The Physical Educator Vol. 75 • pp. 546–566 • 2018
https://doi.org/10.18666/TPE-2018-V75-I3-8159

SPORT EDUCATION

Moral Development in Sport Education: A Case Study of a Teaching-Oriented Preservice Teacher

Benjamin Schwamberger and Matthew Curtner-Smith

Abstract

***Purpose*:** *The occupational socialization literature suggests that teaching-oriented teachers are more likely to deliver Sport Education (SE) in its purest form and so provide conditions in which fair play and sporting behavior can be developed. The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which Derrick, a teaching-oriented preservice teacher, promoted moral and sporting behavior while teaching 38 middle school boys within two SE seasons of team handball.* ***Method*:** *The theoretical perspectives employed were structural development theory and social learning theory. Data were collected with eight qualitative methods and analyzed with standard interpretive techniques.* ***Results*:** *Many of the students gained a more sophisticated understanding of fair play and sporting behavior during the study. On numerous occasions, students were observed playing fairly and acting in a sporting manner. Derrick's teaching orientation, his own concept of sporting behavior and fair play, his delivery of a pure version of SE, and his pedagogy had much to do with these positive outcomes. However, many of the more skilled students' willingness to engage in sporting behavior was context specific. As gameplay became more competitive,*

Benjamin Schwamberger is an Assistant Professor, Department of Human Performance, Minnesota State University, Mankato. Matthew Curtner-Smith is a Professor, Department of Kinesiology, University of Alabama. Please send author correspondence to ben.schwamberger@mnsu.edu

some of these more skilled students engaged in more unsporting behaviors. Conversely, many of the less skilled students maintained a universal concept of sporting behavior and fair play when the competition became fiercer. ***Conclusion*****:** *The results of the study confirm that the pure form of the SE model is an excellent medium through which sporting behavior and fair play can be developed.*

The development of moral and sporting behavior and playing fairly are key overarching objectives of the Sport Education (SE) curriculum model (Siedentop, Hastie, & van der Mars, 2011). In addition, the model aims to develop *enthusiastic* and *literate* sportspeople (Siedentop, 1994). Literacy, in this context, involves students being able to comprehend what is good and bad sporting behavior and understanding and valuing the traditions of sport including its rules and rituals. Enthusiasm involves students learning to preserve and protect the good in sporting culture (Siedentop et al., 2011).

The limited amount of research in this area has indicated, however, that those using the SE model have had mixed results in realizing these objectives and goals. Holding students accountable for playing fairly within competitive phases of an SE season, for example, yielded positive results (Hastie & Sharpe, 1999). Moreover, some data suggest that students' use of destructive behaviors decreases over an SE season (Vidoni & Ward, 2009) and that students recognize that fair play includes supporting fellow players and officials and providing equal amounts of game time for all players (Brock & Hastie, 2007). In contrast, other data indicate that students struggle to define fair play during SE (Sinelnikov & Hastie, 2008) and that as a season progresses and becomes more competitive, students are less keen to support elements of fair play (Brock & Hastie, 2007) and do not increase their use of constructive behaviors (Vidoni & Ward, 2009).

Critical analysis of the SE model provides a possible explanation for these mixed results. Several scholars, for example, have pointed out that the version of SE normally delivered in schools is conservative in nature and so reflects, includes, and passes on all that is bad about institutionalized sport including poor moral and sporting behavior (Parker & Curtner-Smith, 2012; Penney, Clarke, & Kinchin, 2002). In contrast, teachers who deliver a version of SE in tune with the spirit of the Siedentop et al. (2011) text are more

likely to influence students positively (Chen & Curtner-Smith, 2013; Harvey, Kirk, & O'Donovan, 2014), including the development of their moral and sporting behavior.

