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ABSTRACT

The need for more extensive research examining the tactical TGFU instructional model was necessary to provide teachers with adequate information to make informed decision about their selection of games instruction models. The pre-service teachers were one male and three female undergraduate students, at California State University, Sacramento. The public school students were 102 fifth grade students (55 boys and 47 girls) from four coeducational, public school classes in an urban school located in northern California.

The pre-service teacher’s implemented eight TGFU field hockey lessons within a two-week period to the same set of students; four developed by the primary researcher and four developed by each of the pre-service teachers. Verifying that the lesson plans represented the TGFU model required an evaluation of skill feedback, content related questions, and use of time for each lesson implemented. The pre-service teachers utilized the Game Performance Assessment Instrument (GPAI) twice during the study; one was developed by the primary researcher and one by each of the pre-service teachers.

Daily questionnaires and a post-study, semi-structured interview were used to collect the qualitative data. The planning phase results indicated that the tactical content was the most challenging aspect, as well as difficulties developing the tactical questions and the heightened frequency of student arguing. The implementation experiences included challenges with tactical questioning and content, as well as an increase in instructional and management time. The pre-service teachers reacted positively to the GPAI, but reported being challenged with the instrument, as well as not knowing how to use results.

Ennis and Chen’s Value Orientation Inventory – 2 (1993) provided information needed to analyze the relationship between the orientations and the implementation of the TGFU model. This evidence supported the fact that pre-service teachers who value the discipline mastery and learning process orientations have beliefs that are aligned with the goals of TGFU and therefore, may be better equipped to implement the model. Implications of TGFU as it relates to value orientation are complex and need further study.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Social psychologists have done extensive research on participation motivation in order to determine what motivates individuals to select and continue to participate in certain activities (Amabile, Hill, Hennessey & Tighe, 1994; Archer, 1994; Cash, Novy & Grant, 1994; Csikszentmihalyi & Nakamura, 1989; Gauvin, 1990; Hoyenga & Hoyenga, 1984; Roberts, 1984; Wankel, 1993). Relative to teachers making decisions about curriculum models, it would seem fitting to investigate what motivates teachers, pre-service or otherwise, to select and continue to implement particular curriculum models.

Typically studies involving physical education and motivation have been conducted to determine commitment or adherence to a particular exercise program, sport or game (Cash, Novy, & Grant, 1994; Dwyer, 1992; Gauvin, 1990; Gill, Gross & Huddleston, 1983; Gould, Feltz & Weiss, 1985, Klint & Weiss, 1986; Wankel & Kreisel, 1985). Given that motivation is the key to getting people to do what they do, it’s an important variable in determining future choices, behaviors and adherence (Amabile, Hill, Hennessey & Tighe, 1994; Csikszentmihalyi & Nakamura, 1989; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Hoyenga & Hoyenga, 1984). Whether motivation is derived from extrinsic factors, such as performing a task for external reasons, or intrinsic factors, such as performing a task for enjoyment, learning, or satisfaction; motivation is an important determinant of potential behaviors (Archer, 1994; Csikszentmihalyi & Nakamura, 1989; Garcia & Pintrich, 1996; Hoyenga & Hoyenga, 1984; Kimiecik & Harris, 1996). Enjoyment and intrinsic motivation are variables linked to positive affective experiences and contribute to desire to be continually involved with an activity or in a behavior (Kimiecik & Harris,
Research designed to determine what makes something more enjoyable is key to comprehending and enhancing motivation.

In addition to enjoyment, teachers’ beliefs and values directly influence their selection of content topics, their willingness to utilize a particular curriculum, and the nature of the instructional and assessment decisions. Teachers’ beliefs about the value of the content and its relevance and meaning to students play an important role in their motivation to teach a particular curriculum. These values have been articulated into five orientations that represent a set of beliefs that appear to influence the curricular decisions that teachers make (Ennis & Chen, 1993). These value orientations reflect priorities that teachers place on particular goals and objectives for curriculum decision making. Each time teachers decide what content to teach, they make statements about their belief systems. In the field of physical education, these value systems have been expressed in the following five value orientations: discipline mastery, learning process, self-actualization, ecological integration, and social reconstruction. The discipline mastery and the learning process orientations share common components with an overall focus on the ability to perform, while self-actualization, ecological integration and social reconstruction describe affective curricular goals that use disciplinary knowledge as a means of accomplishing personal or social goals. Investigation into a teacher’s value orientation profile may shed light on which curriculum model that an individual will select and/or is better suited to implement. In the realm of adequately preparing pre-service teachers to make appropriate and informed curricular choices, if teacher educators or the pre-service teacher curricula are to have an influence and/or encourage pre-service teachers to value and utilize particular curriculum models, then it is important to gain an understanding of the factors that contribute or motivate someone to utilize and value such models. Understanding one’s motives for selecting a particular curriculum model sheds light on the decision-making process and better equips educators to appropriately address and prepare students for this decision.

Having a good understanding of how curriculum models can be implemented to promote a wide range of learning outcomes in physical education was of particular interest to this study. Metzler (2000) advocated that teachers should view curriculum models as tools that are designed to help accomplish certain tasks. If the correct model is
selected, teachers are more than likely to get the tasks accomplished with more efficiency and effectiveness. The Sport Education model, Social Development Model, the Cooperative Learning model and the Tactical Teaching Games for Understanding model are several different curriculum approaches that represent a variety of value orientations. The Sport Education model strives to develop competent, literate and enthusiastic sportspersons, by involving students in authentic participation in all aspects of sport, including roles like coaches, players officials, score keepers, etc. (Siedentop, 1994; 1998; Metzler, 2000). The Social Development model affectively focuses on treating students as individuals, for personal growth and social development are the main focuses of this model (Hellison, 1995, 1996; Siedentop, 1998). The Cooperative Learning model focuses on engaging all students in the learning process at the same time as they all work towards a common goal (Metzler, 2000; Slavin, 1983). The Tactical Teaching Games for Understanding (TGFU) model focuses on improving students’ game performance by providing a concrete link between skills and tactics at a time when students appreciate the value of skills within a game context (Mitchell, 1996; Mitchell, Griffin, Oslin, 1994). The TGFU skill instruction model is the focus of this study, therefore further review of this model was necessary.

In the late 1960’s, the tactical TGFU model was originally developed in order to address increased dissatisfaction with traditional methods of skill instruction. The TGFU model attempts to overcome the shortcomings of these models by focusing on the development of “game sense” through early immersion of students into modified game situations (Bunker & Thorpe, 1982; Mitchell, 1996; Mitchell, Griffin, & Oslin, 1994). This instructional model does not accept that tactics must wait for the development of prerequisite, enabling skills, but embraces the belief that games consist of deep-seated knowledge and understanding, as well as the ability to display that knowledge and understanding (Chandler, 1996; Thorpe, Bunker & Almond, 1986; Mitchell, Griffin, & Oslin, 1994). This approach is grounded by the assumption that the demands of a game far exceed the need for simple physical skillfulness and that decisions concerning what to do in certain game situations are as important as the ability to execute a particular motor skill (French & Thomas, 1987; Mitchell, Griffin, & Oslin, 1994).
One of the benefits of utilizing the TGFU approach is its connectivity with the games classification system. This system provides curricular structure for teaching games by organizing sports by their fundamental design and evolved out of the need for a more generic appreciation of games, as well as an understanding of the similarities and differences between game forms. The games classification system was designed to utilize the knowledge and strategies of one game to enhance the learning and performance in another game (Doolittle & Girard, 1991; Jones & Farrow, 1999; Mitchell & Oslin, 1999a; Werner & Almond, 1990; Werner, Thorpe & Bunker, 1996). Utilization of this system permits educators to make well informed curricular decisions and, as a result, provides students with the best possible situations for transference of learning. Physical educators are able to promote the transfer of previously learned information about one game to the learning of a new game by organizing the curriculum in a manner that takes the similarities and differences of the games into account (Brooker, Kirk, Braiuka, & Bransgrove, 2000; Chandler, 1996; Jones & Farrow, 1999; Mitchell & Oslin, 1999a; Pigott, 1982; Rink, French, Tjeerdsma, 1996). This system allows for a richer understanding of the decisions that are made during games, promotes the transfer of previously learned information or skills, and provides a logical progression for tactical concepts to be presented.

Inherent to the TGFU model is the self-propelling motivation that involvement in games offers. Participation in games provides the type of motivation that learning skills in isolation often erodes (Chandler, 1996; Schmidt, 1988). The significance of enhancing motivation through strategies such as game play is recognized as a positive basis for learning (Chandler, 1996, Mitchell & Chandler, 1992). With the TGFU model, educators are able to use the motivation of games to provide learning opportunities for students while fostering task and skill mastery (Chandler, 1996).

Opponents of the TGFU model caution that it is not without its faults. Though all curricular models have strengths and weaknesses, closer inspection of the presented weaknesses of TGFU will offer alternative explanations, including that they exist either from teachers’ lack of knowledge, a lack of teacher commitment, and/or the misinterpretation of the TGFU model; all of which could also be reinterpreted as strengths of the model.
TGFU is a high-order curriculum model that beginning teachers might find extremely challenging to implement. Not only does the nature of the model demand that teachers are truly knowledgeable about the deep structure of a game, but teachers must possess pedagogical content knowledge as well. When teachers have only a surface level of understanding of a particular sport, they are unable to implement the model correctly (Chandler, 1996; Thorpe, Bunker & Almond, 1986; Turner, 1996). Though content specific knowledge is critical to successfully implementing the TGFU model, pedagogical content knowledge is equally as important. The teacher’s ability to transform the content knowledge into forms that are pedagogically powerful can be an intimidating task, especially for a beginning teacher (Griffin, Dodds, & Rovegno, 1996; Hopper, 2002; Rovegno, 1991; 1994; 1995; Rovegno & Bandhauer, 1994; Shulman, 1987). Successful implementation of the TGFU model requires extensive planning, knowledge of game play and effective pedagogical content, and an overall commitment to using the model.

Given that the TGFU model is such a complex model, misinterpretations are commonly expressed. Three common misconceptions include: (1) that the model is not concerned with teaching skills and techniques, (2) that students will not equate playing games with learning, and (3) that educators will perceive the model as a glorified “roll-out-the-ball” approach. The following review of literature will provide extensive information dispelling these misinterpretations.

Teacher educators must determine what predicates the implementation of a particular curriculum model, in this case the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding model, as well as what factors motivate teachers to continue to use a certain curriculum. The need for more extensive research examining the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding model is necessary to provide teachers with information enabling them to make informed and appropriate decisions about games instruction models.

Review of Literature

The following section contains the literature review and is divided into the following: (1) intrinsic motivation, (2) value orientations, including discipline mastery, learning process, self-actualization, ecological integration, social reconstruction, and (3) curriculum models, including direct instruction, sport education, social development,
cooperative learning, peer teaching and the tactical model. The following sections will highlight each of the variables.

Intrinsic Motivation

Much of the research involving the variables of motivation and physical education has focused on commitment to a particular exercise or physical education program (Cash, Novy, & Grant, 1994; Dwyer, 1992; Gauvin, 1990; Gill, Gross & Huddleston, 1983; Gould, Feltz & Weiss, 1985, Klint & Weiss, 1986; Wankel & Kreisel, 1985). It may stand to reason that motivation to adhere to a particular program may be closely related to the motivation involved with adherence to a certain curriculum model. Given that motivation influences people into certain decisions, it is important to understanding the definition and the factors that contribute to motivation.

Motivation is defined as the internal state or condition that activates and gives direction to thoughts, feelings, and actions (Csikszentmihalyi & Nakamura, 1989). It is the key to getting people to do what they do. An individual’s own experiences help mold what motivates them. People can feel motivated by interest, enjoyment, satisfaction and challenge of the task itself when they are driven by a deep involvement in their work and a passion for it (Amabile, Hill, Hennessey, & Tighe, 1994). Research has indicated that motivation can be derived from extrinsic and/or intrinsic factors. Extrinsic motivation is performing a task for external reasons, for example, money, recognition, social achievement, to avoid punishment, to earn a grade, etc. Hoyenga and Hoyenga (1984) defined extrinsic motivation as the motives that are outside of and separate from the behaviors they cause. They added that the extrinsic motive for behavior is not inherent in or essential to the behavior itself. Extrinsic motivation is usually the result of an external reward and therefore considered to be short term.

In contrast, if involvement in an activity promotes enjoyment in the work that is being done, then the participant is more likely to be motivated to do the activity because they take pleasure in it. Intrinsic motivation is taking part in something primarily for the sake of the activity itself, for the enjoyment it provides, the learning it permits and/or the satisfaction it brings (Csikszentmihalyi & Nakamura, 1989). Intrinsic motivation originates entirely from within oneself, and it is free from external pressures, such as rewards or contingencies. Deci and Ryan (1985) stated, “The intrinsic needs for
competence and self-determination motivate an ongoing process of seeking and attempting to conquer optimal challenges” (p.32). It tends to be more powerful and is more likely to lead to personal success. When intrinsically motivated, individuals will be inspired to demand more effort of themselves, which requires persistence and effort put forth by the individual. Kushel (1994) defined the following motivations as likely to be intrinsic:

- Enjoyment of the work itself for its own sake
- Pride in performing excellently
- Achievement of a deep-seated value, such as helping another person
- Having a deep belief in the importance of the work one is doing
- The excitement and pleasure of a challenge

Students with intrinsic motivation strive to develop goals relative to learning and achievement, which Archer (1994) and Garcia and Pintrich (1996) agreed that this desire has been found to correlate with the following: effective learning strategies, positive attitudes toward school, the choice of difficult tasks as opposed to simple ones, perceived ability, effort, the use of deep cognitive processes, persistence, achievement, choice and initiative.

Research on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation has identified two academic dimensions in order to further describe achievement motivation. Individuals involved in achievement related contexts will define success in either ego-oriented or task-oriented terms (Duda, 1993). Those who are more ego-oriented define success in terms of surpassing or outperforming others and are “other-person-referenced,” rather than “self-referenced” (Fox, Goudas, Biddle, Duda, & Armstrong, 1994). Those with a disposition towards an ego-orientation are likely to report being motivation by extrinsic, socially derived factors, like recognition and status. An ego-orientation was found to be associated with negative sporting behaviors, legitimacy of aggression, and the belief that ability leads to success (Duda, Olson, & Templin, 1991). Conversely, those who are task-oriented defined success intrinsically in terms of mastering skills, self-improvement and working hard. Mitchell and Chandler (1992) stated that task oriented individuals may have their achievement needs met by producing a good performance and/or putting forth a good effort, even if the outcome is a loss. A task-oriented participant, who is more
concerned with learning and personally mastering a task, is likely to assume more
intrinsic motivational incentives and patterns, such as skill development and enjoyment.
Mitchell and Chandler (1992) added that by encouraging students to develop positive
self-perceptions and adopt a task orientation, teachers could instill motivation in students
that is based on the pleasure of performance and the belief that tasks can be successfully
accomplished. In this way motivation will be intrinsically rather than extrinsically based,
thereby increasing the probability of future permanent behaviors.

Kimiecik and Harris (1996) proposed that enjoyment, intrinsic motivation, and
positive affect were intimately linked with the following statement, “Fostering enjoyment
optimizes positive affective experiences and enhances the development of intrinsic
motivation (i.e., perceptions of competence and self-determination) which creates a
continuous cycle of human experience that is likely to be very positive and very
fulfilling” (p. 258). Knowledge of what makes an experience enjoyable to a participant is
critical to understanding and enhancing motivation (Scanlan & Simons, 199)

It has been argued that enjoyment is a critical construct for understanding and
explaining the motivation for engaging in activities (Kendzierski & DeCarlo, 1991;
Kimiecik & Harris, 1996; Scanlan & Simons, 1992; Wankel, 1993). Though Kimiecik
and Harris (1996) believed that there is ambiguity in the definition of enjoyment, they
defined it as an optimal psychological state that leads to performing an activity primarily
for its own sake. Scanlan and Simons (1992) defined enjoyment as a positive affective
response to an experience that reflects feelings and perceptions such as pleasure, liking
and experienced fun. Enjoyment is an optimal experience. An enjoyable activity is one
that is done not with the expectation of a future benefit, but simply because the doing
itself is the reward, and therefore serves as the cornerstone of intrinsic motivation
(Csikszentmihalyi, 1990).

Value Orientations

Value orientations represent education beliefs and values that appear to influence
curricular decisions that educators make. Pajares (1992) stated that “beliefs are the best
indicators of the decisions that individuals make throughout their lives” (p. 307). These
orientations reflect priorities that teachers place on particular goals and objectives for
curriculum decision making, and they can range from judgments about what content to
teach and how much practice time to provide to decisions about how strictly to set performance criteria. They can include both academic goals associated with the body of knowledge and affective goals related to the learners’ needs and interests. “These orientations determine, in part, which content topics will be emphasized during instruction and the extent to which the content will be learned” (Ennis, 1994, p. 163).

Each time teachers decide what content to teach, they are making statements about their belief systems. Prioritizing of these goals within a teachers’ value systems have been articulated within the physical education literature into the following value orientations: discipline mastery, learning process, self-actualization, ecological integration, and social reconstruction.

**Discipline Mastery**

The discipline mastery value orientation is defined as, “the mastery of fundamental core knowledge and performance skills considered essential to the knowledge base” (Ennis & Chen, 1993, p. 438). At the core of this orientation is the belief that the subject matter of physical education should be the major emphasis of the curriculum. Center to this orientation is the idea that students should learn movement patterns and skills that lead to more complex movements, such as those utilized in dance, gymnastics, team sports and fitness activities. Discipline mastery is the dominant value orientation in the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) definition of a physical educated person, with more than 20 outcomes representing performance and knowledge competence (Ennis, 1992).

Ennis, Ross and Chen (1992) reported that discipline mastery teachers believe that they can increase student performance on skills and fitness content, despite limitations in class size, scheduling, prior student experience, and facilities and equipment available. Therefore, it stands to reason that students who are interested in learning about movement, sport and exercise gain the greatest benefit from discipline mastery teachers (Ennis, 1996).

**Learning Process**

Research indicates that discipline mastery and learning process orientations share common components. They both contend that having the ability to perform is central to being a physically educated person; though the learning process advocate would offer
alternative ways to teach students. They believe that “students must not only perform skillfully, but must also know how to solve problems about movement, sport and exercise” (Ennis, 1996, p. 129). Learning process educators focus on creating effective environments for learning by challenging their students to think about how and why certain movements or fitness activities lead to particular outcomes. Students are encouraged to use knowledge to solve problems and to focus on the process of solving the problem as well as the product, or solution itself (Ennis, 1992). As a result, students are able to analyze situations and alter their behavior(s) accordingly.

**Self-Actualization**

A curriculum that addresses personal growth and student autonomy is advocated in the self-actualization value orientation. In this child-centered approach, the students’ needs and interests are at the core of the curriculum, whereby teachers try to match the curriculum to the interests and motivation levels of their students. Teachers are personally interested in the lives of their students and work to integrate topics that are important to the students into their physical education programs. They are flexible and are ready and able to respond to the diversity of their students. “Tasks and activities are planned to provide opportunities for students to achieve success believed to contribute to the development of independence, individuality, and positive student growth” (Ennis & Chen, 1993, p. 439). In this orientation, skills and fitness content serves as a means to help students develop positive self-esteem, rather than the primary goal within the curriculum. Self-actualization teachers help students set and meet relevant personal goals, resulting in the development of a positive self-concept.

**Ecological Integration**

Ecological integration seeks a balance between student needs, group needs and subject matter demands. Teachers who advocate this orientation believe that the knowledge base, the learner and the social group are all equally important. They help students about the connectivity of knowledge and other aspects of their lives. “Students learn that personal needs must sometimes give way to group concerns; similarly, the group learns that sometimes it must be sensitive to the needs of the individual” (Ennis, 1996, p. 130).
Social Reconstruction

Teachers who advocate this value orientation are primarily concerned with the development of positive interpersonal relationships among their students. In this orientation, movement, sport and fitness are utilized to provide opportunities for students to work cooperatively together to achieve success. “They focus on teaching students how to cooperate and accept personal responsibility for their roles in game play or group problem solving” (Ennis, 1996, p. 130). From this orientation, students develop the ability to support each other through the development of appropriate personal and social skills like patience, negotiation and self-control.

Influence of Value Orientations on Curricular Decisions

Findings suggest that when teachers control their educational setting, they can and do make curricular, instructional and assessment decisions that reflect their value orientation profile (Ennis, 1994; Ennis & Chen, 1993; Ennis, Chen & Ross, 1992). In short, value orientations influence teachers’ selection of content and teaching strategies. Teachers’ beliefs and values directly influence their choices of content topics, their willingness to enthusiastically teach a curriculum, and the nature of their instructional and assessment decisions. Teacher beliefs about the value of the content and its relevance and meaning to the students play an important role in their motivation to teach the curriculum. “In reality, teachers are influenced by a number of value perspectives that blend to influence their curricular and instructional plans” (Ennis, 1994, p. 166). Having a good understanding of how curriculum models can be implemented to promote a wide range of learning outcomes in physical education is particularly interesting. Metzler (2000) advocated that teachers should view curriculum models as tools that are designed to help accomplish certain tasks. If the correct model is selected, teachers are more than likely to get the tasks that they value accomplished with more efficiency and effectiveness.

Curriculum Model Overview

As trends influence the curriculum in physical education, a large variety of nontraditional games and activities (e.g. martial arts and outdoor adventures) have frequently been added to the curricula. Given that games make up about 65% of the physical education curriculum, continually adding a variety of activities may have
deleterious effect on opportunities for students to acquire skills. “By offering an extensive variety of sports in one- or two-week units, students never have time to become proficient” (Werner & Almond, 1990, p. 23). As a result, teachers must make difficult decisions about the content they will teach and which instructional models they will utilize in order to use this valuable time wisely. Examples of these instructional models include, but are not limited to: Direct Instruction, Sport Education, Social Development, Cooperative Learning, Peer Teaching and the Tactical Teaching Games for Understanding. A description of each of these models is presented.

**Direct Instruction**

One of the most widely utilized teaching approaches in the United States in physical education is the Direct Instruction model. It is characterized by teacher-centered decisions and teacher-directed engagement patterns for learners. In this model, (1) the teachers has a clear set of learning goals, (2) presents the students will the desired movement, skill or concept, and (3) organizes the activities into blocks of time that are arranged to provide high rates of feedback during practice segments. “The purpose of this pattern is to provide the most efficient use of class time and resources in order to promote very high rates of student engagement in practice tasks and skills” (Metzler, 2000, p. 162). The model focuses on giving the students as many practice opportunities as possible so that the teacher can observe the skill attempts and provide high frequencies of appropriate feedback.

In order to promote student achievement, Rosenshine (1983) outlined the duties performed by the Direct Instruction teacher as follows:

1. They structure the learning.
2. They proceed in small steps at a brisk pace.
3. They give detailed and redundant instructions and explanations.
4. They ask a large number of questions and provide overt, active practice.
5. They provide feedback and corrections, especially in the beginning.
6. They have a student success rate of 80 percent or higher on initial learning tasks.
7. They divide large academic tasks into smaller sub-tasks.
8. They provide for continued student practice with a success rate of 90 to 100 percent.
A direct instruction unit is typically divided into a series of sequential performance skills and knowledge areas. This model’s lessons include tasks that are planned by the teacher and are presented in the following progression: (1) review of previously learned material, (2) presentation of new content and/or skills, (3) student practice segment, (4) delivery of feedback, (5) independent practice periods, and (6) periodic reviews of selected tasks. The student’s role is this model is to simply follow the teacher’s directions and respond to the teacher’s questions, for they are given only a few decisions to make.

**The Sport Education Model**

Stemming from the popularity of sport in the American culture, the teaching and learning of institutional sports have been a central part of physical education in the United States (Metzler, 2000). Traditionally, sports have been the curricular backbone for many grade levels. As a result, an instructional model called the Sport Education model was designed to appropriately use this time by providing students with positive, educational and lasting sports experiences as part of the school physical education program. Daryl Siedentop (1998) developed this model to “provide authentic, educationally rich, sport experiences for girls and boys in the context of school physical education” (p.18).

This model combines direct instruction, cooperative learning and peer-teaching in the context of developmentally appropriate forms of sport. The Sport Education model teaches the overall concept and conduct of sport, including variables like: team affiliation, fairness, etiquette, traditions, appreciation, strategy, and values. The basic structure of the Sport Education model mimics that of organized sport leagues by including such roles as players, coaches, officials, score keepers, trainers, etc. It is this authentic participation and involvement in these features of the sport that allow students to learn about sport in its entirety.

Siedentop (1994) cites that the major goal of the Sport Education model is to develop competent, literate and enthusiastic sportspersons. A competent sportsperson is: (1) one who has sufficient skills to participate, (2) one who understands and can execute appropriate strategies, and (3) one who is a knowledgeable game player. A literate sportspersons understands the rules, rituals and traditions of sports, and an enthusiastic
sportsperson is one who behaves in ways that preserve, protect and enhance the sport culture. Siedentop (1994) illustrates ten specific learning objectives for the Sport Education model (pp. 4-5):

1. Develop skill and fitness specific to particular sports
2. Appreciate and be able to execute strategic plays in sports
3. Participate at a level appropriate to students’ development
4. Share in the planning and administration of sport experiences
5. Provide responsible leadership
6. Work effectively within a group toward common goals
7. Appreciate the rituals and conventions that give particular sports their unique meanings
8. Develop the capacity to make reasoned decisions about sport issues
9. Develop and apply knowledge about umpiring, refereeing and training
10. Decide voluntarily to become involved in after-school sport

A Sport Education unit closely resembles a sport season. Students are initially selected or assigned to teams. Once teams are formed, they practice as a team throughout the season, preparing for competition together. Once the competitive season begins, students prepare for and compete in matches and/or games. The focus of the team becomes to improve their performances individually and as a group. Daily lessons are divided between practice and competition, with the later portion of the unit devoted primarily to competition, much like the culmination of any sports season.

The rationale for the development and utilization of the Sport Education model is simple. If sport is to be “a valued part of any society, it is the society’s responsibility (and in its best interest) to find ways to formalize the process of how people come to learn and participate in the sport culture” (Metzler, 2000, p. 258). Though physical education traditionally teaches sport, it was doing so in ways that deny students access to the most important joys and lessons of organized sport. By featuring sport’s most positive characteristics, the culture of sport can be successfully passed down.

The Social Development Model

This model is commonly referred to as the “humanistic” model for physical education primarily because of its focus on (1) treating students as individuals, and (2)
focusing on personal growth and social development. This model was “designed to help young people better cope with a complex social world, to achieve a higher degree of control over their own lives, and to contribute more positively to the small social worlds of which they are a part” (Siedentop, 1998, p. 232). To achieve these goals in physical education, Hellison (1995) conceptualized an approach he refers to as teaching personal and social responsibilities (TPSR). Two of these goals, effort and self-direction, address the students’ responsibility for personal development. Two other goals address the student’s moral and social responsibility for their relationships with others and as members of groups. These goals are referred to as respect for the rights and feelings of others and being sensitive and responsive to the well being of others. The last goal focuses on the application of this level of responsibility to the rest of the school, playgrounds, neighborhoods, etc.

Hellison (1995, 1996) conceptualized a five-level progression of social development to be presented to students as a loose progression. The five levels include: irresponsibility, respect, participation, self-direction, and caring.

- **Level 0, Irresponsibility:** Students at this level make excuses and blame others for their behavior. They deny personal responsibility for what they do or what they fail to do.

- **Level I, Respect:** At this level, students may choose not to participate in activities. If they do participate, they may not show improvement or content mastery. Without being prompted by the teacher or without constant supervision, students are able to control their behavior so as to not interfere with other students’ and teachers’ rights.

- **Level II, Participation:** Students at level II show others minimal respect, while they are participating in the subject matter. They willingly, sometimes even enthusiastically, play accept challenges, practice motor skills and work on improving fitness levels under the teacher’s supervision.

- **Level III, Self-Direction:** Here, students show respect and participate without direct supervision. They can identify their own needs and can begin to plan and execute their own physical education program.
Level IV, Caring: Students at this level not only respect others, participate and are self-directed; they are also motivated to extend their sense of responsibility beyond themselves by cooperating, giving support, showing concern, and helping. In order for the students to become responsible, they must be given responsibility, and they must learn to take responsibility. Generally speaking, this means that there must be an emphasis on sharing the power with the students by allowing them to make decisions and then reflect upon them once they are made, as well as permitting the students to negotiating issues when they arise. The goals related to this model become provisional, and they must be “learned, experienced, reflected upon, and eventually validated, changed, or even rejected” (Hellison, 1996, p. 274).

A unit typically commences with a discussion of the issue of respect and, once established, is followed by the relevance of the levels. Participation in physical activity and the exploration of effort will only be addressed after respect is thoroughly introduced and reinforced. This focus helps students learn that respect is the number one concern. Once this awareness is firmly established, the students can enter the physical education arena and begin their personal plan, which typically represents a goal to improve in a specific skill or fitness component. Once responsibility is conceptualized, it must be a part of each physical education lesson. “To do this, TPSR levels must become a framework for the program, so that, as far as possible, everything that goes on in the gym is related back to taking responsibility” (Hellison, 1996, p. 275). It is this continual focus and commitment that makes the TSPR a model that holds promise for doing more to help students grow socially.

The Cooperative Learning Model

An important dilemma facing educators is how to engage all students in the learning process at the same time, without allowing one or a few students to dominate the interactions and opportunities. The Cooperative Learning model was developed primarily by Robert Slavin at Johns Hopkins University in the 1970’s to address this dilemma. Cooperative learning by itself is not a model as much as it is a set of teaching strategies that share important keys; the most important being the formation of students into learning teams with the expectation that all students will contribute to the learning process and outcomes. In this model, the word team very closely resembles the meaning
it does in sport, all members work to achieve a common goal. This goal can require teams and students to “base their achievement on intragroup performance (trying to be the best team they can be), intergroup performance (competing with other teams), or shared-group performance (learning content so they can teach it to the rest of the class)” (Metzler, 2000, p. 221). Slavin (1983) stated that cooperative learning is based on three concepts: team rewards, individual accountability and equal opportunities for success. Each of these concepts is explained below.

- Team rewards: Whether all teams are working on the same task or different ones, the teacher will state one or more stated performance criteria that the teams must meet, along with the reward received by those teams who meet the standard.

- Individual accountability: A key to cooperative learning tasks is the specification that all team members must contribute to the team’s final outcome. All students must be factors in the team’s effort. This requirement leads to peer-teaching within a group as the students who possess higher ability levels interact and seek to assist the lower-ability students to improve the whole team’s performance.

- Equal opportunities for success: This model calls for small groups of students who are as heterogeneous as possible, so that the total performance of each team is equal. When forming teams, an even mixture of the following should be considered: gender, skill levels, previous experience with the content, cognitive ability and motivation. Once this balance is achieved; increased student motivation, fair competitions, and promotion of social learning outcomes will result.

A cooperative learning unit begins with the teacher deciding what the assigned task will be, selecting the teams, explaining the requirements of the performance and social skill behaviors. Once the teacher completes these tasks, the model then becomes student-centered, and the teacher only interacts when social skill feedback is needed. The students decide how to organize themselves, how to divide the work among the group members, and how to use the available time and resources. It is expected that the students will utilize peer teaching as their main mode of instruction. As the students negotiate the dynamics of learning in this environment, they are learning with, from and for each other, the basis of the Cooperative Learning model.
The Peer Teaching Model

The Peer Teaching model is very similar to direct instruction given that in both models the teacher retains control of making and implementing nearly all the content, managerial, task and instructional decisions. The major difference between these two models is that in Peer Teaching the instructional interactions that occur during and after student learning trials are delegated to the students, who have been trained to observe and analyze other students’ practice attempts.

The Peer Teaching model was developed out of the need for more teacher observation and feedback. The model relies on strategies that use students to teach other students and is based on an accepted trade-off to help reduce the problem of too little teacher observation of practice attempts and limited feedback received by students. “Actual student opportunity to respond in class is for all intents cut in half in the Peer Teaching model, since each student spends approximately half of the activity time as a tutor (someone temporarily assigned to the role of teacher) and half of the activity time practicing as the learner” (Metzler, 2000, p. 288). The trade-off, however, is when they are in the learner’s role, the students have a private tutor to observe and analyze each practice trial. In addition, the tutor is cognitively engaged in a way that can increase his or her own comprehension of the task, possibly contributing to future successful practice trials of the tutor. The fewer opportunities to respond in peer teaching is counterbalanced by the increased effectiveness of practice time, which allows the teacher to cover more within a unit of instruction.

Proponents of the Peer Teaching model believe that the interactions inherent to this model add to increased social learning. Both the tutor and learner become dependent on each other in ways that do not typically occur in other models. The tutor is responsible for paying close attention to the task presentation and structure of the task given by the teacher. The tutor must also “apply good concentration skills when observing skill attempts, have good verbal communication skills when giving cues and feedbacks, and be sensitive to the abilities and feelings of his temporary charge” (Metzler, 2000, p. 288). The roles of the learner include being willing to accept comments from the tutor, to ask the tutor questions when clarification is needed, and to apply feedback while practicing.
the assigned tasks. While the students alternate between these roles, they are forging a positive relationship based on this shared level of responsibility.

The Peer Teaching model differs from other partner learning situations because of the preparation and training of the tutors in the Peer Teaching model. In order for this model to be correctly implemented, the teacher must help the tutors to understand and carry out their roles successfully. Metzler (2000) outlined the following training plan for the tutoring role (p. 289):

1. Clarification of the learning objectives
2. Expectations of tutors (what they should and should not do)
3. Task presentation and check for understanding
4. Task structure and check for understanding
5. How to communicate errors to the learners
6. How to provide praise appropriately
7. How to practice safely
8. How to assess mastery or task completion
9. Knowing when to ask questions of the teacher

Though the teacher must retain much of the decision making and leadership responsibilities, relinquishing a small portion of the instructional process to the tutors furthers social skill development. In addition to this heightened social involvement associated with this model; peer teaching has great potential to enhance students’ cognitive development as well. To be a good tutor, the students must understand what the skill cues are and understand the relationship between the cues and the performance outcomes.

The Tactical (TGFU) Model

In the late 1960’s, in recognition of the large percentage of curricular time devoted to games play and the dissatisfaction with traditional methods of teaching games, the staff and research students at Loughborough University began to develop a more cognitively based approach that placed greater emphasis on developing student’s tactical awareness within game play (Thorpe, Bunker, & Almond, 1984). Bunker and Thorpe first proposed the Teaching Games for Understanding (TGFU) model in 1982. The model was initially developed as a result of repeated observations of a (a) large percentage of
children achieving little success due to the emphasis on performance, (b) a majority of youngsters who leave school knowing little about games, (c) the production of supposedly “skillful” players who in fact possess inflexible techniques and poor decision-making skills, and (d) performers who are dependent on the teacher/coach to make their decisions (Bunker & Thorpe, 1982). In an attempt to overcome these shortcomings, TGFU provides a way of teaching games that focuses on the development of “game sense” through the early immersion of students into modified games situations. The intent of this approach is to afford students the opportunity to improve game performance by providing a concrete link between skills and tactics, as well as to encourage skill practice at a time when students appreciate the value of skills within a game context (Mitchell, 1996). This approach was developed to provide a balance between skills and tactics “by emphasizing the appropriate timing of skill practice and application of skills within the context of the game” (Mitchell, Griffin, Oslin, 1994, p. 21). Thorpe, Bunker, and Almond (1986) added the following:

The approach does not accept that tactics must wait for the development of sophisticated enabling skills but takes the point of view that games are about tactics and that rules and equipment must be modified to ensure that all children gain insights into the games they play. (p.11)

TGFU gives educators the tools to successful integrate the cognitive and contextual dimensions of learning in the physical domain. Chandler (1996) stated,

If expertise in games consists of both deep-seated knowledge and understanding on one hand, and the ability to display that knowledge and understanding in practice on the other, then an approach to teaching games which fosters both of these capacities is likely to be more successful in developing expertise than one that doesn’t. (p.49)

A typical TGFU lesson would begin with modified game play, followed by a teacher lead question and answer period, skill development, and then finally a return to modified game play (see figure 1).

Within this model progression, Bunker and Thorpe (1982) described a six-stage model for developing decision-making and improved performance in game situations (see figure 2). Stage 1 suggests that teaching should commence with a game form that is
modified to meet the developmental level of the learner, as well as to emphasize the need for a specific tactical solution. Stage 2, the game appreciation stage, encourages students to begin learning the need for rules to shape their game. The third stage presents students with tactical problems to help them increase their tactical awareness. Tactical awareness or tactical understanding is the ability to identify problems that arise while a game is in progress and to select the skills necessary to solve these problems (Mitchell, Griffin & Oslin, 1994). An example of tactical understanding would be the ability to make

![Figure 1. Teaching Games for Understanding model lesson progression](image)

appropriate decisions about the type of shots to play and movements to make during game play. By modifying components of the game, for example, the rules, equipment, and playing area, teachers can exaggerate selected game aspects to facilitate the opportunity for every player to address the following question, “What must I do to succeed in this situation?” The forth stage involves a teacher initiated question and answer session used to guide the students to understand what skill, skills and/or tactical understanding is needed to be successful in that particular game-like situation.

As students see the need to use a certain skill, they will work harder to master it (Rink, 2001). Here, the students are presented with questions and challenges to encourage them to explore their ability to solve tactical problems apparent in the modified game. “Students are asked what to do (i.e., tactical awareness) and how to do it (i.e., appropriate response selection and skill execution)” (Griffin, Butler, Lombardo, & Nastasi, 2003, p. 7). After the question and answer portion of the lesson, the structured practice or skill activities would focus on solving the tactical problems presented in the modified game, stage 5. The skills are then practiced under conditions that enable the learners to relate the
skill to game contexts. These activities would allow students to practice the skill, while they have an understanding of how and where the skill can be applied in a game situation.

Stage 6 measures performance leading toward the development of competent and proficient games players. This structured practice session would then be followed by another modified game, allowing students the opportunity to immediately apply the information to the game. Grehaigne and Godbout (1997) stated that the use of different modifications would shape the game and allow or restrict certain tactical behaviors and/or skills that are to be emphasized in the TFGU model.

It was Bunker and Thorpe’s (1986a) belief that, if the emphasis is shifted to tactical considerations in a game, children will recognize that games can be interesting and enjoyable as they are encouraged to make correct decisions based upon tactical awareness. At the point in which children are encouraged to think about correct responses to tactical questions, they should begin to see the need for and relevance of particular techniques, as they are required in the game situation. Whereas the typical reaction to a lesson based on the teaching of techniques is “when can we play a game?” this approach now

Figure 2. Bunker and Thorpe’s Games Understanding Model (1982)
elicits the response “how can we do it?” – the child is beginning to appreciate the tactical necessity for improving specific technique required in a particular game situation (pp 7-8).

