

Teacher Candidates' Implementation of the Personal and Social Responsibility Model in Field Experiences

Okseon Lee

Abstract

With the teacher concerns theory (Fuller, 1969) as a theoretical framework, this study has set out to examine how physical education teacher candidates perceive their implementation of the Personal and Social Responsibility Model (Hellison, 2003) and how they actually implement it during field experience. Five teacher candidates (three female, two male) who were enrolled in pre-student teaching field experience volunteered to participate. The study inductively analyzed data collected from participant interviews, non-participant teaching observations, and informal post-lesson interviews following each observation. Peer debriefing and member checks were used to enhance the trustworthiness of data. Findings revealed that teacher candidates' concerns shifted from self and tasks and became more impact-related through the implementation stages and afterward. The model's implementation evolved through three phases: (a) functional implementation as behavior management, (b) mechanical implementation as a formula, and (c) a move toward holistic implementation.

The ultimate goal of physical education as cultivating the whole person has been a challenge (Hellison, 2003). Although physical education has been assumed to provide appropriate contexts for developing a well-rounded person by teaching values and character

Dr. Okseon Lee teaches at Seoul National University, Shilim-dong, Kwanak-gu, Seoul, Korea.

as well as physical skills, studies on physical education culture have reported issues and challenges such as student disengagement, non-compliance, and alienation (Cothran & Ennis, 1999; Ennis et al., 1999). These challenges are not limited to urban schools, but prevail in physical education settings in general (Hellison, 2003). Consequently, physical education faces the need to provide a more relevant and engaging curriculum in order to reach its goal.

Donald Hellison's (2003) Personal and Social Responsibility Model (PSRM) is an exemplary physical education curriculum model for well-rounded personal development by capitalizing on the potential benefits of sport and physical activity. Sport and physical activity provide rich contexts for practicing decision-making skills, helping and leading others, on-task persistence, and peaceful conflict resolution. The goal of the PSRM is to develop personally and socially responsible people who can tend to the well-being of themselves and others through sport and physical activity. The model includes two sets of values, personal responsibility (i.e., effort, self-direction) and social responsibility (i.e., respect, helping others), with the ultimate goal of transferring the lessons learned in the gymnasium to outside settings such as the classroom, community, and home.

As a way to ensure consistency in implementation, Hellison suggested the following four themes across the lessons and units: (a) integration, or incorporating responsibility concepts into physical activities rather than just adding PSRM values; (b) transfer, which focuses on applying responsibility values learned in physical education to life outside the gym; (c) empowerment, whereby students learn personal and social responsibility through voicing their opinions and being actively involved in the decision-making process; and (d) teacher-student relationship, which focuses on recognizing the strengths of the individual and showing caring and empathy.

The PSRM was originally developed as a way to address behavioral problems with underserved children. However, there is a growing interest in implementing the model not only in extended day programs (Lee & Martinek, 2009) but in a regular physical education setting (Wright & Burton, 2008), adapted physical education (Wright, White, & Gaebler-Spira, 2004), and physical education teacher education programs (Oslin, Collier, & Mitchell, 2001; Walsh, 2008). With implementation of the model on the increase, many studies have examined the learning outcomes of the

PSRM-based program participants and found a positive impact on participants' level of personal and social responsibility not only in physical activity settings but also in classrooms and other settings (Martinek, McLaughlin, & Schilling, 1999; Martinek, Schilling, & Johnson, 2001; Wright & Burton, 2008).

Despite greater attention on the impact of the PSRM on learning outcomes, studies on how practitioners perceive and use the model in an actual teaching context have not been widely explored. Without an examination of how teachers and practitioners interpret the model and actually use it in the field, its impact on participants' learning outcomes cannot be fully explained. The topic of teacher perceptions and implementation of the PSRM in actual teaching contexts has been a missing link in PSRM-related studies. This lack, however, was not only a PSRM issue. Researchers recognized the same challenge from other curriculum models (e.g., sport education model, tactical approach) and have recently launched studies to examine diverse curriculum models and the factors influencing teachers' adoption of them (Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008; Gurvitch, Blankenship, Metzler, & Lund, 2008; Lund, Gurvitch, & Metzler, 2008; McCaughtry et al., 2004; McMahan & MacPhail, 2007; Stran & Curtner-Smith, 2009). Although these studies did not examine the PSRM as a research focus, they can shed some light on understanding how teachers adopt and implement it. However, it must be noted that each curriculum model is based on unique theoretical foundations, so the findings from one specific model cannot be generalized into an understanding of others (McCaughtry et al., 2004). Therefore, model-specific research must aim for an understanding of how teachers perceive and implement the PSRM.