Work within more traditional physical education (PE) curricula (Figley, 1984; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995) also suggests that the purest form of SE would be a good medium through which teachers can promote moral and sporting behavior. Teachers working within traditional curricula have had some success in nurturing this kind of behavior through modeling, praise (Giebink & McKenzie, 1985), discussion (Giebink & McKenzie, 1985; Hassandra, Goudas, Hatzigeorgiadis, & Theodorakis, 2007; Romance, Weiss, & Bockoven, 1986), the use of a points/reward system (Giebink & McKenzie, 1985), and fostering a task-involving climate (Mouratidou, Goutza, & Chatzopoulos, 2007). These teachers have employed indirect teaching styles, which give students the opportunity to make decisions about their own learning, solve problems, make choices, and take part in cooperative activities (Gibbons, Ebbeck, & Weiss, 1995; Hassandra et al., 2007; Mouratidou et al., 2007; Romance et al., 1986). They have also asked students to face and respond to moral dilemmas (Gibbons et al., 1995; Romance et al., 1986). The "curricular scaffolding" of SE (Ennis, 1999), it could be argued, provides teachers with more options and opportunities to provide this nurturing environment, employ indirect teaching styles, and construct moral dilemmas for their students to tackle.

The occupational socialization literature suggests that "teaching-oriented" teachers more interested in curricular PE than extracurricular sport (Curtner-Smith, Hastie, & Kinchin, 2008; Lawson, 1983a, 1983b) are more likely to deliver SE in its purest form and, if our hypothesis is correct, provide conditions in which moral and sporting behavior can be developed. The purpose of this study, therefore, was to test this hypothesis and determine the extent to which one teaching-oriented teacher promoted moral and sporting behavior while teaching within the SE curriculum model. The specific questions we attempted to answer were (a) To what degree did the students taught by the teacher play fairly and display moral and sporting behavior? and (b) To what extent did the teacher employ pedagogies that promoted fair play and moral and sporting behavior?

Theoretical Framework

In congruence with past research of moral development in PE (Hassandra et al., 2007; Mouratidou et al., 2007), this study used the two theoretical perspectives of *structural development theory* (Kohlberg, 1976; Piaget, 1965) and *social learning theory* (Bandura, 1977) in data collection and analysis.

Structural Development Theory

Structural development theory argues that to develop morally, individuals must first develop cognitively (Mouratidou et al., 2007). Specifically, a person must form an organized core cognitive structure of values and beliefs against which new social contexts and situations are evaluated and through which they are filtered (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). In addition, this core cognitive structure is modified, shaped, and developed when individuals *accommodate* values and beliefs that are very different from their own and *assimilate* views and thoughts that are like their own through a process of *equilibration* (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995).

If an individual's core cognitive structure becomes more sophisticated, the person can pass through the three levels of moral development identified by Kohlberg (1976). At the first of these, the *preconventional* level, an individual is incapable of understanding moral and ethical norms and follows societal or group rules through fear of punishment (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). An example of behavior at this level of development in SE is a student who decides not to foul an opponent who is certain to score in a game of soccer, because the student is worried about the chances of receiving a red card. Individuals who progress to the *conventional* level of moral development comprehend societal or group values and beliefs and behave accordingly. They do not, however, have the capacity to question the morality of these values and beliefs (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). An example of behavior at this level of development within an SE season is a student arguing with and attempting to intimidate an official because this is also how his teammates behave. Individuals who get to the *postconventional* level of moral development have a superior comprehension of what is morally good and bad and so can examine societal values and beliefs critically and may not follow cultural norms if they believe them to be immoral. Within SE,

an example of behavior at this level of development is a student who refuses to employ "trash talking" as a tactic even though it is a common practice among her teammates.

Social Learning Theory

The central concept of social learning theory is that significant persons and institutions within an individual's culture and environment have a considerable effect on their values, beliefs, and consequent behavior (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). By espousing and modeling specific values (Hassandra et al., 2007), these individuals and institutions shape the views of youth as to what is morally wrong or right (Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, & Thoma, 1999). Individuals with high status (e.g., coach, teacher, gang leader) and of a similar background (e.g., gender, race, and class) have more influence on youth than those with low status and differing backgrounds (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). Therefore, individuals whom youth hold in high regard (i.e., teachers and/or coaches) tend to have a greater effect, whether positive or negative, on a child's moral behavior.

Method

Participants

The primary participant in this study was Derrick[1], a purposefully selected teaching-oriented preservice teacher who was enrolled in a PE teacher education (PETE) program at a large public university in the southeastern United States. Thirty-eight middle school boys taught by Derrick within SE seasons during his culminating internship also participated in the study. Derrick and his students and the students' parents signed consent and assent forms, in line with the requirements of the university's policy on human participants in research.

