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Abstract
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The Teaching Games for Understanding instructional model (TGfU), which was specifically created for physical education, enables students to explore their understanding of game-like situations and the tactical decisions they will have to make within game play. Thus, this learner-centred approach to games within physical education teaches students not only to understand how to be physical game players, but also how to execute appropriate decisions cognitively. With affective research lacking within the TGfU forum, it is the intention of this research study to directly embed a specific affective instructional model within a game-based TGfU context. Using Hellison’s Levels of Personal and Social Responsibility (PSR) within the context of the TGfU instructional model, the purpose of this qualitative multi-case study was to evaluate the effectiveness of a hybrid instructional model on the development of personal and social responsibility behaviours (Respect, Participation, Self-Direction, and Caring) in grade seven students within an invasion/territory games environment.

Three grade seven classes from a large middle public school in lower mainland British Columbia were invited to participate. A total of 58 students, 30 males and 28 females, were taught an 8-lesson invasion/territory games unit through one of three instructional models (hybrid, TGfU or Mr. A’s way).
Through analysis of student journal entry responses as well as observational field notes and unstructured interviews with the physical education teacher, all three cases provided six meaningful findings: developing personal and social responsibility behaviours, perceived responsibility, all about the game, irresponsibility in action, a positive learning environment, and a learned response. Based on the study’s findings, recommendations for future research include studying the longitudinal impact hybrid instructional games teaching could have on our students’ lives and studying the impact on effective questioning within our physical education environments.
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Thinking back to my days in middle school “gym” class, I was bombarded with memories of sport drills, school runs, climbing gymnastics equipment, and big games of dodge ball. Sport skills such as “Bump, set spike” (Volleyball) and “Right, Left, Up” (Basketball lay-up) were drilled into my head on an annual basis. Well-managed sport units structured around the specific skills needed to play the game suddenly became one big chaotic game as my classmates and I struggled to attempt a formal game saturated with rules, tactics and etiquette. Part-part-whole teaching or the direct method is one of the most used and/or popular instructional models in physical education today (Rink, 2010). Even though games are one fifth of movement expected to be taught within a well-developed physical education program, game play or more specifically sport skills dominate most of our students’ classes (Fairclough & Stratton, 2005). An argument can be and has been made to balance the teaching of these five movement categories; however, this will not be the intention of the dissertation. Rather, this dissertation examines how physical educators can manipulate this games category in order to provide many high quality learning experiences for our students. We must look to our past to answer our present.

The playing of games can be historically dated to 8000 BCE, through carvings and paintings portraying hunters in a target ready position. Documented games including bowling, bocce, curling, darts, stool ball, rounders, cricket, baseball, hurling, shinty, lacrosse, and hockey have become the backbone of games played within the physical education program. As noted by Wall and Murray (1994), games are unique to each student, satisfying each individual in different ways. As young children we are introduced to informal game play as a process for
development. From pulling the dog’s tail to playing tag with our siblings, we are expanding our creative minds and also preparing our bodies for optimal growth and development (Cronin & Mandich, 2005). When we reach school age, this type of game play becomes redefined within the confines of the physical education classroom. Student game play now has an academic purpose. Mandated by our provincial Ministry of Education, physical education’s academic intentions are to provide students with opportunities to acquire knowledge, movement skills and positive attitudes as they move through their schooling years, developing both healthy and active behaviours to last their lifetime (BC Ministry of Education, 2013).

Youth’s health and wellbeing has been given the spotlight by many governments and organizations due to the increase in such detrimental diseases such as obesity, type II diabetes, and heart disease (Baranowski et al., 2000; Tremblay, Katzmarzyk, & Willms, 2002). With reports declaring that the youth of today will not live to be as old as their parents, and that over half of our youth are overweight (Evans, 2006), initiatives have been launched on many levels to tackle this difficult problem (Federal Government: Children’s Fitness Tax Credit; Heart and Stroke Foundation: Jump Rope for Heart). Many of these initiatives have been launched directly into the school system and more specifically within the subject of physical education and/or daily physical activity. These concerns and initiatives have provided renewed purpose for physical education in the learning environment.

In 1978, the United Nations, focusing on the positive effects physical education had on the development of a child’s personality, declared that physical education was a fundamental right for all students. Because of this strong declaration and support from the United Nations and other organizations, the growing importance of getting students physically active has driven educators to improve the quality of physical education. In 2000, a quality physical education
class was defined by the World Health Organization (WHO) as including components that: a) lay the foundation for lifelong learners; b) develop and enhance the health and well-being of students; c) offer enjoyment, fun and social interactions; and d) develop health and help to prevent or reduce future health problems.

These components lay the groundwork for many elementary/middle school physical education curricula around the world. DeCorby, Halas, Dixon, Wintrup and Jenzen (2005) state that “policy makers have rewritten many physical education curricula to deemphasize the promotion of competitive sports (perceived as meeting the need of very few students) in favor of health and wellness outcomes for all students” (p. 2).

The need for quality physical education (QPE) programs in our nation is not a new idea. This term was coined in 1988 by the Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, now known as Physical and Health Education Canada (PHE Canada) and its American counterpart National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) and is now used consistently by Education Ministries in every province (DeCorby et al., 2005). QPE is defined as programs that can reach every type of child within our school system. Moreover, it has been deemed as very important in our students’ development of knowledge, skills, habits, and attitudes that would shape their understanding of living a healthy active lifestyle (PHE Canada, 2013). QPE includes “a) opportunities to learn; b) meaningful content; c) appropriate instruction; and d) student and program assessment” (PHE Canada, 2013, NASPE, 2013).

Once again, game play, whether formal or developing, is an active tool used to attain or maintain a high quality physical education program. As defined by Morris and Stiehl (1999), games are “activities confined by implicit rules in which there is a contest between players in order to produce predictable outcomes” (p. 8). These types of predictable outcomes allow
teachers to break down the games into skills, tactics, strategies, and physical fitness needed to play these games. Three main game classification systems (Ellis, 1983; Thorpe, Bunker, & Almond, 1986) were created as an adaptable way for teachers to teach an array of different games within their school year (Hopper & Bell, 2000). Ellis (1983) shaped the way game play was taught by classifying the different aspects of the game. These classifications included skills, strategies, and rules, laws and etiquette. Ellis classifies skills as a way of describing the physical body in game play action.

Physical skills, including the fundamentals of locomotion, stability, and manipulative skills, fall within Ellis’ first classification. Cognitive strategies such as offensive and defensive game play, whether individual or team, is Ellis’ second classification. The third classification of Ellis’ game system is rules, laws, and etiquette. With each type of game, specific rules must be followed and aspects of sportsmanship must be found within game play (for example, when a player gets hurt on the soccer pitch, the other team kicks the ball out of bounds to stop play).

Thorpe, Bunker, and Almond (1986) used the conceptual approach set in motion by the previous game classification models in order to progressively organize games. By sorting each formal game into one of four games categories (Target, Net/Wall, Striking/Fielding and Invasion/Territory) (Curtner-Smith, 1996), Thorpe et al. (1986) applied each game’s tactical demands as its definer (Hopper & Bell, 2000). For example, target games include golf, bowling, and curling, with the tactical goal for each being to aim accurately at a target, whereas invasion/territory game examples include basketball, soccer, ice hockey, and lacrosse, with tactical goals ranging from getting the object into open space to defending the goal (Hopper & Bell, 2000). This game classification could be taught to our students and used widely by our teachers as an organizational tool in order to teach conceptual and skill understanding and
transference of the games categories. As educators, the impact of play through the learning and understanding of games is an essential part of the educational process, and therefore game play must be relevant to the physical, cognitive and affective characteristics of the students that we teach (Wall & Murray, 1994).

Even though many schools are actively implementing quality physical education programs, Canada as a nation is still failing our students (Active Healthy Kids Canada, 2011). Specifically, Canadian children are not receiving the appropriate amount of physical activity time (CFLRI, 2008). Bedal (2006) compared the amount of physical education time students between grades one to eight were actually receiving per week in Canada. The results indicated that only 3 out of 10 provinces studied (Nova Scotia, Saskatchewan and British Columbia) were meeting the benchmark of 150 minutes a week set by PHE Canada (Bedal, 2006). Three provinces (Prince Edward Island, Quebec and Ontario) did not even provide 100 minutes per week (Bedal, 2006).

There are many reasons for the decrease in physical education in schools. First, the negative stigma and constant stereotyping of physical education class leads many teachers to shy away from what can actually be taught within the class. Teachers within schools highlight physical education as having low subject status and esteem (Hardman & Marshall, 2001; Quay & Peters, 2008). Because physical education is deemed a nonessential curriculum (DeCorby et al., 2005), teachers appear not to value its potential to contribute to a child’s development (Kim & Taggart, 2004). Rather than teaching the actual development of skills, teachers have forfeited quality lesson planning and have concluded that organization, maintenance discipline, and control should be the main focus for physical education classes (Chorney, 2009; Gubacs, 2004; Parker 1995; Quay & Peters, 2008). Studies demonstrate that whereas physical education within
the elementary system is a favourite for many students, after the elementary years higher numbers of students are dissatisfied with their physical education classes and therefore are not selecting these courses in their secondary years (Chorney, 2009).

The second reason is that the financial and personal resources specifically for physical education have diminished over time within the tight budgets mandated by ministries of education. This constraint has affected 87 percent of Canadian schools, which reported inadequate equipment and facilities for physical education programs (Bedal, 2006). Hardman and Marshall (2001) also echo the marginalization of physical education by school authorities. More specifically, school authorities are not providing their schools with specialized physical education teachers (DeCorby et al, 2005; Janzen, 2003). Only three provinces in Canada (Manitoba, Quebec, and Prince Edward Island) hire physical education specialists (De Corby et al, 2005).

Significance of the Study

One argument that is usually absent in the discussion about the lack of resources, specialists, and teacher esteem is the important role physical education has in the development of the child. When we reflect on our time spent in physical education classes, we usually remember just the physical movements, games, or activities played. However, physical educators have an obligation to meet the needs of every individual, including the cognitive and emotional needs of the learner throughout their whole educational experience. Quay and Peters (2008) have stated that our physical education programs should be continuous and purposeful specifically for the student rather than the teacher. It is the intention of this dissertation to delve into the affective needs, specifically in our elementary students, through the utilization of a hybrid model physical education unit plan concerned with more than just the game play.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative multi-case study was to evaluate the effectiveness of a hybrid instructional model on the development of personal and social responsibility behaviours (Respect, Participation, Self-Direction, and Caring) in grade seven students within an invasion/territory games environment. The second practical purpose of this study was to develop effective professional development materials for teachers that will help them create Personal and Social Responsibility environments using the TGfU instructional model (e.g., lesson plans).

Research Questions

1) How does the implementation of a hybrid instructional model affect the learning of personal and social responsibility behaviours within a grade seven invasion/territory games unit?

2) How does the implementation of a TGfU instructional model affect the learning of personal and social responsibility behaviours within a grade seven invasion/territory games unit?

3) How can Hellison’s levels of responsibility be taught within the confines of a physical education invasion/territory games unit?

Researcher Background

Growing up as an elite athlete in two different team sports (fastball and basketball), being physically active was a way of life driven by the success of our seasons. Even though I learned many fundamental and specialized skills from physical movements to cognitive tactics, what led to the demise of my elite career were the negative stressors that come from this type of play. Moreover, my experiences in physical education classes led me to believe and/or surmise that
this time was to be used as more practice time. To be called “jock” was a rite of passage, but one that did not sit well with my academic self. At this point in my life, I made the tough yet necessary decision and followed my academic dreams rather than pursuing national and international prowess in either fastball or basketball.

As I left for my undergraduate education in the Physical Education program at Brock University, it was with a narrow mind based on the athlete position. By the end of my degree and through the direction of such professors as Dr. Anna Lathrop, Dr. Nancy Francis, and Dr. James Mandigo, my personal and professional stance on the importance of sport and more specifically physical education has led to my humanistic ideology that the intrinsically motivating power of physical education is one I strive to promote by using theory-based learning in applicable and adaptable ways.

With this passion, I began my graduate work with a focus on creating optimally challenging experiences for students by promoting “new” or different approaches to the teaching of physical education, more specifically games teaching. Through my various teaching experiences, conference presentations, and workshops provincially, nationally, and internationally, I have had the opportunity to analyze, question, and create new physical education resources based on different humanistic models of teaching.

Alongside Dr. James Mandigo, I have developed an online Teaching Games for Understanding resource called Playsport.net. This resource utilizes the TGfU teaching model while teaching life skill development through over 60 small-sided games. It was created and is implemented by many teachers, coaches, and recreation leaders from across the world. I have also been involved as the key games creator in the Physical and Health Education Association’s Active Living, After School Program (2012) and Physical Literacy assessment tool creator for
BC Sport (via Sport) (2013). I have written two book chapters on the practical use of the TGfU model (2009) as well as a new chapter together with Dr. Doug Gleddie concerning the importance of using different Physical Education curriculum models within the K-12 school system (2013). I am also the Canadian member of the International Teaching Games for Understanding Advisory Board.

I am an instructor (sessional/permanent) in the departments of Physical Education, Pedagogy and Elementary Education at the University of the Fraser Valley, British Columbia. Specializing in instructional design, health education, and elementary education, I encourage my students to break beyond the historical barriers of Physical Education teaching and promote inclusive environments directly teaching the importance of the “whole child.” As a strong supporter of Quality Daily Physical Education, Teaching Games for Understanding, and the teaching of life skills and hybrid model approaches within Physical Education, I anticipate that this research study will support the importance of hybrid model curriculum as a venue for teachers to meet all the needs of the whole child. As a teacher I aspire to create a learning environment that motivates my students by challenging them at an optimal level while promoting an environment where students can feel a sense of ownership for their learning. I believe ownership in learning can increase students’ confidence in the material being taught, increasing the belief in their own ability to apply it outside of the classroom. In this way students can become more reflective on their learning and can implement their knowledge more effectively.

**Delimitations of the Study**

Within the school district I chose for this research study, I selected a participant school that emphasizes the importance of physical activity and physical education on a daily basis. Because of this selection, I made it clear to the Principal that Mr. A for this study had to be
unaware of both the Teaching Game for Understanding instructional model and the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model.

As the physical education teacher for this study was also the students’ everyday teacher, I was very aware of issues of bias such as already established teacher-student relationships, and I attempted not to allow these relationships to compromise the study in any way. Even though it was very difficult to control these biases entirely, an attempt was made by asking the teacher to follow the created lesson plans very closely through the use of the talking points, timelines, and discussion questions and to maintain their enthusiasm for all three classes despite the lesson plan being taught. I also asked that the teacher try to allow all of his students in the three classes the opportunity to answer the discussion questions found within the lesson plans.

The second delimitation was the introduction of “strangers” into the physical education class. Knowing this intrusion could lead to skewed results, my two undergraduate researchers and I began attending all three grade seven classes one month before the beginning of the study. Mimicking our researcher behaviours led to an understanding of trust between researchers, teacher, and student participants. During the study, I attempted to create an open and honest atmosphere with my undergraduate researchers and the student participants so that they felt comfortable to perform, discuss, and lead their peers throughout the study.

Due to the nature of this multi-case study, other limitations inevitably existed. Even though I was accompanied by two undergraduate students, I realized that there would be a bias for the successful implementation of this study. Also, I felt that I could not assume that the understandings achieved by the student participants would necessarily take place in other environments with other participants. However I was optimistic that lesson plans created by this study could be used and modified for other physical education classroom environments.
Plan of the Thesis

My multi-case study begins with an introduction to the importance of physical activity and the history of physical activity and physical education within our Canadian educational system. Chapter 2 is the Literature Review, which outlines in detail the Teaching Games for Understanding instructional model, the Teaching of Personal and Social Responsibility model, and the theoretical underpinnings which guide these models, as well as research related to my guiding research questions. In Chapter 3, “Research Design and Methodology,” I discuss why I chose a three-case, multi-case study. I highlight how I selected participants and the steps involved in scheduling, preparing, and implementing the lesson plans, and I illustrate how I collected, categorized, and analyzed the data using common themes. In Chapter 4, evaluation of common themes based on Hellison’s four PSR levels and discussion based on field notes observations are presented. Chapter 5 is the discussion, a summary of the conclusions, critical analysis related to my literature review and research questions, and further recommendations for research.
Figure 1  Conceptual Framework for Teaching Games for Understanding and Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility
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Chapter 2
Literature Review

Introduction

Many colleagues and specialists have called for more research and practical resources in the area of physical education. However, one could get sidetracked by the comparisons and contrasts found in the plethora of information that has already been published. Therefore through this review, it was my intention to provide a well-focused search of literature in order to guide my multi-case study. The literature review begins with a brief history of the beginnings of the physical movement and the development of physical education as a curriculum. By highlighting the “fathers” of physical education, I explore how we as a country re-evaluated our need for physical prowess through drills and became more inclusive to game play activities. I investigate the notion of teaching physical education with the “whole child” as the educational focus, specifically stressing the prominence of the affective domain. I emphasize the domain characteristics of young adolescence and the causal impact they may have on the teaching environment. With these two strong building blocks as the backbone of my study, I discuss the theories of constructivism and positive youth development, and their approach to student involvement within educational settings. Through the deliberation of two constructivist/humanist teaching models, the Teaching Games for Understanding model and the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model, this review of literature prepared me to conduct a well-focused study. Throughout the literature review, I added my own questions, concerns, and comments, which led to the research questions I hope to answer.
Historical Perspective

In order to understand why physical education programs are taught the way they are today, we must look into our past. Even though physical education programs do vary from province to province, all physical education began with the same movements: military calisthenics. The European nineteenth and early twentieth centuries fixated the importance of being physically fit by embedding the “institutional systems” of exercise to meet the training needs of the masses. Systems included the Ling system from Sweden, the Danish system, and the German gymnastics or “Turnverein” societies (Martins, 1986). These traditionally gymnastic dense movement systems caught the attention of Canada’s first Minister of Education, Edgerton Ryerson, and significantly inspired the inclusion of physical education within his own country’s educational system.

In the middle of the nineteenth century alongside the imminent threat of war, Ryerson’s ideology for the use of physical education was to entrench the program with militaristic drills and rigid calisthenics. Under the guidance of retired military instructors, physical education was taught to those teachers and school boards interested in such an approach (Constantino & Howell, 1971). This military-led movement sparked the creation of the first nationwide physical education program called “the Strathcona Trust“ after its financier, Lord Strathcona. Reluctance and disenchantment about such a program was felt across the nation. Many were concerned about the blatant exclusion of play, games, and sport from the physical education programs, leading to an outcry by educators studying physical education at different educational institutions (Margaret Eaton School, McGill University).

By 1933, the named “father of physical education,” Dr. Arthur Stanley Lamb, had had enough of the Strathcona Trust and began the new movement of physical education within
Canada by the creation of the Canadian Physical Education Association, recently renamed Physical and Health Education Canada (PHE Canada, 2013). From the outset, this association has promoted the importance of physical education in Canada, lobbied on behalf of physical educators against budgetary cuts, and guided the curricular expectations set for our students. The inclusion of educational dance, gymnastics, and games, as well as an emphasis on the importance of maintaining a healthy body through physical activity has become the core of the more recent physical education programs. Even though the Canadian physical education system does include educational dance, educational gymnastics and outdoor pursuits, for the purpose of this research study, the movement category of games will be the main focus.

