

TEACHERS' EXPERIENCES OF THE TPSR (TEACHING PERSONAL AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY) MODEL IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

EXPERIENCIAS DE PROFESORES CON EL MODELO «TPSR» (ENSEÑANZA PARA LA RESPONSABILIDAD PERSONAL Y SOCIAL) EN EDUCACIÓN FÍSICA

Jan-Erik **ROMAR** (Åbo Akademi University — Finland)¹

Emilie **HAAG** (Åbo Akademi University — Finland)

Ben **DYSON** (The University of Auckland — New Zealand)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to understand the experiences of Finnish in-service physical education teachers when using the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Model (TPSR). Eight elementary and middle school physical education teachers participated in a professional development course organized by the university and the course focused on implementing instructional models into the teachers' own teaching. Data were gathered from interviews with the teachers. The result showed that the teachers felt it was important to adjust the TPSR model and its levels to their students. The teachers also reported that it was easy to adapt the model and that the students enjoyed the model. The study showed that regular physical education teachers can implement a novel curriculum.

RESUMEN

El propósito del presente estudio fue comprender las experiencias de un grupo de profesores de Educación Física finlandeses que utilizaban el modelo de Enseñanza para la Responsabilidad Personal y Social (TPSR). En el estudio participaron ocho profesores de Educación Física de educación primaria y media que recibieron un curso organizado por la universidad cuyo objeto era que los docentes implementaran dicho modelo de enseñanza en su propia enseñanza. Los datos se obtuvieron a partir de entrevistas con los docentes. Los resultados mostraron que los profesores consideraban que era importante ajustar el modelo (TPSR) al nivel de a sus estudiantes. Indicaron también que les resultó sencillo adaptar el modelo y que a los estudiantes les gustó. Finalmente, el estudio puso de manifiesto

¹ Correspondence concerning this article (correspondencia en relación con este artículo): jromar@abo.fi

que un profesor de Educación Física normal puede desarrollar un currículum novedoso apoyándose en este modelo.

KEYWORDS. Teaching physical education; model based instruction; Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility; professional development.

PALABRAS CLAVE. Enseñanza de la Educación Física; instrucción basada en modelos; Enseñanza para la Responsabilidad Personal y social; desarrollo profesional.

1. INTRODUCTION

The professional lives of teachers have considerably changed during the past decade. A number of instructional models are recognized as new ways to think about teaching physical education. There is a shift from what might be traditionally viewed as a “multi-activity” approach to physical education to using national and local curriculums that reflect one or more instructional models (Metzler, 2011; O'Sullivan, 2013). However, Annerstedt (2008) concluded that it is possible to talk about a Scandinavian model for PE, characterized by a broad content area, where pupils choose from a kind of ‘smorgasbord’ of physical activities. Although Scandinavian teachers with these multi-activity programs of different physical activities expect students to learn, different ball games are the most frequent content area in PE in Finland (Palomäki & Heikinaro-Johansson, 2011) and Sweden (Quennerstedt, Öhman, & Eriksson, 2008). This is not unproblematic, while Öhman and Quennerstedt (2008) found that cooperation is described by teachers as a main element in various games and exercises with the aim to improve cooperation, but is often taken as granted just by playing team sports.

All subjects, including physical education (PE), are required to contribute to the social and moral development of the children. Social and moral development is a cross-curriculum goal in Finland and is placed at the center of the education process. In addition, one learning goal in the National Core Curriculum (The Finnish National Board of Education, 2004) for Basic Education in physical education is that students can work independently, in a group according to agreed guidelines, can participate responsibly and can promote principles of sportspersonship. Social development in the Scandinavian field of PE aims at improvement in cooperation, leadership skills, fair play and respect for other (Annerstedt, 2008). More specifically, Finnish PE teachers indicated that student improved responsibility and development of cooperation are some learning goals that are most frequently achieved in their teaching (Palomäki & Heikinaro-Johansson, 2011). Öhman and Quennerstedt (2008) also identified a social development discourse in the Swedish local curriculum documents as well as in the physical education lessons. However, despite this focus on the development of students' responsibility, the Finnish national curriculum in PE does not provide teachers with clear instructions. This problem might even lead back to teacher education, while Dowling (2011) concluded that Norwegian PE student teachers seem ill-prepared to develop cross-curricula learning opportunities for their socially diverse pupils because that the Norwegian teacher education institutions in her case study lacked clarity in

their local aims about professional practice. Therefore it is important to see what kind of evidence and help can be found in the international research literature.

Traditionally many physical education classrooms are teacher led with drill oriented teaching (Siedentop, 1998) while several new models give students voice and choice and thereby claiming to empower students by providing them with active roles and meaningful choices in a democratic learning context (Hastie, Rudisill, & Wadsworth, 2013). However, Bechtel and O'Sullivan (2007) concluded that despite instructional models have been around for more than two decades, these models have not been adopted by teachers and have still remained as an innovation in physical education.