Derrick was a 22-year-old Caucasian male identified by his PETE faculty as possessing a strong teaching orientation and showing much promise. In line with other teaching-oriented PE teachers (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008), he had played relatively little organized youth and school sport at a modest level. Moreover, his motivation for entering PETE was his elementary PE teacher, Ms. Curtis, who "had a passion for teaching and cared about her profession" and

"wasn't someone who would roll out the ball." Further, she "was really good [because] she taught . . . a lot of different things . . . was very well organized, and did skill stuff." Consequently, Derrick was not interested in "coaching right away." Rather, he wanted to focus on "learning how to teach."

Derrick's Training for and Experience of Sport Education

Before the study commenced, Derrick completed three semesters of coursework that trained him to use the SE model. During the first semester, he watched SE being taught on film, read the Siedentop et al. (2011) text, was lectured about and engaged in discussion of the model, and taught a 13-lesson soccer season of SE to middle school students. During the second semester, Derrick delivered three mini-seasons of SE on volleyball, tennis, and rugby to middle school students. Within the third semester, he taught one full-length season of SE on batting-fielding games to students in the upper elementary grades.

Setting

Data were collected during Derrick's 7-week secondary teaching internship at a local middle school. During this experience, he was supervised by a cooperating teacher and a university supervisor. For the purposes of the study, he was observed teaching two 20-lesson seasons of team handball. The first of these SE seasons was taught to a class of 20 seventh grade boys (aged 12 to 13 years). The second season was taught to a class of 18 eighth grade boys (aged 13 to 14 years). Lesson length was 45 min. Both seasons consisted of three organizational lessons, five lessons of preseason practices and games, eight lessons of regular season play, three lessons of postseason playoffs leading to the championship game, and awards ceremony. During the two seasons, Derrick asked the boys to perform the roles—in addition to player—of coach, captain, warm-up leader, official, and scorekeeper.

Data Collection

Data were collected with eight qualitative techniques. This ascertained the extent that Derrick's delivery of SE promoted moral and sporting behavior within his students. These techniques included four types of interviewing. Derrick was formally interviewed prior

to and immediately following the completion of the internship. Pertinent demographic information and data indicating the degree to which he was teaching oriented were collected during the first formal interview. Moreover, Derrick was asked about his views on fair play and moral and sporting behavior. Questions posed in the second formal interview were designed to elicit reflections about his ability to promote fair play and moral and sporting behavior during his respective SE seasons. Derrick also engaged in one stimulated recall interview in which he observed film of his teaching and was asked to comment on his specific actions. Groups of two to four students participated in focus group interviews. In the interviews, they were asked about their views on fair play and moral and sporting behavior, and how their SE unit may have contributed to their moral and sporting development. They were also asked to react to fictional sporting dilemmas. For example, students were asked whether they would voluntarily tell an official they had trapped a ball that was ruled caught in a game of baseball. Formal, stimulated recall and focus group interviews were recorded verbatim and transcribed. Whenever the opportunity presented itself, Derrick was also informally interviewed. The contents of these interviews were recorded as soon as possible after they occurred.

Nonparticipant observation involved watching Derrick teaching his SE seasons and taking copious notes focused on pedagogies related to fair play and moral and sporting behavior. Derrick supplied his season plans, lesson plans, and evaluations at the conclusion of his SE seasons for document analysis. Finally, Derrick made entries into an electronic journal and weekly completed critical incident reports. In both cases, he focused his comments on moral and sporting behavior and fair play.

Data Analysis

During Stage 1 of the analysis process, data indicating the extent to which Derrick promoted fair play and moral and sporting behavior were identified, as were data revealing the degree to which students in his SE seasons played fairly and displayed moral and sporting behavior. Analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) were employed in Stage 2 as a method of coding, categorizing, and sorting these data sets into meaningful

themes. Methods that established trustworthiness and credibility of the data included member checking, searching for negative cases, and triangulation (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

Results and Discussion

Student Perceptions and Behaviors

Three themes emerged from the analysis of the data set related to the first research question of the study. These were *student conceptions of fair play and sporting behavior*, *context-specific versus universal fair play and sporting behavior*, and *improvement in understanding/decline in action*.

