2022

Navigating Change: Implementation of Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility in K-1 Physical Education

Adam D. Rosenbery
Illinois State University, arosenbery@gmail.com

NAVIGATING CHANGE: IMPLEMENTATION OF TEACHING PERSONAL AND SOCIAL

RESPONSIBILITY IN K-1 PHYSICAL EDUCATION

ADAM ROSENBERY

101 Pages

This paper provides perspective of a teacher's experiences attempting pedagogical change. Action research (AR) served as the structured methodology for self-inquiry which influenced the teacher/researcher's approach to instructional change while providing evidence to support the results outlined in this paper. Nonexistent and vague affective student learning outcomes were the driving force behind the adoption of Hellison's responsibility model. Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) was implemented in an existing K-1 physical education program, consisting of a six-week cumulative intervention. The teacher/researcher's experiences, perceptions, teaching strategies, and planning practices where chronicled throughout the study by utilizing daily journals, the TARE post-teaching reflection, the TARE implementation checklist, and daily lesson plans. The results of the study suggest pedagogical change is messy, and often leaves more questions than answers. Changes were noted in the teacher's planning and delivery of responsibility-based content, suggesting the teacher became more comfortable and confident resulting in a shift towards self-efficacy when considering the teachers role as a TPSR program leader. The paper concludes by suggesting that, pedagogical change is gradual and requires the support of others sharing a common philosophical perspective towards priorities in physical education. Furthermore, the teacher's

willingness to change and perseverance where the result of the teacher's value orientation and the perceived benefit of responsibility-based education in a K-1 physical education setting.

NAVIGATING CHANGE: IMPLEMENTATION OF TEACHING PERSONAL AND SOCIAL

RESPONSIBILITY IN K-1 PHYSICAL EDUCATION

ADAM ROSENBERY

A Thesis Submitted in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

School of Kinesiology and Recreation

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

2022

NAVIGATING CHANGE: IMPLEMENTATION OF TEACHING PERSONAL AND SOCIAL

RESPONSIBILITY IN K-1 PHYSICAL EDUCATION

ADAM ROSENBERY

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Emily Jones, Chair

Andrew Eberline

Mary Henninger

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

What is physical education? The answer will likely vary greatly depending on who is being asked the question. When viewed from an outsider's perspective, physical education may be characterized as an environment for gameplay, traditional sports, and fitness-based education. That type of characterization is not completely inaccurate, yet it does not paint a complete picture of what physical education is, or more importantly, should be. Contrary to the beliefs of some, physical education is an academic subject that provides students with a planned, sequential, and standards-based curricula designed to develop physical literacy, critical thinking, and affective competencies to support lifelong engagement in health-enhancing practices (SHAPE, 2015). As noted, physical education extends beyond the physical, making physical education unique concerning fact-finding standards focused on the development of the whole child. SHAPE (2014) specifically states in Standards 4 and 5, the development of emotional and responsibility-based characteristics. Although these affective standards are clear and require strategic planning, implementation, and assessment, they are often overlooked (Wright & Irwin, 2018) or lumped in as assumed outcomes of sport or team-based activities (Ang & Penney, 2013).

With appropriate planning, affective student learning outcomes can be addressed and assessed in physical education due to the unique learning environment offered in physical education which often elicits various emotions and feelings not created in a traditional classroom setting (Ciotto & Gagnon, 2018; Melo et al., 2020). Recognizing the value and importance of responsibility-based education is apparent, yet actionable change is less evident (Wright & Irwin, 2018). With the majority of attention focused on childhood obesity (Wright & Irwin, 2018), responsibility-based standards can be neglected or assumed byproducts of physical

education. Therefore, it becomes the responsibility of physical educators to seek instructional support and guidance to address National physical education standards 4 and 5. The Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) instructional model provides the structure and guidance for physical education specialists to implement emotional and responsibility-based content with skill, sport, and fitness-based curricula (Hellison, 2011; Lee & Choi, 2015).

The skills and knowledge associated with the affective domain need to be taught in the physical education setting in order to ensure student skill knowledge acquisition (Parker et al., 2021). Affective skills need to be taught, not simply expected outcomes of the physical education learning environment (Ang & Penney, 2013). To accomplish this, teachers should consider embracing the holistic development of students through personal, social, and motor skill development (Melo et al., 2020). Hellison (2011) provided a blueprint for physical educators and physical activity-based leaders to navigate the implementation of responsibility-based education through the TPSR instructional model. The TPSR model is not a one size fits all approach (Gordon, 2020; Gordon & Doyle, 2015; Hemphill, 2015; Lee & Martinek, 2012), instead, it provides a framework and a set of strategies to influence the growth and development of participant's responsibility-based characteristics. Effective TPSR program leaders modify program strategies in order to align and make the model work with the unique characteristics of their participant population. As with any educational approach, trial and error accompanied by reflective practices are required to ensure program success. The process of action research (AR) facilitates self-imposed pedagogical change through planning, action, observation, reflection, and fact finding (Keegan, 2016). Keegan (2016) suggests that AR has the potential to improve physical education through the teachers' pursuit of more effective teaching and learning while seeking to better understand one's own instructional practices (Keegan, 2016). The AR process

provides teachers seeking improvements related to professional practices with an appropriate set of procedures to document, reflect, and modify instructional practices with the aim of improving student learning outcomes and experiences.

Self-inquiry of one's professional practice is necessary when seeking to improve instructional outcomes associated with select change (McNiff, n.d.). Additionally, professional inquiry has the potential to advance pedagogical literature, ultimately influencing the field of education more generally (McNiff, n.d.). The research in this study sought to observe, measure, and reflect on pedagogical change centered on responsibility-based education. The TPSR instructional model provided the framework for improved affective learning in K-1 physical education. The pedagogical shift related to responsibility-based education was documented through the qualitative process of action research. The results of the study are intended to influence the teacher/researcher's instructional practices to improve affective student learning outcomes.

Research Questions

The following questions guided the study.

1. What responsibility-based teaching strategies and TPSR themes were planned and implemented into six K-1 Physical Education units?

2. What changes were observed over time in the teacher's planning and delivery of responsibility-based teaching strategies and TPSR themes?

Limitations

Limitations for the study included the following:

1. The non-participants (i.e., students) for the study lacked socioeconomic and ethnic/racial diversity, leaving the findings of the study less generalizable.

2. The researcher in the study also assumed the role as the physical education instructor. This scenario potentially impacted student motivation both positively and negatively.

3. The short duration (25 minutes) of each class period presented the potential for the loss of physical activity (PA) engagement, or low TPSR model fidelity due to missed opportunities within the model's daily formatting guidelines.

4. The developmental level of the participants presented issues regarding the student's ability to articulate a response to daily reflective prompts guided by the teacher/researcher.

5. The mid-semester introduction of TPSR was disruptive to pre-established class procedures.

Delimitations

The delimitations for the study included the following:

1. The non-participants (i.e., students) involved with the study were attendees of a single elementary school (K-1) in the rural Midwest.

2. The TPSR instructional model was implemented in K-1 physical education during the late fall, early winter (i.e., November-December).

3. The instructional units consisted of two three-week units separated by a one-week reflective/planning phase.

4. The collection of student data was not analyzed or shared for the purpose of this study.

5. The modification of the TARE post-teaching reflection instrument to reflect the absence of student data.

Definition of Terms

1. <u>Fidelity</u> – The degree of exactness with which something is copied or reproduced (Lexico, n.d.).

2. <u>Relational Time</u> – The time in which the program leader and participants build meaningful relationships through one-on-one conversations during daily transitional periods (i.e., before, after class; Hellison, 2011).

3. <u>Awareness Talk</u> – A brief introduction of the lesson's responsibility-based theme or point of emphasis (Hellison, 2011).

4. <u>Physical Activity Plan</u> – The psychomotor-based activity programmed for the lesson (Hellison, 2011).

5. <u>Group Meeting</u> – The point in the lesson where the program leader initiates a large group or set of small groups to discuss and evaluate the effectiveness of the affective content and psychomotor content emphasized during the lesson (Hellison, 2011).

6. <u>Reflective Time</u> – Prompts or sets of prompts introduced by the program leader to influence self-reflection related to the lesson content in order to transfer the skill knowledge from the program setting to the life outside of the program (Hellison, 2011).

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study was to examine the journey of a physical education teacher's attempt to plan and deliver responsibility-based educational units in K-1 physical education. The literature review is organized and presented by the following sections: (a) social and emotional learning (SEL) as it relates to TPSR in physical education, (b) examining how TPSR was implemented in previous research, (c) professional development, (d) TPSR model fidelity, (e) outcomes associated with TPSR, and (f) implications for future research.

Physical Education: A Platform for Social and Emotional Learning

Social and Emotional Learning

Understanding and managing emotions is necessary for both children and adults when attempting to establish positive relationships, and make responsible decisions (CASEL, n.d.). CASEL (2020) identifies five core competencies self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making. These competencies must be addressed in the classroom, embraced by the school, in addition to forming parental and community partnerships to foster the social and emotional development of students (CASEL, 2020). The need for SEL is recognized at the national level yet developing and implementing social and emotional standards remains the responsibility of each state. Of the 50 states in the US, only 18 have K-12 SEL learning standards or goals on the books (CASEL, 2018). It is fair to note, 11 states have SEL goals in place for pre-K through third grade (CASEL, 2018). Efforts have been made to address the social and emotional needs of students, but the lack of guidance and direction provided by most states leaves the decision-making up to school districts and teachers. The absence of SEL standards and guidance from the federal level prompts all teachers

to act (Goh & Connolly, 2020). What better subject than physical education to promote and cultivate SEL?

Physical Education

An important distinction to identify prior to describing the findings of an extensive review of literature pertaining to TPSR is the difference between physical education and PA. In the simplest of terms, PA is any type of bodily movement (SHAPE America, 2016). Physical activity can include walking to school, taking the stairs at work, or structured movements like weightlifting and exercise. Physical education, on the other hand, is built on the foundation of PA, but differs from PA in that physical education is planned, structured, and standard driven K-12 programming taught by a certified/licensed professional (SHAPE, 2016). Defining both PA and physical education in this section will provide clarification of terms used throughout the literature review.

Social and Emotional Learning Integration. Physical education is unlike any other subject in the K-12 school system. This bold statement is likely to be met with resistance and argument from other subjects regarding physical education's uniqueness. In order to provide support for this claim, one must examine the domain(s) that each subject address and assess. When physical education curriculum is appropriately developed and implemented the result is the opportunity for creating an authentic learning environment aimed at addressing the psychomotor, cognitive, and affective learning domains. The whole person approach (i.e., psychomotor, cognitive, and affective) of physical education provides the perfect opportunity to address SEL through physical education due to the unique attributes of experiences offered in an activity-based setting (Dressel, 2020; Ciotto & Gagnon, 2018). Though the opportunities exist to address the whole child, theory does not always translate to action. Often overlooked are the

personal and social responsibility-based goals (Wright & Irwin, 2018). In a broader sense, SEL tends to be an assumed outcome by physical educators, which is misguided thinking. These affective skills must be taught and not be considered a byproduct of psychomotor skill practice and program environment (Parker et al., 2021), but instead should be taught, practiced, and assessed like psychomotor skills (Ang & Penney, 2013; Ciotto & Gagnon, 2018).

National Standards for K-12 Physical Education are the foundation for integrating SEL in physical education (Goh & Connolly, 2020; Jacobs & Wright, 2014; Wright & Irwin, 2018). The standards that most closely align with SEL are Standard 4 and Standard 5 (Ivy & Jacobs, 2017; Jacobs & Wright, 2014; Richards et al., 2019). Standard 4 is defined as, "The physically literate individual exhibits responsible personal and social behavior that respects self and others" (SHAPE America, 2014, p. 12). Standard 5 is defined as "The physically literate individual recognizes the value of PA for health, enjoyment, challenge, self-expression and/or social interaction" (SHAPE America, 2014, p. 12). The standards that guide physical education teachers explicitly address striving to develop personal and socially responsible individuals through PA and social interaction (Wright & Irwin, 2018). The structured lessons, guided activity, social interactions, and problem solving in physical education provide the ideal environment for developing personal and social responsibility when approached through the lens of the SEL framework (Wright & Irwin, 2018). To ensure student learning, SEL must be taught (Ang & Penney, 2013; Parker et al., 2021), which places the responsibility on the teacher to create authentic opportunities for students to practice personal and responsibility-based skills, coupled with meaningful feedback on a routine basis (Ciotto & Gagnon, 2018; Wright & Irwin, 2018). Recognizing the value of lesson structure to address affective skills necessitates a framework for integrating deeper, more meaningful SEL to facilitate student learning outcomes.

Models-Based Practice

Models-based practices (MBP) provide the structure needed to effectively elicit desired student outcomes (Landi et al., 2016). There is not a consensus as to which model should be utilized (Landi et al., 2016), but rather teachers aligning their philosophies and beliefs with a model that best fits the needs of their students (Casey, 2014). The academic world has mixed feelings regarding the use of MBP. For instance, Landi and colleagues (2016) conclude that the implementation of a model should not restrict the variety of curriculum taught in physical education. This type of sentiment reflects the advocacy of a multi-model approach by Casey (2014); Casey & MacPhail (2018). The rigidity of MBP must be avoided to ensure the needs of all students are met while striving to maintain the true spirit of physical education. The adoption of a model must align with teacher philosophy. Careful planning and research are necessary for the appropriate implementation of an instructional model (Casey, 2014). Continued professional development and study must follow to better understand program strategies to strengthen positive student outcomes (Escartí et al., 2010; Hemphill et al., 2013; Lee & Choi, 2015; Richards & Gordon, 2017). Specifically, scholars have highlighted the importance of physical education teachers adopting MBPs in an effort to more effectively promote students' SEL development (Dyson et al., 2021). Although the SEL framework and physical education content standards address personal and social responsibility, there is no formal instructional framework for delivering responsibility-based content, and guiding teacher practices (Wright & Irwin, 2018). To move from standards to measurable responsibility-based student learning outcomes, the TPSR model design provides the necessary framework to move towards developing students' SEL learning competencies.

Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Model. The TPSR model is a pedagogical model centered on character building through structured goals combined with an activity-based environment (Hellison, 2011). Teaching personal and social responsibility is recognized as an appropriate instructional model for use in physical education (Casey, 2014; Dyson et al., 2021). After-school and extended-day programs were the initial setting for TPSR application (Hellison, 2011). Since the model's inception, the model has evolved through research and practice moving to the school-based physical education setting as well. The TPSR model is centered around five goals or levels that are sequential in nature (Hellison, 2011). The levels of responsibility designed by Hellison (2011) are as follows: respecting the rights and feelings of others (level I); effort and cooperation (level II); self-direction (level III); helping others (level IV); and transfer outside of the classroom (level V). Transfer is often the most elusive level to achieve (Walsh et al., 2010) in part because of the difficulty of measuring participant skill knowledge transfer outside of the gym. The transference of TPSR program goals to other aspects of life is arguably the most important level of responsibility (Hellison, 2011).

Physical education is a structured environment that is well suited to foster SEL through the TPSR pedagogical model (Wright & Burton, 2008, Wright & Irwin, 2018). Although TPSR is rooted in after-school and extend-day programs, researchers have begun focusing on the model's application in physical education (Hemphill et al., 2013; Lee & Choi, 2015). The lack of research examining student outcomes associated with TPSR implementation in physical education requires the attention of researchers and scholars (Pozo et al., 2018). The effectiveness and impact of TPSR have been noted to be less apparent when the model is implemented in a physical education setting as compared to an extended-day or alternative

activity-based setting (Escartí et al., 2010). A variety of factors influence the effectiveness of

TPSR model implementation, particularly class size (Hellison, 2011).

Implementing TPSR in Physical Education

Framework

Careful consideration and planning are necessary when implementing any MBP. The

adoption of an MBP cannot simply be selecting a model and dropping it into an existing program

(Casey, 2014). The MBP must align with the educator's philosophies, and most importantly

meet the needs of students (Casey, 2014; Pozo et al., 2018). For TPSR to effectively make an

impact on student learning, teachers must embrace the empowerment of students and the shifting

of responsibility from the teacher to the students (Hellison, 2011). This is accomplished through

planning and a structured daily program format. Hellison (2011) divides daily programming into

five distinct sections: relational time, awareness talk, physical activity, group meeting, and self-

reflection. The format provides a blueprint to ensure responsibility concepts are clearly defined

and the activities associated with the lesson promote responsibility (Parker & Hellison, 2001).

Through deliberate planning and scaffolding the levels of responsibility, students will develop

the attributes of a responsible individual, and ultimately applying the skill knowledge learned

through TPSR to other aspects of life outside of the gym. The transfer of TPSR skill knowledge

does not "just happen", the concept of transfer must be specifically addressed and modeled to

promote personal-social responsibility outside of the gym (Parker & Hellison, 2001). The

framework designed by Hellison (2011) guides teacher and program leaders with a template for

developing student personal-social responsibility, but it is up to the teacher to employ strategies

to enhance participant outcomes.