“Learners develop understanding when they are active and seek solutions for themselves” (Butler, 1997, p. 42). Instead of modifying the game to provide skill practice, the skills are modified to provide practice with the tactical challenges of the game. This approach capitalizes on the intrinsic motivation most children have for playing games (Thorpe & Bunker, 1989). The approach is grounded by the assumption that the demands of a game require far more than simple physical skillfulness. Mitchell, Griffin and Oslin (1994) recognize that while the contribution of motor skill execution to game performance is critical, decisions concerning “what to do” in appropriate game situations are as important as the ability to execute the selected motor skills. “Mistakes commonly observed in young children in various sports may stem from a lack of knowledge about what to do in the context of a given sport situation” (French & Thomas, 1987, p. 17). The TGFU model shifts the interest from physical ability to game understanding.

Since both skill and knowledge contribute to game performance, it was necessary to research the realm of cognition as it related to the models. This knowledge component includes declarative knowledge, the factual information about rules and goals, and the procedural knowledge, including the if-then statements for completing a sequence of actions. In high-strategy activities, procedural knowledge involves the selection of an appropriate action within the context of a game. Proponents of the TGFU model suggest that exposing children to game-like experiences early in the teaching-learning process helps them acquire substantive declarative and procedural knowledge, thereby facilitating successful, tactical decision-making during play. If a foundation of declarative knowledge (Anderson, 1976), such as knowledge of the rules and regulations is necessary for the development of procedural knowledge, then the provision of game-like experiences early in the teaching-learning process should help students acquire a more substantive knowledge base and facilitate appropriate, strategic decision making abilities. McPherson and French (1991) also indicated that students’ declarative knowledge and decision-making during games increased dramatically when strategy was emphasized first.
Kirk and MacPhail (2002) provided the following example in soccer. The various strategies that may be employed for getting past an opponent in soccer would require some knowledge of the rules and techniques of the game. Both developing and accomplished players need to expand their attention from how to perform a skill to how and when to perform it (Rink, 2001). Decisions concerning appropriate actions in game situations are often as important as the execution of the motor skills used to carry out those actions (French & Thomas, 1987). Many mistakes commonly observed in beginning performers may stem from a lack of knowledge about what to do in the context of a given sport situation (French & Thomas, 1987). Singer (1982) illustrated that if the purpose of a learning experience is to lead to the development of a learning process, to encourage learners to think, resolve any situational dilemmas, and adapt to new but related game situations, then the encouragement of decision-making approaches in the initial learning situations should be advantageous. It may be argued that traditional games teaching neglects these premises. Thomas, French, and Humphries (1986) explained that “sport performance is a complex product of cognitive knowledge about the current situation and past events combined with the player’s ability to produce the sport skill(s) required” (p. 259). If students do not understand the game, their ability to select the correct technique for a given situation is hindered. Bunker & Thorpe (1986) propose that the uniqueness of games lies in the decision-making processes that precede the use of appropriate techniques.

Rink, French, Tjeerdsma (1996) postulated that the cognitive aspects of the game might be more easily acquired than the motor skill aspects. “Many low skilled students find their initial success in their cognitive understanding of the ideas behind the games. They can demonstrate that competence to the teacher and to themselves when they are asked to think of solutions to different problems typical of all net games” (Doolittle, 1995, p. 19).

Games Classification System Within the TGFU Model

At the core of the TGFU approach is the games classification system. This system provides curricular structure for teaching games by organizing sports by their fundamental design (Doolittle & Girard, 1991). This classification model, established by Werner, Bunker, and Thorpe in the 1980’s, allows teachers to teach the essential
components of all games rather than the superficial specifics of each. It grew out of the desire to give individuals a more generic appreciation for games and an understanding of the similarities and differences between game forms. The underlying principle of the games classification system is the generic strategies within games that share a similar tactical framework. Games classification curriculum uses knowledge from one game to accelerate learning and performance in another game from the same games category (Jones & Farrow, 1999). For instance, tactical awareness of gaining possession in basketball may enhance soccer and hockey performance due to the inherent similarities that exist between these distinct games.

There are many different forms of games categories, structures, and classifications (for complete list, see Werner & Almond, 1990) but the framework most commonly accepted is Bunker, Thorpe and Almond’s (1984) games classification model (Table 1). Table 1
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Games classification system, modified from Thorpe, Bunker and Almond (1984)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invasion</th>
<th>Net/Wall</th>
<th>Fielding/Run Scoring</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>Bowling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>Handball</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>Croquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>Golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>Racquetball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Handball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate Frisbee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Polo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This model categorized games into four game classifications: invasion, net/wall, fielding/run scoring and target. Werner and Almond (1990) defined each as the following:

- **Invasion games** are played on courts, fields, rinks or pools by two equal teams. As the game is played, teams intermingle and attempt to outscore the opponent by invading the opponent’s territory.

- **Net/Wall games** include those in which teams are divided by a net or play against a wall. Unlike invasion games where territory is invaded, net/wall games feature strategies in which players gain an offensive advantage by placing objects on a court so their opponent cannot effectively make a return.
• Fielding and run-scoring games include those in which an object is struck into a field of play as a symbol of invasion; the defensive team attempts to field the ball and limit runs being scored.

• Target games are the least complex of all the games and include bowling and golf. Target games involve games in which participants are trying to hit some type of a target.

Intuitively it makes sense that learning one invasion game, for example, field hockey might facilitate learning another invasion game, such as soccer. Here, a concept of the game, for example moving into an open space in field hockey, is held constant, and students apply that concept to different games within the same game form, including soccer, lacrosse, basketball, and so on, given that the games come from the same game classification category. Despite the different skills employed in these games, they are very similar from a tactical perspective in that they involve movements and skills aimed either at invading the opponent’s space or at preventing scoring by defending space and the goal. By encouraging students to see each of the categories of as a complete game type, the TGFU approach helps students understand the relationship among games and the skills that make up that type (Chandler, 1996). “This would enable students to gain a deeper understanding of decision making aspects of game play, provide a more effective games education, and allow for an enhanced progression of tactical concepts to be addressed during instruction” (Mitchell & Oslin, 1999a, p. 165) making teaching more efficient and student learning more meaningful.

Inherent to both the TGFU model and the games classifications is the idea that students play a major role in learning, whereby they are taught the structure of the content and the relationships between content areas, and as a result, the students will be able to construct cognitive maps for the information learned (Rink, French, & Tjeerdsma, 1996). The job of the teacher in the specified content area would be to design learning experiences that encourage students to discover principles and concepts for themselves so that these concepts will transfer to other applicable areas. “Anything (that) can help teachers make connections among activities is going to be valuable, since the multi-activity program often takes the form of an exposure curriculum where students get a sprinkling of many activities” (Chandler, 1996, p. 50). Pigott (1982) expressed
dissatisfaction with the traditional curriculum methods that were presented as a disconnected series of self-contained packages. What is certain is that technique-based approaches to teaching games have not encouraged teachers to explore the connections between games with similar conceptual bases (Brooker, Kirk, Braiuka, & Bransgrove, 2000). Mitchell and Oslin (1999a) addressed the following question: “Does the ability to make appropriate decision during game play situation transfer between badminton and pickleball?” Their results

...suggest(ed) the likelihood that the learning of tactical concepts in one game might aid game performance in another tactical similar game, suggesting implications for the relationship between teaching methods and curriculum design. Specifically the use of a TGFU model in an appropriately organized and sequenced games curriculum might aid in the development of intelligent game performance in this valuable area of school Physical Education” (p.170-71).

Jones and Farrow (1999) suggested that utilization of the games classification is “…successful in promoting the transfer of previously learned information about one game to the learning of a new game” (p.103). Games experiences in school should not be a summation of playing several games, but rather a continuous experience that provides progression (Werner, Thorpe & Bunker, 1996). Chandler (1996) added the following, “Think how much easier we can make teachers’ jobs if students playing soccer are also learning components of game play that will be useful in lacrosse or basketball” (p. 50).

By organizing the curriculum in a way that takes these similarities and differences into account, we help students form connections and transfer knowledge (Almond, 1986; Butler, 1997; Mitchell, 1996; Mitchell & Oslin, 1999a). The games classification system could provide for a basis for selection and allow a teacher to build on information learned in playing one game when introducing and playing a game from the same classification category. Mitchell and Oslin (1999a) suggested that it might be wise to teach games with similar tactical goals consecutively in order to emphasize and capitalize on their tactical similarities. Transfer of learning should provide the basis for the sequencing of skills and/or concepts to be learned. Games experiences can be designed so that students receive continuous opportunities to be involved in activities throughout the school year.
that are selected to provide progression, balance and transfer of learning (Werner, Thorpe & Bunker, 1996). Once one accepts the TGFU approach, it becomes difficult to separate games into discrete elements because the principles that are used to solve tactical problems are common. “For example, the teacher recognizes that what he or she says in basketball may well be useful in soccer and he or she begins to view the games curriculum in a different light” (Thorpe, Bunker, & Almond, 1984, p. 163). A well-balanced games program can be developed from games classification, teaching broader and more fundamental tactical considerations, and using curriculum time more effectively (Jones & Farrow, 1999).

**TGFU Effects on Student Motivation**

Though to physical educators, the instructional and skill/drill phases of a lesson or unit may be seen as a vital part of games instruction, Bunker and Thorpe (1986) stated that students do not necessarily share the same beliefs, and as a result, low student motivation may ensue. Schmidt (1988) believed that it is important that students be motivated to attempt a skill in order for learning to occur. Simply playing the game provides motivation for the students to participate, motivation which learning skills in isolation so often erodes (Chandler, 1996). If the student perceives the task as meaningless or undesirable, then learning from it will probably be minimal. If students appreciate the value of using particular skills within a game situation, it stands to reason that they will show greater motivation to practice those skills. Rink (1996) stated that one of the ultimate goals of sports instruction “…is to enable students to enjoy participation and to play the game reasonably well so that they have increased motivation to play and gain the benefits of participation” (p. 397).

Researchers have commonly cited instances when students ask the ever-popular question, “When can we play a game?” (Berkowitz, 1996; Chandler, 1996; Thorpe, Bunker, & Almond, 1984; Werner, Thorpe, & Bunker, 1996; Werner, 1989). Thorpe, Bunker, and Almond (1986) suggested that the development of tactical awareness should precede development of the motor skills so that students will be motivated to participate in games by their new found tactical understanding. Understanding the game and wanting to play it better motivates us to return to the game (Chandler, 1996). Because the TGFU approach is both game-dependent and student-centered rather than being content-centered
and teacher-dependent, it provides self-propelling motivation (Chandler, 1996). Educators are able to use the motivation of games within the TGFU model to provide learning opportunities for students of all ability levels while fostering task and skill mastery (Chandler, 1996). It is this motivation for task mastery within a game setting that the TGFU strives to attain.

TGFU Shortcomings

Though the TGFU model has many strengths, the shortcomings that have emerged through recent research efforts were noteworthy to mention. These shortcomings can be categorized into three main areas: (1) teachers’ extensive knowledge base, both in content and pedagogical aspects, (2) misinterpretations of various aspects of the teaching games for understanding model, and (3) the lack of total commitment by the teacher or merely the lack of the knowledge that a high level of commitment is needed.

TGFU requires that teachers are truly knowledgeable about the deep structure of games (Chandler, 1996). Curricular pitfalls occur when teachers with a surface-level of understanding of difficult or confusing topics attempt to apply the knowledge in teaching and learning situations. In order to be successful, teachers must be able to completely understand and select developmentally appropriate activities and game forms, and then present them to students in a manner that can be easily comprehended. During every aspect of a TGFU lesson, the teacher must show how a concept fits into the larger context of the game, all while never losing sight of the fact that skill progression and skill practice are still very important. It takes a talented teacher to know what game situations will focus on selected skills, as well as to apply those skills in a game of appropriate level of difficulty (Turner, 1996). It is highly unlikely that teachers will always provide game forms that are true parallels of the game. It is a “…complex challenge for teachers to think of ways of representing games forms or devising enabling games to illustrate certain principles” (Thorpe, Bunker & Almond, 1986). Chandler (1996) added that even if teachers promote skills that are effective in the game form, it is highly possible that these skills will be inappropriately developed because of a lack of congruence between the activity and game form. When thinking about the knowledge base needed to successfully implement the TGFU model, we must ask ourselves, “Will beginning practitioners be able to develop appropriate modified games for students who are at
varying stages of skill and tactical awareness?” In the worst-case scenario, this confusion can lead to the game-only approach, where students play the game while the teacher emphasizes the rules and gives the students overall, game related feedback, for instance, where to position themselves. There is no discernable progression in this game-only approach, and soon the students become overwhelmed by the game’s complexity. Even the students who are capable of successfully performing in the game become bored and frustrated (Hopper, 2002).

Though content specific knowledge is vital to successfully implementing the model, pedagogical content knowledge is equally important. Pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) is defined as “the capacity of a teacher to transform the content knowledge he or she possesses into forms that are pedagogically powerful yet adaptive to the variation in ability and background presented by the students” (Shulman, 1987, p.15). Understanding games and sports from a participant’s perspective is simply not enough for excellent teaching. “Teachers need pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) so that they can “package” everything they understand – about the learners, the activity, the physical education program goals, the instructional strategies, the school, the students, and the community – in order for the students to learn” (Griffin, Dodds, & Rovegno, 1996, p. 8). Teachers must assume responsibility for appropriately identifying student needs and then selecting material accordingly, a daunting task considering the research citing that many beginning teachers have difficulties observing students’ movement, giving appropriate feedback, planning developmentally appropriate progressions, and generating explanations and tasks that match the learner’s needs (Rovegno, 1991; 1993a; 1993b; 1994; 1995; Rovegno & Bandhauer, 1994).

The next shortcoming of the TGFU approach may exist as a result of the model’s highly complex nature. TGFU is not a simple approach to implement, and with this level of difficulty comes the increased probability that people will misinterpret several aspects of the model. For example, teachers can acquire the impression that ‘teaching for understanding’ is not concerned with the teaching of techniques. Given that there is an increase in game play within the lesson, a misconception can develop based on the subsequent decrease of time spent in skill drills.
Another misperception is associated with the frequent discussion and questioning installments that the students did not readily equate with learning in physical education. Students are traditionally accustomed with being told what they are going to learn and why? Though the question and answer sessions are carefully calculated, students may interpret this aspect of the lesson as non-educational because they were not directly provided the answers.

Lastly, Chandler and Mitchell (1990) noted that in the United Stated use of any teaching approach that does not focus of the teaching of specific skills is often misinterpreted as the “ball roller” approach to games teaching, where students are permitted to play without any teacher intervention. Opponents of the teaching games for understanding approach caution that this model might be a glorified “roll out the ball” model, and while it is possible, Werner (1989) stated that it is no different than the teaching practices of teachers who teach a few skill drills and let the students play the game for the remainder of the unit.

The final weakness of this model is that once a teacher commits to using the TGFU approach they must understand that it is not a short-term commitment. It requires extensive teacher planning, knowledge of game play, and a commitment to using the model for all or most of an instructional program. For example, due to the small-sided nature of these games, it is necessary to have several games played simultaneously in the gymnasium or field space so that students are not sitting and watching others play (Mitchell, 2000). Planning for and setting up enough fields or activity areas to enable teams to be small takes a considerable amount of time. The planning and set-up time alone could deter the most willing practitioners.

Game Performance Assessment Instrument (GPAI)

Skills tests in physical education are typically implemented before and/or after a unit of instruction and are used predominantly as a summative form of evaluation. These skills tests assume that the test scores represent the students’ ability to perform the skills in a game setting. What these scores neglect to represent is the ability of the student to perform skills when and where those skills are appropriate. Given that game play is a dynamic event that requires skill proficiency, as well as tactical understanding, results from summative skills tests can not sufficiently measure all that is needed to be
successful in game or game-like settings. While skill proficiency is important to successful game performance, it is only one facet of game play, and in team sports in particular, a considerable portion of game play occurs off-the-ball. Mitchell, Oslin and Griffin (1995) added that it is these decisions or movements made by the players who are not in possession of the ball that are critical to the overall success of a team.

Mitchell, Oslin, and Griffin (1995) developed the Game Performance Assessment Instrument (GPAI) that was “designed to provide teachers and researchers with a means of observing and coding performance behaviors that demonstrate the ability to solve tactical problems in games by making decisions, moving appropriately, and executing skills” (p. 40). This assessment provides a means of thinking more broadly about game performance and assessing game play in its entirety. The GPAI provides analyses of individual categories, (e.g., decision making, skill execution and player support), and/or over game performance, (game involvement and game performance). Griffin, Mitchell and Oslin (1997) broadly defined the seven GPAI seven components, which extend beyond mere skill execution alone.

1. Base: Appropriate return of performer to a “base” position between skill attempts
2. Decision making: Making appropriate decisions about what to do with the ball during a game
3. Skill execution: Efficient execution of selected skills
4. Support: Provides appropriate support for a teammate with a ball by being in position to receive a pass
5. Guard/Mark: Appropriate guarding/marking of an opponent who may or may not have the ball
6. Cover: Provides appropriate defensive cover, help, or backup for a player making a challenge for the ball
7. Adjust: Movement of performer, either offensively or defensively, as necessitated by the flow of the game

One of the appealing aspects of the GPAI is that the user may adapt the instrument and the components selected based on the game being assessed and the particular focus of a particular game or lesson.
Validity and reliability of the GPAI were examined through three separate studies using middle school physical education specialists and their sixth-grade classes (Oslin, Mitchell & Griffin, 1998). Findings suggest that though not all observation categories were appropriate for all games, the GPAI provides a valid and reliable method for assessing game performance.

**Statement of the Problem**

If the ultimate goal of physical education is to produce skillful movers, then educators must be concerned with providing the best environment possible for those skills to be obtained. The tactical Teaching Games for Understanding model was developed to address the high percentage of students who were leaving physical education programs with little to no skill and/or knowledge. As physical educators are challenged to increase student participation in lifelong activities, the TGFU approach may promote this involvement by using the self-propelling motivation of games to foster increased participation and resulting increase in skill acquisition. If TGFU leads to more skillful, knowledgeable and motivated participants, as many proponents of the model have claimed, then we must determine how to prepare and provide physical educators with the curricular knowledge and experiences to facilitate future implementation of the TGFU model (Light, 2003). Chandler (1996) referred to this as the “double barreled approach” which promotes teacher’s skills through improved pedagogical content knowledge, while encouraging a student centered approach to learning. Griffin, Dodds and Rovegno (1996) cited pedagogical content knowledge as the quality that affords physical education teachers the best opportunities to build bridges between students and physical activities and to help students become highly skillful movers.

Findings suggest that in certain situations teachers make curricular, instructional and assessment decisions that reflect their value orientation profile (Ennis, 1994; Ennis & Chen, 1993; Ennis, Chen & Ross, 1992). Teachers’ beliefs and values directly influence their choices of content topics, their willingness to enthusiastically teach a curriculum, and the nature of their instructional and assessment decisions. Teacher beliefs about the value of the content and its relevance and meaning to the students play an important role in their motivation to teach the curriculum. “In reality, teachers are influenced by a number of value perspectives that blend to influence their curricular and instructional
plans” (Ennis, 1994, p. 166). Kirk and McPhail (2002) stated that we know very little about how teachers use the TGFU model and whether it is valuable to them as a model of instruction.

It is important to examine teacher’s experiences related to a variety of different content areas and curriculum models in order to add to the research base that could assist teachers and teacher educators in making informed choices. If we do not examine pre-service teachers’ experiences planning, implementing and assessing in the TGFU model of instruction, then it will be difficult to address variables related to the education of pre-service teachers. “If teacher education programs encourage change in the way physical education is taught in schools then we need to better understand the ways in which the beliefs, attitudes, and personal histories of engagement in physical culture, which pre-service teachers bring with them, shape their responses to innovative approaches such as TGFU” (Light, 2003). The purpose of this study was to examine and describe four pre-service teacher’s experiences planning, implementing and assessing the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding skill instruction model.

**Research Questions**

The specific research questions addressed were:

1. What are the pre-service teacher’s experiences during the *planning* phases of the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model?
2. What are the pre-service teachers experiences *implementing* the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model?
3. What are the pre-service teachers experiences *assessing* student’s skills, using the Games Performance Assessment Instrument, in the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model?
4. Is there a relationship between the pre-service teacher’s value orientation and their implementation of the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model?

**Definition of Terms**

The following are the definitions of terms used in this dissertation and are provided to assist in the reading and comprehension of it:
1. **Tactical model**: A curriculum model that focuses on developmentally appropriate skill acquisition and insures that skills are learned at a time when their value to the game is appreciated, also referred to as the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding (TGFU) model (Griffin, Mitchell, & Oslin, 1997).

2. **Tactical awareness**: The ability to identify problems that arise while a game is in progress and to select necessary skills to solve these problems (Mitchell, Griffin, & Oslin, 1994).

3. **Intrinsic motivation**: Taking part in a task primarily for the sake of the activity itself, for the enjoyment it provides, the learning it permits, and/or the satisfaction it brings (Csikszentmihalyi & Nakamura, 1989).

4. **Games Performance Assessment Instrument**: A multidimensional system designed to measure game performance behaviors that demonstrate tactical understanding, as well as a player’s ability to solve tactical problems by selecting and applying the appropriate skills (Oslin, Mitchell, & Griffin, 1998).

5. **Value Orientation**: Value orientations are the belief systems about teaching and learning that represent competing philosophies and are assumed to affect priorities concerning educational decisions. They are represented in five value orientations, including discipline mastery, learning process, ecological integration, social responsibility, and self-actualization (Ennis & Chen, 1993).

**Assumptions**

The assumptions of this study are:

1. The participants in this study will respond *truthfully* to the questions asked on the daily questionnaires, as well as the semi-structured, post-study interview.
2. The participants in this study will respond *accurately* to the questions asked on the daily questionnaires, as well as the semi-structured, post-study interview.

**Limitations**

The limitations of this study are:

1. The study will be limited to the four pre-service teachers.
2. The results can only be generalized to the four pre-service teachers.
3. Participants in this study are not permitted to randomly select the students they will instruct.
4. Peer review will be utilized to select pre-service teachers from a pool of students who have successfully passed KINS 145A, Analysis of Team Passing Games at California State University, Sacramento.

**Significance of the Study**

It is common for professionals in the field of physical education to investigate various teaching methods, styles and curricular approaches. Over the past two decades the debate has evolved and, fittingly, research related to the Tactical Teaching Games for Understanding model has followed suit (Allison & Thorpe, 1997; French, Werner, Rink, Taylor, & Hussey, 1996; French, Werner, Taylor, Hussey, & Jones, 1996; Gabriele & Maxwell, 1995; Griffin, Oslin, & Mitchell, 1995; Lawton, 1989; Turner & Martinek, 1992, 1995). The majority of research efforts related to the TGFU model have focused on student performance outcomes; including knowledge, skill, and game play performance. Thus far, the research has been restricted to cognitive and psychomotor student learning outcomes. Strean and Holt (2000) suggested that it is no longer sufficient to assess and report only on physical or cognitive performances of students.

As literature and research in the area of Teaching Games for Understanding has intensified, Strean & Holt (2000) postulated that investigating affect and enjoyment might offer some direction for bringing greater consideration of affect into games teaching. Given that children, teachers, coaches and parents all acknowledged that games and game-like situations were more fun than skill oriented drills (Strean & Holt, 2000), there was no evidence that research has attempted to illustrate whether teachers, novice or experts, enjoy and/or prefer the planning, implementing and assessing processes involved in teaching the TGFU approach. The need for more extensive research examining the tactical TGFU instructional model was necessary to provide teachers with information to make informed decisions about their selection of games instruction models.
The purpose of this study was to examine and describe pre-service teacher’s experiences planning, implementing and assessing the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model. The research questions this study addressed were as follows:

1. What are the pre-service teacher’s experiences during the planning phases of the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model?
2. What are the pre-service teacher’s experiences implementing the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model?
3. What are the pre-service teacher’s experiences assessing student’s skills, using the Games Performance Assessment Instrument, in the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model?
4. Is there a relationship between the pre-service teacher’s value orientation and their implementation of the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model?

This chapter is divided into the following sections: (1) participants, (2) instruction and treatment validation, (3) instrumentation, (4) procedure for data collection, (5) data analysis, and (6) pilot study findings and resulting study transformations.

Participants
Pre-Service Teachers

Four pre-service teachers were selected from a list of students who successfully completed the senior level course - Kinesiology 145A, Analysis of Team Passing Games in the fall, 2003 and spring, 2004 semesters. A panel of experts selected the pre-service
teachers who they believed were capable of implementing the lessons, and whose expertise and competence was rendered to be adequate to successfully carry out the lessons, with special consideration given to the ability of the pre-service teacher to provide congruent, model-specific feedback. This panel of experts was composed of the nine members of the California State University, Sacramento’s Physical Education Committee. Members of this committee consist of faculty experts appointed by the Department of Kinesiology and Health Science, with an expertise in preparing pre-service teachers. Once selected by the panel, each of the pre-service teachers was given the opportunity to volunteer to be part of the data collection process of this study. There was no compensation for these participants, other than a certificate of appreciation and letter of recommendation. Three female and one male volunteered. Ages of the pre-service teachers were 24, 26, 30 and 31 years old.

Public School Students

The public school students involved in this study were 102 fifth grade students (55 boys and 47 girls) from four coeducational, public school classes in an urban school located in northern California. Each class (n = 23 to 27) received daily physical education as part of their regular school curriculum. The students in these classes represented a low socioeconomic status and were divided into the following ethnic backgrounds: 28.4% White, non-Hispanic, 27.5% African-American, 22.5% Asian-American, 14.7% Hispanic, and 6.9% Filipino. The two pre-service teachers involved in the pilot study taught one-fourth grade class (9 male and 13 female) and one-sixth grade class (8 male and 10 female).

The school was selected because: (a) it was within reasonable driving distance of the university; (b) the physical educators were willing to administer and collect the parental and student informed consent documents as procedurally dictated by Florida State University’s Human Subjects Committee and California State University, Sacramento’s Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects; and (c) the school administration was willing to permit a study of this nature to be conducted on their campus. Permission to conduct the study was obtained through Florida State University Human Subjects Committee and California State University, Sacramento’s Human Subjects Review Committee, as well as from the public school authorities, teachers,
parents and children involved in the research study. Consent forms were distributed to all pre-service teachers, as well as the student participants and their parents (see Appendix E). Consent forms were translated into Spanish and traditional Chinese for the non-English speaking parents.

**Instruction and Treatment Validation**

**Lesson Content and Instruction**

Field hockey was selected for this instructional unit because (1) it was chosen in the following studies: Turner (1996), Turner and Martinek (1992; 1995; 1999), and Allison and Thorpe (1997), and (2) the public school students had very little to no previous experience playing field hockey. The unit began with an introductory lesson and was followed by an estimated two to four days for field hockey skills pre-test. Next, each pre-service teacher implemented eight experimental lessons within a two-week period, to the same set of students. The unit concluded with the field hockey skills post-test. The classes were scheduled to be 30-35 minutes in duration. All instruction took place on a large, grass field, with enough space and equipment for each student to be continually involved.

The primary researcher was responsible for the development of the introductory lesson and the first four experimental field hockey lesson plans that the pre-service teachers implemented, and the pre-service teachers were responsible for developing the remaining four tactical lessons. Task descriptions, developmental type of task, class organization, skill cues, and time frames for all eight lessons were documented in detailed lesson plans (see Appendix D). The task description indicated the main focus of that portion of the lesson and explained what the pre-service teachers and the students were asked to do. The developmental type of task was abbreviated in the lesson plans as follows: Informing (inf.), extension (ext.), refining (ref.) and application (app.). Rink (2001) provided the following definition of each type of task. An informing task is the portion of the lesson that presents the initial informational details about what the students will be engaged in for the lesson or particular activity. Movement tasks where the practice conditions are changed are defined as extension tasks. These tasks are manipulated by varying the difficulty or complexity of a motor skills objective during a lesson by changing the condition or the focus of the intent of the task. Tasks that focus a
group of learners on an aspect of performance (the process) without changing the conditions of the task are described as refining tasks. Tasks that focus the students on how to use movement(s) in competitive, self-testing or self-challenging ways are defined as application tasks.

The first lesson was an introductory lesson for all experimental groups. Replicating the methodology performed by French, Werner, Rink, Taylor, and Hussey (1996a) and French, Werner, Taylor, Hussey, and Jones, (1996b), the first day of instruction for all classes included an introduction to the game of field hockey, including brief historical aspects of the game, basic rules and regulations, safety considerations, equipment used, and a description of the field. A short period of game play was introduced during which time students were involved in small-sided (3-on-3) games with small goals and no goalies. No formal instruction related to the tactical model occurred on this day.

The first four tactical TGFU lessons plans (see appendix D) were developed by the primary researcher through the replication of the tactical problems, lesson focuses, objectives, modified games, suggested questions and accompanying answers outlined in the lesson plans in the Griffin, Mitchell and Oslin (1997) and Mitchell, Oslin and Griffin (2003) textbooks. The lessons in these texts, developed for soccer and basketball, were modified for their application to field hockey. Research has shown that sports that fall within the same games classification category, in this case the category of invasion games, have strategic similarities allowing for this transference. Werner & Almond (1990) suggest that as game forms are learned, strategies from one particular game may be transferred to a similar game.

Using a tactical TGFU approach (Bunker & Thorpe, 1982; Griffin, Mitchell & Oslin, 1997), both the primary researcher and the pre-service teachers developed tactical lessons that began with students engaging in a modified game that was constructed so that a tactical problem would emerge for the students during their involvement. Following game play, the pre-service teacher planned to intervene by asking the students predetermined questions about the challenges they experienced during the game. The primary researcher and pre-service teachers highlighted each series of questions in the tactical lesson plan. During the pilot study, it was determined that it was necessary for the
pre-service teachers to carry a 3 x 5 index card to ensure that they recited the questions during the tactical awareness portion of the lesson exactly as they were designed. This card also served as a reminder of the skill cues for the day, which better prepared them to provide their students with congruent feedback. During this question and answer phase of the lesson, the primary researcher and pre-service teachers focused on leading the students to answer “what to do” type questions in particular situations. Once the students were able to identify the tactical problem and solution, they were introduced to an activity that reinforced the skill and relevant tactical skill cues that the students identified as being involved in the solution. The skills taught in the first four tactical lessons included: receiving, shooting, moving to the open spaces, and faking. During the latter portion of each of the tactical lessons, the primary researcher and pre-service teachers planned for the students to return to modified-game play in order to facilitate application of practiced skills to game situations. In each of the lesson plans, the closure consisted of questions related to knowledge of the lesson’s tactical problems that were presented and solved.

Once the first four lesson plans were developed, a panel of experts evaluated the lessons and provided general feedback, as well as feedback regarding the lessons representation of each of the curriculum models. This panel of experts consisted of nine members of the California State University, Sacramento’s Physical Education Committee, which was comprised of faculty experts appointed by the Department of Kinesiology and Health Science, with an expertise in preparing pre-service teachers. After the suggested changes were made to the lessons, two pre-service teachers piloted each of the lessons. Changes, recommended by the two pre-service teachers, the public school physical educators and the primary researcher, were noted. The majority of the changes made to the lessons involved time frames, particularly in the realm of management time, as well as additional activity clarification. (See the “Pilot Study Results and Resulting Transformations” section of the chapter for more details). The four pre-service teachers involved in the data collection of this study reviewed the videotapes of the lessons and provided any additional feedback. The lesson plans were then submitted an additional time to the panel of experts for their final approval.
Pre-Service Teacher Training

The four pre-service teachers involved in the data collection portion of this study all successfully completed the Analysis of Team Passing Games course. Course content relevant to this study consisted of eight weeks of instruction and practical application of the tactical TGFU model within basketball, team handball, field hockey and floor hockey. Each pre-service teacher had an in-class, peer teaching and a middle school teaching experience using the tactical model. The textbooks for this course were Teaching Sport Concepts and Skills: A Tactical Approach (Griffin, Mitchell & Oslin, 1997) and Assessment in Games Teaching (Mitchell & Oslin, 1999b). Articles and chapters that the pre-service teachers were required to read during the course of the semester included: Berkowitz, 1996; Chandler and Mitchell, 1990, 1996; Chapter 13 in Rink, 2001; Werner, 1989; Werner and Almond, 1990; and Werner, Thorpe, & Bunker, 1996. The pre-service teachers had extensive field hockey knowledge as evidenced by a minimum of 90% correct scores on Messick’s (1987) Field Hockey Knowledge Test.

The four pre-service teachers observed each of the four lessons that were videotaped during the pilot test, in order to prepare the pre-service teachers for instruction, as well as to assist in the final phase of the lesson plan revisions. The four pre-service teachers participated in a one-hour workshop and a two-hour workshop, facilitated by the primary researcher, where their participation in the study was discussed, their informed consent was attained, each of the lessons was discussed and questions related to the study and/or lesson plans were addressed. In a brief meeting each day before the lessons were taught, the primary researcher discussed the specifics regarding equipment set-up and critical elements for the lessons, as well as addressed any questions that the pre-service teacher had. Each student was reminded about the daily cues and the importance of congruent feedback.

A critical element to the lesson’s implementation was the congruency of feedback provided by the pre-service teachers. Consistent with procedures conducted in French, et al. (1996a, 1996b), the pre-service teachers were limited to interventions and feedback statements that were consistent with the tactical model, and congruent to the tactical skills selected. In this case, the pre-service teachers were encouraged to only intervene and provide tactical feedback and/or instruction. The 3 X 5 index cards the pre-service
teachers carried highlighted/reminded them of the cues so that they had the key to providing congruent feedback at their fingertips.

The primary researcher was present for every lesson in this study and was responsible for setting the equipment up before each lesson, continually monitoring the pre-service teacher’s instruction, and supervising all of the data collection processes. After each class was taught and after each pre-service teacher completed the daily questionnaire, the primary researcher discussed pedagogical observations with the pre-service teachers, for example, how to reduce management time by not bringing students in for every instructional episode.

Treatment Validation

For each class, the pre-service teachers were video and audio taped. Two back-up video cameras were used to ensure that the lesson was documented. Several important advantages to videotaping research observations have been established (van der Mars, 1989). These advantages include:

1. The video camera meets the criteria of an impartial observer and recorder. The recordings occur without interpretation or bias.
2. Several individuals can review the video recordings, and they may be reviewed more than one time, if necessary.
3. Observer reliability is enhanced.
4. Video recording permits a variety of types of analyses to be completed.

A cordless microphone connected to the video camera, as well as a portable micro-cassette recorder the student carried, was utilized to ensure that the instructions and feedback portions of the lesson plans were also recorded.

In order for the pre-service teacher’s responses to be a valid representation of their experiences within the curriculum model, the lesson plans must be a valid representation of that model. Supported by techniques utilized in French, et al., (1996a, 1996b) and Turner and Martinek, (1999), the treatment validation required data to be collected on each of the following criteria: (a) feedback provided by the pre-service teacher, (b) the instructional aspects regarding games or game-like practices, and (c) time spent during the lesson in games or game-related situations. In order to determine model appropriateness, each of the lessons was evaluated on the following variables: (1) the
nature of the skill feedback, (2) the nature of the content related questions, and (3) the use of time. The following sections describe each of the criteria.

The Nature of Pre-Service Teacher’s Skill Feedback

Skill feedback for each teacher and lesson was counted by episode and categorized by general, specific non-tactical, or specific tactical (see Appendix A). Percentages for each pre-service teacher were calculated based on his/her total number of feedback episodes in each of the categories. The majority of the specific feedback given in the lessons had to be tactically oriented or the lesson was not an appropriate representation of the tactical model and was not used in the data analysis portion of this study.

The Nature of the Pre-Service Teacher’s Questions

Each content related question asked by the pre-service teachers was recorded in order to determine whether the instructional emphasis was tactically based or not (see Appendix B). The questions asked during the lesson provided additional support to the overall lesson focus. Simple percentages were calculated for each of the categories. The majority of the content related questions must be tactically focused to be a valid representation of the model.

Pre-Service Teacher’s Use of Time

Each pre-service teacher’s use of time was coded in five second episodes and placed into the three following categories: instruction, transition/management and activity time. Activity/practice time was broken down further into either “tactical,” which was time spent in game/game-like practices, or simple “activity” time for non-game or game-like practices. Simple percentages were calculated for each category. The activity time were evaluated in order to determine whether the lessons were an appropriate representation of the model. The majority of the activity time in the lessons must be spent on tactically oriented for the lesson to be valid and therefore used in the analysis portion of this study.

Observer Training

In addition to the primary researcher, one independent observer was trained to code the data. This independent observer was a graduate student in the Department of Kinesiology and Health Science at California State University, Sacramento and was
adequately trained in the three systematic observations; use of time, skills feedback, and teacher’s questions. The training of this observer followed the guidelines described by van der Mars (1989a) for proper training of observers. These guidelines include the following five steps: (1) orientation to the coding systems, (2) learning the categories, (3) using the coding forms correctly, (4) initial coding practice, and (5) live observation practice. For practical purposes, this study replaced the live observations with videotaped observations.

Observer Reliability

Observer reliability was critical for accurate interpretation of the data collected. van der Mars (1989a) stated that interobserver reliability is measured by the degree to which multiple observers using the same definitions and coding protocol, while observing the same activity, agree upon their coding. In order to establish reliability and validity for this study, interobserver agreement was determined before coding the data can commence. Interobserver reliability was calculated as follows:

\[
\text{Agreements} \times \frac{X}{100} \text{Agreements + Disagreements}
\]

Once interobserver agreement of at least .85 was obtained with the training videotape, the primary researcher and observer began coding the data. An interobserver reliability check was conducted halfway through the study to monitor for observer drift and to re-verify that the percentage of agreement remained at an acceptable level.

Instrumentation

In order to gather adequate data related to pre-service teachers’ experiences planning, implementing and assessing within the tactical TGFU model of skill instruction, both quantitative and qualitative research instruments were utilized. Given that these research methods both have their strengths and weaknesses, utilization of both of the methods contributed to a strengthened methodology. Although some may argue the superiority of one research method over another, Earls (1986) stated that both paradigms should be seen as complimentary, not competitive. To ensure that the results obtained through the data collection process accurately portrayed what was actually occurring,
triangulation, or overlapping of methods, was employed. Verma and Mallick (1999) defined triangulation as, “a process of corroborating judgments by drawing evidence from more than one source – for example from interviews, questionnaires and observations” (p. 205). Using multiple methods to provide different types of data created what Patton (1990) referred to as “cross-data validity checks”. The collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data provided the primary researcher with more specific information about the experiences that the pre-service teachers encountered. The primary researcher anticipated that more specific and detailed information would be of greater use in understanding each of the three phases of the tactical TGFU model represented in the methodology.

