

## A NATIONAL SURVEY OF NEW ZEALAND SECONDARY SCHOOLS PHYSICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TEACHING PERSONAL AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (TPSR) MODEL

ESTUDIO NACIONAL DE LA IMPLEMENTACIÓN DEL MODELO 'ENSEÑANZA DE LA RESPONSABILIDAD PERSONAL Y SOCIAL' (TPSR) EN LOS PROGRAMAS DE EDUCACION FISICA DE LAS ESCUELAS SECUNDARIAS DE NUEVA ZELANDA

Barrie **GORDON**, Victoria University of Wellington (New Zealand)<sup>1</sup>  
Liz **THEVENARD**, Victoria University of Wellington (New Zealand)  
Flaviu **HODIS**, Victoria University of Wellington (New Zealand)

### ABSTRACT

All New Zealand secondary schools (370) received a 38-item survey examining their use of the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model (TPSR) within their physical education programs. A total of 148 schools (40%) responded of which 79 reported that they were teaching TPSR in their physical education programs. On average, the teachers using TPSR (158) had taught physical education for 4.8 years. While some were in their first year of teaching TPSR, 69.7% reported that they had been using the model for over two years and 37.8% for more than five. Teachers indicated that they had high levels of knowledge of, and confidence in, using TPSR.

When exploring how teachers implemented TPSR it was found that many did not follow the daily program format consistently when teaching TPSR-based lessons. Almost 70% of teachers using TPSR had taught it in combination with Sport Education and most considered the combination to be highly successful. Teachers generally believed that TPSR-based teaching led to better behaved, more supportive students who were more able to be self-directed learners. They also believed TPSR resulted in improved learning in physical education and generated positive outcomes in other areas of the schools.

### RESUMEN

Todas las escuelas de secundaria neozelandesas (370) recibieron un cuestionario de 38 preguntas destinado a examinar la utilización del modelo 'Enseñanza de la Responsabilidad Personal y Social' (TPSR) en sus programas de Educación Física (EF). Respondieron 148 escuelas (40%), de las cuales 79

<sup>1</sup>. Email: barrie.gordon@vuw.ac.nz

indicaron que sí lo usaban. Como promedio, los profesores que aplicaban el TPSR (158) llevaban dando clase de EF 4,8 años. Aunque algunos indicaron que era el primer año que estaban desarrollándolo, el 69.7% afirmó llevar haciéndolo más de dos años, y el 37.8% más de cinco. También, los profesores dijeron tener un nivel alto de conocimiento del TPSR y una gran confianza en su utilización.

Al explorar el modo en que los profesores aplicaban el modelo, se observó que, cuando llevaban a cabo sus lecciones basadas en TPSR, muchos no seguían de forma sistemática el formato de programa diario. Casi un 70% de los profesores que usaban el TPSR lo habían enseñado en combinación con la Educación Deportiva, y la mayoría consideraba dicha combinación muy exitosa. En general, creían que la enseñanza basada en el TPSR conllevaba una mejora en el comportamiento de los alumnos que se hacían más comprensivos, solidarios y eran más capaces de auto-dirigir su aprendizaje. También creían que el TPSR mejoraba el aprendizaje en EF y generaba resultados positivos en otras áreas escolares.

**KEYWORDS.** Physical Education; secondary school, responsibility; New Zealand.

**PALABRAS CLAVE.** Educación Física; escuela secundaria; responsabilidad; Nueva Zelanda.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

---

Sport and physical activity have long been considered suitable contexts for the development of positive social and moral development. Well documented examples of these contexts being used as a deliberate means of cultural socialisation include the promotion of “Muscular Christianity” by many churches in the early 19<sup>th</sup> Century and the introduction of sport and games such as cricket and rugby football into the English public school system (e.g. Redman, 1988). Writers have continued to champion sport and physical activity contexts for social and moral development (Laker, 2000; Tinning, MacDonald, Wright, & Hickey, 2001; Wright, Li, Ding, & Pickering, 2010).

While writers acknowledge the positive potential of activity-based programs, they also acknowledge that participation is no guarantee that positive development will actually occur (Lidor, 1998). There is a general understanding that depending on the participants' experiences, programs can have little, or in fact a negative influence on social development (Estes, 2003; Laker, 2000). For programs to be successful, it is generally considered that they should have positive social development as an overt aim and be clearly structured to increase the possibility that appropriate learning will occur.

