

## **Collegiate Students' Empirically Experiences and Perception in the Sport Education Model**

**Boung Jin Kang, Ph.D.**

Associate Professor

Department of Education, Psychology, and Health  
123 Vaughan Center, Elizabeth City State University  
1704 Weeksville Rd., Elizabeth City, NC 27909, USA.

### **Abstract**

---

*Generally, the previous SE studies are designed and conducted on secondary level students, PETE program, and pre-service and in-service teachers in PE major. A significant amount of research into Sport Education (SE) and Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) program or Physical Education (PE) major courses has been conducted; however, not much research has been conducted in the collegiate Physical Activity (PA) course. The purpose of this study was to examine the eight-six (29 females and 57 males) PE and Non-PE Major collegiate students' social interaction, empirically experiences and receptivity and how they changed the perception of Sport Education (SE) model (Siedentop, Hastie, & van der Mars, 2004) in collegiate team and individual classes for the academic year. Qualitative data were collected through class observations and interviews to assess students' receptivity and perceptions of the SE model as well as students' attitudes and beliefs about SE.*

*Most students' knowledge of the SE model and both sports skill level significantly improved more in the SE model season class than a previous traditional class format. Every student expressed a variety of experiences of SE in both team and individual classes. (1) All students recognized the benefit of the SE model in both team and individual classes (i.e. actual involvement, leadership, and social interaction). (2) Most students pointed out that implementing the SE model in PA class took too much time at the beginning of the each semester. (3) Level and gender mixed (experienced & non-experienced) classes and team setting supported non-experienced students easy to acquire sports skills and understand knowledge. Despite much positive findings, the students pointed to both positive and native outcomes from the SE model. The increased levels of student participation, student ownership in it, and the students' enjoyment of the unit. Most students complained that the lack of their understanding of the SE model concept increased the implementation time at the beginning of the semester because it was very time consuming to implement due to the organization involved. Nonetheless, the students at both low and high level did see the greater utility of the SE model for skill improvement and decision making opportunities- the shift from an instructor centered to a student centered model of instruction as students took on various roles during the season.*

---

**Key words:** Curriculum Change, Sport Education Model, Students' Empirically Experiences'

### **Introduction**

During the last two decades, policymakers, educators, and researchers have long been interested and involved in curriculum reform and teachers' professional development in the nation's public schools. A significant amount of research into curriculum reform and teachers' professional development has been conducted, however, not much research has been conducted curriculum reform in the physical education field and collegiate students' professional development.

In the area of physical education curriculum reform, there is a need to improve the quality of physical education programs so that they will be developmentally and instructionally appropriate in order to provide quality physical education to students. An opportunity for every student to participate in a quality physical education program, a goal articulated by the National Association for Sport and Physical Education [NASPE] (2006, 2013), is a commendable goal for the profession. Currently, there are a number of curriculum and instructional models in physical education based on different perspectives that can aid teachers in achieving the objective of providing quality physical education to their students. Many physical educators in the United States have a choice about which curriculum and instructional model to use in improving and reforming their schools. One of the curriculum model in the physical education area that could in fact provide an authentic sports experience for students during regular scheduled physical education classes. This curriculum and instructional model is known as Sport Education (Siedentop, 1994; Siedentop, Hastie, van der Mars, 2004).

The basic concept of the Sport education model includes students' role involvement, class participation, and student enjoyment. Siedentop (1982) introduced the Sport Education (SE) model which could be viewed as a subject matter of PE only if this situation were remedied and only if students' experience of sport in the context of physical education were both educationally rich and contextualized within their understanding of contemporary sport culture. SE (Siedentop, 1994; Siedentop, Hastie, & van der Mars, 2004, 2011) is a curriculum and instructional model for physical education that aims to develop pupils as "competent, literate, and enthusiastic sport people" (Siedentop, 1994, p4). Traditionally, the research on the SE model has been conducted in two different ways: small-scale studies and larger-scale studies (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004). The small-scale studies represent the implementation and impact of the SE model in a single school situation such as on a single skill, single class, and single school, or occasionally on several classes or skills mixed together. In practice, the number of studies conducted within a small-scale condition, in addition most current teachers and students implicated under this small-scale situation. A significant amount of research into Sport Education (SE) and Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) program or Physical Education (PE) major courses has been conducted; however, not much research has been conducted in the general Physical Activity (PA) course in the collegiate level.