The quantitative instruments utilized in the study were Messick’s (1987) Field Hockey Knowledge Test, the Value-Orientation Inventory-2 (VOI-2), and the Henry-Friedel Field Hockey Test (H.F.F.H.T.). The qualitative measures implemented in this study included post-lesson questionnaires and post-study, semi-structured interviews. The last instrument that was utilized was the Game Performance Assessment Instrument (GPAI). This section will review the specific aspects related to utilization in each of these instruments.

Quantitative Measures

Messick’s (1987) Field Hockey Knowledge Test

In order to test the pre-service teacher’s declarative and procedural field hockey knowledge, this study mimicked Turner (1996) and Turner and Martinek’s (1992) implementation of the Messick’s (1987) Field Hockey Knowledge Test. The pre-service teachers had extensive field hockey knowledge as evidenced by a minimum of 90% correct scores on the 270-question test.

Value Orientation Inventory-2 (VOI-2)

The Value Orientation Inventory-2 (Ennis & Chen, 1993) was utilized to determine the pre-service teacher’s value orientation profile. The VOI-2 is a 90-item instrument, 18 sets of five value orientation teaching statements, for which a composite score for each orientation was developed. Higher composite value orientation scores indicated a high priority. Alpha coefficients for the subscales range from .65 to .82.
As reported in Ennis & Chen, 1995) reliability coefficient of .70 is acceptable for the affective domain.

Given that the pre-service teachers’ beliefs impact the learning environment and all related components, it was critical to examine their beliefs about teaching and learning. These belief systems represent competing philosophies and are assumed to affect priorities concerning educational decisions. They are represented in five value orientations, including discipline mastery, learning process, ecological integration, social responsibility, and self-actualization (Ennis & Chen, 1993).

The Henry-Friedel Field Hockey Test (H.F.F.H.T.)

The Henry-Friedel Field Hockey Test was used as a pretest and posttest measure of the public school student’s general field hockey skills. The H.F.F.H.T. was selected for the following reasons: (1) it was used in Turner and Martinek (1992, 1999), (2) it provided a measure of field hockey playing ability, and (3) it incorporated the attacking skills of ball control, dribbling, beating an opponent and shooting. On the whistle each student was required to run 15 yards with a field hockey stick in hand(s) to a target area where he or she received a ball, then dribbled and controlled the ball for 5 yards, performed a dodge around a stationary person, dribbled another 5 yards, performed a circular tackle around a cone and returned 10 yards to a restraining line before shooting at the goal. At the beginning of each of the skills pre-test lessons, the primary researcher provided the students with a full demonstration of the test, which included what the skills looked like and where in the trial they were to be performed.

Each subject completed the trials of the test, alternating with other pupils as indicated by the test procedures. Each trial provided a time score and a shooting accuracy score for each student. At each site a timekeeper and scorer/recorder conducted the test. An overall mean score for the trials was calculated for both of these components.

The validity of the H.F.F.H.T. was previously determined via its comparison to the Strait Field Hockey Test (Barrow, McGee & Tritschler, 1989). The H.F.F.H.T. test reliability was calculated using test-retest and ANOVA. The total test scores were .71 and .67, respectively (Barrow, et al., 1989).
Qualitative Measures

McLaughlin (2002) described the nature of qualitative research as emphasizing the “process, or how things happen, and a focus on attitudes, beliefs and thoughts – how people make sense of their experiences as they interpret their world” (p. 209). Qualitative researchers study variables in their natural setting, and then focus on how people make sense or interpret their experiences in that setting. In order to obtain the dynamic qualitative details of the pre-service teacher’s experiences, including their attitudes, qualitative questionnaires and interviews were employed.

The qualitative portions of this study sought to describe the pre-service teacher’s experiences related to their involvement in the planning, implementing and assessing phases of utilizing the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding skill instruction model. Slavin (1984) reported that when both questionnaires and interviews were utilized to gather data, “a decision has to be made about the functions of the two data gathering exercises” (p. 118) and whether these methods were to be complimentary or supplementary. If they are to be complimentary, in which case they would cover different but related aspects of the study, then they will have to be constructed as if they were the sole instruments utilized. If they are to be supplementary, that is to say that they will cover much of the same information, but at an increased level of detail, this will affect the number and nature of the questions asked. It was the primary researcher’s goal to use these two measures to supplement each other, as well as the quantitative data, with the richly detailed data about the pre-service teacher’s skill instructional model experiences through the utilization of a daily questionnaire, as well as a post-study, semi-structured interview.

Daily Questionnaire

Immediately following each of the eight experimental lessons, the pre-service teachers filled out a daily questionnaire, designed for self-completion. Bogdan and Biklen (1992) stated that data obtained through questionnaires provides insight as to how the participants interpret their world. The daily questionnaire was composed of four open-form questions, which Slavin (1984) described as questions where the responses are not categorically restricted. He continued that though open-form questions are difficult to code and are time consuming, they are very valuable when respondent’s complex
responses do not lend themselves to the categories within the closed-form questions. Since this questionnaire supplemented the other data gathered, only four questions were employed. The open-ended daily questionnaire included the following questions:

1. Please describe what you liked and/or disliked about this lesson plan.
2. Please explain in what ways it was easy and/or challenging to implement this lesson plan.
3. Explain why you would or wouldn’t choose to teach this lesson again in the future.
4. Explain what you think your students liked and/or disliked in this lesson. When relevant, please give examples to explain.

An important resource in establishing a questionnaire is fieldwork in the environment prior to the development of the survey. Patton (1982) stated that by spending time in the relative environment observing what is happening, talking with participants and learning about their concerns and interests, the researcher can develop insights that will make it possible to “ground” the questionnaires in the realities of firsthand, direct program experience.

Piloting the Questionnaire

In interview studies of this nature, it was critical to pilot test the instrument on respondents similar to the intended subjects of the main study. This process was conducted to identify possible weaknesses in the protocol so they can be corrected. Slavin (1984) added that pilot testing also provides important training for interviewers and almost always brings up issues that will need to be addressed in advance, including, but not limited to: pacing, how long to wait for a response, what to do when respondents say “I don’t know”, and/or how to determine whether an answer is complete. Resolving these issues in advance will reduce unwanted differences between interviews and, “is likely to increase the ultimate reliability of the interviews” (Slavin, 1984, p.91).

The daily questionnaire was employed on the two pre-service teachers involved in the pilot study. The pilot test revealed that two of the questions were not truly open-ended questions. Patton (1982) added that,

The truly open-ended question does not presuppose which dimensions of feeling, analysis, or thought will be salient for the interviewee. The truly
open-ended question allows the person being interviewed to select from among his or her full repertoire of possible responses. (p. 170)

In this case, one of the original questions was, “What did you like about this lesson?” This question prohibited the pre-service teacher from answering freely and guided him/her to provide a favorable answer, when in fact, the pre-service teacher may not have liked anything in the lesson. The necessary changes were made to neutralize these questions, and this question read, “Please describe what you liked and/or disliked about this lesson plan.” Additional details regarding these results can be found in the “Pilot Study Results and Resulting Transformations” section of this chapter.

Validity of the Daily Questionnaire

Though statistically based forms of validity are numerically concrete, Patton (1982) places a high value on “face validity”. He added,

For local evaluations aimed at getting simple straightforward information from participants in a program, and where results will not be generalized beyond the local setting, I shall argue that the concern for face validity is not only sufficient, but is, indeed, a priority. (p. 153)

The daily questionnaire was presented to the panel of experts comprised of the Physical Education Committee at CSU, Sacramento, and they concurred that the questionnaire appeared to have face validity.

Post-Study Semi-Structured Interview

A post-study interview was administered immediately following the completion of all of the lesson plans. An interview is defined as a series of questions given by an interviewer to which the interviewee makes verbal responses (Slavin, 1984). Individuals are asked specific questions and are allowed to answer using their own words. Bogdan and Biklen (1998) stated that,

The goal of understanding how the person you are interviewing thinks is at the center of the interview. The researcher has to be captive to the larger goal of the interview – understanding. (p. 97)

Interviews fall into three categories: (1) structured, (2) semi-structured and (3) unstructured or open-ended. In a structured interview, a list of questions is prepared, and the interviewer must not deviate from the list, or “script”, in any fashion. At the other end
of the spectrum, the unstructured interview employs broadly defined objectives and allows a great deal of freedom on both the interviewer and interviewees part. There is a continuum between structured and unstructured, and in the middle of these two categories lies semi-structured, the chosen interview category for this study.

A semi-structured interview involves the set of questions that are intended to provide a guide for the direction of the interview, all while not restricting it. The semi-structured interview does not involve the commitment of a pre-determined set of questions. Rather the semi-structured interview permits the researcher to explore a specific number of major questions and issues, but retain the freedom to delve more deeply into the participants’ responses (McBride, 1989). Bogdan and Biklen added that this structure gives the researcher latitude to pursue a wide range of topics while offering the participant the opportunity to shape the content of the interview. Verma and Mallick (2001) stated that the beauty of interviews is that, “interviewees do not respond in foreseeable ways, and the researcher will have to be ready to invent further questions as the interview proceeds to explore in depth the issue of interest” (p. 124). Follow-up or clarifying questions can be asked if there seems to be “more information there” or misconceptions by either the interviewer or interviewee (Baumgartner, et al., 2002). “Respondents can be asked to clarify or expand on responses, making the data from an interview potentially richer and more complete than that which can be obtained from a questionnaire” (Slavin, 1984, p. 90). The semi-structured interview was utilized and included a series of open-form questions that elicited the experiences of the pre-service teachers with reference to the planning, implementing and assessing within the tactical skill instruction model.

One of the strengths of interviews is the “moderately high measurement validity for well-constructed…interviews” (Johnson & Burke, 2003, p. 308). According to van der Mars (1989a), the goal of any data collection instrument is to portray an accurate picture of what really happened. Therefore, research procedures must ensure that the instrument utilized provides a valid reflection of the events. Slavin (1984) defined content validity as the degree to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure based on research within the field of study. In order for the interview questions to be well-constructed and valid, they must be tightly linked to pertinent data within the
field, in this case; lesson planning, implementing and assessing in physical education. In the process of developing relevant, open-ended interview questions, it was necessary to examine the literature and investigate pre-established frameworks developed by experts in the field to create questions that provided adequate insight into the variables of interest. The following interview questions and prompts for planning were developed from the topics highlighted in Allison and Barrett (2000) chapter; Planning for Student Learning.

Interview Questions and Prompts for Planning

1. Talk to me about the process you went through planning your daily lesson plans.
2. What resources did you use in your planning?
3. How did you begin to decide what content to teach?
4. How did you select which learning cues to use during the lesson?
5. How did you select which activities to use during the lesson?
6. How did you select which modified games to use during the lesson?
7. What things did you consider when you were planning your lesson progression? (modified games – emphasizing skills – modified games)
8. What strategies did you plan for to keep students on-task?
9. What strategies did you plan for to keep students motivated to learn?
10. Describe how your lessons contributed to meeting your learning goals/objectives.
11. What did you expect students to do, feel and know as a result of participating in the lessons?
12. Describe the process of developing the questions that were to lead students to recognize the importance of certain skills.
13. How did you plan the assessments of your students during the lesson?

The following interview questions and prompts for implementation were developed from the topics featured in the Rink’s (2003) chapter titled, Effective Instruction in Physical Education.

Interview Questions and Prompts for Implementation

1. Explain the student’s opportunities to practice tactical skills during the lessons.
   a. Specific to game play
   b. Specific to extensions
2. Looking back on this unit, explain whether or not students had enough time/opportunities to learn the tactical skills.
3. Explain your thoughts on if your activities/extensions resembled game-like situations.
4. Talk to me about the amount of success you felt your student’s experienced in your tactical lesson.
5. Describe the student’s cognitive involvement in these lessons; address tactical question phase, if not addressed.
6. Tell me your feelings about the time spent in managing your lesson, as compared to Activity & Instruction time.
7. Describe the feedback you gave to students during the lessons.
8. How did the student’s react to your feedback statements?
9. Discuss how your students reacted to your instructions, demonstrations and learning cues.
10. How did you feel your Extension, Refinement and Application (ERA) went in the lesson?
11. Do you plan on using this model in the future? If so, when & why. If not, why?

The following interview questions and prompts related to assessment were derived from topics found in Rink (2002).

Interview Questions and Prompts for Assessment

1. How did you feel about using these assessments Games Performance Assessment Instrument (GPAI)?
2. How did you select which components of the GPAI to assess?
3. How did you select the students you chose to assess?
4. Talk to me about how much time you needed to complete the assessment.
5. How do you think the GPAI results will help you make a judgment about the effectiveness of your teaching and the unit?
6. How did you use the results of the GPAI to plan future lessons?
7. When looking at your assessments, explain whether or not your students met your learning objectives.
8. How do you think you might use this to give students a grade?
9. Would you use this assessment in the future? If so, when & why. If not, why?

Additional Assessment Instrument Utilized

Game Performance Assessment Instrument (GPAI)

Each of the pre-service teachers implemented two GPAI’s during the course of this study. The primary researcher developed the first GPAI by replicating an example in the Mitchell and Oslin (1999) *Assessment in Games Teaching*, the manual for this assessment instrument (see Appendix C). The two components selected for the first GPAI were skill execution (e.g. students pass the ball accurately, reaching the intended receiver) and decision making (e.g. students make the appropriate choices when passing – pass to unguarded teammates to set up a scoring opportunity). The second GPAI was developed by each of the pre-service teachers based on their observations of their students during the first four lessons. The outcomes of this assessment were not direct variables of interest and were not analyzed. The GPAI was implemented in order to examine and describe the pre-service teacher’s experiences implementing this assessment.

The GPAI is a multi-dimensional system, developed by Mitchell, Oslin and Griffin (1995), was designed “to provide teachers and researchers with a means of observing and coding performance behaviors that demonstrate the ability to solve tactical problems in games by making decisions, moving appropriately, and executing skills” (p. 40). It permits assessment to take place in actual game play, when skills are authentically applied to the fluid environment of the game. The GPAI provides analyses of individual categories, like decision making, skill execution and player support, and/or overall game performance, including game involvement and game performance. Observation categories for the GPAI include: base, adjust, decision making, skill execution, support, cover and guard/mark.

Validity and reliability were examined through three separate studies using middle school physical education specialists and their sixth-grade class (Oslin, Mitchell & Griffin, 1998). Findings suggest that the GPAI provides a valid and reliable method for assessing game performance.
**Procedure for Data Collection**

Prior to the onset of data collection, the pre-service teachers exhibited their declarative and procedural field hockey knowledge as evidenced by a minimum of 90% correct scores on Messick’s (1987) Field Hockey Knowledge Test. Before the completion of the study, the pre-service teachers completed Ennis and Chen’s (1993) Value Orientation Inventory – 2.

The first day of instruction was an introductory lesson, where the pre-service teachers introduced the game of field hockey, including brief historical aspects of the game, basic rules and regulations, safety considerations, equipment used, and a description of the field. A short period of game play followed, during which time students were involved in small-sided (3-on-3) games with small goals and no goalies. No formal instruction related to the tactical model occurred on this day.

Following the introductory lesson, the H.F.F.H.T. was used to measure the general field hockey skills of the students. During these lessons, which took three days, the students were equally divided into small-sided teams. The teams rotated between the modified games and the H.F.F.H.T. trials. The primary researcher was responsible for administering the H.F.F.H.T., as well as rotating the teams from the pre-test to the modified games. The pre-service teachers monitored the students during their participation in the modified games. The introductory lesson and skills pre-test trials took four days and were the only lessons taught the first week.

Next, each of the pre-service teachers implemented the eight experimental lessons, starting with the four tactical lesson plans developed by the primary researcher, and then followed by the four tactical lessons that the pre-service teachers developed. Immediately following each of the eight experimental lessons, each of the pre-service teachers completed a daily questionnaire based on their experiences during that lesson.

During the first four lessons, each of the pre-service teachers was instructed to utilize the GPAI that the primary researcher developed. During the last four lessons, the pre-service teachers were instructed to utilize the GPAI that they each developed.

The field hockey unit concluded with the H.F.F.H.T. post-test, which took two days. Here again, the students were divided into small-sided teams, and the teams rotated between the modified games and the H.F.F.H.T. trials.
Immediately following the completion of the study, the primary researcher conducted the post-interview with each of the pre-service teachers.

**Data Analysis**

**Quantitative Analysis**

In order to determine whether the pre-service teachers met the minimum requirement of 90% correct scores on Messick’s (1987) Field Hockey Knowledge Test, a percentile score was calculated.

A composite score for each of the pre-service teachers was developed from their responses on the Value Orientation Inventory - 2. A higher composite value orientation score indicated a higher priority. Each of the composite scores was used to determine whether the pre-service teachers had a high, neutral or low priority level for each of the five orientations.

Ten trials of the Henry-Friedel Field Hockey Test were administered. Each trial provided a time score and a shooting accuracy score for each student. A mean score for the trials for each of the classes was calculated for both of the components. Comparisons of the scores the pre- and post test results were conducted.

**Qualitative Analysis**

Independently, transcripts of the post-study interview with the pre-service teachers and the responses to the daily interview was used to generate a tentative coding system of common themes, categories, words, phrases or participant’s ways of thinking (Bogdan & Biklen, 1997). Developing a list of coding categories for the interviews and the questionnaires after the data were collected was a crucial step in data analysis. When a category was formed, all the incidents and conversations that appeared to fit were compared. To choose the best codes, Miles and Huberman (1994) recommended determining how frequently the codes appear. New categories were formed when responses did not fit into pre-existing categories. Once the major categories were in place, the primary researcher searched for trends and differences, as well as inductively began to synthesize explanations and phenomena (McLaughlin, 2002). This involved the comparison of the established themes and categories for each of the pre-service teacher. The multiple data collection technique of the daily questionnaire and the post-study, semi-structured interview helped create triangulation. The primary researcher also
attempted to develop credibility by proving descriptions and quotations that support the findings and conclusions. This system provided a rich description of the pre-service teachers experiences related to the tactical TGFU skill instruction model.

When interview and questionnaire responses are coded, it is essential to compute a reliability coefficient that indicates how closely the independent coders agreed on how to score responses. The coders read the transcriptions and made their rating independently.

\[
\text{Agreements} \times 100 \quad \text{Agreements + Disagreements}
\]

Interobserver reliability was calculated by dividing the number of times the coders agreed on a coding category for a particular item by the number of agreements plus the number of disagreements. “If the coders cannot agree at least 80% of the time, the categories (will) be refined or changed, perhaps by reducing fine distinctions or gradations, until the coders can agree on them (Slavin, 1984, p. 93).

Pilot Study Results and Resulting Transformations

A pilot study was conducted in January of 2004 and included two pre-service teachers (one male and one female), who were enrolled in Kinesiology 145A, Analysis of Team Passing Games course in the fall of 2003. These two pre-service teachers taught one-fourth grade class (9 male and 13 female) and one-sixth grade class (8 male and 10 female). The four lessons developed by the primary researcher were pilot tested to determine whether they adequately represented the intended model, as well as to determine whether the systematic observations sheets would adequately measure the intended variables. The following section contains the transformations made to this study as a result of information obtained during the pilot study and are presented in the following sections: (1) lesson plan modifications, (2) modifications to the teacher questioning observation sheet, and (3) the addition of the qualitative components.

Lesson plan modifications

During the implementation of the lessons, the research and regular public school physical education teachers all provided feedback on the lesson plans. Suggested changes
included, time frames, especially those in the realm of management time, and the provision of additional details for further clarification.

A comparison of activity time during the lessons provided interesting information. Whenever the time allocated to activity time dipped into the management time because less then 50% of the students were active, changes were made to the lesson plan, for example the exclusion of a particular activity, to help motivate the students towards increased activity time.

Analysis of the use of time also indicated during the lesson number two, both pre-service teachers had a lower tactical (game or game-like situations) activity time than non-tactical related activity time. The skill activity times were 39% and 40%, while the time spent activity involved in the game and game-like practices was 19% and 24%, exactly the opposite of what was needed to appropriately validate these lessons. Changes were made to this lesson plan to ensure that more time and feedback were spent in tactical, game or game-like practices.

Also noteworthy to mention is that during the pilot study, it was determined that pre-service teachers needed to carry a 3 x 5 index card to remind them of the exact questions to ask during the tactical awareness questioning portion of the lesson, as well as the skill cues for the day. This immediately increased the accuracy of the questions asked during the lesson, as well as increased the number of congruent feedback statements.

Modifications to the Teacher Questioning Observation Sheet

During the coding of each of the lessons, it was determined that teacher questioning observation sheet needed further modification. Originally, all questions asked during the lesson were to be recorded and then qualified as either tactical or not tactical. Upon review of the results, it was determined that logistical questions related to rules and directions inaccurately affected this number. Questions like, “Can you please go over here?” “Who can tell me what you are supposed to do on the whistle?” were accurately coded as not tactical related questions, but this did not necessary translate to the lesson not being tactically focused.

Originally, the coding sheet required the coders to decide whether the question was tactical or not by corresponding with a “yes” or “no”. Changes made to this form including an additional column, “general” or “content related”. Coders continued to
record all of the questions asked during the lesson, but the first distinction that was made was whether the question was content related or not. If it was determined that the question was not content related, then nothing further will needed to be decided for that question. If the decision was made that the questions was content related, then an additional decision as to whether the question was tactical or non-tactical was be made. Once these general and direction related questions were removed from the pilot study data, the questions remaining proved to be an appropriate measure of the focus of the lesson.

Addition of the qualitative components

In order to adequately describe the pre-service teachers’ experiences related to their implementation of these lesson plans, additional descriptive information needed to be gathered. Given that quantifying beliefs, feelings, and thoughts is a difficult task to accomplish, qualitative data collection measures were added to provide rich, descriptive information that would enable the primary researcher to focus on the dynamic details provided by this research. A daily questionnaire and post-study interview were added to complete the data triangulation involved in this study.
CHAPTER THREE
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine and describe four pre-service teachers’ experiences planning, implementing and assessing the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding skill instruction model. The collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data provided specific details regarding the variables of interest related to these experiences. Quantitative instruments utilized in the study included: Messick’s Field Hockey Knowledge Test, the Value-Orientation Inventory-2 (VOI-2), the Henry-Friedel Field Hockey Test (H.F.F.H.T.), as well as the Game Performance Assessment Instrument (GPAI). Qualitative data were collected through daily questionnaires and post-study, semi-structured interviews in order to explore what may account for experiences and the similarities and differences within those experiences that pre-service teachers encountered; an area almost completely unexplored in the literature to date.

This chapter contains the following sections: (1) quantitative data results, including data gathered from: the pre-service teacher’s knowledge test, the pre-service teachers’ Value Orientation Inventory - 2, the students’ skills tests, and the systematic observations of variables involved in the treatment verification of the tactical lesson plans, including pre-service teacher feedback, pre-service teacher questioning, and use of time, (2) qualitative data results, including the daily questionnaires and the post-study, semi-structured interviews, (3) the content analysis of the data collected through the questionnaires and interviews, and (4) the explanations regarding the research questions examined in this study.
Quantitative Data Results

Messick’s (1987) Field Hockey Knowledge Test

In order to test the declarative and procedural field hockey knowledge of the pre-service teachers, Messick’s (1987) Field Hockey Knowledge Test was administered prior to the onset of data collection. Each of the pre-service teachers met the minimum requirement of 90% correct scores on the test on his or her first attempt. The four scores ranged from 91.5% to 96.3% correct scores and are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher #</th>
<th>Correct Responses out of 270 Questions</th>
<th>Percentile Score on Knowledge Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the preliminary 90% minimum requirement was successfully fulfilled, the teachers were given clearance to continue to participate in the study and were provided with the four lesson plans developed by the primary researcher, as well as the inventory document utilized to determine the value orientation information.

Value Orientation Inventory – 2 (VOI-2)

The Value Orientation Inventory – 2 was utilized to determine the pre-service teachers’ value orientation profile. Given that the pre-service teachers’ beliefs impact the learning environment and all related components, it was critical to examine their beliefs about teaching and learning to perhaps discover another dimension and/or additional explanations regarding their experiences utilizing the tactical TGFU model. These belief systems represent competing philosophies and are assumed to affect priorities concerning educational decisions. They are represented in five value orientations, including discipline mastery, learning process, ecological integration, social responsibility, and self-actualization (Ennis & Chen, 1993). A composite score for each of the pre-service teachers was developed from their responses on the inventory. A higher composite value orientation score indicated a higher priority. Each composite score was used to determine whether the pre-service teachers had a high, neutral or low priority level for each of the
five orientations and were presented with a prioritized list of value orientation for each pre-service teacher in Table 3.

Table 3
Value Orientation Inventory Profiles for Each Pre-Service Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher</th>
<th>Prioritized Value Orientation</th>
<th>VOI Composite Score</th>
<th>Priority Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1. Social Reconstruction</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Discipline Mastery</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Learning Process</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Ecological Integration</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Self-Actualization</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher</th>
<th>Prioritized Value Orientation</th>
<th>VOI Composite Score</th>
<th>Priority Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>1. Learning Process</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Social Reconstruction</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Discipline Mastery</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Self-Actualization</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Ecological Integration</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher</th>
<th>Prioritized Value Orientation</th>
<th>VOI Composite Score</th>
<th>Priority Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>1. Discipline Mastery</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Learning Process</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Self-Actualization</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Ecological Integration</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Social Reconstruction</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher</th>
<th>Prioritized Value Orientation</th>
<th>VOI Composite Score</th>
<th>Priority Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>1. Social Reconstruction</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Learning Process</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Discipline Mastery</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Self-Actualization</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Ecological Integration</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The VOI-2 affords the opportunity to examine the relative value that each of the pre-service teachers place on the five theoretical value orientations. The first pre-service teacher’s profile suggested a high priority on social reconstruction, but a neutral value on the VOI stated learning goals associated with discipline mastery, learning process, and ecological integration. Self-actualization was valued at a low priority level for pre-service
teacher #1. Pre-service teacher #2 also placed a high priority on only one value orientation; learning process. Social reconstruction, discipline mastery and self-actualization were reported as having a neutral prioritization, while ecological integration was a low prioritized value orientation for pre-service teacher #2. Pre-service teacher #3 placed a high priority profile on two value orientations; discipline mastery and learning process, and a low priority on the remaining three orientations; self actualization, ecological integration and social reconstruction. The fourth pre-service teacher presented a high value orientation for both social reconstruction and learning process, while exhibiting a neutral priority level for discipline mastery and a low priority level of the self-actualization and ecological integration value orientations.

The Henry-Friedel Field Hockey Test (H.F.F.H.T.)

Ten trials of the Henry-Friedel Field Hockey Test were administered. Each trial provided a time score and a shooting accuracy score for each student tested. A mean score for the trials for each of the classes, as well as a total mean score for all classes, were calculated for both of the components. Results were reported by group number in Tables 4 and 5. This group number coincides with the pre-service teacher number, for example, group #1 the pre-service teacher #1’s class, and so on.

All classes improved in both the time and accuracy components of the test. Group #1 improved from an average of 47.4 seconds to 35.0 seconds on the obstacle course, a decrease of 12.4 seconds. This group’s accuracy improved by an average of 5.3%, going from 31.8% to 37.1%. Group #2 improved from a 42.2 second average to 32.9 second average, an improvement of 9.3 seconds. This group also improved in the accuracy component with a 7.0% improvement, going from 21% to 28%. Group #3 also improved in both components, going from an average of 37.1 seconds to 31.2 seconds, a 5.9 second
overall improvement and increasing their accuracy by 11.5%, reporting a jump from 27.9% to 39.4%. The final group of students had an overall average improvement of 3.9 seconds, going from 38.0 to 34.1, and an 8.4% improvement on their accuracy, increasing from 23.9% to 32.3%.

The average overall improvement for all four groups was 7.9 seconds, the difference from 41.2 seconds to 33.3 seconds, with an 8.0% overall improvement on accuracy, rising from 26.2% to 34.2%. From these results, it was determined that on average all four classes improved in both the time and accuracy components of the Henry-Friedel Field Hockey Test.

Table 5
Overall Pre and Post-Test Mean Scores for Time and Accuracy on the H.F.F.H.T. for All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-test mean time in seconds</th>
<th>Post-test mean time in seconds</th>
<th>Pre-test mean accuracy score</th>
<th>Post-test mean accuracy score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tactical Lesson Plan Treatment Verification

In order for the pre-service teacher’s responses in the qualitative portions of this study to be a valid representation of their experiences within the tactical TGFU model, a validation process was utilized to verify that the lesson plans validly represented the tactical TGFU model. French, Werner, Rink, Taylor, and Hussey (1996a); French, Werner, Taylor, Hussey, and Jones (1996b) and Turner and Martinek (1999) outlined a verification process requiring data to be collected on each lesson for each of the following criteria: (a) feedback provided by the pre-service teacher, (b) the instructional aspects regarding games or game-like practices, and (c) time spent during the lesson in games or game-related situations. In order to determine model appropriateness, systematic observations were performed on each lesson plan on the following variables: (1) the nature of the skill feedback, (2) the nature of the pre-service teacher’s content related questions, and (3) the use of time. The results for each are presented below.

Pre-Service Teacher’s Skill Feedback Results

Providing congruent, tactical specific feedback was a critical element in the verification process of these lessons. Skill feedback for each teacher and lesson was counted by episode and categorized by general, specific non-tactical, or specific tactical.
Percentages for each pre-service teacher were calculated based on the total number of feedback episodes in each of the categories. The majority of the specific feedback given in the lessons had to be tactically oriented or the lesson would not appropriately represent the tactical model. The results were reported in Table 6. Noteworthy to mention is that general feedback was coded and reported in Table 6, but was not a variable involved in the verification process. It was merely a variable of interest.

Table 6
Feedback Statement Mean Scores per Lesson for Each Pre-Service Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher #1</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Specific Non-Tactical</th>
<th>Specific Tactical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher #2</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Specific Non-Tactical</th>
<th>Specific Tactical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher #3</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Specific Non-Tactical</th>
<th>Specific Tactical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher #4</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Specific Non-Tactical</th>
<th>Specific Tactical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observer reliability was critical for accurate interpretation of the data collected on the feedback provided. Interobserver reliability for skill feedback was established prior to the onset of the study at .93. An additional reliability check was conducted half way through the study, after each observer coded four lessons, to monitor for observer drift. This check revealed a .90 level of observer agreement. Interobserver agreement ranged from .87 to .94, with an overall reliability rate of .90.
Pre-service teacher #1 provided an average of 26.3 specific tactical feedback statements per class during week one, an average of 29.5 tactical statements during week two, for a total average of 27.9 specific, tactical feedback statements per lesson for both weeks. Pre-service teacher #1 provided less specific, non-tactical feedback for weeks one and two, scoring 3.9 and 7.1 respectively, for an overall average of 5.5 specific, non-tactical statements per lesson for both weeks combined. Higher specific, tactical feedback averages for pre-service teacher #2 were reported as well. For weeks one and two, a per lesson average of 37.3 and 21.9 specific tactical feedback statements were provided, respectively. For specific, non-tactical feedback, pre-service teacher #2 provided an average of 3.4 a day for week one and 2.6 a day for week two, for a total average of 3.0 statements per lesson for the two weeks combined. Pre-service teacher #3 reportedly provided the most specific, tactical feedback per lesson with an average of 35.5 for week one and 35.4 for week two, for an overall average of 35.4 specific, tactical feedback statements provide on average per lesson. Pre-service teacher #3 provided less specific, non-tactical feedback with an average of 4.3 statements per lesson the first week and a 4.9 average the second week, for a total average of 4.6 specific, non-tactical feedback statements per lesson for both weeks. The fourth pre-service teacher reported an average of 32.0 specific, tactical feedback statements per lesson for the first week, and 29.3 for week two, for a total average of 30.6 specific, tactical feedback statements per lesson for the two weeks combined. This pre-service teacher provided an average of 3.6 specific, non-tactical feedback per lesson for week one and an average of 4.0 for week two, bringing the overall two week average to 3.8 specific, non-tactical feedback statements per lesson.

Table 7
Feedback Statement Mean Scores per Lesson for All Pre-Service Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Specific Non-Tactical</th>
<th>Specific Tactical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results illustrated that each of the individual teachers was able to meet the minimum requirement for all lessons by providing more specific, tactical feedback than
specific, non-tactical feedback. When the averages for the combination of all of the teachers were calculated, the larger percentages of specific, tactical feedback provided during this study was evident (see Table 7).

On average, the pre-service teachers provided 32.0 specific, tactical feedback statements during week one and 29.3 during week two, for a total average of 30.6 specific, tactical feedback statements per lesson for the two weeks combined. When compared to the 3.6, 4.0 and 3.8 for week one, week two and the combined total, respectively, it is evident that the pre-service teachers were able to exceed the minimum requirement of providing a majority of specific, tactical feedback. The results from this systematic observation indicated that all four pre-service teachers consistently provided more specific, tactical feedback, when compared to specific, non-tactical feedback for all of the lessons.

Pre-Service Teacher’s Questions Results

Each content related question asked by the pre-service teachers was recorded in order to assist in the determination of whether the instructional emphasis was tactically based or not. The questions asked during the lessons provided additional support to the overall lesson focus. Simple percentages were calculated for each of the categories and are presented in Table 8.

Observer checks were calculated for teacher-posed, content-related questions to establish reliability of the data for this variable. Interobserver reliability for questioning was established prior to the onset of the study at .96. An additional reliability check was conducted half way through the study, after four lessons were coded, to monitor for observer drift. This check revealed a .91 level of observer agreement. Interobserver agreement ranged from .87 to .96, with an overall reliability rate of .92 for the study.

Pre-service teacher #1 reported more tactical questions than non-tactical questions over the two weeks, posing an average of 10.4 questions per lesson for week one and 15.9 per lesson for week two, for a total average of 13.1 tactical questions stated per lesson for both weeks. The non-tactical questions asked by this teacher were fewer at 2.3 statements per lesson for week one and 2.1 for week two, averaging out to be 2.2 non-tactical questions stated per lesson for both weeks combined. The second pre-service teacher scored higher on tactical questions as well, providing an average of 13.1 tactical
questions per lesson for the first week, and 10.1 for the second week, totaling 11.6 tactical questions posed per lesson for the combination of the two weeks. This teacher’s non-tactical questions totaled 2.0 per lesson for the first week and 2.3 for the second.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher #1</th>
<th>Tactical</th>
<th>Non-tactical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher #2</th>
<th>Tactical</th>
<th>Non-tactical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher #3</th>
<th>Tactical</th>
<th>Non-tactical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher #4</th>
<th>Tactical</th>
<th>Non-tactical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

bringing the two week average to 2.2 non-tactical questions asked per lesson.

Pre-service teacher #3 reported an average of 11.6 tactical questions asked per lesson for week one and 8.4 per lesson for week two, which averages to be 10.0 tactical questions asked per lesson for the two week period. For non-tactical questions, this teacher posed an average of 1.5 questions the first week and 1.9 the second week, for an average of 1.7 non-tactical questions per lesson for both weeks collectively. Pre-service teacher #4 also posed more tactical content questions than non-tactical questions, by reporting an average of 14.9 tactical questions per lesson for week one and 16.5 per lesson for week two, with an average of 15.7 tactical questions asked per lesson over the course of the study. This teacher’s non-tactical questions were reportedly 2.0 and 1.1 for week one and two, respectively, with a combined average of 1.6 non-tactical questions asked per lesson for the two weeks combined.
For each individual pre-service teachers, the majority of the content related questions for all of the lessons were tactically focused, further verifying that each of the lessons was a valid representation of the tactical model. When the overall averages for all of the teachers combined were calculated, the larger percentages of tactical questions posed during the experimental lessons was apparent (see Table 9). On average, the pre-service teachers provided 12.5 tactical questions during week one and 12.7 during week two, for a total average of 12.6 tactical questions per lesson for the two weeks. When compared to the non-tactical question averages of 2.0 and 1.0 for week one and week two, respectively, and the combined average of 1.9 for the two week period, it is evident that the pre-service teachers were able to exceed the minimum requirement of providing a majority of tactical questions. These results indicated that all four pre-service teachers consistently provided more tactical based content related questions when compared to non-tactical content based questions for all of the lessons.

### Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tactical</th>
<th>Non-tactical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-Service Teacher’s Use of Time Results

Each pre-service teacher’s use of time was coded and placed into the three following categories: instruction, transition/management and activity time. Simple percentages were calculated for each category and are presented in Table 10.

In the verification process of the lesson plans, reliability checks were conducted on the teacher’s use of time during the lesson. Interobserver reliability was established prior to the onset of the study at .95. After each observer coded four lessons, an additional reliability check was conducted to monitor for observer drift. This check revealed a .94 level of observer agreement. Interobserver agreement ranged from .85 to .97, with an overall reliability rate of .93 for the study.

Overall use of time, though not a direct variable in the treatment verification process, was a necessary step to precede the process of evaluating how activity time was
allocated. It was first necessary to divide the overall time for each lesson into activity, transition/management and instruction categories in order to analysis how the activity time was spent in each lesson. These results are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Use of Time Mean Percentiles per Lesson for Each of the Pre-Service Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher #1</th>
<th>Activity Time</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Transition/Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week #1</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week #2</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher #2</th>
<th>Activity Time</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Transition/Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week #1</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week #2</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher #3</th>
<th>Activity Time</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Transition/Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week #1</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week #2</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher #4</th>
<th>Activity Time</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Transition/Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week #1</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week #2</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the first week, pre-service teacher #1 reportedly spent an average of 30.9% of the lesson time in activity, 49.1% of the time in instruction, and 20.0% in transition and management time. For week two, the average percent this pre-service teacher spent in each of the categories was as follows: 37.1% in activity, 44.3% in instruction, and 18.5% in transition/management. These totals were combined for an overall average use of lesson time for the two weeks. These totals were: 34.0% activity, 46.7% instruction and 19.3% transition/management. Pre-service teacher #2 recorded the first week’s averages of 42.5% activity time, 29.9% instruction time and 27.6 transition/management time. For week two, this pre-service teacher recorded an average of 39.4% of the time in activity, 38.9% was spent in instructional aspects, and 21.7% was
spent in transition and management components. The two week average total of time for
pre-service teacher #2 was 41.0% in activity, 34.4% in instruction and 24.6% in
transition/management. Pre-service teacher #3 reported the following average for week
one; 50.9% activity, 33.9% instruction, and 15.2% transition/management. For week two,
the scores were 55.9% average time spent in activity, 28.2% spent in instructional aspects
of the lessons, and 15.9% spent in transition/management type tasks. The overall
averages for both weeks for pre-service teacher #3 were as follows: 53.4% activity,
31.1% instruction, and 15.5% transition/management. The last pre-service teacher
reportedly spent an average of 48.6% of the time in activity, 30.2% of the time in
instruction, and 21.2% of the time in transition/management during the first week. During
the second week, this pre-service teacher spent an average of 33.6% of the time in
activity, while spending 38.6% and 27.8% in instruction and transition/management,
respectively. Total averages for pre-service teacher #4 for both weeks were as follows:
41.1% activity, 34.4% instruction, and 24.5% transition/management.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Time Mean Percentiles per Lesson for All Pre-Service Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall averages for all of the pre-service teachers were calculated and
presented in Table 11. During week one the pre-service teachers spent an average of
43.3% of the time in activity, 35.7% of the time in instruction, and 21.0% of the time in
transition/management. Similar percentages were reported for week two at 41.5%
activity, 37.5% instruction and 20.9% transition/management. The combined two week
total averages were 42.5% of the time was spent in activity, 36.6% of the time was spent
in instructional aspects of the lesson, and 21.0% of the time was spent in transition and
management type tasks.