Literature strongly supports the theory that teacher candidates should be exposed to diverse curriculum models and experience those models by teaching them during field experience (Jenkins, 2004). This gives them a good opportunity to test new ideas and implement new curriculum models for the first time in an actual teaching context (Armaline & Hoover, 1989). Consequently, the purpose of the study was to examine teacher candidates' changes in stages of concern and the implementation of the PSRM during their thirty hours of pre-student teaching field experience. Specifically, this study examined (a) teacher candidates' changes in their stages of concern over PSRM implementation and (b) the features of the actual implementation.

As a way to examine teacher candidates' change in stages of concern regarding the PSRM implementation, Fuller's (1969) teacher concerns theory was used as a theoretical framework. The stages of concern can explain individuals' perceptions or feelings about the new approach or innovation. According to Fuller (1969), an individual has a certain pattern of concerns: with self, with tasks, with the impact. Teachers who have self-concern focus on their personal feelings of the competency or adequate knowledge required to implement the new approach. When they move on to task concern, they tend to focus more on teaching and completing required tasks accompanied by implementation. Finally, impact concern focuses on maximizing the effects of the new approach on student learning outcomes and on teacher improvement. The key feature of stages of concern is that in this predictable pattern of teacher concerns, it is important to match the stage with facilitation strategies to help teacher candidates implement the new model.

Methods

Participants and Setting

Study procedures were approved by University's Institutional Review Board, and teacher candidates were provided an informed consent form for the study. Five out of 32 candidates enrolled in pre-student teaching field experience at one university in the Midwestern United States during fall 2008 or spring 2009 volunteered to participate in the study. All were Caucasians (three female, two male), and their ages ranged from 22-24. The pre-student teaching field experience is a one credit-hour required course for those who plan to student teach the following semester. Participants were at the final stage of the teacher education program. They had completed elementary and intermediate methods courses, and were taking a secondary methods course at the time of this study. Each methods course was three credit hours and included 10-12 hours of early field experience at public schools. They had also completed a two credit-hour curriculum course and were introduced to diverse curriculum models, designing a mini-lesson based on each model.

During the pre-student teaching field experience, the participants were placed at a school level of their choice, either elementary or secondary. Sara, Kelley, and Michael (pseudonyms) went to elementary schools, while Jordan and Chris (pseudonyms) went to secondary schools. They observed five hours and planned and

taught 25 hours, which led to 30–50 lessons in the field, depending on the length of the class period. All the candidates were encouraged to plan and implement lessons based on a curriculum model of their choice. The five participants who volunteered for this study selected and implemented the PSRM during their pre-student teaching field experience.

Participants placed at elementary schools taught manipulative skills (e.g., throwing and catching, kicking) and locomotor skills. Meanwhile soccer and floor hockey were taught by the participants who were placed at secondary schools. In order to help participants implement the model, the university supervisor provided a summary sheet of the PSRM, which included a brief overview of philosophy, goals, and strategies of the PSRM. Participants also had meetings with a university supervisor each week and discussed issues and challenges of implementation throughout the pre-student teaching field experience. The format of lesson plans was modified in order to document the PSRM implementation. Participants identified needed PSRM goals and reflected them to the lesson objectives. In addition, each lesson plan included counseling time (pre-lesson), awareness talk (introduction), activity time (body of lesson), and reflection (closure) as suggested by Hellison (2003). The university supervisor and mentor teachers utilized the seven PSRM teacher benchmarks (Metzler, 2005, p. 456) to observe implementation of the PSRM and provided feedback to the teacher candidates.