Within the broader context of sport and physical activity, physical education has been identified as an appropriate means towards positive moral and social development. For many, the content of physical education offers specific opportunities not available in other curriculum areas (Laker, 2000; Siedentop, 1991). One pedagogical approach within physical education that has gained a high profile as a model with a specific interest in social and moral development is Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR).

## 2. OVERVIEW OF TPSR

---

TPSR was developed by Don Hellison (Hellison, 2003, 2011) in response to his perception that physical activity programs needed to be more specifically designed to meet the true needs of underserved youth. As a result of this belief he developed a model of teaching sport and physical education that had the explicit intention of teaching students to become more personally and socially responsible. While originally developed for use in school physical education programs, TPSR has been implemented in a variety of contexts including after-school clubs for underserved youth, outdoor education programs, and programs for students with disabilities (Stiehi, 2000; Walsh, Ozaeta, & Wright, 2010; Wright, White, & Gaebler-Spira, 2004).

Within physical education TPSR had established a high profile as a pedagogical approach to the teaching of physical education. It has been consistently included in pedagogically orientated physical education text books (e.g. Lund & Tannehill, 2010; Siedentop, 1991) and numerous articles on the model have been published in professional journals over a number of years (e.g. Georgiadis, 1990; Hammond-Diedrich & Walsh, 2006; Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Parker & Hellison, 2001; Walsh, et al., 2010; Wright & Burton, 2008).

TPSR has also become well known internationally and is taught in a number of countries including Ireland, Spain, South Korea, Australia and New Zealand (Escartí, Gutiérrez, Pascual, & Llopis, 2010; Escarti, Gutierrez, Pascual, & Marin, 2010; Gordon, 2010a). Hellison himself has been a regular keynote speaker at physical education conferences in a wide variety of countries. He has worked with a number of physical education academics, and their students throughout the world and this has helped to increase and maintain TPSR's international profile.

While it is beyond the scope of this article to give a full and detailed description of TPSR, two aspects, the daily program format and the underpinning themes which were specifically examined in this research, will be briefly described.

The five-stage daily program format was developed by Hellison because of his belief that day-to-day consistency in the way TPSR is implemented was essential. This consistency was considered to offer an important support for student learning as "kids' understandings and exploration of these ideas [TPSR] grows slowly and unevenly, often with considerable backsliding" (Hellison, 2011, p. 49). The daily program format was designed as a generic structure to be used as the basis from which teachers and leaders would develop programs appropriate for their particular contexts.

The program format consists of five parts: *relational time*, when the teacher spends time developing appropriate relationships with students; an *awareness talk*, a brief reorientation of students to the goals of the model; *physical activity plan*, the period of the lesson where meeting the physical education curriculum goals is achieved by using pedagogical approaches that enable the goals of TPSR to also be addressed; *group meeting time*, held towards the end of the class where students can discuss, as a class, how the lesson has gone, what went well and what can be improved; and *self-*

*reflection time*, where students reflect on their own personal and social responsibility that day.

Underpinning TPSR is a number of themes that have been identified as central to a successful implementation of TPSR in physical education. (Hellison, 2003). Four themes – the successful *integration* of TPSR and the physical activity aspect of the lesson, the *transfer* of TPSR related learning outside the classroom, the *empowerment of students*, and the development of appropriate *teacher-student relationships* – were included in this study. A fifth theme, *self-reflection*, was identified by Hellison (2011) after the creation of the survey and was therefore not included.

The success of TPSR is largely due to the pleasure and enjoyment that students gain from physical activity and sport. It is activity that hooks students and maintains their attention while TPSR is introduced into their world. It is therefore important that the physical activity part of the lesson be taught in ways that maintain the interests of the students while also allowing for the successful *integration* of TPSR. For physical education teachers there is the added requirement that they meet mandated curriculum goals, goals that must be met while integrating the learning associated with TPSR. To be able to successfully meet these ‘twin goals’ (Hellison, 2003) requires strong physical education pedagogical knowledge and an in-depth understanding of TPSR.

The *transfer of learning* about personal and social responsibility from the physical education program to students’ lives outside of the classroom is the fundamental reason behind TPSR. As Hellison (2011, p. 25) commented, “Transfer is really my ultimate goal in teaching kids to take personal and social responsibility”. This transfer is not, however, automatic and must be overtly taught in the same way as the other aspects of TPSR. There is a variety of ways that transfer can be taught but fundamentally a commitment to the teaching of transfer of learning should be integral to any implementation of TPSR.