**Meeting the Needs of the Whole Child**

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has stated that students are multi-dimensional and have a right to full development of the “whole child” (UNESCO, 1978). First discussed by Heatherington in the early twentieth century, the whole child philosophy is based on the premise that the interplay amongst the three domains of physical or moving, cognitive or thinking, and affective or feeling creates the “whole child” (Noddings, 2005; Rink 2010; Wall & Murray, 1994). This philosophy refocuses the assumption that students are a blank slate to one that suggests that each child should have a learning environment suited for his/her own physical, cognitive, and affective needs (Manzo & Casale, 2000).

It is equally important to discover and implement the most effective teaching components to suit the individual needs of all learners and be reminded of the fact that within the physical education environment of the gym, students may feel more at ease and/or tense and may display a different personality while in participation (Lu & De Lisio, 2009). Therefore, trying to
enhance the physical education environment to one of positive movement experiences for all students is one way in which the whole child approach could be implemented (Lu & De Lisio, 2009).

**The Three Domains**

The physical domain concentrates on the fundamental movements of the child. Also called the moving domain, this domain encourages the physical learning of locomotor skills such as running, jumping and dodging, non-manipulative skills such as balancing and creating shapes with the body, and manipulative skills such as throwing, catching, and striking (Lloyd & Smith, 2013; Wall & Murray, 1994). In a progressive teaching environment encompassing many different skills, students will learn and adapt their movements to match their growth and development (Lloyd & Smith, 2013).

The cognitive domain concentrates on the knowledge, understanding, and thought processes of the child (Wall & Murray, 1994). Also named the thinking domain, this domain requires educators to constantly refine their own teaching strategies and ideas to enhance their students’ movements and cognitive understandings (Espiritu, 1987). Students must feel safe in their learning environments in order to actively discover their own thought processes and apply new knowledge appropriately.

The affective domain concentrates on the emotional aspects of the child including moods, attitudes, self-concept, motivation, and social awareness (Holt & Hannon, 2006; Rink, 2010; Wall & Murray, 1994). Also called the feeling domain, this domain prompts teachers to focus on providing positive class environments that encourage learners to focus on their individual needs, as well as their social needs (Wall & Murray, 1994). While being involved in physical education class, students can develop sportspersonship, fair play, respect for others, self-control,
and responsibility (Holt & Hannon, 2006). Even though they are hard to measure, it is essential to understand the rationale and motivation behind students’ participation in physical education so that researchers and educators can discover how best to address the affective domain of every child.

**Meeting the Needs of a Grade Seven Student**

Meaning “to grow to maturity” (Cronin & Mandich, 2005), adolescence can be broken into three stages: early adolescence (ages 11–14), middle adolescence (ages 15–17), and late adolescence (ages 18–21) (Cenameri, 2013). Early adolescence will be the focus of this section as my research includes three grade seven classes. During early adolescence, youth are becoming more independent in nature yet value the opinions and influences of their peers. Physical changes including height, weight, and puberty develop at a hurried pace in this stage of development, with girls reaching development 1–2 years earlier than boys (Bindler et al., 2012; Cronin & Mandich, 2005). Motor skills or those skills needed within the physical domain are becoming more specialized by the combining of motor skills together. Fine motor control is still being developed, but flexibility is beginning to decrease. An overall feeling of awkwardness while performing skills could occur as youth become more comfortable within their taller, stronger bodies.

Cognitively, younger adolescents are becoming more able to process (energy or effort needed in order to complete a task or how to choose and use task-related knowledge), organize (skills needed to organize space or tasks), and adapt (anticipate, correct, and benefit by learning of consequences of errors) to their environments (Cronin & Mandich, 2005).

Affectively, younger adolescents are being bombarded with choices, such as “who should I be?,” “who should I follow?,” “what types of physical activities should I be involved in?”
Within this stage, youth are becoming more aware of the gender roles, are selecting role models found in the media or community, and are establishing their values and morals usually based on the formation of peer groups such as cliques, clubs, and sports teams. Control of authority begins to shift from parents/guardians or teachers to the approval of peers (Cenameri, 2013). Outside of their home, the school environment becomes a hub of social interactions and one of the important settings in which both academic and non-academic engagement occurs. It has been stated that “school activities are the most significant contributions to achievement in adolescents” (Cronin & Mandich, 2005, p. 230). Noddings (2005) concludes that we must customize our school environment not only for the sake of our students’ academic endeavours but also to impress upon our students the importance of morals, values, and one’s duty to others and our country. Creating instructional models with the affective domain and adolescent development stage in mind is the intention of this study.

**Affective Domain: With a Little More Feeling**

In theory, the learning opportunities within quality physical education programs should develop a well-rounded person. Practically, however, many specify it to be a struggle (Holt & Hannon, 2006; Lee, 2012). Educators must learn to apply all three domains of the whole child equally and with student effect. The focal point of my research study is the affective development of the student, more importantly the positive impacts physical education can have on a student’s social awareness (personal and social responsibility). However, McHugh (1995) argued that “affective goals are important and will not ‘just happen’ in the dynamic of teaching a lesson.” Students need to be given direct instruction within their educational programs (Hellison, 1990; Holt & Hannon, 2006; McHugh, 1995).
Physical education provides an environment that could potentially enable students to explore their personal and social development (Cutforth & Parker, 1996). Even though it has been stated that physical activity can lead to learning how to be dependent on one another, improving one’s self esteem, teaching the importance of teamwork and responsibility, and sportspersonship (Holt & Hannon, 2006), not all physical educators are taking advantage during their physical education class time. The dynamic, social, and qualitative atmosphere of the gymnasium rather than that of the classroom seems to push students’ and teachers’ boundaries.

Moreover, experiences in the physical education environment seem to differ greatly from those within the structured classroom setting (Kuhrasch, 2007; McHugh, 1995). We, as educators, tend to believe that the affective domain of the child is developed mainly through extra-curricular environments and the adults within these environments (McHugh, 1995). However, the affective domain (also called the social-emotional domain) must be nurtured within the school environment to maintain or grow the values and morals our students bring with them (Holt & Hannon, 2006; Kuhrasch, 2007; McHugh, 1995; Solomon, 1997). Teachers can therefore implement different teaching components and assessment tools that specifically match the learners’ affective development (Cutforth & Parker, 1996, Kuhrasch, 2007). Even so, the affective domain as it relates to relevant experiences in physical education is lacking as a theme in scholarly research. Many researchers and educators believe that affective development is a by-product of participation in a physical education class (Cutforth & Parker, 1996; Shields & Breidemeier, 1995), and not a goal-oriented process set by the teacher. Consequently, this study will focus on the creation of a learner-centred physical education environment with a specific focal point on social awareness (personal and social responsibility) as found within the affective domain of the child (Hellison, 2003).
**Theory of Constructivism: Philosophy of Teaching**

Previously, teaching used a blueprint where the typical exercises and drills allow for students to understand just enough of the topic to correctly choose the right answers on examinations (Brandt, 1993; Perkins, 1993). This type of teaching for knowledge (Graffam, 2003) has dominated schools at every level, determining that any knowledge learned in the classroom only makes sense within the classroom. The opportunities for students to apply what they have learned outside of the classroom walls presents a challenge (Graffam, 2003). This concern and others have led researchers and educators to search for a new and improved way of teaching. A more “team oriented” approach to teaching involves the teacher and the student.

One way that educators can present an affectively focused curriculum is by engraining the theory of constructivism throughout their lessons. This type of cognitive learning theory (Rink, 2006) is based on the belief that “learners are actively involved in a process of meaning and knowledge construction rather than passively receiving information” (Gray, 2007, p. 2). As described by Richardson (2003):

> the general sense of constructivism is that it is a theory of learning or meaning making, that individuals create their own new understanding on the basis of an interaction between what they already know and believe and ideas and knowledge with which they come into contact. (p. 1624)

In essence, students’ past experience, whether or not within the physical activity realm, will shape their learning and understanding. Using a constructivist approach to teaching has enthused many researchers and teachers alike to create different models or approaches in an attempt to create a constructivist classroom (Tytler, 2002). The “learning cycle,” the “learning spiral,” the “generative learning model” and the “interactive approach,” all used within the science and math education curriculum, strive to create a constructivist classroom offering ideas for teaching roles, group work, and use of assessment through the cognitive domain. By creating “Thinking
Classrooms,” teachers facilitate student learning within these two curriculum areas in order to “cultivate the active use of knowledge,” and “help students become self-regulated learners” (Tytler, 2002, p. 34).

Within a physical education class, students have the opportunity to explore their physical, cognitive, and affective characteristics while learning. As a constructivist (see Figure 1), the role of the teacher mirrors that of a guide or mediator by meeting students’ intellectual and emotional needs with different venues of learning and various understandings of the content and its personal meanings (Beck & Kosnik, 2002; Rink, 2010). Teachers provide an environment that allows students to acquire new knowledge at the same time as building on previous experiences. The intention here is to expand students’ constructive understandings. The “social constructivist” teaching approach involves students in many partner and group activities, allowing students a chance to goal set and to solve problems with one another (Rink, 2010; Tytler, 2002). This gives students the opportunity to work with others and enhances their appreciation of others’ thoughts, values, and opinions (Beck & Kosnik, 2002).

A Constructivist Approach to Physical Education: Teaching Games for Understanding

One physically active constructivist approach to learning is called Teaching Games for Understanding. It is studied and practised by many scholars and educators across the world. This hands-on, teacher facilitated approach, accompanied by others, has led to the modification of physical education curricula throughout Canada and more specifically within British Columbia with the most recent changes occurring in 2006 (BC Ministry of Education, 2013). With the aim of creating positive attitudes and behaviours, contributing to a healthy, active lifestyle through the teaching of movement skills and development of movement knowledge, three curricular organizers were established. These are Active Living, Movement Skills, and
Safety, Fair Play and Leadership. These three organizers essentially mimic the whole child approach by focusing each organizer on the beneficial results that can be taught throughout the physical education curriculum (see Figure 2). Even though these three organizers are to be taught throughout the five movement categories (dance, gymnastics, games, alternative environment activities, and individual and dual activities), it is not surprising to note that a high percentage of our physical education classes are spent playing games (Hardman & Marshall, 2001; Pope, 2011). Whether they are cooperative, developmental, or formal games, most students enjoy this large amount of game play (Mandigo et al., 2004; Wall & Murray, 1994).

The Teaching Games for Understanding instructional model, known from this point on as TGfU, was created by physical educators David Bunker and Rod Thorpe in 1986. After observing their own physical education classroom environments, Bunker and Thorpe surmised that their students were getting bored or frustrated by the skill heavy (technique-based) classes and wanted to “just” play the game. This “top-down approach,” as described by Lu, Francis, and Lodewyk (2013), highlights the prominent role the teacher has as sports specialist; one of being in charge of deciding which skills, tactics and rules will be emphasized throughout a sport specific unit. Such an approach could lead to a lack of skill improvement, an overemphasis on competition, and a lack of interest or connection to the bigger picture of leading a healthy lifestyle (Hopper, 1998; Mandigo, Butler, & Hopper, 2007).

Bunker and Thorpe’s novel approach to games teaching could be called a bottom-up instructional approach (Lu, Francis, & Lodewyk, 2013). Underpinned by the constructivist and pedagogical beliefs of inclusive education, conceptual learning, games theory, and growth and development principles, students learn games by playing games (see Figure 1). By setting up
small-sided game play experiences centred on student performances of tactical understanding and ongoing assessment opportunities, the teacher becomes the facilitator of games teaching.

As stated by Butler, Griffin, Lombardo, and Natasi (2003), “TGfU was proposed as a shift from the development of techniques or content-based approach with highly structured lessons to a more student-based approach which links tactics and skills in game context” (p.2). With the use of tactical problems and solutions as the driving force of this instruction approach to games teaching, students develop cognitive and physical understanding of how to use the skills needed in game play and, more importantly, when to use them effectively. TGfU is meant to create better and more knowledgeable game players (Belka, 1994) and to motivate learners while participating in a variety of small-sided games or rather modified formal games focusing on specific tactical problems and solutions.

**TGfU Instructional Model**

The TGfU instructional model includes six lesson planning steps (see Figure 2):

*Step 1: Game Form.* Students are introduced to a small-sided game or modified version of a formal game found within one of the game categories (Target, Net/Wall, Striking/Fielding, and Invasion/Territory) and play.

*Step 2: Game Appreciation.* By game play as well as discussion-led questioning by the teacher, students are introduced to the rules of this small-sided game.

*Step 3: Tactical Awareness.* With teacher-led discussion questions and more game play, students understand what tactics are most important to that specific game.

*Step 4: Decision Making.* Whether individual, pair, or team play, students choose how to solve the tactical problems found within the game they are playing with many different answers.

*Step 5: Skill Execution.* This step requires the students to focus in on the actual movement
skills needed in order to be tactically successful. This can be done by the creation of
skill/practice activities that focus on physical movement specific to the game play.

Step 6: Performance. While playing either the small-sided game or a more formal game,
students play the game focusing on both the tactics and the physical skills just learned in order
for effective game play.
The following model outlines the procedure, step by step, whereby the teacher helps the child to achieve a new level of skilful performance. While absolute levels of performance will vary, each and every child is able to participate in decision making based upon tactical awareness thereby retaining an interest and involvement in the game.

TGfU Pedagogical Principles

Four pedagogical principles guide the implementation of the TGfU instructional model: sampling, game representation, exaggeration, and tactical complexity.

Sampling

By allowing our students to sample a collection of different games within the same category (e.g., using the underhand motion in bocce and curling) or across the four games categories (e.g., the tactic of open space found in baseball and basketball), students will learn the key tactical and skill progression that might have been missed otherwise.

Game Representation

The teacher breaks down the formal game into more developmentally appropriate game play in order to provide students with understanding of how to use certain tactics and strategies effectively.

Exaggeration

By focusing the game on one aspect of the play, students would have the opportunity to practise, master, and include this aspect in future game play.

Tactical Complexity

Through the progression of tactical complexity, students can master a less difficult tactic found within game play before moving on to a more difficult tactic. For example, while playing a small-sided game of lacrosse, students must first learn to effectively maintain possession of the ball before attacking the goal (Holt, Strean, & Bengoechea, 2002).

Throughout the entire TGfU instructional model, teacher facilitated discussions and tactical questioning are used in order to create understanding for the students. By asking our students the why before the how, it is the intention of this instructional model to provide students
with the motivation to learn more about the tactics and skills involved within the game play. As a result, the TGfU constructive instructional model offers teachers an effective method of delivering games programs in physical education classes that can meet the affective needs of students.

Since the conception of this new games model, research has focused on the physical and cognitive benefits of TGfU (Butler, 2006; Holt, Strean, & Garcia Bengoechea, 2002). Specifically, research has focused on the technique perspective of skill acquisition (physical domain) versus the tactical perspective of understanding game play (cognitive domain) (Butler, 2006; Hopper, 1998, 2003; Hubball, 2006; Mandigo, 2003; Sheppard, 2007). TGfU research has also focused significantly on the impacts—both positive (Li & Cruz, 2008; Wang & Ha, 2012) and negative (Dudley & Baxter, 2009; Light & Georgakis, 2007; McNeil et al, 2008)—this instructional model has had on physical education pre-service teachers and coaches within their teaching/coaching environments. The collaboration of teaching frameworks has also been a focus of recent research, however, still promoting the physical and cognitive outcomes of such a partnership (Alexander & Penney, 2005).

TGfU researchers and practitioners have stated that using this instructional model develops the affective domain, but specific research needs to be conducted in order to provide substantial evidence (Holt, Strean, & Garcia Bengoechea, 2002). In recent years, studies have begun to explore this domain, more specifically student motivation and notions of fun within game-based instructional models (Jones, Marshall, & Peters, 2010; Mandigo, Holt, Anderson, & Sheppard, 2008). However, the student development of personal and social responsibility behaviours while participating within TGfU game-based instruction has not been explored and will be the focus of this study.
Teaching Social Awareness in Physical Education

Role of Responsibility

A momentous shift over the past decade towards life skills teaching throughout the entire British Columbia curriculum has led to purposeful planning to meet these learning needs. Life skills can be described as the “abilities and characteristics that enable individuals to deal effectively with the demands and challenges of everyday life” (Page & Page, 2007, p. 45). Alcohol, tobacco, substance abuse, interpersonal relationships, sexual and reproductive health, and physical fitness are just a few examples of challenges our students will face throughout their lifetime. These life skills need to be balanced against the needs of the individual and the society that surrounds them. Life skills as defined by the United Nations have been categorized into three sets: communication and interpersonal skills; decision making and critical thinking skills; and coping and self-management skills. It is this set of self-management skills, and more specifically the life skill characteristic or ability of responsibility, that are the focus of this study.

Wentzel (1991) defines responsibility as “the adherence to social rules and role expectation.” In the educational context, responsibility can include following the “rules and norms that govern social interaction in the classroom” (p. 1066). Engaging students to be accountable for their own wellbeing and the wellbeing of others within both the classroom and gymnasium environments is a requirement of responsibility that must be taught and practised (Parker & Hellison, 2001). Responsibility, as used in educational terms, should teach our students how to be both personally and socially responsible, including self-control, setting personal goals, and caring (Parker & Hellison, 2001). Self-control, self-motivation, self-effort, independent work, and being a role model are all goals of personal responsibility, whereas respecting everyone’s right to be included, cooperation, sensitivity, responsiveness to others’
needs and interests, and contributing to the well-being of both individuals and the group are the goals of social responsibility.

Humanistic in nature and known by others as a social development model for physical education (Sidentrop, 1990), Hellison’s Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) model was a teaching tool for specific populations (see Figure 1) (Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Martinek & Lee, 2012). At-risk, underserved, and inner city adolescents drove Hellison educational passion to create the trial and error based TPSR model leading to many research based and practical interventions (Cummings, 1998; Cutforth, 1997; DeBusk, & Hellison, 1989; Sheppard & Gleddie, 2013). The TPSR model was so well received that the model was implemented not only in at risk communities, but also in many general populations as an after school program or, more recently, as part of the physical education curriculum. TPSR is one of the more researched curriculum models.

More importantly, the TPSR model was created with the ideology that if students wanted to be successful individuals within a social environment, they must first learn the components to be responsible for themselves and the situations that surround them (Escarti, Gutierrez, Pascual, & Llopis, 2010; Sheppard & Gleddie, 2013). In essence this model was created for the individual student and not the group to be able to take responsibility for their own actions whether they are personal or social (Martinek & Lee, 2012). This ideology is underpinned by the theory of positive youth development which states that “all adolescents have strengths and resources from which they can build” (Baber & Rainer, 2011, p. 49) and therefore have the potential for positive developmental change (Holt & Neely, 2011).

Positive youth development theorists argue that, as educators, we must stop reinforcing the teaching of negative behaviours we do not want to see in our schools, but rather support,
educate, and engage our students in positive human development (Commission of Positive Youth Development, 2005). We must include our adolescents in their own development process by enabling them to make their own decisions regarding selection of experiences and engagement in activities (Baber & Rainer, 2011). Physical activity and sport have recently become a social context to implement the theory of positive youth development (Holt, 2008; Holt & Neely, 2011) and it is therefore the context in which Hellison’s Teaching of Personal and Social Responsibility is found.