TPSR Implementation Strategies

When implementing TPSR, the initial model format presented a rigid structure for delivery, due to the scaffolding of program goals. Researchers have suggested flexibility when delivering program goals (Gordon, 2020; Gordon & Doyle, 2015; Hemphill, 2015; Lee & Martinek, 2012) to improve participant personal-social responsibility skill knowledge acquisition and transference. Flexibility of delivery should not cause a break from the true meaning and intention of TPSR. Hand-picking aspects of TPSR for use in physical education does not constitute MBP (Casey, 2014). The selective processing of TPSR has shown novice program leaders inappropriately adopting the model as a classroom management strategy as opposed to a platform for SEL that promotes personal-social responsibility (Lee, 2012). To overcome low model fidelity, daily formatting (Hellison, 2011) is essential for ensuring intended program outcomes, yet evidence suggests alternative approaches for introducing responsibility levels may be key to improving participant skill knowledge acquisition and potential transfer of learning (Gordon, 2020). As the TPSR model has evolved through research and practice, flexibility has extended to the notion of "levels" and their hierarchical organization (Gordon, 2020). This is not to suggest a level of TPSR can be ignored when programming. Instead, teachers should consider addressing levels of responsibility based on the unique characteristics of their class (Melo et al., 2020), which means considering the implementation of levels independently (Gordon, 2020; Melo et al., 2020; Parker & Hellison, 2001), moving past the scaffolded approach of level introduction to meet individual and class needs.

Fostering the development of personal-social responsibility requires varying strategies and procedures to meet the needs of all student learners. Before student learning can be developed, teachers must create a learning environment where students feel safe (Dressel, 2020).

The perceived emotional safety students feel in physical education is often the product of strong relationships between the teacher and student (Dressel, 2020). The concept of relationship building is the foundation of the TPSR model (Hellison, 2011) and the model's potential for success developing personally and socially responsible participants. The fortification of relationships is ongoing and should be embedded in daily practice (Dressel, 2020; Hellison, 2011), along with finding ways to connect program goals to physical education and eventually to areas of life outside of the gym, educators implementing TPSR should carefully design lessons to continually relate content to transfer (Gordon, 2020; Parker & Hellison, 2001). Ivy and Jacobs (2017) present strategies to aid and/or enhance discussion and reflection: (a) large-group discussion utilizing student body movement to respond to teacher questions, (b) partner sharing to provide a forum for all students to share thoughts in a large group setting, (c) student journaling, and (d) drawing to illustrate concepts covered during physical education.

The strategies listed remove some of the concern's teachers have expressed when implementing TPSR in physical education. Preservice teachers (PST) and practicing teachers have expressed concern regarding the amount of activity time lost addressing program goals and following the TPSR program format (Lee, 2012, Richards & Gordon, 2017). One of the tenets of TPSR is the shifting of responsibility from the teacher to students (Hellison, 2011). The use of peer-assessment and self-assessment (Hellison, 2011; Parker & Hellison, 2001) not only improves student understanding of the content being assessed which requires a higher level of thinking but the responsibility is shifted to the students as well. The strategies presented to promote TPSR program goals in physical education likely align with the current practices of most quality physical education teachers, with the exception of lower elementary. Therefore, specific programs should be considered for use in lower elementary PE.

Learning-Related Social Skills. The rationale behind the integration of Learning-Related Social Skills (LRSS) with TPSR is the anticipated difficulty lower elementary (K-3) students will have with the TPSR program format (Liu et al., 2010). For instance, kindergarten students will likely struggle with the group meeting, awareness talk, and reflection (Liu et al., 2010). Additionally, there are potential time constraints due to the shorter duration of class time. Goals for the program outcomes are similar between LRSS and TPSR. The student outcomes associated with LRSS have included improved cooperation, responsibility, independence, and self-regulation skills (Liu et al., 2010). The LRSS-TPSR model describes the program format as follows: Level I – listening and following directions; Level II – participating appropriately in groups; Level III – staying on task; Level IV – organizing work materials, and Level V – transferring behaviors (Liu et al., 2010). The integrated model entails more than wording changes to the TPSR levels. Instructional strategies and purposeful application of transfer to the classroom from physical education is identified. Modifying TPSR delivery to meet student needs is necessary to achieve desired student outcomes related to personal-social skill development (Casey, 2014; Lee & Martinek, 2012). Program formatting is the first step towards meaningful responsibility-based programming. The final phase necessitates curricular theme and content alignment with TPSR (Walsh et al., 2010; Wright & Burton, 2008).

Skill Themes Approach with TPSR

Understanding the TPSR model framework, strategies, and model integration offers a starting point for conceptualizing the implementation of TPSR in physical education. After the foundation and framework have been established, what will be taught in conjunction with TPSR? The adoption of the multi-model approach (Casey, 2014) or integrating a preexisting instructional approach is necessary when designing a meaningful curriculum for all students.

Most notably, the approach must be skill and age-appropriate for student learners. Findings in this review are guided towards the need for research examining TPSR in lower elementary physical education, specifically kindergarten, and how skill knowledge and program goals transfer from the gym to the classroom. To achieve the desired outcome of student skill knowledge transfer, the TPSR model must be combined with meaningful content that guides personal-social responsibility in physical education.

Skill themes and movement concepts combined with TPSR in lower elementary physical education provide age and developmentally appropriate content while promoting personal-social responsibility (Richards et al., 2019). Often, elementary physical education focuses too much attention on games, dances, and other complex movements without establishing fundamental motor skills (Graham et al., 2009). Skill themes are fundamental movement skills needed to pursue PA, games, dance, and gymnastics successfully (Richards et al., 2019). Skill themes are categorized as locomotor skills (e.g., walking, skipping), nonmanipulative skills (e.g., turning, twisting), and manipulative skills (e.g., throwing, catching) (Graham et al., 2009). Movement concepts are ways to modify or enrich the skill themes (Graham et al., 2009). Skill themes and movement concepts layered and sequenced appropriately are intended to develop spatial awareness, effort, and relationship (Graham et al., 2009). The connection between TPSR and the skill themes approach is clear. Both MBPs champion student voice and choice through practice, tasks, and general input (Parker et al., 2021). Research findings have suggested that when children are given decision-making responsibilities, they achieve a high level of skill development as compared to a classroom guided by sole teacher decisions (Parker et al., 2021). The content associated with the skill themes approach is developmentally appropriate for elementary students, and similar student outcomes are desired between models. Both models

seek to empower students through voice and choice which concomitantly fosters the development of psychomotor skills and personal and social responsibility (Parker et al., 2021), making the marriage of the two models ideal for approaching physical education from a holistic approach.

With framework, modification, and curricular alignment established, facilitating professional growth is necessary (Lee, 2012; Lee & Choi, 2015; Hemphill, 2015). Implementing a MBP requires guidance, education, and community in order to put a model into practice. Ensuring program success relies on comprehensive professional development opportunities.

Professional Development

Preservice Teacher Education

Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) programs serve as a foundation of formal training for licensed and certified physical educators which can be considered the primary phase of formal professional development. These programs shape the minds of aspiring physical education teachers and often guide their practices outside of the university experience. Structuring course curriculum and field experience to educate and train PSTs can have a substantial impact not only on the PST but the students they serve as well. So, what to teach?

As previously covered in the review, MBPs vary in structure, delivery, and intended student outcomes (Casey, 2014). What all pedagogical models have in common is the framework they provide adds structure and purpose in combination with physical education. Casey (2014) notes that PETE programs need to develop coursework for PSTs that promotes the understanding and practice of MBP. To remain on topic, the remainder of the MBP discussion will focus solely on TPSR. Hellison (2011) illustrates eight ways to teach TPSR that are most closely related to PST education: (a) apprenticeship within an activity-based program

implementing TPSR; (b) site-based practicum for PST interested in TPSR; (c) one-week intensive elective offered to graduate PETE students; (d) within a required activity course; (e) within a required undergraduate methods course; (f) required methods course in an after-school program; and (g) use TPSR as the framework for an entire PETE program. The latter option for teaching TPSR might be a stretch for most PETE programs, while the remaining strategies for teaching TPSR are more realistic. Framework and theory without evidence can be a tough sell, especially when suggesting PETE programs should modify or require new content in their programming.

Researchers have shared evidence that implicates the need for PST programs specifically focusing on TPSR (Lee, 2012; Shiver et al., 2020). An emphasis on culturally relevant physical education (CRPE) (Shiver et al., 2020), is more apparent now than ever. Preparing PSTs for the diversity present within our school system is necessary. The data analyzed by Cardina and DyNysschen (2018) from the 2011-2012 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) identify 87% of physical education teachers as non-Hispanic White, indicating a lack of diversity, and the need for MBP like TPSR to foster CRPE (Shiver et al., 2020). The depth of TPSR content taught plays a significant role when determining PSTs' success during field experience, and eventually teaching independently. Lee (2012) trained PSTs to implement TPSR in their field experience program by providing literature for the PSTs while coupling that with meetings between the researcher and PSTs. The lack of in-depth study related to TPSR caused frustration and eventually misusing the model as a classroom management strategy as opposed to a platform for empowering students (Lee, 2012).

In contrast, Shiver and colleagues (2020) structured a two-semester program focusing on training PETE students on how to integrate TPSR and use instrumentation. The extended

learning platform and combined field experience with an after-school program offered PETE students the opportunity to grow and develop relationships with students and better understand cultural diversity (Shiver et al., 2020). Providing structured TPSR course content establishes the foundation for CRPE (Shiver et al., 2020), and field experience offers guidance and feedback from pedagogical experts to foster PETE students and PSTs implementation of TPSR (Lee, 2012; Shiver et al., 2020).

Continuing Professional Development

Understanding the value of training and the maintenance of skills learned is crucial when attempting to remain effective as a teacher. Before moving towards PD opportunities, teachers must consider the career stage (Bechtel & O'Sullivan, 2007) and possible philosophical shifts. Therefore, teachers should consider factors such as their value orientation or perceived "goods" of physical education (Kern et al., 2021; Lund & Tannehill, 2015) before committing time, effort, and energy towards PD. Continuing professional development (CPD) should match the teacher's values and curriculum (Hemphill, 2015; Kern et al., 2021), and not be viewed as something teachers must do to move up the professional ladder (Armour & Yelling, 2007). When teachers haphazardly select CPD programming based on convenience (Armour & Yelling, 2004), teachers risk hindering the implementation of program strategies learned during the PD offering, particularly when the teacher's philosophy does not align with the programming (Hemphill, 2015). In the case of responsibility-based education, this is abundantly clear. When teachers' philosophies do not match the tenets of responsibility-based education, CPD program outcomes are ineffective when seeking successful responsibility-based program implementation (Hemphill, 2015). Teachers must recognize CPD should be a selective process and requires reflection, professional-self inventory, and ultimately program vision (Armour & Yelling, 2004).

18

Additionally, the context of the professional development is a necessary consideration when selecting CPD (Armour & Yelling, 2004). Often considerations such as CPD proximity and teacher perception of time commitment factor into a teacher's decision to participate in CPD outside of school (Armour & Yelling, 2007). The willingness of a teacher to make a change may depend on their disposition towards change (Kern et al., 2021). These dispositions include (a) program satisfaction, (b) self-efficacy to change, and (c) willingness to change (Kern et al., 2021). Program leaders, stakeholders, PD coordinators must consider these dispositions when creating and promoting CPD programming (Kern et al., 2021). Without an understanding of teacher disposition, programming may fall flat, resulting in poor translation in-program. Understanding this, teachers might explore alternative forms of CPD to support their educational philosophy, program curriculum, and schedule. Creating a PD plan that is meaningful and purposeful for the teacher will likely translate to improved student learning experiences in-program. When focusing specifically on responsibility-based education, professional development is shown to strengthen the implementation of TPSR, specifically related to implementation fidelity and appropriate program modification to meet student needs (Lee & Choi, 2015).

The need for PD is essential for teachers attempting to implement quality physical education (CDC, 2014). Unfortunately, physical education teachers report fewer options and opportunities to participate in continuing professional development, as compared to teachers of other subjects (Bechtel & O'Sullivan, 2007; Cardina & DyNysschen, 2018). The lack of opportunity to participate in the professional learning community hinders a physical education teacher's ability to explore and potentially diversify their instructional strategies to better serve the needs of their students.

Continuing professional development is delivered in various forms that might include a multi-day conference covering a variety of topics, a web-based single session or multi-session platform, or even post-graduate course work. In some instances, CPD is presented in such a way that the content is generic and lacks specificity for successfully implementing content in-program based on the content covered in the PD session (Armour & Yelling, 2007). This places a greater emphasis on teachers seeking alternative practices like AR and self-study (Armour & Yelling, 2004; Ermeling, 2012; Keegan, 2019). CPD presents itself in many ways, but not all forms are equal when considering the complexity of MBP (Casey, 2014), specifically TPSR (Lee & Choi, 2015).

Introducing physical education teachers to TPSR in a condensed form will likely produce mixed results regarding teacher adherence and appreciation for the model's use in physical education (Lee & Choi, 2015; Richards & Gordon, 2017). Reducing TPSR to a single CPD or training session has shown to result in teacher frustration when implementing the model due to the disconnect of teacher philosophy and model purpose (Lee, 2012; Richards & Gordon, 2017). Developing university partnership (Casey, 2014) is key to improving the quality of TPSR implementation (Hellison & Walsh, 2002). The university setting is rich with pedagogical experts that can guide the development of in-service physical education teachers towards appropriate and sustained TPSR implementation (Hemphill et al., 2013; Lee & Choi, 2015; Richards & Gordon, 2017). Coupling university partnership with a professional community like the TPSR Alliance (TPSR Alliance, n.d.) adds relatedness for teachers participating in TPSR CPD (Hemphill et al., 2013; Richards & Gordon, 2017). Teachers can share TPSR strategies in order to adapt the model approach to meet the needs of students and teachers when engaging in

20

both conversation and systematic observation of peers (Hemphill et al., 2013; Lee & Choi, 2015; Richards & Gordon, 2017).

The combination of PSTs experience with TPSR, "traditional" CPD, and/or self-reflective CPD to initiate or improve TPSR content knowledge and instructional delivery for teachers is necessary for structuring appropriate implementation of TPSR (Pozo et al., 2018). Once the foundation is established, TPSR model fidelity must be evaluated to ensure TPSR is being implemented properly in order to achieve desired student outcomes (Wright & Craig, 2011).

TPSR Implementation Fidelity

Given that a primary purpose for implementing TPSR is to develop and strengthen personal-social skills of participants, identifying and measuring the outcomes of the TPSR model helps support the use of the model in physical education and activity-based settings. Studying the outcomes associated with TPSR implementation provides insight into why transfer might not be taking place (Lee & Martinek, 2012), and how program modification can be made to ensure success (Martinek et al., 2001; Pozo et al., 2018). Ultimately, finding a way to structure a program to produce the highest degree of success for program participants and/or students.

Following the development of physical education programming centered around TPSR, the model must be evaluated to confirm the program meets the true spirit of the model's design (Escartí et al., 2018). Measuring implementation fidelity requires the use of reliable and valid instrumentation, such as Tools for Assessing Responsibility-Based Education (TARE) (Escartí et al., 2018; Hemphill et al., 2013; Wright & Craig, 2011). The TARE observational instrument and TARE Post-teaching reflection instrument has demonstrated content validity when used by researchers (Escartí et al., 2018; Wright & Craig, 2011) and applicability for use as a tool for

reflection and assessing model fidelity by practicing physical educators (Lee, 2012; Hemphill et al., 2013; Richards & Gordon, 2017). TARE is rooted in systematic observation methodology (Wright & Craig, 2011) and was originally intended to provide researchers with a system for recording and coding teacher and student behaviors during TPSR implementation to evaluate implementation fidelity (Wright & Craig, 2011). Studies following Wright and Craig's development of TARE (2011) have focused on training physical education teachers to use the instrument for use as a program and peer evaluation tool (Hemphill et al., 2013; Richards & Gordon, 2017) to examine model fidelity and enhancement of TPSR student outcomes. Adherence of TPSR goals and strategies is at the heart of achieving desired personal-social responsibility development. Lacking instructional evaluation and reflection opens the door to inappropriate TPSR model adaptation (Lee, 2012; Richards & Gordon, 2017). Through meaningful and well guided CPD, physical education teachers and pedagogical experts can partner to strengthen TPSR implementation through continued research and application of TARE (Hemphill et al., 2013).

Researchers utilizing TARE training as a form of CPD have yielded positive results in their efforts to apply the instrument outside the context of research (Hemphill et al., 2013). Aside from the applicability of use when assessing TPSR implementation fidelity, the data have produced valuable participant insight regarding the perception of TPSR. Teachers implementing TPSR are often committed to the purpose and align with the philosophy of the model which strengthens their desire to improve program delivery (Hemphill et al., 2013). Commitment to TPSR and MBP for that matter are predicated on the notion that teachers are willing participants and believe in the desired program outcomes (Casey, 2014). The strength and limitations of TPSR implementation are evident as with any instructional model. Teachers implementing

TPSR in physical education have noted a loss in PA due to model format (Richards & Gordon, 2017); and a lack of student interest related to personal-social responsibility strategies (Lee, 2012) in which both can be explained by the need for modification of the model to suit the needs of students (DeBusk & Hellison, 1989), and to understand the student population and environment TPSR applied (Escartí et al., 2010).

TPSR Program Outcomes and Transfer

The worth of any MBP or instructional model rests in its ability to produce the desired theoretical outcome associated with the model's framework. The value of TPSR relies on the development of student personal-social responsibility and the transfer of said skill knowledge to areas of life beyond the gym (Hellison, 2011). Data have suggested desired TPSR model outcomes, but to what extent and how can further research advance the application of the model?