Hellison's model Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Model emphasizes the need to teach through physical education values and behavior that are related to well-being and personal development as well as to social integration and development (Hellison, 2003, 2011). The model defines responsibility as social and moral issue that enhance student's learning experiences. The model is structured around five levels or goals of responsibility: *Respect the rights of and feelings of others, Effort, Self-direction, Helping others, and Outside the gym* (2003). The aim of the first level is that students learn empathy, can solve conflicts peacefully, and include everyone in the activity. In the second level, students are encouraged to try hard, to focus on improvement and to be persistent in difficult tasks. The objective of the third level is that students make choices, manage their time, plan their own learning and set goals for themselves. In level four, students put others' needs before your own, provide leadership, and are sensitive and responsive. Level fifth teaches students to transfer the learning of previous levels into other contexts.

The TPSR model uses sport, games, and physical activity as a vehicle for teaching responsible behavior. Specific instructional strategies contain direct instruction, group discussion, peer instruction, cooperative learning, independent work, personal reflection, and decision making (Hellison, 2011). Opportunities to have responsibility are integrated into the lessons and allow students to take on more and more active roles over time (Hellison & Walsh, 2002).

School based physical education programs can provide students with opportunities to learn responsibility issues and scholars have argued that PE and especially the teacher play a crucial role in the social and moral development of children. Nevertheless, Patrick, Ward, and Crouch (1998) concluded in a review of studies on social behaviors in physical education that, unless planned for and taught by the teacher, appropriate social skills often remain underdeveloped. Therefore, if teachers want the development of social skills as part of the curriculum, then teaching social skills should be an obvious part of the lessons. Jacobs, Knoppers, and Webb (2013) found that PE teachers unanimously constructed PE classes as places where social and moral skills should and can be developed. However, in practice there is perhaps incongruence, because Dutch PE teachers differed, in what they emphasized and the strategies they used to recognize this curriculum objective.

Despite a strong intuitive and practical support relatively few empirical studies of TPSR in school settings have been published in peer-reviewed journals. In the first review of research on TPSR, Hellison and Walsh (2002) concluded that the model was an effective teaching resource that helped teachers to structure teaching and to promote student respect, effort, autonomy, and leadership capacity. Later several researchers (Escartí, Pascual, Gutiérrez, Marín, Martínez & Tarín, 2012; Gordon, 2010; Wright & Burton, 2008; Wright, Li, Ding & Pickering, 2010) have reported similar findings and that this model can be successfully implemented into physical education by a regular physical education teacher.

Researchers have also through analysis of quantitative data reported marked changes in student behavior and self-efficacy between students taught with the TPSR model and students in traditional physical education programs (Cecchini, Montero, Alonso, Izquierdo & Contreras, 2007; Escartí, Gutiérrez, Pascual & Llopis, 2010; Escartí, Gutiérrez, Pascual & Marín, 2010). As a support to this, Hastie, et al., (2013) concluded in a review of 27 interventional studies that providing pupils with opportunities to become self-directed leads to higher levels skill attainment, physical activity and perceived competence.

There is a plethora of research on other model based instruction, like Cooperative Learning (Dyson & Casey, 2012), Sport Education (Hastie, 2012), and Teaching Games for Understanding (Peters & Shuck, 2009; Robinson, 2011). There is also validated evidence that TPSR works but here is a need to focus on how teachers use and learn to use the TPSR model.

Previous studies have showed that TPSR was a pedagogical approach that teachers would use in their future practices. In addition, teachers involved in implementing the TPSR program experienced improved motivation toward their teaching (Escartí et al., 2012). However, educators know that it is not easy to use the model. Gordon (2012) reported an experienced teacher even after many years of experience in teaching TPSR, still challenged by the unpredictability of the classroom context, and the uncertainty of students' responses. This challenge is also noticed with other instructional models, as when Casey, Dyson, and Campbell (2009) noted that doing something differently was 'not easy' while implementing a Cooperative Learning model. Finally, Casey (2014) reviewed research on model based practice and concluded that the use of models required more effort and made teachers feel like novice teachers again.

Beaudoin (2012) showed how responsibility-based strategies were used to support teachers throughout the process of TPSR implementation by empowering teachers through self-supervision, by providing opportunities for success, by setting expectations and by nurturing a respectful relationship. Escartí et al., (2012) used an intensive initial preparation and ongoing training during the program implementation which supported the teachers in their work. However, they concluded that research is needed to evaluate the structure of the teacher-training sessions to enable teachers to successfully implement the model.