Data Collection

Data were collected from participants' interviews, non-participant observations, and informal interviews with the participants following each observation. Participants were interviewed both before and after implementation. The interviews were recorded on audiotape and transcribed by a transcriptionist. During the pre-implementation interviews, they were asked to explain (a) their reasons for choosing the PSRM, (b) the most/least attractive aspect of it, (c) their concerns in implementing it, and (d) its goals and philosophy. After completion of field experience, post-implementation interviews were conducted in which the participants were asked to describe (a) to what extent they implemented the PSRM, (b) their perceptions of the barriers to and facilitators of implementation, and (c) their willingness to use the model in future teaching experience.

The study also involved non-participant observations of teaching, in which the teacher candidates' implementations of the PSRM were

observed and documented in field notes during the first, middle, and last three hours of teaching. An informal interview followed each observation and was recorded and transcribed, with the purpose of identifying candidates' concerns during implementation phases and to examine the extent of their implementation in lessons. Participants were asked: (a) How did you incorporate PSRM goals into this lesson? (b) Did you have any concerns or problems with implementation? (c) Did anything unexpected happen in this lesson? Additional questions were developed based on specific events that happened during observation.

Data Analysis

Raw data from the study were analyzed inductively. Although the use of a priori codes from teacher concerns theory (i.e., self-concern, task concern, impact concern) provided a structure for analyzing interview and field observation data, the possibility of additional emerging themes was open throughout the entire data analysis process (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Each participant's data was coded first, and codes from individual participants' data were cross-examined to find emerging themes and categories. In order to enhance trustworthiness, peer debriefing was used and the research process was shared with another qualitative researcher who was not involved in the study. Member checks were also used. Participants had an opportunity to review the raw data and the summary of the findings and were asked to provide additional comments when clarification was needed (Creswell, 2009).

Results

Teacher Candidates' Concerns on the PSRM Implementation

As can be seen in Table 1, the concerns of the teacher candidates in this study are reported according to the three stages of PSRM implementation: pre-, during, and post-implementation.

Pre-implementation. During this stage, teacher candidates were mainly concerned about accurately understanding the PSRM and handling the demands of the extra time and effort required for implementing it. Their self-concerns were coupled with informational and personal levels. During a pre-implementation interview, Kelley expressed her self-concern as follows:

Table 1

Examples of Teacher Candidates' Concern

	Examples of concern
Pre-Implementation	Accurate understanding of the PSRM Demand of extra time and effort for implementation Concern on power transfer from teacher to students
Implementation	Dealing with students' resistance to new model Organizing appropriate tasks based on the PSRM Obtaining more inputs from students
Post-Implementation	Maximizing the effect of the PSRM Specific strategies to facilitate transfer aspect of the model Designing a model-specific assessment

When I look at the model, as far as the five levels, I guess that's kind of confusing to me. So maybe I need to read through that more. Of course, I'd like to know more about how much more work and preparation it will require than other teachers who don't implement the stuff. (Kelley, Interview)

Another self-concern was related to a critical feature of the PSRM: transferring power to students. Although empowering students by giving them choices and a voice was a critical feature of the model, the teacher candidates were concerned about balancing that with being an authority figure. During the pre-implementation interview, Jordan expressed her concern on this empowerment aspect:

I am a little bit nervous about transferring power over to the students. ... I'm working on being the authority. I think it's a good idea to transfer some of the power over, but I need to be able to balance, like, still having control, but transferring the power over. I think it's going to be very hard and I'm not sure if I'll be able to do it. (Jordan, Interview)

Another participant, Chris, reported that he was concerned about the possibility of disruptive student behaviors caused by the power transfer. As he said:

I like the empowerment aspect because it gives students more options on how they want to participate in PE, and it gives them responsibility. But I thought if you give them too much power, they may become off-task or become disruptive. That is probably why I'm mainly worried about in the model in teaching it. (Chris, Interview)

It is interesting that the participants were attracted to the empowerment feature of the model but concerned about putting it into practice in teaching. This was related to their concerns on the management issue. Considering that management and discipline were critical issues for teacher candidates, the participants were insecure about losing control over the students. For instance, Sara expressed her self-concerns by addressing the issues before implementation of the model. As she said, "It will be a little bit challenging for myself when my mind is on so many different things, like management and discipline. So I guess it will be difficult to implement it."

