves
Many participants enjoyed the programs	Many students enjoyed physical education	Many students enjoyed physical education
The behavior of participants showed steady improvement	The behavior of students improved greatly	The behavior of participants did not improve greatly
Participants' levels of engagement increased	Students' levels of engagement increased	Students' levels of engagement did not increase

Discussion

Before discussing what understandings can be obtained from this study it is important to consider the limitations and restraints integral to research situated in the constructivist paradigm. It should be acknowledged that the beliefs and views expressed by the participants are constructed through their experiences and world views. In a similar manner it needs to be acknowledged that the interpretation process itself is influenced by the beliefs of the researcher. This understanding does not negate understanding derived from interpretation as it is accepted that while no particular interpretation can be claimed as the correct one, interpretations can be both valuable and useful. It is also important, however, to acknowledge that the views and experiences that participants bring to the process often add an insight and understanding that may be unavailable to others. In this study, situated in the reality of practice, the world view of the teachers and students needs to be valued as these are the legitimate inhabitants of this particular "swamp of practice." As Crotty (1998) stated, "different people gain a different meaning even from the same phenomenon" (p. 46), and the meaning given by Sarah and her students is their meaning and must be valued.

What, then, can be taken from this study? Firstly, the study established that the RM can be successfully implemented into a secondary school physical education program by a regular physical education teacher. While the findings from research in both community and out-of-school programs has identified a number of successful outcomes, a physical education class in a secondary school setting differs in a number of important ways. Of particular importance is that a physical education class consists of students who are required to attend and who move as a discrete unit within the school, five or six periods a day, five days a week for the full year. This continuity means that a class unit takes their experiences in the RM with them throughout the day and into the classrooms of a number of other teachers. Other differences include: the requirement for the teacher to ensure that specific curriculum goals are met; the inability of the group to exclude students who do not respond to the RM philosophy or cause problems; the generally large class sizes and the potential different motivations for teachers introducing the RM into their classes as opposed to the motivations behind voluntary groups run out of school.

One issue specific to the secondary school context relates to potential tensions between the RM teacher/class and other teachers who teach the RM classes where the pedagogy associated with the RM is at odds with the more traditional approaches to teaching and classroom management present in the school. This issue is related to the process of student empowerment, a process that can be in direct conflict with the predominant culture of many schools and physical education programs. The empowerment of students is, however, a central tenet in the RM philosophy and clearly needs to occur in any implementation of the model. Conflict between classes taught with the RM and their other teachers is not, of course, an inevitable consequence of implementing the RM into a school environment. The results for 10RM would suggest, however, that discussing the implementation of the RM with other teachers who will be teaching the classes may well be a prudent measure.

While this study makes some progress toward answering questions relating to the realities of implementing the RM into the school context, it also generated others. The first concerns the appropriateness of teaching the goals of the model as a hierarchy of levels rather than as a number of individual goals to be experienced and achieved as appropriate. Presenting the goals as levels has some advantages. Hellison et al. (2000) commented that "Taking on the five levels at once is asking a lot of students [and that] one way to address this issue is to present the responsibilities as a loose progression of levels" (p.40).

While this view has some pragmatic appeal there are also a number of disadvantages, including the fact that teachers sometimes use levels to label students, and that they may also ignore Level five (Transfer outside the gym) which cannot be observed within physical education class time (Hellison, 2003b). A central difficulty with the concept of levels is the possibility that students will come to believe that they need to "successfully" achieve at one level before they can move on to developing the next. The belief that caring, for example, is something to be achieved only after respect, effort and self-direction have been demonstrated is a constriction on both students' development and the overall potential of the model.

Shields and Bredemeier (1995), when discussing the place of levels, made the observation that, if it was necessary to have the goals presented as cumulative levels then they could, in fact, be arranged in any number of ways; with caring (Level four), for example, easily being placed between respect (Level one) and

effort (Level two). Hellison (2003b) has also commented on this issue and while he acknowledged that the concept of levels was used extensively in practice, he noted that personally he had "abandoned the use of cumulative levels within a few years ... As I dug deeper into each of the levels and began to appreciate their nuances, it seemed best to treat each separately" (Hellison, 2003b, p. 29).

A second question arose around the impact of the learning associated with the RM on students in other areas of their lives. Lave and Wenger's (1991) conceptualization of communities of practice (COP) offers the potential to place the RM in the paradigm of situated learning. Kirk and Macdonald (1998) considered that one of the major problems with contemporary physical education was the incongruence between the learning in school physical education and the COPs for which students are theoretically being prepared to participate. They identified the RM as one of a limited number of models that were considered to be attempting to prepare students for successful participation.