In-program Outcomes

The TPSR model attempts to establish: (a) respect for others, (b) effort and cooperation, (c) self-direction, (d) leadership, and (e) transfer outside of the gym (Hellison, 2011). The tenets of TPSR seamlessly align with what physical education represents (Escartí et al., 2010). Therefore, implementing TPSR aids in the structure of program design when striving to improve student outcomes associated with preexisting physical education philosophy. Adoption of TPSR as an instructional model has proven effective with regard to improving student self-efficacy (Escartí et al, 2010), self-awareness (DeBusk & Hellison, 1989; Lee & Martinek, 2012), and behavior (Balderson & Sharpe, 2005; DeBusk & Hellison, 1989; Hellison & Wright, 2003; Wright & Burton, 2008). Success of personal-social responsibility in-program validates TPSR as an appropriate framework of facilitating change in an activity-based setting, yet often misses the mark when fostering student skill knowledge outside of the gym (DeBusk & Hellison, 1989;

23

Wright & Burton, 2008; Escartí et al., 2010). This shortfall or lacking research regarding TPSR skill knowledge transfer demands further research to support use in physical education as a means of developing youth character and responsibility.

TPSR Skill Knowledge Transfer

Research explicitly designed to examine TPSR skill knowledge transfer is deficient and a relatively new topic of interest for researchers (Lee & Martinek, 2012) leading to little research and empirical data. The evidence that does exist implicating transfer of TPSR program goals shows promise. Walsh et al. (2010) present some of the most compelling research supporting the transference of (a) respecting the rights and feelings of other, (b) effort in the classroom, (c) self-direction and goal setting, (d) leadership from a sports-based activity program to the school environment based on teacher and student interview data. Attributing to the success of TPSR goal transference was the use of mentoring to foster the effort of program leaders while students were present at school (Walsh et al., 2010). While weak evidence has suggested the transfer of effort (Martinek et al., 2001), and respect for others (Hellison & Wright, 2003). While other research simply acknowledges the possibility of, or the potential for TPSR skill knowledge transfer (Escartí et al., 2010; Gordon & Doyle, 2015; Wright & Burton, 2008). Weak evidence supporting TPSR skill knowledge transfer calls to question, what might be hindering transfer success?

Barriers for Success. Recognizing the challenging nature of achieving TPSR skill knowledge transfer (Walsh et al., 2010) is the first clue to understanding why researchers have directed attention to research in other areas related to TPSR. Limitations and barriers that hinder skill knowledge acquisition in TPSR modeled programs exist. Factors impeding progress include: (a) the school environment and value system (Escartí et al., 2010; Escartí et al., 2018;

Martinek et al., 2001; Lee & Martinek, 2012; Walsh et al., 2010), (b) the environment outside of the gym (Gordon, 2020; Martinek et al., 2001; Walsh et al., 2010), (c) instructional delivery and strategies (Gordon, 2020), (d) program content (Gordon & Doyle, 2015; Walsh et al., 2010; Wright & Burton, 2008), (e) model fidelity (Lee & Martinek, 2012; Richards & Gordon, 2017), (f) student/participant familiarity with teacher/program leader (Wright & Burton, 2008), and (g) class or group size (Hellison, 2011). Understanding the barriers to success noted through a robust literature review presents the need for careful planning and considerations when introducing responsibility-based education in a physical education setting, particularly when considering the importance of skill knowledge transfer (Hellison, 2011).

Future Research

Lower Elementary Physical Education

As mentioned previously, the vast majority of empirical research reviewed in this paper were conducted in an alternative PA or physical education setting leading to a substantial need for research in a more generalized student population. Of the five studies specifically referencing the setting as physical education, two studies sampled participants that were recommended for the TPSR program by school administration and support staff due to behavioral challenges (DeBusk & Hellison, 1989; Balderson & Sharpe, 2005), the remaining two studies relied on intact physical education programs (Escartí et al., 2010) with one study noting the physical education class recruited for the study was recognized as having behavioral concerns (Wright & Burton, 2008). While other studies covered in the review were carried out in a physical education setting, the purpose of their review was to study CPD (Hemphill et al., 2013; Lee & Choi, 2015; Richards & Gordon, 2017), PST training (Shiver et al., 2020), or instrumentation and implementation fidelity (Escartí et al., 2018; Wright & Craig, 2011).

25

Identifying these gaps in TPSR literature supports the need for continued research designed to study TPSR implementation in physical education. Further suggestions should be made for focusing attention on the lower elementary physical education population, due to the absence of research with a student population below seven years of age (Pozo et al., 2018)

Some pedagogical scholars might argue the feasibility of implementing TPSR into an intact kindergarten and first-grade physical education program. Using the standard TPSR strategies will not work with young children (Liu et al., 2010). Integrating instructional models (Casey, 2014; Liu et al., 2010; Richards et al., 2019) will support TPSR skill knowledge development of student learners. Following program modifications to meet the needs of lower elementary students, support must be garnered from within the school. Using TPSR as a school-wide model is suggested as an added support for TPSR development and student skill knowledge transfer (Escartí et al., 2018) while other scholars believe an informed / supportive school setting is key (Lee & Martinek, 2012; Martinek et al., 2001; Pozo et al., 2018; Wright & Burton, 2008). Designing a developmentally appropriate and supportive TPSR based lower elementary physical education program will contribute to the advancement of model program goals, moving students towards skill knowledge transfer.

Future TPSR research design must consist of multiple data sources in order to produce a robust collection of evidence to support research findings (DeBusk & Hellison, 1989; Escartí et al., 2010; Escartí et al., 2018; Wright & Burton, 2008). The use of TARE to evaluate TPSR model fidelity is necessary for ensuring instructional goals are met (Escartí et al., 2018; Hemphill et al., 2013; Melo et al., 2020; Wright & Irwin, 2018; Wright & Craig, 2011) and instructional reflection takes place (Gray et al., 2019; Hemphill et al., 2013). Additional sources of data include journaling and lesson plans. The use of validated observational instrumentation like the

TARE (Wright & Craig, 2011), and post-teaching reflection tools like the TPSR implementation checklist (Gray et al., 2019) help ensure TPSR model fidelity while journal entries and TPSR implementation checklist reflections provide teacher-researcher perceptions of the TPSR model.

Conclusion

The finding of this extensive review of literature evaluating TPSR and responsibility-based programs have produced the following themes: (a) TPSR in physical education gives SEL standards a daily platform; (b) PETE experience and CPD are key to improving TPSR implementation; (c) research examining TPSR in physical education is scarce, which necessitates further research; (d) evidence of TPSR skill knowledge transfer is underwhelming; (e) empirical research focusing on lower elementary physical education implementing TPSR is non-existent (Pozo et al., 2018); and (f) TPSR program modifications are necessary when finding ways to accommodate student needs. Cumulatively, the themes identified add support for research examining TPSR in kindergarten and first-grade physical education.

Results from future research will strengthen support for TPSR model use in physical education, by reinforcing SEL through structure given by TPSR program goals (Ivy & Jacobs, 2017; Jacobs & Wright, 2014; Richards et al., 2019). Simply dropping TPSR into an existing physical education program will not result in effective change (Casey, 2014). Model fidelity is contingent on continued research and university partnership (Casey, 2014; Lee & Choi, 2015) and will be necessary for guidance and training in preparation for TPSR model implementation and use of TARE instrumentation (Lee, 2012; Hemphill et al., 2013; Richards & Gordon, 2017; Wright & Craig, 2011). Meticulously planned TPSR program design will facilitate program outcomes in physical education. The implementation of TPSR relies on strategies that engage the teacher in reflection, balanced with observation, and council with others (Gray et al., 2019).

The TPSR model itself fits the generalized framework of the AR process, making the exploration

of the TPSR model's implementation in lower elementary through the lens of AR ideal for

creating a foundational understanding of the model for someone new to TPSR. The use of AR in

physical education should take on a greater role in the field to move teachers toward pedagogical

change (Casey, 2013; Casey & Dyson, 2009) in addition to advancing the body of literature

focused on TPSR, MBP, and AR. Finally, the added support for TPSR model implementation in

physical education adds value not only to the model, but physical education itself as a platform

for character building and student empowerment that can be characterized as SEL.

CHAPTER III: METHODS

Participants and Setting

The study aimed to examine the experiences of a physical education teacher's attempt to implement a series of responsibility-based educational units in lower elementary physical education. With an emphasis on planning, the implementation of TPSR, and teacher reflection, the sole participant for the study was the physical education teacher/researcher (N = 1). The physical educator identified as the focus of inquiry had 13 years of teaching experience, ranging from kindergarten to twelfth-grade physical education. The majority of the teacher's instructional experience had occurred at the middle level (grades 6-8). Recently, transitioning to the lower elementary, where the teacher entered his second-year teaching K-1 physical education. The transition to lower elementary physical education has initiated a shift in philosophy and pedagogical practice. Through graduate studies and reflection of past teaching practices, the teacher identified deficiencies with regard to addressing and assessing the affective domain which spawned the need for change to better align with state and national physical education learning standards. Ultimately, to improve the experiences and learning outcomes of the students he serves.

The setting was based in a PK-3 elementary school located in the rural Midwest, comprised of 533 students. The student population consisted of the following racial and ethnic demographics: 93.4% White, 1.7% Asian, 1.3% Hispanic, 0.9% Black, and 2.7% Two or more races. Additionally, the school has an enrollment of 20.2% at the level of low-income status. Although the school housed students in grades PK-3, the setting was based in the K-1 physical education program. The physical education department is divided by grade level with an assigned certified physical education instructor for grades K-1 and 2-3. Kindergarten and first-

grade physical education were scheduled to meet daily for a duration of 25 minutes per class

session, totaling twelve sessions (6 kindergarten, 6 first grade) daily.

Philosophical Reflection

Understanding teacher experiences opens the door to a better understanding of a teacher's

philosophical perspective. My personal philosophy towards physical education content and

practices is largely based on PETE training and experiences yet influenced by K-12 learning

experiences as well. Enjoying physical education and athletics throughout K-12 schooling is

what guided me towards the profession of teaching physical education. The personal enjoyment

of participating in athletics initially shaped my philosophy and in turn focused my curriculum on

students having the ability to participate in a variety of low-organized games and "traditional"

team sports (e.g., flag football, volleyball, soccer, basketball). This personal belief system began

to shift towards lifelong activities with supporting fitness activities due to transitioning to a

different grade level, but more importantly a shifting of values regarding what should be taught.

Where my philosophy stands today is vastly different than it was 13 years ago, or even a year

ago due to a shift in my perceived "goods" of physical education (Lund & Tannehill, 2015) and

value orientation. My evolving personal philosophy has moved towards teaching content related

to skill themes and movement concepts with an emphasis on personal and social responsibility.

The changed philosophy is due to personal improvement through continuing education, teaching

experience, and the transition to lower elementary physical education.

When attempting to understand what I believe to be the most important content or

concepts taught in physical education, I consider the grade level being taught, the school

environment, geographic location, student demographics, and my values related to physical

education. Based on teaching physical education at the lower elementary level, content should

focus on locomotor (e.g., walking, running), nonmanipulative skills (e.g., twisting, turning), manipulative skills (e.g., throwing, kicking), space awareness, effort, and relationships, also known as, skill themes and movement concepts (Graham et al., 2009). In conjunction with skill themes and movement concepts, I find it necessary to focus attention on personal and social responsibility, or more generally SEL. Although Illinois has K-12 SEL learning standards, SHAPE America standards 4 and 5 aligned well with SEL (Ivy & Jacobs, 2017; Jacobs & Wright, 2014; Richards et al., 2019). I believe in developing the whole person, and for me, that starts with SEL and responsibility-based education. Using physical education as a platform for addressing cooperation, effort, leadership, respect, and responsibility is key when working towards the development of personally and socially responsible individuals. Personal and social responsibility in physical education is then structured by using the TPSR instructional model and fostered further by coupling TPSR with skill themes and movement concepts when teaching lower elementary physical education (Richards et al., 2019). Based on the instructional models selected, when planning student goals and objectives, I plan for students to (a) understand and demonstrate TPSR levels of responsibility; (b) be proficient throwing, catching, and kicking based on developmental sequences; (c) demonstrating space awareness during self and group play; and (d) ability to demonstrate a variety of locomotor skills in combination with levels, pathways, direction. Overall, my personal philosophy aligns well with my value orientation of Social Responsibility and Justice (Lund & Tannehill, 2015).

The shift in my philosophy is relatively new, so when examining how implementation occurs, I have little evidence to support my implementation strategy. My philosophy in practice was very much theory. I was confident in my ability to align my espoused philosophy with the content and instruction I provided my kindergarten and first-grade students. My evolving beliefs

towards what should be taught, and the focus of my curriculum was spawned by research which has taken me through the process of continuing education and academic connection to support my beliefs, and ultimately my physical education program. The pursuit of professional development has guided my recent program adaptation that focused on TPSR strategies to support learning goals and objectives.

Study Design

Action Research

The teaching profession requires a commitment to ongoing learning. The continuous engagement in the learning process is more than a valuable attribute of a quality educator, it is a core responsibility for the profession of teaching (Brown, 2011). The ongoing process of teacher learning contributes to improved teacher knowledge and practice, while additionally benefiting student experience and the school system in which the teacher works (Brown, 2011). For continuous learning to be impactful on the teacher, the learning experience must align with teacher beliefs and visions to influence teaching practice, or simply change (Betchel & O'Sullivan, 2007). Therefore, teachers must be selective when evaluating opportunities for CPD. Effective CPD can only take place when the teacher reflects and evaluates their own needs based on their beliefs and values (Armour & Yelling, 2004). The self-evaluation of professional needs is not always considered by teachers. Often, CPD is chosen based on convenience, not the identified learning needs of the teacher (Armour & Yelling, 2004; Keegan, 2019). The sporadic nature of professional development participation (Keegan, 2019) does not have to be the "normal" for physical education PD. Teachers can find ways to enhance their own practice by viewing CPD as a part of their daily practice, not a separate learning experience that takes place outside of their setting (Armour & Yelling, 2007). Recognizing that professional development

opportunities exist in daily practice is the first step when moving towards professional inquiry as a form of CPD (Armour & Yelling, 2004; Ermeling, 2012).

Action research is noted as a well-supported and documented model for professional inquiry (Ermeling, 2012). The teacher inquiry process relies on teachers using a variety of evidence and data to guide their study in order to influence changes in practice or adherence to beneficial pedagogical practices (Ermeling, 2021). McNiff (n.d.) reduces AR to a form of inquiry focused on looking at a teacher's own work to identify their strengths and weaknesses. Self-study shares a similar intent to that of AR which can be described as a teacher's efforts to better understand one's own practice (Brown, 2011; Loughran, 2004). Though self-study and AR are not identical in methodology, both forms of study are considered parallel fields (Loughran, 2004), and are used as interchangeable terms throughout the research process. Self-guided CPD in the form of AR is ideal for teachers struggling to connect with CPD opportunities that align with their values, beliefs, and needs (McNiff, n.d.). The process of AR places the teacher at the focal point of the PD by moving the teacher from end-user to the focus of the investigation as the subject and researcher, resulting in a more meaningful learning experience (Brown, 2011; Keegan, 2016) aimed at meeting the needs of both the teacher and students through potential pedagogical change (Gray et al., 2019; Keegan, 2019). The pursuit of AR must be a well-considered endeavor due to the challenges and time-consuming nature of the process (Casey & Dyson, 2009; Keegan, 2016, 2019).

Barriers to Action Research. Action research does not come without its own set of challenges recognized throughout published research. Embarking on the journey of AR requires the teacher/researcher to commit to change and the time-consuming nature of the process. These challenges have been echoed in research by Keegan (2016, 2019); Casey & Dyson (2009) to

serve as a notice before engaging in the process of AR. Recognizing these challenges before diving into AR improved the experience of the research and learning process due to the established expectations. Additionally, teachers wishing to pursue AR must be willing to learn more about the process through research. Action research is overlooked as a form of CPD in many cases because teachers lack knowledge about the process (Keegan, 2016) which can be attributed to teachers not engaging in the habitual practice of reading research (Armour & Yelling, 2004). Although the process of AR presents itself with a set of challenges, the outcomes generated by the process outweigh the perceived barriers, indicating, a willing participant should consider AR as a form of CPD to reflect upon and improve pedagogical practices for their benefit and that of their students.

       Outcomes of Action Research. Casey (2013) describes the changes associated with AR as a "messy process", yet manageable due to recognizing the outcome, and the general framework of the process. Action research can be summarized and described using four steps (1) plan, (2) act, (3) observe, and (4) reflect (Keegan, 2019). Through repeated cycles of the AR process, teachers can make changes through observation, data analysis, reflection, and planning (Casey, 2013; Casey & Dyson, 2009; Keegan, 2016, 2019). Teacher-researchers have reported the following outcomes associated with the AR process (a) enhanced planning and attention to detail, (b) improved student focus during lessons, (c) more reflective teachers, (d) more collaborative (Keegan, 2016, 2019). Additionally, teachers studying their own practice enhance the authenticity of the research process due to the teacher having a deeper understanding of the school's educational philosophy and the background of the student body (Keegan, 2016). To ensure success, teachers require support (Casey, 2013; Gray et al., 2019; McNiff, n.d.), which can stem from a community of practice (CoP), and school system support of change. A CoP is a

group of individuals sharing a common interest related to a specific topic or concept and strive to work together, finding ways to improve collectively (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2015). Collaboration and communication with others through the AR process are tenets of self-study (Loughran, 2004) and AR (McNiff, n.d.). The recruitment of a critical friend provides a more objective interpretation of AR data and ultimately the changes that take place during each cycle, moving the findings of the research away from being categorized as opinion (McNiff, n.d.). The support of a critical friend is necessary for providing feedback and suggestions to the teacher-researcher during the AR process (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2015). The role of the critical friend is to help enhance the learning process of the action researcher.