The third theme, *empowering students*, allows students to gain more and more responsibility for their own learning, while experiencing opportunities to make choices and to take responsibility for the choices they make. The application of this theme is often seen in the ways that TPSR is integrated into the physical activity segment of the lesson. There are almost unlimited pedagogical approaches that can be utilized within teaching and the choices that teachers make will largely decide the degree to which students are empowered and what opportunities they will have to develop personal and social responsibility within their classes.

The final theme of developing *students/teacher relationships* is an acknowledgement that unless an appropriate relationship is developed between the teacher and the students little will be achieved when teaching TPSR. For Hellison (2011, p. 25), the key to establishing successful relationships is the ability of the teacher to “recognize and respect the strengths, individuality, voice, and decision making capabilities of our students.”

### 3. RESEARCH ON TPSR IN SCHOOL PHYSICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

---

While TPSR has been promoted as a suitable pedagogical approach for use in school physical education, it has received only a limited degree of examination in this context. There is an absence of data on the degree to which TPSR is taught in schools, a limitation that leads to uncertainty about the actual impact that the model is having. Aligned with this is a lack of research that examines what occurs when regular classroom teachers take responsibility for the implementation of TPSR within the physical education program.

Mrugala (2002) surveyed 52 US school physical educators who were using TPSR in their practice. He identified that many teachers had changed the model for their own practice in ways that “seemed suggestive of teachers wanting to use TPSR more as a tool for discipline, or as a device to simplify grading” (p. 133). These changes indicated that the teachers may not have had a commitment to many of the underpinning tenets associated with successful implementations of TPSR. He also identified, however, that of those who had initially implemented the model as a possible answer to classroom control issues, a large majority (more than 70%) reported changes in the way they related to students, which they attributed to the experience of working with TPSR. Most practitioners emphasized that working with the TPSR had:

... led them to modify their educational practices, including student treatment and grading, physical activity instruction, and lesson structuring. Others mentioned a shift in their teaching of life skills and values, specifically citing changes they made to how they taught responsibility, personal accountability, and the encouragement of team spirit. Many teachers described TPSR as having made an impact on how they empowered their students; they reported a tangible increase in their level of patience and understanding when dealing with them. (Mrugala 2003, p. 129)

Two quasi-experimental studies have examined secondary school implementations of TPSR. Gordon (2010), using a mixed method approach, examined a six-month implementation of TPSR in a New Zealand secondary school. The same physical education teacher taught four classes; two classes were based on TPSR while two were taught using a traditional pedagogical approach. This research found that TPSR was successful in developing positive, supportive and well-behaved classes in physical education. By the end of the implementation the majority of students had developed a greater understanding of personal and social responsibility and became more personally and socially responsible in class. The students were not found to be disadvantaged in meeting the physical education curriculum goals and students in the TPSR classes were found to be better behaved and more engaged in their class work than the equivalent students in the control classes. For the vast majority of students in the TPSR classes the teaching and learning about personal and social responsibility was confined to the physical education context with only a small number identifying that the learning was applicable in other areas of their lives.

Wright et al. (2010) used multiple methods to study an 18 lesson TPSR-based wellness program in a USA inner-city high school. A total of 122 participants divided among four classes (two treatment and two comparison) were studied. The study established that the program was implemented with a moderately high level of fidelity to the TPSR model and that the students in the treatment groups had more positive gain scores on truancy, tardiness, grades and conduct than students in the comparison classes. In this study, the teaching was done by a university professor and a graduate assistant rather than the regular teacher, a common approach in many of the studies of school-based implementations of TPSR. Both studies concluded that TPSR could be successfully integrated into the secondary school physical education curriculum, although both also identified that the context of schools offered challenges for the teachers.

This study attempts to help address some of the present gaps in knowledge by completing a national survey of all New Zealand secondary school physical education departments to establish the degree to which TPSR is implemented in New Zealand, and to gain some insight into how TPSR is implemented in practice.

#### 4. NEW ZEALAND CONTEXT

---

New Zealand is a small country of approximately four million people situated in the South Pacific. In 2001 Don Hellison was invited to visit New Zealand to introduce TPSR to New Zealand physical educators. During this visit he ran a number of well-attended regional workshops and presented a well-received keynote presentation at the national physical education conference. This visit proved to be a catalyst that led to a number of physical education teachers introducing TPSR into their own professional practice. The degree to which this occurred is uncertain but anecdotal evidence would suggest that a sizable number of teachers began implementing aspects of TPSR into their teaching. In 2004, Hellison returned to New Zealand to present a three-day workshop at Massey University. This workshop attracted 25 teachers, physical education advisors and university lecturers, the majority of whom were already implementing TPSR in their teaching programs.