**Hellison’s Levels of Personal and Social Responsibility**

Hellison’s TPSR teaching model is organized into five PSR levels of responsibility. Even though Hellison cites that these five PSR levels do not need to be taught in progressive order, the building of levels seems to create the most positive effect for student learning and understanding (Li, Wright, Rukavina, & Pickering, 2008). **Level one** consists of social responsibility behaviours that respect the rights and feelings of others. This level is defined by self-control, respect of everyone’s right to be included, and involvement in peaceful and democratic conflict resolution. Student participation may be low at this level, but it is acceptable that students are not disruptive and are following rules. **Level two** consists of personal responsibility behaviours that speak to participation and effort. This level is defined by self-motivation, one’s own exploration of self-effort and trying new tasks, and on task persistence. At this level an increase of self-motivation and enthusiasm would also be observed. **Level three** consists of personal responsibility behaviours around self-direction. This level is defined by one’s ability to work independently, goal setting progression, and courage to resist peer pressure. **Level four** consists of the social responsibility behaviours of helping others and leadership. This level is defined as one having caring and compassion, a sensitivity and responsiveness to others,
and inner strength. *Level five* consists of responsibility outside the gym, which is defined as trying these ideas outside of the physical activity program and being a role model (Hellison, 2003, 2011; Jung & Wright, 2012; Li et al., 2008; Rink, 2010).

**Hellison’s TPSR Instructional Model**

Hellison’s levels of responsibility help both the teacher and the student understand what they are responsible for and provide specific targets to strive towards or achieve (Escarti et al., 2010; Hellison, 2003). Specific steps in planning lessons can be established with the TPSR model and can also help with the development and implementation of individual lessons (Hellison, 2003). Implementing the personal and social responsibility instructional model into a physical education class includes a specific six-part format beginning with counselling time, awareness talk, the lesson, group meeting, reflection time, and again ending with a counselling time (Hellison, 2003, 2011).

**Counselling Time**

Counselling time at the beginning of the formal physical education class includes the opportunity for the teacher to “check in” with as many individual students as possible. This quick one-to-one time could include speaking about positive and/or negative behaviour from the previous class and how the student could work on their behaviour that day.

**Awareness Talks**

For the beginning of the actual physical education class, the teacher brings all the students together to discuss and explain the five goals of personal and social responsibility. As Hellison suggests, this should be done in a gradual and progressive manner as not to overload the students’ affective learning. The awareness talk can also be used as a lesson reminder to the
students as to what goal of responsibility they will be focusing on during that class.

The Lesson

While students are engaged in the physical or sports related activities, teachers can integrate the goals of responsibility through the use of suggested teaching strategies, such as awareness strategies, direct instruction, individual decision making, and large or small group decision making.

Group Meetings

Group meetings are used close to the end of the lesson when the teacher calls the students in to discuss the class that day. This is a time when students can share with their peers and the teacher about issues that occurred during the class and possible solutions. This is also a time for students to provide feedback to the teacher about what they thought about the class and what they would have changed. Giving the students the ability to give input towards the actual lesson directly connects the lesson to the goals of responsibility.

Reflection Time

Providing the students an opportunity to reflect and summarize their own behaviour and actions as they relate to the goals of responsibility is the purpose of reflection time. Reflection can be used as a self-evaluation and documented through the use of journal entries, checklists, raising their hands or thumbs, or descriptive sharing of examples of their level of responsibility during the lesson.

Counselling Time

Counselling time at the end of the class again is used as a check in and time for the teacher to give feedback on students’ behaviour throughout the lesson (Sheppard & Gleddie, 2013).
Hellison’s TPSR model is a suggested physical education curriculum model that requires both the students and teacher a role to play in its success. More importantly, as stated by Hellison, this model is to be used as a suggestion, guided by the teacher’s own values and beliefs as well as the students’ needs for personal and social responsibility. It is important to note that Hellison’s intention for the use of TPSR was not to create a teaching strategy for behaviour management but rather one encompassing the attitudes, beliefs, values, and intentions needed to be a responsible student (Hellison, 2003).

Physical activity, sport, and physical education have all been determined as the essential environments in which the TPSR model can be implemented (Sheppard & Gleddie, 2013). This is because of the “unique and social development opportunities” that physical education promotes versus other disciplines (Hellison, 2003; Hellison & Walsh, 2002). Kirk (1992) states that in an attempt to constructively redress the social conditions that place some young people’s well-being “at risk”, physical educations in many instances enables this learning within a safe environment. Even so, Hellison reminds us that the TPSR model should not be an addition to the existing physical education program but rather should be rooted within physical education lessons themselves (Hellison, 2003). If we as educators integrate the learning of responsible behaviours as posed by the TPSR model within our lesson plans, this limits the amount of on cue responses by our students and could lead to more dynamic responses based on play.

Through the empowerment of our students within physical activity lessons, the role of the teacher converts from director to facilitator. This teacher-student relationship can allow the teacher to observe their students as individuals rather than part of a whole class (Hellison, 2003), leading to responsible learning (Sheppard & Gleddie, 2013).
Numerous programs have been studied based on the implementation of the TPSR model. Many of these programs were conducted before or after school, at lunchtime, or in the summer months. As a consequence, very few programs have been conducted within a true physical education class despite abundant recommendations for the implementation of TPSR into physical education (Cecchini, Montero, Alonso, Izquierdo, & Contreras, 2007; Escarti, Gutierrez, Pasquale, & Marin, 2010; Jimenez, 2000; Marin, 2011; Pardo, 2008; Pascual, Escarti, Llopis, & Gutierrez, 2011).

**Hybrid Instructional Models**

Creating a hybrid model with either of these models—Bunker and Thorpe’s Teaching Games for Understanding instructional model (Alexander & Penny, 2005; Curtner-Smith, 2004; Hastie & Curtner-Smith, 2006), Hellison’s Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility model (Walsh, 2008; Wright, White, & Gaebler-Spira, 2004) is not a new idea (see Figure 1). Both of these models shift the learning from the teacher to the student and promote a learner-centred environment (Stran, Sinelnikov, & Woodruff, 2012), however, the focus of each model as it complements each other is.

In order to highlight the importance of the affective domain within a games physical education class, one must concentrate the learning on the specific area of the affective domain. As Worrell, Evans-Fletcher, and Kovar (2002) state, “the physical educator teaches these affective behaviours in the same way that physical skills are taught by specifying objectives for the students and designing class activities that promote the development of the behaviour” (p. 31). In other words, one must refocus the purpose of the lesson, embedding game play and discussion guided by affective questioning to effectively teach the importance of social and personal responsibility.
Summary

It has been emphasized throughout the literature that offering a quality physical education program, though important, has barriers to overcome. A lack of recognition by some teachers, a deficiency of resources, and an overemphasis on fundamental skills has led to a need to readdress the benefits that a quality physical education program can offer. More importantly, the adoption of a learner-centred model to teaching physical education, also known as the “whole child” approach, can be significantly effective in providing students with the individual attention they need to support their physical, cognitive, and affective needs. Through the utilization of a constructivist approach to teaching physical education, specifically through the execution of teaching for understanding, students have a higher degree of accountability and ownership in their own learning, therefore the opportunity to meet the needs of each learner is more accessible to the teacher when the students are actively involved.

The Teaching Games for Understanding instructional model, which was specifically created for physical education, enables students to explore their understanding of game-like situations and the decisions that they will have to make within game play. Thus, this learner-centred approach to games within physical education teaches students not only to understand how to be physical game players, but also how to execute appropriate decisions both cognitively and affectively. With affective research lacking within the TGfU forum, it is the intention of my research study to directly embed a specific affective instructional model within a game-based TGfU context. Using Hellison’s Levels of Personal and Social Responsibility within the context of the TGfU instructional model, this multi-case study evaluates the student’s personal and social awareness of responsibility both within and outside of the classroom.
The purpose of this multi-case qualitative study was to evaluate the effectiveness of a hybrid instructional model on the development of personal and social responsibility behaviours (Respect, Participation, Self-Direction, and Caring) in grade seven students within an invasion/territory games environment. Numerous after school, or club programs have been studied (Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Lee & Martinek, 2009; Walsh, Ozaeta, & Wright, 2010) which discuss the positive results these types of out-of-class environments have on students’ understanding of responsibility. However, few studies have embedded Hellison’s levels of personal and social responsibility within a physical education environment, let alone teaching these levels using a TGfU conceptual unit on invasion/territory games. Therefore data collection and analysis in this study focused on the affective developing of personal and social responsibility behaviours through three different instructional physical education unit plans.

This chapter describes the study’s a) Paradigm b) research design, c) researcher profile, d) ethical considerations, e) site selection, f) setting description, g) participants, h) lesson context, i) data collection, j) data analysis, and k) trustworthiness.

**Constructivist Paradigm**

In order to have an effective research program, however, the primary researcher must have a philosophical stance (Patton, 2002). As a researcher who wants to gain understanding about my student participants by interpreting their perceptions within this hybrid physical education setting, I have positioned myself within the constructivism paradigm. Constructivist researchers approach their study with the intention to understand “the world of human
experience” (Cohen & Manion, 1994, p. 36). More importantly, study the multiple realities constructed by others and how these constructions can shape their lives and those around them (Patton, 2002). Interpretive researchers also believe that “reality is socially constructed” (Mertins, 2005, p. 12). One must realize that while observing students’ social interactions, it is a researcher’s opportunity to make sense of what just occurred and why, with full understanding that not one perception is correct or realistic (Glesne, 2006; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2011). It is my intention to observe the reality of a three different physical education instructional environments as it relates to the teaching of personal and social responsibility within the games context.

Through the use of journal entries and field note observations both of the students and of the lessons themselves, I am trying to make meaning from my student participants understanding about the lesson plans they were actively involved in. More importantly to ensure that I was producing knowledge that would be reflective of the students’ reality and not just my own (Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2011). While including the students within this reality (Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2011), it is also my intention to use their feedback and insights in order to create instructional resources for future physical education classes.

**Research Design**

Mertins (2005) states that “research has been described as a systematic investigation or inquiry whereby data is collected, analyzed and interpreted in some way in an effort to understand, describe, predict or control an educational or psychological phenomenon or to empower individuals in such contexts” (p. 4). Based on my constructivist paradigm, a multi-case study approach for this qualitative research was used to evaluate the effectiveness of a hybrid instructional model on the development of personal and social responsibility behaviours.
(Respect, Participation, Self-Direction and Caring). As explained by Merriam (1998), a case study approach enables the researcher to: “gain an in-depth understanding of a situation and meaning for those involved” (p. 19). More importantly, this must be completed within a real life context (Stake, 2005). The research study consisted of three cases. It is my interest to evaluate these three different physical education instructional models, within three different classes, but taught by the same physical education teacher.
Research Questions

1) How does the implementation of a hybrid instructional model affect the learning of personal and social responsibility behaviours within a grade seven invasion games unit?

2) How does the implementation of a TGfU instructional model affect the learning of personal and social responsibility behaviours within a grade seven invasion games unit?

3) How can Hellison’s levels of responsibility be taught within the confines of a physical education invasion games unit?

Setting and Participants

Clayburn Middle School (School District 34)
3 grade 7 Clayburn Middle School classes Mr. A
58 grade 7 students (30 males, 28 females)

Methods

• Pre- and post- open-ended journal entries including demographics (10-15 minutes before and after invasion unit)
• Individual lesson open-ended journal entries (5-8 minutes at end of each lesson)
• Descriptive field notes from lesson observations

Data Analysis

• Coding of open-ended student journal responses
• Coding of transcribed field notes by all three observers
• Content analysis: Relative frequencies and percentages of themes
• Triangulation between two content analyzers
Researcher Profile

As stated by Neutens and Rubinson (2001), qualitative research is quite valuable for those that want to study a naturalistic setting such as a school environment. Using multiple methods that are both interactive and humanistic as well as emergent rather than prefigured allows the qualitative researcher to define how people negotiate meaning (Marshall & Rossman, 1999 & Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). This differs from quantitative research which emphasizes the measurement and analysis of causal relationships between variables through the use of standardized measurements (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Therefore, in order to collect data and observe the findings within such a setting as they dynamic physical education gymnasium, I had to realize the importance of participant relationships and the impact studies may have on all that are involved. This is what has led me create a qualitative study.

From previous research experiences as both participant and researcher, especially within the school setting, I have driven myself to try to provide a research study that will lead to new findings but also create a practical experience for all involved. More importantly provide meaningful findings based on the physical education setting and the way in which we teach the importance of physical activity. However, one must appreciate the differences between these two. Physical Activity is defined “as bodily movements of any type and may include recreational, fitness or sport activities” (Strategies, 2005, p.33 ), whereas Physical Education acts as the vehicle to develop, instruct, assess and promote the importance of physical activity(ies) throughout our lives (Strategies, 2005).

As a university instructor in the area of physical education pedagogy at the time of the study, I wanted to offer a volunteer opportunity for undergraduates to be involved in practical application of theoretical models being taught within their courses. Therefore I involved two
undergraduate students as fellow researchers as I conducted this study. As I appreciate and understand the power play found between teacher and student, I tried to be proactive with this limitation by making these two positions volunteer as well as by choosing undergraduate students I was not teaching during the time of the study.

I also involved the middle school physical educator as lead teacher within my study. The teacher had no previous knowledge of both model, and the teacher and I became colleagues of best practice. Through discussion, stories, study explanations, and examples of both models, we became comfortable in our study roles as well as confident that we would create a positive learning environment for all three grade seven classes.

Student participation was the essential factor for a successful qualitative study. Again from past quantitative or mixed method research experiences, I observed student boredom and lack of interest that led to what I can only describe as a decrease in engagement on the part of the participants. As a qualitative researcher, pursuing questions based on the affective domain of students, it is my goal to create a physical education environment that involves the student participants in a manner that will nurture engagement and critical thinking throughout the entire study (Pekrun, Goetz, Titz, & Perry, 2002; Willis, 2007).

**Ethical Considerations**

Ethical approval from the University of Toronto Research Ethics Board (#29093) was received before any data was collected. Students were given the option to participate or not participate in the study. More importantly, all student participants had the right to withdraw at any point in the study. This did not occur in this study, but illness and family holidays did account for a few missed journal entries.
School Selection

I selected a middle school in an urban area, in a province in Western Canada where the recommended physical education time had been met (Bedal, 2006). This school was chosen based on the following criteria: a) it had a public school physical education program; b) it had a physical education teacher; c) the physical education teacher had time to include an eight-lesson invasion/territory games unit including a pre-unit and post-unit visit; and; d) the physical education teacher had no previous knowledge of either the TGfU instructional model or Hellison’s levels of PSR.

School Setting

The middle school selected had a population of over 600 students and taught grades six to eight. At the time of the study, the principal was a specialist in physical education and also a strong supporter of quality physical education as well as the newer daily physical activity initiatives. Prominence of nutritious choices in vending machines and at the tuck shop, and a Daily Physical Activity resource room which included workout machines, treadmills, weights and gym mats were observed as I walked into the school environment for the first time. It was apparent and can be concluded that this school is not the norm with the district. The gymnasium itself was a medium-sized space in which thirty to thirty-five students could safely participate in physical activities. All safety precautions were in place (safety mats on each end of wall, floors well maintained and swept after each class, change rooms and a water fountain inside gymnasium therefore enclosing the space). The equipment room was well stocked and organized with all the necessities needed for a physical education class. There was also a teaching office, which was used for storage, a sound system, which could play music, and a scoreboard that could be used for timing and score tallying.
Participants

Upon gaining ethical approval from the University of Toronto Research Ethics Board (#23093), I approached the Principal and discussed the possibility of pursuing my study within his school. I intended to study a group of grade six students, however I was informed that the physical education specialist only taught grades seven and eight. After conferring with my supervisor Dr. Doug McDougall, it was decided to study grade seven students. I was given permission by the Principal and began my proposed study program by meeting with the grade seven teachers.

I met with the group of homeroom grade seven teachers and discussed the purpose of my study. I was informed that within the grade seven cohorts, a group of pods had been created in order to rotate students more efficiently between core subjects. I would still need the participation of three grade seven homeroom classes, but would only be working directly with the physical education teacher. I answered any questions or concerns the grade seven homeroom teachers had about my study, as well as reiterating to each teacher that it was their choice, not that of the physical education teacher, whether their class was going to participate in this study. Overall four teachers permitted their homeroom classes to be a part of the study. The final three classes were chosen based on purposive sampling. The three classes were in consecutive blocks of the school day, making it easier to plan and organize the 8-lesson unit plan.

Once the three classes had been selected, the two undergraduate researchers and I were introduced to the grade seven students. Within the students’ homeroom classrooms, I explained the study and made sure that everyone understood what the study was about and what choices they had. Consent forms were given to the homeroom teacher to be handed out at the end of the
day. I ended our first meeting by asking the students if they had any questions about me or about my undergraduate students, and I thanked them in advance for their time.

It took two weeks for all of the signed consent forms to be collected. If permission was granted, the student was given a number within the study in order to maintain anonymity. If a consent form was not signed, the student was not assigned a number and was told that they would still be participating in the physical education class but not in the collection of data. A total of 58 students (30 males and 28 females) provided informed written consent from themselves and their parents/guardians to participate in this study. The students ranged from ten to twelve years of age. All except one student was able-bodied.

The Lesson(s) Context

For the purpose of this study, a different instructional plan was created for each of the three classes. As it was my intention to have as many students participating in this study as possible, each class participated in a different lesson plan design. All three classes involved the same small-sided invasion/territory games throughout the entire unit. What differed between all three classes was how Hellison’s levels of PSR were taught. Class A’s lesson plans were created by embedding Hellison’s PSR levels within the TGfU instructional model; class B’s lessons were taught using Bunker and Thorpe’s original TGfU instructional model; and class C’s lesson plans included Hellison’s levels of PSR utilizing the grade seven teachers’ preferred instructional style. An overview of each type of lesson plan can be found in Figure 4. Because of the way this study was set up due to time available in the school environment and the simple fact that not all classes were taught using the same lesson plan context, without replication I could not account for all of the differences within each class.
The educational resource PlaySport was used to develop Class A and class B’s lesson plans. PlaySport (www.playsport.net) is an online games resource designed for teachers, coaches, and youth leaders. Focusing on the four conceptual games categories (target, batting/fielding, net/wall, and invasion/territory), PlaySport develops tactics and skills through “teaching games by playing games” for a variety of sports. With support from the Ontario Physical and Health Education Association (OPHEA), the Ontario Canadian Intramural Recreation Association, Sport Canada, Physical and Health Education Canada, Right to Play, and Brock University, I was one of two games creators that developed many of the games found in the resource. For the purpose of this study, only the invasion/territory games category was used as the unit was focused on invasion/territory games. Before each lesson, the physical education teacher and I met in order to clarify any questions or concerns about the day’s lessons.
Class A: Lesson Breakdown
TPSR and TGfU
- Introduction to Hellison’s Levels of Personal and Social Responsibility
- First Game Play Focused on PSR Level
- First Teacher Facilitated Questions and Discussion on Making Appropriate PSR Decisions within Game Play
- Second Game Play Focused on PSR Question and Discussion Break
- Lesson Closing and Journal Entry

Class B: Lesson Breakdown
TGfU
- Introduction to Tactical Level of Complexity
- First Game Play Focused on Tactical Level of Complexity
- First Teacher Facilitated Question and Discussion on Making Appropriate Tactical Decisions within Game Play
- Second Game Play Focused on Tactical Question and Discussion Break
- Lesson Closing and Journal Entry

Class C: Lesson Breakdown
TPSR and Teacher’s Preferred Instruction
- Introduction to Hellison’s Levels of Personal and Social Responsibility and Tactical Level of Complexity
- Game Play
- Lesson Closing and Journal Entry
The research study and data collection did not start for a week due to the fact that I wanted the grade seven students to become comfortable with us. We utilized this time, as well as the previous two weeks, to practise our observation skills and field note taking. Students also became more at ease with having the “strangers” in the gym, as we quickly became a part of the educational environment. The study was conducted from early January to the middle of February.