Positive changes in pedagogical practices have been noted in several published articles focused on the process and journey of AR. The challenges, positive outcomes, and reflective nature of AR contribute to the improvement of one's own practice while contributing to the body of literature examining pedagogical practices, helping inform researchers and educators alike (Casey, 2013). Guiding one's CPD through AR demands an understanding of the difficulties that lie ahead through the "messy" process (Casey, 2013) which requires planning, patience, and support to overcome the rigors of AR.

Instrumentation

Lesson Plans

The creation and use of lesson plans (Appendix B) guided the organization of each instructional session through (1) description of content, (2) strategies, (3) goals, (4) student learning objectives, and (5) alignment with Illinois physical development and health learning standards. To support TPSR implementation, strategies and daily formatting outlined by Hellison (2011) were adopted to strengthen student learning outcomes related to personal and

social responsibility. Previous lessons and the corresponding plans provided evidence to support future instructional practice and necessary modifications. Post-lesson reflection and review of plans were the basis of sound instructional philosophy and at the root of AR (McNiff, n.d.). Well-documented lesson plans provided evidence needed to demonstrate the progression of instructional development.

TPSR Checklist

The TPSR implementation checklist (Appendix C) is an instrument designed to guide responsibility-based instructors in both pre- and post-lesson implementation to enhance planning and model fidelity (Gray et al., 2019). The checklist covers a set of indicators aimed at identifying aspects of quality TPSR implementation that include goals, lesson format, teaching strategies, and student behaviors (Gray et al., 2019). Responsibility-based outcomes were enhanced by referencing the TPSR implementation checklist during the planning of all lessons in each of the AR cycles. Further application included the use of the checklist as a post-teaching reflection tool.

TARE Post-Teaching Reflection

The TARE post-teaching reflection (Appendix D) is a self-report instrument TPSR program leaders utilize in order to holistically evaluate the lesson (Hemphill, 2015). Typically, the TARE post-teaching reflection is completed in conjunction with the TARE systematic observation instrument (Hemphill, 2015), yet this study focused solely on post-teaching reflection. The omission of the TARE instrument was due to the aim of the study which sought to examine the planning and development of the teacher/researcher through the adoption of TPSR. The TARE post-teaching reflection provided the necessary feedback to affirm or oppose instructional strategies. This was accomplished through reflection of the following categories:

lesson overview, teaching strategies, responsibility themes, and general comments from observations in-lesson. Student responsibility behaviors were excluded from post-teaching reflection due to emphasis on teacher/researcher experience and planning. The TARE post-teaching reflection was an essential instrument for providing evidence to assess instructional delivery, outcomes, and planning.

Journaling

Journaling in the field and post-lesson provided authentic perceptions and observations during instructional units. The notes were used to detail the evolving nature of a novice's attempt to introduce a MBP in the K-1 physical education setting. Action research is defined as qualitative research (Keegan, 2016), in turn, requiring multiple data sources to validate the quality of its findings. Journaling provided a rich description of the teacher/researcher's experiences throughout the AR process. The descriptive documentation influenced lesson preparation with evidence of lessons learned in practice. Journaling supported planning while documenting the progression of the teacher's journey as a TPSR program leader.

The journaling process took place when feasible for the teacher/researcher. Natural breaks in the daily schedule of the teacher/researcher provided an opportunity to recount insights disposed during each lesson block. The lesson blocks consisted of five lessons followed by a one-hour break, one lesson followed by a ten-minute break, three lessons followed by a 15-minute break, and three lessons concluding the day. An attempt was made to journal after each lesson block to ensure recency of the teacher/researcher's interpretation and thoughts related to the lesson outcomes resulting in a more accurate description of events. Field notes were utilized as prompts when journaling was not feasible (i.e., during a block of lessons). The purpose of the field notes was to preserve meaningful observations in-lesson which were elaborated in further

detail during the journaling process. Potential inconsistencies regarding journaling were present due to the nature of the setting. Teacher/researcher responsibilities occasionally took priority over journaling when necessary due to the teacher/researcher's role in an operational school setting.

Data Collection

The study was approved by the Illinois State University IRB. Research site approval was granted by the superintendent of schools. Communications with district administration were established early in the planning phase of the study design to ensure site permission, and to expedite the process upon final IRB approval. Informed consent was not required for students in the study due to the focus of the data collection. All gathered and analyzed data were sourced from the teacher/researcher's (1) lesson plans, (2) TPSR-based instrumentation, and (3) journaling.

Data were analyzed inductively to sort through and organize multiple forms of data collected using various techniques (Keegan, 2019). Data were collected from the onset of the study through postintervention. The study spanned two teaching cycles (6-8 weeks), covering 26 instructional lessons focused on fundamental movement skills in combination with responsibility-based content framed by the TPSR instructional model. Data were shared with the research committee weekly to ensure study quality and direction. A small CoP was established by the researcher in order to support planning and strategies associated with responsibility-based education. The CoP included Sandra Hagenbach a veteran elementary physical education teacher from Green Bay, Wisconsin, and Andrea Dunlap a certified social worker with the school district. Sandra is an author and practitioner of responsibility-based education embedded in lower elementary physical education. Andrea works with the lower elementary students and is

based in the elementary building. Andrea was a source of support when planning SEL based

strategies and assessments through the research design process. Upon completion of the first

teaching cycle, the researcher completed a one-week reflective/planning phase prior to initiating

the second AR research cycle. The midpoint planning phase consisted of sharing lesson plans

and experiences.

The instrumentation used in the study was utilized at various points of the AR. Lesson

plans and the TPSR checklist were completed daily, offering evidence of teacher change and

experience interacting with the TPSR instructional model. While journals were an integral data

source, it was not feasible to ensure journaling would be completed for each individual class

session throughout each teaching cycle. Due to the demanding class schedule of the

teacher/researcher, an attempt was made to journal, yet most journaling took place after blocks of

lessons concluded. The TARE post-teaching reflection was completed at the conclusion of each

week of instruction. The instrument was used to document a cumulative reflection of the twelve

class sections taught during the week of instruction. The data collected provides a rich

description of the teacher's journey as a TPSR program leader in a lower elementary physical

education setting. Appendix A outlines the instrumentation used in conjunction with the

intervention timeline.

Data Analysis

Action research is supported by the collection of qualitative data. After harvesting data

from a variety of sources, the data requires analysis to answer the research questions. To do so, a

method for data analysis was established and adhered to for the purpose of sorting and

understanding the raw data collected during the research process. The study analyzed data

through thematic analysis. Thematic analysis was selected for data analysis in order to

systematically organize and analyze the collected data into manageable data sets (Keegan, 2019).

Braun and Clarke (2006) state that, "thematic analysis is a method of identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data" (p. 79). Braun and Clarke (2006) suggest that thematic analysis serves as the first qualitative method of data analysis for novice researchers, due to the flexibility and usefulness of the research tool, which often offers a descriptive interpretation of the collected research data.

The cumulative raw data collected is defined as, data corpus (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This type of data is uncategorized and refers to all the data collected from various sources throughout the research process (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The data then needs to be sorted and organized into manageable data sets for analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The data collected throughout the study was gathered and organized in a way to provide structure to move from data corpus to data sets. The triangulation of data was necessary to ensure the reliability of the findings (Keegan, 2019). Ultimately, the data sets provided the researcher with themes that represented the findings for the study. Specifically, thematic analysis follows a defined set of phases to harvest and analyze collected data. The phases include (1) data familiarization, (2) initial code generation, (3) searching themes, (4) reviewing themes, (5) defining and naming, and (6) producing the report (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Appendix E provides a description of each phase of thematic analysis. By carefully analyzing and organizing the data, the researcher was able to answer the research questions.

As previously identified, AR can be a messy process, yet beneficial to the pedagogical growth of an educator (Casey, 2013; Casey & Dyson, 2009; Keegan, 2016, 2019). The AR process requires various sources of data in order to answer the stated research questions. The aim of this research was to understand the learning process and experiences of a teacher seeking

to improve pedagogical practices, specifically related to responsibility-based education. To accomplish this, the various instruments used throughout the study needed to be analyzed separately, and then compared to illustrate the teacher's learning process throughout the AR. Ultimately, to find answers to the research questions.

Data analysis began with the reading of journal entries. Beginning the analysis with journal entries allowed the researcher to better understand the teacher's perceptual progression throughout each individual lesson and teaching cycle. Doing this helped the researcher better understand what may have caused shifts in lesson planning, which related to potential changes in data presented by the TARE post-teaching reflection. Though these data sources were very different, there was the possibility to identify shifts in pedagogical practices based on perceptions noted in the field, and how that translated to planning, practice, and results.

Second, understanding how lesson plans adapted through the AR process was necessary when attempting to understand the professional growth of the teacher. This was accomplished by the lesson plans being cross-reference with previous lesson journals, the TPSR checklist, and when applicable, the TARE post-teaching reflection. To reason why or how teacher change is taking place, a clear picture should be drawn (McNiff, n.d.). This required multiple data sources providing a different perspective of the planning and implementation process. In other words, were lesson plans being influenced by reflections noted from the journals and TARE post-teaching reflections? If so, was there a clear perceptual progression of the teacher throughout the AR process noted in the journals? The aim was for the data to demonstrate positive professional growth through planning, practice, and perception.

Separately, the data provided a small glimpse of the teacher's learning process. However, when combined, the full picture began to come into focus. The collected data were used to

41

demonstrate how planning progressed through each cycle of the AR; how model implementation

improved through planning; and teacher perceptions of the TPSR model.

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

Action research was the framework for self-inquiry during the study. The AR process supported the examination of my attempt to plan and deliver TPSR in K-1 physical education. Specifically, seeking to better understand (1) what responsibility-based teaching strategies were planned and implemented, and (2) what changes were observed in the teacher's planning and delivery of responsibility-based teaching strategies and TPSR themes.

Thematic analysis was used to reduce the data collected over the six-week cumulative teaching cycle. The data were sourced from journal entries, TPSR implementation checklists, TARE-post teaching reflections, and teacher designed lesson plans as supplementary support. The data were analyzed inductively through the coding of the data source materials. Inductive, open-coding was conducted by the lead researcher. Codes were organized across each week of the instructional unit and correlated with the research questions. All data collected throughout an isolated instructional unit week were coded before moving to the next week. Following the weekly coding, data were reviewed across the full data set and combined into a codebook categorized by research questions. The codebook reflected the labeled codes, reference to the data source, and examples of raw data. The codes evolved into themes and subthemes and were reviewed for interrater agreement by a member of the research team. The final codebook, references, and a description of the themes and subthemes were presented to Dr. Emily Jones (thesis committee chair) for review. Upon approval of themes and descriptions, the document was reduced to general results and effects of the TPSR implementation process found in Appendix F. These include (1) planning, (2) delivery, (3) challenge, (4) change, and (5) plans for the future.

Planning

Looking back across the cumulative six-week teaching cycle, planning required a bit of a reset in my daily schedule and responsibilities. Though lesson planning has always been an aspect of my weekly or daily routine, the lessons most recently planned prior to the TPSR unit were not planned with the level of detail necessary when embarking on the delivery of a new instructional model. Designing detailed lesson plans took me back to undergraduate methods course work. The investment of time to plan the TPSR lessons was exponential, and at time it felt as though developing the lesson was more time-intensive than the delivery itself, as noted during week one: *The process of planning and implementing a new instructional model is time-consuming.* (TARE, Week 1). What initially seemed to be an exhaustive process, became less so over time. Lesson content better aligned with TPSR content and lessons became more concise which allowed for a more balanced approach to PA and responsibility-based concepts within each lesson. This was briefly described in a journal entry *I am certainly improving with regard to planning affective content and am doing okay at delivering the planned content.* (Journal, Week 2 Lesson 8).

The change in planning was not immediate or without its highs and lows. This process was a bit of an evolution and I believe it will continue to be as I gain more experience and continue to integrate TPSR in future units. The process of pedagogical change was a series of trials and errors allowing me to recognize what planned teaching strategies and content pairings (i.e., psychomotor w/ TPSR) produced the most effective lessons. As time progressed, and there was evidence of improved TPSR planning, I became more self-aware of additional pedagogical and instructional improvements that could be of value in my practice.

Levels

Using action research as the framework for TPSR model implementation, the reiterative

nature of the process and the imposed contextual timeframe presented limitations. To meet the

developmental needs of the K-1 learners, it was determined that a focus on Level I (Respect) and

Level II (Effort and Cooperation) would be most feasible and value-added. The narrowed TPSR

level focus was based on time spent with students both interacting with and observing student

behaviors. Having a deep understanding of my students' needs and developmental readiness

guided my decision to limit TPSR level introduction. Appendix G reflects how Level I (Respect)

and Level II (Effort and Cooperation) were distributed across the planned lessons. Introducing

Level I often centered on or around the concept of self-control. Awareness talks and experiences

were designed to help students first understand how to recognize their behavior and second how

those behaviors might have an impact on others. This concept first appeared in lesson two:

> *Self-control is thinking that helps you… keep control of your emotions when you*
> *get frustrated; think before you act and make a connection between your thoughts*
> *feelings, and actions. Self-control can… stop you from making a bad decision;*
> *keep yourself positive when things are not going well; controlling yourself from*
> *having a temper tantrum. Examples when to use: when you need to stop talking*
> *in class; when you need to take time with your homework; when you try to stay*
> *calm during an argument. I want you to be aware of your level of self-control*
> *during the lesson. At the end of class, you will rate your level of self-control*
> *before leaving the gym.* (Lesson Plan, Week 1 Lesson 2)

This later evolved into how students can respect the rights of others by demonstrating self-

control. This was evident in lessons that focused on concept application:

> *How can you show self-control to keep from going "wild"… By following*
> *directions and thinking before you act. When the music stops, if you keep moving,*
> *are you going "wild" or are you respecting every child? When we practice body*
> *positions and balances, think about how well you stay on task… Are you always*
> *following directions or choosing a behavior that is considered going "wild".*
> *Going "wild" does not show self-control… On-task behavior and actions do.*
> (Lesson Plan, Week 4 Lesson 16)

Incorporating respect (Level I) into the learning environment and planned activities became a fundamental priority. Concepts of respect were linked to how one respects rules, equipment, self, and others, and were necessary for K-1s to understand how to function within the open environment of our physical education classroom. An example from a lesson plan is shared:

> *What is cooperation (Level II)?... working together to accomplish the same thing. Today's activity is going to require you to work with another person. In order to be successful, you will have to cooperate. This means communicating, respecting each other's strengths and weaknesses. If you can throw very far at this point, should your partner stand really far away from you? If your partner makes a mistake, how should you respond?* (Lesson Plan, Week 1 Lesson 4)

It became evident that concepts of effort and cooperation (Level II) took a backseat to Level I. This was likely due to the value I placed on wanting students to understand and demonstrate respecting the rights and feelings of others. When planning it became evident to me that cooperation and effort were often byproducts of the physical education learning environment, which seemed to more naturally incorporate with the lesson.

The Level V concepts of transfer were introduced only sporadically throughout the unit. Early on in lesson three (week 1), an attempt was made to include transfer in the lesson: *We related leaving a clean station for other groups to leaving your room clean at home. Also, when it is appropriate to talk in PE and the classroom as well.* (TARE, Week 1 Lesson 3). Upon reflection, it was evident the connection to the concept was not strong or relatable enough for the students, which I perceived to not facilitate meaningful group discussion. Initially, the plan included an aspect of transfer but due to time constraints or omitted to focus more substantially on the primary level of focus, I deliberately omitted it from the lesson. Based on these experiences, introducing Level V transfer-related concepts in-lesson was well intended, but not applicable in delivery of the K-1 lessons.

Instructional Strategies. An advantage of TPSR is how the model is presented to have application to an existing PA setting. Many of the planned teaching strategies were developed before model implementation. Most notable was the teaching strategy Opportunities for Success as stated in an excerpt from the week four TARE post-teaching reflection: *All lessons were self-paced giving students a chance to explore and participate in a way that promotes individual success*. (TARE, Week 4). Prior to utilizing TPSR, I planned my lessons with the primary goal of every student having success. This is often facilitated by students having choice when completing lesson tasks. Planning with TPSR merely highlighted previous practices and made this aspect of the planning process more natural.

When examining planned responsibility-based teaching strategies, I relied heavily on (1) opportunities for success, (2) setting expectations, and (3) choice and voice. This was the product of my comfort level with the strategies due to the existing practice. On the other hand, I often fell short when it came to empowering students through leadership roles and assigning tasks which were noted during post-teaching reflections: *Giving students narrowed choices or open choices [Empowerment] was an emphasis during lesson three of this cycle, yet absent during other lessons* (TARE, Week 2); and *I have tried to make this work but assigning tasks with this age level and with time constraints it can be difficult. Task assignments were given but were often insignificant.* (TARE, Week 2).

Shifting responsibility to students was intentionally neglected due to student developmental readiness. Based on my opinion and experience with my class and age group, I reasoned maintaining a more teacher-led program was more developmentally appropriate for my students. Additionally, fostering social interaction was most often a result of the lesson rather than a planned strategy, as reflected in post-teaching reflection: *The opportunities existed for*

students to socialize, yet I did not always encourage social interaction. Instead, it was a
byproduct of the lesson. Only during two lessons did I specifically note socializing during
activity. (TARE, Week 2).