In order to verify that each of the lessons was a valid representation of the model
with respect to how time was spent, the majority of activity portions of the lessons must
be tactically oriented in order for the lesson to be a valid representation of the model.
Each activity time segment was either designated as “tactical,” defined as time spent in
game/game-like practices, or “non-tactical,” the time spent in non-game or non-game-like practices. These percentages are presented in Table 12.

Pre-service teacher #1 spent an average of 82.4% of the activity time during week one in tactically oriented activities and the remaining 17.5% in non-tactical activities. During week two, this pre-service teacher spent 100% of the activity time in tactical components. Pre-service teacher #1 spent an average of 91.2% of the activity time for both weeks in tactical, game or game-like situations and 8.8% in non-tactical situations.

Pre-service teacher #2 spent 83.3% of

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher #1</th>
<th>Tactical</th>
<th>Non-tactical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week #1</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week #2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher #2</th>
<th>Tactical</th>
<th>Non-tactical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week #1</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week #2</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher #3</th>
<th>Tactical</th>
<th>Non-tactical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week #1</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week #2</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Service Teacher #4</th>
<th>Tactical</th>
<th>Non-tactical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week #1</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week #2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the activity time during week one in tactical activities and 16.7% in non-tactical aspects. This teacher spent 90.3% of the activity time in week two in tactical components and 9.7% in non-tactical components. The overall breakdown of time for pre-service teacher #2 for both weeks was 86.8% tactical and 13.2% non-tactical. Pre-service teacher #3 spent 90.0% of the activity time in week one in tactical activities and remaining 10.0% in non-tactical aspects. This teacher spent 95.9% of the activity time in week two in tactical components and 4.1% in non-tactical components. Pre-service teacher #3 spent an
average of 93.0% of the activity time for both weeks in tactical, game or game-like situations and 7.0% in non-tactical situations. Pre-service teacher #4 spent an average of 86.5% of the activity time during week one in tactically oriented activities and the remaining 13.5% in non-tactical activities. During week two, this pre-service teacher spent 100% of the activity time in tactical components. The overall breakdown of time for pre-service teacher #4 for both weeks was 93.3% tactical and 6.7% non-tactical.

Table 13

<p>| Activity Time Breakdown Into Tactical or Non-Tactical Mean Percentiles per Lesson for All Pre-Service Teachers |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactical</th>
<th>Non-tactical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week #1</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week #2</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall percentages for the combined allocation of activity time for all of the teachers for all of the lessons was calculated and presented in Table 13. For week one, 85.5% of the activity time was spent in tactically oriented activities, and 14.4% of the activity time was spent in non-tactical activities. During week two, the majority of the activity time (96.6%) was spent in tactical components, while the remaining 3.4% was spent in non-tactical activities. The overall average activity time spent in tactically oriented activities for both weeks was 91.1%, and the remaining 8.9% of the lesson time for both weeks was spent in non-tactical activities.

The results presented in Tables 12 and 13 highlight the last variable in the treatment verification, whereby the majority of the time spent in activity must be spent in tactically based games or game-like experiences in order for the lessons to be qualified as tactical. All teachers were able to spend the majority of their activity time during all of the lessons in tactical game or game-like components, and therefore each of the lessons plans validly represent the tactical TGFU model.

In closing, several instruments were utilized to measure important components related to the main variables of interest. In order for the pre-service teachers to be rendered knowledgeable in the realm of procedural and declarative field hockey, they all were required to met the minimum of 90% successful scores on Messick’s Field Hockey Knowledge Test. Student outcomes were measured by utilizing the Henry-Friedel Field
Hockey Test as a pre- and post-test in order to determine skill improvement over the course of the unit. These instruments verified that the pre-service teachers were knowledgeable in field hockey and that the public school students exhibited improvement in the field hockey skills measured as a result of being involved in this study. The value orientation inventory was utilized to determine prioritized values that each of the pre-service teachers placed on each of the five value orientations. The treatment verification of the lessons required an analysis of teacher’s questions, feedback and use of time to verify that the lessons were indeed tactical lesson plans. Results from each of these variables provided evidence that all of the lessons taught by all of the teachers utilized the tactical model. The qualitative data gathered from the daily questionnaires and semi-structured, post-study interview can now be a valid representation of what these four pre-service teachers experienced in the tactical teaching games for understanding model.

**Qualitative Data Results**

The qualitative data collected from the daily questionnaires and from the interviews addressed three of the research questions regarding the pre-service teachers’ experiences planning, implementing and assessing the tactical TGFU model. The researcher and one independent, trained coder analyzed the qualitative data. Initially the coders did not achieve a .85 agreement rate when a reliability check was conducted. This was due in large part to the differences in agreement rates involving the teacher’s positive statements. The researcher’s personal experiences with the model may have influenced the categorization of some statements, whereby the researcher initially did not divide the positive statements made by the pre-service teacher into a separate theme. Though these statements were coded and appeared in other themes, further discussion resulted in the coders agreement to create a category called positive teacher statements to represent the positive nature of the statements within this category. Following this change, an interobserver reliability rate of .88 was achieved.

**Daily Questionnaires**

Immediately following each of the eight experimental lessons, each pre-service teacher completed the daily questionnaire. The daily questionnaire included the four following open-form questions and prompts:

1. Please describe what you *liked* and/or *disliked* about this lesson plan.
2. Please explain in what ways it was easy and/or challenging to implement this lesson plan.

3. Explain why you would or wouldn’t choose to teach this lesson again in the future.

4. Explain what you think your students liked and/or disliked in this lesson. When relevant, please give examples to explain.

This questionnaire attempted to garner the daily experiences of the pre-service teachers during the utilization of this model. Once themes and categories were established for each pre-service teacher, a cross-case analysis was performed to identify similarities and differences among the pre-service teachers. Five themes emerged upon completion of the cross-case analyses: They were: (1) enjoyment, (2) challenge level, (3) tactical questions, (4) use of time, and (5) attitudinal effects.

**Enjoyment**

The first theme emerging from the data was the enjoyment that either the pre-service teachers expressed about their own enjoyable experiences or the level of enjoyment, both positive and negative, that the teachers thought the students experienced. This was the most predominant of the themes with 34 instances of pre-service teacher’s responses falling into this theme. All four pre-service teachers noted that the students either enjoyed the games or that they wanted to play the games more, while two of the four pre-service teachers reported themselves as liking the game play. Pre-service teacher (PST) #2 stated: “I think the students enjoyed the games. They liked getting straight into the game situation. I think they also felt that they did not have enough time to play.” PST #4 reported that he and the students “liked the game play and modified games.” PST #3 made the following statement about her and her student’s levels of enjoyment: “I would and will use this lesson again, because I enjoyed teaching it, and the students enjoyed it. It was a great way to teach these skills for hockey.” Three of the four pre-service teachers reportedly enjoyed the progression of the tactical lesson plans. PST #4 stated: “I liked the lesson progression so the students would know how to pass more effectively by the end and to use fakes.”

On the contrary, one pre-service teacher reported three instances where he noticed that his students did not enjoy the modifications of the modified games. He made the two
following comments: “I would choose to teach this lesson again, but maybe let them play the game with less modifications, maybe less rules would make it easier for them”, and “The students just wanted to play a real game with no modifications. They really didn’t like not having a goalie.” Though only one pre-service teacher reported this occurrence in the daily questionnaires, additional instances appeared in the interview with another pre-service teacher.

Degree of Challenge

Challenge level was the next theme to emerge from the data. Within this theme, the pre-service teachers identified that either they were challenged by the content, that the students were challenged by the content, or that the challenges presented to the student were appropriate.

All four pre-service teachers reported that they were challenged by the content. PST #1 stated: “The challenge for me was figuring out ways to teach faking or at least getting the students to understand how beneficial faking can be in a game situation.” PST #2 added the following statement in response to her experiences teaching the give-and-go:

The challenge was being able to explain the give-and-go in a way they would understand it... It was challenging getting them to begin to understand how the give-and-go works when trying to score. I found it difficult to break down the skill so they would understand it.

PST #3 also noted that a particular lesson plan was: “…challenging due to the content of the lesson. I needed more time. It was too much, too fast.” PST #4 expressed his challenges with the statement: “I got the (lesson) ideas from the book so I thought it would be ok. It was hard for the children to understand though.” PST #1 affirmed this with the following statement: “I disliked trying to implement (the lesson) when I started feeling they weren’t understanding it.” These last three statements overlap with the next portion of this theme, which were reported by three of the four pre-service teachers; the level of challenge the students experienced. PST #1 stated: “I probably wouldn’t choose to teach this lesson to this age group again because it was too advanced for them.”

Another category within this theme was the instances that the teachers thought the content constituted an appropriate challenge for the students. All four pre-service teachers
reported instances where they believed the students were appropriately challenged. PST #1 stated that she thought: “…the students were finally getting the idea of spreading out and moving to the open spaces…I think they understood.” PST #2 reported that her students understood the formation she was teaching and that the students: “…learned something new that helped the team out.” PST #2 also reported that: “…the student’s prior knowledge from the previous lessons helped them in the drills. PST #3 reported two separate instances that the students were appropriately challenged. She stated: “I liked the way the students really used the fakes in their games and realized how they really helped them score.” Similarly, she added: “I liked the Cheetah drill because the kids really used it (quick passes) during the game.” PST #4 added, “I liked the fact that the children were moving a lot. I also liked the fact that they were challenged by the games.”

Tactical Questioning

Of the four pre-service teachers, three reported statements related to the tactical questioning theme. This theme contained the student’s reaction to the questions, the questions’ affect on student cognition, and the teacher’s experiences developing and implementing the questions. Of the 17 overall statements reported regarding tactical questioning, 12 of them were related to the student’s negative reactions to the questioning aspects of the lessons and the model. PST#1 noted: “I don’t think they liked being called in so much for questioning. They definitely didn’t like me calling them in as often as I did.” On a separate occasion, she added: “I think they disliked the questions I asked. They seemed bored or uninterested.” PST #2 concurred with these statements with the following: “They disliked the questions and the transitions away from games and activities to answer the questions…They become impatient to listen to questions by the end of the lesson.” PST #4 responded similarly with the following: “They are tired of answering questions. It takes too long to stand around.”

Two of the pre-service teachers reported positive outcomes related to the tactical questioning. PST #1 stated: “I liked the lesson with regard to the tactical questions because I felt many of the students understood what I was trying to teach them.” This teacher added: “I thought having them come up with possible solutions was a great way for them to begin working on their critical thinking skills.” PST #3 added: “I liked the
way they can answer my questions. They always complain about having to come in for a bunch of questions, but at least they all know the answers.”

The last category in the tactical questioning theme concerned two of the pre-service teacher’s reactions to the questioning aspects of the lesson. PST #4 declared that: “It was challenging getting the students to answer the tactical questions correctly after the first game.” PST #2 added: “It was difficult leading them to the answers…plus the time it took to get the answers was too long.” PST #4 acknowledged the time considerations related to the questioning phase with the following statement: “I don’t like the transition time to go to and from the field, to questions and back out again. I felt rushed and in a hurry.” PST #4 affirmed this concern with the statement: “There was a lot of time taken up by the Q and A.”

Use of Time

Another common theme to emerge from the data was the use of time. Where all four teachers reported that the game and activity set-up utilized in this model lead to increased practice and activity time during the lessons, there were also concerns regarding the increase in transition/management time, as well as the need for increased instruction time.

Each pre-service teacher made a statement connecting activity and/or game set-up to an increase in activity or practice time. PST #1 stated: “I liked the smaller teams because it led to more activity time.” PST #2 added: “I liked the 3 vs. 3 modified games because it involved a majority of the students while they practiced their passing skills.” PST #3 confirmed these statements with the following: “I liked the small groups and the increase in activity and competition.” PST #4 declared that: “The games and skill/drills set-up kept them very active.”

Three of the four teachers reported statements regarding the increase in transition/management time. PST #1 identified her challenges in this area as the following: “The challenge was getting the students going so they will have enough time to actually play the game…Transition time was slow” On a separate occasion, she added: “The challenge for me was getting students into the activities quickly in order to actually practice the cues and skills…I NEED to challenge them to get into activities much quicker.” PST #2 responded similarly with this statement: “I disliked the management
time because it cut into much of the short activity times.” PST #4 agreed with these teachers by stating: “It was challenging because the children took a while to get organized on the separate fields.” On another day this pre-service teacher added: “I disliked the management part, getting the kids to play and setting up the drills.”

Two of the four pre-service teachers reported the need for increased instruction time in these lessons. PST #1 admitted: “My explanations may have been lengthy, but I think they have to be here…I did spend way too much time on instructions though.” PST #4 concurred: “Students needed a lot of instruction time to understand the rules of the game and to understand about moving around. They had trouble moving around in the game.” These broad statements will be further reinforced with the data gathered from the interviews.

Attitudinal Effects

The final theme that was revealed in the data was the attitudinal effects on the students. Three of the four pre-service teachers reported negative student outcomes regarding their attitude. Some of the outcomes included: arguing, frustration, lack of cooperation, low motivation, boredom, and lack of interest. PST #1 reported that students “…were frustrated due to lack of cooperation with classmates.” On a different occasion, she stated: “Some students weren’t motivated. Some didn’t hustle. Some didn’t care.” This teacher also noted that during the tactical questioning, as mentioned earlier, that her students seemed “bored or uninterested.” PST #3 reported having difficulties getting through the lesson “due to some bad attitudes.” PST #4 provided the most detail regarding his frustration in this area:

What made this lesson and others so hard is the behavior issues in the class. They wanted to play, but they wouldn’t stop arguing with each other…They always like the game play – at least that’s what they say but they seemed more worried about scoring and arguing than what I wanted them to work on.

Additional details from the teacher included:

It was hard to cover all that I had planned because of the arguing and lack of participation. I think they would have liked playing the last game more but it had to be cut short because I had to deal with all the behavioral problems during the first game and activities.
PST #3 also reported:

The games are making them mean and unhappy because they can’t get along once I put them against each other in games… I can’t seem to get anything done because they argue first in game one, then it seems to continue all lesson… It seems like they argue as soon as I put them on teams each day, and then I have to get them into the game right away, yeah right…. I think they argue because they bunch up and can’t be successful in the games all bunched up.

Post-Study, Semi-Structured Interviews

A post-study, semi-structured interview of each pre-service teacher was conducted immediately following the implementation of all of the lesson plans. The semi-structured interview was utilized to acquire a detailed account of the pre-service teachers’ experiences in the tactical skill instruction model. This interview included a series of open-form questions that elicited the experiences of the pre-service teachers with reference to the three different components of utilization of the model: planning, implementing and assessing.

Pre-Service Teacher’s Planning Experiences

The following interview questions and prompts for planning were developed from the topics highlighted in Allison and Barrett (2000) chapter; Planning for Student Learning:

1. Talk to me about the process you went through planning your daily lesson plans.
2. What resources did you use in your planning?
3. How did you begin to decide what content to teach?
4. How did you select which learning cues to use during the lesson?
5. How did you select which activities to use during the lesson?
6. How did you select which modified games to use during the lesson?
7. What things did you consider when you were planning your lesson progression? (modified games – emphasizing skills – modified games)
8. What strategies did you plan for to keep students on-task?
9. What strategies did you plan for to keep students motivated to learn?
10. Describe how your lessons contributed to meeting your learning goals/objectives.
11. What did you expect students to do, feel and know as a result of participating in the lessons?

12. Describe the process of developing the questions that were to lead students to recognize the importance of certain skills.

13. How did you plan the assessments of your students during the lesson?

Four themes emerged from analysis of the planning process. They were: (1) challenges with the tactical content, (2) tactical questioning, (3) congruency of the lesson plan components, and (4) on-task considerations.

Challenges with the Tactical Content

The first theme that surfaced from the data was the tactical content challenges that both the pre-service teachers and the students experienced. The majority of the responses the pre-service teachers provided were contained in this category. The responses in this theme were categorized into two sections: (1) teacher challenges and (2) student challenges, including the sub-category of clustering.

Teacher Challenges. When asked what the pre-service teachers considered when planning the lesson progression, PST #4 responded:

I think that besides spreading out, nothing else mattered, so I, what I tried to do is figure out how to teach that. Seriously what are the pieces of that? I don’t know how to break that into pieces, so when we talked you suggested getting someone moving, and um, hopefully moving away from others, or to the open spaces, but it was hard because the only time I think I’ve ever taught something like this was in our class, and when you tell everyone to spread out in class, they either do it or maybe I didn’t notice it but No, our class spread out. We definitely didn’t bunch like this class. I thought about putting poly spots out and have students stand on them, and say this is what spreading out looks like, or cones and say you stay around this cone and, or stay within 10 feet of this cone, but then you said that that didn’t really represent the game.

PST #1 stated: “No matter how I tried, or what I did, they just clustered back up. It drove me crazy sometimes, and I know that I had to do parts of the lesson, but I just wanted to say forget it.” PST #1 responded with the following with reference to a lesson plan on give-and go:
It was a hard concept to teach, and I had a hard time getting them to understand what I was saying, even with a demo, it seemed just too hard to do and explain and everything. They didn’t understand pass the ball and then go ahead to get open to receive a pass.

Within the teacher challenges, three of the four pre-service teachers reported difficulty developing tactical skill cues. PST #4 offered the following statement about his struggles with selecting cues:

It wasn’t as easy as I thought. I don’t know, it seems easier to do cues for game stage one skills because you could just describe the skill, like little pieces of the skill, but like I said, I don’t even know what the pieces of not bunching up are. I did try to use the book, but that didn’t help at all.

PST #1 concurred with the following statement regarding the development of the cues:

They were hard cues though, because it’s not like a single skill. It’s a bigger thing than that, so the cues have to be bigger, more, I don’t know what the word is, like just not simple, I guess.

PST #3 added:

Lot of times, if I would put cues in that are too hard, and I needed them to be about the tactic instead of the simple skills, and so they were hard to develop because I wanted them to be right.

Student Challenges. PST #1 responded with the following with reference to the give-and-go: “It was just so hard for them to understand…they didn’t understand pass the ball and then go ahead to get open to receive a pass.” She added:

I didn’t want to give up because I know they needed it, but they just weren’t successful, no matter what I tried. I mean, they’d get it a little bit in the activity, but then they’d just cluster up again in the games. I don’t think they understood that they were supposed to be working on it in the games, and they were just trying to score or steal the ball from other people. I think spreading out was the last thing on their minds, like it didn’t even matter, or make sense, or something like that.

PST #4 explained that his student’s struggled with trying to understand the concept of the off-ball, offensive person faking to get open with the following statement:
They were either standing around, or just passing back and forth, like they were just playing keep away, or the people with the ball were all faking, it was a mess in my point of view. It was just frustrating because I thought I did a good job demonstrating but they just didn’t get it or something.

PST #1 pinpointed the following example of the students struggle with the content:

It was such a pain to keep saying over and over again, spread out so I thought if I worked on give and go that they might get away from each other. It didn’t really work, though I did see some of them trying to go. It was just so hard for them to understand.

As a sub-category of the struggles the pre-service teachers encountered, spreading out or not clustering appeared frequently in the pre-service teachers’ responses. All four pre-service teachers reported that student clustering or not spreading out was a challenge for them to address. PST #1 stated:

One of the things I noticed was that most of the students during the games were going to the ball no matter where it was, and it was just one big cluster of students fighting for the ball, and it didn’t look like they were playing the game it just looked like they were all just trying to get the ball. So, I thought about the skills that they learned, and I thought about what I can do to teach them to move to get away from the ball without going into offense and defense formations. My goal was to try to get them away from the ball…to spread out.

PST #2 observed the following:

We talked about moving and spreading to the open space, and they still didn’t have the concept of spreading out and using the whole field. So I just decided to keep talking about their clustering because something needs to be done to teach them how to physically spread out.

When asked what the pre-service teachers decided to teach, PST #4 emphasized his commitment to teaching spreading out with the following statement: “Well, I taught different things on other days, but I felt like they were pieces of the same thing; spreading out, spreading out, spreading out.”

Tactical Questioning
Tactical questioning was the next theme to emerge from the data. All four pre-service teachers reported that they thought that developing the tactical questions was challenging. When asked how the pre-service teachers felt about developing the tactical questions for their lesson plans, PST #1 responded with the following statements:

Well, I felt it was challenging for one, because I wanted to develop questions that would lead them to the right answers. So, it was hard for me to come up with the correct wording to get them to understand. I just thought it was a challenge. It was hard for me, and at times I may have even slipped and really just gave them the right answer…It’s something I would like to become better at, having them come up with the right answers. I think I got better at it by the end of the two weeks.

PST #2 added:

It was kind of tricky to figure out the wording I wanted to use. And then, I know I even went back and re-read them another day, and I was like, that’s not going to work because I can read it again, and it will actually lead me to a different spot.

PST #3 stated:

You can never know what those kids are going to say. That was hard to plan for, but I got good at figuring out how to lead them and not just like giving them the answer. I made them work for it.

PST #4 concurred with these difficulties by expressing the following:

That was nerve racking. I don’t know why it was so hard for me, but I’d say it was my biggest challenge in planning because they never seemed to answer exactly as I had planned… it was so hard to get them to say the right answer, though I think I got pretty good at it. If it got to the point where no matter what I said they just couldn’t get the answer,… if I wanted them to say that words “pass quickly”, I would finally just get to the point where I’d ask them, “When you’re in a game, do you want to pass the ball quickly or slower?” Which I guess is better than just giving them the answer like you said. I think I got a lot better at that. I had a lot of practice at it.

In addition to the struggles that the pre-service teachers expressed about the development of the questions, PST #3 provided a detailed account of her experiences with the following statement:
(It) was kind of hard at first because you just want to ask them, uh, questions that…weren’t over their head…some days it was just overwhelming, maybe I think it had a lot of importance, and I wanted them to get the questions right, but I didn’t want to confuse them with wrong questions, or questions that would lead them to the wrong answer or you know like the wrong direction.

The last variable of this theme that presented itself was the fact that three of the four pre-service teachers used the Mitchell, Griffin, and Oslin (1997) book to develop the tactical questions. PST #1 stated the following in response to whether she utilized the book to develop the questions:

I did. All but the first lesson plan, I made up the questions for them. But that’s only because I couldn’t come up with the correct wording. I was struggling with figuring out what they would say, so I liked going to the book, because I figured it would be right.

PST #3 expressed that she referred to the book to verify that her questions were tactical. She stated: “I looked at the book… I had a hard time with making sure the questions were tactical.”

Congruency of the Lesson Plan Components

Another theme that emerged from the data was the congruency of the lesson plan components. All of the pre-service teachers reportedly designed the lesson plans by considering the congruency between the lesson objectives, the tactical skill cues, the tactical skills, the feedback provided, the focus of the modified games and the tactical questions. This connectivity was reported once by PST #4, three times by PST #2, four for PST #1, and five times for PST #3. The following statement, made by PST #3, reflects the congruency consistently seen throughout all of the interviews:

If I wanted them to pass quickly, the activity and cues and stuff would all be about passing quickly, in the activities and the games. All of my lessons did that, focused on the same cues throughout the lessons.

On-Task Considerations

The last theme to emerge from the data was the considerations made in the lesson planning phase of this model to keep the students on-task. The pre-service teachers
replied with two factors that they considered affecting on-task behaviors: arguing and increased activity due to smaller teams.

Two of the four pre-service teachers considered student arguing a factor in the student’s ability to remain on-task during the lesson. When the pre-service teachers were asked what considerations they made when planning to keep the students on-task, PST #4 replied:

As far as keeping them on-task, I think that small teams good, because they are supposed to be more active, but it just seemed like there were, or there was more arguing. I did try a bunch of different teams, like breaking up kids that couldn’t get along. I think that worked a little.

PST #4 reportedly wanted to avoid putting students into offensive and defensive activities because of the increase in the off-task behavior of arguing. This statement also pointed out a student selected, team-selection strategy this pre-service teacher in attempts to minimize the arguing:

I would have liked to include more offense and defense like the book suggested, but I just didn’t want to deal with it. The arguing made me not want to even have defense ever, so I guess that affected my lesson. Sometimes I just let them pick their teams or their group members, because I thought that if they were with friends they wouldn’t argue but, well, I guess that worked a little.

When planning for increased on-task behaviors, another variable that three of the four the pre-service teachers considered was small-sided games. PST #1 replied: “I think it was good that the teams were small because even if they were on a team with their friends, they still had more chances to play because there are less people around to rely on.”

Pre-Service Teacher’s Implementation Experiences

The next set of themes emerged from the interview questions designed to illicit the experiences the pre-service teachers during their implementation of the TGFU model. The questions were developed from the topics featured in the Rink’s (2003) chapter titled, Effective instruction in physical education. The interview questions and prompts regarding implementation were as follows:
1. Explain the student’s opportunities to practice tactical skills during the lessons.
   a. Specific to game play
   b. Specific to extensions
2. Looking back on this unit, explain whether or not students had enough time/opportunities to learn the tactical skills.
3. Explain your thoughts on if your activities/extensions resembled game-like situations.
4. Talk to me about the amount of success you felt your student’s experienced in your tactical lesson.
5. Describe the student’s cognitive involvement in these lessons; address tactical question phase, if not addressed.
6. Tell me your feelings about the time spent in managing your lesson, as compared to Activity & Instruction time.
7. Describe the feedback you gave to students during the lessons.
8. How did the student’s react to your feedback statements?
9. Discuss how your students reacted to your instructions, demonstrations and learning cues.
10. How did you feel your Extension, Refinement and Application (ERA) went in the lesson?
11. Do you plan on using this model in the future? If so, when & why. If not, why?

Five themes emerged from analysis of the implementation portion of the interview. They were: (1) tactical questioning, (2) challenges related to the content, (3) use of time, (4) frustrating aspects, and (5) positive teacher comments. An additional section on variables that were noteworthy to mention was added to the end of the implementation results.

Tactical Questioning

The theme most frequently reported by the pre-service teachers related to the tactical questioning aspects of the TGFU model. All four pre-service teachers reported instances of either having to ask too many questions, taking too long for the students to
answer correctly, students getting bored during the questioning, and/or the questions were too difficult for the students to answer or for the pre-service teachers to ask.

PST #1 acknowledged:

They didn’t seem too interested in the questions I was asking, except for a few who did answer…I think during instructions many of the students were bored or just not interested in what I had to say. Again, I think they just wanted to play, and the questions seemed too much for them.

When this pre-service teacher was asked to clarify whether she intended “too much” to mean too many questions or too hard of questions, she responded:

Hmm, I think both. There were a lot of questions, and the students got bored just answering questions all of the time. I just wanted to say this is what we are going to do, not give them time to give input, and then get on with things, but I knew I couldn’t do that. It was just hard always getting their input.

PST #4 gave this detailed description of his experiences with the tactical questions:

I think that they really have to answer a lot of questions. I didn’t even ask as many questions as were in the book. I did ask all the questions on the lesson, because you said we had to, but like there are a ton of questions listed on all those lessons, but the students were like, not again, more questions. It was pretty funny, one day, when we were coming in to the talking, I mean listening area, one of the students like yelled out, “No high sticking, move to the open spaces and quick passes,” which was pretty funny because he pretty much answered all my questions before I asked them, which I guess is good but I think they felt like they kept being brought in and didn’t want to listen to them. By the closure, I mean I know I had to read all of the questions, I just wish I could have let them go some days. I guess if I had to answer, I would say they definitely learned everything we wanted them to. That’s good.

PST #3 expressed her challenges with the following statement:

The hardest part was to get them involved in the cognitive parts of the lesson when they didn’t know the answers, or even what the heck I was talking about. That was hard getting them to the answer without just saying the answer for them.
PST #2 agreed: “I would try and lead them to a word like fake, and it took them forever to get them there.” She continued:

It was difficult for me because it was easy in class because everybody already knew the answer to the questions, but the way that I would question it here, didn’t work, and how did I fix it right on the spot with the kids? It was like, “Ok you’re not getting this question right now?” With our classes it didn’t work that way. It was like, “Use head fakes!” I would respond, “That’s a great answer”.

Though negative responses regarding the tactical questioning were the most predominant in this category, positive responses were reported regarding achieving the cognitive objectives. Within this theme, all four pre-service teachers stated that they felt that their students successfully met the cognitive objectives. When asked to describe the student’s cognitive involvement in the lessons, PST #3 stated:

The cognitive involvement would definitely be very high. Uh, just by asking questions in the beginning, getting them into the right mind set, like I said before, having them go out, giving them something to do, and then having them reiterate the cues, asking them what did I say today, what were the things I was telling you before, or even if you asked them like what did we talk about yesterday, they did a good job remembering everything, and then using that in the lessons that came after that. When I wrote my lesson plans, I’d always ask what did we work on yesterday, so it keeps it in their minds, keeps it fresh. So yeah, I think that was a big whole cognitive aspect, and besides, they had to put themselves in position when they’re playing, and trying to figure out and especially the diamond formation and try to figure out where to go, how do I stay in this formation and how do I use this to score. So, it was a lot to do there.

When PST #4 was asked the same question, he replied: “I would say that they definitely learned everything (cognitively) we wanted them to. That’s good.” He added: “I think they definitely met all of my cognitive objectives. I pretty much can say for sure that they all could answer all the questions, if I were to give them a test or quiz or something, so I guess that’s good.” PST #1 stated:

I would have to say, on a cognitive level, they started realizing like, they were able to remember some of the skills that were done; the little passes, the quick
passes. A few, even though it was difficult, said they learned the give and go…I felt that even though there were stubborn when I was asking questions and checking for understanding and trying to lead them into the right answers…they probably were somewhat successful…on the last day more hands went up when I asked what skills they learned…Even one student who wasn’t very cooperative out there. She’s the one who complained the whole time, but she was even able to answer a question regarding fakes.

PST #2 added: “They did answer the questions correctly when I was leading them with questions…cognitively they could answer the questions even if they weren’t skillful enough to demonstrate it.”

Challenges Related to the Content

The next theme to emerge from the data was the challenges the pre-service teachers expressed that they and the students encountered with regards to the content. During their interviews, two of the four pre-service teachers reported struggling; while another pre-service teacher cited that the difficulties the students had applying skills may have been due to the small amount of lesson time.

PST #1 explained her students difficulties as follows:

Students didn’t quite understand passing and then moving up the field to get open. They’d pass, some would just stand there. They’d pass, and some would just follow the ball, which I did talk about, “Do you follow the ball or do you move away from the ball and find an open spot?” I think a few students kind of got the idea but I think for the most part they just didn’t understand it

She added:

I don’t think many of the students did a very good job of applying the skill during the games. My goal during the lessons was to teach skills that would get the students to spread out on the field rather than bunch up around the ball. But students still stayed in clusters on top of the ball…I don’t think very many of them were successful at the skills. They just struggled, well, I struggled, but they seemed to struggle more.

PST #4 confirmed the student and pre-service teacher challenges with the following statements:
I think the skills I tried to pick to do were way too hard for them to learn or something. And though I thought I kept making the lesson easier, they just couldn’t seem to get it. I’m glad to have, I’m glad I was able to ask you questions, but I would have rather just taught another week of your lessons. I would have liked that more, though I don’t know why they argue so much. I would have really been in trouble if I would have just gone and did my other lessons, the ones I made up the first weekend, but could they have been worse?

He added:

Between them complaining, not understanding, and, um always taking time to explain every little thing, and answer all the questions, and um such a hard, like having a hard time for them to do all this, I think made it a bad experience.

Lastly, PST #1 identified that the difficulties the students had applying skills may have been due to the small amount of lesson time the students had to practice. She stated: “The biggest challenge for me was the small amount of time that we had to work in daily…my biggest struggle was time …they weren’t getting enough time to practice.”

Use of Time

Though the two previous themes were the most frequently cited, responses regarding the next theme, use of time, was expressed by all pre-service teachers in a consistent and concise manner. All four pre-service teachers reported that they thought they had an increase in instruction time, as well as an increase in management time. PST #2 provided the following additional details:

I think the tactical lessons take longer to instruct kids because you have to let the kids tell you the answers, and if you can’t get them to tell you the answers you have to keep going. And if you’re not really skilled at leading them there then it takes more time during instruction.

PST #1 stated:

I think my instructions might have been a little too long. Maybe I should have figured out a way to figure out what I needed to say in less time and get them back into their activities a lot quicker. But also, ensuring they knew what I wanted them to know out there. So I think that instruction time took up a lot of my lessons.
PST #3 added: “My instruction time, depending on the lesson, like the diamond formation, I’m sure my instruction time was much higher than any of my other lessons.”

PST #4 concurred:

I was in instruction time a lot. I think the students need or needed a lot of time to understand what I was trying to teach. The concepts are hard. It wasn’t like you stand here and you stand here and then pass back and forth. It was hard for them to understand things like open space. I wish I could have just broken into a command lesson, and say just do this! At least I’d feel like I was in control.

All four of the pre-service teachers reported that an increase in management time occurred. PST #1 stated:

I think it just took them so long to come in that they were wasting so much time. That was frustrating too. I was like, let’s go. Move quicker, and then you can play more. They wasted a lot of time walking every where.

PST #1 added: “I just felt like I was constantly calling the students in. They weren’t getting enough time to practice…It just seemed to take forever to get them in and so I struggled with those parts of the lesson.”

PST #2 agreed:

I think there was a little bit more management with the tactical lesson of having to bring them back in and give them something new to work on. And any time you give them something new to work on you have to take time to describe and introduce, then send them back out.

PST #3 added that though she felt she did a good job of quickly bringing them in and out, she addressed the management issue with the following: “Management, it does eat time up, especially when you don’t set that protocol.” PST #4 noted that he “had a ton of management time” and agreed with the other pre-service teachers with the following statement related to the time it took his students to transition between the instructions and the game or activity portions of the lesson:

They walk in. They walk out. They walk around everywhere. It drove me crazy. But I tried to get them moving fast by saying things like the first team ready gets to have the ball first. I think that maybe worked one day, but it’s funny because they want to play games, they beg for games, but then they just like dilly-dally
around before they get going and put jersies on and stuff. I’d say let’s move quickly, and they just look at me like, whatever. I guess their hurry is probably different then my hurry. I can’t believe it takes them 2 to 3 minutes to get a game started when everything is already set-up and out there for them. Most of the time, I would have to go to the field and pick up the ball and say alright, get ready, here we go. And then like drop the ball so they would get started.

Frustrating Aspects

The next theme to surface in the data was teacher and student frustration. The responses in this theme ranged from the teachers feeling rushed or nervous to their frustration with the students arguing and standing around. This theme also includes students’ frustration related to wanting to be involved in games more.

The response most frequently cited in this category was the teachers’ belief that the students wanted to get into games quicker and more often, as well as stay in games once involved in them. PST #2 stated the following: “They always complained about not getting to play, like they didn’t have enough time to play.” PST #1 concurred: “They want to just play. That’s all they wanted to do was just play the game.” She added: “They complained about not getting to play in games more, which is pretty funny considering they get to play everyday.”

With reference to the pre-service teacher’s frustration with student arguing, PST #4 responded: “I think that if they would spread out more, a lot of things would be better, like they wouldn’t argue as much for sure.” He also stated:

Arguing was still a big deal. So many of them, all of them, had to argue about one thing or another during the games. It’s like put in a defender and they can’t get along. What’s that about? That’s supposed to be the fun part.

PST #1 added: “I just couldn’t win with them. I’d put them in games, and they’d argue. I put them in application tasks, and they goofed around. It was challenging all around.”

This teacher continued:

I felt there was a lot of wasted time on their part like arguing over the balls. I think that some enjoyed (games) while others didn’t. It just seems like when they were in games, which is where they complained they wanted to be, all they did
was complain about something, anything, and then I’m like when all you do is
complain, you cut into your playing time. I would constantly think, just play!
The frustration expressed by this pre-service teacher was represented in the next
aspect of this theme; the pre-service teachers feeling frustrated or nervous. PST #4
reported: “Sometimes I would get so nervous, or so frustrated.” PST #1 added that she
felt “rushed” during the skill presentation portions of the lessons.
Positive Teacher Comments
The last theme that emerged from the implementation portion of the data was
collected into a positive comment theme. In addition to the fact that all four pre-service
teachers stated that they would utilize this model again in the future, all four of the pre-
service teachers responded with an array of positive comments regarding the
implementation of this model. These statements ranged from positive feelings related to
the feedback they provided to meaningful experiences with demonstrations, enjoying the
games, benefits of the model and student success.
When asked to discuss the feedback they provided during the lesson, all four pre-
service teachers responded either favorably or with details about the appropriate
provision of feedback. PST #3 stated: “Feedback was very specific. I tried to keep the
feedback to my cues, because they would remember it, because that’s what I wanted to
 ingrain in their brain. A lot of times, the feedback would be about my questions.”
PST #4 provided the following details about the feedback he provided:
I did do a good job, what I thought was a good job of that. The cue card really
helped me, because sometimes I would get so nervous, or so frustrated, that I
could just look down and remember that I was working on whatever it was, like I
could just see, quick passes, and then I could look up and find someone who was
doing that, and I could say, “Good job, way to make a quick pass.” I think I
scored good on feedback. I gave a lot of it.
PST #1 added:
The feedback, um, I think I gave some positive feedback just in general. But I
know that I really tried to go around and give feedback like: “Hey, excellent job
of giving and going, passing the ball and moving to the open space.”…I think I
gave a lot…I try to get around to all the students.
PST #2 described her feedback with the following:

I actually wrote (the feedback) to where whatever game they were working on in the modified game, I made a special little box for me to tell me what I felt was important just for that modified game and then put that down as my cue, or whatever, or to give feedback. That’s kind of how I did it. I decided after that. And during my extensions, I basically used the cue I was using during the drills I switched around just slightly and gave it as feedback. For example: I used fake with your head, great head fake, way to use your head to fake the defender.