Kirk and Macdonald's comments raise the interesting question of the implications when the learning from the RM is incongruent with the COPs in which students are actually participating. There is an underlying assumption that the COPs, for which the RM is preparing students, are receptive to and value the outcomes being developed. It should be acknowledged, however, that the values promoted by the RM are but one set of constructed values available to participants in our communities. The set of values promoted by the RM, therefore, has the potential to be disadvantageous for some students participating in COPs where caring for others, for example, may be seen as weakness and lead to negative consequences. In many business COPs, a value system that places caring for others as a priority could well result in disadvantage and, in some street-based COPs, caring could have potentially dire results for students who attempt to live these values. The issue of the compatibility of the learning around personal and social responsibility with the reality of their lives outside of the classroom offers a potentially rich area for discussion during group and reflection time.

A final question relates to the degree to which the outcomes achieved with the RM can be attributed to the humanistic and pedagogical approaches associated with the RM rather than the RM itself. The RM gives students the opportunities to practice skills such as self-directed learning, decision-making, being personally responsible and helping others. It also places value on establishing teacher-student relationships that are respectful and positive. These opportunities are created as an integral part of the physical education program and are underpinned by the learning associated with, and the structure of, the RM. It is interesting, then, to contemplate to what degree the positive outcomes observed in the RM classes are the result of the reconstituted relationships and the specific pedagogies used rather than the RM itself. How different would the results be in a physical education program that encouraged decision-making and student empowerment and that used a number of the same pedagogical approaches but did not underpin the program with either the structure of the RM or the specific teaching and learning about personal and social responsibility? This current study would suggest that the RM has been successful in going some way toward meeting Hellison's (2003a) plea to put kids ahead of physical activity and to teach for personal and social development. The question then becomes "Is it important?" Perhaps the answer can be seen in history where "educated men" have often behaved in the most immoral and inhuman ways. We

need to look no further than Nazi Germany, for example, to see a stark illustration that education offers no guarantee of humanity.

What then is the future for the RM in physical education? Are the humanistic values promoted by the model truly valued or will they be sidelined by the more easily taught and measured technocratic outcomes traditionally linked to physical education? The decision to embrace the potential of the RM is neither a simple nor an easy one to make. It requires a belief that the outcomes associated with the model are important, a vision that sees they can be met and the courage to try.

Perhaps an equally important question for teachers is "Can I make a difference?" While no definitive answer can be given, the following paragraph written by Sarah three years after the completion of the study, perhaps offers a glimpse at what can be:

> Thanks, this was an awesome opportunity which I feel has really challenged me to find my own style of teaching and formed a strong backbone for my own philosophy of teaching and basically why I am a teacher. If I can help spread the word – let me know. Since this [study], I have implemented the model and have had even more success both for the students but as importantly for myself and my professional practices. It is really powerful stuff to have such an effect on young people and I do feel that I have made a difference.

Notes

1. The Responsibility Model is also commonly referred to as Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR).

References

Bloor, M., Frankland, J., Thomas, M., & Robson, K. (2001). *Focus groups in social research*. London: SAGE Publications.

Buchanan, A. (2001). Contextual challenges to teaching responsibility in a sports camp. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 20*(2), 155–182.

Collingwood, T. (1997). Providing physical fitness programs to at risk youth. *Quest, 49*(1), 67–83.

Compagnone, N. (1995). Teaching responsibility to rural elementary youth. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 66*(6), 58–63.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research*. Crows Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin.

Cummings, T. (1997). Testing the effectiveness of Hellison's personal and social responsibility model: A drop-out, repeated grade and absentee rate comparison. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. California State University.

Cutforth, N. (1997). What's worth doing: Reflections on an after-school program in a Denver elementary school. *Quest, 49*(4), 130–139.

Cutforth, N. (2000). Towards university-community collaboration. In *Youth development and physical education* (pp. 51–64). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Georgiadis, N. (1990). Does basketball have to be all W's and L's. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 61*(6), 42–43.

Georgiadis, N. (1992). Teaching an inner-school after school program. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 63*(8), 14–18.

Gillham, B. (2000). *The research interview*. London: Continuum.

Gordon, B. (2007). *An examination of an implementation of the responsibility model in a New Zealand secondary school physical education programme.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Massey University, New Zealand.