Neglect and under planning to use these strategies likely resulted in a marginal shift of responsibility from the teacher to students. Appendix H represents TPSR implementation checklist data focused on teaching strategies used in-lesson, which was based on my reflection at the end of each lesson. The data indicate I was consistent in utilizing the strategies of *modeling respect, setting expectations, providing opportunities for success, fostering social interaction, and giving choices and voices*. These strategies were not always specifically planned, but instead were generative byproducts of the planned lessons. For instance, I did not regularly note social interaction in my lesson plans; yet, the way the lesson was planned fostered the students' ability to interact during the lesson. I was much less successful in planning for or utilizing the following teaching strategies: *promoting leadership, involving students in assessment, and addressing the transfer of life skills*. Assigning management tasks was non-existent in lesson planning efforts across the six-week intervention.

Physical Activity Content

Effectively aligning PA and TPSR content proved to be challenging. When PA content was difficult for students to follow, the TPSR content fell by the wayside. When mapping out a plan of action for this study, it was determined, the most authentic experience would include an established physical education curriculum. A yearly physical education unit plan was established prior to the 2021-2022 school year. I was of the opinion, the implementation of TPSR should meld with pre-existing physical education content. Rationale was based on my belief and understanding of the TPSR model's applicability in the physical education

environment. Forming physical education curriculum to best match TPSR would have likely reduced the authenticity of my experience and the data produced by the study. In retrospect, standing firm on curriculum sequence, may have attributed to some of the hindrances early on when attempting to connect PA content and TPSR. This required finding a way to rationalize and plan preexisting PA content with TPSR content. I found that this was more difficult than anticipated: *Really hard to make a connection between level II and balancing. Yes, I was able to connect through planning, but it wasn't great in practice.* (Journal, Week 5 Lesson 21).

Though it was not always the case, it was always at the forefront when attempting to mesh skill and responsibility-based content. These combination attempts added a lingering feeling of stress when planning a lesson. Recognizing failures as an opportunity for growth is an idealistic perspective when attempting something new, yet failures also surface inadequacies. In my case, this was often planning a quality lesson that was well-balanced between PA and responsibility-based content. Lesson failures made the planning of the next lesson that much more worrisome. Though I may have learned something from my experience with the prior lesson, I was realistic enough to recognize the likelihood of challenges ahead. This left me questioning whether the planned lesson was going to produce the desired student learning outcomes, or would it miss the mark:

> *I was concerned from the planning phase that the activity would not be engaging enough. Lots of blank stares and little interest or enthusiasm. This has greatly impacted my ability to deliver TPSR. It's hard to relate effort to a lesson or activity that does not flow well, and leaves student uninterested* (Journal, Week 2 Lesson 10)

After experiencing lesson failure several times, it was only natural to have some reservations taking a plan to action. The resultant feeling associated with planning was stress. As a teacher, I want is best for my students, and have an obligation to provide them with a quality education. If

I am falling short of that expectation, I am failing in my duty as an educator. My sense of

professional responsibility coupled with pedagogical change was a recipe for stressful planning.

If students were unable to follow the planned skill, game, or activity, I was unable to

effectively deliver the planned TPSR content. This is evident based on a journal entry: *Abandon*

ship! This lesson is awful. Kindergarten students are struggling to get the ball to the person in

the middle of the gym. My focus has to move towards game adjustments and away from TPSR

content. (Journal, Week 2 Lesson 6).

The responsibility-based content was overshadowed by the need to address skill content.

This was a reoccurring challenge when planning and ultimately implementing lessons. Well-

aligned PA and TPSR content was a documented challenge from week one to week six of the

responsibility-based intervention:

> *I am not sure how to describe my feelings about the start of today and the*
> *associated lesson. I thought students would be able to easily apply the rules of*
> *today's game. I was wrong. Due to students struggling with the activity portion of*
> *the lesson, attention is taken away from responsibility-based content. I have had*
> *to stop the class on average 3 times during the game to reexplain the rules.*
> *Throwing overhand when underhand is the focus. Throwing the wrong direction.*
> *Traveling with the ball in their hand when the ball can only move by being thrown*
> (Journal, Week 1 Lesson 4).

> *Today was a lesson built around the concept of a simple game, yet allows*
> *opportunities for students to choose the right choice or wrong choice (honest or*
> *dishonest). Not working, students are struggling with the concept of the game.*
> *Most of my time is spent explaining the rules. This requires continuous starting*
> *and stopping of the game* (Journal, Week 6 Lesson 23)

> *The PA portion of the lesson tanked the TPSR content* (Checklist, Week 6 Lesson
> 23).

Insufficiently planned PA content or misaligned content was not a daily occurrence, yet each

instance was an encumbrance of responsibility-based progression limited by a constrained

timeline.

Learning Curve

Moving from theory to application proved to be challenging. Feeling confident in my ability to outline a quality lesson focused on psychomotor skill content was my comfort zone. Meshing said content with responsibility-based education, that took practice, and is still a work in progress. Planning to practice can produce very different outcomes, resulting in over-planned lessons, not meeting lesson objectives, or the lesson simply falling flat. This was overt in a journal entry: *Lessons seem so well planned, but don't work out as planned. I am always expecting students to have this profound connection to the content being delivered, yet instead, I am met with blank stares*. (Journal, Week 2 Lesson 8). In some cases, this was a result of vague content or more generally, a poorly planned TPSR lesson that left students unengaged and unable to connect the PA content with TPSR content. This resulted in stress when planning lessons:

> *Planning has become a more time-consuming endeavor than I intended. I feel as though I am so focused on planning the perfect lesson to target Level one, I am adding stress to the process and reducing the enjoyment of the learning experience*. (Journal, Week 1 Lesson 3)

Categorizing a poorly planned lesson was the consequence of the lesson not matching the intended outcome. On paper, more often than not, I felt confident about the lesson plan moving towards practice; yet, when applied the plan did not translate well to practice. Indicators of a poorly planned lesson included multiple unplanned activity breaks to reintroduce activity rules, overly descriptive introductions and awareness talks, or poorly developed group discussions and reflective prompts resulting in student disconnect from the content and their behaviors during the lesson. In other words, a poorly planned lesson could only be identified when applied in the physical education setting.

Through reflection, trial and error, a shift began to take place that resulted in improved planning. The progression of improved planning was evident in journal entries and weekly

reflection data: *Planning is becoming easier* (Journal, Week 8 Lesson 17); and *This was accomplished through well-planned lessons* (TARE, Week 6). The AR process is attributed to the developments in lesson planning. Specifically, post lesson journaling facilitated reflection, and prompted me to revisit the lessons taught, and plan future lessons based on my observations and what I learned of past lessons. I was able to recognize the flaws from previous lessons, most notably, the PA portion of the lesson.

Delivery

As a veteran teacher, I have developed a class routine and lesson rhythm I am comfortable with and feel confident that the structure of each lesson fosters an engaging learning environment for all students. It is fair to note, my veteran teacher status is through my collective experience as a physical educator. I am still coming into my own as a lower elementary physical educator. This metamorphosis is taking place alongside a pedagogical shift, resulting in the regularity of inconsistent lesson delivery. Each success and failure provided a learning opportunity for me, as I engaged with responsibility-based programming in the lower elementary physical education setting. Having experience as a physical educator did not spare me from the stress of delivering new content or planning a lesson that did not come to fruition. Delivering TPSR by following the daily format outlined by Hellison (2011) helped frame the lesson through planning yet did not always mesh with my learned teaching behaviors, established daily structure, or constraints of my teaching schedule.

Daily Format

Embedding TPSR concepts into an established and defined daily schedule was not always successful or yield the desired result. The delivery of daily format segments was challenged by several factors leading some planned lesson aspects to fall short and ultimately be omitted from

delivery. For example, establishing the awareness talk was the first major change to lesson delivery. Finding a way to blend the awareness talk with skill introduction for the K-1 learners took considerable effort and became more feasible overtime. The awareness talk was initially time-consuming, leaving little time to introduce the skill content. In an early journal entry, I stated: *As the lesson progressed, I found myself drawing too much detail/depth to the awareness talk* (Journal, Week 1 Lesson 1).

As a result, the awareness talk reduced time otherwise allocated to other aspects of the established daily format. The PA portion was initially the area of the lesson that suffered the most and the group meeting and reflection time had to contend with skill closure. With a 25-minute lesson period for K-1 learners every minute counts. This was described in my reflection early in the unit: *Being firm on presenting each lesson under the guidance of the TPSR daily format is still a struggle, and I don't see it getting any easier. I struggle some days to get only activity-based content covered.* (Journal, Week 2 Lesson 8). At the onset of the unit, the TPSR daily format was disruptive to established teaching practices, but subsided as I became more comfortable with the delivery strategies and made adjustments to my daily routines accordingly.

Obstacle for Delivery

Many of the obstacles for delivery were rooted in my inexperience as a TPSR leader and lower elementary physical education teacher. The duality of learning a new developmental level of children and a new instructional model was perceived to limit the quality of content delivery. Specifically, the developmental readiness of the students, time management, left the instructional time to feel rushed in many instances.

Evidence of these challenges became apparent when the main messaging within an awareness talk was unclear students were unable to relate in-lesson behaviors to the group

53

meeting or reflection time periods. For example: *Using both forms or talking about both forms of self-control left students slightly confused when asked to reflect or contribute to the group meeting at the end of the lesson.* (Journal, Week 1 Lesson 2). There were times that instructional prompts planned for the group meeting did not align with the readiness of the students. When this occurred, students became were disengaged or seemed unwilling to share. This challenge persisted throughout the unit and reflected again later in journal entries:

> *During the group discussion of lesson 7 of the day, I realized I made a mistake in the way I approached the meeting. Asking students about whether they were honest during the game was not the right approach. I notice some students immediately looked ashamed or embarrassed. The point was not to shame the students, but instead to have students think about their behavior during the lesson and how it might have affected others.* (Journal, Week 6 Lesson 23)

As a novice TPSR leader, my ability to anticipate these challenges was limited, and even more so challenged to know how to recognize problems during lesson delivery and adjust accordingly. While my intentions were in the right place, I was unable to fully think through possible adjustments to awareness talk prompts that may better relate to the learners. Given this limitation, there was a sense of inconsistency and displeasure in how lessons were being delivered.

Time management was another obstacle to lesson delivery. Although I was aware this could be an issue prior to implementation, the addition of the new instructional model made it glaringly obvious. What specifically stood out, was the length of time spent introducing the lesson. During lesson one, I made note of myself sharing too many details during the awareness talk. Naturally, the increased time spent in awareness talk limited available time for PA and the group meeting.   The misallocation of time resulted in rushed delivery during other portions of the lesson, with a primary focus on maintaining model fidelity and deliver the planned lesson.

Across the unit, there was the on-going challenge in determining when it was appropriate to keep and pull back on responsibility-based content. There were times throughout the teaching cycle, I found myself forcing responsibility-based content because it was planned, rather than what was best for the learners or the situation: *Feeling like I had to make TPSR, and the new game together, brought me back to feeling like I was forcing the lesson. It was not a natural flow, and I did not feel comfortable during the lesson* (Journal, Week 6 Lesson 23). It became evident that learning was lost when students were unengaged or not able to connect with the content. At other points of the intervention, the student's inability to focus became an impediment to learning the responsibility-based content. The very short and finicky attention spans of children ages 5-6 years old proved to be a challenge. After lesson nine, I wrote: *Students know when the activity is over, so keeping their attention is a challenge. Students are not interested in talking about anything knowing that their teacher is about to arrive and no more activity.* (Journal, Week 2 Lesson 9).

In addition to the developmental level of the children, the timing within the school year when the new TPSR daily format was introduced may have contributed to some of the delivery challenges. The K-12 students had become familiar with the typical classroom routine and knew when an activity was over there was a quick skill closure before dismissal. However, with the addition of TPSR, a group meeting and reflection time the change in classroom procedures that the students were not prepared for. This left them unengaged and disinterested during these segments of the daily format.

Improved Delivery

In-lesson modifications were continually needed to ensure the students were provided the most meaningful learning experiences throughout the physical education lessons. An example of

an in-lesson modification to enhance the student experience was described in a lesson journal

entry:

> *I had to make some changes. I added a tag game at the beginning of class. The
> game was simple if students were tagged, they stepped out of the playing area,
> and performed a movement or exercise of their choice. Additionally, they could
> do as many as they wanted. This was intended to add student choice while
> encouraging them to take responsibility for their effort.* (Journal, Week 2 Lesson
> 10)

Throughout, lessons were modified to enhance student experiences, which in some respects was

attributed to the instincts and learned abilities of the veteran teacher. As lessons progressed and if

determined to be not going well, I tried to find a way to salvage the lesson. Changes in the

lesson sometimes resulted in shifting the TPSR content focus or in one instance, the

responsibility focus was changed altogether.

As I became more experienced as a TPSR program leader, the lesson delivery also

improved and reflected a more developmentally appropriate approach. This approach embraced

in part from advice provided from my critical friend, Sandy Hagenbach. After speaking with

Sandy and expressing certain concerns and challenges related to delivery, I noted a change to my

approach:

> *After speaking to Sandy yesterday, I went ahead and basically started over. I was
> lost on terminology/vocabulary. Students weren't connecting to the content.
> Rather than beating my own path, I opted to use Sandy's book as a guide. So far,
> so good.* (Journal, Week 3 Lesson 11)

While the sense of starting over felt less than ideal, and never did the delivery completely

evolve to a refined practice, it became more natural. Overtime, I learned to modify Sandy's

practices to better match my own teaching style, rather than the attempts made prior, which were

to create new lessons and prompts on my own. Perfect lesson plans do not exist, yet having the

tools and resources necessary to improving planning and ultimately lesson delivery is the key to

future program success. Though better equipped to plan and deliver TPSR, challenges were certain to arise leaving lessons lost and merely a shell of their existence on paper.

Challenge

For change to take place, action must be taken. By taking steps towards change, challenges followed. This is a natural progression, and I was prepared before embarking on pedagogical change. Several challenges were anticipated based on the reviewed literature, my experience with the student population, and the learning environment. Recognizing the potential for a challenge is one thing, experiencing the challenges, and finding a way to adapt is another. Some days tested my limits as a physical educator and TPSR leader. As time progressed, I became more resilient when challenges arose, which often meant modifying or prioritizing PA. Many times, this was a difficult choice. I wanted to promote responsibility-based content while striving to be a model program leader, yet the engrained mindset of promoting PA reigned supreme.

Time

Time constraints were evident throughout the entirety of the six-week cycle. There never seemed to be enough time within each lesson to meet the established learning objectives, especially the newly added responsibility-based outcomes. In attempt to stay true to the instructional model, I worked to incorporate relational-time into the 25-minute K-1 physical education in lesson. However, that proved unsuccessful. This was reflected in post-teaching reflections: *Relational time was a flop. I didn't even have time to connect a five or knuckles with every student today* (Journal, Week 1 Lesson 3).

Recognizing the value of relational time, it was an element that needed to be retained, however, I could not justify it within the context of the physical education lesson. Therefore,

relational time was moved outside the physical education setting. Starting at lesson five, I began implementing relational time during lunch, recess, morning car drop-off, and morning supervision. Shifting the relational time outside of the gym setting was far more valuable than what had been occurring within the gymnasium, and therefore perceived as a success: *Going to the cafeteria to touch base with students was much easier and more meaningful in terms of relational time. Relational time seems forced and unnatural at times in the PE setting.* (Journal, Week 2 Lesson 5).

Several benefits were observed from this adjustment. The main and most notable area this seemed to impact was providing more time for PA within the scheduled 25-minute lesson. However, it is important to note that connecting with students beyond the physical education lesson with intentional prompts related to responsibility, did prove to be difficult to sustain over time. Relational time seemed to really connect with students outside of the gym, but the time commitment was burdensome. This was chronicled in my journal entry:

> *Relational time during recess and lunch might need to be scaled back. It has taken a lot of my time. It is hard to think about changing because the students seem so happy when I'm there. Particularly recess. I'm down to 15min for lunch today.* (Journal, Week 3 Lesson 11)

Even with moving relational time outside of the physical education setting, there was rarely enough time during the 25-minute lesson to accomplish all aspects of the planned daily format. This challenge persisted throughout the intervention. From a journal entry following lesson 16, I stated: *Even though the lesson flowed better today, fitting all that content through formatting is a challenge* (Journal, Week 4 Lesson 16). Before implementing TPSR, I found it difficult to manage my time effectively within the short 25-minute lesson blocks. This became even more difficult with the addition of TPSR. I found myself continually negotiating time and tasks with prioritized content and learning outcomes.

Balancing TPSR and Physical Activity

At the onset of the instructional unit, it was evident that PA took a backseat to TPSR. While this is not necessarily a novel challenge in relation to teaching new procedures or protocols, akin to the start of a school year, balancing the two often seemed impossible when faced with time constraints. The first eight lessons diminished the time students engaged in PA in a considerable manner. This sentiment was established early in the unit, as clearly stated in a journal entry three: *Students are not receiving the planned amount of activity time. Too much time focusing on awareness talks and group meetings*. (Journal, Week 1 Lesson 3). Thereafter, I made the choice to prioritize PA, when necessary, as noted here:

> *Even though I am in the middle of a research project, I felt like the responsibility content was not landing today. Activity time was being lost and students were more eager to participate in the game. I made the decision to quickly cover effort when trying something new (i.e., balloon with paddle, scooters). The group meeting was reduced to highlighting the importance of trying new tasks while challenging ourselves. Reflection was completed in line on the way out the door.* (Journal, Week 3 Lesson 11)

I constantly found myself negotiating the right balance of responsibility-based content and PA within the K-1 physical education setting. At its core, my training as a physical educator, understanding of the school context, and professional orientations toward movement education, I found it extremely challenging (even when intent on integrating responsibility-based content) to break away prioritizing PA as the dominate content for each lesson. When I sensed the students were sedentary for too long because of the TPSR elements, I would find myself torn and would choose activity over responsibility-based content. This is not to indicate TPSR was abandoned altogether but rather modified to accommodate more movement and PA within the lesson. More often than not there was a balanced existence of both responsibility-based content and PA.