Data Collection

Case study findings can be collected in a variety of ways. For the purpose of this research study, collection of findings included demographic information, student journal entries, observational field notes, and field notes gathered through unstructured interviews with the physical education teacher (Merriam, 1998; Stake; 1995; Yin, 2003).

Demographic Information

The collection of background information was included as part of the participant’s first journal entry and included grade, age, and gender.

Journal Entries

Students participated in active journal writing, which took place in the last 5–8 minutes of each lesson. Cutforth and Parker (1996) and Fisette (2010) have stated that giving students the opportunity to write down their thoughts, feelings, and questions in turn enables them to grow and develop as learners. The positive impact journal writing can have on students’ understanding may lead students to explore deeper connections between concepts within the lesson environment and in their outside world (Graffam, 2003). Within this study, students were given a new journal entry after each lesson. Students answered a set of open-ended questions
based on the lesson they had just completed (Cutforth & Parker, 1996). The students also had a
chance to write anything else they wanted to about the lesson.

In total, students participated in ten journal entries, including eight that occurred after
each lesson and the pre-study and post-study entry. All of the journal entries were the same for
each case study. Each journal entry included four questions. The first question was used only
for recall of specific personal or social responsibility level, therefore providing students the
opportunity to refocus on journal writing after being involved in a highly physically active
environment. Questions two and three were open-ended questions which asked students to
provide a practical example of a specific personal or social responsibility level within the
physical education lesson they had just completed. Question four was an open-ended question
that asked if students had any other comments about the physical education they had just
participated in.

| Lesson 1 | 1. What does self-control mean to you?
|          | 2. Can you give me an example of self-control in today’s physical education class?
|          | 3. How did you make sure that everyone on your team was included in the game?
|          | 4. Do you have any other comments you want to tell me about today’s physical education class? |

| Lesson 2 | 1. What does Respect mean to you?
|          | 2. Can you give me an example of Respect in today’s physical education class?
|          | 3. How did you make sure that everyone’s opinion on your team was respected when
|          |  you played the game?
|          | 4. Do you have any other comments you want to tell me about today’s physical education class? |

| Lesson 3 | 1. What does effort mean to you?
|          | 2. Can you give me an example of how you demonstrated effort in today’s physical
|          |  education class?
|          | 3. How did you feel today when Mr. J asked you to try to play the game in a
different way?
|          | 4. Do you have any other comments you want to tell me about today’s physical
|          |  education class? |

| Lesson 4 | 1. What does success mean to you? |
Field Notes

As discussed by Glesne and Peshkin (1992), field notes are one of the most important tools for the qualitative researcher. Field notes can be used to describe people, places, and activities; they are also a place to jot down comments, hunches, or notes from your observations (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). The primary researcher and the undergraduate researchers collected all field notes by using a tape recorder, which recorded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>1. What does independence mean to you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Can you give me an example of how you were independent in today’s physical education class?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Can you give me an example of goals you set for yourself today as you played the game?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Do you have any other comments you want to tell me about today’s physical education class?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>1. What does it mean to have goals?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Can you give me an example of goals you set for yourself today as you played the game?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Can you give me an example of how you were independent in today’s physical education class?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Do you have any other comments you want to tell me about today’s physical education class?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>1. What does it mean to be caring?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Can you give me an example of how you demonstrated caring in today’s physical education class?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. How did you feel today when you were asked to help make sure that everyone understood how to play the game?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Do you have any other comments you want to tell me about today’s physical education class?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>1. What does leadership mean to you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Can you give me an example of how you were a leader in today’s physical education class?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Can you give me an example of how you tried to help others today as you played the game?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|          | 4. Do you have any other comments you want to tell me about today’s physical education class?
lessons in progress and observer reflections during the lessons. Once the day was over, I collected all of the recorded field notes and transcribed verbatim into one observation document in Microsoft Word. Following each class, an unstructured interview or discussion occurred with the physical education teacher and was written down as field notes. This was done with the intention that these unstructured discussions could impact and deepen the study’s results.

Research Protocol

Pre-Study Journal Entry
Each study participant was given the pre-study journal entry sheet, which was completed in the gymnasium and therefore simulated what would occur after each class throughout the invasion/territory games unit. This journal entry sheet included demographic questions as well as three open-ended questions based on personal and social responsibility. The pre-study journal entry was completed one week before the first lesson was taught.

Invasion/Territory Unit
During each thirty-five minute invasion/territory lesson delivered by the same physical education teacher, two undergraduate researchers and I took field notes via tape recorder to record the use of PSR levels during the lessons and to cite any reflections while observing each class. During each day of the study, lessons and observations were completed in sequential order: block 1 (class A), block 2 (class B), and block 3 (class C).

After the completion of each lesson, all participants were asked to complete that day’s journal entry. The first journal question was specifically focused upon the student’s definition of the PSR level (e.g., Respect, Effort etc.). The two practical lesson questions were used to check that the TPSR level was taught within that day’s lesson and to check understanding of that TPSR
level. The last journal question focused on general comments about that day’s lesson. The students were given between five and eight minutes to complete their entry.

After all three classes were completed for the day the two undergraduate researchers and I would discuss our taped observations and clarify any situations that may have arisen during any of the lessons. I then collected all of the recorded field notes and transcribed verbatim into one observation document in Microsoft Word. I would also meet with the teacher to make sure he did not have any concerns about the next lesson plan. In these discussions, the teacher and I would discuss how the lesson plan for that day had gone. This was not tape-recorded and therefore I would reflect on these discussions through mental notes and then add my written notes to my observational field notes.

Post-Study Journal Entry

After all eight lessons were completed; a post study journal entry ended the collection of data. This took place in the gymnasium before the students’ next unit in physical education was to begin. The students and teacher were thanked for all of their time and dedication to the study.

Data Analysis

Once all ten journal entries were collected, they were inputted into the NVivo qualitative software. This software enables the researcher to “manage, shape and make sense of unstructured information” (NVivo, 2013). All transcribed field notes were also inputted into NVivo in an attempt to provide more meaning to the journal entry responses. A computer program was chosen due to the fact that a large number of students participated in this study and there were hundreds upon hundreds of journal entry responses, as well as observation field notes. NVivo assisted with such tasks as coding, data linking, counting frequencies of content, and
storing the large amount of collected qualitative data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The data was analyzed using the content analysis technique (Patton, 2002). Through this type of analysis, the data from the journal responses were defined and then coded by similar characteristics as well as merged by major themes and sub-themes.

Trustworthiness

As a constructivist/interpretative researcher who believes that reality is constructed by the human experience, moreover that no one perception is correct or realistic, I had to ensure trustworthy data. Therefore I chose to apply the following techniques: a) prolonged engagement; b) triangulation of data; c) peer review and debriefing, d) random sampling e) tactics to help ensure honesty in informants f) member checks g) audit trail h) outside member code checks (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992).

a) Prolonged Engagement. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) state that “time is a major factor in the acquisition of trustworthy data” (p. 146). I wanted the students who were to participate in my study to know me and to know my undergraduate researchers and consequently we introduced ourselves early into the school environment. As described by Lincoln and Guba (1985), prolonged engagement should occur between the investigator and the participants in order to ensure organization of the environment as well as develop relationships. Therefore for the three weeks leading up to the study, my undergraduate students and I would attend Mr. A’s classes, more specifically the ones that we would be observing. We would “hang out” with the students before their classes would begin and would also walk with them back to their classrooms after each lesson we observed. I was also invited to teach physical education classes on three separate occasions during those three weeks. I made sure not to use either of the instructional models that were going to be used within the study and chose not to teach games
only, but rather led to dance classes and an outdoor run. I also met with the physical education teacher inside and outside of school time. To create a strong relationship with Mr. A was central to the success of the research study. Through these interactions before the study began, I learned more about his educational background and past experiences in physical education, and about his biases towards some movement categories versus others. By the time the study began, the school was a welcoming and comfortable environment.

b) Triangulation of Data. Through the use of different qualitative data sources and different data collection methods throughout this study, this maintained a triangulation of data (Glesne, 2006). Data sources included student journal entries, field note observations of both the students and the physical education teacher, and unstructured interviews, which occurred after class with the physical education teacher. An example of triangulation within this study occurred when field note observations based on student game play from both the physical education teacher and the three observers were enhanced by the same game play examples being written about within certain student participant journal entries.

c) Peer Review and Debriefing. Throughout the creation of the invasion/territory lesson plans, I was in constant contact with a TGfU games specialist also knowledgeable in Hellison’s TPSR Model. This external input and reflective feedback was specifically used when the lessons were created and sent to the specialist for critical feedback and were approved before being used within the study. If required, modifications to the lesson plans were completed between Mr. A and I and then once again approved by the games specialist.

d) Random Sampling. A purposeful difference from usual qualitative sampling techniques was used throughout this study. A random approach to the sample size included all students who chose to participate in the study and the class that they were in. As Shelton (2004)
states, “random sampling also helps to ensure that any “unknown influences” are distributed evenly within the sample” (p. 65).

e) Tactics to Help Ensure Honesty in Informants. Before and during the study, each student was given opportunities to refuse to participate within the journal entry data collection therefore this specific data collection was only completed by the willing students. Also before each student completed their own journal entry, I made sure students were given enough free space around the gymnasium to ensure privacy in their own responses. As well as before students began to answer the journal entry, I emphasized that they could answer the questions however they wanted therefore allowing the students to feel comfortable if they did not “know” the answer (Shelton, 2004)

f) Member Checks. As stated by Guban and Lincoln (1995), member checking is one of the most important factors to increase credibility. This includes sharing documents (journal entries) with the student participants to confirm understanding of the answers as well as clarification within the answers. These member checks were conducted either after the journal entry was completed or before the beginning of the next lesson.

g) Audit Trail. By keeping a thorough collection of documentation of the data processes, themes, organization and time spent on the study, this allows any observer to follow the study step by step (Shelton, 2004).

h) Outside Member Coding Checks. To ensure trustworthiness in the coding of the data, another person outside of the research journal entry and observation and discussed for similarities and inconsistencies.
Chapter 4
Findings

**Introduction**

As researchers, we are shaped by our disciplines and academic trends and traditions (Glesne & Peshkin, 2013). Bettering ourselves as knowing educators, we look towards models to assist us in our endeavour to create quality physical education environments for all students. The constructivist model of Teaching Games for Understanding (TGfU) guides students to facilitate their own understandings of their worlds based on what they already know and the knowledge and ideas they will learn (Richardson, 2003).

The humanistic model of Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility underpinned by the theory of positive youth development concurs that in order for students to know how to take responsibility for their own actions, they must have the opportunity to learn within social settings. The purpose of this qualitative multi-case study was to evaluate the effectiveness of a hybrid instructional model on the development of personal and social responsibility behaviours (Respect, Participation, Self-Direction, and Caring) in grade seven students within an invasion/territory games environment. This study used Hellison’s levels of responsibility to examine if such affective learning could take place within an invasion/territory games environment. The three research questions that led this study were:

1) How does the implementation of a hybrid instructional model affect the learning of personal and social responsibility behaviours within a grade seven invasion/territory games unit?

2) How does the implementation of a TGfU instructional model affect the learning of personal and social responsibility behaviours within a grade seven invasion/territory games unit?
3) How can Hellison’s levels of responsibility be taught within the confines of a physical education invasion/territory games unit?

In order to make sense of the large amount of qualitative data collected from 58 study participants by means of journal entries, field note observations and unstructured interviews, a content analysis was conducted which created meaningful units, subthemes, themes and major themes. It is important to remember that each case represents a different instructional model in the pursuit to answer my research question of effective implementation of personal and social responsibility teaching. It became quite clear through the collected data that even though each journal entry included open-ended questions based on Hellison’s level of personal and social responsibility, participants’ answers truly reflected the instructional method and focus of each lesson plan.

Through content analysis, six major themes were found within all three cases. These major themes are:

1) Developing Personal and Social Responsibility Behaviours

2) Perceived Responsibility

3) All about the Game

4) Irresponsibility in Action

5) A Positive Learning Environment

6) A Learned Response

Illustrations through the use of journal entry responses, observational notes, and excerpts from the unstructured interviews drawn from the data have been included to represent each major theme, theme, and subtheme. Also, when necessary, each major theme was contextualized based on instructional model in order to create a clear understanding of the findings. A significant
finding in qualitative research and as discussed within my findings in one that has meaning or representation (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2004). Please utilize Figure 6 as a navigational tool as I discuss my findings.
Figure 4  Break-down of Major Themes, Themes, and Subthemes

**Major Theme 1:** Developing Social and Personal Responsibility Behaviours

**Theme:** Respect (Hybrid)
- Self-Control
- Right to be Included
- Right to a Peaceful Conflict

**Theme:** Participation (Hybrid)
- Self-Motivation
- Trying new things
- Success
- Persistence

**Theme:** Caring (Hybrid)
- Compassion
- Helping Others
- Good Leader

**Theme:** Self-Direction (Hybrid)
- On Task Independence
- Goal Setting

**Major Theme 2:** Perception of Responsibility

**Theme:** Personal Responsibility (TGfU)

**Subtheme:** Participation

**Theme:** Social Responsibility (TGfU)

**Subtheme:** Respect
- Caring

**Major Theme 3:** All about the Game

**Theme:** Offensive Tactical Solutions (Hybrid and TGfU)

**Theme:** Defensive Tactical Solutions (Hybrid and TGfU)

**Theme:** Rules (Hybrid and TGfU)

**Theme:** Winning (TGfU)
Major Theme 4: Irresponsibility

Theme:
- Disrespect towards Teacher (TGfU)
- Disrespect towards Peers (Hybrid and TGfU)
- Invention to Harm (Hybrid and TGfU)
- Making Excuses (Hybrid and TGfU)

Major Theme 5: Positive Learning Environment

Theme:
- Fun (Hybrid)
- Teamwork (Hybrid)
- Positive Communication (Hybrid)
- Teacher as Facilitator (Hybrid)

Major Theme 6: Learned Response

Theme:
Case A: The Hybrid Model

Case Study Class A’s lessons were created by embedding Hellison’s PSR levels within the TGfU instructional model. These lessons include an invasion/territory games unit that incorporates the progression of Hellison’s levels from lesson one to eight. Lesson-specific focus, small-sided games, and examples of discussion questions asked throughout the lesson are included. The journal entry questions that each student answered after each consecutive lesson are also included.

Class A consisted of 18 participating students (nine boys and nine girls) and was described by Mr. A as competitive in nature. This class was the first class of the day and started quite quickly after morning announcements. Each of their lessons were taught in progressive order based on Hellison’s four levels of personal and social responsibility. The lesson progression was as follows. Lessons one and two focused on Hellison’s level of respect. This level incorporates three components of respect: self-control, the right to peaceful conflict resolution, and the right to be included. Lessons three and four focused on Hellison’s level of participation. This level is described by the following three components: self-motivation, exploration of effort and new tasks, and courage to persist when the going gets tough. Lessons five and six focused on Hellison’s level of self-direction. Components included on-task independence, goal setting progression, and courage to resist peer pressure. And finally, lessons seven and eight focused on Hellison’s level of caring. This level is described by the four components of compassion, helping others, being a good leader, and acting without reward.

Case B: TGfU Model

Case study class B consisted of 20 participating students. (10 boys, 10 girls) and was described as a general class with many different physical abilities. Case Study Class B’s lessons
were created using Bunker and Thorpe’s original TGfU instructional model. As seen in Figure 2, these lessons include an invasion/territory games unit that incorporated tactical awareness of attacking the goal and defending space. Lesson-specific focus, small-sided games, and examples of discussion questions asked throughout the lesson are included within this figure. The journal entry questions that each student answered after each consecutive lesson are also included.

**Case C: Mr. A’s Way**

Case Study Class C’s students also consisted 20 participating students (9 boys, 11 girls) of which Mr. A. described as including differing abilities specifically within invasion games. Case Study Class C’s lesson plans were created by the physical education teacher. Through discussion, Mr. A was introduced to both Hellison’s levels of PSR and Themes or “ways” to teach personal and social responsibility within a physical education class. Mr. A was then given the responsibility of creating these lesson plans for the class.

**Major Theme: Developing Personal and Social Responsibility Behaviours**

All data collected and analyzed concluded that Hellison’s four levels of personal and social responsibility were found within Class A (the hybrid model). These four themes also included thirteen subthemes. Hellison’s levels or themes within this chapter will be summarized based on frequency of theme found within the data analysis and not in chronological order, as it was taught within the unit. Therefore themes will be presented in order of the Hellison’s levels: Respect (self-control, the right to peaceful conflict, and the right to be included); participation (self-motivation, exploration of effort and new tasks, courage to persist when the going gets tough); Caring (compassion, helping others, being a leader, acting without reward); and self-direction (on-task independence, goal setting progression, and courage to resist peer pressure).
Theme: Respect

The theme of Hellison’s level of respect was found to have meaning in every lesson within the Hybrid unit. Based on their journal entries, Class A students were asked to answer the open-ended questions directly focused on one or two components of Hellison’s levels of PSR. These meaning units come directly from questions 2 and 3 of the journal entries which asked for game play examples of Hellison’s levels in action. For context, Respect (self-control, the right to be included, and the right to peaceful conflict) was the focused learning outcomes for the first two lessons of the Hybrid unit. With progression, students focused on Hellison’s components of self-control and the right to be included in the first lesson.

Subtheme: Self-Control

Class A students were introduced to the component of self-control specifically within Lesson 1. Students were involved in the invasion/territory game called Chipotle while being introduced to the idea of self-control as well as the right for everyone to be included. The Chipotle invasion/territory game was new to the students, but it resembled another game they had played earlier in the school year. The Class A students were broken into four colour groups with the purpose of the game being to defend the three pins that were set up within their corner, at the same time attempting to knock down the other three coloured teams’ pins (see Appendix A). This difference of self-control was observed in the lesson during the first and second games. Throughout the first game of Chipotle, I observed that the “Males within the class dominated the game play; therefore leaving many of the females within the class looking bored or frustrated” (Observational Field Note).
The Class A students seemed to be easily frustrated with one another while playing the game, leading to yelling at and fighting physically with one another. At one point, observations noted that “There seemed to be a direct intention to hurt other students by throwing balls at each other and not at the pins directly” (Observational Field Note). This specific observation, though noted here, will be discussed under the category of Irresponsibility.

The teacher stopped the activity after the first Chipotle game. The teacher asked the Class A students open-ended questions about self-control and including everyone based on the Chipotle game. Student answers varied as some claimed that the game made them feel:

happy, energetic and excited, whereas others claimed to make them feel anxious and frustrated and, as a result, either did not “bother” to play or yelled at their teammates. (Observational Field Note)

Dealing with these feelings prompted many of the Class A students to try to stay positive and not blame one another. When asked by the teacher about the ramifications of not having respect for one another, class A students replied “That it would be difficult to play with each other as well as the fact that not all would be playing in the game” (Observational Field Note).