Discussions with the coordinators of the physical education pre-service programs at the five major universities within New Zealand have established that they have all taught TPSR as a curriculum model for the teaching of physical education for a number of years. This means that the majority of beginning teachers of physical education enter New Zealand secondary schools with some knowledge of TPSR and an understanding that it is a pedagogical model that they can use in their professional practice.

The New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007) also offers support for the use of TPSR as a model for the teaching of physical education in this country. The document identifies five key competencies that are expected to underpin all learning and teaching in New Zealand schools. These competencies include managing self, relating to others, and participating in and contributing to local, national, and international communities, all competencies that are aligned with the intended outcomes of TPSR. The New Zealand Curriculum Document also presents a series of

essence statements that outline the learning to be achieved within each of the eight areas of learning. The statement for the health and physical education learning area includes the following:

Through learning and by accepting challenges in health-related movement contexts, students reflect on the nature of well-being and how to promote it. As they develop resilience and a sense of personal and social responsibility, they are increasingly able to take responsibility for themselves and contribute to the well-being of those around them, their communities, environments, and society. (New Zealand Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 16)

TPSR then seems to be in close alignment with both the underlying philosophy of the New Zealand Curriculum and the specific area of Health and Physical Education. While it appears that TPSR is established as an accepted pedagogical approach in physical education practice in New Zealand, the lack of empirical examination means that there can be no certainty about the situation.

## 5. DESCRIBING THE RESEARCH

---

### Objectives

This research has three objectives:

- to establish how prevalent the teaching of TPSR is in New Zealand secondary school physical education programs.
- to understand how TPSR is taught in New Zealand schools.
- to understand teachers' beliefs about the outcomes that are generated from using the model.

### Method

An initial version of the TPSR in schools survey, based on a review of TPSR literature, was developed by the research team. The survey was then piloted with experienced teachers of physical education who were also experienced practitioners with TPSR. This process was repeated with different teachers on four occasions. After each of the four trials, suggested modifications were made to the wording of questions to help with the clarity of understanding. The final survey contained 38 questions placed within four sections. Two questions allowed teachers to make comments. One was on the reasons for their not teaching with TPSR and the other gave teachers the opportunity to expand on areas outside of physical education where TPSR was taught. All other questions were closed with teachers being asked to respond with a yes or no answer or on a five or ten-point Likert scale.

### Participants

All New Zealand secondary school physical education departments (370) were surveyed. A total of 148 schools responded of which 79 reported teaching TPSR in their physical education programmes while 70 did not. Of the schools teaching TPSR 83%

were urban and 17% were rural. Of the schools not teaching TPSR 63% were urban and 37% rural. The schools were predominately coeducational with 73% of the TPSR and 61% of the non-TPSR schools coeducational while 27% and 39% were single sex. There was a wide range in school size for both groups of schools. The TPSR schools ranged in size from less than 70 students to over 3000. The non-TPSR schools had a similar range with the smallest of 20 students and the largest a school of 2500.

### Process

An initial mail-out was made to the Head of Department, Physical Education, of every secondary school in New Zealand (N=370). This mail-out included a letter of introduction, an information sheet on the research, a hard copy of the 38-item survey and a pre-paid addressed envelope. The information sheet gave details of ethical considerations and included a statement that completing the survey would be considered as giving informed consent. Four follow-up emails, with an electronic copy of the survey form attached, were sent to all schools that had not replied. The follow-up process occurred over a period of 10 weeks. Completed surveys were received from a total of 148 of the 370 schools (40%). The research was approved by the Victoria University of Wellington, Faculty of Education, Human Ethics Committee.

## 6. RESULTS

---

The results are presented in four sections: i) schools who reported that they were not using TPSR; ii) information on the teachers who were using the model; iii) how the model was being implemented in practice; and iv) teacher beliefs about the outcomes that occur from TPSR-based teaching.

### Schools not using TPSR

A total of 70 schools (47%) indicated that they were not using TPSR. The two most popular reasons given for not implementing the model were, perhaps not surprisingly, that they had simply not considered using it (42%) or that they did not feel that they had sufficient knowledge to implement the model confidently (33%). A small number of schools (eight) indicated that they had not heard of, or had no knowledge of, TPSR while four schools considered that while they were not implementing the model they did teach "some aspects". A variety of other reasons were given including that their school was in the process of introducing TPSR for the following year, that similar programs were already in place, and that they had chosen to concentrate on implementing other pedagogical models instead.