Developmental Readiness of the Student Population

Prior to the introduction of TPSR, students were merely tasked with recalling psychomotor skill cues and the occasional reflection of the skill process in practice. The addition of more inward thinking to relate their behaviors and actions was a foreign and often complex process many students were not developmentally prepared for throughout the TPSR intervention. The concept of respect, cooperation, and effort eluded many students throughout the six-week teaching cycle. Most of the difficulties can be traced back to the students' inability to relate to the awareness talk, and/or the inability to reflect. Students consistently lacked the ability to appropriately reflect on their behaviors and experience during the lesson, as noted during lesson three: *Students are struggling with accurate self-reflection. The students who I would classify as doing a great job showing respect rate themselves the lowest, and students on the opposite end (off-task), rate themselves the highest* (Journal, Week 1 Lesson 3).

In some cases, this could be attributed to poorly planned reflective prompts or instructional strategies that were not developmentally appropriate or relatable to children of this age. Perhaps most often related to student cognitive abilities and developmental readiness to acknowledge self-responsibility and further be able to articulate this to others in a group setting. As a result, nearly all group meetings were anchored by me, leaving very little student input and ultimately impacting student reflection. This was specifically identified here:

> *Group meetings tend to focus on me talking, not a group discussion or even a group response to prompts. Sometimes students reply "yes" to a question before I have finished. This indicates they don't understand or are not following what I am talking about.* (Journal, Week 2 Lesson 8)

When the students were not able to grasp a responsibility concept during the awareness talk, they were unable to establish a responsibility concept connection to the PA which resulted

in minimal group discussion. Regrettably, this created a void of meaningful insight for both the teacher and students during the reflection session.

Teacher Mental/Emotional State

The complexities associated with planning and delivering a new instructional model are substantive. The process was overwhelming at times leaving me feeling lost, frustrated, and like a novice teacher once again. Implementing change can be difficult and the stressors associated with instructional changes were significant throughout this process. Developing detailed lesson plans that seemed to fail in practice, generated stress and fatigue. After 13 years of teaching physical education, I did not anticipate that the addition of an instructional model would be as much of a challenge. Instead, I was back to planning lessons like an undergraduate student, hoping my plan would translate as I had envisioned. I described these feelings of inadequacy during lesson 15:

> *I want to be able to compare it to teaching my first lesson during field experience or a methods class, but it is far more frustrating. I didn't know what I was doing during those lessons. Now I am a veteran teacher, and I am struggling greatly with new strategies and content.* (Journal, Week 3 Lesson 15)

I felt scattered during lesson delivery, self-conscious in my approach, and found myself tense and stressed while delivering each lesson. These were unusual and unwelcome feelings of despair. My fluctuating emotional state occasionally showed in my professional demeanor. I found myself with limited patience – with myself and perhaps my students - it was becoming visible to my students: *I have lost my patience a few times today. I have to keep reminding myself that the students are new to this, and I made some big changes yesterday. It's going to take time.* (Journal, Week 2 Lesson 12). Although there had been some anticipated growing that would occur as a function of implementing the TPSR unit, the level of stress and emotional dysregulation that occurred was surprising. Thankfully, I was able to recognize these issues and

acknowledge that change takes time for my students and equally as important, for myself as a TPSR program leader.

Learning Environment

When attempting to deliver new instructional materials to kindergarten and first-grade students, a stable and consistent learning environment is crucial. Throughout the unit there were unforeseen challenges with the instructional space and learning environment. The unexpected environmental disruptions student behavior and responsiveness to the instruction and learning experience: *Part of me wonders if the gym lights being half on disrupts students' level of intensity. Every time I have the gym half-lit when using the projector, effort/intensity seems too low.* (Journal, Week 2 Lesson10). There were other environmental changes were that were substantial and caused greater disruption to the flow of the lesson, and potentially student learning outcomes. An excerpt from lesson 13 illustrates this well:

> *If it weren't for research purposes, I would have probably held off on the TPSR daily formatting for the next two days. There are lots of changes going on and students are struggling to stay focused in the environment. We have a new space, a holiday break approaching, and a high school/community blood drive taking place in the hallway outside of our gym. Distractions galore.* (Journal, Week 3 Lesson 13)

While a stable learning environment was not a factor I had considered when planning for this study, based on this this experience it proved to be a critical factor in implementation. When unfamiliar or distracting, the learning environment can negatively impact student learning.

Change

Ultimately, the challenges and adversity I faced throughout this learning process produced greater a more confident TPSR program leader and more effective lower elementary

physical education teacher. This was evident when considering the emotional changes

documented throughout the AR process. As I became more comfortable and confident the

students evolved in step. Change takes time and patience. Possibly the most important

ingredient for change is consistency.

Teacher Emotional Shift

Though gradual, a positive emotional shift was observed at the onset of TPSR

implementation, I felt a lack of confidence which diminished the joy in teaching new content.

Each lesson seemed to break down in some capacity, leaving me frustrated and doubting my

approach. My lack of enthusiasm was on full display at the end of the first teaching cycle: *I*

would like to think I am closing my first teaching cycle on a high note, but I do not feel that way

today. I'm ready for a break to gather my thoughts and re-strategize (Journal, Week 3 Lesson

14). This eventually gave way to a more positive outlook. I made an attempt to positively

embrace the challenges associated with change. Eventually giving way to positive journaling:

> *It's one of those days, I don't know if I am happy with the way the lesson is going*
> *because the students are enjoying the game, or the TPSR aspect of the lesson*
> *seems to be going well. It could be both.* (Journal, Week 5 Lesson 25)

There was a sense of relief as I approached the end of the six-week intervention. Relief

was also matched with a feeling of accomplishment. I persevered and attempted to make a major

change in my physical education program. I challenged myself and my students to think beyond

physical activity. Ultimately, I concluded the six-week intervention feeling positive about my

attempt to implement TPSR in K-1 physical education.

Observed Student Change

Time and practice nurtured the improvements associated with student contributions to the

group meeting. The student growth process took time, but students eventually began to share

more meaningful feedback and perceptions during group meetings. Students began to contribute

more to the conversation during the awareness talk and group meetings. Lesson reflection

demonstrated this student level change:

> *Today's group meetings were productive. By highlighting specific examples of how to show respect, students were able to share their experiences during the group meeting. In some cases, they shared their own experience, observations, or things I didn't think to highlight* (Journal, Week 4 Lesson 18)

It was near this point, I observed slightly improved student reflection, and increased application

of TPSR content during the lessons. Student reflection evolved from, inaccurate interpretations

of one's behavior, to a more honest approach to reflection: *Reflections are honest. Particularly*

when considering their following of rules and safe play. (Journal, Week 5 Lesson 24). A product

of improved self-awareness was students learning to apply responsibility-based content in-

program. Students began to help other students and utilize terminology developed during

previous TPSR lessons. Students were observed addressing their classmate's behavior during

lesson nineteen, which was identified in the implementation checklist reflection: *The classes*

overall showed a shift in taking responsibility for their behavior and stepping up to address the

class's behavior by pointing out respect. (Checklist, Lesson 19). By the end of the intervention,

changes to designated student behaviors were becoming evident. Though faint during the final

teaching cycle, student growth was emerging.

Evolution as TPSR Leader

By the end of the six-week teaching cycle, I became more comfortable with the model,

allowing me to more effectively deliver lessons to address the needs of my student population.

Can I confidently state a complete evolution as a TPSR program leader, no? Instead, I would

classify myself as a work in progress. A journal entry nearly sums up my growth as a TPSR

program leader:

I am learning to gauge my audience better. I know when I can push or extend an awareness talk, or when to extend a group meeting. Initially, I would push these meetings/conversations because I had a plan, and I would lose my audience which left me frustrated. (Journal, Week 4 Lesson 20)

Recognizing content saturation made the lesson experience more enjoyable for the students and myself. I was no longer presenting lessons within a rigid format. Lessons needed to evolve with the students I was teaching. I began to recognize and embrace the fact that lesson components fail at one time or another. Having the awareness to recognize this took time, but once I did, it contributed to the progress in my confidence and comfort as a TPSR program leader.

Plan for the Future

Timing is everything. While preparing for this research, I was aware of the potential for implementation difficulties due to introducing TPSR late in the first semester of the school year. Quite frankly, the timing of the model introduction could not have been worse. Along with making changes to the established daily lesson structure, my students and I had to contend with Thanksgiving break and the lead-up to Winter break. The shortfalls of TPSR implementation fell on my inexperience as a lower elementary physical education teacher. Students were not well prepared in advance, contributing to feelings of confusion as to why things were changing. To ensure future success when implementing TPSR, I need to consider the following, (1) introduce TPSR on day one of the school year, (2) utilize visual aids, (3) establish age-appropriate vocabulary, and (4) using the TPSR model to address the needs of my students.

Strategies for Successful TPSR Implementation

Timing is everything, introducing new vocabulary and concepts to K-1 students was a daunting task on its own. The change becomes more difficult when daily routines are disrupted. As detailed previously, the TPSR daily format was disruptive to the established classroom

procedures and routines. Students ages 5 and 6 years old were being asked to think more

critically about their behavior within new instructions and methods of content delivery. I believe

this left some students asking why, as I perceived early in the unit:

> *Although I have explained why we are learning about personal and social*
> *responsibility, many students appear to be lost or concerned as to why we are*
> *learning about these things. To some degree, it appears as though some students*
> *are checked out as soon as I start talking.* (Journal, Week 1 Lesson 3)

As lead teacher, I perceive that much of the fault rests on my shoulders. I should have better

prepared the students for the changes. That said, I cannot help but wonder if the introduction of

TPSR would have been more seamless if the model would have been introduced on day one of

the school year. I stated this following lesson six: *I really think introducing TPSR first thing this*

year would have greatly improved the success of implementation. (Journal, Week 2 Lesson 6).

The daily format and responsibility-based concepts are essential to be a part of what we do,

meaning it is a more natural component of the physical education program. Future TPSR

implementation must be considered from day one. The identity of the physical education

program needs to dually embrace physical education in combination with TPSR.

When preparing for the future, I need to plan like an elementary physical education

teacher. The presentation of lesson materials must be done in a way that utilizes age-appropriate

strategies to better support student learning outcomes. I started with the mindset, that I was

going to mesh TPSR content with my established unit plans. Along with this, I planned to utilize

established TPSR terminology I had learned through research and planning. As I learned, this

turned out to be a mistake. I found myself using vocabulary the students were unfamiliar with,

which may have contributed with students being disconnected from the TPSR lesson content.

Lesson one was my awakening. At the midpoint of my day during lesson one, I became aware of

a major flaw in my approach to terminology, as noted in the journal from this lesson:

> *I may be using vocabulary beyond my students' mental capacity. In this lesson, I asked students to be aware of how their behavior affected others in the class, and this prompted a student to ask what does affect mean? This may explain some of the disconnect during group meetings and reflection time.* (Journal, Week 1 Lesson 1)

This spawned me to rethink my approach to developmentally appropriate vocabulary. The students cannot relate or respond to something they do not understand. I tried to make changes on my own but kept falling short. Reaching out to my critical friend Sandy Hagenbach helped guide changes in my approach. I basically started over at the end of week two. After speaking with Sandy, I began using her book to inform more developmentally appropriate vocabulary in my program. The change was difficult and initially unnatural but became easier over time. The changes in vocabulary needed to introduce responsibility-based content made me realize gaps in my teaching approach prior to implementing TPSR. In general, I see how describing skills and concepts in my physical education program can be improved to better match my students' cognitive abilities and learning readiness.

My inexperience as an elementary physical education teacher was a factor when identifying faults in content delivery. I made note of this during lesson eight:

> *I think I am falling into the same strategies as I used when I started teaching K-1 PE. I was so used to teaching middle school students, I don't know how to effectively communicate new concepts or challenging concepts with young learners. I need to consider using more illustrations, pictures, and videos to relate information to students.* (Journal, Week 2 Lesson 8)

One example of an underutilized instructional strategy was the use of visual aids to support the lesson content. The wall space in my gym is sparingly covered and upon reflection, in future TPSR implementation, I would consider using signage to remind students of the levels of TPSR. Visual aids could include the levels with examples of how the each can be applied in-program

67

and outside of the program. The posters will serve as a reminder for students, and hopefully, the visual support will help reinforce the concepts.

Molding TPSR to Meet the Needs of My Students

Across the unit implementation I began to see that following a rigid format for K-1 learners is not suitable for a large number of students, especially those with a diverse set of needs. However, the TPSR model can be used to addresses the needs of my students.   I found that although one group of students may struggle with the concept of self-control (i.e., respect, Level I), another class on the same day can struggle with effort (i.e., Level II). Meaning, if I planned to address Level I during the span of a day (i.e., 12 lessons), the content may not be meaningful to all groups. I made note of this concern during lesson reflection:

> *The situations that arise during each class are often unique and do not always fit the awareness talk. I understand this does not mean we can't discuss these things during the group meeting, but the situations that arise in class are more likely to be meaningful, as opposed to hypothetical situations to relate to the awareness talk.* (Journal, Week 3 Lesson 14)

The situational differences and needs across classes made it very difficult to connect student behavior with the daily responsibility focus. Yet, finding ways to tailor lessons to the needs of students is exponentially more meaningful. Although this aligns with my beliefs philosophically, there is considerable challenge in translating this into reality. To plan twelve different TPSR lessons to meet the need of each class I see daily is not realistic. This is an area that was not resolved or reconciled across the six-week unit and an area of needed continued growth.

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

The results reported in this study are based on data collected during a six-week intervention that focused on implementing TPSR in a K-1 physical education setting. The study was centered on an elementary physical education teacher's journey towards pedagogical change. Action research served as the framework for self-inquiry, allowing the teacher to self-identify strengths and weaknesses regarding instructional practices (McNiff, n.d.) associated with the implementation of TPSR. Selecting TPSR as the MBP of choice was based on the teacher recognition of inadequacies when addressing the affective domain over the previous year's instructional units. The TPSR instructional model can help bridge responsibility-based content through an activity-based environment (Hellison, 2011). The six-week (26 lessons) intervention was presented in two teaching cycles, each consisting of three weeks. Following the four-step approach described by Keegan (2019), the teacher was able to (1) plan, (2) act, (3) observe, and (4) reflect. The results from the study were derived through this four-step approach to AR. The purpose of the study is to (1) identify teaching strategies planned and implemented in-program by the teacher and (2) recognize changes associated with the planning of themes and strategies.

Action research is a messy process characterized by a rigorous time commitment, not to mention the additional workload (Casey & Dyson, 2009; Keegan 2016, 2019). The resulting outcomes from AR are not always clear and sometimes do not produce the desired change (Casey, 2013). My experience was no different. I had high ambitions for the success of TPSR implementation but was often met with the reality of trying something new. That is, change is difficult. Particularly when exploring a relatively uncharted area of research. Scholars and practitioners alike have offered little to no literature focusing on TPSR within an elementary-age

population (Pozo et al., 2018; Richards et al., 2019). Recognizing the body of literature centered

on TPSR in an elementary-based setting is sparse, adds value to the results of this study. Not

only do the results of the study contribute to the support of AR as a viable form of CPD, but the

interpretation of a teacher's experience implementing TPSR in an elementary-based setting can

serve as a guide for others attempting pedagogical change guided by responsibility-based

education.

The daily task of lesson planning cannot be overlooked. The planning process is often

time-consuming when implementing pedagogical change (Casey & Dyson, 2009; Keegan, 2016;

Lee, 2012). Stress associated with the planning was exacerbated when a "well-planned" lesson

failed in practice. The resulting feelings of self-doubt and frustration persisted. Initially, a sense

of trepidation followed me into each lesson. I was not sure what to expect. Would the lesson

produce the intended outcomes, or would the lesson fall flat, meaning, back to the drawing

board? Planning each lesson requires a high level of teacher content knowledge, but also the

experience to take the plan to practice. My inexperience as a lower elementary physical

education teacher was on full display during AR. I was attempting to plan lessons that engaged

students in new psychomotor skill content while introducing new content in the form of

responsibility-based education. The melding of the two was sometimes a potent mix for failure.

Combining unfamiliar content has the potential to produce more noticeable dysfunction when

applied in practice (Casey & Dyson, 2009). I found myself scaling back activities in the

planning phase to better accommodate TPSR content and the daily format. Planning improved

over time, yet always remained a burdensome task at the end of each day. The planning process

was more formal during AR, taking me back to undergraduate methods coursework. Finding a

way to structure planning with a more time-conscious approach will likely lend itself to a more

enjoyable experience. Change is a product of time when applying a new approach to teaching

(Casey, 2013). I need to consider my early years of teaching and the time it took to develop

quality and meaningful lessons each week. The planning process as a novice physical educator

eventually became more fluid, leaving the task of planning as less of a chore and more of a

routine. This way of thinking will serve me well when planning TPSR-based lessons in the

future. Keegan (2016) echoed a similar sentiment, suggesting, as the skills develop the process

of planning and implementing a new pedagogical approach will become more efficient and less

laborious.

Shifting philosophical perspectives are often the catalyst for pedagogical change.