Implementation stage. Participants' concerns have changed with the implementation of the model. At the initial stage, they were faced with student resistance because the students were not familiar with the PSRM. Chris addressed this in the following way:

My concern is students' resistance to the model. They just wanted to stick to a regular routine and didn't want to learn anything about responsibility. They were all 15 to 18 years old and they were aware of what responsibility is, but you know they really didn't want to relate physical education to it. (Chris, Interview)

Another participant, Michael, also reported that the application of the PSRM was challenging because it was a new approach. He said, “At the beginning, the students were confused, maybe wondered why I was sitting there talking to them about responsibility while in the physical education setting. That was a challenge for me.”

Coupled with a concern about student resistance was task concern. Participants worried about organizing learning tasks based on the PSRM, dealing with physical skills and responsibility concepts within time limits, and finding appropriate resources for implementing the PSRM. For example, Jordan addressed a task concern about the lack of time for teaching both physical skills and responsibility concepts. The following comments showed that she perceived responsibility concepts as yet more things to teach rather than as ideas to integrate into physical activity:

I was concerned that I just didn’t have enough time to teach them everything they need to know, like responsibility and skills. I was worried that I didn’t have enough time to demonstrate and get them working on, like, soccer skills while talking about responsibility. (Jordan, Interview)

Participants were also concerned about enhancing the impact of the implementation. Kelley expressed this impact concern by seeking ways to maximize student inputs and empower her students:

I would say I am concerned about the ways of getting student inputs. I don’t want to just tell them what to do. I want them to have some say in the classroom, because I ultimately think they will enjoy it much more if they’re doing something they would like to do. I feel like with their input I can make it a more enjoyable experience for them while still getting the ultimate goal of PE done. (Kelley, Interview)

In sum, participants’ concerns during the implementation stage ranged from students’ resistance to the model, to task concerns on class organization reflecting the PSRM, to impact concerns with enhancing the effect of the implementation.

Post-implementation stage. Interestingly, participants reported that their concerns with keeping a balance between student empowerment and class control were resolved. For example, Jordan

noted that she was able to empower students while maintaining class control and gaining their respect:

I said in the beginning that shifting the power to the students would be a problem, and now that I've shifted some power to the students, I see that they're still in control, but I was afraid that the class would just go crazy at first. But I realized that they still respect me, and I still respect and shift power to them. Even though they do have choices and they can do things on their own. But it's not a concern anymore. (Jordan, Interview)

Participants' concerns during the post-implementation interview were centered on impact concerns. For example, Kelley stated that she needed more information on the impact of the model in terms of how many teachers actually implement it in the field, and how the use of the model has changed student behaviors outside the classroom:

I'd like to know the number of teachers that use the model just because I kind of want to see how many teachers even know about it. I know this model hasn't been long, but I think it's a really good model and just kind of cool to know how many teachers know about this. And then, possibly if there are other studies that show how this model affects students' behavior outside of class, to see if there's some kind of connection, I guess. (Kelley, Interview)

Another impact concern was that of obtaining more knowledge, skill, and strategies to help students transfer responsibility concepts and skills outside the physical education setting. Michael reported his concern as follows:

As of now I need more knowledge in the transfer part of the responsibility. I want to help my students transfer responsibility from the classroom to home and also take their physical activity home with their friends, show their parents, and then bring it in because I gave them that problem to do. So I think the transfer is what I need to know more, the strategies, knowing how to help transfer—to get the students to want to take responsibility and physical activity home.

That's what I need for my future implementation. (Michael, Interview)

In addition, Chris reported his impact concern over the future implementation of the model during upcoming student teaching. He was concerned about constructing PSRM-specific assessments so that students could enhance responsibility through them. As he said, "My concern is to make the assessment relate to the responsibility model more, and have students take the assessment more seriously to enhance responsibility, because I will be student teaching next semester and definitely plan on implementing this model."

In summary, participants' concerns in the post-implementation stage mainly centered on impact concerns related to maximizing the effect of the PSRM. Participants sought more information regarding the extent of dissemination and implementation of the model in the field, specific strategies to facilitate the transfer aspect of the model, and ways to design model-specific assessments for their future application.