Student conceptions of fair play and sporting behavior. Throughout the study, the students saw fair play and sporting behavior as synonymous. They defined both constructs by providing real-world examples. These included avoiding unsporting behaviors (e.g., cheating; purposefully fouling; and arguing with teammates, the opposition, and officials) and engaging in sporting behaviors (e.g., being scrupulously fair and honest when officiating, respecting the opposition, enjoying the camaraderie created by the team environment, and making sure all teammates participated in gameplay for equal amounts of time). These definitions were like those expressed by students in past research (Brock & Hastie, 2007):

> If you're the refs, you need to be honest. We have had that problem in the past where the refs would cheat or make calls to benefit the teams their friends were on. You also can't be too aggressive, like fouling all the time. (Alex, focus group interview)

> Not knocking the ball out of someone's hands during a game. You know, play defense but don't get all up on them. Give them some space and stuff. Play good defense, play good offense, try not to foul much. (Jason, focus group interview)

> I think fair play is not arguing, getting along with your teammates, having a fair game, no fouling, and having a fun time. Just playing how you would play with your family.

> Teamwork. Also play well with the other team and both teams being able to play together. . . . All of us are friends here. We don't need to get mad at each other. (Reggie, focus group interview)

Context-specific versus universal fair play and sporting behavior. Higher skilled students viewed sport in PE as "different" from the organized youth and school sport. Many of this group noted that they were willing to participate in a sporting manner within PE, but that they would not transfer this attitude and these actions to "sport outside of PE":

> See in competitive sport, fair play, I honestly don't do any of that. . . . On the court when I'm playing basketball, I'm in other people's ears talking a lot of trash. I know last year I was playing in a league at the YMCA. I was standing at the free throw line, talking to the free throw shooter, and talking trash. I'd talk smack during the game, I'd push people, hold on to their jerseys to make them mad. (Jason, focus group interview)

> That's the same with all competitive sports, the other teams don't show any sportsmanship and we don't either. In school, like in PE class, I think this whole unit is to really teach you sportsmanship. . . . But I think outside of school it's about winning. (Emanuel, focus group interview)

Conversely, many of the students with less skill and little or no experience of organized youth and school sport did not share this view. For them, behaving in a sporting manner was a universal concept:

> Without fair play and sportsmanship, the game's not really the game. It's just people arguing. . . . The game would just be another reason to argue, and without fair play it wouldn't be any fun. It would just be crazy. (Jack, focus group interview)

> I think sportsmanship and fair play are more important than winning because . . . if we just want to win the whole time it can get boring. But if people show good sportsmanship and fair play, people will like it more. Like when I played my game

against Aaron's team we had a good game, but we lost by like one point and we liked it. (Reggie, focus group interview)

These contrasting attitudes displayed by more and less able boys were also often reflected in responses to the moral dilemmas presented in the focus group sessions. For example, when asked if they would deliberately foul an opposing player about to score a winning layup, more skilled boys gave responses such as this:

> For me it depends. Like if it's at school, I'd probably just let him make the layup, 'cause it's just school [i.e., PE]. But if it's out of school, I'd foul him or trip him up 'cause I want to win the game. (Emanuel, focus group interview)

In contrast, lower skilled boys gave responses such as this:

> I wouldn't try and foul. I'd do my best to delay him, but I wouldn't foul, because if I was going foul it would go against everything I just said about fair play. It's no fun if you don't play fairly. (Aaron, focus group interview)

In addition, the response that Payton, a more skilled boy, gave for the layup dilemma indicated that some of the more athletic boys had at least modified their perspective on how they would behave in organized sport during the SE season:

> I kind of want to say that I would just let them shoot it, in case they missed. I guess with my moral code, I would let them go. . . . It would depend on the environment. In this kind of environment [i.e., PE] you would be learning from it and be able to go forth, but if it was like the state championship, you would probably want to be competitive and go for the aggressive block. (Payton, focus group interview)