The teacher then put the students into groups to empower them to discuss how their team could be more successful in the game. Their replies ranged from “Not throwing the ball into people’s faces, passing more, and working together as a team to involving better communication” (Observational Field Note). While the students played the game of Chipotle the second time, I noted “there was a shift of frustration from their own team to the opposing teams” (Observational Field Note). However, the lack of self-control was still apparent in some students as they continued to throw the ball at people instead of pins.

Class A students demonstrated understanding of the subtheme of self-control more substantially within their Hybrid Lesson 1 journal entry. One student wrote, “Being nice to your
team and other teams (I mean like not swearing at others and not being disrespectful and hitting)” (Hybrid Lesson 1). Another student wrote: “We didn’t get angry when we were doing bad” (Hybrid Lesson 1). A third student wrote: “Everybody watched what they said (I was about to yell at ‘boy’ for missing a catch but I didn’t’” (Hybrid Lesson 1).

However, students also used other Hybrid lesson journal entries to discuss the importance of self-control. The students wrote:

“One example in today’s PE class was that when Mr. A was telling us the rules for the game, everybody was sitting in front of him watching and listening” (Hybrid Lesson 2)
“You give effort to pass to people on your team and effort for not getting frustrated” (Hybrid Lesson 3)
“I had good attitude” (Hybrid Lesson 6)

Self-control was observed within the actual lessons through the in-class PSR questions and discussion portion of the class. Specific examples of student understanding included when they were asked how as a team they could be more successful. Self-control was also observed through the following discussion during a student-led team “time out”:

This team just discussed the importance of self-control because they were concerned that one of their teammates was hitting the ball too hard and it was difficult to control as well as it was making some of the girls on the team nervous. The outcome of that statement was a simple nod, but I think he got it. (Observation field notes)

**Subtheme: Right to Be Included**

Class A students also demonstrated the understanding of the subtheme as discussed in Lesson 1 (right to be included) in their written Hybrid journal entries for every lesson. With focus on this component specifically embedded within Lesson 1, most students talked about the component of respect, and many Class A students provided examples of how they included everyone in their game play.

“We made sure that everyone was included in the game by switching off goalies so that somebody would play. We also tried to pass to someone” (Hybrid Lesson 1)
“I made sure I passed to everyone at least three times” (Hybrid Lesson 1)
“I kept passing the ball to different people” (Hybrid Lesson 1)
“I let everyone have a chance” (Hybrid Lesson 1)

Class A student understanding of the right to include everyone was also present in the other lessons as well.

“I passed them the ball a lot” (Hybrid Lesson 2)
“I tried to pass to everyone” (Hybrid Lesson 3)
“My team passed to everyone and had good communication and we actually got a goal” (Hybrid Lesson 4)
“We all tried to passed to each other and we all had to try” (Hybrid Lesson 4)
“I worked hard to pass to people” (Hybrid Lesson 5)
“My goals were to score and pass to everyone on my team” (Hybrid Lesson 5)
“I made sure I included everyone” (Hybrid Lesson 6)
“To score on the other team and to pass to everyone” (Hybrid Lesson 6)
“Well I made sure everyone got to participate and have fun” (Hybrid Lesson 7)
“I tried to pass to everyone who was a chaser” (Hybrid Lesson 8)

Class A students used their understanding of inclusion practically in game play action.

Many observations were made while students participated in different TPSR question and discussion portions throughout the eight-lesson Hybrid unit.

“If our team did not respect one another on the team then not everyone would be playing” (Answer during Hybrid Lesson 2)
“We felt better as a team because we were passing more” (Answer during Hybrid Lesson 2)
“Our team was using more effort because we made sure everyone was included” (Answer during Hybrid Lesson 3).

It was also concluded in the field notes that many observations of inclusion occurred throughout the actual game play.

“This handball lesson seems to be going really well from the start. It is obvious to me that inclusion is occurring as many of the teams seem to be making sure that they pass to everyone on the team.” (Observational Field Note)
“I just watched one team player yell to another team player for not passing. I kept on watching this interaction to see what would happen next. Was this because he wanted to score? Or was he making sure everyone was included. To my honest surprise he passed the ball and then stated back to his team mate, ‘See we need to pass to everyone to reach our goal’.” (Observational Field Note)

“One of the boys on the team just told another boy on his team that he was hogging the ball and told him to play like a team member and that this game isn’t just about him.” (Observational Field Note)

**Subtheme: The Right to a Peaceful Conflict**

The second Hybrid lesson for Class A followed games progression by using the same invasion/territory game of Chipotle to focus on the PSR component of respecting differences of opinion and peaceful resolution of conflict among teammates or competitors. Therefore, questions facilitated by Mr. A focused on the importance of involving everyone in team discussions and making sure that all agree with any changes in game play. Within the actual lesson, Class A students had the opportunity to change the game however their teammates wanted but they had to have all team members’ agreement on the change (see Appendix B).

I noted, “Students seemed not to have as much energy on this day” (Observational Field Notes). Moreover I wrote that “There was not a lot of energy overall in the gymnasium” (Observational Field Notes). Overall, the first game was played with no significant observations being made, as it seemed that the students were just going through the motions of the day.

After the first game, the teacher gathered the Class A students to ask probing questions based on Hellison’s level of respecting rights and feelings. When asked how the game made them feel as a team, Class A students seemed to feel better because “They were passing the ball to each other more often and it seemed an easier game because the teams were smaller due to absences” (Observational Field Notes). When Class A students were asked if the teams discussed where the pins were going before they started, one student response said “We
discussed together as they separated the pins so that they would not all get knocked down together” (Observational Field Notes). The teacher then asked each group to come up with a change they would make that would be respectful for all of the group members. I observed that:

When given this responsibility, two out of the four teams came up with a change quite quickly while the other two groups had discussions that led to arguments, leading Mr. A to emphasize the importance of others’ opinions in making decisions. (Observational Field Notes)

When students were placed into game play for the second time, the observation was made that, “Even though changes were created to include everyone on each team, students became upset and rule breaking still occurred” (Observational Field Notes).

The Class A students demonstrated their understanding of Hellison’s component of the right to a peaceful conflict, as all of the meaning units were found within the journal entries, more specifically saturated within hybrid Lessons 1 and 2. The prompted answers included:

“I made sure that I talked to them and shared ideas” (Hybrid Lesson 1)
“We all worked together and strategized” (Hybrid Lesson 1)
“If someone had a different strategy you would respect it and give it a try” (Hybrid Lesson 2)
“Well today we had to respect each other and the choices they made. Like we respected Mr. A.’s choice on what to change in the game” (Hybrid Lesson 2)
“We listened to everyone and compromised” (Hybrid Lesson 2)
“We went around in a circle making sure everyone had a chance to talk” (Hybrid Lesson 2)

However, the importance of resolving conflicts peacefully was also mentioned in other Hybrid lessons:

“I listened to their opinion, and then answered to what it was so they knew I was listening” (Hybrid Lesson 3)
“Today I helped my team make decisions and we all worked to together” (Hybrid Lesson 8)

Theme: Participation
Hellison’s level of participation was found to have meaning in every journal entry within the Hybrid unit with the exclusion of Lessons 2 and 7. The level of participation was the focus of Lessons 3 and 4, once again following the progressive manner set forth by Hellison’s levels of personal and social responsibility. Primarily based on their journal entries, Class A students were asked to answer the open-ended questions directly focused on one or two components of Hellison’s levels of PSR. These meaning units come directly from questions 2 and 3 of the journal entries, which asked for game play examples of Hellison’s levels in action. Subthemes for this level were found for each of the components based on participation and will be discussed in order: self-motivation, exploration of effort and new tasks, and courage to persist when the going gets tough.

**Subtheme: Self-Motivation**

The third Hybrid lesson for Class A signified the progression of both the invasion/territory game that was going to be played and the TPSR level. Small-sided games of handball became the new invasion/territory game in which the TPSR level of Participation through exploring effort and trying new things was embedded. Even though the game of Handball is a “go to game” for physical educators to use, the Class A students had not been introduced to this game before the study was conducted.

With the first game of small-sided handball, it was observed that “the four teams [were] working quite well together as a cohesive team with little distraction or confrontation” (Observational Field Notes). More importantly, “all four teams were trying to pass to everyone within their team as much as possible” (Observational Field Notes). After 10 minutes of game play, Mr. A called the class together to ask prompting questions based on Hellison’s Level of Participation and Effort. When asked if their teams were playing with a lot of effort, I observed
one Class A student answer: “Yes because they made sure everyone was included on their team, they tried to get possession of the ball as much as possible and tried to play as “smart” as they could” (Observational Field Notes.)

The teacher then asked if everyone on the team was putting in a lot of effort, with an overwhelming reply by the Class A students. One student answered, “Yes, because everyone was moving and passing the ball around” (Observational Field Notes). The teacher then asked about individual effort of play and if each student was playing with a lot of effort. The answers indicated that

Many felt they were playing with a lot of effort because they tried hard. When prompted why it was important to try hard, a student answered that if you did not use a lot of effort, then it would not be fun. (Observational Field Notes)

When the teacher asked each team to discuss how they could play with more effort, one student said “Paying more attention and not letting so many goals in during the game” (Observational Field Notes).

Going back to the small-sided handball game again, it was observed that

Each team seemed to be working well together, making passes to everyone on the team. More importantly, each team was trying to include everyone within the game play. (Observational Field Notes)

Class A student understanding of the importance of being self-motivated was apparent within Hybrid journal entry responses. This component is highlighted in the following examples.

“Today in PE I demonstrated effort by always running hard, trying to get the ball” (Hybrid Lesson 3)
“Today we had to put lots of effort into passing and trying to keep the ball” (Hybrid Lesson 3)
“I tried to pass to everyone, tried shooting in the net and I even tried being the goalie” (Hybrid Lesson 3)
Self-motivation was also discussed in other journal entries. One student stated, “I was successful in gym today because I was into it and gave it all my effort” (Hybrid Lesson 4). Another said, “I worked hard to pass to people” (Hybrid Lesson 5).

**Subtheme: Trying New Things**

Class A students also demonstrated the understanding of the subtheme of trying new things, as discussed in Lesson 3 in their written journal entries for every lesson. With the lesson, the teacher, as directed in the lesson plan, chose to change the game, therefore presenting the students with a “new” game. Class A students described this component in their Lesson 3 journal entry. One student wrote, “I felt excited to be able to see two different ways to play a game. It made it a little more challenging but it made it more fun” (Hybrid Lesson 3). A second student wrote, “Well me and another student wanted to be the shooters but well I thought it would be fun and different” (Hybrid Lesson 3).

Class A students also demonstrated their understanding of trying new things in other lessons as well. One student wrote “I believed in myself and my team” (Hybrid Lesson 5), and a second student wrote “Well last time out team didn’t try very hard so this time we wanted to put more effort in.” (Hybrid Lesson 6)

**Subtheme: Success**

Once again, a small-sided game of handball was used to introduce the component of personal definition of success as found in the level of participation. This component was defined to the Class A students as more than just about winning; it can also be about how they make passes, communicate, or be a good team member. Mr. A also expressed that the definition of success could be individualized to meet the needs of every person.

During the first small-sided handball game, I observed that Class A students were:
Calling out each other’s names when passing and tended to be able to control their emotions if teammates made mistakes or missed the goal. They seem to be caring for each other too, specifically when others got hurt within gameplay. (Observational Field Notes)

After the first game, the teacher gathered the students to ask questions about what success meant to them. When asked if they were successful, Class A student replies included, “Yes because everyone had a chance to shoot and because [we] were trying to pass to everyone on the team” (Observational Field Notes). When asked how they could be successful anywhere, student responses included “by scoring within the game or by the attitude you brought to the game” (Hybrid Observational Field Notes).

The teacher then asked if the students felt successfully individually, and the students indicated that they were successful “because they tried to pass to the people who did not usually get the ball passed to them as much” (Observational Field Notes). When asked if the amount of effort they used helped them be more successful, the Class A students stated, “Yes because the harder you try the better results you are going to have” (Observational Field Notes).

The students were then asked by Mr. A to go back into their teams to discuss how they would describe the measure of their success as a team. At the debrief, student responses included “taking more shots, making shorter passes, and passing back and forth between teammates” (Observational Field Notes).

During the second game of small-sided handball, the teams were observed to be playing with more affective thought, they were using communication when passing, congratulating each other when getting goals and listening to their teammates calling for the ball. (Observational Field Notes)

Through their journal entry responses specifically, student demonstrated understanding of what success meant to them.
“I was passing lots with peer#1 and he was passing back and we got by their team then scored” (Hybrid Lesson 4)

“One example of how I was successful in PE today was that I was able to work well with my group and that if there was a problem we could tell them to make the game better” (Hybrid Lesson 4)

“Well I got the ball a lot and I helped one of my teammates when they were surrounded by people” (Hybrid Lesson 4)

Subtheme: Persistence

Even though persistence was not purposefully taught within a specific lesson, this component of participation was stated many times and is therefore noteworthy. Class A students demonstrated understanding by writing in their journals:

“I was the goalie so I dove around and did whatever I could to help my team” (Hybrid Lesson 3)

“I tried hard to keep the ball out of the net even when we were losing” (Hybrid Lesson 3)

“Well I chased after the ball so I could pass it to one of two players” (Hybrid Lesson 3)

“The first game I tried really hard, I didn’t get any goals but I blocked a lot” (Lesson 4)

“Try my hardest and try to score and win” (Hybrid Lesson 5)

Theme: Caring

Presenting the themes, by frequency of meaning units, diverting away from the progressive nature of these Hellison’s personal and social levels in which they were taught occurred. (please see Figure 2). Hellison’s fourth level of Caring was found to have meaning within Hybrid Lessons 7 and 8, which coincided with the fact that the components of caring were the focus of the lessons. Based on journal entries, students were asked to answer the open-ended questions directly focused on one or two components of Hellison’s levels of PSR. Observational field notes and unstructured interviews also illustrated evidence of Caring. The components of the level are compassion, helping others, and being a good leader.

Subtheme: Compassion

The focus of Hybrid Lesson 7 was to teach TPSR Level 4 components of compassion and
helping others. Students were introduced to the small-sided invasion/territory game called Quidditch (based on J. K Rowling’s *Harry Potter* novels). In all four final lesson plans, Class A students played the game and were given the choice by Mr. A to use game breaks. These game breaks could occur at any point in the game but they were only to be used by the students in order to clarify rules and ask questions of their teammates based on the components of PSR.

During game play of the hybrid invasion/territory game of Quidditch, it was observed that

Two teams have stopped the game at some point to discuss the rules as well as how they were doing as a team. They are really concerned that everyone understands the rules and knows that they have to pass the ball to each other in order to score a point. They also took this time to switch positions to make sure everyone had an opportunity to play the different positions. (Observational Field Notes)

Mr. A then stopped game play and brought the Class A students together in order to ask questions. When the students were asked if they used a time out, Class A students answered yes and no: “Yes in order to switch people around” and “No because they weren’t worried about who should switch because everyone was happy in their positions” (Observational Field note).

When asked how they made sure everyone knew how to play the game as well as how they helped one another if someone didn’t know how to play the game, “Yes was the response from all of the teams with the explanation that if someone didn’t understand the rules they would just remind them again and check for understanding” (Observational Field Notes). Mr. A then asked why it was important to help your teammates when you are playing a game. I wrote

Many of the students explained to Mr. A that you wouldn’t enjoy the game and may even get frustrated therefore you need to help your teammates because not only will they enjoy the game more but the will reach their goals together as a team. (Observational Field Notes)
Class A students also demonstrated understanding of compassion through journal entry responses. One student wrote, “Well…when someone fell I helped them up” (Hybrid Lesson 7). Another student wrote, “I cared when someone got hit by someone else’s hand” (Lesson 7). I observed that:

Students were really concerned about making sure that people would not get hurt during the game of Quidditch. Students would tell their teammates or opponents to wait for everyone to be ready before they started the game, and also made sure those that got hurt were taken care of. (Observational Field Notes)

Mr. A also made a comment, although quick, based on the demonstrated understanding of compassion: “This class seems to be really looking out for each other; I actually saw one of my students help another student up” (Unstructured Interview).

**Subtheme: Helping Others**

Class A students also demonstrated the understanding of the subtheme of helping others, discussed in Lesson 7 within their written journal entries for both Lessons 7 and 8.

“In today’s PE class I was caring because I explained the game and helped them if they didn’t know how to play” (Hybrid Lesson 7)
“I helped people learn to play the game” (Hybrid Lesson 7)
“I was helping people on my team if they didn’t understand the game” (Hybrid Lesson 7)
“I felt good because I knew the game and I could help someone who didn’t understand the game” (Lesson 7)
“I helped peer #2 and peer #3 understand their roles” (Hybrid Lesson 8)

**Subtheme: Good Leader**

The focus of Hybrid Lesson 8 was to teach Leadership component of TPSR Level 4 Caring. Class A was divided into two teams and one big game of Quidditch was played. Once again game breaks were only to be used to clarify rules and ask questions of teammates based on the PSR components. Before the students began the game of Quidditch, they were directed to independently break the class into two groups as well as give each student a role in the game.
While watching the final game of the unit, I observed that, “Both teams within the one Quidditch game did take a game break timeout. After game play, the teacher led the class in TPSR open-ended questions based on leadership and involvement.” (Observational Field Notes). Due to a constriction of time, questions were not asked after the game and was noted within the field notes. I noted that, “We ran out of time! Mr. A forgot to tell me it was a shorter class and well they played too long” (Observational Field Notes).

Through their journal entries for Lesson 8, Class A students demonstrated what it means to them to be a good leader. One student wrote, “I helped people choose their roles and I chose one boy seeker and one girl seeker” (Hybrid Lesson 8). Another student wrote, “Today I helped my team make decisions and we all worked together” (Hybrid Lesson 8).

Class A students also applied leadership while answering journal 7 questions as well.

“I felt like I was responsible to make sure because then we would have to help them so we could play better” (Hybrid Lesson 7)
“I felt normal because it wasn’t a hard take so I could easily explain it to my team” (Hybrid Lesson 7)
“I told people how the game was supposed to be played” (Hybrid Lesson 7)

**Theme: Self-Direction**

Based on frequency of data, Hellison’s third level of Self-Direction was found to have the least demonstration of understanding within the Hybrid unit. Most meanings were highlighted within Hybrid Lessons 5, 6, and 7. These findings were primarily based on journal entries. Students were asked to answer the open-ended questions directly focused on one or two components of Hellison’s levels of PSR.

**Subtheme: On-Task Independence**
In the fifth Hybrid lesson of the PSR unit, the invasion/territory game of small-sided soccer (see Appendix C) was used to introduce the importance of on-task independence. These components were defined to the students as being able to play in physical education class without supervision, and setting up their own goals as they play the game. The teacher told the students to play the small-sided game of soccer and to stop playing to take a time out only if the team chose to do so.