Teacher Candidates' Implementation of the PSRM

As can be seen in Table 2, teacher candidates' PSRM implementation has been categorized into three phases: (a) functional implementation as behavior management, (b) mechanical implementation as formula, and (c) a move toward holistic implementation. Findings will be presented and discussed in relation to candidates' stages of concern.

Phase 1: Functional implementation as behavior management.

At the initial stage of field experience, implementing the PSRM was influenced by the participants' concerns with discipline and classroom management. For example, Chris reported that his concern over classroom management impeded his implementation of the model:

Well, these were my first couple lessons, and as of now, I would say I didn't implement it as much as I had planned on because I was just kind of overwhelmed with trying to manage them. Even today, by the end of the day, I was figuring out how to work to manage them better. (Chris, Interview)

Table 2

Teacher Candidates' Implementation of the PSRM

Characteristics	
Phase 1: Functional implementation	Teach the PSRM values (e.g., respect, teamwork) as behavior management tool
Phase 2: Mechanical implementation	Formulaic implementation of the PSRM Teach the PSRM as value-added model not as value-integrated approach
Phase 3: Holistic implementation	Focus on establishing a positive learning environment Integrate the PSRM values into physical activity Emphasize transfer aspects of the model

Participants placed a high priority on management and discipline and emphasized the values of the PSRM (e.g., respect, teamwork) in light of behavior management. In this sense, the PSRM functioned as a behavior management tool for teacher candidates to deal with their immediate concerns. For example, Sara explained how the issue and challenge of classroom management influenced her implementation as follows:

I found it a little challenging for myself when my mind was on so many different things like management and discipline. I had to stop their game and was like, "What are we working on?" So they had to stop and say, "We're working on respecting others." I was like, "Is yelling at another team respecting others?" I just was more set on reminding them of respect and teamwork rather than fully implementing the model. (Sara, Interview)

Participants applied the PSRM approach by clarifying definitions of the values and verbally emphasizing them at the beginning of class. For example, they initiated the class by asking questions such as “What does respect mean?” and “How can we show respect to others?” Participants also emphasized good behaviors through the PSRM because their major concerns were centered on student management. For example, when Michael’s students were distracted, he redirected their attention by using a responsibility concept, saying, “Someone is talking. Listen; remember responsibility.”

Participants’ emphasis on functional aspects of the PSRM was caused by their lack of competency in actual implementation. They requested specific “how to” types of information from people with previous experience in actual implementation. For example, Kelley explained a perceived gap between her understanding and her actual ability to implement the model:

I thought I understood how to apply the model. But when I was trying to apply it I didn’t feel comfortable with it because I was overwhelmed with classroom management. I almost needed, like, some work outside the classroom practicing it before I applied it in the teaching. You know, having feedback or tips from someone before I actually use it on the children would have helped me. (Kelley, Interview)

In summary, participants’ initial stage of implementation was centered on the functional aspect of the model due to their primary concern on classroom management and their lack of competency in implementing the model.

Phase 2: Mechanical implementation as formula. Although teacher candidates initially see the PSRM as a behavior management approach, their implementation is enhanced when they become familiar with it in the context of field experience. One of the characteristics in this phase was the participants’ enhanced ability to apply responsibility values beyond classroom management issues. For example, Michael emphasized the value of effort during the juggling activity when he said, “You don’t necessarily perfect every skill and activity. Instead, give 100 percent effort every skill you attempt.”

Chris also emphasized the value of self-direction in physical activity contexts by providing diverse station activities. He started

the lesson with an awareness talk and explained the definition of self-direction, relating it to the physical activity:

Today, we will work on self-direction. Do you know what self-direction is? It's kind of like you're really motivated to do your work. You will go to stations where you want to go and fill out a task sheet. You're working on being motivated by yourself. I'm not gonna sit here and say "DJ, you need to be working on this station." (Field note)

Although participants were better at connecting physical activity with responsibility values, their implementation was mechanical, focusing on structural aspects of the model rather than the philosophy behind the structure. Despite their efforts to follow the structure of the PSRM by incorporating awareness talk and specific strategies to teach responsibility, their actual implementation did not reflect the spirit of the strategies. For example, Jordan retreated to her zone of comfort when students did not respond to the strategy adopted for teaching responsibility. In a soccer lesson, she implemented all touch rules that require everyone to have a chance to touch the ball before they shoot. When her students ignored the rule and mainly focused on winning, she dealt with the situation by merely mentioning the value of teamwork rather than using it as teachable moment:

Jordan: What are you guys arguing about? Freeze! You can't kick the ball if it is out of bounds. What are we working on here today?