The purpose of this study was to examine the eight-six (29 females and 57 males) PE and Non-PE Major collegiate students' social interaction, empirically experiences and receptivity and how they changed the perception of Sport Education (SE) model (Siedentop, Hastie, & van der Mars, 2004) in team and individual classes for the academic year.

## **Method**

This study was covered two phases of each semester of quantitative and qualitative data collection (middle of August, 1<sup>st</sup> semester and middle of January, 2<sup>nd</sup> semester; middle of November, 1<sup>st</sup> semester and middle of April, 2<sup>nd</sup> semester) took place in Individual Sport and Team Sport course at the collegiate level. At the middle of August, 1<sup>st</sup> semester and middle of January, 2<sup>nd</sup> semester the researcher contacted the students who enrolled in Individual Sport and Team Sport courses to establish a meeting time during which the curriculum plan and the research project were to be introduced to the participants at each school. Each class students were invited to participate in the project, after which consent forms were distributed. Each student was assigned a code number for identification of his/her survey, observation, and interview data. A total eight-six (29 females and 57 males) students enrolled in Individual Sport and Team Sport course for the whole semester. All students asked to participate one practical peer teaching with Sport Education model for a total 14 weeks of the each semester.

### ***Professional Development Workshops***

During phase one of the study, all the students were participated in two different professional development workshops that introduce both Individual Sport and Team Sport students to curricular models that could be incorporated into their practical peer teaching. The first administered in early September in 1<sup>st</sup> semester and early February in 2<sup>nd</sup> semester focused on the Sport Education Curricular Model (Siedentop, et al., 2004, 2006), while the second was conducted focused on Peer teaching. Both workshops held in Individual Sport and Team Sport over one-day period of class time. After each workshop, the researcher provides workshop material in implementing the models in their both class.

## ***Data Collection Procedures***

### ***Phase 1***

**Interviews:** Individual interviews was conducted at the convenience of both Individual Sport and Team Sport class students. The first interview was focused on the biographical and personal background of the school life as well as their perceptions of their physical education program and the initiation of this professional development curriculum change. Interviews was digitally recorded and then transcribed. Recordings was deleted after the transcription of all of the interviews.

### ***Sport Education Workshop***

Sport Education is a curriculum and instructional model design to motivate student engagement and teach students to take responsibility for their own sports experience while under the guidance of the teacher (Siedentop, 1994, 2006). This specialized Sport Education model is helping both Individual Sport and Team Sport students to understand the curricular implications and instructional implications that affect performance in sports and to apply it to school physical education. The Sport Education workshop allowed students to experience this model through both Individual Sport and Team Sport season follow by a session to assist them in planning delivery of a Sport Education season for their class.

The purpose of the Sport Education workshop was to provide the Individual Sport and Team Sport students who were unfamiliar with Sport Education with training in use of the model and implementation of the model. First, at the beginning of January 2019, students provided with a bound set of printed materials about the benefits and the main features of the model, as well as detail explanations about the Sport Education model and application of this model. The printed materials were taken from the latest revision of the *Complete Guide to Sport Education* (Siedentop et al., 2004) and consisted of several articles and book chapters that describe the Sport Education model in detail (Bennet, & Hastie, 1997; Grant, Sharp, & Siedentop, 1992; Hastie, 1998c; Siedentop, 1994, 1998)

### ***Practitioner Journal***

All students at Individual Sport and Team Sport students was asked to keep a journal of their reactions to the reform initiative during the first phase of the research study. In the journals, all teachers was asked to record their perspectives related to the overall process, what they have learn, what they have experience, what they feel, and what the learning meant to them at that moment and into the future.

### ***Phase 2***

**Interviews:** The students were interviewed to assess their reactions to the Sport Education model introduced to them and their perceptions of their practical peer teaching. The second interview with the students was focused on the influence of peer, other subject, studying conditions, students, the curricular model introduced, student reactions to the model, and general questions related to the students' reactions to the Sport Education process.