### Teachers using TPSR

A total of 158 individual teachers (from 69 schools) who were using TPSR completed the survey. Of these, 57% were female and 43% were male. Approximately half of the teachers (52.8%) were working in physical education departments where it was mandatory to teach TPSR; for the remainder, this was a voluntary decision.



There was a wide range of teaching experience among the teachers using TPSR with a number in their first year of teaching while others had taught for up to 30 plus years. On average the teachers had taught physical education for 4.8 years. There was also a wide spread of experience with teaching TPSR. While some were in their first year with the model, 69.7% reported that they had been using the model for over two years and 37.8% for more than five. Teachers indicated on a 10 point scale that they had a high level of confidence (mean 6.8) in using TPSR in their teaching and that they felt they had a high level of knowledge (mean 6.6) of the model.

### How implemented in practice

While it is interesting to identify the numbers of teachers who are using TPSR in their teaching, there is also an interest in finding out how they implemented the model in practice. In this survey the issue of implementation was addressed by asking teachers about their TPSR practices in four areas. These were their adherence to the daily program format, their consideration of the four themes, the length of time they committed to implementing the model with their classes, and their use of the Sport Education/TPSR merged model.

### Daily program format

The teachers were asked in the survey to indicate on a five-point scale how often they implemented each of the five aspects of the daily program format with their classes. The results (**Table i**) show some variance in the regularity of implementation. It is noticeable that in the three aspects that require a structural commitment within lessons – awareness talk, group meeting, and reflection time – between 15% and 20% of teachers included these occasionally or never. It should also be noted, however, that a high percentage of teachers indicated that they included these aspects usually or in most or every class.

**Table i.** Percentage (rounded) of teachers who implemented the various aspects of the daily teaching format by category

Question	1	2	3	4	5
I consciously ensure that I have individual conversations with students during lessons to help establish personal relationships	1%	4%	25%	53%	16%
The class has an "awareness talk" or equivalent process to focus students on the goals of TPSR at the beginning of the lesson	2%	18%	32%	34%	14%
The physical activity component of the lesson is taught in a way that helps meet the outcomes of TPSR	0	8%	32%	46%	14%
A group meeting is held towards the end of the lesson to discuss events related to what has happened during the lesson	2%	13%	28%	47%	11%
The class has a reflection time set aside at the end of the lesson for students to reflect on their behaviour during that session	2%	15%	25%	48%	11%

(1-Never, 2- Occasionally, 3- Usually, 4- Most classes, 5-Every class)

These results do raise the issue of whether the programs that some teachers are teaching have a high level of fidelity to TPSR. Can TPSR be successfully implemented

without all or indeed any of the aspects identified in the daily lesson format? Can a program be TPSR based when students are not given time to discuss the lesson as a group or to reflect individually on their own behavior? These issues will be considered further in the discussion section.

### Themes

Having acknowledged the importance of the underpinning themes, the researchers were interested in establishing the degree to which they influenced the ways that teachers planned and implemented TPSR in their practice. Teachers were asked to indicate on a five-point scale their responses to a series of theme-related statements (**Table ii**).

These responses show that over 80% of the teachers felt that the themes play a part in the teaching of their classes usually, for most, or for all of their classes. This would indicate that the themes play a strong role in the planning and teaching of classes for teachers and that they are a factor in the way that physical education is practiced in the reality of their physical education classrooms.

**Table ii.** Teachers' responses (percentages/rounded) to theme related statements

Question	1	2	3	4	5
Incorporating TPSR has had an impact on how the physical education subject matter has been taught	0	10%	33%	47%	9%
Decisions on how the physical education subject matter will be taught have been directly influenced by the need to shift control and power to students	1%	17%	36%	38%	8%
Students are specifically taught in class that learning about personal and social responsibility can be applied to contexts outside of PE	1%	10%	31%	39%	20%
The relationships I have with students in classes taught using TPSR are positive and respectful	0	1%	12%	49%	38%

1-Never, 2- Occasionally, 3- Usually, 4- Most classes, 5-Every class

The third area of examination in regards to teachers' practice was to establish the length of time that teachers chose to implement TPSR with their classes. If TPSR-based teaching is, as described by Nick Forsberg (Hellison, 2011: 19), "a way of being", a philosophy of teaching that underpins relationships and interactions rather than simply a pedagogical model, then the length of time that teachers taught TPSR is one indication of teachers' philosophical commitment. Teachers were asked to indicate whether they taught TPSR for a few individual lessons, units up to one month, a term at a time, half a year, or for the full year. Teachers were not restricted to one answer only and many chose to tick more than one category.