Students: Teamwork.

Jordan: All right, this is not working. I'd like you to run one lap to cool up because everyone is mad at now. (Field note)

As illustrated in Jordan's case, the participants' efforts to incorporate responsibility concepts into lessons went through dips and difficulties when students did not respond to them as intended. Experience with these dips, however, helped participants refine their implementation through reflection. For example, in reflecting on her lesson, Jordan said, "Now that I look back on it I should've been like, 'Everyone is at different levels, so you need to include everyone.' I should've addressed it as a teachable moment or even addressing it more specifically in the beginning before it even started."

Another challenge to overcome in mechanical implementation was student boredom. Participants perceived the responsibility model as formulaic and repeatedly emphasized responsibility values in combination with physical activity. However, they realized that the lack of flexibility and the mechanical repetitions about responsibility led to bored students. Kelley's statement emphasizes the limitation of mechanically applying the model:

I think they're sick of it almost because every time I teach for them, like respect, we're doing respect. We're doing effort. And they're like, 'Okay, we get it. We know what respect is. We know how to use teamwork.' Like they're kind of over it. They're just thinking that it's stupid at this point, and they want me to focus on dribbling and what fouls are. Trying to focus on these things and incorporating this, it's really difficult. I don't want to spend the whole time just talking, I want them to be active. (Kelley, Interview)

Kelley's dilemma came from her interpretation of the PSRM as a value-added approach rather than a value-integrated approach. Participants' interpretation of the model as a value-added approach led to task concerns such as overcoming student boredom or increasing physical activity time by reducing the time spent on talking about the responsibility values.

Phase 3: A move toward holistic implementation. At the final stage of field experience, participants were able to see the big picture of the PSRM rather than focusing on implementing several features of the model. Instead of specific responsibility goals (e.g., respect, effort), they began to emphasize establishing a positive learning environment. As Michael said, "I feel like as I gave them more responsibility they respected me more as a teacher. I was trying to establish that environment—a positive learning environment that related to responsibility and physical education." Kelley noted, "When students understood that I genuinely cared about them, they took more chances and gave more effort. In short, having a positive environment helped me implement the model." Thus, participants came to be aware how establishing such an environment and building such relationships were important for successfully implementing the model.

Coupled with the importance of a positive learning environment, participants also realized the importance of integrating responsibility

values into physical activity. Kelley explained that her focus shifted from a mechanical approach toward building the right contexts so that students could practice responsibility naturally, even without realizing it. As she noted:

I had to trust my students. ‘Oh, they’re capable of doing this.’ So then it kind of shifted more towards, ‘Okay, now let’s think about more ways of how I can implement it into lessons.’ And that turned into my students not wanting to hear about it, like, ‘Oh, we’re working on effort today.’ They started rolling their eyes at me. So then, now I think it’s turning more into incorporating it into my lesson without talking about it and they’re just doing it. You just set up activities so that they’re just naturally doing it and then they don’t even realize it. (Kelley, Interview)

In the same way, Chris also reported that he grew less obsessed with teaching and talking about the responsibility values and shifted his attention toward constructing learning activities and establishing a learning environment for students to experience the responsibility model in an integrative way:

I am starting to realize that there is a way to teach them skills, and they were just experiencing the model as opposed to me, like, explaining it. They’re gonna take responsibility when they have chances. So it’s just sort of trying to find a way to bridge that connection and try to figure out how to teach dribbling and responsibility in an integrative way. (Chris, Interview)