Once Class A students began to play, a lot of positive examples of team play were observed:

They are using each other’s names to communicate when passing the soccer ball. I am hearing a lot of cheering when scoring. Everyone is sharing playing time and participating equally, encouraging each other and caring when teammates or opponents got hurt. (Observational Field Notes)

All four teams called a time out twice each to discuss strategy based on their own initiative.

Overall, all Class A students seemed to be in an upbeat mood, very focused on game play, and concerned about everyone’s game play, not only their own or their team’s. Mr. A then stopped the game and gathered the students for questions and discussion. When asked if they used a time out, once again it was noted that each team did.

Class A students demonstrated an understanding of what it means to be independent and on task through their Lesson 5 journal entry. One student wrote, “We didn’t need the teacher to tell us what to do” (Hybrid Lesson 5). A second student wrote, “Teacher didn’t have to say much and we did it by ourselves” (Hybrid Lesson 5). A third student responded, “One goal I set for myself as I played the games was to try to get the ball away from the other team more” (Hybrid Lesson 5).

This understanding of on-task independence was also found to be meaningful in other Hybrid journal entries as well.
“One example of how I was independent today was when we were doing warm-up and we had to choose what to do” (Hybrid Lesson 6)
“We didn’t need the teacher’s help, we did it by ourselves” (Hybrid Lesson 6)
“I was the leader by showing I tried hard” (Hybrid Lesson 8)
“I was a leader by choosing what to do for warm-up” (Hybrid Lesson 8)

Theme: Goal Setting

The sixth Hybrid lesson signified the progressive understanding of the Level 3 components of the PSR model (goal setting and independence) while embedded in TGfU. Once again using the small-sided game of soccer, Class A students were asked to independently organize themselves into the teams used previously in Lesson 5. The students were also told that it was their responsibility to stop the game if they felt the need to speak with their teammates.

While playing the small-sided game of soccer for a second lesson, students were again responsible for their game play and they could choose whether to take a team time out. During this game play, it was observed that, “all teammates seemed to be working well with each other and encouraging each other when they would score” (Observational Field Notes). All four teams engaged in encouragement of other players, regardless of whether the team was being successful.

Three of the teams used team time outs to discuss their team play. I wrote, “While using the team time-outs, students talked about switching of team roles; and the importance of effort during their game play” (Observational Field Notes). In direct connection to the use of time-outs, all four teams agreed to switch teams in order to make it a fair competition. This agreement was fully led by the Class A students and only observed by the teacher.

Teacher-facilitated questions after the game play asked about whether they felt they had achieved their goals and why it is important to remember your past goals. I noted:

The students are saying that they feel they achieved their goals because they tried really hard and were more aggressive during their game play. Some have also stated that if you
do not remember your past goals then you won’t try as hard or see how you have improved. (Observational Field Notes)

Class A students demonstrated their understanding of setting goals through their Lesson 6 journal entry.

“My goals today were score goals and have fun and positioning” (Hybrid Lesson 6)
“My goal was to score at least once on net” (Hybrid Lesson 6)
“I made a goal to pass more and help out defensively” (Hybrid Lesson 6)
“Pass to people a lot and be in goal once” (Hybrid Lesson 6)
“I wanted to get into the game” (Hybrid Lesson 6)
“I set a goal to stop shots and to do as much as I can to help the team” (Hybrid Lesson 6)

Major Theme: Perception of Responsibility

As stated in research question two, “how does the implementation of a TGfU instructional model affect the learning of personal and social behaviours within a grade seven invasion/territory games unit,” the meaningful units found within the collected journal entry data indicated that students demonstrated in writing a perceived understanding of social and personal responsibility. It must be emphasized that these themes of responsibility were few in number and only mentioned once, prompted within a journal entry corresponding with a specific lesson.

Theme: Personal Responsibility

In each of the eight TGfU lessons in the invasion/territory games unit, the main focus was either the offensive tactic of attacking the goal or the defensive tactic of defending space. Class B students were introduced to these tactics in the opening of each lesson and through the teacher-facilitated questioning and discussions that occurred after the first game and second game. The teacher guided the students to focus on these tactics throughout their game play as well. Therefore the only time they were introduced to Hellison’s levels of PSR was in the actual journal entry.
**Subtheme: Participation**

Through the entire unit, it was observed that Class B students were actively participating within each game. The nature of invasion/territory games and the small-sided games chosen within this study promoted teams to work together in order to be tactically successful. Participation, as explained by Hellison, describes behaviours based on one’s own motivation to be involved. Class B students’ journal entries 3 and 4 included meaning units evidencing participation.

Class B student responses revealed the importance of the self-motivation component as described by Hellison. One student wrote, “I worked really hard and participated in the game” (TGfU Lesson 3). Another student wrote, “Trying to run harder and faster” (TGfU Lesson 3).

When asked how they felt when Mr. A changed the game that they were playing, student responses explained their understanding of Hellison’s component of trying new things.

“I felt really happy that teacher changed the game” (TGfU Lesson 4)
“I would always try my hardest to score a goal” (TGfU Lesson 4)
“I didn’t really care. I like playing games and trying new stuff and just getting out there and do it” (TGfU Lesson 4)
“I didn’t quite know what would happen until I tried it his way” (TGfU Lesson 4).

**Theme: Social Responsibility**

Social responsibility as described by Hellison PSR Levels 1 and 4 include respecting the rights and feelings of other, helping others, and leadership. Within the context of the invasion/territory games unit, students were given the opportunity to discuss tactical solutions with their teammates. They described some of these interactions in their journal entries.

**Subtheme: Respect**
Respecting the rights of others includes having self-control over your temper and mouth, being able to solve conflict through negotiation, and the including everyone. Students demonstrated in journal entries 1 and 2 their understanding of what it means to have self-control. One student wrote, “Well in the first round we didn’t do well, I controlled my frustration, but my teammates not so well” (TGfU Lesson 1). A second student wrote, “I didn’t hit anybody with the ball and I wasn’t a ball hog” (TGfU Lesson 1). And a third student wrote, “An example of self-control in this class is when you have a soft cushioned ball not to throw it at anyone” (TGfU Lesson 1).

**Subtheme: Peaceful Conflict**

After the first TGfU game of Chipotle, the teacher called all of the students in to ask them probing questions about attacking the goals in the game. I observed that “Mr. A. had a difficult time managing the students to listen to him and had to stop on three occasions to ask students to stop talking” (Observational Field Notes). Mr. A then asked the Class B students if and how they were successful at getting the ball to the corner. Student responses included, “Lots of positive statements including the importance of teamwork when they knocked down the pins and making more passes. They also talked about attacking one area at a time” (Observational Field Notes). When the teacher asked the tactical question about how the teams attacked the pins, responses included, “Passing more until they had a better shot, and working together” (Observational Field Notes). Mr. A asked the Class B students how their team advanced the ball up the court, and students stated, “That they passed it, used non-stop running and worked in groups of two within the team” (Observational Field Notes).

Mr. A. then gave each team the opportunity to make a rule change within the game that all group members must agree on. It was observed that
During the team discussion, one team decided on a rule quite quickly whereas two other teams argued over agreeing on the one rule they were allowed. One team actually had to be stopped during their discussion as the teacher wanted to get the class playing the game again. (Observational Field Notes)

The importance of peaceful negotiation and listening to others’ opinions was described in students’ journal entries directly following this lesson. Student responses included:

“By listening to them when they were talking or wanted to do something” (TGfU Lesson 2)
“We followed the opinion of the teammates” (TGfU Lesson 2)
“We compromised and shared all our ideas and agreed on one thing” (TGfU Lesson 2)
“We all agreed and decided peacefully on the option” (TGfU Lesson 2)

Class B students also demonstrated written understanding of including everyone in their game play. One student wrote, “When all had the ball we didn’t let someone on our team be left out” (TGfU Lesson 2). Another wrote, “We all got the ball at least once even if you weren’t very good” (TGfU Lesson 2).

Subtheme: Caring

Hellison’s fourth level of caring was demonstrated in meaning units in journal entries 7 and 8. Students revealed written understanding of the importance of showing compassion, helping others, and positive leadership within their game play. While embedded within the TGfU instructional model, all questions within Lesson 7 and 8 were based on the cognitive solving of both tactical problems of attacking the goal (Level 4) and defending space (Level 5). The students were involved in a one large game of Quidditch which concentrated on passing, shooting, and putting pressure on their opponents or working together to cover space or a person within game play. Before they began the game, the students had to independently (without the teacher’s help) break the class into two groups and give each student a role within the game.
Class B students wrote about having compassion for others: “I went over to see if peer #1 was ok when he got hurt” (TGfU Lesson 7) and “I was caring today because one of our team mates got hurt and I showed caring by asking how they feel” (TGfU Lesson 7). Class B students demonstrated their written understanding of helping others, especially when it came to understanding the rules of Quidditch. One student wrote, “I would help them play the game or explain to them” (TGfU Lesson 7). A second student responded “I showed caring in today’s physical education class as I told students how to play” (TGfU Lesson 7). A third student wrote that “We showed people what to do and if they were doing something wrong we could tell them” (TGfU Lesson 8).

Class B students also explained how they were positive leaders within these specific lessons. Statements included, “I was the team leader” (TGfU Lesson 7), “An example of leadership today is I told others what positions they are supposed to be at” (TGfU Lesson 8), “I passed and told my team mates where the bouncy ball was” (TGfU Lesson 8).

Overall, few students within Class B demonstrated a perceptual understanding of what it means to be both personally and socially responsible within this unit plan. However, as will be discussed within the next major theme, practical game play observations and unstructured interviews unfolded a quite different reality.

**Major Theme: All about the Game**

Three significant themes have been highlighted as directly connected to the components of a game. More specifically, practical examples of how offensive tactics, defensive tactics, rules, and the importance of winning were found to be meaningful within the TGfU model and the Hybrid model. Subsequently, more meaning units were found within the Class B TGfU
class. Throughout the eight-lesson invasion/territory game unit, data were collected and analyzed specific to themes deemed as part of the game.

**Offensive Tactical Solution—Attacking the Goal**

Based on the Teaching Games for Understanding lesson framework, Class B was introduced to the importance of attacking the goal during the invasion/territory game of Chipotle. The cognitive complexity of the game was at a level four out of five, therefore corresponding to the understanding for a grade seven class.

During the actual playing of the game Chipotle for the first time, it was observed that:

Students seemed aggravated and frustrated. Many of the students were not following the rules of the game properly and were actually trying to cause harm to each other by deliberately throwing the ball at each other. Two boys actually began fighting each other throughout this game. (Observational Field Notes)

The teacher stopped the activity after the first Chipotle game and asked TGfU tactical questions which included how successful the teams were while playing, how the team advanced the ball, and if the whole team attacked the goal. Class B student responses included, “Each team tried to make short passes and alternate who they passed to” (Observational Field Notes). When the teacher asked the Class B students if everyone on the team was successful at attacking the goal, a student said, “All of the teams said they were successful at attacking the goal except for each of the goalies on the teams” (Observational Field Notes).

While the students played the game of Chipotle for a second time, the following observations were recorded:

You can tell that in the beginning minutes of game play, each team is trying to play with more sportspersonship and are trying to make better passes while they attack the goal. However within a small amount of time, frustration by all teams which led to yelling and pushing of other teams. Towards the end of the game all four teams stopped following the rules of the game as well as stopped playing together as a team. (Observational Field Notes)
Using the previous example as a lesson context, Class B students were directly focused on the importance of the offensive tactic of attacking the goal and this led to specific mention of offensive tactics in their journal entries. When Class B students were asked to give examples of when they could have self-control within their game, responses included offensive tactics of attacking the goal. One student wrote, “You have to have self-control to make accurate throws and passes” (TGfU Journal Entry 1). Another wrote, “I didn’t, I just watched to see how I could get pins down” (TGfU Journal Entry 1). And a third student wrote, “I was able to control the ball when I had it. I could choose where the ball went and who to throw it to” (TGfU Journal Entry). When Class B students were asked to give an example of respect, they also discussed the offensive tactic of attacking the goal. A student wrote that, “If someone’s pins are down and you don’t stand and wait, you attack someone else’s goal” (TGfU Journal Entry Lesson 2).

Overemphasis of offensive tactical solutions was also used to explain what goals they achieve within that lesson. One student wrote, “I played good and scored a goal” (TGfU Journal Entry 4). A second student stated, “I scored three goals and tried my hardest” (TGfU Journal Entry 4), and a third student wrote, “We were doing lots of successful passing and shooting” (TGfU Journal Entry 4).

Even though few in number, specific game play techniques were described in every Hybrid lesson except one. All of these meaning units derived from Hybrid journal entries but were not found within the actual lesson observations themselves. This was mainly because all questions and discussion included in every lesson were affective in nature and based on one of Hellison’s levels of PSR. These themes included offensive tactical solutions, defensive tactical solutions, and rules. Within this category, I will highlight themes as found within the data.
Through the data analysis process, offensive tactical solutions were deemed meaningful if described as engagement against the opposing team to score points. Examples of tactical solutions within Hybrid journal entries included:

“Everyone was near someone else so they would have an easy pass” (Hybrid Lesson 1)  
“I was one of the shooters and I had to run around the crease because everyone was guarding me” (Hybrid Lesson 3)  
“I would have had my team pass to me more” (Hybrid Lesson 4)  
“Well in the second game, I would run fast to get the ball and pass it” (Hybrid Lesson 5)  
“I don’t know if this could count but I scored by myself” (Hybrid Lesson 5)  
“I was getting my goals in” (Hybrid Lesson 6).

**Defensive Tactical Solutions**

In TGfU Lesson 4, Class B students were reintroduced to the invasion/territory game tactic of defending space in game play (see lesson plan). Through covering areas on the court while using either person-to-person or zone defence, students were taught the importance of the fourth tactical level of invasion/territory games. As Class B played handball for the second time, I observed:

Students found it necessary to play with the same teams as last class, asking Mr. J. to keep the teams the same. All four teams followed the rules well, however aggressive behaviour such as pushing and horse-play were apparent. (Observational Field Notes)

Mr. A once again gathered the students together to ask tactical questioning about successful defending. When Class B students were asked how they knew they were successful, responses included that they weren’t successful “because other teams could get past their defence” (Observational Field Notes).

When Mr. A then asked the probing question if the Class B students had changed anything from the last time they played, responses included “Having only one shooter on offence
and everyone else on the team to be the defence, therefore they could focus on defending their
goal” (TGfU Observational Field Notes).

When Mr. A. asked a question about whether their whole team was playing to the best of
their ability, there was a resounding “yes” from all four teams. I observed that “All four teams
stated yes even though others shook their head no. They focused [on] this success because no
one was able to score” (Observational Field Notes for Lesson 4).

Mr. A then let the four teams discuss how they could be more successful the next time
they played. I observed that, “Most discussion was based on defensive solutions, specifically
positioning of the team on the court and who should be the goalie” (Observational Field Notes).

Even though positive team play was noted, such as using one another’s name to pass,
congratulating one another for scoring, and playing more defensively and offensively, the
observation of negative game play such as yelling at one another, taking the ball from their own
teammates, and focusing on winning and losing were also noted.

Using the previous example as a lesson context, Class B students were directly focused
on the importance of the defensive tactical solution of defending space, which led to specific
journal entry examples involving defensive tactics. When asked to give examples of self-control
within their game, responses included offensive tactics of attacking the goal and the defensive
tactic of defending space. One student wrote, “I was able to control the way I stopped the balls
from hitting the pins” (TGfU Lesson 1). The defensive tactical solution of defending space was
also used to explain what goals they achieve within that lesson:

“Our man to man defense was successful” (TGfU Lesson 4)
“Today on the handball I did well on the defense and I scored some goals” (TGfU Journal
Lesson 4)
“I was trying to block players and block their shots” (TGfU Lesson 4)
When students were asked to set goals within their game play, students demonstrated defence of space as their main priority.

“To play good D” (TGfU Lesson 4)
“I set a goal to defend the goal and not let any goals in the net” (TGfU Lesson 4)
“I was setting a goal to go man to man with peer #1” (TGfU Lesson 4)
“An example of goals today is to not be scored on” (TGfU Lesson 4)

Defensive tactical solutions or those describing how to prevent the offensive team from scoring were also found within Hybrid lesson meaning units. Examples of defensive tactical strategies included: “When you could only pass to the 2 people, I was always checking one of them” (Hybrid Lesson 3); “I was the goalie and I was making saves when I was on my back” (Hybrid Lesson 4); and “I was making good saves” (Hybrid Lesson 4).

**Theme: Rules**

Changing the rules of the game and following the rules were also found to be meaningful within both the TGfU and Hybrid journal entries, specifically in Lesson 4 when students were asked how they would have changed the game in order to feel more successful. Answers included:

“If you stop in the crease it’s the other team’s ball” (TGfU Lesson 4)
“Well to make it better I would make it so you wouldn’t have to bounce it” (TGfU Lesson 4)
“The ball doesn’t have to bounce for it to be a goal and you can take five steps” (TGfU Lesson 4)
“I would have made it so you could hold the ball for unlimited time” (Hybrid Lesson 4)
“Um maybe being able to take more than three steps” (Hybrid Lesson 4)
“So the ball does not have to touch the ground you can just shoot it” (Hybrid Lesson 4)

Even though this lesson did not create discussion of the rules within the TGfU Model, discussion about rules was also included in answers to question 4, which asked if there were any other comments. Answers included:
“I think that some people should listen to the rules more because people would knock down the pins with their feet” (Hybrid Lesson 2)
“I think the three step rule is better than just stopping” (Hybrid Lesson 2)
“Well if we could have five seconds with the ball instead of three it would have been better but still keep three steps” (Hybrid Lesson 3)
“I like playing with half courts because it was easier with smaller teams” (Hybrid Lesson 8)

**Theme: Winning**

The importance of winning was highlighted within the TGfU Class B especially when students explained their goals for the lesson or their success at reaching their goals. Written responses included “To win, to score a goal” (TGfU Lesson 5), “I wanted to win” (TGfU Lesson 5), “I set a goal to win and we did” (TGfU Lesson 6), “We won” (TGfU Lesson 4), and “Our team won the game today” (TGfU Lesson 4).

**Major Theme: Irresponsibility**

I don’t know what has gone wrong, I know my students have a lot of energy but this is getting out of control. (Unstructured discussion in the middle of Lesson 3)

As discussed by Hellison, Irresponsibility, or rather Level 0, can be described as behaviours that are not responsible in nature. These behaviours include lack of initiative, lack of respect, blaming others for behaviours, and using excuses. Through data analysis of journal entries, observational field notes, and unstructured interviews, irresponsibility was considered meaningful and therefore a major finding. Four themes emerged within the hybrid model and TGfU model instructional classes: disrespect towards teacher, disrespect towards peers, intent to harm, and lack of initiative.
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Deliberate contrast must be emphasized within these findings due to the significance of these irresponsible behaviours within each case. Meaningful responses of irresponsibility in the hybrid model class were only present within the first two lessons of the unit versus the TGfU class, which had meaning throughout the entire unit. Throughout the entire TGfU eight-lesson unit, the words chaotic, loud, and unsafe kept popping into my head. This was the simple way for me to describe what my undergraduate observers and I were seeing through the entirety of every lesson.

**Theme: Disrespect towards Teacher**

As observed throughout each lesson within the TGfU unit, Class B student behaviours that can only be called disrespectful towards the teacher were not only noticeable to the observers but also to Mr. A himself. On frequent occasions, it was observed that this “new” type of physical education class was not meeting the needs of many of the Class B students. From Mr. A’s choices of games to the facilitated questioning portions of the lessons, students both verbally and physically expressed their opinion.