Model based teaching can be found in the whole world, although Hastie, Martínez, and Calderón (2011) reported that there were no Sport Education (Siedentop, Hastie, & van der Mars, 2011) studies from non-native English-speaking countries in the European Union. Recently Hastie (2012) published a book with Sport Education studies from Korea, Cyprus, Spain and Russia. However, Escartí et al., (2012) noticed that teaching and research on TPSR has moved beyond the US to countries as New Zealand, Spain, Portugal, and Brazil. In Scandinavia there is a paucity of research on model based instruction. In Finland however, Rantala and Heikiaro-Johansson (2007) has published a case study of a high school teacher implementing the TPSR model in physical education and concluded that the model is suitable for the Finnish physical education curriculum. Recently Romar (2013) reported that pre-service teachers during student teaching used the TPSR model and that they liked the model and that TPSR provided a good structure to work with order and discipline. Teachers needed time for students to reflect in the beginning and the end of the lesson and they wanted to apply the model and the levels depending on the students in the class. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to understand the experiences of Finnish in-service physical education teachers when using the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Model (TPSR).

2. METHOD

An interpretative-qualitative methodology was chosen as a means of acquiring deeper understanding of teachers' experiences (Pope, 2006). All participants were member of a cohort of 14 teachers participating in a federally funded physical education professional development program. As part of the PD program the cohort participated in two workshops of two days each related to innovative instructional and curriculum strategies for improving physical education practice. From the first workshop, participating teachers were asked to select one curriculum model to implement in in their school context (e.g., teaching personal and social responsibility or sport education [Siedentop, et al., 2011]). Both models were introduced to the teachers during the first workshop by an experienced university lecturer presenting an overview and by two school teachers, with teaching experience of respective model, explaining their way of working with the model. Of the cohort of teachers who participated in the PD program, eight elementary and middle school physical education teachers decided to teach a unit of TSRP within their school setting.

Two teachers came from Southern part of Finland while six teachers came from Ostrobothnia, from the Midwest part of Finland. Six teachers worked in Swedish speaking schools and two teachers in Finnish speaking schools. Three teachers had a degree in physical education while five were classroom teachers. Two classroom teachers had specialized in physical education and two in health education. Their teaching experiences varied from three to 33 years. One teacher (Linn) worked in a high school, three (Johan, Peter, and Lotta) worked in a middle school and four teachers (Sofia, Minna, Inga and Anna) in an elementary school (the names of all teachers in this article are fictional). These diverse teachers implemented the TPSR model in physical

education classes from grade four to ten in both coed and single sex groups. The unit lasted mostly from four to eight weeks with one lesson of 90 minutes a week.

The workshops included content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and active practical learning. The first part was designed for the teachers to learn the content of the models, including how they were developed, how they were structured and how they differed from traditional teacher-directed activity-based instruction. During part two of the first workshop, teachers participated in practical activity lessons in the gym, where methodologies related to student-centered curriculum activities, through pedagogical knowledge were presented. The final part, of the first workshop included a reflection-based group discussion with the experienced teacher on issues related to implementation of TPSR in his school context. The participants were then expected to try the model in their own physical education groups. At the next professional development workshop, nine weeks later, all teachers shared and discussed their experiences of using the model.

The professional development course started in October and was completed in December. Each teacher was interviewed in February, due to Christmas break and the teachers' busy schedule during January. The teachers' interviews focused on their perceptions of PD learning and the unit of TPSR they delivered. These semi-structured interviews were conducted by one researcher in an individual face-to-face format over a period of 30 - 60 minutes. Questions focused on the teacher's preparation and implementation of the model, their rationales for their practices, impact on the teacher and their perspectives of student reactions. Examples of questions posed included, "Why did you choose this model?", "How did you plan for the teaching?", "What worked well/not well with the model?", "When should this model be particularly useful?" and "How did the students respond to the model?"

As data were collected, one researcher transcribed all interviews. After the first print version, the interviews were re-listened to minimize transcription errors. When all data were collected, the first and second authors first read through the interview transcripts several times to gain a comprehensive overview of the material and thereby looking for trends and explanations. The analysis was data-driven and the themes were distilled from the data basis by using inductive constant comparison to find themes describing these teachers. When themes and aspects were identified, the data were analyzed with the use of a qualitative data analysis package (N'Vivo, version 9).

Several strategies were used to show research trustworthiness and credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Memos and notes were used to keep track of the data analysis which increased the confirmability of the study. Verbatim quotes from the teachers were retained in order to stay close to the data. For the result texts, we chose the best of the selected transcripts which are identified by teacher name. Peer review and debriefing across researchers was conducted to assure credibility across findings. The peer debriefing process involved the researchers challenging each other's interpretation of the evidence. Two researchers independently examined the codes and the themes chosen and based on a sample of three teachers' interview data the agreement was 94%.

3. RESULTS

Three categories were generated during the analysis and they were identified as (a) implementation, (b) teachers' view of the model, and (c) student impact.

Implementation

The aspect, *enactment*, consists of statements describing the practical arrangement teachers do when they use the model in teaching physical education. All teachers carried out the model without changing their original lesson plans. The actual execution of the model was essentially the same for all teachers. They introduced the model for the students in the beginning of the lesson and students received information about the model and the different levels and how to work with the reflection that occurred at the end of the lesson.