Improvement in understanding/decline in action. At the beginning of the seasons, students were more likely to define sporting behavior and fair play in terms of avoiding unsporting actions. Conversely, by the conclusion of the season, they were more likely to strike a balance between avoiding unsporting behaviors and engaging in sporting behaviors, which signals a growing sophistication in their understanding of the two constructs. Moreover, instances of

unsporting behavior, such as those portrayed in the following field note extracts, declined from the beginning of the season to the end of the regular season:

> Standing in the gym, waiting for the seventh grade students to come out of the locker room, I overhear Malik and Andrew talking to each other. As they walk out into the gym, Malik states, "Man, my team sucks, we don't have any athletes." At which point Andrew nods his head in agreement, stating, "Yeah, I wouldn't want to be on your team." (Field notes, seventh grade season, lesson 5)

> During a regular season game between the Jaguars and the Vipers, Ryan (a Viper) begins complaining to the official, stating, "Come on Simon, he took more than three steps, you have to call that." Ryan repeatedly tries to get Simon (an official) to call the foul, but Simon ignores Ryan's request. Ryan then turns to Derrick (PT), stating, "Coach we need better officials because they are terrible, they're missing so many calls!" (Field notes, eighth grade season, lesson 10)

During the same time, exhibitions of sporting behavior increased:

> Standing on the sideline during a regular season game between the Cardinals and the Coyotes, Jimmy, a substitute for the Coyotes, witnesses Nathan (the Cardinals' goalkeeper) make a diving save. Jimmy shouts, "Great stop Nathan, nothing is getting by you today." (Field notes, eighth grade season, lesson 9)

> Watching a game between the Hawks and the Bulls, Justin (a Bull) takes a shot at goal. Jose (an official) indicates that it wasn't a goal, but Brandon (an official) indicates a score. Brandon and Jose come together, discuss the play, and end up making a joint decision that the goal was good. (Field notes, seventh grade season, lesson 15)

Once engaged in the playoffs, however, when every game was "important" in a sporting sense and the stakes were higher, many

of the higher skilled boys reverted to type and, in line with their views on participation in "real sport," began to engage in unsporting behaviors that they had previously jettisoned, because they thought this course of action might help them win:

> Jack makes a good defensive play during a team scrimmage, swatting the ball out of the air as Trevon tries to shoot at the goal. Trevon stares at Jack and says, "I wished that we would have been using a harder ball so that the ball would have jammed your finger." (Field notes, seventh grade season, lesson 17)

During a game between the Jaguars and Leprechauns, Jesse (a Jaguar) begins yelling unconstructively and aggressively at Alex, a teammate of his who is the goalkeeper: "Alex, stop getting out of the goalie box! You're losing the game for us! You need to stop some shots!" (Field notes, eighth grade season, lesson 18)

Regardless of these trends in their use of unsporting and sporting behaviors, at the end of the season, the majority of boys were adamant that, in general, they had become a more sporting group:

> I think it [i.e., sporting behavior and fair play] improved. I learned a lot more. We played team handball in fourth grade and it was wild. We argued a lot then. I also think in this unit, there are people who aren't as good, but, like, we take that into account. . . . Our sportsmanship, I think, has been a lot better. I think it's very important to show the other team that they're not bad, especially if they are down. You know you can give them a pat on the back and try and cheer them up because . . . you got the whole rest of the day and if you're upset you're going to be pouty. And then you're going to ruin other people's day. (Sam, focus group interview)

Derrick's Perceptions and Pedagogies

Two themes were identified from the analysis of the data set related to the second research question of the study. These were *Derrick's conception of fair play and sporting behavior* and *implementing a pure form of SE*.

Derrick's conception of fair play and sporting behavior. Derrick possessed a relatively sophisticated conception of fair play that was universal, like that of his lesser skilled students, and crossed the boundaries of different types and levels of sport. Also in congruence with his students, Derrick noted that playing in a fair and sporting manner involves not using unsporting behaviors and engaging in sporting ones:

> I think sporting behavior and fair play have to do with being a good sport to your team, as well as others like opponents and referees, like helping an opponent up during a game and not ignoring them. Looking at the aspect of negative sporting behavior or fair play would be like arguing with a teammate, an opponent, or the officials. (Derrick, formal interview 1)

For Derrick, however, the former condition was a prerequisite for the latter, and he was interested in moving his students toward the realization that to be truly sporting, they needed to engage in positive behaviors:

> I tried to always point out the good behavior students would show. Like, for example if a student was good about cheering on his teammates as well as his opponents, I would try to point that out during class to let him know, and the rest of the class know, that that was what I wanted to see. You know specifically if students were demonstrating poor sporting behavior . . . I would have them think about . . . how they could improve upon their behavior. . . . I would just talk to them one-on-one to let them know why the behavior was wrong and how they should correct it. (Derrick, formal interview 2)

Derrick was also quick to point out that to have an influence on his students, he needed to model positive sporting behavior:

> I knew this group might be a handful, so I always try to be very conscious of what I say and do in class and even out of class. I always talk about being a good sport and treating others like you want to be treated, so I really try to also copy

that behavior for the students by my own actions. (Derrick, stimulated recall interview)

Implementing a pure form of SE. Derrick did not "water down" or pick and choose elements of the SE model to employ, as coaching-oriented teachers have been shown to do (Curtner-Smith et al., 2008). Rather, he delivered a unit that included all the elements that Siedentop et al. (2011) suggested comprise a pure season of SE. This allowed him to take full advantage of the structure of SE to improve his students' understanding of fair play and sporting behavior and their ability to behave in a fair and sporting manner.

Derrick's early lessons were characterized by direct instruction, as he laid a managerial and organizational foundation for the seasons to come. After establishing these, he shifted to a blend of direct and indirect teaching styles. For example, like the teachers described by other researchers (Giebink & McKenzie, 1985; Hassandra et al., 2007; Romance et al., 1986), he frequently held discussions with his students at the end of lessons to explore their sporting behavior (or lack of it) in the previous lesson:

> Following the lesson, Derrick meets with his students and asks, "Looking at fair play and sportsmanship, how do you think y'all did today?" Jason raises his hand and responds, "Overall, I think it was pretty good, coach. Although there might have been a few too many arguments with the officials, nothing like serious, but you know." (Field notes, seventh grade season, lesson 13)

In addition, once students were engaged in practice or gameplay, Derrick constantly prompted them to engage in less unsporting behavior and more sporting behavior:

> At the end of the first set of 7th grade preseason games, Derrick has the class sit down in a half circle and begins talking to them: "I thought y'all did a pretty good job today. One thing I want you to really focus on and improve on is your sportsmanship. I noticed many of you were arguing with the refs. We don't need any of that! That's not part of being a good sport, do you all get that?" The students nod

their heads in agreement. (Field notes, seventh grade season, lesson 6)

Following the end of a game, Derrick calls Emanuel over to talk with him. Derrick says, "Emanuel I thought you played really hard during that first game, but you shoot every time you have the ball in your hand. Do you think that is being a good teammate?" Emanuel replies, "Mr. D, I just want to score the most goals that I can." Derrick responds, "I understand that, but you really need to try and get your teammates involved, be a team player." (Field notes, seventh grade season, lesson 12)

At the conclusion of their respective seasons, many of Derrick's students noted the positive effect of Derrick's prompts on them. They acknowledged that "the times when he [i.e., Derrick] talks about fair play and sportsmanship during class we tend to do better."

Another key to Derrick's success was that he gave those in leadership roles (i.e., coaches and captains) a lot of responsibility for their teammates' behaviors:

The most meaningful aspect of class today was seeing my class run the preseason game without my help. I have been really stressing with my students that they need to take on a lot of the responsibility. (Derrick, critical incident report, lesson 6)

During the second game between the Tigers and Sharks, Marvin (a Shark) begins arguing with Dennard (a Tiger) about stepping over the goal line while attempting a shot. Marvin shouts, "Dennard, quit stepping over the line, you're cheating!" Michael, the Sharks' coach, immediately goes over to Marvin and says, "Marvin, arguing with Dennard won't help us. You have to just move on. If the refs see it they will call it, but we don't need to lose fair play points dude." (Field notes, seventh grade season, lesson 19)

Moreover, following Hastie and Sharpe (1999), Derrick included his "fair play system" at the heart of his effort to improve his students'

understanding and exhibition of sporting behavior. This system involved the two officials of each game being able to award a maximum of 3 points for fair play and sporting behavior to each team. These points were added to those points that teams acquired for winning (3 points) and drawing (2 points) games and so counted toward teams' league positions during the regular season. As illustrated by the following field note extract, the system appeared to have the intended effect:

> The Wildcats and Huskies are engaged in a regular season game. Jack, one of the more athletic boys, steps out of the game. He tells Eric, his teammate, to "sub in" for him. Jack says, "I can't handle this! I need to take a break or I'm gonna lose it." I ask Jack what the problem is. He replies, "I thought the ref missed that traveling call on Lamar, and I almost went up to him to say something, but I held up 'cause I didn't want to lose my cool and cost our team fair play points." (Field notes, 7th grade season, lesson 12)

One feature of Derrick's teaching was his awareness of what was happening in his classes. He was quick to detect that "some of the more athletic students [had] become overly competitive" once the playoffs began and that, consequently, "poor sportsmanship and fair play" increased and some students became "overly aggressive." To counter this state of affairs, Derrick "decided to double the [number of] fair play points" officials could award "so they counted for more than a win." However, this strategy did not have the desired effect on many of the students. It did, however, positively influence some of them:

> I mean you have to demonstrate good sportsmanship and fair play if you seriously want to get to the championship game in order to get fair play points. You can't get to the championship game by simply winning. If you're a poor sport or you're arguing with the refs all the time, you won't get there. You have to represent your team positively and be a good sport. (Wyatt, focus group interview)

Derrick also tried a second strategy to counter the increase in unsporting behavior during the playoff phase of the season. He

required "the coaches to assess the refs on how they did during games." Specifically, the coaches of each team in a playoff game could award a maximum of 2 points to the teams who supplied the referees. The bases for this award were the standard of officiating and the degree to which the referees were perceived to be impartial. Again, although it was not a total success, Derrick and his students thought that the strategy positively affected some students:

> During the late part of the season, I noticed some students really focusing on their fair play. The fact that fair play points counted for more during the playoffs really seemed to push students to demonstrate good fair play and sportsmanship. If students got angry, I really noticed their teammates, like their coach, trying to calm each other down. I think it's coming more from the students than me towards the end of the unit. (Derrick, formal interview 2)

> Mr. D also started giving fair play points to the refs. Basically as a way to make sure they were focused on making the right calls and paying attention. The better they did, the more points they got, and I think it's really helped in getting them to pay attention and make the right calls. (Sam, focus group interview)

Conclusion

Data collected during the study indicated that many of the students gained a more sophisticated understanding of fair play and sporting behavior during the two seasons. That is, their conception of these constructs shifted along the continuum encompassing the preconventional, conventional, and postconventional levels of moral development (Kohlberg, 1976). In addition, on numerous occasions students' actions matched their enhanced understanding and they were observed playing fairly and acting in a sporting manner.

Derrick's teaching orientation, his own concept of sporting behavior and fair play, his delivery of a pure version of SE, and his pedagogy had much to do with these shifts and positive outcomes. Collectively, they allowed him to present new ideas about

sporting behavior and fair play, which the students assimilated and accommodated.

However, many of the more skilled students' willingness to engage in fair play and sporting behavior had boundaries and was context specific. These students noted that they were more inclined to act in a sporting fashion during PE than during "real" sport. Moreover, in line with past research (Brock & Hastie, 2007), this research shows that as gameplay became more competitive in the SE seasons and began to resemble the organized sport to which students were more accustomed, some of the more skilled students regressed to behaving at the preconventional or conventional levels of moral development. That is, they engaged in more unsporting behaviors and were prepared to play outside the rules of the game in accordance with what they viewed as societal norms, unless stopped by the officials for fear of sanction.

Conversely, many of the less skilled students maintained a universal concept of sporting behavior and fair play and so did not take the same backward step as their relatively skilled peers when the competition became fiercer. The different impact of Derrick's teaching on the more and less skilled boys, then, illustrates the powerful socializing force that organized youth and school sport has on students of this age.