Mr. A has just had to restart this class three times because the students will not stop talking. (Observational Field Notes)

The students are not listening to Mr. A, he is trying to ask questions to start the class, but instead of answers they are just asking him other questions…I don’t get it. (Observational Field Notes)

It feels different in here all of the sudden. Students seem to be taking their time in the change rooms, when usually they are as fast as superman in a phone booth. (Observation Field Notes)

In our last class, the students are still not listening to Mr. A. If they don’t stop talking they aren’t going to hear the instructions to the game of Quidditch and well it is difficult to understand. (Observational Field Notes)

The Class B students also demonstrated disrespect to Mr. A while participating in game play. In each lesson, Mr. A would introduce and explain the game, focusing on the specific rules
that must be followed. Once clarifications were answered and understanding seemed visible to Mr. A, the students were sent to play. However, as observations noted, the rules for many of the games seemed to be ignored and/or changed by the students themselves.

Within minutes of explaining the rules to the students, I have just watched all four teams do exactly the opposite of how the game is to be played. (Observational Field Notes)

Mr. A just had to stop the class in order to tell them the rules again.” (Observational Field Notes)

I don’t even think my students were listening to me while I explained that game. (Unstructured discussion with Mr. A)

One specific student shared his displeasure of a game change Mr. A made, saying “This is gonna suck” (Observational Field Notes).

Students also demonstrated their displeasure at the games chosen by their teachers through their journal entries. When asked specifically how they felt when Mr A. asked the students to try to play the game in a different way, one Class B student wrote, “I felt mad because the different way was bad and you couldn’t do anything about it” (TGFU Lesson 3). Another student wrote, “I was excited but when we started I became aggravated, I didn’t like the change at all” (TGfU Lesson 3)

**Theme: Disrespect towards Peers**

A lack of respect for peers in the class was observed at the beginning of Lesson 1 and written about in Lessons 1 and 2 in the corresponding Hybrid journal entries. During the first game of Chipotle, it was quickly observed that:

Students are screaming at each other either to pass the ball or for doing something wrong. The boys are blatantly dominating the ball and a lot of the students seem frustrated and angry. I am not seeing one of the four teams actually following the rules of the game. Mr. A has just approached me asking with sarcasm if this was what I thought I’d see. I responded by telling him he was doing a great job. (Observational field)
Class A students also described disrespect in some of their Hybrid journal entry answers. These answers included disrespect for their peers. One Class A student wrote, “I was mad at my team so I just said this is horrible but I was laughing when I said it so no one took it seriously” (Hybrid Lesson 1). A second student wrote, “I would have chosen my team and had girls against girls” (Lesson 2). These answers also included disrespect for the game: “It was boring” (Hybrid Lesson 2).

The lack of respect towards peers in the class was observed within each of the eight TGfU lessons. Visual frustration, arguments, and yelling were the key indicators observed within each lesson of the unit.

The students keep on yelling at each other, the more frustrated they are, the louder the yell becomes. (Observational Field Notes)

Even after stopping to discuss the importance of attacking the goals and coming up with solutions, they are still yelling at each other in game play. (Observational Field Notes)

They keep on arguing about goals, if they went in, if they didn’t, if someone cheated and that’s why it went in. They are wasting their own time! (Observational Field Notes)

Class B students also demonstrated a lack of respect for one another by the exclusion of others. It was observed within the lessons and noted in the journal entries that not everyone was being given the right to be included.

While warming up for the day, a gender divide occurs every single time, boys with boys and girls with girls. This is the fourth lesson in a row that I have noticed this, which is interesting as for the rest of the class each team is equally divided. (Observational Field Notes)

Students have just run up to Mr. A ‘begging’ him to let them be on the same team. This mix of students has been observed as the stronger more competitive game players in the class. (Observational Field Notes)

Exclusion within game play was noted within journal entry 2 as a solution to making sure everyone was included. However, this led to a critique of another peer’s skill level and therefore
disrespect. One Class B student wrote, “When one of our team mates could shoot but there was someone who couldn’t shoot and they had the ball they passed” (TGfU Journal Entry 2).

**Theme: Intention to Harm**

Hybrid Lessons 1 and 2 also led to observations of intention to harm within game play. An observer noted:

I have just observed two students ripping the balls out of other’s hands and throwing them at each other. I have also just seen boys pushing each other and making clenched fists as if they were getting ready to fight. What is going on? (Observational Field Notes)

This intention to harm was also described in a journal entry. One student wrote, “In PE class I was stressing out and then I threw the ball and it hit someone in the nose” (Hybrid Lesson 1).

Class B students demonstrated their intent to harm one another within each TGfU lesson of the unit, therefore at points making the class environment unsafe. Overall, it was noted that this class was more aggressive than the other two classes involved in this study.

Students are pushing each other while they are running in the game. I am concerned that someone is going to get hurt. I just observed one teammate aggressively taking the ball out of their other teammate’s hands, there seems to be more physical contact in this game when they shouldn’t been touching each other at all. Two male students just have a full out physical fight, it began with not agreeing with a call, swearing at each other to a full out pushing fight. Thank goodness that game play started again, it seemed to get them back into the game. (Observational Field Notes)

Class B students also discussed being hurt during game play in their journal entries. A student wrote, “One of my teammates didn’t pay respect on me because they hit me in the head with the ball” (TGfU Lesson 2). Other students wrote, “Make it full contact so I can kill peer #1” (TGfU Lesson 6) and “Full contact so I can kill peer #1” “(TGfU Lesson 6).

**Theme: Making Excuses**
Blaming others or the game for their own failures was a used excuse that resonated within a few written Hybrid journal entries. Class A examples included:

“I didn’t really like it because it was harder and more difficult to play” (Hybrid Lesson 3)
“I didn’t like the change because he chose me to shoot and I can’t shoot very well” (Hybrid Lesson 3)
“I started to get a little worried because some of the people he picked aren’t as good as sports as others. So it made the game more difficult” (Hybrid Lesson 3)

Blaming game changes by the teacher or specific students for their lack of success or effort was also found within TGfU journal entry reflections. When Class B students answered questions specifically about game play changes examples included “Well his idea was harder to play with defensively because there were two good offence men and our defence didn’t put much effort into it” (TGfU Lesson 3); “I didn’t like it cause when the other team had the ball if you were in their zone you could not do anything” (TGfU Lesson 3); and “I didn’t really like it. Because then you had to stay on one check” (TGfU Lesson 3).

Class B students blamed others for their failure through the following comments:

“I would have liked a better goalie” (TGfU Lesson 4)
“If we had a better goalie we probably would have won” (TGfU Lesson 4)
“I was trying to get the ball into the net but with no one helping me” (TGfU Lesson 4)
“I wasn’t because peer #1 always kicked the ball too hard” (TGfU Lesson 6)

**Major Theme: Positive Learning Environment**

All data collected and analyzed from hybrid model Class A described a quality physical education environment. These themes include sense of fun, teamwork, positive communication, and teacher as facilitator (see Figure 1). I will highlight themes from this category as found within the data.

**Theme: Fun**
Throughout the entire eight-lesson invasion/territory games unit, examples of fun were noted in the journal entries and observations. When asked if they had any other comments they wanted to tell me about today’s physical education class, a significant number of Class A students recorded something in their journal. Most of these statements were game related.

“I liked the game that we played today” (Hybrid Lesson 1)
“The game was complicated but fun” (Hybrid Lesson 1)
“I think handball is a very fun game and take a lot of effort” (Hybrid Lesson 3)
“It was fun we should play soccer again” (Hybrid Lesson 5)
“It was a fun game” (Hybrid Lesson 6)
“It was fun playing games” (Hybrid Post Journal Entry)

Some of these statements of fun tended to be impacted by the instructional hybrid model being used within the lesson. Even though Class A students did not understand why this “fun” was different they expressed it anyway. One Class A student wrote, “It was fun and different” (Hybrid Lesson 3). A second explained, “Today handball was more fun, don’t know why but it was!” (Hybrid Lesson 4), and a third wrote, “It was more fun than last time” (Hybrid Lesson 4). This perception of fun was observed during the lessons themselves and post-lesson.

The students seemed to really have a fun time today; teams were exploding with cheers and laughing while they were playing. Mr. A said that it was nice to see them smiling and that they were all in really upbeat moods (which can be difficult first thing in the morning). (Observational Field Notes)

It seemed that despite a few frustrations at the beginning, this new approach to the teaching of their physical education class overall led to many students expressing their sense of fun through their journals or game play. As noted in my field notes, “At the beginning of this study for Class A, I was really concerned about the impact of ‘throwing’ a different type of PE class at these students, however I am starting to sense that they are ok with this approach the more I observe you and your class” (Lesson 6 Observational Field Notes).

Theme: Teamwork
Both the importance of teamwork and the characteristics of what makes a good team player were observed throughout the entire eight-lesson Hybrid unit game play, as well as in the affective question and discussion portion of the lesson. Within all eight lessons, observations collected by all three observers once noted that teamwork was in some part present. After game play, students wrote:

“The teams are working together” (Hybrid Lesson 1)
“Two teams quickly came up with a rule” (Hybrid Lesson 2)
“Teams seem to be working well together (making passes to everyone on the team)” (Hybrid Lesson 3)
“Everyone sharing and participating equally within the team” (Hybrid Lesson 5)
“Seem to be working well as teams” (Hybrid Lesson 6)
“All passing well to one another as a team” (Hybrid Lesson 7)

While we were observing the question and discussion portion of the lessons, students were also signifying the importance of teamwork.

While answering the question as a team, how they can be more successful? Student answers included work together as a team, and once again when asked the same question after a second go at the game they also replied that they were successful because they used teamwork. I wonder if they actually know [what] teamwork means however they were very confident in their response. (Lesson 1 Observational Field Note)

Even though teamwork would be assumed to be present in an invasion/territory/territory game unit, the significance of this theme will be made clearer in the comparison of the other two cases.

**Theme: Positive Communication**

Through observations and unstructured interview discussion with Mr. A, the theme of positive communication was deemed significant. Game play observations concluded that most of the positive communication came from how students called to one another.

In the first game of handball, I noticed that there seemed to be more students calling out each other’s name while playing the game. This of course to be used for passing purposes but this has not been observed at this level before. After a question period based on Hellison’s level of participation, more specifically success, I noticed once
again that all of the four teams were significantly calling out each other’s names. After the lesson was completed I questioned Mr. A. if this was the norm and he said that it wasn’t. (Observational Field Notes)

It seemed that after this lesson it became the norm for students to positively communicate while passing, as it is noted that this “name calling” was found in every lesson from that point on.

Another positive communication occurred and was noted in Hybrid Lesson 6. While playing soccer and learning the importance of what it means to be independent, two male students exchanged words.

While watching Class A play soccer today, I observed two boys come to a disagreement. Boy A was concerned that Boy B was kicking the ball too hard, I could see his frustration on his face before he spoke with Boy B, but rather than yelling at Boy B, Boy A stated that if he didn’t kick the ball so hard, then he would probably be able to score more goals. I think this was an effective way to communicate whereas I don’t know if that would have occurred a few lessons ago. (Observational Field Notes)

Theme: Teacher as Facilitator

Observations of the Hybrid eight-lesson unit plan highlighted the subtheme of teacher as facilitator. To put this into context, within the Hybrid model used for Class A the teacher changes instruction type from teacher to facilitator, therefore guiding the students’ learning. Within these lesson plans, the teacher didn’t “tell” the students each of Hellison’s levels of responsibility, but rather used questions and discussion to guide students to their own understanding of what it means to be personally and socially responsible. Based on the instructional model it was observed that within each lesson Mr. A facilitated a question and discussion period. He also facilitated group discussions when students would get stuck or off track.

Mr. A walked around to each group and stopped from time to time. I knew that he was nervous by the way he kept on looking at his lesson plan but I overheard him using guiding questions to get some of the students back on track. I heard him ask how the
team could make sure everyone was involved and why it was important to listen to everyone’s opinion before making a decision. (Observational Field Notes)

Major Theme: A Learned Response

A final, unanticipated major theme that emerged from meaningful data was the difficulty the physical education teacher (Mr. A) had in implementing his “own” invasion/territory games unit based on Hellison’s levels of responsibility.

Mr. A’s Way

The instruction given to Mr. A was to create his own invasion/territory games unit in which Hellison’s levels of responsibility could be taught. Before the study, Mr. A and I sat down and we discussed Hellison’s levels of PSR as well as the themes that can be involved when trying to teach them. I left the lesson planning to Mr. A with the understanding that he could teach Hellison’s levels “with whatever made him most comfortable” in his physical education environment. At the beginning of the study, I observed that:

After speaking with Mr. A, he is going to use the same invasion/territory games that I had chosen from the Playsport resource in order to create his unit. This makes sense because the other two classes that he teaches are involved in the study and playing these games and students in this class might wonder why they didn’t get to try out these new games. (Observational Field Notes after Lesson 1 and discussion with Mr. A)

It was quickly apparent that Mr. A also implemented the same instructional progression as had been designed for the other two cases.

Mr. A is mimicking the lesson plans I gave him in order to teach Hellison’s levels of responsibility. He has started with the same intro and also used a question and discussion break within game play to talk about PSR. (Mr A’s Way Observational Field Note after Lesson 1)

Mr. A’s mimicking of the other two lesson plans occurred throughout the entire unit and therefore deemed the meaningful units void within this study. However, this finding will lead to discussion found in Chapter 5.
The Research Questions Discussion

Anderson (2002) challenged physical educators to create more cases, stories, and narrative accounts of students thinking about what they are learning in physical education. By modelling this learner-centred approach within this research study, students become the lens through which we focus our study and the voice that we listen to. It was my intention to create a physical education multi-case study that focused on students’ awareness of personal and social responsibility within game play. By reading their answers and observing their play, it became clear that these students had something to say and more importantly something to teach me.

The purpose of this qualitative multi-case study was to evaluate the effectiveness of a hybrid instructional model on the development of personal and social responsibility behaviours (Respect, Participation, Self-Direction, and Caring) in grade seven students within an invasion/territory games environment. At the time this study was conducted, other specialists in the area explained that intersections between these two models, as well as other physical education models, could benefit our learners (Quay & Peters, 2008). However, as discussed in the literature review, studies have attempted the hybridity approach with TPSR and other instructional models (Gordon, 2009; Hastie & Curtner-Smith, 2006), but not specifically with the TGfU model. It can also been stated that a significant amount of research is still being conducted based on students’ physical and cognitive awareness during a TGfU unit, however research focusing on students’ affective awareness (personal and social responsibility) is still limited (Harvey & Jarrett, 2013). This study was intended to fill this gap in the research.
Through analysis of student journal entry responses, observational field notes, and unstructured interviews with the physical education teacher, all three cases provided six significant themes: developing personal and social responsibility behaviours; perceived responsibility; all about the game; irresponsibility in action; a positive learning environment; and a learned response. I will discuss the six themes in detail by answering my guiding research questions.

**Research Question 1**

How does the implementation of a hybrid instructional model affect the development of personal and social responsibility behaviours within a grade seven invasion/territory games unit?

**Developing Personal and Social Responsibility Behaviours**

With respect to the first question of this research study, the findings from Class A confirm an increased positive effect in students developing levels of personal and social responsibility while actively engaged in the hybrid model of physical education games teaching. Respect, participation, self-direction, and caring were all found in progressive nature throughout the unit, as intended by the study. The social responsibility behaviour of respect (including student self-control, right to a peaceful conflict, and the right to be included) was deemed to be the most significant throughout the entire Class A invasion/territory unit, with observations and journal entries including practical examples of this behaviour in action. Students’ responses continually focused on the inclusion of others, the discussing of game options, and strategies, as well as control over their tempers and mouth. Results from other TPSR studies have concluded similar findings in relation to respect (Debusk & Hellison, 1989; Georgiadis, 1990; Hayden, 2010; Martinek et al., 2001; Wright, 2012).
Physical Education: Time is of the Essence

The TPSR model has been studied in many extracurricular sports programs (Lee & Martinek, 2009; Martinek & Hellison, 2009; Shilling, 2001; Wright, 2012), outdoor activity programs (Hansen & Parker, 2009; Stiehl, 2000), and mentoring programs (Martinek & Hellison, 2009; Martinek & Parker, 2000; Walsh 2012; Wright, 2012). However, Hellison and others have adamantly put forward that this model could be and has been effective within the physical education setting (Cecchini, Montero, Alonso, Izquierdo, & Contreras, 2007; Escarti, Gutierrez, Pasquale, & Marin, 2010; Jimenez, 2000; Marin, 2011; Pardo, 2008; Pascual, Escarti, Llopis, & Gutierrez, 2011). The difference between these studies and my own is the duration and amount of class time that was used to teach these behaviours.

In this research study, time is best described as the amount of teaching and activity minutes for each physical education lesson. Within the confines of the British Columbia Physical Education curricula and the appropriate time allotments for each area of study, and with the acute awareness that a high percentage of British Columbia elementary schools (including middle) are not meeting the Ministry’s ten percent of instructional time allocated to physical education, I investigated a lesson plan instructional model to input as many of Hellison’s strategies from the TPSR model as possible in a short thirty-five minute class period.

Hellison (2003) explains that his strategies (awareness talks, reflection time, and group meetings) take time even if they are done quickly, therefore taking over specific time that would be usually allotted for skill (game) development. The same argument could be used for the practical application of the TGfU instructional model. To progress within each step of the model with quality experiences for each student would take longer than the thirty-five minute timeline. This led me to a paradigm shift of concluding that both models would need to be modified to
meet this time crunch and be able to create an environment conducive to the learning of responsible characteristics within a games setting. Therefore, based on the Class A findings of my study, these four levels of responsibility were effectively taught within the confines of the thirty-five minute lesson. This is a significant finding because much, if not all, of the previous research using Hellison’s PSR model has involved physical education classes no shorter than one hour in duration (Cecchini, Montero, Alonso, Izquierdo, & Contreras, 2007; Escarti, Gutierrez, Pasquale, & Marin, 2010; Jimenez, 2000; Marin, 2011; Pardo, 2008; Pascual, Escarti, Llopis, & Gutierrez, 2011).

By completing this study, I have learned and guide others to deflect the excuse of time constraints within our physical education classes. More importantly, by creating a learning environment for our students such as the one found within Class A, and modifying curriculum models to meet these time constraints, the benefits of these limited physical education classes will still lead to progressive and impactful learning experiences for our students.

**Significance of Small-Sided Invasion/Territory Games**

As time was a constraint, how the message of personal and social responsibility was delivered must also be discussed. Within the context of TGfU small-sided invasion/territory game play, students were surrounded by ever-changing situations leading to success or defeat. As expressed by Quay and Peters (2008), game play has different personal meaning to all students, in contrast to skill-drills or fitness training sessions. Games, and especially team games, are social in nature and bring different meanings as to how to participate, when to participate, and when to be a spectator. As underlined by Hellison (2003), invasion/territory games, more specifically popular sports such as basketball and football, include the use of trash-talking, fighting, and even cheating. This anti-sport rhetoric could make it “difficult to use sport
as a vehicle for teaching responsibility” (Hellison, 2003, p. 57). Anxieties and stresses due to lack of physical skill or cognitive understanding can override the importance of this social experience for our students in leading to teaching of both personal and social values. In Class A, the hybrid instructional model allowed students the opportunity to focus and reflect on specific personal and social responsibility behaviours, as described by Hellison, while taking part in a team invasion/territory game.