So then I took a lot of time during the first lesson. So I had 15 minutes. I went through and explained that now I have an assignment that I now will do with you. And then I went through that form and explained to them. And then I gave them these forms. And they (the students) could look through it and write the name on the form and then mark appropriate number...
(Minna)

The teachers used either a separate sheet or a booklet for students to reflect about the level they had achieved. Half of the teachers used only a numeric reflection while the other teachers used a justification in addition to the numeric value.

Not just 'enter a number,' and then you disappear without justifying this number and then I thought that's the way I do it. (Linn)

Only the number does not tell you very much. The written reflection provides a better picture of the situation. (Lotta)

One teacher used individual discussions and two teachers used group discussions to review the reflections. However, four teachers felt that next time they use the model then they would use more discussions with individual students.

If I were to do it again and for an extended sequence, I would have planned also discussions, more individual, so what they can improve.
(Johan)

Teachers felt it was important to adjust the model and its levels to the group of students they were teaching. Three teachers changed the levels already before the implementation of the model, because they wanted to clarify the different levels and to adapt the model to the specific group.

Well I would change them (the levels) for next time... that they (the students) know better. For some (levels) were a little fuzzy, I thought. (Inga)

So it will be according to their level? Well, that's probably most important ... we changed them (the levels) now also... (Linn)

One way of making the levels more explicit was to involve the student in designing the levels. Only one teacher used a poster in the gym to remind the students about the different levels.

Of course, it is always what you do together; it makes more sense for them.
(Inga)

I did that big laminated poster with all the steps. The idea was to make it even clearer for the students and I think it worked great ... It was always up on the wall. (Lotta)

The aspect, *requirements*, describes statements about what is needed for the implementation to become successful. First of all, teachers need to be engaged and plan for the model.

To plan ahead ... this to perhaps prepare more carefully... (Johan)

In addition, the teachers expressed that they need to have enough knowledge about the model, the levels and the meaning of the levels.

Well, maybe it really was when I had of course gone through the model ... and that I think you must be familiar with it. (Sofia)

One teacher also felt that teachers' motivation will grow when they see that the students are motivated and that the model works.

Yes, if they are motivated, so then I'm already motivated because of that.
(Sofia)

The teachers indicated that also the students need to be motivated to work with the model and here the introduction was the most essential part. During the introduction the teachers should make sure that students understand the different levels.

That it's the beginning; the start is most important to it, that it will work at all.
(Linn)

Teachers' view of the model

The aspect, *teachers' preferences*, is related to how teachers perceived the model. They reported that it was easy to adapt the model to their own physical education teaching and several teachers continued to use the model afterwards.

It was so well structured this model so I did not think it was any problems using it. (Minna)

I've been really pleased. (Sofia)

Yes, I have continued to use the model... (Lotta)

I could probably think of including it (the model) because it is a good tool if there is a need for it. (Linn)

The model was best suited for groups with problem students although several teachers reported that it could be used in other school subject as well. The teachers

recommended the model to other teachers because the students liked the model and that their awareness and responsibility increased.

Well certainly I could (recommend). Just because you learn and you behave, and so you learn to take responsibility... (Lotta)

The effects on teachers, is described by how the teachers stated that they gained pedagogical knowledge through using the model. The increased knowledge was by three teachers seen as a way of professional development.

It has given a different perspective. I think it's been a good addition, a good support... (Sofia)

Yes, an experience in itself, which probably is ... everything for the future. ...of course I have become aware that there is this kind of model, and that you can use it and broaden my understanding in this way. (Linn)

Every time that I use something new and start to think that's a good thing, I think one then has developed (professionally). (Inga)

The aspect, *benefits*, describes statements about how and when the model is useful and who will profit. All teachers argued that the model is most suitable for groups where there are problems to work with. Some teachers felt that the model should be used when there really was a problem while other teachers said that there is always something that a group can improve.

I liked the model, and of course it can be adapted directly to more problematic classes and to situations where there is always something to work with. (Peter)

Well, probably I would do that and especially for these groups where there are those unmotivated students who struggle in school. (Johan)

In addition, several teachers said that the model could be integrated into other subjects and into general school rules.

Next year I thought we would try to implement it into other subjects. ... I worked with it and tried to form a structure for levels that could be used in all subjects. (Minna)

One could think that it coincides with school policies... (Linn)

The model was according to the teachers a helpful way to reach all students and similarly work with social goals in physical education.

I reached probably all. Although it was more efficient for those who were perhaps less motivated. (Johan)

Those social goals are more achievable. (Johan)

One can't make social beings by just putting them all together in one group. That you think that now we all are so nice and sweet. You have to intentionally work with it. (Anna)

Deliberate work under an extended period of time with the model will be more productive. They also felt that the model could be used in all sports, although outdoor sport made it more difficult.

Student impact

According to all teachers, students had generally a positive *attitude* which made the implementation easy for the teachers. Students looked forward to work within the model and they perceived it important. Some students even reminded the teacher to do the reflection. On the other hand, a few students felt obligated and forced to do the paper work at the end of the lesson.