The results (**Table iii**, next page) show a wide range of answers with only 20% of teachers implementing TPSR for the full year while almost half of the teachers implemented TPSR for either a few lessons or in units of up to a month.

**Table iii.** Length of time TPSR implemented by teachers

Length of implementation	Numbers of selections.	
A few individual lessons	23	(11%)
Units of up to one month	80	(38%)
A term (8-9-weeks) at a time	53	(25%)
Half a year	12	(6%)
Full year	42	(20%)

These responses generated a number of further questions. What does the fact that over a hundred teachers implemented TPSR with classes for “a few individual lessons” or in “units up to one month” mean about their understanding and/or commitment? Alternatively, a similar number indicated a longer-term commitment of a term, half a year or a full year. Some teachers implemented TPSR for different periods of time with different classes. Why did they do this and what is the impact on the programs and the students’ learning?

#### **Sport Education/TPSR merged model**

The specific questions around combining Sport Education and TPSR were included as there was strong anecdotal evidence suggesting that this was common practice in New Zealand schools. Of the teachers who used TPSR, a high percentage (68.9%) of them reported that they had taught TPSR in combination with Sport Education. Teachers who stated they had taught the combined model were also asked to rate how successful they found the combination (0-Very unsuccessful to 9- Very successful). The mean response of 7.3 would indicate that teachers were happy with the combination and that they believed it was a successful way to teach physical education.

#### **Teachers’ beliefs on the outcomes of TPSR-based teaching**

The final section looks at the beliefs that teachers held about the impact that TPSR had on their students. Teachers were asked to indicate on a ten-point scale their response to a series of statements about the outcomes resulting from teaching TPSR. The results (**Table iv**) indicated that in general teachers believed that TPSR-based teaching resulted in a number of favorable outcomes.

**Table iv.** Teachers’ beliefs about outcomes resulting from teaching TPSR (0-Totally disagree to 9-Totally agree)

Statement	Mean	SD
Teaching classes with TPSR has a positive impact on student behavior in PE	7.36	1.31
Teaching classes with TPSR leads to an increase in student learning in the PE curriculum (e.g., aquatics, dance)	6.71	1.49
Teaching PE classes with TPSR leads to students being more supportive of each other in class	7.67	1.02
Teaching PE with TPSR leads to students being more able to be self-directed learners in PE	7.67	1.10
Teaching PE with TPSR leads to positive outcomes in other areas of the school	6.71	1.50

Teachers believed strongly that TPSR led to better behaved, more supportive students who are better able to be self-directed learners. Teachers also believed that teaching with TPSR resulted in increased learning in the physical education curriculum and positive outcomes in other areas of the school. With teachers under pressure to meet outcomes in an already pressurized curriculum, this offers support for teachers who may be concerned that introducing TPSR will adversely impact on the teaching and learning around physical education. The transfer of TPSR-related learning to other areas of students' lives has already been noted as fundamental to TPSR. There is some support that transfer does occur (Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Walsh, et al., 2010), but the research to date has been limited. These results show that, in the opinion of teachers using TPSR, transfer does occur as a result of TPSR being taught in schools.

## 7. DISCUSSION

---

As can perhaps be expected, while the results of this research have helped answer a number of questions, they have also raised others. The research has established that a sizable number of teachers use TPSR in their practice. Its implementation is supported by its alignment to both the New Zealand Curriculum and the specific area of health and physical education. This has given confidence to teachers contemplating introducing TPSR into their schools and encouragement for them to continue. The number of teachers who have continued to teach the model for a number of years is a telling indication of the value that they attribute to it. That so many teachers continue to use TPSR year after year signals that it is a model that works in the pragmatic swamp of real life teaching.

Exactly what teachers' interpretation of TPSR is and how closely their practice is aligned to the intent of the model is less certain. The teachers ranked their confidence in teaching TPSR and their knowledge of the model highly. There were, however, a number of factors identified in the survey that, at the very least, give pause for thought. For some teachers there was an inconsistent approach to how they prepared for, and taught, TPSR in the classroom. The results for the consistency of the daily program format, the consideration of the underpinning themes, and the length of time for some implementations raise a number of questions about the levels of fidelity to TPSR.

The majority of teachers, however, indicated that they understood the model, implemented the daily teaching program, and considered the themes in their planning usually, in most classes or for every class. This is an encouraging response which shows a good level of commitment for teachers involved in the day-to-day realities of teaching physical education.