Another positive statement identified related to the demonstrations. One of the pre-service teachers affirmed that demonstrations were helpful in providing the important visual information to the students. PST #3 stated:

I think a lot of the kids really watched the demonstrations because I could just go…as soon as I did it once…and I would send them out, and you see them go right to the formation, and they would correct the other person, so I knew they were watching the demonstration and they were getting it. And you could tell who was not listening, because when they went out, they were totally clueless. And you could tell, because some of these activities were a little more advanced then they were probably use to so if they didn’t pay attention you could easily see it.

Pre-service teacher #3 reportedly enjoyed getting the students into games immediately as well as the resulting knowledge students get from involvement in the games. She stated: “This (model) kind of gives them more freedom where they get to go out and experience it, and you know, move into the game right away. I think that’s important to them understanding how games work.” PST #4 affirmed portions of this statement with the following:

It’s very easy for the kids once they get the idea how it works, I think they really like it. They like to be engaged in games a lot of the time. So, especially, like the first you just throw them out there, and let them play, and they don’t really know what they’re doing and as time goes on, you start to give them a little bit more feedback and information about the game, and it’s almost like they know everything right away because they were in a game. So it’s just really neat, plus I think it’s a way that allows us, as educators, to see what we’ve taught our students
from the beginning to the end, where most of the time when you have just a regular lesson, like a game stages model, or whatever, you don’t really get to see the whole transition into a game, because, you know, it just goes from one activity onto another.

Pre-service teacher #3 recognized the successes of one student in particular with the following:

This one student who did not do a thing, and just sat there and literally stood there with her stick in her hand, I mean, it was just like the whole turn around, the whole full circle. She was one of the best students who practiced during the activities and at the end of the lessons and she was in there, and she’s just a frail little girl who was just terrified, and I think because of the success she experienced in offense activities during the lesson that she got better in, and she loved it now. So, yeah, I think a lot of kids were really successful.

Other Notables

Other interesting variables presented themselves upon review of the data. These data did not fit into the themes presented in this section, but were unique, and therefore noteworthy to mention. The first variable of interest was related to the set-up of the playing fields. Several fields were set-up in order to facilitate the small-sided games needed for high activity involvement in the games. When asked how the students reacted to the feedback provided during the lesson, PST #4 reported:

One of the things I know is that it was hard to get around to all the fields. We have to have them spread out all over, but I got really tired running between the fields. Sometimes I would be so out of breath I would have to make myself slow down before I gave feedback. I think that made me more nervous too. I knew I had to give all the feedback, but they were so spread out.

The next variable was the teacher’s decision to remove the defensive components from the activities in between the modified games in order to avoid an element of student arguing. PST #4 stated: “I needed a break from all the whining, and I wanted to end on a positive note, so I just had them work on shooting quick, like getting rid of the ball quickly. No defense.”
Another variable of interest was that one pre-service teacher felt that the modifications and rules in the modified games may have been too much for the students to remember. PST #1 stated:

Though I think maybe one of the problems I ran into is maybe I had too many rules or conditions. Even though I think I gave feedback during that game with regards to my lesson focus, I think that there were too many things for them to think about.

The last variable of interest was the focal point of one of the pre-service teacher’s point when he expressed an interest in “getting a break” from the tactical lesson plan format. He stated: “Maybe if we put some game stage one days in there, they could have a break from the games and stuff.”

Pre-Service Teacher’s Assessment Experiences

The next set of themes developed for the assessment questions and prompts designed to illicit detailed descriptions of the pre-service teachers’ experiences during the assessment phase of the TGFU model, specifically their implementation of the GPAI. The interview questions and prompts for assessment were developed from topics found in Rink (2002). The questions and prompts were as follows:

1. How did you feel about using these assessments Games Performance Assessment Instrument (GPAI)?
2. How did you select which components of the GPAI to assess?
3. How did you select the students you chose to assess?
4. Talk to me about how much time you needed to complete the assessment.
5. How do you think the GPAI results will help you make a judgment about the effectiveness of your teaching and the unit?
6. How did you use the results of the GPAI to plan future lessons?
7. When looking at your assessments, explain whether or not your students met your learning objectives.
8. How do you think you might use this to give students a grade?
9. Would you use this assessment in the future? If so, when & why. If not, why?
Five themes emerged from analysis of the assessment portion of the interview. They were: (1) positive teacher statements, (2) implementation challenges, (3) perceived value of the results, (4) time needed to implement, and (5) group selection. An additional section on variables that were noteworthy to mention was added to the end of the assessment results.

Positive Teacher Statements

The theme most frequently reported by the pre-service teachers was positive statements related to their experiences utilizing the Game Performance Assessment Instrument (GPAI). Three of the four pre-service teachers stated that they enjoyed assessing skills during games or activities. PST #1 stated:

I really liked the GPAI because I was able to assess other things within the games such as what students did while passing the ball as well as what they did when they didn’t have the ball rather than just assess whether or not they were able to pass accurately. It was nice looking at something other than what a student can do with the ball, because it seems like there are a lot of other things involved in these games.

She added: I really like it, and it looks at important parts of the game. PST #2 agreed: “I like the idea of assessing them while they are in activity.” Similarly, PST #3 added: “I really liked assessing the students while they were in games.” Later in the interview, she added: “I like being able to look at what they are doing in the games. I mean that seems like the best place to look at it anyways.”

Two additional positive statements were made by pre-service teacher #3, one related to having a description of the relevant skills readily available and only having to assess groups of students in one day. PST #3 stated:

I thought (the GPAI) was really easy to do. Once I had my components and my criteria down…I could look down and instantly know what I was looking for. You have the definition right there; provide the appropriate support for a teammate with the ball; you know, like being in position with your man, and then I could just sit there and watch and go, oh yeah, that was great. That was a good one and then look again, and look again and, and go yeah, that person does that pretty regularly. It was a good reminder.
This teacher added, “I also like that I don’t have to assess everyone in one day.”

When asked if they enjoyed using the GPAI and if they would use it again in the future, all four pre-service teachers responded favorably.

Implementation Challenges

The next theme that emerged from the data was the challenges the pre-service teachers reportedly experienced during the implementation of the GPAI. These challenges included experiencing stress or feeling overwhelmed, as well as difficulty watching one skill and staying on one field.

Three of the four pre-service teachers reported feeling overwhelmed or stressed when implementing the GPAI into their lessons. PST #1 stated:

I do have to say that it was a little bit much to have to assess for me. I mean, I knew I had to assess last week, but I just could never fit it in. I tried to get to it on the third lesson, but then I had to deal with them not understanding something, or something like that. Then I knew I had to get to it on lesson number four, but I couldn’t because something else came up. I can’t remember what. Then I was so sad because I thought I ruined everything, but then you told me I could do it the second week. I finally did them both on the last day.

She concluded: “I just feel like it was a lot for me to do, just starting out and all.” PST #2 expressed similar feelings: “I just got a little stressed out trying to fit the second one into my lesson, actually lessons.” PST #4 provided the following example:

Well, I got to the second (GPAI) about the last five minutes of my lesson, the last one. Everything just seemed crazy, and I couldn’t slow down to try to do it earlier because I was so worried about everything, the arguing, of course, high sticking, and things like feedback and um, getting to the fields. I was so worried about getting them involved and making sure they stayed involved. It was crazy and very stressful.

Other challenges the pre-service teachers expressed were have difficulty watching one skill or staying on one field. PST #2 stated: “I kind of felt like I was neglecting other students because it was hard to stay with one group the whole time.” PST #3 added:

Sometimes it was hard because while I was watching one group for a while, sometimes the students, or just one of the students wouldn’t move much so I
couldn’t really give them a score, but then we talked and you told me that I could skip parts of the assessment if I wasn’t able to see one of the skills, right?

PST #4 responded:

I did remember having a hard time observing one skill, or I mean the skill that was on the form. It was kind of hard just watching for that one. That’s why I asked you if I could use a tape. It’s good to know that when I teach, like in student teaching, that I can use this with a video tape. I think I would like that, because I can rewind whenever I want. That would be less stressful for me. That’ll be cool.

PST #1 added “I just think it was hard to base a judgment on a bunch of arguers. They seemed more interested in arguing over the parts of the game than playing the game.”

PST #2 summarized her assessment experience with the following: “I think I ended up just giving them a number, you know so I could get on with my lesson. I really liked the system, but I just was so rushed. I worried that I didn’t do it right.”

Perceived Value of Results

The next theme to emerge from the data was the pre-service teacher’s perceived value or usefulness of the GPAI results in judging effectiveness of lessons or planning for future lessons. When asked if the GPAI results could help the pre-service teachers make a judgment regarding whether or not the learning objectives for the lesson were met, three of the pre-service teachers responded favorably towards the instrument and one responded negatively. PST #1, #2, and #3 reported that the results from the GPAI were going to be useful either for future planning, seeing what students learned, or evaluating whether the students meet the objectives of the lesson. PST #2 replied:

I think the results will give me a good indication of whether or not I’m meeting the objectives or goals that I’m trying to teach the students. Um, sometimes you might think things are going well when in actuality they are not, maybe, when you look at the results. Maybe something is wrong with my instructions or questions or something. Maybe I would have to focus on one certain thing like “base” before I focus on one of the other components.

PST #3 responded with the following:

If I had a bunch of students not score high on the assessment, I would know that I needed to spend more time on that part of the game. It would really help me
because, like I said, I could redo stuff that they scored low on, like I’m sure I need
to stay on spreading out and the base and support kind of deal with that area,
spreading out to support your team and stuff.
PST #1 thought the skills she selected were difficult to assess, but thought the instrument
was useful in assessing off-ball movements and skills. She stated:
I think that it could give great information about things not directly related to the
person who has the ball, but I would like to try it to see if I could maybe look at
other skills, maybe skills more easier than what I selected.
Pre-service teacher #4 was unsure if the results from the GPAI would be useful in
planning future lessons. He responded with the following:
Well, I guess, but I’m looking at the one I did last week, and it really doesn’t tell
me much. I guess by itself, it doesn’t really let me figure anything out. I know that
three students did ok that day, and one did good, but I can’t really or I don’t know
where to go from here.
When this pre-service teacher was asked if he thought that he could utilize the results
from the instrument to make a decision about how effective he was as a teacher, he
answered:
I guess it would be good to look at if I did one in the beginning and one in the
end, but it might be hard to get everyone in…I mean give a score to everyone in
the beginning and then again, do the whole class again at the end. Well, I can look
at them and see what score or what number they got and tell whether I did a good
job, I guess. Well, it looks like there is a bunch of random scores spread out
between one and five, so I don’t think I can tell whether it was good or not. I’d
definitely have to see if, or how they’d score in the beginning of a year or unit. I
think it would be hard to base my whole unit it was something like this
assessment. I guess I could learn how to do it, but I don’t know right now.
Time Needed to Implement
The next theme to emerge from the data was as a result of a direct question. When
the pre-service teachers were asked about the amount of time needed to complete the
assessment, two of the pre-service teachers replied that it was an easy and/or quick
instrument to implement, and two of the pre-service teachers wished that they could have more time or could have used a video to implement the assessment.

PST #1’s response was: “I don’t think it took very long to assess the students I wanted to assess. I watched them during the games and was able to quickly give, what I felt, was an accurate score based on their performance.” An interesting observation was made by PST #1 relative to how the design of the games lead to easily assessing students. This statement was:

Also, I think that having small sided games made assessing easier because the students had to be more involved in the game at all times whereas with larger teams some students would have been able to hide during the game.

Addressing the amount of time it took to implement, PST #3 responded:

Not very long. Oh, I would say, at the most, five minutes. Um...maybe between five and eight minutes. It was just so easy to do, because I could stand on the outside of the perimeter and watch that team that I was watching and still see everyone else, and I could just glance over and watch them and every so often and check it off and see and still maintain control of my class and help other students out who need it.

Conversely, PST #2 stated: “It took me a little long to do... It was actually pretty interesting because sometimes you couldn’t really tell quickly whether they were actually working on what we were doing that day.” As mentioned previously in the implementation challenges section of the results, PST #4 expressed difficulty watching one skill and would have liked to use a videotape to observe the skills.

Group Selection

When asked how each pre-service teacher selected the groups to assess, all four pre-service teachers selected students who were on the same team. PST #3 added the following related to selecting students on the same team: “They were on the same team, actually...both times. I did that the first time just because, but then I saw on the assessment that it said “team”, so I thought they had to be on the same team.” Other variables that were involved in the selection of the students were: these who were typically on-task, those who were skillful, those who argued less, and those who were
playing on the center field. PST #2 “I just selected kids that were all playing the game or were all involved in the activities.” PST #3 added the following details:

The first time I chose them, because I thought, oh, this will be an easy one to watch because they’re all very skillful, and as a new teacher, I just thought oh, that would be a lot easier than trying to watch someone else and try to assess them, because I thought it would be hard to see them do what I wanted them to do so that’s why I did that one. The other one was just random, and the last one I felt more comfortable using the assessment, and I just randomly chose, though I have to say that they were a group that at least was very involved in the lesson. They didn’t have as many arguers on the teams. That made it easy to do the assessment quickly because they were involved more.

In interesting statement made by PST #4 cited that he selected the assessment group based on their placement on the field:

I learned that if I picked a team that was on the field in the middle that maybe I wouldn’t feel so far away from everyone, so that’s what I did the last time. I picked the group in the middle, that way I could be close to everyone and feel like I had more control, kind of.

Noteworthy to Mention

Other interesting variables arose during this section of the interview.

Three of the four pre-service teachers used the GPAI booklet to help them plan their assessment. PST #3 noted: “That book on this assessment really helped me make sense of everything. I liked it.” PST #2 was the one who did not use the booklet, which was interesting when the following statements about her values are taken into consideration.

PST #2 stated:

I liked the idea of using the decision making, because that let me know if they were understanding what we were conveying when we were talking about…move away from the defender, and things like that. Were they actually doing that during game play? Skill execution wasn’t quite as big for me because I noticed some of these kids having a difficult time actually demonstrating their skills but they were actually the ones telling me the answers, and that was different because I knew that they could say it but maybe not do it.
Lastly, it was necessary to report three additional variables that occurred relative to the implementation of the assessment that will be discussed later in this chapter. First, PST #1 was unable to implement her assessment during the first week. She was told that she could do it during the second week, but wasn’t able to get to the first one until the last day. On this day, she implemented both assessments. Second, PST #2 “couldn’t get to the second assessment,” and never implemented the one that she created. Third, PST #4 was able to get to the second assessment during the last five minutes of the last lesson.

In summary, the daily questionnaires and post-study, semi-structured interviews provided vital information regarding the similarities and differences in the experiences that pre-service teachers encountered during the planning, implementing and assessing aspects of the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding skill instruction model.

Discussion

The data collected from the daily questionnaires and the post-study, semi-structured interview provided vital information in the triangulation process identifying regarding the experiences that the pre-service teachers encountered during the planning, implementing and assessing aspects of the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding (TGFU) skill instruction model. These research instruments sought to examine and describe the pre-service teacher’s experiences and attempted to answer the three following research questions:

1. What are the pre-service teacher’s experiences during the planning phases of the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model?
2. What are the pre-service teacher’s experiences implementing the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model?
3. What are the pre-service teacher’s experiences assessing student’s skills, using the Games Performance Assessment Instrument, in the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model?

The Value Orientation Inventory-2 (Ennis & Chen, 1993) was utilized to determine the pre-service teacher’s value orientation profile and therefore assisted in answering the following research question:
Is there a relationship between the pre-service teacher’s value orientation and their implementation of the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model?

The research questions will be discussed in the same order as they are presented in this section. Data collected the daily questionnaires and the post-study, semi-structured interview will be discussed first, followed by the data discovered through the Value Orientation Inventory.

Pre-Service Teacher’s Planning Experiences

In order to identify the pre-service teacher’s experiences in the planning components of the Teaching Games for Understanding model, the responses from the daily questionnaires and semi-structured, post-study interviews were analyzed. Three common variables of interest related to planning were revealed. They were: (1) challenges with the tactical content, (2) tactical questioning and (3) on-task considerations. The following sections include the examination and discussion of these variables.

Challenges with the Tactical Content

As mentioned earlier, the tactical content challenges that both the pre-service teachers and the students reportedly experienced was the most common theme within this section. These challenges included: Difficulty deciding what content was developmentally appropriate for the students, how to break down the difficult concepts into teachable and learnable pieces, including the continually reported concept not clustering up or spreading out, and the difficulties in the development of tactical-appropriate skill cues. The data showed that all four of the pre-service teachers found that planning for the TGFU model was challenging to some degree. The majority of these responses were associated with the curricular decisions the pre-service teachers had to make in order to plan appropriate lessons.

During the planning phases, there were several instances the pre-service teachers noted that the lesson plans, tactical questions or tactical skills/concepts were too difficult for the students to comprehend. One example of this occurring was when one of the pre-service teachers developed all of his lessons during the days preceding the second week of instruction, only to conclude that what he had planned was too difficult for his students.
Even after he attempted to simplify the lessons, he still reported that he thought that the revised content he selected was too challenging for the students to understand.

Though for the most part the pre-service teachers were unsure of what tactical skills to select to teach, one consistent variable reported by all four pre-service teachers was that the students clustered together. The pre-service teachers all independently identified that they wanted to focus on something that would result in the students spreading out, not clustering and/or moving to the open spaces, but had no idea how to develop this concept into a lesson plan. Though the teachers were able to identify the need for students to be introduced to the concept of spreading out and moving to the open spaces, they reportedly did not know how to approach teaching such a complex concept. The pre-service teachers testified that they did not know what the pieces of such a concept were, how to identify and break down a difficult concept, and that he was challenged with trying to explain, demonstrate and select cues for such concepts. It was interesting to note that each pre-service teacher developed lessons that dealt with this concept in a different manner. One teacher taught give-and-go so that in her words, “At least one student would be moving at all times”, two teachers taught offensive formations focusing on moving away from the defender and not standing next to your own teammates and staying in your position, and the last pre-service teacher focused on moving to the open spot. At times, all of the pre-service teachers described attempts to use the Griffin, Mitchell and Oslin (1997) textbook as a reference, but didn’t find it useful in determining how to address their identified problem. They stated that they found the book to be helpful in identifying concepts appropriate to teach for a particular skill level, as well as giving examples of activities and designing tactical questions, but that when they had selected something that they wanted to teach that the book was not helpful in developing the lesson further.

One explanation the pre-service teachers provided regarding their difficulties in developing tactical lesson plans was the fact that they each found teaching game stage one skills more simple when compared to the complexity and difficulty of teaching tactical concepts. They found it easier to identify single skills, skill cues and activities for those from books and college preparatory courses on single skills. In several instances they commented that these lessons were more difficult than those that focused on single,
isolated skills and that selecting skill cues for game stage one was easier because simple pieces of the skill were the descriptive cues.

One plausible explanation for the difficulty the pre-service teachers had in the planning phases of the model was that their college preparatory classroom experiences did not adequately preparing them for the true needs of public school children. Given that the majority of the pre-service teacher’s experiences teaching prior to this study were peer teaching experiences, the knowledge of what public school students know and need to learn varies tremendously from what college, physical education students need to learn. Given that physical education majors typically have background experiences that promote at the very least appropriate positioning and movement in a game, it is probable that the concept of teaching spreading out to students never even crossed the pre-service teacher’s mind. During these peer-teaching experiences they were unable to get an adequate gauge of what skills beginning learners need to know to be successful in a game situation. When these beginning teachers enter the public school, they have difficulties identifying concepts or strategies that their students need to be successful in a game situation, because what the public school students need differs tremendously from what their peers needed in their college preparatory classes. This variable added to the aforementioned evidence that game stage 3 is typically skipped or is extremely difficult for beginning teachers to implement successfully.

**Tactical Questioning**

As mentioned previously in this text, tactical awareness or tactical understanding is defined by Mitchell, Griffin and Oslin (1994) as the ability to identify problems that arise while a game is in progress and to select the skills necessary to solve these problems. During the tactical awareness phase of the model, as described by Bunker and Thorpe’s (1982) presentation of the model, students are presented with tactical problems to help them increase their tactical awareness. This phase of the model is followed by a teacher initiated tactical question and answer session. All four pre-service teachers reported that planning and developing the tactical questions for this phase of the model was challenging. Among the challenges reported were: Developing the appropriate wording for the questions, not answer for the students when they were unable to respond, problems with developing the appropriate sequence of
questions, anticipating what the students will say and then developing the resulting, appropriate follow-up question, and developing questions that weren’t too difficult or confusing. Since the teaching games for understanding shifts the interest from physical ability to game understanding, these question and answer sessions were extremely important in facilitating the student’s increased cognition.

It was interesting to note that all four of the pre-service teachers utilized the textbook to help them develop questions, or make sure the questions were tactically appropriate. One teacher reported that it was his biggest challenge in planning because he was unable to sequence questions that would appropriately guide the students down the intended path. One teacher was concerned that inappropriate questions or the sequencing of questions might confuse the students.

**On-Task Considerations**

One of the variables that has been seen consistently across all of the aspects of utilizing the TGFU model was the element of student arguing. In the planning aspects of the model, the pre-service teachers reported that student arguing was a factor in the student’s ability to remain on-task during the lessons. One pre-service teacher reportedly wanted to focus on offensive and defensive skills but wanted to avoid putting the students into modified games where teams would be playing each other because with the addition of defense, comes the increase in arguing amongst the opposing teams and even teammates. This pre-service teacher reported trying several different team formations, separating students, and letting students select their own teams; hoping that having friends on the same team would lead to less fights. Of all of the factors involved in the planning phase, student arguing was the biggest obstacle in the pre-service teacher’s eyes.

Another model related variable that may have negatively influenced student arguing is the progression of a tactical lesson. Given that a tactical lesson is initiated with a modified game, the place where pre-service teachers reported the most arguing took place, and then progressed into the skill practice aspects of the lesson could facilitate the students coming to the skill practice activities with the post-arguing attitudes. If students do argue in games more, and the model is initiated with games, it stands to reason that the arguing will start early in the lesson and quite possibly continue throughout the remained of the activities.
It was interesting to note that one of the positive aspects consistently reported related to on-task behaviors was the similarities in the daily game set-up. Given that the lesson plans always begin and end with a modified game lends itself to simplified transitioning phases because from day-to-day students already know where the fields are, which direction they go, where the goals are, etc. This could have possibly lead to students knowing where to go for games, which perhaps resulted in lower instruction and management time, therefore resulting in higher activity time, and hopefully an increase in time on-task.

Pre-Service Teacher’s Implementing Experiences

The results related to the implementation aspects of the tactical TGFU model of the interview and questionnaires revealed the largest overall number of variables of interest. These variables included: tactical questioning, challenges related to the content, use of time, frustrations, and positive comments. A discussion of each of these variables will follow.

Tactical Questioning

Interestingly, implementation inquiries pertaining to tactical questioning yielded the largest number of responses, as well as the widest variety of responses from the pre-service teachers. As previously noted, these remarks ranged from reports of the pre-service teachers feeling like they asked too many questions, it taking too long for students to derive the correct answer, students getting bored with the questioning phase of the model, to the questions posed being too difficult for the students to answer. Though all four teachers responded positively when asked if they thought their students achieved the cognitive objectives of the lesson and agreed that this was an important aspect of the model, they all stated that they thought there were too many questions.

In the previous section, the challenges related to the tactical questioning were primarily experienced by the pre-service teachers. On the contrary, in the implementation process the pre-service teachers reported that it was the students who had more negative responses regarding tactical questioning. During the question and answer sessions, the pre-service teachers reported that the students continually complained about having to come in for questioning. Several variables may have contributed to these complaints and
negative responses, though some of the justifications may prove to have nothing to do with the actual questioning portion of the lesson.

It is possible that the mere sequencing of going from a game situation straight into the question and answer session set the tone, so to speak, for their negative attitude about the tactical questions before this phase was even initiated. Consistent with the literature, the students could have been enjoying their participation in the games so much that they may have responded negatively to being called away from this participation even if they weren’t proceeding to the questioning portion of the lesson. The sequencing of the components of the lesson plan may have accounted for the negative responses given by the students.

Another plausible explanation for the poor attitudes the students exhibited towards the tactical questions may have originated from the high amounts of transition and management time that the pre-service teachers engaged in just prior to the questioning phase. Given that the pre-service teachers displayed management times consistent with that of beginning teachers, including the walking in from the games, or “dilly-dallying” as one pre-service teacher referred to it, compounded with the amount of behavioral issues that accompanied the students in the games; it is understandable that the negative behaviors and attitudes exhibited towards the next element of the lesson may be evident, no matter what element proceeded this game play. Students who came in slowly from the modified game and those who were off-task during the transition to the questioning phase were all exhibiting behaviors that the pre-service teachers had to address. These behaviors combined with the fact that the pre-service teachers reportedly had difficulties with the questioning phase of the model, may have all resulted in a tedious process for both the pre-service teachers and the students.

Another factor that may have contributed to the negative attitudes surrounding the question and answer phase of the model could have been the student arguing that the pre-service teachers continually reported that occurred during the games preceding the questioning. Again, given that the question and answer segment of the lesson follows modified game play and that the pre-service teachers reported that the most arguing could be seen during the modified games, the negative atmosphere that accompanies the arguing could have lead to the students bringing this poor attitude with them to the
tactical questioning episodes. Here again, this explanation has nothing to do with the actual process of asking and answering questions and could be part of the reason the questions were so negatively perceived.

Another possible explanation of the student’s poor outlook on the questioning phase could have resulted from the poor questioning techniques of the pre-service teachers. Many times the pre-service teachers reported that it was challenging to get the students to respond correctly to their pre-determined questioned. The pre-service teachers gave detailed descriptions of not knowing what to ask or what answers to expect. On the contrary, pre-service teacher #3 asked the least number of questions and reportedly enjoyed this aspect of the model the most. One possible interpretation of this result is that this pre-service teacher could have more competently designed the questions she asked, and therefore needed less follow-up questions, resulting in less instruction time and perhaps a reduction in the negativity that reportedly surrounded the tactical questioning. Given these elements, it is not surprising this pre-service teacher exhibited the least amount of management time and the highest amounts of activity time.

These variables coupled with the earlier reports of pre-service teachers not feeling comfortable developing questions that lead the students to the desired answer, made this section of the lesson one of the least enjoyable for the pre-service teachers and students.

**Challenges Related to the Content**

The majority of the difficulties related to the lesson content were reported about student’s inability to understand a concept or strategy. Since tactical learning and awareness are very different from simple skills and often times more challenging to comprehend, difficulties were expected. Most students have experienced lesson plans designed to teach simple skills in isolation, for example, how to pass to a partner. The tactical TGFU model might focus on how to pass quickly in a game situation, as well as when and why quick passes are important in successful game play. This shift in focus to the concept surrounding the skill, instead of the simple components of a skill proved challenging for the pre-service teachers and students alike.

In addition to this challenge, the pre-service teachers reported that they did not think their students understood that they were supposed to be applying the skill(s) taught in the lesson to the modified games. Consistently, the pre-service teachers reported that once
the students were in the game settings that instead of focusing on the presented skill or concept, the students were focusing on scoring, and/or where concentrating on stealing the ball from opponents. Contrary to the data presented earlier in this text, once in games the students were seen arguing, not following rules or using the skills, as well as clustering up continually. These reports are not consistent with what Mitchell (1996) reported regarding the value of the tactical model as it capitalizes on the link between games and skill execution, while providing a concrete link between skills and tactics.

It is possible that the above challenges were due in part to a lack of outside experiences the students have had in invasion game settings. While this is a possible explanation given that it is likely that this could have been the first time these concepts were presented to these students, the lesson components presented in the game situations were appropriate for the students to learn, as verified by the Mitchell, Griffin and Oslin (1994) textbook used to develop them. Given the short amount of time the pre-service teachers and students were involved in this unit, this lack of knowledge and/or experiences could have affected the learning and acquisition of the concepts presented in the lesson plans. As research has shown, the lessons required more cognitively-based, higher-order thinking, and therefore previous experiences in these types of experiences may have been helpful and could have lead to increased positive experiences in a unit utilizing the tactical model.

Use of time

It appears that the pre-service teacher’s primary complaint was their disappointment in themselves and their students regarding the amount of time it took to get the students organized on separate fields and to get them started in the modified games. It didn’t appear to be the time involved with the process of transitioning the students in and out for each task, as much as it was the time it took to transition from instruction to being actively involved in games or activities. The pre-service teachers reported that this is when students wasted the most time. It is probable that this is a result of the pre-service teachers lack of established protocols that may have resulted in students reportedly walk in and walking out, not hustling to get started in games which resulted in the reported increase in transition and management time.
The pre-service teachers reported that they had to bring the students in and out too frequently and that they believed this affected the activity time. This is surprising considering that the tactical model calls for no additional managerial episodes of bringing the students in and out, when compared to other models. Perhaps the pre-service teacher’s negativity stemmed from the student about being pulled away from games, as discussed in the previous section. The pre-service teachers believed that bringing the students in and out “so many times” lead to an increase management time, and therefore a reduction in activity time. In addition, they noted that the increase in off-task behaviors, such as walking around when they were supposed to be involved in activities, could have also contributed to higher management and transition times. Though the details regarding the increase in transition and management time may be accurate, these management instances within the tactical model may not be any different if students where in a single-skill oriented lesson. One of the pre-service teachers reported the irony surrounding the fact that the students walked to get into the games that they continually complained about wanting to be in. Once in games, they spent most of their time arguing and not playing.

Though the pre-service teachers agreed that the tactical model would require more instruction time, the instruction time may be higher because of the nature of the content, and the fact that it may be more difficult to explain a concept than a simple skill. An increase in instruction time could have also been because of an increase in time spent in the tactical questioning components of the lesson, which as mentioned previously, could have been longer than usual given that the pre-service teachers may have utilized poor questioning techniques, consistent with that of a beginning teacher.

Frustrations

Contrary to what the literature says, the pre-service teachers reported that the students still continually complained about not getting to be in games quicker and more often, as well as wanting to stay in games longer. Interestingly, when they were put into games, the pre-service teachers consistently reported that an increase in arguing was apparent and almost overwhelming at times. The pre-service teachers thought that it was probable that this may have been increased due to the nature of the activities utilizing offense and defensive players. At times, pre-service teachers reported searching the text for tactical concepts that involved the least amount of time spent in offensive and
defensive roles. One pre-service teacher found comfort in spending time on shooting quickly to an unguarded goal. He stated that he was exhausted from all the arguing that he believed escalated in situations where students where involved in activities that had both offensive and defensive players, and he wanted to end his unit on a positive, non-arguing note. He decided to select shooting quickly to the corners to an unguarded goal.

Positive Comments

Most of the statements in this theme did not appear to be specific only to the tactical model but to positive pedagogical aspects. The responses here were primarily positive statements about general effective teaching qualities, for example, the pre-service teacher’s satisfaction with the feedback he/she provided, or the demonstrations they were pleased with, or on the positive statements about the amount of time the students were engaged in games. Another positive aspect within this theme was the pre-service teachers report that the students enjoyed getting into games quickly in the lesson and frequently in the lesson. This is consistent with the literature related to the intrinsic motivation of games participation.

Interestingly, two pre-service teachers reported participation from students that ordinarily did not participate. These pre-service teachers noted that students usually marginalized and not motivated to be involved in lessons were active participants in some portion of the lesson. One pre-service teacher stated that she was pleased that a non-cooperative student was more engaged during the questioning phases of the lessons, whereas another pre-service teacher noticed a smaller, unskillful child becoming more interested and involved in the game settings. The latter of these examples is echoed in Doolittle’s (1995) report that low skilled students might find initial success in games through cognitive understanding.

Pre-Service Teacher’s Assessing Experiences

The triangulated responses from the daily questionnaires and the post-study, semi-structured interviews were analyzed in order to identify the pre-service teacher’s experiences assessing within the Teaching Games for Understanding model, more specifically their experiences implementing the Games Performance Assessment Instrument (GPAI). The four variables of interest that arose from the themes were: (1) positive pre-service teacher statements regarding the assessment instrument, (2)
implementation challenges, (3) perceived value of the results, and (4) group selection. Description and examination of these variables will be presented in the following section.

Positive Pre-Service Teacher Statements

As mentioned previously, the most frequently reported variable associated with the pre-service teacher’s experiences utilizing the GPAI was the positive statements related to the instrument. They reportedly enjoyed assessing off-ball movements, as well as assessing “other important parts of the game.” Amongst other variables, they allegedly enjoyed assessing skills during game-play and/or in an activity.

Although all pre-service teachers agreed that utilizing the GPAI was an enjoyable experience and that they would use it again in the future, surprisingly three of the four reported struggling with it. There were several instances during the interviews and in questionnaires where they reported feeling stressed or overwhelmed. In addition to these reports, other occurrences may have corroborated these difficulties, for example, two pre-service teachers did not implement the instrument until the last modified game of the last day, one did not implement the instrument in the prescribed time, and one did not implement the instrument for the second time at all. These examples will be discussed further in the implementation challenges section.

One explanation is that when the pre-service teachers responded positively to implementing the assessment instrument, it may be a statement that they are ready for a new assessment (and/or curricular model) that is deemed appropriate by books or educators, but they may not have the skills to implement it correctly or with positive results. Once in the field, if they try to implement new curriculum models and fail, they might become overwhelmed and discouraged, and may not continue to utilize the model again. It is also possible that the pre-service teachers responded positively because they may not have realized that other alternative responses were acceptable possibilities. They may not have fully grasped the option of saying “I don’t like this instrument.” In addition, they may have responded positively because they may have thought that is what was expected of them, and if they reported otherwise, they may have thought that this might have been interpreted as a failure in some form.

Though all pre-service teachers responded positively to the GPAI, pre-service teacher #3 had evidence of her success and enjoyment of utilizing the model throughout
her responses. Almost of her responses were positive, and she did not report feeling stressed or overwhelmed during the assessment, and in fact, she reportedly thought it was easy and quick. The only statement that could not be qualified as a positive statement was that she felt challenged when she had to assess a student that did not move during the time allocated for the assessment.

It is interesting to note that upon further review of the behaviors that pre-service teachers #3 exhibited, she displayed behaviors consistent with that of a veteran teacher. She had the highest overall average activity time (53.4%) and the lowest transition/management time (15.5%). She recorded the most overall feedback statements and provided the most specific, tactical feedback statements. In addition to this data, she was the only pre-service teacher that did not report that her students were bored or uninterested, and she did not observe arguing to be a problem during the lessons. It is possible that these results may account for her success and possible resulting enjoyment associated with the model and assessment instrument.

Specifically relative to the GPAI, pre-service teacher #3’s overall effectiveness as a teacher may have predicated the successful implementation of this assessment instrument. Since the other three pre-service teachers all reported being overwhelmed or stressed at times, and all three of them had difficulties implementing the assessment into their lessons, evidence that pre-service teacher #3 had a positive experience may be accounted for by taking a closer looks at these effective teaching variables.

Evidence of the overwhelming nature of the requirements of the study can be seen in pre-service teacher #4’s description of how “crazy” it was to try to implement the assessment instrument during the lesson while he was worried about everything including: arguing, high sticking, feedback, management time, and getting students involved; to name a few from his list. On the contrary, pre-service teacher #3 gave an account that she was able to stand on the outside of the group she was assessing and was still able to assess while watching everyone else and still maintaining control of the other students in her class, as well as help others who needed it; an overlapping or multi-tasking behavior consistent with that of a veteran teacher. This pre-service teacher may have had more success and enjoyment implementing this model and instrument given that
she was a more effective teacher and may not have been as overwhelmed with the various aspects of a lesson plan and assessment implementation.

Implementation Challenges

The biggest challenge reported by three of the pre-service teachers was that they were overwhelmed trying to fit the GPAI into their lessons. This is understandable given that all the other aspects that normally occur during a lesson do not cease during assessment phases. This taken with simultaneously trying to assess the students’ skills proved to be too much for the pre-service teachers to accomplish, and in some cases, to even attempt. They reported being stressed, overwhelmed and not knowing where to implement the assessment based on the number of unrelated variables, like arguing or long instruction episodes, that arose during any given day. These testimonies are consistent with what the literature says about beginning teachers. They consistently reported that they were worried about a variety of others things that beginning teachers tend to spend additional time on, including managerial aspects and discipline problems.

Another implementation challenge that the pre-service teachers reported was that because they had to assess during the modified game-play that they felt like they had to stay on one field too long, and at times, they felt like they were neglecting the other students. There are two possibilities that may explain how this challenge could have emerged. First, they could have needed to stay on one field longer than necessary because they were new at this type of assessment, and it may have taken them longer to accurately assess students’ skill levels. Second, given that three of the four pre-service teachers exhibited an average activity time of 41%, 41% and 34%, they could have felt the pressure of assessing in a smaller segment of activity time, and therefore, during the time allocated to activity they had to focus all of their attention on the assessment of one group, therefore resulting in the feeling, or actual event, of neglecting the other students. Given that the pre-service teachers either needed to spend more time on one field to assess than the instrument may deem necessary and/or that they spent a significant portion of the reduced activity time assessing one group, it is possible that they were neglecting the other students.

Beyond the challenges reported by the pre-service teachers, three important occurrences related to the difficulties they had implementing the GPAI must be
discussed. First, one of the pre-service teachers did not get to the assessment during the second week that he was required to do until the last five minutes of the last modified game during the last lesson of the study. Second, another pre-service teacher was unable to implement the assessment that was required during the first week. In addition, she couldn’t implement either assessments until the last day, and on this day, she attempted to do two separate assessments. These pre-service teachers mentioned that they were so overwhelmed or stressed dealing with other variables of the lesson, that they felt they were unable to “get to” the assessment prior to when they ultimately implemented it. The third pre-service teacher did not do the second required assessment. This pre-service teacher made an interesting statement pertaining to this experience. During her interview, she stated that “Skill execution wasn’t quite as big for me.” Her statement provides insight into her thought processes when she decided not to implement the required assessment for the second time. This statement speaks volumes as to this pre-service teacher’s value orientation related to the perceived usefulness of the GPAI, and teaching and assessing skills and skill execution. This statement will be discussed further in the value orientation section of this discussion.

Perceived Value of the Results

One variable of interest that arose in the perceived value of results theme was that the pre-service teachers did not have an understanding of how to use the results from the GPAI. Once they allocated the scores to their target students, the pre-service teachers did not possess the knowledge of how the results from an authentic assessment, such as the GPAI, could possibly translate to making a judgment about how effective a lesson was or to assign a student’s grade. The pre-service teachers reported not knowing whether the results were good or bad and, in their words, if the results were “really an indication of anything.” This probably originated from the fact that these students have very limited experiences with authentic assessment, and they have difficulty understanding how to translate these scores into something useful.

It is likely that a link could be made between the stressful feelings that reportedly overwhelmed the pre-service teachers and the perceived value. One pre-service teacher reported that she “just ended up giving them a number,” so she could “get on with her lesson.” One of the reasons the perceived value might be so reportedly low could have
been a result of pre-service teachers quickly giving scores for the targeted skills so that they could “get on” with the lesson. If, during the stressful times of the lesson, other pre-service teachers allocated scores just so they could get the assessment over with, it would stand to reason that their perceived value of these scores would be correspondingly low. The fact that these scores were probably not accurate ones would lend itself to the perception that these scores are not useful or valuable in the eyes of the pre-service teachers, and therefore should not be used to develop a grade.