Yes, they really showed a positive attitude. (Sofia)

They even began to request that we should complete the form where the levels... (Johan)

Some students asked that must we again fill out that form and so. (Lotta)

Another aspect teachers described was related to *student behavior*. The teachers were not so sure about students learning specific sport skills, because there were so many other factors that could have attributed to that. However, some teachers felt that students were more active during the lessons and they did not choose to sit out and not participate as much as in general.

They performed more, they were more active, they sort of showed more effort. (Linn)

And there was really noticeable difference in this group, before I started with it (the model) and then when I had started with it. (Minna)

All teachers pointed out several things related to students' social behavior. Students showed an increased awareness of their own actions and the consequences of that as well as an awareness of the other students in the class and how their own actions will affect their friends. This was also seen as a gain in student responsibility and helpfulness.

They began to think more on "how I behave". (Minna)

Perhaps more that they thought a little about how they are and what they have learned and what we have done during PE lessons. (Linn)

It worked better with PE clothes after this... they were not as often careless.

They actually began to check each other a little bit. That it was the pressure that everybody would have appropriate clothes and all that. (Johan)

Two teachers also pointed out that the order improved and the students were not as messy as before.

I noticed some improvement in that some (students) have had as a major task to destroy. You know, kick the ball away as far as possible or to push someone else all the time or just destroy for others. And I think it has gotten a little better. (Inga)

In addition, most teachers indicated that the group cohesion and cooperation improved.

Yes I felt the team cohesion improved... and cooperation of course. (Minna)

However level five, the issue of transfer from gym into other settings divided the teachers so that while some teachers felt that they observe that students used their knowledge in other settings, some indicated that it was difficult to observe and some said that they noticed no transfer.

Surely it would be possible but it is difficult to confirm it. (Lotta)

I think this time it stayed pretty much within PE... (Inga)

The aspect student *reflection* consisted of statements describing how students reflected and evaluated their own work. Most teachers felt that students generally reflected and evaluated their work in a realistic way, although some students indicated that they were on a higher level compared to what teachers viewed.

Yes, the majority were realistic in their assessment. (Anna)

They had probably given higher scores than they were worth. (Sofia)

On the other hand, two teachers stated that students were too rigorous and evaluated their work on a lower level. However, some teachers felt that students are doing a subjective reflection and that the teacher has no right to intervene because the students have the right to interpret the different levels in their own way.

They gave maybe even too low levels for themselves. I think that in some cases they were very critical of themselves. You did not give the highest score just like that... (Peter)

Children interpreted it in different ways. A five for one was not the same for another. So evaluation was subjective. (Anna)

4. DISCUSSION

The study showed that regular physical education teachers can implement a novel curriculum model and that this could be done through continuous professional development. To be successful in implementation, teachers require knowledge about the model and prior experience in teaching. In congruence with previous research (Alexander & Penney, 2005; Beaudoin, 2012; Escartí et al., 2012; Ko, Wallhead, & Ward, 2006), this could be done through in-service education but there is a need for a specific structure to implement this innovative pedagogical practice (Gordon, 2012). In practical terms, the model needs to be in philosophical alignment with the teachers' view of teaching (Dyson & Casey, 2012) and teacher need to take some responsibility for change.

This model was not perceived by teachers as demanding and difficult, although they needed to be prepared and to plan for the implementation. In-service education, in form of continuing professional development (Dyson & Casey, 2012) is required to

provide teachers with on-going knowledge about the model and also motivate the teachers. Previous research (Kinchin, Penney, & Clarke, 2005; Oslin, Collier & Mitchell, 2001) underscores the opportunity for teachers to observe instructional models being taught in a school setting. The CPD program in this study was unable to provide teachers with this possibility and some of the other options recommended in the literature, such as the possibility to discuss and reflect during the implementation with a university teacher (Escartí et al., 2012; Sinelnikov, 2009). Such options were not possible due to the structure of the program. However, these teachers received a lecture about the theoretical background of the model and an inspiration talk from an experienced teacher, who had used the model. In addition, they had a possibility to discuss with the teacher and within the group.

These teachers showed that a new teaching model can be implemented into their teaching. However, teachers used their previous expertise and content knowledge and applied the model according to their own preferences, which meant they were reflective practitioners (Tsangaridou & O'Sullivan, 1997). This is common for teachers to modify the instruction model to suit their preferences (Dyson & Casey, 2012). Teachers reflected on the student group and restructured the different levels for their students. This study also showed an impact on teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, (Amade-Escot, 2000) because they said that they learned new knowledge about teaching when they worked with the model. Once teachers tried the model then several continued to use it because they felt it was a good thing to do. Another sign of teachers being reflective practitioners is that they pointed out that TPSR model also could be used in other subject and instructional setting in their schools.