Hastie, P., & Buchanan, A. (2000). Teaching responsibility through sport education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 71*(1), 25–38.

Hellison, D. (2003a). Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility. In S. Silverman & C. Ennis (Eds.), *Student learning in physical education* (pp. 269–286). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hellison, D. (2003b). *Teaching responsibility through physical activity*. Campaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hellison, D., Cutforth, N., Kallusky, J., Martinek, T., Parker, M., & Stiehl, J. (2000). *Youth development and physical activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hellison, D., & Martinek, T. (2006). Social and individual responsibility programs. In D. Kirk (Ed.), *The handbook of physical education* (pp. 610–626). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Hellison, D., & Walsh, D. (2002). Responsibility-based youth programs evaluation: Investigating the investigators. *Quest, 54*(4), 292–307.

Hellison, D., & Wright, P. (2003). Retention in an urban extended day program: A process-based assessment. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 22*(4), 361–381.

Kirk, D., & Macdonald, D. (1998). Situated learning in physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 17,* 376–387.

Laker, A. (2000). *Beyond the boundaries of physical education*. London, New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lawson, H. (2007). Renewing the core curriculum. *Quest, 59*(1), 219–243.

Li, W., Wright, P., Rukavina, P., & Pickering, M. (2008). Measuring students' perceptions of personal and social responsibility and the relationship to intrinsic motivation in urban physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 27*(2), 167–177.

Macdonald, D., Kirk, D., Metzler, M., Nilges, L., Schemp, P., & Wright, J. (2002). It's all very well in theory: Theoretical perspectives and their applications in contemporary pedagogical research. *Quest, 58*(1), 60–70.

Martinek, T., Schilling, T., & Johnson, J. (1999). Evaluation of a sport and mentoring program designed to foster personal and social responsibility in underserved youth. *The Urban Review, 33,* 29–45.

Meller, M. (1977). *Leisure and the changing city, 1870-1914*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mrugala, K. (2002). *Exploratory study of responsibility model practitioners.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago.

Newton, M., Sanderg, J., & Watson, D. (2001). Utilizing adventure education within the model of moral action. *Quest, 53*(4), 483–494.

Parker, M., & Hellison, D. (2001). Teaching responsibility in physical education: Standards outcomes and beyond. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 72*(9), 25–27.

Redman, G. (1988). *Historical aspects of fitness in the modern world.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Salter, G. (1999). Unfolding attitudes and values in physical education: stretching the limits of traditional pedagogy. *Teachers and Curriculum, 3,* 11–22.

Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research*. New York: teachers College Press.

Shields, D., & Bredemeier, B. (1995). *Character development and physical activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Shields, D., & Bredemeier, B. (2001). Moral development and behavior in sport. In *Handbook of sports psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 585–603). New York: John Willey and Sons.

Siedentop, D. (2002). Sport education: A retrospective. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 21*(4), 409–418.
Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
Tinning, R. (1993). *Learning to teach physical education. New York*. Sydney: Prentice Hall.
Ward, B., & Doutis, P. (1999). Towards a consolidation of the knowledge base for reform in physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 18*(4), 382–402.
Wright, P., & Burton, S. (2008). Implementation and outcomes of a responsibility-based physical activity program integrated into an intact high school physical education class. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 27*(2), 138–154.
Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION of the *JOURNAL OF TEACHING IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION* (ISSN 0273-5024), as required by 39 U.S. Code 3685:

The *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* (ISSN 0273-5024) is published four times a year (quarterly). Subscription fees are $63 per year for individuals and $315 per year for institutions.

The owner of the *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* is Human Kinetics, Inc., whose office of publication is at 1607 N. Market St., Champaign, IL 61820-2200. The editor is Ron McBride, Texas A&M Univ., College Station, TX 77843. The publisher is Rainer Martens, whose address of publication is PO Box 5076, Champaign, IL 61825-5076. There are no bondholders, mortgagees, or other security holders.

Average number of copies printed per issue (net press run) during the preceding 12 months is 1,260; number nearest to filing date is 1,208. Average number of copies of each issue distributed in mass mailing to subscribers during the preceding 12 months is 25; number nearest to filing date is 61. Average number of copies of each issue distributed after mass mailing to subscribers during the preceding 12 months is 989; number nearest to filing date is 946. Average number of copies of each issue distributed free during the preceding 12 months is 30; number nearest to filing date is 30.