Group Selection

During this study, the pre-service teachers were able to select the groups they wanted to assess. Not surprisingly, they reported selecting students that were typically on-task, those who did not argue as much, those who were skillful or those who were on the same teams. An interesting extension of this process was that if the pre-service teachers were in a regular class setting and would have needed to assess all the students in the class, the pre-service teachers could have faced future implementation difficulties. If the teacher wanted to assess every student in his or her class, he or she would not be able to continue to select students that were on the same team, unless a curriculum model implemented required students to remain on the same team from day-to-day. If students were to rotate teams each day, the pre-service teachers would be challenged even further to assess students who were spread out all over the playing fields.

The Pre-Service Teachers’ Value Orientation Profile

Ennis and Chen’s (1993) Value Orientation Inventory – 2 was utilized to determine the pre-service teachers’ value orientation profile. Given that the pre-service teachers’ beliefs impact the learning environment and all related components, it was critical to examine their beliefs about teaching and learning to provide explanations related to their experiences utilizing the tactical TGFU model. These belief systems represent competing philosophies and are assumed to affect priorities concerning educational decisions. As mentioned previously, they are represented in the following five value orientations: discipline mastery, learning process, ecological integration, social responsibility, and self-actualization. An examination of the pre-service teacher’s values provides important information regarding the successes and failures of the models as they relate to the pre-service teacher’s value orientation.
Pre-service teacher #1 classified one value orientation at the high priority level. This orientation was social reconstruction. The next value orientations were discipline mastery, followed by learning process and then ecological integration, which were all ranked as a neutral priority for this teacher. As mentioned previously, the teachers who advocate for the social reconstruction value orientation are primarily concerned with the development of positive interpersonal relationships among their students. Beliefs that are central to the social reconstruction orientation are that students should develop the ability to support each other and that sport and fitness should be utilized to provide opportunities for students to work together.

Given that this pre-service teacher reportedly struggled with the amount of student arguing during games and that she had the most frequent problems with students not cooperating with each other or her, as well as having bad attitudes, being bored and/or uninterested throughout the unit, strengthens the case that this model might not be the best fit for this teacher. The belief that positive interpersonal relationships are paramount to all other goals in this teacher’s most valued curriculum lends evidence to the fact that this teacher may not flourish or even feel comfortable in the TGFU curriculum model, which prioritizes the affective domain as the least important of the three domains. This taken into consideration with the fact that this pre-service teacher recorded the most instruction time and the lowest activity time, strengthens the conclusion that the TGFU model might not be the best fit when this pre-service teacher’s value orientation is taken into consideration.

Pre-service teacher #2 presented very interesting data related to her value orientation. This pre-service teacher placed a high priority on learning process, and close behind she valued the social reconstruction orientation. Learning process educators focus on creating effective environments for learning by challenging their students to think about how and why certain movements lead to particular outcomes. As a result, students are able to analyze situations and alter their behavior accordingly. As mentioned above, fostering positive interpersonal relationships ranks high on the list of priorities for a social reconstruction advocate.

One of the most important variables to take into consideration was the fact that this pre-service teacher did not implement the second required GPAI into her lesson
plans. During the interview process when she was asked to discuss this decision, this pre-service teacher made the following statement, “Skill execution wasn’t quite as big for me because I noticed some of these kids having a difficult time actually demonstrating their skills but they were actually the ones telling me the answers.” This gives strength to the theory that she values a curriculum model that places a higher emphasis on the affective domain, while continuing to focus on the cognitive domain as well. Though she said that she might implement this model in the future, she stated that it would only be in combination with other models, and she would not do an entire unit utilizing TGFU.

Pre-service teacher #3 had two value orientations prioritized so high that the remaining three value orientations all ranked in the low priority range. The value orientation categorized as the highest for this pre-service teacher #3 was the discipline mastery with learning process ranking as the second high prioritized orientation. The discipline mastery value orientation considers the mastery of fundamental core knowledge and performance skills as essential elements of a curriculum. The learning process orientation shares common components. Both of these orientations contend that having the ability to perform is central to being a physically educated person; though the learning process advocate believes that students must also know how to solve problems about sport. This proved to be consistent within several components related to pre-service teacher #3 during this study.

It would stand to reason that pre-service teacher #3 might be better prepared to successfully implement the TGFU model, because her value orientation and the TGFU domain priorities are aligned. Metzler (2000) stated that the most basic assumption of the TGFU model is that learning in the psychomotor domain will be more proficient if it follows cognitive learning. Metzler identified the TGFU model’s first priority as the cognitive domain, followed by the psychomotor.

Pre-service teacher #3 reportedly enjoyed the model the most, was the most successful at implementing it, and reported the least amount of problems with the students in the lessons. Of all of the comments pre-service teacher #3 made on the daily questionnaires and the interview, only one negative statement about the model was reported. This comment pertained to the difficulties she had during the tactical questioning aspects of the model, in particular when the student didn’t know the answers
to the tactical questions. During the lesson implementation, she exhibited the most effective teaching behaviors of all the teachers. Evidence of these behaviors was as follows: (1) she had an average of 53.4% activity time in all of her lessons, which was the highest for all of the teachers; (2) she recorded the lowest transition/management time, which was 15.5%; and (3) she gave the most overall and specific tactical feedback. In addition to this evidence, she did not report any problems with arguing or students getting bored, nor did she find the model particularly challenging. Perhaps the best supporting evidence of pre-service teacher’s value orientation regarding the TGFU model was found in the interview when she made the statement, that the model “had a lot of importance.” This comment supported the productive connection between the discipline mastery and learning process value orientations and this pre-service teacher’s belief that the TGFU model is an effective and value model of instruction.

Pre-service teacher #4 placed a high priority on social reconstruction and learning process. Here again, accepting personal differences and developing the ability to support each other are skills that a social reconstruction advocate would support. Throughout the study, this pre-service teacher struggled the most with the TGFU model. He reported the most instances of student arguing, as well as his continual frustration related to the students not getting along. He reported that both he and his students struggled with the tactical content, and he was the pre-service teacher who most frequently said that his students were not applying the skills into the games. He stated that he would have liked to avoid the components of the TGFU model, including the modified games because the games seemed to result in student arguing. This teacher made lesson plan decisions supporting the fact that he believed the modified games sparked increased arguing amongst his students. He was observed continually trying to implement tactical concepts that did not involve offensive and defensive players, because of his frustration with the students not being able to get along. He recorded the highest transition and management time, which he attributes to dealing with students arguing during games, and therefore reducing the activity time. Though he said that he enjoyed the model, it wasn’t really something that seemed truthful, for he also reported feeling rushed or nervous throughout the study. His belief that physical education curricula should foster affective and
cognitive goals above all others provides the evidence that this model may not be an adequate match to his value orientations.

Teacher’s values directly influence their willingness to enthusiastically teach utilizing a particular curriculum model. Teacher’s beliefs about the value of the content and its relevance and meaning to the students play an important role in their motivation to teach the curriculum. Determining the pre-service teacher’s value orientations permits the analysis of the relationship between the orientations and their implementation of the TGFU model. One of the pre-service teachers possessed the belief system most closely aligned with a TGFU advocate.

Given that Metzler (2000) determined that the first priority of TGFU model was the cognitive domain, followed by the psychomotor; it would stand to reason that teachers who believe that cognitive and psychomotor objectives should be prioritized in a curricula would be the teachers best equipped to implement the TGFU model. Data determining the pre-service teacher’s value orientation supports this statement.

The pre-service teachers who reportedly struggled the most with the TGFU model all valued orientations that prioritized the affective learning domain to some degree. Evidence ranging from effective teaching characteristics to the personal notations of the pre-service teacher, to the value orientation specifications, all supported the fact that pre-service teachers who value the discipline mastery and learning process have beliefs that are aligned with the goals of TGFU and therefore, may be better equipped to implement the model. A lack of continuity was seen when the pre-service teachers attempted to utilize a curriculum model that prioritizes domain(s) of learning that they did not value. Metzler (2000) stated that if the correct model is selected, teachers are more likely to get the tasks that they value accomplished with more efficiency and effectiveness, resulting in a positive and productive environment.

Consistently in the pre-service teacher’s responses, they referred back to their college preparatory classroom experiences. The consensus was that they found it easier to identify single skills, single cues and activities that focused on single skills, not only because it was reportedly easier to identify “smaller pieces” that are more easily visually spotted, than a concept or strategy, but because of the easy access to the skills found in textbooks and college preparatory materials. It is difficult to determine whether these
difficulties stemmed from the inadequacies of the college preparatory courses, requirements and experiences, the pre-service teacher’s level of pedagogical content knowledge, or simply the tendency of teachers in general to design curricular jumps from practicing simple skills straight to modified games. The final section of this discussion will present these variables.

As part of the typical physical education pedagogy program, pre-service teachers are usually required to develop lesson plans that focus on teaching a particular skill and then provide time for students to practice the basic components of that skill. The teachers then modify the activity to make the skill gradually more difficult by offering an environment with an increased amount of variability. In comparison to the development of more complex strategies within more complex environments, it is considerably easier to develop a curriculum structured around learning specific skills and the development of techniques and mechanical efficiency associated with these skills.

Bunker and Thorpe (1986) hypothesized that the reason pre-service teachers are so focused on these types of lessons results from the continual emphasis placed upon skill acquisition in measurement and evaluation, as well as pedagogy courses during the teacher’s training period. The lesson plan development focus tends to gravitate towards the simple skills that Thomas, French, Thomas and Gallagher (1988) stated are rarely employed in a sport context. Since these skills are much easier to plan and evaluate than other aspects, for example, tactical understanding or decision making, future physical educators are passively guided to a simple skill and/or technique approach for games teaching. Given this, teachers, as well as teacher educators, may have been unknowingly fostering incompetence in the majority of children. “Mistakes commonly observed in young children in various sports may stem from a lack of knowledge about what to do in the context of a given sport situation” (French & Thomas, 1987, p. 17). Given that the TGFU model shifts the interest from physical ability and performance of isolated skills to understanding components of the game, college preparatory programs must evaluate how they prepare pre-service teachers in order to facilitate an environment appropriate to learning the components of this model of skill instruction?

Bunker and Thorpe (1986) alleged that the insistence by training colleges and universities upon the development of lesson plans that ensure pre-service teachers follow
clear and easily documented, technical procedures has led to a lesson format divided into distinct sections with a lack of progression. This lack of progression has otherwise been identified as the curricular jump from game stage one, teaching simple skills, directly to game stage four, modified game play. As a result, the contextual nature of skills is lost, and the games teaching become a set of skill drills derived from highly regarded textbooks with inadequate progression and avoidance of instruction on the combination of skills and/or offensive and defensive strategies all together. Researchers have cited that this format leads participants to believe that the game is a mere addendum to technique training.

Where some difficulties may have been perceived by pre-service teacher as curriculum model difficulties, it may have been difficulties typically associated with implementation of offensive and defensive strategies, game stage three skills and concepts. Often times misinterpretation or lack of knowledge regarding progression through the developmental game stages result in students being lead from learning individual skills (game stage one) straight into competing in large group games (poorly constructed game stage four), where little emphasis is placed on learning how to combine skills or learn and apply tactics. Generally speaking, understanding strategies is difficult to comprehend. This compounded by the fact that it is more than likely that strategies were not a part of most pre-service teachers physical education experiences, as well as not enough exposure to the model in the undergraduate programs underscores the importance of a well-developed, cohesive undergraduate program.

Another plausible explanation of the struggles the pre-service teachers encountered can possibly be identified through evaluation of the undergraduate pedagogy course experiences and requirements. The most relevant of the examples includes the peer teaching component typically required in teacher preparation pedagogy courses. Here, the majority of the students are physical education majors, and most already have the pre-requisite skills necessary to successfully participate in games and activities. When introduced to a new game or activity, the physical education majors tend to have enough background experiences to facilitate their quick and successful participation in the game. For example, most physical education students already know how to move to the open spaces and where to position themselves on offense or defense in certain situations, when
placed into a game situation, especially one within the same games classification system of one they are familiar with, the physical education major is able to transfer learning and actively and successfully participate in the game. Individuals who do not have these skills can be seen doing seemingly easy skills incorrectly, for example, standing behind a defender, or not moving to get open.

Pre-service physical education teachers may not even realize that they possess certain skills because they are integrated into games so naturally. When these pre-service teachers are required to develop units of instruction for public school students, they are unable to accurately select skills their students really need. The peer teaching process may reinforce the pre-service teacher’s conditioning to identify individual skills or pieces of skills to be focused on. When they enter the “real world” of the public school system, for the first time they are quickly exposed to having to identify the skills and concepts the majority of students truly need to be successful in the game. Without several practical teaching experiences in the public school settings, pre-service teachers have little to no opportunities to see or identify what skills beginning learners actually possess and need to work on. Several times during the interview, pre-service teachers made comparisons to college classes, and how students in those courses would either spread out in games automatically or would answer the tactical questions correctly. This underscores the importance of implementation of practical teaching experiences with a variety of different age levels in the pre-service, college preparatory classes.

Another aspect possibly contributing to the difficulties the pre-service teachers expressed can be interpreted as a lack of pedagogical content knowledge. Though content specific knowledge is vital to successfully implementing the model, pedagogical content knowledge is equally important. Understanding games and sports from a participant’s perspective, as well as being successful participants, are simply not enough for excellent teaching. Teachers need pedagogical content knowledge so that they can appropriately “package” everything in order for the students to learn in the most productive manner. Teachers must assume responsibility for appropriately identifying student needs and then selecting material accordingly, a daunting task considering the research citing that many beginning teachers have difficulties observing students’ movement, giving appropriate feedback, planning developmentally appropriate progressions, and generating
explanations and tasks that match the learner’s needs. During the lesson implementation, pre-service teacher #3 exhibited the most effective teaching behaviors of all the teachers. Evidence of these behaviors was as follows: (1) she had an average of 53.4% activity time in all of her lessons, which was the highest for all of the teachers; (2) she recorded the lowest average transition/management time, which was 15.5%; and (3) she gave the most overall and specific tactical feedback. She also reportedly enjoyed the model the most, was the most successful at implementing it, and reported the least amount of problems with the students in the lessons. This underscore the importance of the development of competence as a teacher, given that the most competent pre-service teacher did the best and could possibly successfully implement any number of more challenging curricular models, because she is no longer concerned with mastering the simple managerial, transitional and behavioral aspects of a lesson.

College preparatory classes may be falling short of providing future teachers with adequate experiences that prepare them for identifying and developing and implementing appropriate lessons using the appropriate curriculum models and assessment tools. Implementing these materials on college-level students who typically possess the background skills and knowledge to be successful in a peer teaching situation may not be as beneficial as professional in higher education my believe them to be, especially considering such a complex model like TGFU. Teaching Games for Understanding and the Games Performance Assessment Instrument are difficult to adequately implement. Even veteran teachers struggle with these models. If teacher preparation programs are to adequately prepare teachers to implement these instruments, they must be infused throughout the undergraduate curriculum. These models must be introduced early in the curriculum and reinforced in several classes. From the results of this study, it may be concluded that if PST are to have a positive experience, then they need to have more of the UG programs dedicated to TGFU, GPAI and authentic assessment, perhaps leading to continued implementation of these instruments.
CHAPTER FOUR
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter will summarize the purpose, methods and findings of this study. It will also discuss the overall conclusions and will offer recommendations based on the study’s results.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine and describe four pre-service teachers’ experiences planning, implementing and assessing the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model. The research questions were:

1. What are the pre-service teacher’s experiences during the planning phases of the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model?
2. What are the pre-service teacher’s experiences implementing the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model?
3. What are the pre-service teacher’s experiences assessing student’s skills, using the Games Performance Assessment Instrument, in the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model?
4. Is there a relationship between the pre-service teacher’s value orientation and their implementation of the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model?

In order to gather adequate data related to the pre-service teachers’ experiences planning, implementing and assessing within the tactical TGFU model of skill instruction, both quantitative and qualitative research instruments were utilized. The quantitative instruments utilized in the study were Messick’s Field Hockey Knowledge Test to measure the pre-service teacher’s field hockey knowledge, the Henry-Friedel Field Hockey Test (H.F.F.H.T.) to measure the general field hockey skills of students, the Value-Orientation Inventory-2 (VOI-2) to gather information regarding the pre-service
teacher’s value orientations, and the Game Performance Assessment Instrument (GPAI) to provide assessment experiences for the pre-service teachers. The qualitative measures utilized were daily questionnaire and a post-study, semi-structured interview.

The pre-service teachers who participated in this study were one male and three female undergraduate students, who successfully completed the analysis of team passing course at California State University, Sacramento. Prior to the onset of data collection, the pre-service teachers exhibited their declarative and procedural field hockey knowledge as evidenced by a minimum of 90% correct scores on Messick’s (1987) Field Hockey Knowledge Test. This instrument verified that the pre-service teachers were knowledgeable in field hockey as exhibited by a range of 91.5% to 96.3% correct scores.

The public school students involved in this study were 102 fifth grade students (55 boys and 47 girls) from four coeducational, public school classes in an urban school located in northern California. Student outcomes were measured by utilizing the Henry-Friedel Field Hockey Test as a pre- and post-test in order to determine skill improvement over the course of the unit. This instrument confirmed that the public school students exhibited improvement in the field hockey skills measured as a result of being involved in this study. The average overall improvement for all four groups was 7.9 seconds, with an 8.0% overall improvement on accuracy.

The field hockey tactical TGFU unit began with an introductory lesson for all experimental groups and included an introduction to the game of field hockey, including brief historical aspects of the game, basic rules and regulations, safety considerations, equipment used, and a description of the field. A short period of game play followed, during which time students were involved in small-sided (3-on-3) games with small goals and no goalies. No formal instruction related to the tactical model occurred on this day.

The introductory lesson was followed by administration of the Henry-Friedel Field Hockey Test (H.F.F.H.T.) which was used to pre-test students’ the general field hockey skills. During these lessons, which took three days, the students were equally divided into small-sided teams. The teams rotated between the modified field hockey games and the H.F.F.H.T. trials. The primary researcher was responsible for administering the H.F.F.H.T., as well as rotating the teams from the pre-test to the modified games. The pre-service teachers monitored the students during their
participation in the modified games. The introductory lesson and skills pre-test trials took four days and were the only lessons taught the first week.

Following the skills test, each pre-service teacher implemented eight experimental lessons within a two-week period, to the same set of students. The primary researcher was responsible for the development of the introductory lesson and the first four experimental field hockey lesson plans that the pre-service teachers implemented, and the pre-service teachers were responsible for developing the remaining four tactical lessons.

The primary researcher developed the first four tactical TGFU lessons plans through the replication of the tactical problems, lesson focuses, objectives, modified games, suggested questions and accompanying answers outlined in the lesson plans in the Griffin, Mitchell and Oslin (1997) and Mitchell, Oslin and Griffin (2003) textbooks (see Appendix D). Using a tactical TGFU approach (Bunker & Thorpe, 1982; Griffin, Mitchell & Oslin, 1997), both the primary researcher and the pre-service teachers developed tactical lessons that began with students engaging in a modified game. This modified game was constructed so that a tactical problem would emerge for the students during their involvement. Following this game play, the pre-service teacher planned to intervene by asking the students a series of predetermined questions about the challenges they experienced during the game. The primary researcher and pre-service teachers highlighted each series of questions in the tactical lesson plan. During this question and answer phase of the lesson, the primary researcher and pre-service teachers focused on leading the students to answer “what to do” type questions in particular situations. Once the students were able to identify the tactical problem and solution, they were introduced to an activity that reinforced the skill and relevant tactical skill cues earlier identified as being involved in the solution. The skills taught in the first four tactical lessons included: receiving, shooting, moving to the open spaces, and faking. During the latter portion of each of the tactical lessons, the primary researcher and pre-service teachers planned for the students to return to modified-game play in order to facilitate application of practiced skills to game situations. In each of the lesson plans, the closure consisted of questions related to knowledge of the lesson’s tactical problems that were presented and solved.
Immediately following each of the eight experimental lessons, each of the pre-service teachers completed a daily questionnaire describing their experiences during that lesson. The daily questionnaire was composed of the following open-forms questions:

1. Please describe what you liked and/or disliked about this lesson plan.
2. Please explain in what ways it was easy and/or challenging to implement this lesson plan.
3. Explain why you would or wouldn’t choose to teach this lesson again in the future.
4. Explain what you think your students liked and/or disliked in this lesson.
   When relevant, please give examples to explain.

In order for the pre-service teacher’s responses to be a valid representation of their experiences within the curriculum model, the lesson plans must be a valid representation of that model. In order to determine model appropriateness, each of the lessons was evaluated on the following variables: (1) the nature of the skill feedback, (2) the nature of the content related questions, and (3) the use of time. The primary researcher and one independent, trained coder analyzed the data in each of the above variables. An interobserver reliability rate was calculated at .90 for skill feedback, .92 for questioning, and .93 for time. Results from each of these variables provided evidence that all of the lessons taught by all of the pre-service teachers utilized the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding skill instruction model.

During the first four lessons, each of the pre-service teachers was instructed to utilize the Game Performance Assessment Instrument (GPAI) that the primary researcher developed. During the last four lessons, the pre-service teachers were instructed to utilize the GPAI that they each developed. The primary researcher developed the first GPAI by replicating an example in the Mitchell and Oslin (1999) Assessment in Games Teaching, the manual for this assessment instrument (see Appendix C). The two components selected for the first GPAI were skill execution (e.g. students pass the ball accurately, reaching the intended receiver) and decision making (e.g. students make the appropriate choices when passing – pass to unguarded teammates to set up a scoring opportunity). The second GPAI was developed by each of the pre-service teachers based on their observations of their students during the first four lessons. The outcomes of this
assessment were not direct variables of interest and were not analyzed. The GPAI was implemented in order to examine and describe the pre-service teacher’s experiences assessing within the TGFU model.

The field hockey unit concluded with the H.F.F.H.T. post-test, which took two days. Here again, the students were divided into small-sided teams, and the teams rotated between the modified games and the H.F.F.H.T. trials.

Immediately following the implementation of all of the lessons, the primary researcher conducted the post-study, semi-structured interview with each of the pre-service teachers. In order for the interview questions to be well-constructed and valid, they must be tightly linked to pertinent data within the field, in this case; lesson planning, implementing, and assessing in physical education. The following interview questions and prompts for planning were developed from the topics highlighted in Allison and Barrett (2000) chapter; Planning for student learning.

Interview Questions and Prompts for Planning
1. Talk to me about the process you went through planning your daily lesson plans.
2. What resources did you use in your planning?
3. How did you begin to decide what content to teach?
4. How did you select which learning cues to use during the lesson?
5. How did you select which activities to use during the lesson?
6. How did you select which modified games to use during the lesson?
7. What things did you consider when you were planning your lesson progression? (modified games – emphasizing skills – modified games)
8. What strategies did you plan for to keep students on-task?
9. What strategies did you plan for to keep students motivated to learn?
10. Describe how your lessons contributed to meeting your learning goals/objectives.
11. What did you expect students to do, feel and know as a result of participating in the lessons?
12. Describe the process of developing the questions that were to lead students to recognize the importance of certain skills.
13. How did you plan the assessments of your students during the lesson?

The following interview questions and prompts for implementation were developed from the topics featured in the Rink’s (2003) chapter titled, Effective instruction in physical education.

**Interview Questions and Prompts for Implementation**

1. Explain the student’s opportunities to practice tactical skills during the lessons.
   a. Specific to game play
   b. Specific to extensions

2. Looking back on this unit, explain whether or not students had enough time/opportunities to learn the tactical skills.

3. Explain your thoughts on if your activities/extensions resembled game-like situations.

4. Talk to me about the amount of success you felt your student’s experienced in your tactical lesson.

5. Describe the student’s cognitive involvement in these lessons; address tactical question phase, if not addressed.

6. Tell me your feelings about the time spent in managing your lesson, as compared to Activity & Instruction time.

7. Describe the feedback you gave to students during the lessons.

8. How did the student’s react to your feedback statements?

9. Discuss how your students reacted to your instructions, demonstrations and learning cues.

10. How did you feel your Extension, Refinement and Application (ERA) went in the lesson?

11. Do you plan on using this model in the future? If so, when & why. If not, why?

The following interview questions and prompts related to assessment were derived from topics found in Rink (2002).
Interview Questions and Prompts for Assessment

1. How did you feel about using these assessments Games Performance Assessment Instrument (GPAI)?
2. How did you select which components of the GPAI to assess?
3. How did you select the students you chose to assess?
4. Talk to me about how much time you needed to complete the assessment.
5. How do you think the GPAI results will help you make a judgment about the effectiveness of your teaching and the unit?
6. How did you use the results of the GPAI to plan future lessons?
7. When looking at your assessments, explain whether or not your students met your learning objectives.
8. How do you think you might use this to give students a grade?
9. Would you use this assessment in the future? If so, when & why. If not, why?

The qualitative data gathered from the daily questionnaires and post-interview, semi-structured interviews provided depth and meaningful insight in the pre-service teacher’s experiences planning, implementing and assessing the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding model that quantitative data was unable to ascertain. Particularly, it enhanced the understanding of what challenges they encountered and provided a means of exploring the thought processes of the pre-service teachers during each of the variables of interest. The primary researcher and one independent, trained coder analyzed the qualitative data. An interobserver reliability rate was of .88 achieved. Once identified and described, these findings were compared to determine similarities and differences among the experiences of the pre-service teachers.

Upon completion of cross-case analyses, four themes emerged from analysis of the planning aspects of the TGFU model. They were: content challenges with the tactical content, tactical questioning, on-task considerations, and congruency of the lesson plan components. Several interesting themes related to the implementation of the TGFU also surfaced. These themes were: tactical questioning, challenges related to the content, use of time, frustrating aspects, and positive teacher comments. Finally, the five themes that materialized from analysis of the assessment portions of the study were: positive teacher
statements, implementation challenges, perceived value of the results, time needed to implement, and group selection.

Lastly, the pre-service teachers completed Ennis and Chen’s (1993) Value Orientation Inventory – 2. The value orientation information was gathered on the pre-service teachers to further elucidate the thinking process during the planning, implementation and assessment within the TGFU model. Determining the pre-service teacher’s value orientations permitted the analysis of the relationship between the orientations and the implementation of the TGFU model.

Metzler (2000) determined that the first priority of TGFU model was the cognitive domain, followed by the psychomotor; it would stand to reason that teachers who believe that cognitive and psychomotor objectives should be prioritized in a curricula would be the teachers best equipped to implement the TGFU model. Data determining the pre-service teacher’s value orientation supported this statement.

The three pre-service teachers who reportedly struggled the most with the TGFU model all valued orientations that prioritized the affective learning domain to some degree. Evidence ranging from effective teaching characteristics to the personal notations of the pre-service teacher, to the value orientation specifications, all supported the fact that pre-service teachers who value the discipline mastery and learning process have beliefs that are aligned with the goals of TGFU and therefore, may be better equipped to implement the model. A lack of continuity was seen when the pre-service teachers attempted to utilize a curriculum model that prioritizes domain(s) of learning that they did not value. Metzler (2000) stated that if the correct model is selected, teachers are more likely to get the tasks that they value accomplished with more efficiency and effectiveness, resulting in a positive and productive environment.

Conclusions

Based on the results of this research study, the following is a summary of the research questions and the resulting conclusions:

1. What are the pre-service teacher’s experiences during the planning phases of the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model? The results indicated that, above all, the tactical content was a challenging aspect of the planning phase of the tactical TGFU model. These challenges included those specific to the pre-service
teachers, such as determining what content to teach, how to teach it and selecting the appropriate cues, as well as challenges the students encountered, including difficulties understanding the tactical concepts selected. The pre-service teachers were also challenged with developing appropriate tactical questions for the lessons. Lastly, pre-service teachers also reported student arguing was a factor considered in the planning process.

2. What are the pre-service teacher’s experiences implementing the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model? The data revealed that the most frequently reported theme was related to the tactical questioning aspect of the lesson plan implementation. Some of these challenges included: being required to ask too many questions, students taking too long to answer correctly and selecting questions that were too difficult. Data associated with the implementation of the TGFU also revealed content related challenges for both the pre-service teachers and students, and again included difficulties teaching and learning the concepts. The most consistent and concise theme reported in the implementation phase was the use of time, specifically that for the pre-service teachers the model required more instruction time, as well as an increase in management time. The results also indicated that frustrating aspects of lesson plan implementation also existed, including the pre-service teachers feeling rushed or nervous, as well as students expressing their frustrations about wanting to be in games more. Positive statements about the benefits of the model and increased student success were also revealed.

3. What are the pre-service teacher’s experiences assessing student’s skills, using the Games Performance Assessment Instrument, in the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model? The results suggested that the pre-service teachers reacted positively to the GPAI, specifically to the components of assessing skills during activity and focusing on “other” parts of the game. The data also suggested that the pre-service teachers were challenged with a variety of aspects of the instrument, including watching one skill, staying on one field and feeling stressed or overwhelmed trying to fit the assessment into the lesson. The responses also revealed that the pre-service teachers might not be equipped to use the results of the GPAI in an appropriate and productive
manner, as evidenced by the reports of the lack of value the pre-service teachers placed on the results of the assessment.

4. Is there a relationship between the pre-service teacher’s value orientation and their implementation of the tactical Teaching Games for Understanding instruction model? Evidence ranging from effective teaching characteristics to the personal notations of the pre-service teacher, to the value orientation specifications, all supported the fact that pre-service teachers who value the discipline mastery and learning process have beliefs that are aligned with the goals of TGFU and therefore, may be better equipped to implement the model. A lack of continuity was seen when the pre-service teachers attempted to utilize a curriculum model that prioritizes domain(s) of learning that they did not value.

Recommendations

The results of this study have revealed the need for more information concerning pre-service teachers’ experiences with the TGFU model, as well as the GPAI. Therefore, the following recommendations are made for future research studies:

1. A study prescribing the ways the answers to the research questions from this study may help transform teacher education programs to better prepare pre-service teachers to implement the tactical teaching games for understanding model and the Games Performance Assessment Instrument.
2. Additional studies investigating whether pre-service teachers develop and utilize the GPAI correctly and accurately.
3. A study investigating the ways that utilizing the tactical TGFU model affects value orientation.
4. A study investigating the ways that utilizing the GPAI affects value orientation.
5. Additional studies investigating the cognitive outcomes of the students to determine if both procedural and declarative knowledge improved as a result of a tactical TGFU unit.
6. Additional studies investigating the cognitive outcomes of the students to determine if both tactical and strategic knowledge improved as a result of a tactical TGFU unit.
7. A replication of this study involving different grade levels.
8. A replication of this study involving different content areas, including content
   the pre-service teachers knows well and areas they are not as familiar with.
9. A replication of this study involving longer daily class sessions.
10. A replication of this study involving a longer over all unit.
11. A study investigating how the GPAI affects teacher movement during a
    lesson.
12. A study investigating ideal time frames within a tactical lesson devoted to
    skill practice and/or skill application.
13. A replication of the study, with the exception of the pre-service teachers
    developing all the lessons involved in the experimental unit.
14. A replication of the study utilizing the Games Performance Assessment
    Instrument as the pre and post test of the student’s skills.
15. A replication of the study with modifications made to the question and answer
    sessions permitting the teachers to question small groups of students on their
    particular fields, as opposed to questioning the class as a whole.
APPENDIX A

SKILL FEEDBACK CODING INSTRUMENT
Skill Feedback Coding Instrument

Teacher’s Initials: ________________  Developed by: Teacher or Student
Observer’s Initials: ________________  Lesson Number:  1  2  3  4

DIRECTIONS:
1. While watching the video, list ALL of the **SKILL FEEDBACK** given during the lesson.
2. Type and number each of the statements for the lesson. (Each coding sheet must be accompanied by a typed and numbered list of feedback statements).
3. Place the number of the statement in the correct box below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Feedback</th>
<th>Number of the Feedback Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Non-Tactical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Tactical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

TEACHER QUESTIONING CODING INSTRUMENT
Teacher Questioning Coding Instrument

Teacher’s Initials: ________________  Developed by: Teacher or Student
Observer’s Initials: ________________  Lesson Number:  1  2  3  4

DIRECTIONS:
1. **List ALL of the questions** the teacher asked during the course of the lesson.
2. Next, determine whether the question was **general or content related**?
   a. If you determined that the question was general, place a “G” in the appropriate column and **move on to the next questions**.
   b. If you determined that the questions was content related, place a “CG” in the column, and continue on to the next column, described below in #3
3. Did the question address the tactical, game or game-related aspects of the lesson?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>General (G) or Content Related (CR)</th>
<th>Tactical? Y or N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List additional questions on the back.
APPENDIX C

GAME PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT
FIELD HOCKEY
Game Performance Assessment Instrument

Class: __________ Evaluator: ___________ Team: ___________ Game: Field Hockey

Observation Dates: a)__________ b)___________ c)___________ d)__________

Scoring Key:
5 = Very effective performance
4 = Effective performance
3 = Moderately effective performance
2 = Weak Performance
1 = Very weak performance

Components/Criteria:
1. **Skill Execution** – Students pass the ball accurately, reaching the intended receiver
2. **Decision Making** – Students make appropriate choices when passing (i.e., pass to unguarded teammates to set up a scoring opportunity)

**Recording Procedures:** Observe the selected player(s) for 5 to 10 minutes, observing only the performance related to the above criteria. After the observation period give each player a score from 1 to 5 on each component.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Skill Execution</th>
<th>Decision Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
APPENDIX D

TACTICAL LESSON PLANS
ONE THROUGH FOUR
Tactical Lesson #1
Field Hockey

Grade Level: 5th Grade
Class Size: 20-29 students
Time: 30 - 35 minutes
Tactical Focus: Maintaining possession of the ball
Lesson Focus: Passing and receiving balls.
Equipment: 29 field hockey sticks, 29 wiffle balls, 3 sets of 3 pennies, 3 sets of 4 cones (3 different colors), 12 cones different from others for goals, 29 poly spots.

Field and Equipment Set-up: Sticks and balls spread out on field, three 30-by-30 fields, each field is individually marked with same colored cones so students can easily distinguish between the fields, poly spots are set-up in passing lines, 10 feet away from partners across and next to them, pennies are spread out on each field, 12 cones are stacked on side so that teacher can pick them up during lesson and make goals.

Objectives:
Psychomotor:
- The students will be able to receive and pass the ball quickly to a partner during activities and modified games.

Cognitive:
- During closure and after the initial modified game, the students will be able to recite the cues for successfully receiving a ball and passing it quickly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Skill Cues</th>
<th>Class Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td><strong>Intro Warm up (Demo dribbling)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students gathered around teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We’re going to do an activity to get warmed up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for the lesson. What we are going to do is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dribble around that ____ (landmark about 50 to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75 yards away) using little taps to control the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ball. When I say go, everyone grab a stick and a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ball and get started.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ready, go. (inf.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Warm up (ext.)</td>
<td>Little taps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td>Freeze (stop, drop and listen). Thank you for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>putting your sticks down quickly and quietly and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>looking at me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td><strong>Review previous lesson(s)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students gathered around teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td>-What happens if you hit the ball on the rounded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>side of the stick? (turn over)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-What happens if you kick the ball or stop it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with your feet? (turn over)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Give a non-example of the ready stance (i.e.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stand with legs straight), and ask, “With a quiet hand, who can tell me what’s wrong with my ready stance?”
-Next, perform a push pass with a follow through that extends above your waist. Ask, “What’s wrong with this pass?” (inf.)
What’s our #1 safety rule? (sticks below waist)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 min 30 sec</th>
<th><strong>Intro Possession Game</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be broken up into 3 vs. 3 or 2 vs. 2 (depending on # in class). The object is to maintain control of the ball. For every time your team passes the ball 4 times in a row, your team gets one point. (Make sure to do a mini demo to illustrate counting the number of passes, boundaries and starting at 1 when ball is turned over or stolen). Once a team gets 4 passes, they get one point and then give the ball to their opponents. (The person guarding you, also known as the defense, <strong>may not steal</strong> the ball from the dribbler. They may only intercept or steal a pass). (inf.)</td>
<td>Students gathered around teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 min</th>
<th><strong>Possession Game</strong> (ext.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Freeze, drop your sticks and gather around me.”</td>
<td><strong>No skill cues</strong> at this point. Teachers should circulate and reinforce rules/directions/safety rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students spread out playing games.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 min 30 sec</th>
<th><strong>Tactical Questions:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- What was the goal of the game? (<em>Pass 4 times to get one point</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What did you and your teammates do to be successful? *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Make good passes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Received the ball under control by cushioning it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- When you were passing, were you more successful when you got rid of the ball quickly or slowly? (<em>Quickly</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Right, making quick passes and getting rid of the ball quickly are both very important skills to being successful.</td>
<td>Students gathered around the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td><strong>Intro and Demo Quick Pass Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now we are going to practice receiving and making quick passes. Demo where students and their partners will stand. Students will practice passing the ball <em>QUICKLY</em> to their partner. (inf.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td><strong>Quick Pass</strong> (ext.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GIVE SKILL FEEDBACK –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Way to make quick passes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good job getting rid of the ball quickly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freeze, sticks down, stay where you are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td><strong>Quick Pass – Refinement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I really liked how you all were passing the ball quickly back to your partner. Now I want you to concentrate on really cushioning the ball so that the ball stays close to you and you can get rid of the ball quickly. (Can use student demo) (ref.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td><strong>Quick Pass – Concentrating on cushioning ball to get rid of it quickly</strong> (ext.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freeze, sticks down, stay where you are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td><strong>Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Did cushioning the ball and making quick passes work in the games? <em>(Yes)</em> 😊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Was it easy to make quick passes when the ball came to your left side during the game? <em>(No)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Why? <em>(Because you have to turn your stick over/you can’t touch it with the round side)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 sec</td>
<td><strong>Intro – Speedway</strong> (Inf.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Let’s see how many passes you can get in 30 seconds? Concentrate on making quick passes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td><strong>Speedway</strong> (app.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GIVE SKILL FEEDBACK –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great quick passes. I liked the way you two are getting rid of the ball quickly. How many people got 10 passes? 15? <strong>Repeat</strong> Speedway for 30 seconds, and try to beat your score. Ready, go. Raise your hand if you beat your score.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 sec</td>
<td>Freeze. Let’s see if you all can leave your sticks on your poly spot and gather around me in 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
seconds. Ready, go, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1.