### ***Observational Data***

The researcher was conducted classroom observations of the all students at Individual Sport and Team Sport students for the total 12 weeks of the semester. After the students introduced to the curricular models being focused upon (Sport Education), they was observed in the class as they implemented the models through instructional units. Two observations per students was conductd while the students are practical peer teaching their lessons. The observation guide lists elements specific to each model that the researchers should look for and take notes on concerning the students' behavior, class procedure, and instruction.

### ***Trustworthiness:***

Researcher used inductive analysis, and trustworthiness (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) is supported through member checks and triangulation of various data sources. Peer debriefing is another useful technique for establishing credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Periodic peer debriefing ensures that the interview transcripts and observation notes describe the responses accurately.

**Table 1**  
**Data Collection Timeline**

Collect Date	Data	Method (or Tools)
Phase I Middle of January and September	- Demographic information	- Personal Information Sheet
	- Students' interviews	- Formal/ informal interview - Digital audio recording
	- Students' journals	- Open-ended writing journal
Beginning of February	- Sport Education workshop	- Printed materials - Lectures/ Discussions/ Practices
Phase II Middle to end of April and middle to end of November	- Teachers' behavior / class procedure	- Class Observations / field note
	- Students' interviews	- Formal/ informal interview - Digital audio recording
	- Students' journals	- Open-ended writing journal

## Results

Although both PE & non-PE major students received a complete SE curriculum package and demonstrational workshop, non-PE major students were still unable to demonstrate a clear understanding of the model until the second phase of stage.

However, most PE major students stated that the workshop was a big motivation and inspiration for their knowledge. They said that the workshop was really helpful to them in their professional development and that it would help them improve their knowledge of the new curriculum model.

Student A (PE major: male) "...you know, all-inclusive whatever we do, make it work, do what I got to do. I got how the SE model worked and I picked up few good ideas from the workshop on how I'd like to try it in the future and just seeing somebody that's done it and tried it and it works just kind of catches you on fire, where you want to go back and try it with a class."

Both PE & non-PE major students thought that different roles and responsibilities (e.g. team-leader, coach, trainer, or manager.) were good for their participation. They said that SE helps students' work on many skills and become involved in cooperative learning.

Student B (non-PE major: female) "I think it really gets the all students excited, and just how they would cooperatively sit down and talk and try to figure out who can do what and who should we get at this position and just listening to them reason. You know, the focus wasn't so much on the sports, but it was more on I think sportsmanship and doing a good job and having responsibilities."

However, some of students criticized the SE curriculum model because it was very time-consuming as to the organization needed to implement it.

As student C (PE major: female) stated, "The students doing duty team. To me you are getting zero exercise. They are getting knowledge of the game but they are getting zero exercise during that 15 minute block but you know, you know I don't know if that's awful. But it is less exercise there. But also the kids playing three on four are getting more. I don't think volleyball is going to credibly increase our fitness levels."

The SE workshop helped the PE major students expand their knowledge. Active participation and demonstrations during the seasons were the most helpful presentation style, according to both PE and non-PE major students.

Both PE & non-PE major students acknowledged some benefits from SE, such as increased communication and collaboration amongst students, student engagement and after learning the SE model.

Pros/Cons of Sport Education (SE) curriculum.

Most students thought that different roles and responsibilities (e.g. team-leader, coach, trainer, or manager.) were good for students. Students' said that SE helps students work on many skills and become involved in cooperative learning. Most students' said that the only thing that really troubled her was that some of the students that even she had difficulty dealing with expected their coach and players to keep them in line. Students' thought that this was a problem just with the troubled students, who were always difficult to handle, and it was hard to find a way to treat them respectfully.

As one female student (PE major) said, "all students did what was expected of them which I think really lends itself to really helping to build students' self-esteem and to help build their character which is what sport should be all about, and what school should be all about is building their character and helping them to become responsible citizens. And to take responsibility for their group." As to disadvantages with the SE model, she stated, "I think that for some people, it's hard to let go of some of the control. For me, it's not a problem. Yes. I had to do some learning and some readjusting too but I really like the model."

View of Sport Education approach.

All PE major's students mentioned that the new SE curriculum model was easy to apply to their peer teaching class and most students felt that students did learn various real sports skills through this model. However, one male student (PE major) stated that the new SE model wasn't much different from what he had done in the past: "I think it's a lot of what I already do. It's just a lot more organized. It's a lot more structured for the students and I like the leadership that's involved with it. And I have heard some peers; I do the team lead, which is an anti-bullying thing here too and have about 30 students involved with that. And so I hear some of the class mates using some of the same team analogy in getting, you know, we can't act this way. This is what we are supposed to do. The assertiveness training that goes along with that and the team lead students are also teaching these skills in their home rooms."