Through an inventory of perceived "goods" of physical education (Lund & Tannehill, 2015) and

reflection of past and current practices, I was able to identify the needs of my physical education

program. My value orientation was not necessarily matching instructional practices and as a

result, the desired learning outcomes centered on affective competencies, more specifically,

personal and social responsibility. To support a pedagogical shift and student learning outcomes,

a MBP is necessary for providing structure to elicit change (Landi et al., 2016). A self-described

need for change required an alignment of my newfound philosophy with a MBP that addresses

instructional deficiencies impacting desired student learning outcomes (Casey, 2014). The

adoption of TPSR was identified as the MBP that best met the needs of my students and most

closely aligned with my philosophical shift. The TPSR model provides structure to

responsibility-based content integration in an activity-based setting through daily formatting (1)

relational time, (2) an awareness talk, (3) PA, (4) a group meeting, and (5) student reflection

(Hellison, 2011). The TPSR daily format is well established in practice, yet some aspects of the

typical TPSR format may not easily translate when applied in a traditional physical education

setting (Hellison, 2011). The TPSR daily format can be disruptive to the pre-established classroom routines, suggesting structural adherence may need to be reconsidered when attempting to minimize interference with established lesson delivery (Lee & Choi, 2015).

Time constraints plagued instructional delivery throughout the TPSR implementation process. Initially, I felt bound to the TPSR daily format, resulting in teacher stress, and inadequately delivered responsibility-based content, often coupled with lost PA. Rather than utilizing TPSR as a blueprint for delivering personal and social responsibility content (Parker & Hellison, 2001), I was adopting the model as a rigid framework for delivery. The confined approach was not beneficial when considering student learning outcomes, or my growth as a TPSR leader. As time progressed, I became more comfortable delivering responsibility-based content through the TPSR daily format. This was accomplished through more concise instruction as a result of more effectively planned lessons. To ensure success, I had to modify the daily format to better align with my unique setting. Relational time was moved from the gym to other settings within the school environment (Hellison, 2011) while group meetings and reflection time were combined (Lee & Choi, 2015) with skill closure to better manage lesson time, specifically regarding the time student spent engaged in PA. Future TPSR program leaders must consider how to make that model fit their program. The TPSR daily format is merely a guide, organizing each aspect of the daily structure is contingent upon each TPSR program leader acknowledging the uniqueness of their instructional setting.

Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility is anchored by five goals or levels (1) respect, (2) effort and cooperation, (3) self-direction, (4) caring, and (5) transfer of skill knowledge (Hellison, 2011). When implementing TPSR, program leaders must recognize the needs of their students when considering the level of introduction (Jones, 2012) instead of

following a hierarchical approach when attempting to present levels of responsibility (Gordon, 2020). I espoused the need to focus program goals centered on Level I (i.e., respect) and Level II (i.e., effort and cooperation). Program goals were predicated on the notion, students need to build a foundation of responsibility-based skill content before moving toward more challenging goals (Richards et al., 2019). My approach was centered on the idea that students need to first understand what respect is, along with how and why it is important when interacting with others in physical education. The initial prioritization of Level I was intended to better support the introduction of Level II. The implementation was supported by teaching strategies designed to empower students, ultimately shifting responsibility from the teacher to the students (Hellison, 2011). The findings from this study suggest this was unsuccessful due to my inability to relinquish my traditional role consistently and effectively as a physical education teacher.

My resistance to change was due to instructional tendencies developed over 13 years of teaching with a teacher-directed instructional style. This is not unique when implementing a MBP that promotes a shift in roles of teachers and students (Casey & MacPhail, 2018). Previous literature suggests novice TPSR leaders have struggled to transfer responsibility to their class, particularly when years of engrained teaching habits exist (Richards & Gordon, 2017). Throughout TPSR implementation, I was ineffective regarding planning and delivering opportunities for students to take a leadership role. Students were rarely involved in assessment and were never given assigned tasks that fostered a sense of leadership, or ownership of the program. My reservations for shifting responsibility to my students hinged on my belief K-1 students are not developmentally ready to appropriately manage leadership opportunities. This position will likely be argued by others, yet I felt the teacher's central role as the leader of the program, best met the needs of the students I serve. Other teaching strategies implemented were

simply a byproduct of the existing learning environment. Long-standing teaching habits inhibited the shifting of responsibility from the teacher to students. Future implementation must include more intentional teaching strategies to empower students, allowing ownership of the program to be a shared responsibility between teacher and students. To accomplish a shift in responsibility, both the students and I must become more familiar with TPSR in our shared physical education experience.

Challenges implementing TPSR in a K-1 setting were present during most lessons. The primary concern I had when preparing for this study was the impact TPSR implementation would have on the time students spent engaged in PA. With 25-minutes to introduce psychomotor skill content and responsibility-based content, I anticipated the potential for a daily time crunch. This was made a reality in practice. I found myself battling with conflicting objectives, prioritizing PA or TPSR. Concerns regarding reduced PA as a result of TPSR implementation have been reported in previous studies examining novice TPSR leaders' experience implementing TPSR in physical education (Lee, 2012; Richards & Gordon, 2017). The struggle was not isolated to the time student spent engaging in PA, but also, how I was supposed to direct my instruction during the lesson. Psychomotor skill closure was minimized to accommodate the group meeting and reflection. Class instructional breaks became more focused on the responsibility goal for the day, and less about psychomotor skill feedback. When I did make an effort to devote more attention to psychomotor skill content, the responsibility goal suffered. Gray and colleagues (2019) cited similar results when teachers were acclimating to the use of TPSR in physical education.

Eliciting meaningful student feedback and reflection was the next major barrier. Liu and colleagues (2010) noted kindergarten students will likely struggle with the awareness talk, group

meeting, and reflection. The results suggest students lacked self-awareness when asked to reflect on their behavior during the lesson. Student interpretation of their behavior was inaccurate in most instances. The challenges with student reflection could be linked to the prompts I provided, or the reflective practices selected. Hand signaling was the initial mode of reflection, yet was quickly moved past due to students responding based on peer influence. This eventually gave way to an exit check requiring students to touch a sign rating their level of adherence to the daily responsibility focus. The change in reflective strategy improved the authenticity of reflection slightly, but not to the point of my expectations. Future reflective strategies need to better align with student developmental capabilities in order to provide meaningful feedback to the teacher and learners. Additionally, students could have been better informed of the structural changes taking place in-program. I did not prepare students well for the changes I implemented. Students were initially caught off guard by the change, leaving them questioning what we were doing, and why. Jung & Wright (2012) reported similar findings in the secondary school setting. This leads me to believe, implementing TPSR early in the school year, and establishing daily formatting early on, will improve program outcomes.

Factors beyond my control were the most frustrating aspect. The results suggest the learning environment was a detriment to the student learning experience at times. Physical education classrooms are often the setting for schoolwide events which can displace a functional classroom environment. My experience during AR was not unique. My class was relocated to a different space various times throughout the six-week intervention, leaving me to contest with K-1 students experiencing the newness of a foreign learning environment. The unexpected environmental changes can hinder the unit of work (Casey & Dyson, 2009; Hastie & Casey, 2014). When faced with a challenging environmental change, I gave way to old teaching habits

and loosely held together with a TPSR infused lesson. I prioritized my sanity and the enjoyment of the student's learning experience, rather than forcing content that was likely to fall short of meeting lesson expectations. During these instances model fidelity was low, yet the spirit of TPSR still existed while affording students the opportunity to enjoy the experience of physical education.

Student attention issues cannot be understated. Lessons require concise instructional delivery matched with meaningful context. My experience in middle-level education did not suit me well when attempting to introduce responsibility-based education to K-1 learners as a second-year elementary physical educator. Awareness talks were riddled with blank stares and wandering eyes, followed by off-the-wall questions. Students were not engaged. I was talking but the students were not listening. This can be attributed to longwinded delivery, developmentally inappropriate vocabulary, or presenting information in a way that was unrelatable. I was able to identify the flaw in my delivery early on through daily reflection supported by journaling. Furthering support for self-inquiry through AR. Action research facilitates program intervention by allowing the teacher to manage change through planning, evaluating, gathering a fresh perspective, and starting anew (Casey, 2013). Starting out, I was certain I could blaze my own path to change, but I quickly found that not to be the case. I needed help. Teachers do not learn in isolation; they require support and resources to thrive (Bechtel & O'Sullivan, 2007; Gray et al., 2019). Prior to TPSR implementation, I recruited a critical friend to provide guidance and feedback (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2015) during my learning process. My critical friend, Sandy Hagenbach was an integral part of my development as an elementary physical education teacher attempting to implement TPSR. By sharing lesson plans and my experiences, we were able to identify areas for improvement. Most

notably, my lack of age-appropriate terminology. Sandy shared resources to better facilitate responsibility-based content in the K-1 learning environment. Without a critical friend, I am not certain I would have concluded the six-week intervention with a promising vision for future TPSR implementation in the K-1 physical education setting. Results from this study affirm the value of collegial support (Bechtel & O'Sullivan, 2007; Gray et al., 2019; McNiff, n.d.; Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2015).

Conclusion

The results of the study suggest a change in my teaching behaviors was present. I became more confident when planning and presenting responsibility-based content in the K-1 physical education setting. Over time I became more comfortable utilizing modified TPSR terminology to better connect with my students. Change was not always permanent. I would find myself drifting back to past practices not aligned with TPSR (Gray et al., 2019; Richards & Gordon, 2017). My approach to change was not without error, yet the results from this study serve a purpose for myself and others attempting to navigate instructional change. The process of AR is messy and does not always produce a clear outcome or change in pedagogical practice (Casey, 2013). My experience with AR was not unique. I was able to preserve through difficult times because of a perceived value in what I was attempting to accomplish. The willingness to change and adopt a new teaching strategy is recognized as an impactful disposition towards change (Kern et al., 2021). Perseverance through trial and error must be coupled with a willingness to change in order for a shift in pedagogical change to take place (Casey & Dyson, 2009). Was implementing TPSR in K-1 physical education a success, no. This experience was merely a trial for change. The cycle of planning, acting, observing, and reflecting must continue to ensure real and lasting pedagogical change.

REFERENCES

Ang, S. C., & Penney, D. (2013). Promoting social and emotional learning outcomes in physical

   education: Insights from a school-based research project in Singapore. *Asia-Pacific*

   Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education, 4(3), 267-286.

   https://doi.org/10.1080/18377122.2013.836768

Armour, K. M., & Yelling, M. R. (2004). Continuing professional development for experienced

   physical education teacher: Towards effective provision. *Sport, Education and Society,*

   9(1), 94-115. https://doi.org/10.1080/1357332042000175836

Armour, K. M., & Yelling, M. (2007). Effective professional development for physical education

   teachers: The role of informal, collaborative learning. *Journal of Teaching in Physical*

   Education, 26(2), 177-200. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.26.2.177

Balderson, D., & Sharpe T. (2005). The effects of personal accountability and personal

   responsibility instruction on select off-task and positive social behaviors. *Journal of*

   Teaching in Physical Education, 24(1), 66–87. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.24.1.66

Bechtel, P. A., & O'Sullivan, M. (2007). Enhancers and inhibitors of teacher change among

   secondary physical educators. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 26*(3), 221-

   235. http://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.26.3.221

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in*

   Psychology, 3(2), 77-101. http://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brown, T. D. (2011). More than glimpses in the mirror: An argument for self-study in the

   professional learning of physical education teachers. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health,*

   Sport and Physical Education, 2(1), 19-32.

   https://doi.org/10.1080/18377122.2011.9730341

Cardina, C. E., & DeNysschen, C. (2018). Professional development activities and support

among physical education teachers in the United States. *The Physical Educator, 75*(1),

138-157. https://doi.org/10.18666/TPE-2018-V75-I1-7716

Casey, A. (2013). 'Seeing the trees not just the wood': Steps and not just journeys in teacher

action research. *Educational Action Research, 21*(2), 147-163.

https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2013.789704

Casey, A. (2014). Models-based practice: Great white hope or white elephant? *Physical

Education and Sport Pedagogy, 19*(1), 18-34.

https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2012.726977

Casey, A., & Dyson, B. (2009). The implementation of a model-based practice in physical

education through action research. *European Physical Education Review, 15*(2), 175-199.

https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1356336X09345222

Casey, A., & MacPhail, A. (2018). Adopting a models-based approach to teaching physical

education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 23*(3), 294-310.

https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2018.1429588

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2014). *Physical education profiles, 2012: Physical

education and physical activity practices and profiles among secondary schools at select

US sites* [PDF file]. cdc.gov.

https://www.cdc.gov/healthyschools/physicalactivity/pdf/PE_Profile_Book_2014.pdf

Ciotto, C. M., & Gagnon, A. G. (2018). Promoting social and emotional learning in physical

education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 89*(4), 27-33.

https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2018.1430625

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (n.d.). *What is SEL?* CASEL.

https://casel.org/what-is-sel/

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2018). *K-12 learning goals for*

SEL in all 50 states [PDF file]. casel.org. https://casel.org/wp-

content/uploads/2018/03/K-12-Learning-Goals-for-SEL-Feb-2018-V2.pdf

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. (2020). *CASEL's SEL framework:*

What are the core competence areas and where are they promoted [PDF file]. casel.org.

https://casel.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/CASEL-SEL-Framework-11.2020.pdf

DeBusk, M., & Hellison, D. (1989). Implementing a physical education self-responsibility model

for delinquency-prone youth. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 8*(2), 104-112.

https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.8.2.104

Dressel, D.P. (2020). Breaking the ice to build relationships: Using icebreakers to create new

relationships, promote emotional safety, and incorporate social and emotional learning.

Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 91(5), 51-54.

https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2020.1739434

Dyson, B., Howley, D., & Shen, Y. (2021). 'Being a team, working together, and being kind':

Primary students' perspectives of cooperative learning's contribution to their social and

emotional learning. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 26*(2), 137-154.

https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2020.1779683

Ermeling, B. A. (2012). Improving teaching through continuous learning: The inquire process

John Wooden used to become coach of the century. *Quest, 64*(3), 197-208.

http://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2012.693754

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. https://www.ijpsy.com/volumen10/num3/269.html

Escartí, A., Llopis-Goig, R., & Wright, P. M. (2018). Assessing the implementation fidelity of a

    school-based teaching personal and social responsibility program in physical education

    and other subject areas. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 37*(1), 12-23.

    https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2016-0200.

Goh, T. L., & Connolly, M. (2020). Efficacy of school-based SEL programs: Aligning with

    health and physical education standards. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation &*

    Dance, 91(5), 16-19. https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2020.1739430

Gordon, B. (2020). An alternative conceptualization of the teaching personal and social

    responsibility model. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 91*(7), 8-14.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2020.1781719

Gordon, B., & Doyle, S. (2015). Teaching personal and social responsibility and transfer of

    learning: Opportunities and challenges for teachers and coaches. *Journal of Teaching in*

    Physical Education, 34(1), 152-161. http://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2013-0184

Graham, G., Holt/Hale, S. A., & Parker, M. (2009). *Children moving: A reflective approach to*

    teaching physical education (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Gray, S., Wright, P. M., Sievwright, R., & Robertson, S. (2019). Learning to use teaching for

    personal and social responsibility through action research. *Journal of Teaching in*

    Physical Education, 38(4), 347-356. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2018-0190

Hastie, P. A., & Casey, A. (2014). Fidelity in models-based practice research in sport pedagogy: A guide for future investigations. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 33(3), 422-431. http://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2013-0141

Hellison, D. (2011). *Teaching personal and social responsibility through physical activity* (3rd ed.). Human Kinetics.

Hellison, D., & Walsh, D. (2002). Responsibility-based youth programs evaluation: Investigating the investigations. *Quest, 54*(4), 292-307. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2002.10491780

Hellison, D., & Wright, P. (2003). Retention in an urban extended day program: A process-based assessment. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 22*(4), 369-381. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.22.4.369

Hemphill, M. A. (2015). Inhibitors to responsibility-based professional development with in-service teachers. *The Physical Educator, 72*(5), 288-306. https://doi.org/10.18666/TPE-2015-V72-I5-5756

Hemphill, M. A., Templin, T. J., & Wright, P. M. (2013). Implementation and outcomes of responsibility-based continuing professional development protocol in physical education. *Sport, Education and Society, 20*(3), 398-419. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2012.761966

Ivy, V. N., & Jacobs, J. M. (2017). Developing personal and social responsibility: Committing time to reflection. *Strategies: A Journal for Sport and Physical Educators, 30*(5), 45-47. https://doi.org/10.1080/08924562.2017.1345263

Jacobs, J., & Wright, P. (2014). Social and emotional learning policies and physical education. *Strategies: A Journal for Physical and Sport Educators, 27*(6), 42-44. https://doi.org/10.1080/08924562.2014.960292

Jones, R. (2012). Teaching personal and social responsibility through physical activity. *Active &
Healthy Magazine*, *19*(3), 19-22. https://appec.asia/wp-
content/uploads/formidable/11/Beyond-Behaviour-Management-Introducing-TPSR.pdf

Jung, J., & Wright, P. M. (2012). Application of Hellison's responsibility model in South Korea:
A multiple case study of "at-risk" middle school students in physical education. *Agora
for Physical Education and Sport, 14*(2), 140-160.