The variation in the length of time teachers chose to implement TPSR also raises questions. If TPSR is really about "a way of being," a philosophical commitment by teachers underpinning what and how they teach, then the numbers who chose to implement short discrete units with TPSR raises questions about teachers' commitment to the model. Again these concerns should be balanced with the acknowledgement

that many teachers were teaching TPSR for substantial periods of time, including 20 who taught TPSR for the full year.

The variations in the way TPSR is taught and in the lengths of implementation does not necessarily mean that it is being taught badly or in ways that are contrary to the underpinning philosophy and intent of the model. It is possible that variation occurs because teachers have a full and sophisticated understanding of the model that allows them to modify their practice in ways that suit their students and context, while still achieving the goals of TPSR. In a previous article Gordon (in print) reported on a very experienced and successful TPSR-based teacher who commented that the structure and understandings aligned with TPSR were now so firmly established in her personal philosophy of teaching that she no longer consciously considered the model in her planning and/or teaching. This is an example of a teacher who has reached the level of unconscious competence, a point where she is able to skilfully use TPSR without the need for conscious consideration. It would be naïve to suggest that this is the case with all, or in fact many of the teachers responding to this survey. The reality is more likely to be that there is a wide range of expertise and sophistication in the ways that teachers implement the model with their classes.

The pragmatic modification of TPSR to meet the realities of teachers' practice can be observed in the numbers of teachers who combined TPSR with Sport Education and taught them together as merged units. With almost 70% of the teachers who have taught TPSR having combined it with a Sport Education unit this is a well established practice in New Zealand secondary school physical education. The popularity of combining the two models together, in merged units of work, may well be particular to New Zealand due to the historical relationship between Sport Education and New Zealand physical education. In 1990, Darryl Siedentop from The Ohio State University was invited to New Zealand to help implement a nation-wide trial of Sport Education (Siedentop, 2002). As a result of the success of this trial, Sport Education was actively promoted, with Government support, for use in secondary schools. Sport Education subsequently became a popular means of teaching physical education in many New Zealand schools.

For teachers the requirement that students undertake a variety of responsibilities in Sport Education may well suggest that there is a high level of congruity between the two models and that teaching them together is largely unproblematic. There has been some critique of the merging of TPSR and Sport Education, however, with Gordon (2009) suggesting that there are a number of potential problems. Difficulties can arise, for example, when the requirements of one model conflict with those of the other. This can occur in areas such as the use of referees versus self-regulated games or when changing rules mid-game to help generate TPSR related learning. Whatever the reality of their practice teachers considered the merging of the two to be highly successful. The survey did not, however, establish on what grounds this success was measured. Was it in relation to outcomes related to TPSR, to Sport Education, to both, or to some other criterion such as student engagement?

When asked about the outcomes resulting from teaching TPSR the teachers were consistently positive in their responses. Their belief that TPSR led to better behaved students is consistent with previous research (Cummings, 2000; Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Mrugala, 2002) and adds encouragement to those who believe in TPSR's humanistic approach to building positive classroom relationships. For those considering the academic implications of introducing TPSR, that teachers considered TPSR led to an increase in learning in the physical education curriculum and to students more able to be self-directed learners is particularly positive.

Previous research has generally been mixed in reporting the degree to which transfer of learning has occurred (Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Walsh, et al., 2010; Wright, et al., 2010). In this survey teachers indicated strongly that, in their professional judgement, this was occurring. While the research was limited to what they considered was happening in schools, the consistency of their responses suggests that, in their opinion, transfer was occurring to a noticeable degree.

### Further Research

There are a number of inherent limitations in survey research. In this study the responses were dependent on the teachers' understanding of the concepts and ideas being examined. There is also the reality that teachers' answers are self-reported and based on their self-perception of what they are doing in their practice. Greater understanding of the reality of TPSR in New Zealand could be achieved with further research including an exploration of teachers' TPSR practice in their classrooms. It would be interesting to complete such a study using the Tool for Assessing Responsibility-Based Education (Wright & Craig, 2011) which would allow for a more objective analysis of teachers' use of TPSR. There would also be interest in examining the impact of TPSR-based physical education on students' learning in other curriculum areas, on other teachers involved with the students and on the schools in general. Finally there is a need to examine whether transfer of learning occurs into students' lives outside of school?