In the final phase, participants focused more on the overall concept and essence of the model rather than on verbalizing the responsibility goals. These changes were related to their enhanced relationship with students and the ability to accommodate the students’ needs. As Sara said, “As the semester went on, I trusted them more and I know that I am capable of doing this. I just needed to make changes to not address the responsibility too often because students were kind of over it.” In addition, participants emphasized the transfer aspect of the model, reflecting the fact that they were able to see a bigger picture of the model. Interestingly, they emphasized the transfer of both physical activity and responsibility

values outside the class settings. For example, Michael closed the class by emphasizing transfer aspects:

Today it's really beautiful outside. So when you go home try something outside, like bike ride, or you can do chalk. Just be active and do something outside. And also try to do something for others and be respectful to others. Next time when I come to teach, I'm gonna ask you about it. (Field notes)

In summary, the final phase of implementation was characterized by building a positive learning environment reflecting the spirit of the PSRM, integrating values into physical activity by providing appropriate contexts for experiencing responsibility values, and emphasizing transfer aspects of the model.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine how physical education teacher candidates perceived their implementation of the PSRM and how they actually implemented it during pre-student teaching field experience. As indicated by Fuller (1969), the findings of this study showed that teacher candidates' stages of concern shifted in a predictable pattern from self and task concerns to impact concerns throughout pre-, during, and post-implementation stages. At the beginning stage, teacher candidates' concern was centered on personal concerns. They requested more information about the PSRM and were concerned about how adopting it would influence their workload and demand. Research on the adoption and implementation of other physical education curriculum models also supports that teacher candidates are concerned about the extra work and planning required by an innovative approach. This was one factor that deterred implementation of new approach (Gurvitch et al., 2008; McCaughtry et al., 2004).

Second, teacher candidates' use of the responsibility goals (e.g., respect, effort) as a classroom management tool during the initial stage of implementation was also noted in a previous study. Mrugala (2002) reported that teachers tend to focus on the practicality of the PSRM rather than implementing its underlying philosophy. Thus, they use it as a behavior management system rather than empowering students by giving them choices and a voice. It appears to be a typical developmental process for beginning teachers to place

a strong emphasis on management issues, reflecting their concerns on self-survival at the initial stage of teaching.

Third, the findings on the transitions in teacher candidates' stages of concern and implementation features should be interpreted with the limitation of this study. Although the findings of this study revealed that teacher candidates went through functional implementation, mechanical implementation, and holistic implementation stages, this does not indicate that they progressed in a linear way throughout a short-period of time. When participants had a limited understanding of the model and student characteristics, they experienced a minor setback and retreated to their zone of comfort. Although they showed a trend in transitions from functional implementation to holistic implementation, they can slide back to the previous stage when faced with new teaching contexts or teaching different groups of students. A longitudinal study can capture teacher candidates' experience in "implementation dip" (Fullan & Miles, 1992, p.749)—difficulties and challenges teachers actually experience in order to make changes or implementations happen especially in changes of contexts and students. The fluctuating nature of teacher candidates' concerns and implementation, especially for beginning teachers, requires long-term investigations.

Implications

The findings of this study suggest the following implications. First, teacher educators need to understand that teacher candidates' adoption and implementation of a new curriculum model is a developmental process. In this study, teacher candidates' stages of concern and their implementation of the responsibility model changed throughout their field experience. As indicated by Hall and Hord (2001), implementing a new curriculum model is "a process rather than an event" (p. 4), one that requires long-term commitment and constant support. Teacher educators and mentor teachers should understand both individual candidates' stages of concern and their actual implementation stages in order to provide the appropriate support and facilitation strategies.

Second, findings showed that participants' implementation of the PSRM was interrupted by diverse challenges in the field, such as dealing with immediate classroom management concerns, student resistance to the new approach, and limited practical knowledge of "how-to" types of information. It is obvious that the stand-

alone curriculum course cannot fully address these challenges and provide solid experience for teacher candidates to implement the model in the field. Considering these challenges, teacher education should infuse diverse curriculum models into multiple coursework so that candidates can obtain theoretical knowledge of the model and experience it in curriculum courses, activity content courses, field experience, and student teaching experience (Lund, Metzler & Gurvitch, 2008).