Previous research confirms that utilizing a student-centered model requires modifications in which teachers and students must learn and practice non-traditional roles (Alexander & Penney, 2005; Casey & Dyson, 2009; Hastie & Curtner-Smith, 2006). It is possible that teachers with appropriate pedagogical content knowledge as well as prior experience and being a reflective practitioner might be less confused by the change in teaching strategies and more willing to concentrate on developing students' social competencies.

As required in the Finish National Curriculum and part of most international PE curricula (Dyson & Casey, 2012) social goals are part of physical education and these teachers expressed that the model helped them to work with explicitly, more student awareness and more student responsibility, as also reported in other studies (Gordon, 2010; Wright & Burton, 2008). However, we do not have student or other data to support this finding, but our suggestion is that when teachers feel that something has changed they have at least taken some steps in the progressive direction. Moreover, teachers reported that students enjoyed participating in lessons that taught the TPSR model although the model is different from what they were used to.

Still, it is important to once again point out, as Patrick, Ward, and Crouch (1998) stated that unless planned for by the teacher appropriate social skills often remain undeveloped in teaching physical education. We have reported from our findings, however, that teachers believed that students in this study did improve their social

behavior. This finding supports other research studies that demonstrate that students significantly improve their social competencies when participating in TPSR (Cecchini et al., 2007; Escartí, Gutiérrez, Pascual & Llopis, 2010).

Teacher described that students showed social responsibility and helpfulness, which is in line with the cross curriculum goals in Finland. In addition, teacher reported that students were physically active and this goal is also found in the National Curriculum for basic education in physical education. Nevertheless, teachers are nowhere given practical guidelines and instruction how to reach these goals. Therefore, this study showed that TPSR is a valuable teaching method for physical education teachers.

They can easily apply the model to their own teaching while teachers can still do mostly what they always have been doing but add one short strategy to the start and to the closure of the lesson. Indeed, teachers could continue to work on student motor skills, game strategy and student behavior as they already have as a focus in their curriculum. But this study showed that teachers now have an additional tool to their teaching repertoire. One central part of the teaching strategies in TPSR is student reflection at the end of the lesson. Teachers tried to explain the model and to make the goals clear and understandable to all students. They felt that individual students understood and interpreted the goals in different ways. But the teachers also recognized that there is no absolute or correct answer and the important issue is that students critically reflect on their work as described by Hellison (2011).

Natural resistance to change may hinder a well-planned reform and upset its orderly implementation and also teachers can be resistance and doubtful to reform (MacLean, Mulholland, Gray, & Horrell, 2013; McCaughtry, Sofo, Rovegno, & Curtner-Smith, 2004). Although teaching by the TPSR model was new for teachers and students and not previously commonly used in the Finnish context, the findings suggested that they enjoyed the implantation of the model. This finding validates Zach and Inglis (2013) study that noted when teachers perceive their work with students as fruitful, they demonstrate a positive attitude to change.

This study indicates, as also Rantala and Heikiaro-Johansson (2007) and Romar (2013) reported, that the model is appropriate for the Finnish physical education curriculum. While Annerstedt (2008) has presented many similarities among physical education national curriculums in the Scandinavian countries, we argue that this model could provide teachers in these countries a new approach in teaching physical education. These findings underscore the importance of infusing physical education teacher education programs with early exposure and teaching experience with the TPSR model to facilitate the process of learning of pre-service teachers. In addition, the implementation of the TPSR model based instruction is, an approach advocated by a number of researchers (Glotova & Hastie, 2012; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007; Tsangaridou, 2012).

Implementing a new model takes time and persistence, particularly if neither the teacher nor the students have experience with models (Casey & Dyson, 2009). Without comprehensive pedagogical content knowledge and experience, novices and even

experienced teachers can experience frustration and even failure in their first attempts to implement a new instructional model (McCaughy et al., 2004). It is important to remember, however, that teachers' expertise cannot be supplemented by any model in teaching physical education. If teachers are unsure, we encourage them to introduce TPSR gradually and to one group, in a manner, which reflects the teacher's pedagogical content knowledge, students' readiness for the model and the school context.

A limitation of the study was that the CPD program did not offer all of the methods noted in the literature (Escarti et al., 2012; Sinelnikov, 2009) regarding the inclusion of TPSR, as well as that only a few teachers were interviewed after implementing the model.

5. CONCLUSION

This study has aimed to contribute to the current paucity in Scandinavia regarding the inclusion of model based instruction in teaching physical education. We offer insights into how such an experience with TPSR can help teachers learn a new approach and thereby extend their pedagogical content knowledge. This study pinpoints the importance of providing in-service teachers with exposure to new pedagogical models. Teachers were able to engage with the model because of their prior experiences of teaching and through reflective practice. Although some teachers reported adaptations of the model, they were all able to expand and enhance their understanding of the model and they perceived a change in student social behavior.