Keegan, R. (2016). Action research as an agent for enhancing teaching and learning in physical
education: A physical education teacher's perspective. *The Physical Educator, 73*(2),
255-284. http://doi.org/10.18666/TPE-2016-V73-I2-6236

Keegan, R. (2019). Unleashing the powers within: Delving into our own talents to provide
effective CPD. *The Physical Educator, 76*(1), 110-134. https://doi.org/10.18666/TPE-
2019-V76-I1-7718

Kern, B. D., Richards, K. A. R., Graber, K. C., Templin, T. J., & Housner, L. D. (2021).
Towards an integrative model for teacher change in physical education. *Quest, 73*(1), 1-
21. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2020.1835680

Landi, D., Fitzpatrick, K., & McGlashan, H. (2016). Models based practices in physical
education: A sociocritical reflection. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 35*(4),
400-411. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2016-0117

Loughran, J. J. (2004). A history and context of self-study of teaching and teacher education

 practices. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russel (Eds.),

 International Handbook of Self-Study of Teaching and Teacher Education Practices (pp.

 7-39). Springer.

Lee, O. (2012). Teacher candidates' implementation of the personal and social responsibility

 model in field experiences. *The Physical Educator, 69*(2), 150-170.

Lee, O., & Choi, E. (2015) The influence of professional development on teachers'

 implementation of the teaching personal and social responsibility model. *Journal of*

 Teaching in Physical Education, 34(4), 603–625. http://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2013-0223

Lee, O., & Martinek, T. (2012). Factors influencing transfer of responsibility-based physical

 activity program goals into classrooms. *The Physical Educator, 69*(2), 188-207.

Lexico. (n.d.). *Fidelity*. https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/fidelity

Liu, M., Karp, G. G., & Davis, D. (2010). Teaching learning-related social skills in kindergarten

 physical education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 81*(6), 38-44.

 https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2010.10598490

Lund, J., & Tannehill, D. (2015). *Standards-based physical education curriculum development*

 (3rd ed.). Jones & Bartlett Learning.

Martinek, T., Schilling, T., & Johnson, D. (2001). Transferring personal and social responsibility

 of underserved youth to the classroom. *The Urban Review, 33*(1), 29-45.

 https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010332812171

McNiff, J. (n.d.). Action research for professional development: Concise advice for new action

 researchers (3rd ed.) Retrieved July 23, 2021, from https://www.jeanmcniff.com/ar-

 booklet.asp

Melo, M., Santos, F., Wright, P. M., Sá, C., & Saraiva, L. (2020). Strengthening the connection

    between differentiated instruction strategies and teaching personal and social

    responsibility: Challenges, strategies, and future pathways. *Journal of Physical*

    Education, Recreation & Dance, 91(5), 28-36.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2020.1734506

Parker, M., & Hellison, D. (2001). Teaching responsibility in physical education: Standards,

    outcomes, and beyond. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 72*(9), 25-

    27. https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2001.10605863

Parker, M., Patton, K., Iannucci, C., & Mangione, J. (2021). Connecting skill themes and social

    emotional learning in elementary physical education. In P.M. Wright & K. A. R.

    Richards (Eds.), *Teaching Social and Emotional Learning in Physical Education* (pp. 62-

    93). Jones & Bartlett Learning.

Pozo, P., Grao-Cruces, A., & Pérez-Ordás, R. (2018). Teaching personal and social

    responsibility model-based programmes in physical education: A systematic review.

    European Physical Education Review, 24(1), 56-75.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X16664749

Richards, K. A. R., & Gordon, B. (2017). Socialisation and learning to teach using the teaching

    personal and social responsibility approach. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and*

    Physical Education, 8(1), 19-38. https://doi.org/10.1080/18377122.2016.1272424

Richards, K. A. R., Ivy, V. N., Wright, P. M., & Jerris, E. (2019). Combining the skill themes

    approach with teaching personal and social responsibility to teach social and emotional

    learning in elementary physical education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation &*

    Dance, 90(3), 35-44. https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2018.1559665

SHAPE America – Society of Health and Physical Educators. (2014). *National Standards &*
Grade-Level Outcomes for K-12 Physical Education. Human Kinetics.

SHAPE America – Society of Health and Physical Educators. (2015). *The essential components*
of physical education [PDF File]. shapeamerica.org.
https://www.shapeamerica.org/upload/TheEssentialComponentsOfPhysicalEducation.pdf

SHAPE America – Society of Health and Physical Educators. (2016). *2016 Shape of the nation:*
Status of physical education in the USA [PDF file]. shapeamerica.org.
https://convention.shapeamerica.org/uploads/pdfs/son/Shape-of-the-Nation-
2016_web.pdf

Shiver, V. N., Richards, K. A. R., & Hemphill, M. A. (2020). Preservice teachers' learning to
implement culturally relevant physical education with the teaching personal and social
responsibility model. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 25*(3), 303-315.
https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2020.1741537

TPSR Alliance. (n.d.). *Our mission*. TPSR Alliance: Teaching Personal and Social
Responsibility through Physical Activity. https://www.tpsr-alliance.org/mission

Walsh, D. S., Ozaeta, J., & Wright, P. M. (2010). Transference of responsibility model goals to
the school environment: Exploring the impact of coaching a club program. *Physical*
Education and Pedagogy, *15*(1), 15-28. https://doi.org/10.1080/17408980802401252

Wenger-Trayner, B., & Wenger-Trayner, E. (April 15, 2015). *Introduction to communities of*
practice: A brief overview of the concepts and its use. Wenger-Trayner. https://wenger-
trayner.com/introduction-to-communities-of-practice/

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.

    http://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.27.2.138

Wright, P. M., & Craig, M. W. (2011). Tools for assessing responsibility-based education

    (TARE): Instrument development, content validity, and inter-rater reliability.

    Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science, 15(3), 204-219.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/1091367X.2011.590084

Wright, P. M., & Irwin, C. (2018). Using systematic observation to assess teacher effectiveness

    promoting personally and socially responsible behavior in physical education.

    Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science, 22(3), 250-262.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/1091367X.2018.1429445

APPENDIX A: INSTRUMENT IMPLEMENTATION

	Lesson Plan	TPSR Checklist	Field Notes	TARE Post-teaching Reflection
Week 1 **Week 2** **Week 3**	Daily documentation			Once per week as a cumulative reflection of all classes taught.
Week 4	Planning Phase			
Week 5 **Week 6** **Week 7**	Daily documentation			Once per week as a cumulative reflection of all classes taught.

Figure 1: Instrument Implementation

APPENDIX B: LESSON PLAN TEMPLATE

Teacher: **Date:**

Grade(s):   **Number of students:**

Physical activity content: **Lesson #   of**

Level Focus/Awareness Talking Point:

___ 1 Respecting the rights and feelings of others

___ 2 Effort and cooperation

TPSR Strategies for Content Delivery:

Psychomotor/Physical Activity-based Lesson Focus:

Student learning goal(s):

Psychomotor -

Cognitive -

Affective -

Assessment:

Instructional Goal(s):

Daily Format

Relational time:

Awareness talk:

Physical activity:

Group meeting:

Self-reflection:

Equipment Needed:

APPENDIX C: TPSR IMPLEMENTATION CHECKLIST

TPSR Implementation Checklist

Trainee_____   Date _____

Session/sport _____   Observer_____

<table>
<tr><td>

Which of the Levels (goals) was directly addressed in this lesson? (mark all that apply)

_____ Level One (respect)

_____ Level Two (self-motivation)

_____ Level Three (self-direction)

_____ Level Four (caring)

_____ Level Five (transfer)

</td><td>

Which components of the Lesson Format were used in this lesson? (mark all that apply)

_____ Relational time

_____ Awareness talk

_____ Physical activity with responsibility

_____ Group meeting

_____ Reflection time

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

Which of these Teaching Strategies was used in this lesson? (mark all that apply)

_____ Modeling respect

_____ Setting expectations

_____ Providing opportunities for success

_____ Fostering social interaction

_____ Assigning management tasks

_____ Promoting leadership

_____ Giving choices and voices

_____ Involving students in assessment

_____ Addressing transfer of life skills

</td><td>

Which of these Student Behaviors could be seen in this lesson? (mark all that apply)

_____ Participating

_____ Engaging

_____ Showing Respect

_____ Cooperating

_____ Encouraging others

_____ Helping others

_____ Leading

_____ Expressing voice

_____ Asking for help

</td></tr>
</table>

Additional Comments_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX D: TARE POST-TEACHING REFLECTION

Tool for Assessing Responsibility-Based Education (TARE)
Post-Teaching Reflection

Instructor and Program Information:

Instructor Name: Date of Report: Day of Week:

School/Program Name: Setting:

Locale (urban, rural, suburban):   Youth Grade Level / Age:

Activity Content:

Teacher Gender: Teacher Race/Ethnicity:

Reporting period: Single lesson   Several Recent Lessons   Other_____

Student Information:

Approximate Number in Class: Participant Gender(s):

Race/Ethnicity Background(s):

Special Education Included:

Part One: Brief overview of lesson(s)
Provide some information on the context, content, and goals of the lesson(s) being reported.

Part Two: Responsibility-based Teaching Strategies
For the time period being reported, use the scale provided to rate your use of each of the nine responsibility-based teaching strategies below. More explicit definitions for these strategies can be found at the end of this form. After selecting your rating, provide some comments to justify that rating, i.e. give concrete examples of things you did and said that would serve as evidence. In cases where you realize you did not make full use of the strategy, you may want to identify ways that you could have or that you might in future lessons.

Teaching Strategies	4- Extensively	3- Frequently	2- Occasionally	1- Rarely	0- Never	Comments to Justify Rating
Modeling Respect	4	3	2	1	0	
Setting Expectations	4	3	2	1	0	
Opportunities For Success	4	3	2	1	0	
Fostering Social Interaction	4	3	2	1	0	
Assigning Tasks	4	3	2	1	0	

Extensively – Seamlessly addressed directly and evidenced in multiple ways throughout the lesson through the words and actions of the teacher.
Frequently - Addressed directly and evidenced at several points in the lesson through the words and actions of the teacher.
Occasionally – Some of the teachers' words and actions connect to this theme either directly or indirectly during the lesson.
Rarely – This theme is not generally integrated into the teaching but may be reflected in some isolated words or actions on the teacher's part.

Never – Throughout the entire lesson, none of the teacher's words or actions clearly convey or align with this theme.

Part Two, cont.

Teaching Strategies, continued	4- Extensively	3- Frequently	2- Occasionally	1- Rarely	0- Never	Comments to Justify Rating
Leadership	4	3	2	1	0	
Giving Choices and Voices	4	3	2	1	0	
Role in Assessment	4	3	2	1	0	
Transfer	4	3	2	1	0	

Extensively – Seamlessly addressed directly and evidenced in multiple ways throughout the lesson through the words and actions of the teacher.
Frequently - Addressed directly and evidenced at several points in the lesson through the words and actions of the teacher.
Occasionally – Some of the teachers' words and actions connect to this theme either directly or indirectly during the lesson.
Rarely – This theme is not generally integrated into the teaching but may be reflected in some isolated words or actions on the teacher's part.
Never – Throughout the entire lesson, none of the teacher's words or actions clearly convey or align with this theme.

Part Three: Personal-Social Responsibility Themes
For the time period being reported, use the scale provided to assess your overall application of these general themes. After selecting your rating, provide some comments to justify that rating, i.e. give concrete examples of things you did and said that would serve as evidence. In cases where you realize you did not address a theme very strongly, you may want to identify ways that you could have or that you might in future lessons.

	4- Extensively	3- Frequently	2- Occasionally	1- Rarely	0- Never	Comments to Justify Rating
Integration: extent to which responsibility roles and concepts are integrated into the physical activity	4	3	2	1	0	
Transfer: extent to which connections being made to the application of life skills in other settings	4	3	2	1	0	
Empowerment: extent to which the teacher shares responsibility with students	4	3	2	1	0	
Teacher-Student Relationship: extent to which students are treated as individuals deserving respect, choice, and voice	4	3	2	1	0	

Extensively – Theme is seamlessly addressed directly and evidenced in multiple ways throughout the lesson through the words and actions of the teacher.
Frequently - Theme is addressed directly and evidenced at several points in the lesson through the words and actions of the teacher.
Occasionally – Some of the teachers' words and actions connect to this theme either directly or indirectly during the lesson.
Rarely – This theme is not generally integrated into the teaching but may be reflected in some isolated words or actions on the teacher's part.
Never – Throughout the entire lesson, none of the teacher's words or actions clearly convey or align with this theme.

Part Five: Additional Comments or Plans

APPENDIX E: PHASES OF THEMATIC ANALYSIS

Table 1

Phases of Thematic Analysis

Phase	Description of the process
1. Familiarization with the data:	Transcribing data (if necessary), re-reading the date, and recording initial ideas.
2. Generating initial codes:	Coding interesting features of the data and classifying data relevant to each code.
3. Searching for themes:	Organizing codes into potential themes.
4. Reviewing themes:	Checking if the themes work when compared to coded data, creating a thematic map.
5. Defining and naming themes:	Analyze and refine each theme and the overall story of each theme, clearly define each theme.
6. Producing the report:	Final analysis, organize extracts to align with research questions and literature.

Adapted from Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. http://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Table 2
Summarized Results of TPSR Implementation

Themes & *Sub-themes*	Summary of Theme & *Sub-themes*

Planning
  Levels
    Instructional Strategies
  Physical Activity Content
  Learning Curve
	Well-developed lessons required significant time and considerations to create a comprehensive TPSR infused physical education lesson that included TPSR levels, teaching strategies, and PA content. Planning was initially an arduous process, yet subsided with experience.

Delivery
  Daily Format
  Obstacle for Delivery
  Improved Delivery
	Delivering a TPSR framed lesson was at times an unnatural shift with regard to instruction practices and presented difficulties at the onset. Through experience and improved planning, lesson delivery improved over time.

Challenge
  Time
  Balancing TPSR and Physical Activity
  Developmental Readiness of the Student Population
  Teacher Mental/Emotional State
	Pedagogical change was met with a variety of challenges in the instructional setting, often leaving the teacher emotionally drained and conflicted regarding the balance between PA and responsibility-based content.

Change
  Teacher Emotional Shift
  Observed Student Change
  Evolution as TPSR Leader
	Experience (i.e., trial and error) gave way to a more confident and well-prepared TPSR leader. Resulting teacher improvements supported student growth in-program.

Plan for the Future
  Strategies for successful TPSR Implementation
  Molding TPSR to Meet the Needs of My Students
	Concluding the six-week intervention the teacher recognized shortcomings as a novice TPSR leader while noting the need for program customization to accommodate the unique characteristics of his student learning population.

APPENDIX G: TPSR LEVEL DISTRIBUTION

Table 3

TPSR Level Distribution

	Lesson	**Level I** **Respect**	**Level II** **Effort & Cooperation**
Week 1	1	X	
	2	X	
	3	X	
	4		X
	5	X	
Week 2	6		X
	7		X
	8	X	
	9		X
	10		X
Week 3	11	X	
	12	X	
	13	X	
	14	X	
Week 4	15	X	
	16	X	
	17		X
Week 5	18	X	
	19	X	X
	20		X
	21		X
	22		X
Week 6	23	X	
	24	X	
	25		X
	26		X

Table 4

TPSR Teaching Strategies

Week 1				
Lesson 1	**Lesson 2**	**Lesson 3**	**Lesson 4**	**Lesson 5**
Modeling respect, Setting expectations	Modeling respect, Setting expectations, Opportunities for success, Choice and voice	Modeling respect, Setting expectations, Opportunities for success, Fostering social interaction, Choice and voice, Involving students in assessment, Addressing transfer	Opportunities for success, Fostering social interaction, Choice and voice	Modeling respect, Setting expectations, Opportunities for success, Fostering social interaction
Week 2				
Lesson 6	**Lesson 7**	**Lesson 8**	**Lesson 9**	**Lesson10**
Modeling respect, Setting expectations, Opportunities for success, Promoting leadership	Modeling respect, Setting expectations, Fostering social interaction	Modeling respect, Fostering social interaction, Choice and voice	Modeling respect, Setting expectations, Fostering social interaction, Choice and voice	Opportunities for success, Choice and voice
Week 3				
Lesson 11	**Lesson 12**	**Lesson 13**	**Lesson 14**	
Modeling respect, Setting expectations, Fostering social interaction, Choice and voice	Modeling respect, Opportunities for success, Choice and Voice	Modeling respect, Opportunities for success, Promoting leadership, Choice and voice	Modeling Respect, Opportunities for success, Fostering social interaction, Choice and voice	

(Table Continues)

Table 4, Continued

		Week 4		
Lesson 15	**Lesson 16**	**Lesson 17**		
Modeling respect, Setting expectations, Opportunities for success, Choice and voice	Modeling respect, Setting expectations, Opportunities for success, Fostering social interaction, Choice and voice	Modeling Respect, Opportunities for success		
		Week 5		
Lesson 18	**Lesson 19**	**Lesson 20**	**Lesson 21**	**Lesson 22**
Modeling respect, Setting expectations, Opportunities for success, Fostering social interaction, Choice and voice	Modeling respect, Opportunities for success, Choice and voice	Modeling respect, Opportunities for success, Fostering social interaction, Choice and voice	Modeling respect, Opportunities for success, Choice and voice	Modeling respect, Setting expectations, Opportunities for success, Fostering social interaction, Choice and voice
		Week 6		
Lesson 23	**Lesson 24**	**Lesson 25**	**Lesson 26**	
Modeling respect, Setting expectations, Opportunities for success, Choice and voice	Modeling respect, Opportunities for success, Fostering social interaction, Choice and voice	Modeling respect, Setting expectations, Opportunities for success, Fostering social interaction, Choice and voice	Modeling respect, Opportunities for success, Fostering social interaction, Choice and voice	