This study has reported on the beliefs and practices of a large number of teachers from a wide range of schools situated across the whole of New Zealand. As such it gives an insight into the realities of teaching TPSR in a variety of "swamps of practice". It shows that TPSR has become well established in New Zealand secondary school physical education; it is well known by teachers and is implemented in a number of schools and programs throughout the country. It is supported by the national curriculum and the majority of students training to be teachers of physical education are introduced to the model during their pre-service programs. What the future holds for TPSR is uncertain but hopefully the solid base that it has established and the generally supportive attitudes held towards it by teachers will allow it to continue to be a positive influence on the youth of New Zealand well into the future.

## REFERENCES

---

- Cummings, T. (2000). *Testing the effectiveness of Hellison's personal and social responsibility model: A dropout, repeated grade, and absentee rate comparison*. Masters, California State University, Chico.
- Escartí, A., Gutiérrez, M., Pascual, C., & Llopis, R. (2010). Implementation of the Personal and Social Responsibility. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 10(3), 387-402.
- Escartí, A., Gutierrez, M., Pascual, C., & Marin, D. (2010). Applications of Hellison's Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Model in Physical Education to improve Self-Efficacy for Adolescents at Risk of Dropping-out of School. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 13(2), 667-676.
- Estes, S. (2003). Physical Education and Educational Sport. In A. Laker (Ed.), *The Future of Physical Education: building a new pedagogy*. London: Routledge.
- Georgiadis, N. (1990). Does basketball have to be all W's and L's. *Journal of Physical Education Recreation and Dance*, 61(6), 42-43.
- Gordon, B. (2009). Merging teaching personal and social responsibility with sport education: A marriage made in heaven or hell? *Healthy Lifestyles Journal*, 56, 13-16.
- Gordon, B. (2010). An Examination of the Responsibility model in a New Zealand Secondary School Physical Education Program. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 29(1), 21-37.
- Gordon, B. (2010a). *Teaching personal and social responsibility through physical education: An examination of the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model when taught in a New Zealand secondary school*. Saarbrücken:Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Hammond-Diedrich, K., & Walsh, D. (2006). Empowering Youth through a Responsibility-Based Cross-Age Program: An Investigation into Impact and Possibilities. *Physical Educator*, 63(3), 134-142.
- Hellison, D. (2003). *Teaching Responsibility Through Physical Education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hellison, D. (2011). *Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Through Physical Education* (Third ed.). Champaign :IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hellison, D., & Walsh, D. (2002). Responsibility-Based youth Programs Evaluation: Investigating the Investigations. *Quest*, 54(4), 292-307.
- Laker, A. (2000). *Beyond the Boundaries of Physical Education*. London: New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Lidor, R. (1998). Development of Character Through Sport and Activity. *International Journal of Physical Education*, 3, 86-98.
- Lund, J., & Tannehill, D. (2010). *Standards-based physical education curriculum development: Jones and Bartlett*.
- Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Mrugala, K. (2002). *Exploratory study of responsibility model practitioners*. PhD, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago.
- Parker, M., & Hellison, D. (2001). Teaching responsibility in physical education: Standards outcomes and beyond. *Journal of Physical Education Recreation and Dance*, 72(9), 25-27.
- Redman, G. (1988). *Historical aspects of fitness in the modern world*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

- Siedentop, D. (1991). *Developing Teaching Skills in Physical Education*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Siedentop, D. (2002). Sport Education: A retrospective. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 21(4), 409-419.
- Stiehi, J. (2000). Outdoor and Adventure Programs. In D. Hellison & N. Cutforth (Eds.), *Youth Development and Physical Activity* (pp. 67-85). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Tinning, R., MacDonald, D., Wright, J., & Hickey, C. (2001). *Becoming a Physical Education Teacher*. French Forest Australia: Pearson Educational.
- Walsh, D., Ozaeta, J., & Wright, P. (2010). Transference of responsibility goals to the school environment: exploring the impact of a coaching club program. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 15(1), 15-28.
- Wright, P., & Burton, S. (2008). Implementation and outcomes of a responsibility-based physical activity program integrated into an intact high school physical education class. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 27(2), 138-154.
- Wright, P., & Craig, M. (2011). Tool for Assessing Responsibility-Based Education (TARE): Instrument Development, Content Validity, and Inter-Rater Reliability. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 15(3), 204-219.
- Wright, P., Li, W., Ding, S., & Pickering, M. (2010). Integrating a personal and social responsibility program into a Wellness course for urban high school students: assessing implementation and educational outcomes. *Sport, Education and Society*, 15(3), 277-298.
- Wright, P., White, K., & Gaebler-Spira, D. (2004). Exploring the Relevance of the Personal and Social Responsibility Model in Adapted Physical Activity: A Collective Case Study. *The Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 23, 71-87.