While teachers struggle to implement new innovative instructional models this is not our major concern in physical education. We are more concerned globally at the problematic nature of the curriculum, such as, the "multi-activity" approach to physical education (Metzler, 2011; O'Sullivan, 2013) and the often narrow focus that teachers have when they just teach basic physical activity to their students (Kirk, 2010; Tinning, 2012). We are encouraged and motivated to think that teachers are willing and able to take on a new instructional model and see the propensity for the development of a positive learning.

Future research is encouraged to examine the effectiveness and practicalities of the various recommendations provided in the TPSR literature with regard to teaching physical education and the National Curriculum in the Scandinavian countries. This research suggested that TPSR is a purposeful and meaningful model based practice for physical education teachers. Additional research that explores the realities of TPSR in practice in different contexts and physical education settings and explores scenarios from other countries are welcomed.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, K., & Penney, D. (2005). Teaching under the influence: feeding Games for Understanding into the Sport Education development-refinement cycle. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 10(3), 287-301.
- Amade-Escot, C. (2000). The contribution of two research programs on teaching content: "Pedagogical Content Knowledge" and the "Didactics of Physical Education". *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 20(1), 78-101. Available online at: <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00782593/document>.
- Annerstedt, C. (2008). Physical education in Scandinavia with a focus on Sweden: a comparative perspective. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, 13(4), 303-318.
- Beaudoin, S. (2012). Using responsibility-based strategies to empower in-service physical education and health teachers to learn and implement TPSR. *Ágora para la Educación Física y el Deporte*, 14(2), 161-177. Available online (accessed 28-1-2013) at: http://agora-revista.blogs.uva.es/files/2012/10/agora_14_2c_beaudoin_et_al.pdf.
- Bechtel, P.A., & O'Sullivan, M. (2007). Enhancers and inhibitors of teacher change among secondary physical educators. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 26, 221-235.
- Casey, A. (2014). Model-based practice: great white hope or white elephant? *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 19(1), 18-34.
- Casey, A., & Dyson, B. (2009). The implementation of models-based practice in physical education through action research. *European Physical Education Review*, 15(2), 175-199.
- Casey, A., Dyson, B., & Campbell, A. (2009). Action research in physical education: Focusing beyond myself through cooperative learning. *Educational Action Research*, 17(3), 407-23.
- Cecchini, J. A., Montero, J., Alonso, A., Izquierdo, M., & Contreras, O. (2007). Effects of personal and social responsibility on fair play in sports and self-control in school-aged youths. *European Journal of Sport Science*, 7(4), 203-211.
- Dowling, F. (2011). 'Are PE teacher identities fit for postmodern schools or are they clinging to modernist notions of professionalism?' A case study of Norwegian PE teacher students' emerging professional identities. *Sport, Education and Society*, 16(2), 201-222.
- Dyson, B., & Casey, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Cooperative learning in physical education: A research-based approach*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Escartí, A., & Gutiérrez, M., Pascual, C., & Llopis, R. (2010). Implementation of the Personal and Social Responsibility Model to improve self-efficacy during physical education classes for primary school children. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 10(3), 387-402.
- Escartí, A., Gutiérrez, M., Pascual, C., & Marín, D. (2010). Application of Hellison's Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Model in physical education to improve self-efficacy for adolescents at risk of dropping-out of school. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 13(2), 667-676.
- Escartí, A., Pascual, C., Gutiérrez, M., Marín, D. Martínez, M., & Tarín, S. (2012). Applying the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model (TPSR) in Spanish schools context: lesson learned. *Ágora para la Educación Física y el Deporte*, 14(2), 178-196. Available online at: http://agora-revista.blogs.uva.es/files/2012/10/agora_14_2d_escart%C3%AD_et_al.pdf (accessed 28-1-2013).