The results of the study confirm that the SE model is an excellent medium through which to develop sporting behavior and fair play. They also suggest that PETE faculty training undergraduate preservice teachers or conducting professional development for in-service teachers would do well to stress that the best results are achieved when teachers deliver the pure form of the model as opposed to incorporating parts of the model within traditional multiactivity teaching. Moreover, the results of the study suggest that PETE faculty require preservice and in-service teachers to examine their own concepts of sporting behavior and fair play, warn them about the difficulty of changing the behaviors of students who have an extensive background in organized youth and school sport, and attempt to provide them with specific strategies for improving sporting behavior and fair play that are compatible with the SE model.

Future research detailing the extent to which the results of this study transfer to other preservice and in-service teachers would be

useful. Such work would be particularly helpful if carried out in different contexts and with different students in terms of gender and age.

References

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Brock, S. J., & Hastie, P. A. (2007). Students' conceptions of fair play in Sport Education. *ACHPER Australia Healthy Lifestyles Journal*, *54*(1), 11–15.

Chen, Y., & Curtner-Smith, M. (2013). Hegemonic masculinity in Sport Education: Case studies of experienced in-service teachers with teaching orientations. *European Physical Education Review, 19*, 360–380. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X13495631

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. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573320701780779

Ennis, C. D. (1999). Creating a culturally relevant curriculum for disengaged girls. *Sport, Education, and Society, 4*(1), 31–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/1357332990040103

Figley, G. E. (1984). Moral education through physical education. *Quest, 36,* 89–101. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.1984.10483804

Gibbons, L. S., Ebbeck, V., & Weiss, M. R. (1995). Fair play for kids: Effects on the moral development of children in physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, *66*, 247–255. https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.1995.10608839

Giebink, M. P., & McKenzie, T. L. (1985). Teaching sportsmanship in physical education and recreation: An analysis of interventions and generalization effects. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 4*, 167–177. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.4.3.167

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Harvey, S., Kirk, D., & O'Donovan, M. (2014). Sport education as a pedagogical application for ethical development in physical education and youth sport. *Sport, Education, and Society, 19*(1), 41–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2011.624594

Hassandra, M., Goudas, M., Hatzigeorgiadis, A., & Theodorakis, Y. (2007). A fair play intervention in school Olympic education. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 2,* 99–114. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03173516

Hastie, P. A., & Sharpe, T. (1999). Effects of a Sport Education curriculum on the positive social behavior of at-risk rural adolescent boys. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *4*, 417–430. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327671espr0404_4

Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.), *Moral development and behavior* (pp. 31–53). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Lawson, H. A. (1983a). Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: The subjective warrant, recruitment, and teacher education (part 1). *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *2*, 3–16. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2.3.3

Lawson, H. A. (1983b). Toward a model of teacher socialization in physical education: Entry into schools, teachers' role orientations, and longevity in teaching (part 2). *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *3*, 3–15. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.3.1.3

Mouratidou, K., Goutza, S., & Chatzopoulos, D. (2007). Physical education and moral development: An intervention programme to promote moral reasoning through physical education in high school students. *European Physical Education Review, 13*(1), 41–56. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X07072675

Parker, M. B., & Curtner-Smith, M. D. (2012). Sport Education: A panacea for hegemonic masculinity in physical education or more of the same? *Sport, Education, and Society, 17*, 479–496. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2011.608945

Penney, D., Clarke, G., & Kinchin, G. (2002). Developing physical education as a 'connective specialism': Is sport education the answer? *Sport, Education, and Society, 7,* 55–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573320120113576

Piaget, J. (1965). *The child's conception of number*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton

Rest, J., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M., & Thoma, S. (1999). *Postconventional moral thinking: A neo-Kolbergian approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Romance, T. J., Weiss, M. R., & Bockoven, J. (1986). A program to promote moral development through elementary school physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 5*, 126–136. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.5.2.126

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

Siedentop, D. (1994). *Sport Education: Quality PE through positive sport experiences.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Siedentop, D., Hastie, P. A., & van der Mars, H. (2011). *Complete guide to Sport Education* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Sinelnikov, O., & Hastie, P. (2008). Teaching Sport Education to Russian students: An ecological analysis. *European Physical Education Review, 14*, 203–222. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X08090706

Vidoni, C., & Ward, P. (2009). Effects of fair play instruction on student social skills during a middle school Sport Education unit. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 14*, 285–310. https://doi.org/10.1080/17408980802225818