Third, future research should explore what factors are influencing or mediating teacher candidates' implementation of the PSRM during field experience. Considering that field experience provides a unique way to work within a dynamic situation that includes students, mentor teachers, university supervisors, and teacher candidates, future research should explore the implementation of the PSRM within a complex interplay of these factors and explore what factors are impeding or facilitating it.

Finally, there should be more research on how teacher candidates are learning to teach new curriculum models. This topic should be explored in relation to specific characteristics of the PSRM. Considering that it is a value-based curriculum model, candidates' value orientations and their personal beliefs in the model can mediate their learning processes and implementation in the field. Not all teacher candidates will buy into the spirit of the PSRM, such as empowerment, responsibility transfer, and giving students a choice and a voice. The examination of candidates' beliefs and values *vis-à-vis* the model and how those influence their learning to teach it will provide better understanding on PSRM implementation in the field. Therefore, learning and implementing the PSRM should be explored in relation to candidates' values and beliefs toward both the model and teaching.

References

- Alexander, K., & Luckman, J. (2001). Australian teachers' perceptions and uses of the sport education curriculum model. *European Physical Education Review, 7*, 243-267.
- Armaline, W. D., & Hoover, R. L. (1989). Field experience as a vehicle for transformation: Ideology, education, and reflective practice. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(2), 42-48.
- Cothran, D. J., & Ennis, C. D. (1999). Alone in a crowd: Meeting students' needs for relevance and connection in urban high

- school physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 18, 234-247.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- 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, 97-117.
- Ennis, C. D., Solmon, M. A., Satina, B., Loftus, S. J., Mensch, J., & McCauley, M. T. (1999). Creating a sense of family in urban schools using the "Sport for Peace" curriculum. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 70, 273-285.
- Fullan, M. G. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. G., & Miles, M. M. (1992). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73(10), 745-752.
- Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American Educational Research Journal*, 6(2), 207-226.
- Gurvitch, R., Blankenship, B. T., & Metzler, M. W., & Lund, J. L. (2008). Student teachers' implementation of model-based instruction: Facilitators and inhibitors. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 27, 466-486.
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hellison, D. (2003). *Teaching responsibility through physical activity* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Jenkins, J. (2004). Sport Education in a PETE program. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 75(5), 31-36.
- Lee, O., & Martinek, T. (2009). Navigating two cultures: An investigation of cultures of a responsibility-based physical activity program and school. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 80, 230-240.
- Lund, J. L., Gurvitch, R., & Metzler, M. W. (2008). Influences on cooperating teachers' adoption of model-based instruction. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 27, 549-570.
- Lund, J. L., Metzler, M. W., & Gurvitch, R. (2008). Pedagogical content knowing for model-based instruction in physical education and future directions for research. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 27, 580-589.

- 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.
- Martinek, T. J., McLaughlin, D., & Schilling, T. (1999). Project Effort: Teaching responsibility beyond the gym. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 70(6), 59-65.
- McCauthry, N., Sofo, S., Rovegno, I., & Curtner-Smith, M. (2004). Learning to teach sport education: misunderstandings, pedagogical difficulties, and resistance. *European Physical Education Review*, 10, 135-155.
- McMahon, E., & MacPhail, A. (2007). Learning to teach sport education: The experience of a pre-service teacher. *European Physical Education Review*, 13, 229-246.
- Metzler, M.W., & McCullick, B. A. (2008). Introducing innovation to those who matter most-The p-12 pupils' perceptions of model-based instruction. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 27, 512-528.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mrugala, K. (2002). *An exploratory study of responsibility model practitioners*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Oslin, J., Collier, C., & Mitchell, S. (2001). Living the curriculum. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 72(5), 47-51.
- Stran, M., & Curtner-Smith, M.D. (2009). Influence of two preservice teachers' value orientations on their interpretation and delivery of sport education. *Sport, Education, and Society*, 14, 339-352.
- Walsh, D. (2008). Stranger in a strange land: Using an activity course to teach an alternative curriculum model. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 79(2), 40-44.
- 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, 138-154.
- Wright, P. M., White, K., & Gaebler-Spira, D. (2004). Exploring the relevance of the personal and social responsibility model in adapted physical activity: A collective case study. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 23, 71-87.