**Conclusions**

Researcher found that the students at both PE & non-PE major students' implemented the SE model in some hybrid form. The PE major students enthusiastically developed materials and implemented the model in its pure form, while the non-PE major students opted to implement certain elements most suited to team members and importantly, to their own comfort levels.

The data indicated that there were two significant findings about the SE curriculum model on general PA course. The first finding was that every students recognized the positive aspects of the SE model: the pressure the students applied to each other to attend class, the increased levels of student participation, the students' improved social behavior and leadership, and the students' enjoyment of the unit. This finding was supported by Carlson and Hastie (1997), who stated that the SE model changed the way students socialized in class. This finding also agreed with Hastie's (1996) statement that the students became involved not only in player roles but also in instructional and managerial roles, which was not the case in the teacher driven system. This finding indicated that the SE curriculum model accompanied increased students' class participation, leadership, and excitement.

The other finding was the negative aspect of the SE model. Most students complained that the lack of non-PE students initial understanding of the SE model concept increased the implementation time at the beginning of the season.

Both PE & non-PE students indicated that they liked the SE curriculum model and found it useful for their general physical activity course, but the implementation, participation, and practice of the students in the two major students were clearly different. The students in the two majors interpreted and delivered the SE curriculum model in one of two different ways: Full and Cafeteria style approach and Watered-down style approach (Curtner-Smith, Hastie, and Kinchin, 2008).

## References

1. Curtner-Smith, M. D., Hastie, P. A., & Kinchin, G. D. (2008). Influence of occupational socialization on beginning teachers' interpretation and delivery of sport education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 13(1), 97-117.
2. Deal, T. E. (1990). Reframing reform. *Education Leadership*, 47(8), 6-12.
3. Fullan, M. G. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
4. Fullan, M. G. (1992). *Successful school improvement: The implementation perspectives and beyond*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
5. Griffin, L. and Patton, K. (2008). Experiences and patterns of change in a physical education development project. *Journal of teaching in physical education*, 27 (3), 272-291.
6. Hastie, P. A. (1996). Student role involvement during a unit of sport education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 16, 88-103.
7. McLaughlin, M. W., and Shepard, L. A. (1995). *Improving education through standards-based reform: A report by the National Academy of Education Panel on Standards-Based Reform*. Stanford, CA: National Academy of Education.
8. Murphy, J. (1993). Restructuring schooling: The equity infrastructure. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 4(2), 11-130.
9. Murphy, J., & Datnow, A. (2003). Tracing the development of comprehensive school reform designs. In J. Murphy & A. Datnow (Eds.), *Leadership for school reform: Lessons from comprehensive school reform designs* (pp. 3-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
10. National Association for Sport and Physical Education. [NASPE]. (2006, 2013). *Shape of the nation report: Status of physical education in the USA*. Reston, VA: Author.
11. O'Sullivan, M. (2007). Creating and sustaining communities of practice among physical education professionals. Paper presented at the *AIESEP-Loughborough Specialist Seminar on PE-CPD*. Loughborough, England.
12. Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Designing qualitative studies*. In *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed., pp. 209-257). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
13. Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
14. Siedentop, D. (1982). Teaching research: The interventionist view. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 1, 46-50.
15. Siedentop, D. (1987). The theory and practice of sport education. In G. Barrette, R. Feingold, R. Rees & M. Pieron (Eds.), *Myths, models and methods in sport pedagogy* (pp. 79-86). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
16. Siedentop, D. (1994). *Sport Education: Quality PE through positive sport experiences*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
17. Siedentop, D., & Kinchin, G. (2003). What makes sport education different? *The British Journal of Teaching Physical Education*, 34, 10-12.
18. Siedentop, D., Hastie, P., & van der Mars, H. (2011). *Complete Guide to Sport Education*. 2nd. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics..
19. Wallhead, T., & O'Sullivan, M. (2005). Sport Education: physical education for the new millennium? *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 10(2), 181 –210.