1 min **Intro - Return to Possession Game**
Students will return to their original fields for 2 vs. 2 or 3 vs. 3.
This time 5 passes = 1 point.
Reminder: NO stealing the ball from the dribbler. They may only intercept or steal a pass. “Let’s see if concentrating on cushioning the ball and making quick passes helps us in our game situation?” (inf.)

3 min **Possession Game**
5 passes = 1 point
Freeze, bring it in. (ext.)

1 min **Intro Modified Game with Goals** –
Same teams as before, but now you are shooting at a goal. If you pass 4 times in a row, and shoot and make it, you get 5 points. If you shoot without passing 5 times and make a goal, you get one point. (inf.)

4 min **Modified game with Goals**
5 passes and goal = 5 points
Goal without 5 passes = 1 point (ext.)
SKILL FEEDBACK ON CUES!
Cushion ball
Turn stick over
Quickly pass back

2 min **Closure** – See questions below (inf.)

- What are two things that helped make you successful passing in the games today?
  - Cushioning the ball when receiving
  - Getting rid of the ball quickly (Quick passes)

- What do you have to do when the ball is passed to your left side in order to pass it quickly?
  - Turn your wrist over and
  - Then get rid of it quickly

- Was it more difficult to get rid of it quickly in a game situation or the drills? Why?

- Did you enjoy playing the game? Why? Or why not?

- What was your favorite part of the lesson today?

Tactical Lesson #2
Field Hockey

Grade Level: 5th Grade
Class Size: 17-23 students
Time: 30 - 35 minutes
Tactical Problem: Attacking the goal
Lesson Focus: Shooting at the corners of the goal
Equipment: 29 field hockey sticks, 29 wiffle balls, 29 field hockey balls, 3 sets of 3 pennies, 3 sets of 4 cones (3 different colors), 12 cones different from others for goals, 29 poly spots.
Field and Equipment Set-up: Hockey sticks and field hockey balls will be spread out for warm-up, one of three wiffle balls will be on each of the three fields – the rest of the wiffle balls will be evenly distributed at each of the 6 goals, pennies should be spread out on field, 4 cones (12 cones total) will mark the boundaries of the 3 fields (20 x 30), 12 different cones will be set-up for goals (about 2 ft. wide) on each field.

Objectives:
Psychomotor:
• The students will be able to receive a pass and shoot aiming at the corners of the goal during the activity and game situations.
Cognitive:
• The students will be able to correctly answer the questions regarding attacking the goal (objectives) after the initial modified game, as well as during closure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Skill Cues</th>
<th>Class Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 30 sec  | **Intro Warm up**  
For our warm-up today you are all going to get a chance to use the *real field hockey balls*.  
When I say go, I’d like you each to get a stick and a field hockey ball and dribble around that ____ (landmark about 50 yards away) using little taps to control the ball. It’s important that you use little taps because these balls are very hard, and everyone needs to be in control when they dribble. When I say go, everyone grab a stick and a ball and get started.  
Ready, go. (inf.) | Little taps | Students gathered around teacher |
| 1 min   | **Warm up**  
When the quicker students come back, have them practice control dribbling while waiting for other students to finish their warm-up.  
(ext.) | | |
| 30 sec  | **Review previous lesson**  
-When we played a game yesterday, we | | Students gathered |
learned a NEW cue to use when passing. Can anyone remember what our new cue was? 
(Pass quickly or get rid of it quickly) 
-With a quiet hand, who can tell me why getting rid of the ball quickly in a game situation is important? (A variety of answers may follow – lead them to = beating the defender, getting it down the field quicker, etc.) (inf.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 min 30 sec</td>
<td><strong>Intro Attacking the Goal Game</strong>&lt;br&gt;Students will be broken up into 3 vs. 3 or 2 vs. 2 (depending on # in class).&lt;br&gt;-The object is to score goals, with no goalie.&lt;br&gt;-One point for each shot attempted&lt;br&gt;-Two points for each goal scored</td>
<td>. Students gathered around teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min 30 sec</td>
<td><strong>Attacking the Goal Game</strong>&lt;br&gt;(ext.)&lt;br&gt;WATCH OUT FOR HIGH STICKING AND DANGEROUS PLAY!&lt;br&gt;“Freeze, BRING YOUR STICKS IN, gather around me, and put your sticks by your feet.” (You should bring the students in close to a goal for the next demonstration)</td>
<td><strong>No skill cues</strong> at this point. Teachers should circulate and reinforce rules/directions/safety rule Students spread out playing games on three fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td><strong>Tactical Questions:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• What should you do when you get close to the goal? (Shoot)&lt;br&gt;• Where do you think the best place to shoot if you had a goalie in the goal? * (In the corners or low)&lt;br&gt;• Why? (Difficult for the goalie to reach it and make the save).&lt;br&gt;(*You may receive any number of answers so be prepared to lead them to “Shoot low and to the corners.” (inf.)</td>
<td>Students gathered around the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min 15 sec</td>
<td><strong>Intro and Demo Shooting on Goal Activity</strong>&lt;br&gt;Now we are going to practice taking shots on an empty goal. DEMO where each student and his/her partner should stand. Have partners stand facing each other with goal in between (10 ft away from each person). The partner with the wiffle balls will shoot each of the 3-4 balls into the goal (low and in the corners).&lt;br&gt;-Can anyone tell me what it means to shoot low and in the corners?</td>
<td>Shoot low and in the corners Students gathered around teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 min</td>
<td><strong>Shooting on Goal (ext.)</strong></td>
<td>The non-shooting partner(s) will gather the balls up on the opposite side of the goal, preparing for his/her turn to shoot. This partner will stay on the backside of the goal and shoot from there. (inf.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min 30 sec</td>
<td><strong>Shooting on Goal – Refinement</strong></td>
<td>I really liked how you were all shooting low. Now I want you to concentrate on really shooting towards those corners. (Should use student demo) (ref.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td><strong>Intro and Demo Shooting on Goal from Rolled Ball</strong></td>
<td>Now you are going to practice shooting on goal but this time it will be from a ball that is rolled to you. With a quiet hand, who can tell me what we need to remember when we are receiving a ball? (cushioning it) And where are we aiming? (corners) Have partner roll 3-4 balls to shooter, then the shooter will shoot each ball at the goal aiming for the corners. (inf.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 min</td>
<td><strong>Shooting on Goal from Rolled Ball</strong></td>
<td>Aim for the corners. Students at their goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td><strong>Intro - Return to Attacking the Goal Game</strong></td>
<td>Students will return to their original fields for 2 vs. 2 or 3 vs. 3. 1 point for shooting 2 points for making it 3 points for hitting it in the corner “Let’s see if concentrating on shooting at the corners helps us in our game situation.” (inf.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 min</td>
<td><strong>Attacking the Goal Game</strong></td>
<td>Switch teams each 3-4 minutes 1 point for making it 2 points for hitting it in the corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 min</td>
<td><strong>Closure – see questions below</strong></td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• With a quiet hand, why is it important to aim in the corners? Because it’s difficult for the goalie to reach

• Why is it important to make it difficult for the goalie to reach? The more difficult, the more you can score.

• Was it difficult to aim towards the corners? Why or Why not?

• Was it easier to hit the rolling ball to the corners or the stationary ball? Why do you think it’s harder to hit a rolling ball?

• What did you like about the games today?

Tactical Lesson #3
Field Hockey

Grade Level:  5th Grade
Class Size: 17-23 students
Time:  30 - 35 minutes

Tactical Problem: Maintaining possession of the ball to support teammate
Lesson Focus: Supporting the ball carrier

Equipment: 29 field hockey sticks, 12 wiffle balls, 29 field hockey balls, 3 sets of 3 pennies, 3 sets of 4 cones (3 different colors), 12 cones different from others for goals.

Field and Equipment Set-up: Hockey sticks and field hockey balls will be spread out for warm-up, one of three wiffle balls will be on each of the three fields – the rest of the wiffle balls will be spread out on outside of the fields, pennies should be spread out on field, 4 cones (12 cones total) will mark the boundaries of the 3 fields (20 x 30), 12 different cones will be set-up for goals (about 2 ft. wide) on each field.

Objectives:
Psychomotor:
• The students will be able to move to open spaces and use the whole field during activity and game situations.

Cognitive:
• The students will be able to correctly answer questions regarding moving to the open spaces and using the whole field after the initial modified game, activities and during closure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Skill Cues</th>
<th>Class Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td><strong>Intro Warm up</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students gathered around teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For our warm-up today you are all going to use <em>real field hockey balls</em>. When I say go, I’d like you each to get a stick, a field hockey ball and a partner and dribble around that ____ (landmark about 50 – 75 yards away) using little taps to control the ball. Why is it important to use little taps when dribbling? Because the balls are very hard, and everyone needs to be in control when they dribble. When I say go, everyone grab a stick, a partner and one ball and get started. Ready, go. (inf.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td><strong>Warm up</strong></td>
<td>Little taps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td>When the quicker students come back, have them practice passing back and forth while waiting for other students to finish their warm-up. (ext.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td><strong>Review previous lesson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• With a quiet hand, who remembers where in the goal do we aim when shooting?  
  *(Corners)*
• Why is it important to aim at the corners of the goal?  *(Because it’s difficult for the goalie to reach).*
• Why is it important to make it difficult for the goalie to reach?  *(The more difficult, the more you can score).*  *(inf.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 min</th>
<th><strong>Intro Possession Game</strong> (and break into teams)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students will be broken up into 3 vs. 3 or 2 vs. 2 (depending on # in class – 3 v 3 is ideal for easy activity grouping).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> We’re going to really try to score goals while <em>using the whole field and moving the ball around</em> a lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conditions:</strong> Complete at least three passes before shooting. You can only shoot after 3 passes. Each goal is worth one point. No Goalies. <em>(inf.)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 min</th>
<th><strong>Possession Game</strong> <em>(ext.)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WATCH OUT FOR HIGH STICKING AND DANGEROUS PLAY!</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Freeze, LEAVE YOUR STICKS ON YOUR FIELD and gather around me.” <em>(You should bring them to the center of the fields for the next demonstration)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 min 30 sec</th>
<th><strong>Tactical Questions:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Who remembers what the goal of this game was? <em>(Use the whole field or move around).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What does it mean to use the whole field? <em>(Spread out, move away from other players, don’t bunch up, etc.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What do you have to do to use the field? <em>(Move around, move your feet, look for open spaces).</em> <em>(inf.)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 min 30 sec</th>
<th><strong>Intro and DEMO 2-v-1 Keep Away</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now we are going to practice moving to the open spaces while playing Keep Away! Pick 3 well-behaved students and ask them to demonstrate. The person the in the middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Move around to the open spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students gathered around teacher and demo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(the defender) must be 2 feet away from the offense. The person with the ball (the passer) is trying to get the ball to the other offensive player (the receiver), who is MOVING AROUND TO GET OPEN (i.e., NOT standing in one spot). Show the receiver in a couple bad spots, where it would be hard to get a pass to him/her, and then show that person moving to an open space to receive a pass. Person in the middle plays medium defense (50%-not full defense). Person stays in the middle for 30 –45 seconds, then switches on the teachers signal. Remember that the goal is to move around to the open spaces. (inf.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 min</th>
<th><strong>2-v-1 Keep Away</strong></th>
<th>Move around to the open spaces</th>
<th>Students in groups of 3 spread out in personal space.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GIVE SKILL FEEDBACK – Good job moving around. Way to use that open space. Way to move those feet. (ext.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td><strong>2-v-1 Keep Away – Refinement</strong></td>
<td>Move around to the open spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I really liked how you all are moving around your area. Now I’d like you to really use the field and move to open spaces. (Could use student demo, if needed) (ref.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 min</td>
<td><strong>2-v-1 Keep Away</strong> (ext.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SKILL FEEDBACK!!! SKILL FEEDBACK!!!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td><strong>Re-Intro - Possession Game</strong></td>
<td>Students gathered around teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td>Students will return to their original fields for 2 vs. 2 or 3 vs. 3. Same rules as above – 3 passes before you shoot, no goalies, goals worth one point. “I’m going to be rotating around to see who is moving to the open spaces. (inf.) Ready, GO!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 min</td>
<td><strong>Possession Game</strong></td>
<td>Move around to the open spaces</td>
<td>Students spread out in 2 vs. 2 or 3 vs. 3 games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Switch teams each 3-4 minutes (ext.) SKILL FEEDBACK Freeze, bring it in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 min</td>
<td><strong>Closure – see questions below</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Who remembers what the goal of the game today was?  
(Use the whole field, move around, MOVE TO THE OPEN SPACES)

• What does it mean to use the whole field?  
(Spread out, move away from other players, not to bunch up, etc.)

• What did you or what do you have to do to use the field?  
(Move your feet, not just stand there).

• Was moving to the open spaces hard for you to do?  Did you move around today more than you usually do?

• Did anyone score by shooting at the corners?  Great job.  It’s great that you are using what you learned from the days before.  You are all getting really good at field hockey.

Tactical Lesson #4
Field Hockey

Grade Level: 5th Grade
Class Size: 17-23 students
Time: 30 - 35 minutes

Tactical Problem: Maintaining possession of the ball to support teammate
Lesson Focus: Create passing lanes using ball fakes
Equipment: 29 field hockey sticks, 29 field hockey balls, 29 wiffle balls, 3 sets of 3 pennies, 3 sets of 4 cones (3 different colors), 12 cones different from others for goals, 29 poly spots.

Field and Equipment Set-up: Sticks and field hockey balls spread out on field, three 20-by-30 fields, wiffle balls spread out on field outside of playing fields, each marked with same colored cones so students can easily distinguish between the fields, poly spots are set-up in passing lines, 10 feet away from partners across and next to them, pennies are spread out on each field, 12 different cones will be set-up for goals (about 2 ft. wide) on each field.

Objectives:
Psychomotor:
• The students will be able to use fakes to elude a defender during practice tasks with their partner or group and during game situations.

Cognitive:
• The students will be able to answer the questions correctly during the lesson and after the initial modified game regarding using fakes in a game setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Skill Cues</th>
<th>Class Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td><strong>Warm-up - Follow the Leader</strong>&lt;br&gt;In groups of 2 or 3, student will use all areas of the field playing Follow the Leader. Make sure to explain boundaries. When I say go I want you to find a partner and begin. (If you don’t have a partner raise your hand = groups of 3) Ready, go (inf.)</td>
<td>Little taps</td>
<td>Students spread out next to their hockey sticks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 min</td>
<td><strong>Follow the Leader</strong> (with real hockey balls)&lt;br&gt;Change partners on teachers signal after 30 seconds. Encourage students to change speeds, directions, pathways, etc. (ext.) Put field hockey ball away!</td>
<td><strong>Little taps</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td><strong>Review previous lesson</strong>&lt;br&gt;• With a quiet hand, who remembers what we worked on yesterday during our games and</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students gathered around teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
activities? *(Moving to the open spot)*
- Why is it important to move to the open spot? (Or why should we avoid bunching up on the field?) - *(Because it’s easier to receive passes, move down the field, score, etc.)* *(inf.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 min</td>
<td><strong>Intro Modified Game (and break into teams)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Game:</strong> 2 vs. 2 or 3 vs. 3  &lt;br&gt;<strong>Goal:</strong> Spread out and use the whole field  &lt;br&gt;<strong>Conditions:</strong> Complete at least three passes before shooting; 1 point for every goal. Can’t steal a ball that is being dribbled, but dribbler can only have the ball for 3 taps (or 3 seconds for those who just push ball down the field on their stick), then s/he must pass it to a player who has moved to the open spot <em>(inf.)</em></td>
<td>Use the whole field  Spreads out  Students gathered around teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td><strong>Possession Game</strong>&lt;br&gt;(ext.)&lt;br&gt;<strong>WATCH OUT FOR HIGH STICKING AND DANGEROUS PLAY!</strong>  &lt;br&gt;“Freeze, LEAVE YOUR STICKS ON YOUR FIELD and gather around me.” <em>(You should bring them to the center of the fields for the next demonstration)</em> <em>(ext.)</em></td>
<td>Spread out &amp; Use the whole field  Safety rule  Students spread out playing games on three fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td><strong>Tactical Questions:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- What was the goal of this game? <em>(Spread out and use the whole field).</em>&lt;br&gt;- What does it mean to use the whole field? <em>(Move away from other players and move to the open spaces.)</em>&lt;br&gt;- What do you have to do to receive a pass when you are being defended? <em>(Get away from the defender).</em>&lt;br&gt;- Does anyone know a way that the passer can help his/her teammate to get open? <em>(Using fakes – faking out the defenders so they think you are going to pass one way and then you can pass the other).</em> Great! Now we’re going to practice our fakes in some activities. <em>(inf.)</em></td>
<td>Students gathered around the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min 30 sec</td>
<td><strong>Intro and DEMO Practicing Fakes</strong>&lt;br&gt;Teacher and one student stand on poly spots facing each other, before each pass everyone must take a step and fake pass (with stick), then pass the ball to his/her partner. Demonstrate a step and fake, then pass  Quick fake</td>
<td>Students gathered around teacher and demo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Feedback/Instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIG fake so it’s understood what you are expecting. Fake one way and then pass the other. (inf.) Sticks below waists!!!!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 min</td>
<td><strong>Practice Fakes</strong> (ext.)</td>
<td>Step &amp; fake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GIVE SKILL FEEDBACK –</td>
<td>Students 10 ft away from each other on poly spots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great fake! Way to use that stick to fake out the defender.</td>
<td>Quick fake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td><strong>Fake – Refinement</strong></td>
<td>Use shoulders to fake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I really liked how you all are using your sticks to fake before you pass. REMEMBER THAT YOU CAN FAKE TO BOTH THE RIGHT AND THE LEFT. Now I’d like you to really do some acting and get your body into it. By using your shoulders you can make the fake more believable. (Should use student demo) (ref.)</td>
<td>Quick fake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td><strong>Fake</strong> – concentrating on using shoulders (ext.)</td>
<td>Use shoulders to fake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SKILL FEEDBACK!!!</td>
<td>Quick fake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SKILL FEEDBACK!!!</td>
<td>Quick fake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 min</td>
<td><strong>Fake 2 v. 1</strong></td>
<td>Use shoulders to fake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td>You all did such a great job practicing your fakes that we are going to see if your fakes work on a defender now. I’ll put you in groups of three, and you’ll have 2 on offense, and 1 on defense. Try to fake the defender out with your shoulder movements and then pass the other way. (inf.) ? Who can tell me our #1 safety rule? (Time will be needed to re-group into threes)</td>
<td>SAFETY RULE!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td><strong>Intro and DEMO Fake 2 v. 1</strong></td>
<td>Use shoulders to fake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students will return to their original fields for 2 vs. 2 or 3 vs. 3.</td>
<td>SAFETY RULE!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> Using fakes to fake out defense</td>
<td>Students gathered around teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conditions:</strong> Complete at least three passes before shooting; 1 point for every goal. If you fake before you score, your team gets 3 points. Can’t steal a ball that is being dribbled, but dribbler can only have the ball for 3 taps, then s/he must get rid of it. (inf.)</td>
<td>Students gathered around teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min</td>
<td><strong>Fake Game</strong> (ext.)</td>
<td>Quick fake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If needed, you may switch teams after 3</td>
<td>Students spread out in 2 vs. 2 or 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
minutes. SKILL FEEDBACK
Freeze, bring it in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vs. 3 games</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closure – see questions below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Why is it important to use fakes when you are playing a game?
- What do you do when you are guarding someone who uses fakes?
  - Does it work on you?
  - Do you know when they are going to fake it or not?
  - So does that mean that fakes are a good idea if you want to pass to your teammates?

APPENDIX E

HUMAN SUBJECTS FORMS AND VERIFICATION
Consent for your Child to Participate

Dear Parent,

My name is Julie Kuehl-Kitchen, and I am an Assistant Professor at CSU, Sacramento, in the Department of Kinesiology and Health Science. I am currently also a graduate student working on my dissertation under the direction of Professor Chuck Imwold at Florida State University in the Department of Sports Management, Recreation Management and Physical Education. This letter was written to inform you of the details of my research, as well as to request your permission to include your child in the study.

The project will consist of pre-service teachers, those who have yet to obtain their California Teaching Credential, teaching field hockey lessons to your child. The benefit of this project is two-fold. Not only will this project assist in motivating students into better participation, but it also stands to provide the education community at large with a great deal of information regarding effective teaching in physical education.

- **The purpose** of this study is to investigate the experiences of pre-service teachers relative to skill instructional models.
- **Procedures:** Selected 5th grade classes will be videotaped during their regular physical education class. During this time, your child’s class will have the opportunity to participate in at least twelve different field hockey lessons. These lessons will take approximately twelve days, barring any inclement weather. The lesson plans will not affect the amount or quality of physical education your child receives.
- **Special attention will be paid to the air quality and temperature.** If these levels rise above the acceptable, healthy ranges, the study will be postponed until the appropriate conditions return. Every effort will be made to schedule these classes during the cool, morning temperatures.
- There are no foreseeable risks, discomforts or immediate benefits that your child will experience other than that which normal activities in physical education provide, and the lessons plans are designed with your child’s enjoyment and involvement as goals.
- Information obtained during the course of this study will remain confidential to the extent allowed by law. These tapes will be kept in a locked filing cabinet and only the researcher will have access to these tapes. Immediately following the analysis of data (scheduled to take place before December 25, 2004), the tapes will be destroyed.
- The results of this research study may be published, though only your child’s grade level and gender will be reported to assure confidentiality.
- **Participation is voluntary,** and there will be no penalty for choosing not to participate in the study. There will also be no repercussions if at any time your child decides to withdraw from the study. There will be no compensation for participation.
This study is (1) purely observational, (2) conducted in an established educational setting, (3) involving normal educational practices, instructional strategies, and techniques, and (4) conducted for the purpose of extending the body of knowledge available in this area.

If you’d like any additional information regarding research subject’s rights, please contact the Chair of the Human Subjects in Research Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the Office of the Vice President of Research, at (850) 644-8633.

Every effort has been made to ensure that this will be a positive experience for all the students involved. Please carefully read and sign the attached permission slip. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at any time at (916) 278-4022. I sincerely thank you for your support in my efforts to find the best possible learning environment in physical education. I hope you find this a worthwhile endeavor and consent to your child’s participation.

Sincerely,

Julie Kuehl-Kitchen
CSUS, Assistant Professor
FSU, Doctoral graduate student

Consent to Participate in Research

I have read the above information regarding informed consent and understand the nature, demands, possible risks and benefits of the project. I knowingly assume the risks involved and understand that I may withdraw my consent and discontinue my child’s participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefit to me or my child. My child has my permission to be involved and play an active role in this excellent opportunity. A copy of this consent form was given to me.

______________________________  ______________________________
Print child’s name     Date

______________________________    ______________________________
Print parent or legal guardian’s name  Parent or legal guardian’s signature
Pre-Service Teacher Consent to Participate in Research

This letter was written to inform you of the details of my research, as well as to request your permission to involve you in the study. The benefit of your involvement in this project is two-fold. Not only will this project assist in identifying ways to motivate students and teachers, but it also stands to provide the education community at large with a great deal of information regarding effective teaching in physical education.

- The **purpose** of this study will be to examine and describe your experiences related to utilizing the tactical TGFU model of skill instruction in physical education.
- **Procedures:** You will have the opportunity to teach at least twelve different field hockey lessons: four utilizing tactical lesson plans developed for you, four lessons using tactical lesson plans you will develop, and at least four skill assessment lessons. All of the lessons will be video and audio taped. Immediately following each lesson, you will be asked to fill out a questionnaire relative to your experiences in the lesson plan.
- Teaching the lessons will take approximately twelve days, barring inclement weather.
- There are no foreseeable risks, discomforts or immediate benefits that you will experience other than that which normally accompanies teaching in physical education.
- Information obtained during the course of this study will remain confidential to the extent allowed by law. The tapes will be kept in a locked filing cabinet, and only the researcher will have access to them. Immediately following the analysis of data (scheduled to take place before December 25, 2004), the tapes will be destroyed.
- The results of this research study may be published, though none of your personal information, except gender and year in school, will be reported to assure confidentiality.
- **Participation is voluntary,** and there will be no penalty for choosing not to participate in the study. There will also be no repercussions if at any time you decide to withdraw from the study. You will not receive any compensation for participation.
- This study is (1) purely observational, (2) conducted in an established educational setting, (3) involving normal educational practices, instructional strategies, and techniques, and (4) conducted for the purpose of extending the body of knowledge available in this area.
- If you’d like any additional information regarding research subject’s rights, please contact the Chair of the Human Subjects in Research Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the Office of the Vice President of Research, at (850) 644-8633.
Every effort has been made to ensure that this will be a positive experience for you. Please carefully read and sign the attached permission slip. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at any time at (916) 278-4022 or by e-mail at jkitchen@csus.edu. I sincerely thank you for your support in my efforts to find the best possible learning environment in physical education. I hope you find this a worthwhile endeavor and consent to participate. A copy of this consent form will be given to me.

Julie Kuehl-Kitchen,
CSUS, Assistant Professor
FSU, Doctoral graduate student

**Project Title:** The examination and description of pre-service teachers’ experiences related to planning, implementing and assessing the tactical model of skill instruction

**Pre-Service Teacher Consent to Participate in Research**

I have read the attached information regarding informed consent and understand the nature, demands, possible risks and benefits of the project. I knowingly assume the risks involved and understand that I may withdraw my consent and discontinue my participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefit. I give my permission to be involved and play an active role in this excellent opportunity.

__________________________
Print Name

__________________________  _______________________
Signature       Date
Hello Mr/s. (teacher’s name) _____ graders. My name is Mrs. Kitchen, and I am a physical education teacher at CSU, Sacramento. I teach college students how to be physical education teachers, just like Mr/s. (teacher’s name).

I want to talk to you today about an opportunity that I’d like to invite you to participate in. I’m going to bring a group of my student teachers over to your school so that they can teach your physical education class. For about three weeks you’re going to get the opportunity to learn how to play field hockey. Raise your hand if you’ve ever played field hockey before. Great!

Each day, Mr/s. (teacher’s name) will bring you out to the field and then watch you participate in the lessons. You’ll notice that during your lessons, there will be a couple of video cameras taping your activities. This is so I can take a closer look at what you and your teachers were doing during the lessons. You can just pretend that the cameras aren’t even there, if you’d like. You may also notice that your Sac State teacher will have a microphone connected to his or her shirt. This is to make sure that I can always hear what your teacher is saying.

I want you to know that everything on the tapes will be kept confidential, which means that only people involved in the study will be looking at and listening to the tapes. Your participation in these lessons is voluntary, meaning that you get to choose if you’d like to be involved or not. Although your parents may give permission for you to participate, you also have the right to decide for yourself if you’d like to be involved. If you decide not to participate now, or at any time during the study, you will not be punished or penalized.

I also want you to know that there are no foreseeable risks or instant benefits from participating in these lessons, but you may be helping me take steps to find the best way to learn in physical education class. I think these lessons are going to be really fun for you, and I also think you are going to learn a lot about field hockey! Are there any questions?

I’m going to hand out what is called an “assent form.” If you decide that you’d like to participate in this study and in the field hockey lessons, then I’m going to need you to fill this form out. This form says that I have explained the study to you and that you understand what are being asked to do. It also says that you understand that you have a choice to participate, and you can choose not to participate at any time during the study without any penalty. Are there any questions?
Consent Form for Child Assent

Print Name: ______________________  Date: _______________

The following are true statements:

• I was in class the day that Mrs. Kitchen described the field hockey study to us.

• I understand that I am going to be playing field hockey for three weeks.

• My teacher for the field hockey is going to be a Sacramento State student.

• I know that I will be videotaped and that the tapes are going to be confidential/secret.

• I know that though my parent(s) may say that it is OK for me to participate, that I can choose not to play at any time.

• I know that if I choose not to participate, that I will not get in trouble or be penalized.

• I have been given a copy of the description of this study.

YES, I understand the above information.

YES, I would like to participate in this study.

X ______________________________________
Sign your name here
Office of the Vice President For Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2763
(850) 644-8633 · FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 3/16/2004

To:
Julie Kuehl-Kitchen
15140 Drillar Court
Rancho Murieta, CA 95683

Dept: SPORTS MANAGEMENT

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
The relationship between pre-service teachers and their preferences to utilize tactical
or technical models of skill instruction in the physical education setting

The forms that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal
referenced above have been reviewed by the Human Subjects Committee at its meeting on
3/10/2004. Your project was approved by the Committee.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh
the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and
benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals which may be required.

If the project has not been completed by 3/8/2005 you must request renewed approval for
continuation of the project.

You are advised that any change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the
project to the Committee for approval. Also, the principal investigator must promptly report, in
writing, any unexpected problems causing risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is
reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving
human subjects in the department, and should review protocols of such investigations as often as
needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS
regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Protection from Research Risks. The
Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

cc: Charles Irnold
IDC No. 2004.122
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March 5, 2004

TO: Julie Kuehl-Kitchen, Assistant Professor
   Kinesiology

FROM: John Schaeuble, Chair
       Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects

RE: The relationship between pre-service teachers and their preference to utilize
tactical or technical models of skill instruction in physical education

The IRB Committee conditionally approved or approved with a request for changes(s)
your protocol at its meeting on February 16, 2004. With the additional information you
have provided, your protocol is now fully approved as No Risk. The approval applies to
the conditions and procedures described in your protocol. Your approval expires one
year from this date.

Approval carries with it the understanding that you will inform the Committee promptly
should an adverse reaction occur, and that you will make no modification in the protocol
without prior approval of the Committee.

If you need any further information about the use of human subjects, please contact me at
278-6666 or the Office of Research & Sponsored Projects at 278-7381.

Thank you.

JS:
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POST STUDY, SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW
PRE-SERVICE TEACHER #1
POST STUDY, SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW
PRE-SERVICE TEACHER #1

Planning

Q: What is the process you went through in planning the four lessons, either daily or all four?

A: Well, what I did after I taught the fourth one you gave me to teach, I started looking at the skills that they were introduced to. And then I started thinking “what’s the next logical skill they should learn to enhance their game” I guess. So I started looking at the tactical games approach book and started picking out lessons that I thought would build up the skills they already knew. I started to try and build on what they were lacking and then tried really hard to work on the give and go…the tactical approach lessons were a little more advanced, and I was worried that they wouldn’t be able to do it.

Q: Did you base your content on what you observed? What were they doing that lead you to pick a certain strategy?

A: Yeah, I did. One of the things I noticed was that most of the students during the games were going to the ball no matter where it was, and it was just one big cluster of students fighting for the ball, and it didn’t look like they were playing the game it just looked like they were all just trying to get the ball. So, I thought about the skills that they learned, and I thought about what I can do to teach them to move to get away from the ball without going into offense and defense formations. My goal was to try to get them away from the ball…to spread out.

Q: Ok, then you mentioned you used the book. Did you use any other sources?

A: I used the book and I used one thing off of PE Central and the one book was the SPARK physical education program. I got one lesson from that book.

Q: What decisions did you make or processes did you go through to develop the whole lesson progression? From game to the skills to the last modified game.

A: The biggest thing that I kept considering is what I just talked about… was I wanted them to play the game, but I wanted them to be more successful than I thought that they were being. So I just, um, wanted to come up with the drills that focused more on like moving away from the ball. So, I just really wanted to teach them how to get rid of the ball and move like in the Give and Go. It was such a pain to keep saying over and over again, spread out so I thought if I worked on give and go that they might get away from each other. It didn’t really work, though I did see some of them trying to go. It was just so hard for them to understand.

Q: So when you decided that you were going to do the give and go, do you remember what your objectives were for that day?

A: Yeah, they had to practice the give and go. I could tell you specifically on my lesson. Is that ok?

Q: Yes.

A: Well, my objectives were they had to be able to pass a wiffle ball to a teammate, then move up the field to receive a pass from a teammate. So, give and then go to receive the ball”. I think the way that I tried to set up the drills contributed to meeting that objective. I didn’t think it was very successful. Like I said it was a hard concept to teach, and I had a hard time getting them to understand what I was saying, even with a demo, it seemed just too hard to do and explain and everything. They didn’t understand pass the ball and then go ahead to get open to receive a pass.
Q: You did parts of the give and go for two days, right?

A: Yeah, I taught the give and go and then I taught one touch passing while also working on the give and go. And then the give and go to try and score. So the give and go was really worked on. I didn’t want to give up because I know they needed it, but they just weren’t successful, no matter what I tried. I mean, they’d get it a little bit in the activity, but then they’d just cluster up again in the games. I don’t think they understood that they were supposed to be working on it in the games, and they were just trying to score or steal the ball from other people. I think spreading out was the last thing on their minds, like it didn’t even matter, or make sense, or something like that.

Q: So, including all of your lessons, what did you expect your students to do, feel and know as a result of your lessons? What did you want them to come away with from your lessons with?

A: I wanted them to come away with understanding the importance of spreading their game out, moving to the open spaces, passing and them moving ahead, trying to advance the ball up the field without getting stuck in a little bunch. So, just because I felt that they would probably be more successful and probably even enjoy the game more if they learned how to pass and then move away or work the long passes to move the ball. But it just seemed like they didn’t get it. No matter how I tried, or what I did, they just clustered back up. It drove me crazy sometimes, and I know that I had to do parts of the lesson, but I just wanted to say forget it.

Q: Explain how you felt about developing questions and that led students to realize the need for the skill or kind of moving them to the extensions you are doing, how did you feel about developing those questions in the planning phase?

A: Well, I felt it was challenging for one, because I wanted to develop questions that would lead them to the right answers. So, it was hard for me to come up with the correct wording to get them to understand. I just thought it was a challenge. It was hard for me, and at times I may have even slipped and really just gave them the right answer. But I liked it. It was neat because it helps them to think critically. I liked it. It’s something I would like to become better at, having them come up with the right answers. I think I got better at it by the end of the two weeks.

Q: Did you use any questions from the book?

A: I did. All but the first lesson plan, I made up the questions for them. But that’s only because I couldn’t come up with the correct wording. I was struggling with figuring out what they would say, so I liked going to the book, because I figured it would be right.

Q: How did you pick your learning cues for the day?

A: I just looked at the focus, like one touch passing, and just without telling them how to do it, I just tried to think of ways to focus like, “awesome one touch pass. Way to go. That was a nice one touch pass”. Just without telling them what to do and just kept throwing out the lesson focus like “one touch passing.” Or, “Awesome give and go”. “Way to move your feet to the open space to receive the pass”. But I guess I just made sure that the cues and the objectives were about the same. It makes sense that way. They were hard cues though, because it’s not like a single skill. It’s a bigger thing than that, so the cues have to be bigger, more, I don’t know what the word is, like just not simple, I guess.

Q: How did you select which modified games to use during the lesson?

A: Oh, um, I know that in most of my lessons I made it a rule in the modified game that they had to pass to all of their teammates just because they need to realize it’s a team sport and not just between one or two players. So, move the ball around. And for the give and go lesson, each goal if they did the give and go right before the goal they scored two points. And um, ok, for the second
lesson which was one touch passing, three points went to the team that gives a one touch pass to all teammates before the shot on goal, and then one point to the team that does not give a one touch pass. So, I tried to tie it in to make that the focus. Though I think maybe one of the problems I ran into is maybe I had too many rules or conditions. Even though I think I gave feedback during that game with regards to my lesson focus, I think that there were too many things for them to think about.

Q: That’s a good observation.

Q: During planning, what strategies did you plan to keep your students on task and hopefully motivated to learn?

A: Well, I put them on teams, because of course it’s a team sport, it’s a team game. So, but what I tried to do is I tried to think in my head, “Are these going to be advanced enough, too advanced, not advanced enough, or are they going to be boring based on what I see their skill levels are”.

Q: So, if you were to sit down right now and think, “What kind of things am I going to do to in the planning phase to keep them on task?

A: Well, I really tried to think of…even though I used the activities, I made sure I felt that they were going to keep the students busy enough so they weren’t going to be able to stand around and socialize. Although, they were able to. And for motivated, I guess I kind of wanted to make it a little challenging, but I think keeping the students on task for the give and go. I think maybe it was difficult for a lot so it led to maybe frustration or maybe I don’t care I don’t want to do this. Other than that, I think it was good that the teams were small because even if they were on a team with their friends, they still had more chances to play because there are less people around to rely on.

Implementation

Q: Explain your student’s opportunities to practice the tactical skills during your lessons.

A: I just put them into activities that after the first modified game, I put them into activities to focus on the skill of the day. And then, so they were given the opportunity to play while I walked around to give feedback. And then during the game, I tried to tie in that skill and give feedback to that particular skill, as well as, I think I made comments to students about previous skills that the learned. But I tried to give skill feedback based on that skill from the last game.

Q: Ok. Now, looking back on this unit and your lessons, explain whether or not students had enough time or opportunities to learn the tactical skills that you taught them.

A: The biggest challenge for me was the small amount of time that we had to work in daily. I really liked the first week’s lessons and I liked the lessons I got from the books too, but my biggest struggle was time. I just felt like I was constantly calling the students in…they weren’t getting enough time to practice. So, but with a few more minutes I think it would be a great approach. It just seemed to take forever to get them in and so I struggled with those parts of the lesson. They complained about not getting to play in games more, which is pretty funny considering they get to play everyday. I think it just took them so long to come in that they were wasting so much time. That was frustrating too. I was like, let’s go. Move quicker, and then you can play more. They wasted a lot of time walking every where.

Q: Ok, during the extensions, explain your thoughts on if your activities resembled game-like situations.
A: They may have been somewhat challenging like a game could be. Like, see how many times you can pass back and forth in 30 seconds. See how many quick passes you can do in 30 seconds. That may have been a challenge, I don’t know if those extensions resembled game-like situations. I think some of drills, like the keep away game for instance, the 2 v 1 keep away, that might have resembled a small sided game because it’s a challenge to beat a defender or play defense. So you had offense and defensive drills. Also, the give and go drill, I think if it would have looked the way I wanted it to look it may have been a game, again like a 2 v 1….pass and move. You know, it could have been a game.

Q: So when you say “the way that you wanted it to look”, how did it look as opposed to the way you wanted it to look?

A: Well, what I wanted it to look like, ok you have two on offense and one on defense. One gets a lead pass and then moves, moves around the defender, beats the defender and is open to receive the pass. It’s like a keep away game that goes in like a straight line down the field. It didn’t look like that. Students didn’t quite understand passing and then moving up the field to get open. They’d pass, some would just stand there, they’d pass and some would just follow the ball, which I did talk about….”Do you follow the ball or do you move away from the ball and find an open spot?” I think a few students kind of got the idea but I think for the most part they just didn’t understand it.

Q: Tell me about the amount of success you felt your student’s experienced in your tactical lessons.