- Finnish National Board of Education (FNBE). (2004). *National core curriculum for basic education*. Vammala: Vammalan Kirjapaino.
- Glotova, O., & Hastie, P. (2012). Learning to teach Sport Education in Russia: factors affecting model understanding and intentions to teach. *Sport, Education and Society*. DOI:10.1080/13573322.2012.732567
- Gordon, B. (2010). An examination of the responsibility model in a New Zealand secondary school physical education program. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 29(1), 21-37.
- Hastie, P. (2012). The nature and purpose of Sport Education as an educational experience. In P. Hastie (ed.), *Sport Education; International perspectives*. (p. 1-12). Routledge: Oxon.
- Hastie, P., & Curtner-Smith, M. (2006). Influence of a hybrid sport education-games for understanding model on one teacher and his students. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 11, 1-26
- Hastie, P., Martínez, D., & Calderón, A. (2011). A review of research on Sport Education: 2004 to the present'. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 16(2), 103-132.
- Hastie, P., & Rudisill, M., & Wadsworth, D. (2013). Providing students with voice and choice: lessons from intervention research on autonomy-supportive climates in physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 18(1), 38-56.
- Hellison, D. (2003). *Teaching responsibility through physical activity* (2nd ed). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hellison, D. (2011). *Teaching responsibility through physical activity* (3rd ed). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hellison, D., & Walsh, D. (2002). Responsibility-based youth programs evaluation: Investigating the investigations. *Quest*, 54, 292-307.
- Jacobs, F., Knoppers, A., & Webb, L. (2013). Making sense of teaching social and moral skills in physical education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 18(1), 1-14.
- Kinchin, G. D., Penney, D., & Clarke, G. (2005). Sport education in teacher education. In D. Penney, G. Clarke, M. Quill, & G. D. Kinchin (Eds.), *Sport education in physical education: Research-based practice*. (pp. 217-228). London: Routledge.
- Kirk, D. (2010). *Physical education futures*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Ko, B., Wallhead, T., & Ward, P. (2006). Professional development workshops – What do teachers learn and use? *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 25(4), 397-412.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- MacLean, J., Mulholland, R., Gray, S., & Horrell, A. (2013). Enabling curriculum change in physical education: the interplay between policy constructors and practitioners. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, 1-18. DOI:10.1080/17408989.2013.798406.
- McCaughy, N., Sofo, S., Rovegno, I., & Curtner-Smith, M. (2004). Learning to teach sport education: Misunderstandings, pedagogical difficulties, and resistance. *European Physical Education Review*, 10(2), 135-55.
- McMahon, E., & MacPhail, A. (2007). Learning to teach sport education: The experiences of a pre-service teacher. *European Physical Education Review*, 13(2), 229-246.
- Metzler, M. (2011). *Instructional models for physical education* (3rd ed.). Scottsdale, Arizona: Halcomb Hathaway.
- Oslin, J., Collier, C., & Mitchell, S. (2001). Living the curriculum. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 72(5), 47-51.

- Öhman, M., & Quennerstedt, M. (2008). Feel good—be good: subject content and governing processes in physical education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 13(4), 365-379.
- O'Sullivan, M. (2013). New directions, new questions: relationships between curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment in physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 18(1), 1-5.
- Patrick, C. A., Ward, P., & Crouch, D. W. (1998). Effects of holding students accountable for social behaviors during volleyball games in elementary physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 17, 143-156.
- Palomäki, S., & Heikinaro-Johansson, P. (2011). Liikunnan oppimistulosten seurantaarviointi perusopetuksessa 2010. Koulutuksen seurantaraportit, 4. [The follow-up evaluation of learning outcomes in physical education in basic education 2010]. Tampere: Tampereen Yliopistopaino.
- Peters, J., & Shuck, L. (2009). Breaking down the barriers: Insights into using a student centred games approach in Australian and Malaysian pre-service settings. *Australian Council for Health, Physical Education and Recreation*, 56(3/4), 29-35.
- Pope, C. (2006). Interpretative perspectives in physical education research. In D. Kirk, M. O'Sullivan, & D. Macdonald (Eds), *The Handbook of Research in Physical Education*, (pp. 21-36). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rantala, T., & Heikinaro-Johansson, P. (2007). Hellisonin vastuuntuntoisuuden malli osana seitsemännen luokan poikien liikuntatunteja. [Personal and Social Responsibility Model as part of physical education lessons for seventh-grade boys]. *Liikunta & Tiede*, 44(1), 36-44.
- Robinson, D. (2011). Possibilities for physical education teacher education: Service learning and TGfU. *PHENEX Journal/Revue phénEPS*, 3(1), 1-16.
- Quennerstedt, M., Öhman, M., & Eriksson, C. (2008). *Physical education in Sweden – a national evaluation. Education-line*. Available online at: www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/169508.pdf (accessed 28-3-2008).
- Romar, J-E. (2013). Lärarstuderandes erfarenheter av en modellbaserad undervisning i gymnastik under lärarutbildningens praktikperioder [Preservice teachers' experiences of model based instruction in physical education during student teaching]. *Didaktisk Tidskrift*, 23(1), 429-450.
- Siedentop, D. (1998). What is sport education and how does it work? *The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 69(4), 18-20.
- Siedentop, D., Hastie, P., & van der Mars, H. (2011). *Complete guide to Sport Education* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Sinel'nikov, O. (2009). Sport education for teachers: Professional development when introducing a novel curriculum model. *European Physical Education Review*, 15(1), 91-114.
- Tinning, R. (2012). The idea of physical education: a memetic perspective. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, 17(2), 115-126.
- Tsangaridou, N. (2012). Educating primary teachers to teach physical education. *European Physical Education Review*, 18(3), 275-286.
- Tsangaridou, N., & O'Sullivan, M. (1997). The role of reflection in shaping physical education teachers' educational values and practices. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 17, 2-25.
- Zach, S., & Inglis, V. (2013). Physical education teachers and their attitudes toward change: Implementation of the New Horizon educational reform. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 32, 355-374

- Wright, P. M., & 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.
- Wright, P. M., Li, W., Ding, S., & Pickering, M. (2010). Integrating a personal and social responsibility program into a Wellness course for urban high school students: assessing implementation and educational outcomes. *Sport, Education and Society*, 15(3), 277-298.