As an attempt to step away from the usual game suspects found within the physical educator’s bag of tricks, as well as being guided by the purpose of the TGfU model (Bunker and Thorpe), this study introduced new invasion/territory games to all three classes. The definition of “new” incorporated the physical education teacher’s explanation “never played before” (Chipotle, Quidditch) or “have not played this year” (small-sided handball and small-sided soccer). All four games were forced target games with essential objectives accentuating team play within small numbers. This type of approach to Hellison’s TPSR model is quite different to past studies.

Traditional games such as tennis, basketball, football, lacrosse, and volleyball (Debusk & Hellison, 1989; Hellison, 2003; Lee & Martinek, 2009; Schilling, 2001) have resulted in significant finding of the effects of Hellison’s levels of PSR. Through this study’s findings, the same can be stated through a new games context. Effectively utilizing the TGfU instructional model’s use of “sampling” invasion/territory games through small-sided games while promoting the reflection on personal and social responsibility through game play led to more focused game play by the students and a progressive change of negative behaviours towards positive behaviours.
A Positive Learning Environment

The impact of the “new” physical education class, including small invasion game play and affective questioning, was observed in both Class A and Class B but the students reacted differently in each class. When implementing the new lesson plans into Class A and Class B, the students’ first reactions were of confusion and game play frustration. However, a succinct difference was observed between these two classes as the students became more comfortable with the new type of physical education class. Class A seemed to embrace this new way of learning about Hellison’s levels of responsibility and even became excited when they were asked to reflect on their game play from an affective point of view. However, in Class B the students’ interaction with the progressive lesson plans led to more outcries for the “good old days.”

Similar results have been found in other studies involving TPSR, specifically in relation to how TPSR had contributed to the establishment and maintenance of positive class environment (Debusk & Hellison, 1989; Hellison & Wright; Lee & Martinek, 2009). In this study, the findings suggest that the students’ expressions of fun, teamwork, use of positive communication, and seamless transference of teacher as facilitator, as highlighted in Class A, characterize the qualities that we as physical education specialists want to see within our classes (Barney & Christenson, 2013; Ridley & Walther, 1995; Todorovich & Curtner-Smith, 1998).

Research Question 2

How does the implementation of a TGfU instructional model affect the learning of personal and social responsibility behaviours within a grade seven invasion/territory games unit?

Perception of Personal and Social Responsibility

It was the intention of my research study to compare two physical education instructional models (TGfU and TPSR) and the creation of a hybrid model embedding one within the other.
Because of this intent, Class B was observed for student awareness of Hellison’s PSR levels of responsibility within a tactically focused lesson. The disconnection between personal and social behaviours was blatantly witnessed in Class B. At points, fights, cheating to win, and/or total disrespect for other team members was observed during game play, while throughout their journal responses many of these students perceived themselves to be model students acquiring all of Hellison’s characteristics during the exact same game play. With limited studies presented on students’ responses and reported through teachers’ perceptions, the effective use of TGfU as a vehicle to teach the affective domain (personal and social responsibility) of our students can neither be supported nor dismissed but rather highlight the importance of conducting further studies in this area.

Irresponsibility

As discussed in the findings, a significant observation of negative behaviours not conducive to positive learning environments was concluded in Class B. The use of excuses for game failure and lack of control, disrespect towards peers, disrespect towards the teacher and lesson, and overall intention to harm was comparatively higher in Class B than in Class A. Similar to Cecchini et al. (2007), the students in Class A reduced their actions of aggression, frustration, and excuses shortly after the invasion/territory game unit began. In contrast, Class B’s irresponsible behaviours got progressively worse as the need to win became more prevalent. Cothran, Kulina, and Hodges (2007) suggest that lesson boredom, attention seeking, and confusion in lesson objectives could lead to these types of misbehaviours. One past study (Cruz, Li, & Kam, 2012) has suggested that student misbehaviours were recognized as teaching barriers when implementing the TGfU instructional model. Unstructured teacher interviews and lesson observations also noted this frustration on the part of the physical education teacher in this study.
Even though he remained consistent in following the lesson plans, the struggle to facilitate learning rather than manage negative behaviours was observed.

This new learning of irresponsibility highlighted to me the importance of game play management while teaching specifically invasion/territory games. As discussed within the literature, invasion/territory games are the most tactically complex games category in which players are either attacking or defending their space. The jostling of player position in the same playing area can lead to heightened awareness of frustration, and competitive tendencies based on the importance of winning. Focusing our students to reflect on their own personal and social responsibility characteristics, both prior to and after game play, could lead to a more tactically driven game play based on the essentials of the game being played while muting the negative behaviours.

All About the Game

Since the conception of TGfU (1983), Bunker and Thorpe’s main goal for the model was to teach games by playing games. In a more tactical approach to teaching games, students understand the why before the how. With the use of small-sided games and effective tactical questioning techniques, Class B students in this study were successfully introduced to tactical solutions specifically focused on attacking the goal and defending space. Game play observations and journal entries concluded that students comprehended the tactical solutions and skills needed to succeed across four games within the similar invasion/territory games category. These results are similar to other studies completed in this area. Memmert and Harvey (2010), and Holt, Ward, and Wallhead (2006) also found tactical transfer between games within the same category. A study by Vande Broek, Boen, Claessens, Fey & Ceux (2011) found that students involved in tactical questioning improved significantly in retention compared to the other two
instructional groups. These findings draw straight comparisons with Class A. Even though findings were minimally highlighted through journal entries that students had a practical awareness based on offensive and defensive tactics, overall most responses and observation indicated developing personal and social responsibility behaviours.

With respect to Research Question 2, the TGfU instructional model provided positive comparisons for the purpose of this study. Purposeful findings, as expected due to the nature of TGfU, again provided significance in cognitive awareness in student game play but limited affective awareness in the effective development of personal and social behaviours. This finding therefore supports the implementation of a hybrid instructional game model.

**Research Question 3**

How can Hellison’s levels of responsibility be taught within the confines of a physical education invasion/territory games unit?

**A Learned Response**

Due to protocols not being followed within Class C, an unintended yet major finding was discovered and will be discussed in respect to Research Question 3. Within a thirty-five minute physical education class, the physical education specialist was observed to struggle with the implementation of the TPSR levels as described by Hellison and instead mimicked the two instructional models used within my study. As explained earlier, much if not all of the previous research on Hellison’s TPSR model have had physical education class duration times no shorter than one hour (Cecchini, Montero, Alonso, Izquierdo, & Contreras, 2007; Escarti, Gutierrez, Pasquale, & Marin, 2010; Jimenez, 2000; Marin, 2011; Pardo, 2008; Pascual, Escarti, Llopis, & Gutierrez, 2011). Hellison et al (2002), (Buchanan, 2001; Walsh, 2007, 2012; Wright & Burton, 2008) also emphasized that the teaching time needed to effectively utilize the TPSR themes
(awareness talks, reflection time, and group meetings) should occur over a term or school year rather than a unit. This study is therefore significant because utilizing the hybrid model met these confines with positive findings.

**Limitations**

My study does have limitations that must be discussed in order to interpret my findings appropriately. The first limitation was the duration of the unit and allotted time of the lessons. As discussed, the TPSR and TGfU models usually involve more time and longer durations within the physical education program. The impact of more time and longer duration focused on either model or hybrid model could affect the findings of my study.

The second limitation was the order in which instructional lessons were taught throughout the study, in particular the placement of the physical education teacher’s instructional model class. If Mr. A was given the opportunity to teach his way before teaching the hybrid or TGfU model, the protocols of this study may have been impacted, leading to inclusion of Class C within the findings.

The third limitation of my study was the program's objectives. Based on the purpose of the study, I was concerned about the effect of the instructional model on the developing of both personal and social responsibility behaviours. Even though significance was found, my study cannot interpret these results outside of the physical education environment the students were in or, in other words, the retention rates that may have occurred after the study's completion.

The fourth limitation of my study was the use of qualitative data. At the time of this study, objective measurement tools were still being created (Hellison & Wright, 2011) and qualitative data were therefore selected for this study. Even though trustworthiness can be stated for this study, using mixed methods approaches could lead to stronger results.
The fifth and final limitation was the number of participants. With over 50 participants, an overwhelming amount of data through journal entries and observational field notes were collected and in turn coded.

Conclusions Based on Major Findings and Future Research

Hellison has emphasized in much of his writing and research that the learning of both personal and social responsibility is more about the individual student and less about the class as a group. Even though I appreciate this notion, within the context of overcrowded classes, lack of resources, and lack of time dedicated to physical education, the opportunity to promote a quality physical education program without taking the group as a whole into consideration would not be realistic or fair on the teacher. Rather, the importance of teaching our students how group or social values can be impacted by our individual values should be emphasized and not disconnected.

Through this multi-case study, I was able to yield a practical approach to theoretical models of teaching physical education. Even though this qualitative study was large in size, the importance of enhancing affective inquiry through qualitative research supports the ideology of giving the learner a voice. As strongly stated by one of the students, it was nice to be able to implement a study where the perception of “thinking” was front and centre in the physical education environment. As this study was only one attempt at a hybrid instructional model to teaching personal and social responsibility in the physical education classroom, one future area of research would be to study the impact that this type of pedagogical teaching would have outside the classroom. More specifically, creating a longitudinal research design following a small number of students throughout their educational years could reveal the impact that life skills (responsibility) teaching within games teaching could have on our students’ lives.
Based on this study’s findings, the affective side effects (personal and social responsibility) of playing games within a team environment focused mainly on cognitive strategies as identified by TGfU as intended by the original creators was limited. A small amount of students perceived that through their game play and tactical questioning found within the TGfU lesson, their behaviours were indeed responsible. As discussed in the literature, this meaning could be explained as a by-product of participation in physical education class (Cutforth & Parker, 1996; Shields & Breidemeier, 1995) or rather the overall school and or classroom environment and its practiced curriculum goals.

Moreover, based on this study, leaving the teacher to teach value-based characteristics within a game environment was deemed difficult to practically implement without guidance. Specifically the use of Hellison’s TPSR model which overall shifts the control of the gymnasium from the teacher as director to facilitator (Beck & Kosnick, 2002; Rink, 2010).

However, leading students through a progressive path of individual and social responsibility levels while maintaining the learner at the centre of the game play through small-sided games and open-ended questions did result in a richer reality, not only to the students themselves but also to the observers.

In an attempt to approach invasion/territory games teaching through the constructivist lens, the utilization of this hybrid model confirms a shift in pedagogical design as we as educators try to meet the various individual needs of our students within a short amount of time. As stated by the British Columbia Ministry of Education, “The aim of Physical Education K to 7 is to provide opportunities for all students to develop knowledge, movement skills, and positive attitudes and behaviours that contribute to a healthy, active lifestyle” (BC Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 11). The hybrid model as created in this study successfully acknowledges the areas of
importance based on this Ministry’s aim and therefore could be a catalyst for teachers in most effectively utilizing their physical education class time.

Because of the potential impact of this hybrid approach, the way we prepare our teachers (PETE, PDP) and the learning of effective questioning and discussion in physical education could also be researched. The focused affective open-ended questioning used in this study led to rich discussions in the area of responsibility. This is only one area of life skills teaching within one context of invasion/territory games. There are endless opportunities to study this hybrid model approach in the other three games areas.

Study Conclusion

As I began this qualitative research journey, I was concerned about the perceived disconnect between theory and practice. How could I create a study that would bridge the gap between researcher and educator while keeping the learner at the core? The physical education classroom creates more chances for students and teachers to interact, transferring teacher from the role of leader to that of facilitator, as well as enabling students to take ownership of their own invasion/territory game learning and also the learning of their peers. Being actively involved within the TGfU invasion/territory lesson, students were asked to focus on the important personal and social behaviours needed not only within their game play but also in their everyday lives. With the informative findings of this study and the observed positive impact of this hybrid model approach towards teaching personal and social responsibility, I look to my future as an academic and educator as I challenge others in dialogue, through resource creation and through modelling best practices, to remember to teach physical education with a little more feeling.
References


http://learningwebconnect.homeftp.org/sara_bedal/sites/default/files/portfolio_content/Fit_for_Kids.pdf


112


Wright, P. M. (2012). Offering a TPSR physical activity club to adolescent boys labeled “at risk” in partnership with a community-based youth serving program. *Agora Physical Education and Sport, 14*(1), 94–114.


Appendices

Appendix 1 PSR/Teaching Games for Understanding Lesson 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Plan</th>
<th>Personal and Social Responsibility Lesson 1 (TGfU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Specific</th>
<th>Respect for the Rights and Feelings of Others (Self Control and Everyone has the Right to Be Included)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prescribed Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Select and assume responsibility for various roles while participating in physical activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The major problems Level 1 attempts to address:
- Verbal and physical abuse, such as name calling and making fun of others;
- Intimidation, bullying, and hogging equipment or space;
- Inability to control one’s temper or to resolve conflicts peacefully; and
- Disrupting the work and play of others.

| Introduction (2 Minutes) |Introducing Self-Control

Definition
- Controlling one’s attitude and behaviour in a way that respects the rights and feelings of others.
- Controlling your mouth and your temper.
- Introducing that everyone has the right to be included.

Definition
- All participants deserve turns and playing time.
Ask students to think about how they can work on their self-control and how they can include everyone in the game they are going to play.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warm-Up</th>
<th>5 minute run/walk warm-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play Game</th>
<th>CHIPOTLE (Self Control and Participation in Game Situation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10 Minutes)</td>
<td>• Break class into 4 colour teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Each team is placed into a corner of the playing surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This will be that team’s home corner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Each team must strategically place 3 bowling pins upright inside their given hula hoop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Each team starts off with 2 balls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teams must travel into opposing teams’ corners (whichever they choose) and attempt to knock over other teams’ bowling pins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Balls may be thrown at bowling pins from any distance, but to advance the ball players must move to open space and receive passes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Running with the ball is not permitted. Only passing can advance your throwing position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If the ball is intercepted by an opposing team or if the ball is dropped, possession of the ball is awarded to the team whose ball it belongs to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>OPTIONAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Once the team’s bowling pins are all knocked over, the team can rejoin the game, retrieving any ball and passing it over/under throughout the entire team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Once over/under is complete then pins are reset.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**STOP GAME AND ASK QUESTIONS**  
(5 Minutes)

Select which questions you want to ask!  
These are suggestions.

- Stop students and bring into a group
- How did this game make you feel?
- Did you feel anxious/stressed or frustrated when playing this game?
- What did you do when you felt this way?
- How did you control yourself to make sure that you respected your teammates?
- Did you make sure each of your teammates got to touch the ball?
- What do you think would have happened if your team members did not respect one another?
- Ask students to get into their teams and discuss how as a team they can be more successful in the game.
- Circulate from group to group to listen to their discussion.
- Keywords such as using communicating with one another, making shorter passes to everyone on the team.

---

**Play Game Again**  
(5 Minutes)

- Play game exactly how you played the game the first time.

---

**STOP GAME AND ASK QUESTIONS**  
(3 Minutes)

- Was your team more successful in the game than the last time?
- Did the ideas that you discussed work?
- Ask students if they want to change the game. And ask how they would like to change it. Pick change that many students agree with and play again.

---

**Play Changed Game**  
(5 Minutes)

- Play game with changes as discussed with students.
| Closing and Journal | • Students will fill out their journal entry.  
• Once entry is completed, students may go and change. |
Appendix 2  PSR/Teaching Games for Understanding Lesson 2

PSR /Teaching Games for Understanding Lesson 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Plan</th>
<th>Personal and Social Responsibility Lesson 2 (TGfU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Specific</td>
<td>Respect for the Rights and Feelings of Others (Recognize and Respect Differences of Opinion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribed Learning Outcome</td>
<td>Select and assume responsibility for various roles while participating in physical activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The major problems Level 2 attempts to address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Not letting others have an opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feeling left out of discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Negotiation is null.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction (2 Minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• When we played Chipotle last day, what did we work on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Having self-control and letting everyone participate is a way that we can respect one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Another way we can do this is by listening to one another and what they have to say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This can also be called respecting others’ opinions and differences in opinions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respecting differences of opinion

Definition

• This is when you can negotiate with your teammates even when you might not agree.

Ask students to think about how they can work on respecting others’ opinions and what they would do if they did not agree with what another teammate was saying.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warm-Up (3 Minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 3 minute run/walk warm-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10 Minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to play the ORIGINAL game again so they will remember how to play and how they felt when they played.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOP GAME AND ASK QUESTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5 Minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Game Again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5 Minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STOP GAME AND ASK QUESTIONS</th>
<th>(5 Minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Was your team more successful in the game than the last time?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did you like the change that I picked?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUPS WHOSE GAME CHANGE DID NOT GET PICKED</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How did you feel when your game change wasn’t picked?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did this frustrate you or make you angry?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did you respect how I changed the game? How?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ask them if they would want to change the game again and, if they could, which new team’s change they would use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closing and Journal</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Students will fill out their journal entry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Once entry is completed, students may go and change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lesson Plan
| Personal and Social Responsibility Lesson 5 (TGfU) |

### Lesson Specific
| Level 3: Self Direction |

### Prescribed Learning Outcome
| Select and assume responsibility for various roles while participating in physical activity |

### The major problems Level 3 attempts to address:
- For students to take more responsibility for their well being.
- Go from teacher-directed class to student-directed.
- Setting short- and long-term goals.
- Understanding one’s needs not just interests.

### Introduction (2 Minutes)
- Today we are going to play Floor Hockey.
- But we are also going to explore what it means to be more responsible about your well being. To be more independent in physical education class.

#### On task-independence
- Being able to play in physical education without supervision, meaning I don’t always have to help you set up or run a game.
- It also means that you can set your own goals as you are playing the game...whatever those goals could be...for example making a good pass, saving a goal or scoring a goal, or playing good defence.

### Warm-Up (3 Minutes)
- 7 Minute Beep Test
- Before you start ask them to think about what they want to be successful at during the beep test.

### Play Game (5 Minutes)
| Hand Ball (Self-Direction) |
- Break class into 4 colour teams.
- Two games of handball will be played at once.
- Each team is allowed to have a goalie.
- Ask students if they remember the different ideas about what it means
to be responsible. So what have they been working on the past two weeks?

(R espect, self-control, everyone participates, working out conflicts, being motivated, definitions of success).

- Now place them in their groups and ask them to think of what goals they want to achieve in their game as a team and as an individual and discuss in their teams.
- THIS IS THE IMPORTANT BIT
- Tell them that you will not be stopping the game to ask questions this time HOWEVER if your team is thinking they should stop the game and talk to each other about how they are feeling about their goals or rethink their goals, all they have to do is ask for a timeout. Tell them that you respect their decision to want to play for the whole time but would like them to use a timeout if they can.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STOP GAME AND ASK QUESTIONS</th>
<th>Did your team stop and use a timeout?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5 Minutes)</td>
<td>If you did, why did you? If you didn’t, why didn’t you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you feel your team achieved their goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did you achieve your goals?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Closing and Journal          | Students will fill out their journal entry. |
|------------------------------| Once entry is completed, students may go and change. |