A: I would have to say, on a cognitive level, they started realizing like, they were able to remember some of the skills that were done: the little passes, the quick passes. A few, even though it was difficult, said they learned the give and go. Did they really learn it? I guess if they felt they learned it, it was to the best of their ability. I guess, I did notice a little bit of success toward the end maybe a few more were doing it really good. They were doing especially good at passing and keeping the sticks below their waist, so even if maybe the skills didn’t look all that great they were still keeping in mind the safety rule. I felt that even though there were stubborn when I was asking questions and checking for understanding and trying to lead them into the right answers…they probably were somewhat successful. I mean I think they would probably be able to play and understanding what’s stealing vs. what’s intercepting like some of the other rules that we taught. Little taps, long passes, shooting to the corners. I hope they were successful. I don’t think very many of them were successful at the skills. They just struggled, well, I struggled, but they seemed to struggle more.

Q: Can you elaborate on their cognitive involvement in the lesson?

A: Well, I had a few, like literally two students who answer all my questions, but just a few students who would raise their hand and actually come up with the right answers. Even one student who wasn’t very cooperative out there, she’s the one who complained the whole time, but she was even able to answer questions regarding fakes. I think, they didn’t seem too interested in the questions I was asking, except for the few who did answer. But I think that on the last day, more hands went up when I asked what skills they learned. So maybe they weren’t paying attention but they were actually still listening and learning.

Q: Tell me your feelings about management time during the lesson.

A: Management, I think that I did have some management issues but I don’t think the management issues I had took up a lot of time, but I think my instruction time…I think my instructions might have been a little too long. Maybe I should have figured out a way to figure out what I needed to say in less time and get them back into their activities a lot quicker. But also, ensuring they knew what I wanted them to know out there. So I think that instruction time took up a lot of my lessons.

Q: Then what about the time spent in activity during the lessons?
A: The activity time, well, I felt that some days were better than others. I felt there was a lot of wasted time on their part like arguing over the balls. I think that some enjoyed it while others didn’t. It just seems like when they were in games, which is where they complained they wanted to be, all they did was complain about something, anything, and then I’m like when all you do is complain, you cut into your playing time. I would constantly think, just play! I mean, just some days were better than others…but I think some students actually probably enjoyed it.

Q: Do you think the students were more active in the activities or the games?

A: Games.

Q: Why?

A: I think probably because it’s just a game, they want to just play. That’s all they wanted to do was just play the game. So I think they were probably more active in the actual games. But, there were still that few that two or three students in each game that would just stand there and not doing anything. I think that they weren’t very motivated or things didn’t go how they wanted it to go.

Q: Ok, so now, describe the feedback you gave to students during the lessons.

A: The feedback, um, I think I gave some positive feedback just in general. But I know that I really tried to go around and give feedback like: “Hey, excellent job of giving and going, passing the ball and moving to the open space”. I could have given more when I called them up after the activity. I could have maybe reinforced the students who were doing a really good job and maybe even used them as examples. I guess I could have given more, I think I gave a lot, but I think I could have given more. I try to get around to all the students and I don’t know, like I probably could have given a better job at that too.

Q: Discuss how your students reacted to your instructions and demonstrations.

A: Um, I think during instructions many of the students were bored or just not interested in what I had to say. Again, I think they just wanted to play, and the questions seemed too much for them. During demonstrations, some students watched while others looked away or whispered to their friends. I think my demonstrations were not too meaningful to most of them because I rushed through them. When I yelled out the cues most students didn’t acknowledge me or at least they didn’t make eye contact with me. I only remember two students out of all the eight lessons that actually wanted to show me what they were doing with regard to the cues. And, um, I believe it was during the give-and-go.

Q: When you say that the questions are too much for them, do you mean there were too many questions, or that they were too hard?

A: Hmm, I think both. There were a lot of questions, and the students got bored just answering questions all of the time. I just wanted to say this is what we are going to do, not give them time to give input, and then get on with things, but I knew I couldn’t do that. It was just hard always getting their input.

Q: How did you feel about how your application tasks went in the lesson?

A: Um, some lessons I think went better than others. I don’t think many of the students did a very good job of applying the skill during the games. My goal during the lessons was to teach skills that would get the students to spread out on the field rather than bunch up around the ball. But students still stayed in clusters on top of the ball. As far as the actual application tasks, they went ok. Sometimes students would hurry to start, but just get side-tracked and start goofing off, instead of counting whatever they were doing, or whatever the skill, I mean the application task was. I just
couldn’t win with them. I’d put them in games and they’d argue. I put them in application tasks, and they goofed around. It was challenging all around.

Q: Do you plan on using this tactical model again?
A: Um, yes, I do. I think I would use it for a lot of sports, especially because you could pick ones that are similar, and hopefully the students will learn things about one sport from another, like they could have learned something about basketball, like the whole spreading out thing, that’s something that it needed in that sport too. So I would definitely use it again, especially when I get my own students.

Assessment

Q: How did you feel about using the assessments, the Game Performance Assessment Instrument, also called the GPAI?
A: I really liked the GPAI because I was able to assess other things within the games such as what students did while passing the ball as well as what they did when they didn’t have the ball rather than just assess whether or not they were able to pass accurately. It was nice looking at something other than what a student can do with the ball, because it seems like there are a lot of other things involved in these games, at least that’s what the GPAI book says. I do have to say that it was a little bit much to have to assess for me. I mean, I knew I had to assess last week, but I just could never fit it in. I tried to get to it on the third lesson, but then I had to deal with them not understanding something, or something like that. Then I knew I had to get to it on lesson number four, but I couldn’t because something else came up. I can’t remember what. Then I was so sad because I thought I ruined everything, but then you told me I could do it the second week. I finally did them both on the last day.

Q: Ok, don’t worry about that. This study is all about the entire process you go through. You didn’t ruin anything. Ok, now, in terms of assessing, what’s the process you went through to pick the areas you were going to assess?
A: Well, I thought, I looked at the choices I had to choose from the GPAI, and I came up with support and base because those are the two I felt most emphasized like, “getting rid of the ball then moving”, “being available for an open pass”, “getting yourself open”, which is like a big thing that I wanted to work on. Again, spreading the game out rather than having them cluster up. So I thought with support, being in a position to receive a pass like the give and go, passing then getting open to receive a pass. Again, I really looked at whether they are moving their feet, are they just passing and standing still. Since most of my lessons centered around the give-and-go I, um, wanted to assess students on how they moved to the open spaces after passing during a give-and-go. So I tried to pick the two components of the GPAI that would mainly focus on how the students moved and where they moved before and after touching the ball. Um, so I thought base and support would be the best two to assess.

Q: How did you select the groups you chose to assess?
A: Well, I really tried to pick some of the higher skilled students and some of the students that were not very skilled at all. I picked students that were on the same team, because that seemed the easiest. At least, I could find them easy, or at least if I was standing on one field, that I could see them all. That seemed to help.

Q: Talk to me about how much time you needed to complete the assessment.
A: I don’t think it took very long to assess the students I wanted to assess. I watched them during the games and was able to quickly give, what I felt, was an accurate score based on their performance.
Also, I think that having small sided games made assessing easier because the students had to be more involved in the game at all times whereas with larger teams some students would have been able to hide during the game.

Q: How do you think the GPAI results will help you make a judgment about the effectiveness of your teaching and the unit?

A: Well, I think I could look at the results and determine whether I should have spent less time in one area such as skill execution and more time on guard/mark or adjusting. I think it would be helpful in planning lessons that focus on certain components to help students improve all areas of the game performance.

Q: When looking at your assessments, explain whether or not your students met your learning objectives.

A: I feel that about three of the six that I assessed met my learning objectives and the other three probably didn’t. I just think it was hard to base a judgment on a bunch of arguers. They seemed more interested in arguing over parts of the game than playing the game.

Q: Do you think you might use this to give students a grade?

A: I might give a grade based on an average of all the components I assessed, but I would need a ton of practice using this. I really like it, and I think it looks at important parts of the game, I just feel like it was all a lot for me to do, just starting out and all. I can only imagine me giving someone a grade, and their parents coming in and saying how the heck did my kid get this grade, and I pull out my assessment. I would really have to understand every part of this thing to use it for grades. I could use it as part of their portfolio, and then they would have a copy, or an idea of what kinds of things that I wanted to see, I guess, uh, that might work, but I wouldn’t know, right now, how to do that.

Q: Ok, Do you think you would use the GPAI in the future? Why or why not?

A: Well, like I said, I think it’s a good one, and I think that it could give great information about things not directly related to the person who has the ball, but I would like to try it to see if I could maybe look at other skills, maybe skills more easier than what I selected. Like not chose base and maybe pick skill execution, then I could maybe see the skill easier. I will definitely use it in the future, and then maybe I’ll get better at it.
POST STUDY, SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW  
PRE-SERVICE TEACHER #2

Planning

Q: Talk to me about the process you went through in planning your daily lessons.

A: I went over some of the things we had done previously and then just kind of progressively went on past that. So, I’m just thinking of the next lesson, lesson four we did fakes so I began on fakes and then moved on to practicing head fakes instead of just stick fakes. So, I kind of did progressions.

Q: What resources did you use to develop these lesson plans?

A: I used your lesson plans, I talked with the other teachers, and used our notebook from team passing class, you know the lesson plans that we all did in class for peer-teaching.

Q: How did you decide what content to teach?

A: I actually wanted to teach an offense, because I thought it would be easier for the kids to come up with that strategy and feel more successful about scoring points. Rather than teach some defense or something where nobody is scoring any points where the kids wouldn’t be as interested in my opinion. That’s where I kind of based it off the first, and then I led up to it. Like when we talked about moving and spreading to the open space, they still didn’t have the concept of spreading out and using the whole field. So I just decided to keep talking about their clustering because something needs to be done to teach them how to physically spread out.

Q: What things did you consider when you were planning your lesson progression?

A: Well, I guess from the lessons you gave us when I looked at them. The game at the beginning went into the tactical questions somewhere in there, so then from there the tactical questions were based on something I wanted to lead them into for the next drill and then the next game dealt with whatever I was focusing on in the activities.

Q: How did you select your activities to use during the lesson?

A: Part of it was looking at what you had done from the lessons before, but then also it was taking that and modifying it into what I needed them to work on. First day they did the head fakes, then they did practicing moving away from your defender. So this one, it was a modification where you still have 2 v. 1 but instead of having the defender on the passer I had the defender on the receiver, and the receiver had to try and move away from them. The same formation but the defender was doing something different, and the purpose was a little bit different. The third day was a quick shooting activity where we worked on flicking it into the corners low and away.

Q: So, talking about your lessons, how did you select the learning cues to use during those lessons?

A: The first day was based on some of the same ones that were done in the previous lesson because it was on fakes still, but it was just a head fake. The next day, it was using some of the cues we had done previously but then we added on body fakes so, you know, it just kind of led from one day to the next. And then because the game would need quick shooting…quick shots.

Q: What strategies did you plan for to keep students on task and motivated?

A: I think giving them a goal. Giving them one thing to focus on, because I noticed when we just told them to go to the possession game, if I didn’t tell them during that time before they went out what the focus was, then I actually had to go out there and use it as a cue very loudly telling them to
focus. In the activities and drills, it had anything to do from doing the feedback. If I found something that they were doing… I remember one day I used they were a hockey pro. And for some reason their eyes lit up. It was just something that I tried.

Q: Be more specific with the planning aspect of keeping them on task.
A: Small groups. Make sure that they have enough equipment to participate where everybody has a chance to learn.

Q: Describe how your lessons contributed to meeting your learning objectives.
A: Most of the times I made the objective first and then figured everything out. I already knew the progression I was kind of going for so that helped me write the objective. I knew the end product so I could kind of go backward and write my objectives.

Q: What did you expect students to do, feel and know as a result of participating in the lessons?
A: To know some strategies of game play. Like we gave them individual things to focus on: pass quickly, shoot quickly, move to open spaces. Then when we put them into the actual offensive strategies they actually used quick shots and quick passes without me having to say them.

Q: How did you feel about having to develop questions to lead students to recognize the importance of certain skills?
A: Initially, I sat down and it was kind of tricky to figure out the wording I wanted to use. And then, I know I even went back and re-read them another day, and I was like, that’s not going to work because I can read it again and it will actually lead me to a different spot. Just kind of playing with it myself and then asking kids listening to what their response was going to be without really understanding what it was. If they couldn’t give me a response then I was like, I need to change that again.

Q: How did you select the modified games you were going to use during the lessons?
A: From your lessons before, I liked the possession game. It got them into it real quickly. They knew the rules already, so it was something that they could just jump into. I wouldn’t have to re-explain everything or re-introduce. So, I used it that way and then just modified it. For example, we used head fakes and body fakes. If you did head fakes or body fakes before scoring you got more points for it. Using a body fake and moving away before scoring got you more points. Shooting at the corners was another one where they would get more points. And in the diamond offense, if they yelled out diamond offense and then shot they got more points.

**Implementation**

Q: Explain the student’s opportunities to practice the tactical skills during the lessons.
A: Well, when they were in the game play, even though I gave them one thing to focus on, like if it was quick passes, they could work on quick passes but the other people were also working on moving away from the defender so they could move to open spaces. So, they were still working on other things that we might have introduced them also like head fakes. They might have been able to do a head fake with a quick pass. So, incorporating two skills. As far as extensions go, the same thing almost, you know, even though you give them one thing to focus on, maybe shooting at the corner you still have to know how to pass quickly.

Q: Looking back on this unit and your lessons, explain whether or not your students had enough time to learn the tactical skills.
A: Yeah, that’s a difficult one because they always complained about not getting to play, like they didn’t have enough time to play or whatever. But, I think the ones that really did take it to heart and really tried during the modified games, and tried during the drills, and then tried at the games at the end I think they really did have enough time to improve it. I think the ones who maybe weren’t paying attention during demonstrations and stuff, I do think that they had a more difficult time catching on to a lesson like this.

Q: Explain your thoughts on if your activities or extensions resembled game-like situations.

A: Some of them did but some of them didn’t. But I did noticed that the ones that were more like game situations did help the kids. There was one where they were practicing shooting at the goals back and forth. But then when I tried to use the same goal settings, but they were actually supposed to be on the same side as the goals. They couldn’t transition that because then it was like, well wait, we were starting on the opposite sides of the goals and now you want us inside. I think that was tricky for them to understand so just having them understand that this goal you always stand inside the field and shoot outside the goal. I think that helped them understand that it was more like a game. Also, in this situation we didn’t put too many defenders on them like in a 2v1 so I don’t think that one was real game like.

Q: Talk to me about the amount of success you felt your student’s experienced in your tactical lesson.

A: One of my favorite ones was watching the diamond offense and that was the last day, the last lesson. I got to watch the kids actually yell out the offense, spread out into their positions and try and use it. They also used some of the other skills we had been working on before to try and score a point. I got to see everything we had been working on in the lessons all put down into one thing: they spread out, they moved quickly, they passed quickly, they shot quickly. They didn’t always make the goal though.

Q: Ok, now describe the student’s cognitive involvement in these lessons.

A: In the beginning, I could actually tell that most of the kids had not been involved in team activities. Based on that, I would try and lead them to a word like fake, and it took them forever to get them there because I don’t know how often you would work on fakes with kids outside of school. You know, on fakes that was a really difficult one. But afterwards, not only did they know how to say it but they could actually show it. I was leading them and being an informant to tell them things, but only after they gave me their two cents first after I was asking the tactical questions to get them to think cognitively.

Q: Tell me your feelings about the time spent in managing your lesson.

A: I think when kids were absent it was a very difficult thing because if you had teams of 2, 3, or 5 then you had to fix those real quickly. Jerseys and sticks and all that didn’t take a whole lot of time, but the most difficult for me was getting them started. And with the transitions, coming in and everything like that, I did try the competitions but with teams not just with one kid. I did “what color can come into me first?” That made the whole team come rather than just one kid. I thought that worked real well. And actually, I think there was a little bit more management with the tactical lesson of having to bring them back in and give them something new to work on. And any time you give them something new to work on you have to take time to describe and introduce, then send them back out. Hopefully, they go back out quickly to do it and get back into their teams or pairs or whatever. You’re always having to change if it’s pairs or teams.

Q: What about in terms of your activity time?

A: I would say my average was around 40 percent, which I thought was pretty good considering how many times I had to bring them in and then send them back out. I thought that once they got
started then they were able to continue to play. Also, I think the tactical lessons take longer to instruct kids because you have to let the kids tell you the answers, and if you can’t get them to tell you the answers you have to keep going. And if you’re not really skilled at leading them there then it takes more time during instruction.

Q: Describe the feedback you gave to your student’s during the lesson.

A: I actually wrote it to where whatever game they were working on in the modified game, I made a special little box for me to tell me what I felt was important just for that modified game and then put that down as my cue, or whatever, or to give feedback. That’s kind of how I did it. I decided after that. And during my extensions, I basically used the cue I was using during the drills I switched around just slightly and gave it as feedback. For example: I used fake with your head, great head fake, way to use your head to fake the defender.

Q: Discuss how your students reacted to your demonstrations.

A: There were times that they had already seen the drill before and that same formation so it was easy for them to understand. I really didn’t have to go into too much demonstration. On my lesson seven, trying to get them to midfield, because I didn’t have a midfield established for them some kids might not even know what a midfield is, so there were ways I know I could have done that demonstration better. After I talked to you about trying to demonstrate again.

Q: How do you feel the students reacted to the application tasks?

A: I think if they were already into the drill or whatever it was that we were doing, I think it did help them out, you know they kind of got a little more excited about it. But the ones who already weren’t into it it didn’t really affect them that much they just kind of went along with it….they were moving but not doing it.

Q: Do you think or do you ever plan to use the tactical model in your teaching career?

A: Before these lessons? No.

Q: Before this you wouldn’t of?

A: Correct.

Q: And then now you would?

A: Yes.

Q: Really? And why?

A: Because I would probably use it during something that is similar to these kind of strategies...in sports or activities that have these same types of things. They can even transfer over to other sports because it just seemed like, for me, it was almost easy to do. And I wasn’t having to try and re-teach them new things it was just having them figure out what I was trying to get them towards and then they kept moving on. It was difficult for me because it was easy in class because everybody already knew the answer to the questions, but the way that I would question it here, didn’t work, and how did I fix it right on the spot with the kids? It was like, “ok you’re not getting this question right now?” With our classes it didn’t work that way. It was like, “use headfakes!” I would respond, “that’s a great answer”.

Q: Explain to me if there’s a situation where you might not use this model.
A: I can’t think of one. Because I walked into this, not even establishing an learning environment or anything like that. They had no clue who I was but it still seemed to work.

Assessment

Q: How did you feel about using the GPAI assessments?

A: I think that I like it, but I just got a little stressed out trying to fit the second one into my lesson, actually lessons. I planned on doing it on Wednesday, but since I had that disaster, I had to deal with the fact that they didn’t understand me. So, I guess on the day I did use it that it was good. I like the idea of assessing them while they are in activity but it was hard to stay with one group the whole time. I kind of felt like I was neglecting other students because I had to stay at one field, but if I faced the class I could kind of keep an eye on them. I think I ended up just giving them a number, you know so I could get on with my lesson. I really liked the system, but I just was so rushed. I worried that I didn’t do it right, but I like the idea of it.

Q: How did you select which components of the GPAI to assess your students during the lessons?

A: I liked the idea of using the decision making, because that let me know if they were understanding what we were conveying when we were talking about…move away from the defender and things like that. Were they actually doing that during game play? Skill execution wasn’t quite as big for me because I noticed some of these kids having a difficult actually demonstrating their skills but they were actually the ones telling me the answers, and that was different because I knew that they could say it but maybe not do it. So, I guess I’d have to say that skill execution isn’t a priority for me. I’m just glad that they learned though. Also, with the component “base”, I didn’t focus on that too much but I did see I needed to focus on something like that after doing a few lessons.

Q: Ok, Good. How did you select the groups you chose to assess?

A: I kind of liked how I was able to put them into groups of two/four with girls and boys. I also, tried to group them with two good kids and two not so good kids, so the teams would be even. Then I just selected kids that were all playing the game or were all involved in the activities. I didn’t want to spend a ton of time with one group, because they all really needed feedback.

Q: Talk to me about how much time you needed to complete the assessment.

A: For example: when I did in the last modified game on the day I did it, it took me a little long to do, because I basically looked at one to two things that each kid did, and based on those things that’s how I did it. And for the most part, the rest of the students, while I was going around and assessing, most of the kids were working on the skill that we were working on that day using the cues and everything like that to try and help themselves out. It was actually pretty interesting because sometimes you couldn’t really tell quickly whether they were actually working on what we were doing that day.

Q: Ok, so now, how do you think you might use the results from the GPAI to make a judgment about the effectiveness of your teaching?

A: I think the results will give me a good indication of whether or not I’m meeting the objectives or goals that I’m trying to teach the students. Um, sometimes you might think things are going well when in actuality they are not, maybe, when you look at the results. Maybe something is wrong with my instructions or questions or something. Maybe I would have to focus on one certain thing like “base” before I focus on one of the other components.

Q: How would you use the results of the GPAI to plan future lessons?
A: Well if the numbers went down, in my opinion, and I’m still assessing the same kids and they keep going down then that obviously means that I’m not being effective as a teacher or the unit isn’t planned right or something. If it goes up then that also can be attributed to the lesson plan, my teaching, etc.

Q: Ok, when looking at your assessment, explain whether or not your students met your learning objectives.

A: Well, they did answer the questions correctly when I was leading them with questions. I guess that was sort of just my formative assessments, but cognitively they could answer the questions even if they weren’t skillful enough to demonstrate it another thing. I know when I was doing the GPAI my motor objectives were directly related to the assessment. When I was doing the assessment it made it easier to see if they were indeed meeting my objectives…like, are they doing the skill execution component, and the decision making component.

Q: Ok, now, how do you think you might use the GPAI to give students a grade?

A: Well, it does go along with my objectives, so if that’s what my objective was for that day, although this would be part of it I wouldn’t assess them all just based on this. There’s also effort going on out there that they may not be able to demonstrate…they may gotten a 1 saying they were very weak. If they were trying to practice it out there during game play, and you know, I could see they were trying, I would use this as part of it but not all the grading.

Q: Do you think that you would use the GPAI in the future? Why or why not?

A: I would use it in the future, but like I said before I would want to do one even before they pick up the equipment. Like where are they at the beginning, the middle and the end. And then it also gives you different things you need to focus on for future lessons.
Planning

Q: What was the process that you went through on a day to day basis for planning your lesson plan?

A: Every night I looked at my lessons that I had from our class for different tactical plans. Some people did hockey. So I looked at theirs to defend my questions, and then every so often I looked at my book, the tactical one, just to make sure they were tactical. I had a hard time with making sure the questions were tactical. And then I wrote them out, and went through and made sure my objectives matched my cues and made sure my cues were OK and they weren’t too hard, that they made sense and they were little quick words, and, I, uh, and, oh, sometimes I ran it by my kids and would ask them if, uh, or say something to them, because I couldn’t figure out how to say phrase something that a fifth grader would understand that didn’t play a sport so I would run something by Nolan and say, uh, what would you think this would mean, and then one time he said to me, get to the open field, and then I thought Oh, Great! So that worked. So that’s what I did.

Q: You mentioned tactical lessons from our class. Did you use any other resources?

A: It was just the book and then the lessons from the class, and that was really it. And then I looked at your lessons also that you had given us, uh, before the first four and then from when I talked to you before.

Q: How did you decide what content to teach, what to include in your lesson plan?

A: By the first lesson, uh, when I went out there to teach them, and I saw what they were capable of and what I thought they needed and that’s why at the very end, when I did the diamond formation, cause it’s something I really wanted them to learn so they could spread out and learn how to all move down the field, instead of one kid moving down the field and three others staying back, uh, and that to me, when I went back, and thought, this would be cool, and they need to really work on passing, because they were really having a hard time passing and people clustering and just spreading out using the whole field.

Q: You mentioned earlier about your learning cues, but what or how did you select what learning cues to use during your lesson?

A: Well, basically, from other lessons that I’ve taught in team passing class and then watching other kids and having my own kids. Like I said, running things through by them and seeing what they would understand, cause sometimes I would throw something out there, and they would not know what I was talking about. So then, having a son who is going to be in fourth grade, I knew that was way over their heads, also, and he plays sports so he should have got it before they did I would think. Umm, other things was that I would just go through and think, you know, if I said it, was it something quick and easy to say? Lot of times, if I would put cues in that are too hard, and I needed them to be about the tactic instead of the simple skills, and so they were hard to develop because I wanted them to be right.

Q: How did you select the activities that you were going to use between the modified games?

A: I wanted to select things that would build on what the games were focusing on. I wanted to, my activities were meant to reinforce what the games were, and the “cheetah” activity I played which was getting them to pass quickly to each other and having them compete for how many they could pass quickly. That’s what the focus was of that game…was to pass quickly and to shoot quickly. So I played something like that. I tried to name it something that was fast so they would get the idea of doing it fast.
Q: What about other activities? How did you select other activities...can you think of any others?

A: The other ones that I selected...I basically just from other lessons I taught before and ones I've seen in class, um, and just kind of went of your lesson plans that you have done, um, and just made up my own from there and tried to make them a little bit different so the kids weren't bored, but yet kind of on the same premises cause I knew they worked.

Q: How did you select which modified games to use during your lesson?

A: It depended on what my goal was. So, like the diamond formation...my modified game was always trying to get them to focus on it. I wanted them to use it and I knew they wouldn't use it unless I gave them like a big percentage point, so that's why I liked my modified game...I gave them ten points for using diamond formation when they scored and if they didn't use it, it was worth one point. So, umm. It was basically that, it was just what I wanted them to know and to focus on is how I set up my games. I just went around that, cause just by watching them you knew what they need to work on. And it was funny...some kids really had it and others didn't, so you kind of had to go on that, too.

Q: When you're thinking about the lesson progression, so, going from modified games to activities to modified games, what things did you consider when you're planning for that?

A: Again, the student's level of ability, umm, the time frame, only having them for thirty minutes was a factor. Uh, only having them for two weeks was another huge factor uh, so I took into account how difficult I could make it and especially, a lot of these kids never had a long implement in their hand, and it's completely different than, you know, playing and catching with a ball or something, so, I took a lot of things into consideration on how I was going to do it, and just, I would say, from the first day, just getting to know the kids and seeing what they were able to do, and I think it would have been neat to see their score first to know who, but, actually, just by watching them play, I knew who could play and who couldn't and who had played organized sports and who hasn't.

Q: It's impressive. I've been calculating the numbers for their skills tests, and it looks great. You can pat yourself on the back. Ok, I'm going to focus you on your lesson progression. What things did you consider during a lesson when you were creating the progression?

A: Oh, I see, well, like when I developed my modified games, if I wanted them to focus on a certain skill, so I would remove the defenders and try to make them focus on the skill I wanted them to learn, for example, if I wanted them to pass quickly, the activity and cues and stuff would all be about passing quickly, in the activities and the games. All of my lessons did that, focused on the same cues throughout the lessons. That's what you mean, right? Isn't it?

Q: What strategies, again we are talking about planning, and so the types of things you planned on using to keep your students on task? What types of things did you plan to use to keep your students on task?

A: Um, I do a lot of quick things, so like, when I send them out, they can only do it for a minute and if they're not doing it right, I try to refine it to where they understand my words, then I send them out to work on the same task again and then, I only give them like a minute and a half, maybe, and then call them back in and move them on to something, and I'll either make, either I'll make it easier or harder, just by watching how they're doing, and usually I plan for both, so, you know, just take that into consideration. Uh, and then the other thing, is to keep them motivated is, just, you know, total positive reinforcement...even when you see them doing something wrong, I try to nicely say "that was really good, but... try this next time". So I always try to keep it a positive.
Q: So, now…thinking about the planning part, so I’d like you to focus on the times when you were actually sitting down, prior to the lesson and deciding what might make them on task, what types of things do you think that you can plan for that keeps kids on task?

A: I would say the time again, when you’re planning your lesson plan and you’re sitting there figuring out how much time transitions take you could use things like the countdown, like when you want them to come over…ten…nine…eight… you know, so they know they have to begin, or all equipment goes down at their feet, you know, those are things you put on your lesson plan and you always reinforce. Then just going back through your lesson plan, and going… “Is this something I would want to do, you know, or a totally boring lesson plan that I wouldn’t want to do,” Then how are they going to stay motivated and how are they going to stay on task? So, I think that this is something I do when I sit down and plan. Um, sometimes I look at it and go… “This looks great!”…then I go out there and they are so bored. So I guess its just trial and error when you’re planning.

Q: Describe how your lessons contributed to meeting your learning objectives.

A: Again, when I write the lesson, the first thing I do is write my objectives, whenever I write a lesson plan and try to stick with that throughout the lesson and then, as I write my lesson, especially since the objectives are about tactical skills, it was important to do a good job putting that stuff in my objectives. Once it’s in my objectives, I always make my cues and objectives about the same thing so I go back through and see if it meets my objectives, cause what’s the point of the lesson if it doesn’t meet my objectives. Uh, then I check my cues… I go back though to make sure, you know, that my cues reinforce what my objectives are and everything just kind of goes together.

Q: What did you expect your students to do, feel and know as a result of participating in your unit?

A: Well, I expected them to do the skills and improve. So, from the first days when you did the obstacle course with them, I expected them to improve, and you know, and I’m sure they did, because everybody out there tried really hard, for the most part. Uh, to feel, I wanted them to feel comfortable. I wanted them to know, you know, that, it was ok for them to try, and fail, and, you know, there again. I’m Miss Positive. That was something I wanted them to feel. And something I wanted them to know was how hockey was played, and, you know, and the rules, and everything that went with it to know someday that, if they ever see it again, maybe they could join in though we don’t live somewhere that hockey is a major sport, but, you know, I wanted them to know that. And also, hockey, uses a lot of sports, I kept referring to basketball, that kind of translates into it, so it’s not like hockey!

Q: And a lot of those kids play soccer, too. Describe the process you went through when you were developing the questions for the tactical part of the lesson. Describe what you kind of went through during that process.

A: Again, I used my son, and by asking him questions and making sure it was a tactical question that went to the lesson, because that was kind of hard at first because you just want to ask them, and, uh, questions that, not to talk down to them, but questions they weren’t over their head, again, using midfield when some kids didn’t know what midfield was. Uh and always making sure that my questions reinforced what my cues were or what my whole objective was for the day. Uh…and how I felt about it…some days it was just overwhelming, maybe I think it had a lot of importance, and I wanted them to get the questions right, but I didn’t want to confuse them with wrong questions, or questions that would lead them to the wrong answer or you know like the wrong direction.

Q: Do or did you use other resources when you were developing the questions or …
A: I used lessons plans from the week before, and that really helped, but you can never know what those kids are going to say. That was hard to plan for, but I got good at figuring out how to lead them and not just like giving them the answer. I made them work for it.

Implementation

Q: Explain the student’s opportunities to practice tactical skills during the lessons.

A: They had a lot of opportunities because we put in the activities...is that what you are talking about... during the middle of the lessons?

Q: Yes, anytime in the lesson is ok to talk about; activities or games.

A: Ok, Uh...the activities always played off the games or added to it. So, like I said, just for an example, one that sticks out in my mind, because it worked so well was the cheetah and with moving to the diamond formation because it really helped them...I mean not the diamond formation, it’s the other one where I wanted them to score quickly and pass quickly was their goal of the game, because it really reinforced it home, and it was a chance for them to break up into small groups, and it actually had them looking out for people on the field to see where they’re at again for support, so that’s one that really sticks in my mind. As far as the extensions, I think it really does give them a lot more time cause they get to go out and they try harder so they get more practice cause they actually do it more. Uh...like the cheetah game, when I told them...ok, now, to do it in thirty seconds. Count how many you can get. Ok, now who can beat this high score? Go back out, and they’re so competitive, they want to beat each other or themselves, that the practice was there, that they got more and more practice, instead of me just going...ok, go do it again.

Q: Do you think the activities or extensions in between the modified games resembled game-like situations?

A: Yes, because the lessons were so focused on the aspects of the games. I never did anything in my lessons, I mean in the middle of the lessons, the extensions, that weren’t focused on game things, game-like situations. I mean. This one student who did not do a thing, and just sat there and literally stood there with her stick in her hand, I mean, it was just like the whole turn around, the whole full circle. She was one of the best students who practiced during the activities and at the end of the lessons and she was in there, and she’s just a frail little girl who was just terrified and I think because of the success she experienced in offense activities during the lesson that she got better in and she loved it now. So, yeah, I think a lot of kids were really successful and I think like I said, I’d like to see the different scores from the first day of the obstacle course to the end and I think that would speak for the success them.

Q: Do you think the more skillful kids were also successful?

A: Yes, because, at first, they were good because they knew how to hit and stuff with the long implement which helped them, but as time went on, they had to realize how to do it without high sticking, uh, how to get through, how to cutoff without stealing. You know, they went beyond what the other students did because they started to learn if I cut here and I look up to where they are going to pass, I can cut it off, but a lot of kids didn’t get that you know. So, I think, they excelled in the games and activities.

Q: Describe your student’s cognitive involvement in these lessons.

A: The cognitive involvement would definitely be very high. Uh, just by asking questions in the beginning, getting them into the right mind set, like I said before, having them go out, giving them something to do, and then having them reiterate the cues, asking them what did I say today, what were the things I was telling you before, or even if you asked them like what did we talk about
yesterday, they did a good job remembering everything, and then using that in the lessons that came after that. When I wrote my lesson plans, I’d always ask what did we work on yesterday, so it keeps it in their minds, keeps it fresh. So yeah, I think that was a big whole cognitive aspect, and besides, they had to put themselves in position when they’re playing, and trying to figure out and especially the diamond formation and try to figure out where to go, how do I stay in this formation and how do I use this to score. So, it was a lot to do there.

Q: So, during the tactical questioning, the students were…

A: The students were listening and trying to answer questions. Like the questions I’d phrase had to do specifically with my cues or my objectives for the day. So… they would have to recall exactly too, from the day before on how to answer and what were those specific cues that I wanted them to learn. The hardest part was to get them involved in the cognitive parts of the lesson when they didn’t know the answers, or even what the heck I was talking about. That was hard getting them to the answer without just saying the answer for them.

Q: Tell me your thoughts about the time spent in your lesson in management; the management and transition time in your lesson.

A: I try to keep my management to as little as I possibly could. Of course, I always think I have a high activity level. I try to send them out. I try to say specifically what I want. I very quickly ask if there are questions. I try to address it as fast as I can…and specific to your question…management, though, it does eat up, especially when you don’t set that protocol. Like I said the first two weeks is mainly your time to set that management and to learn that I’m not going to listen to every little boo boo complaint that you have. So, I think that takes effect, but, I think if we could have went longer, of course, that management time would go down, and I would like my activity time to go up. My instruction time, depending on the lesson, like the diamond formation, I’m sure my instruction time was much higher than any of my other lessons, uh, but I think if you have very clear instructions, and once they get to know you and the way you talk, and the way you grade things, that they will understand a lot faster in what you want.

Q: Do you feel that this type of lesson, a tactical lesson, because of the components, that it has more or less management time than, say like a game stage lesson?

A: I think it has less management, because you’re bringing them in and out so fast and your activities have so much to do and they’re so involved in it. Other times, I think I had a lot more management, because I was constantly yelling at kids or trying to stop and bring them back and trying to focus them, where this one, you bring them in, you focus them so much you keep them on track by the questions, that I think it cuts down on your management time.

Q: Describe the feedback you gave to your students during the lessons.

A: Feedback was very specific. I tried to keep the feedback to my cues, because they would remember it, because that’s what I wanted to ingrain in their brain. A lot of times, the feedback would be my about questions. I think that had a lot to do with the feedback, even though they were questions, but still feeding them back what I wanted, because it was reinforcing it. Like I said, the feedback was just kind of specific and trying to help them too, like look up, look down the field, try to get out of there. You know, try to move your feet …that kind of tactical stuff in my feedback.

Q: Did you notice that how your students reacted to your feedback statements? I mean, how did they react to your feedback?

A: Um…Most of them…they just… would look up and kind of ok…they would try to do it. Some kids, I mean if you call their name they think instantly they’re in trouble, but I think whenever I said the cues, they appreciate it. You could see it…they would think about it, and you could see
their mind just working and then a lot of times, I think about ninety percent of the time, you would see them actually execute what you just said.

Q: Discuss how your students reacted to your demonstrations.

A: They really liked the demonstrations. Sometimes it helped and sometimes it just brought on more questions. I think, because my students were such perfectionists, that they wanted to please me so bad, that they wanted to make sure they had it. So they would see it… but they would ask me questions…what if this happened? What if that happens? I’d just say don’t worry about it…that’s not going to happen and stuff, but I think a lot of the kids really watched the demonstrations because I could just go…as soon as I did it once…I didn’t really demonstrate more than once, cause hopefully, I have strict rules and they were watching, and I would send them out and you see them go right to the formation and they would correct the other person, so I knew they were watching the demonstration and they were getting it. And you could tell who was not listening, because when they went out, they were totally clueless. And you could tell, because some of these activities were a little more advanced then they were probably use to so if they didn’t pay attention you could easily see it.

Q: I know you did application tasks in your lessons. How do you think those went?

A: I think my application tasks went great! I think application tasks are the key to keeping kids motivated and especially the ones who are more skilled because a lot of times they get bored in your lessons, because you have to really start from the beginning a lot of time with a lot of kids nowadays don’t have that. They sit at home and watch TV and play video games…not like when we were kids. So I think that keeps the kids who are more athletic or more skilled involved in the lessons because they always try to beat everybody or themselves, and so I love application tasks and plus, it’s challenging and something quick and fun to do. A lot of kids, especially at the younger age, they love it, because they want to tell you how many they got and they always want to be the center of your attention.

Q: And did your application task frequently match your cues or your objectives for the day?

A: Yes. They always went with it. It was just an extension of my cues or my, you know, my objectives for the day.

Q: Ok, last question on implementation…Do you plan on using this model again?

A: Absolutely, and using it a lot.

Q: When or why?

A: When I do my student teaching, which is in another month, I plan to use it for my two weeks of field hockey. Also, I would like to use it for my basketball unit. I think it would be a great way to teach basketball, because I love the way its set up. I like it because it cuts down my management time, it’s very easy for the kids once they get the idea how it works, I think they really like it. They like to be engaged in games a lot of the time. So, especially, like the first you just throw them out there and let them play and they don’t really know what they’re doing and as time goes on, you start to give them a little bit more feedback and information about the game, and it’s almost like they know everything right away because they were in a game. So it’s just really neat, plus I think it’s a way that allows us, as educators, to see what we’ve taught our students from the beginning to the end, where most of the time when you have just a regular lesson, like a game stages model, or whatever, you don’t really get to see the whole transition into a game, because, you know, it just goes from one activity onto another.

Q: What type of situation, if any, might you choose not to use this?
A: Well, like in my tumbling and balancing unit for younger kids...I wouldn’t use it, but I guess that makes sense, since there aren’t any tactics, duh. I think fifth grade is like the level to start it at, really, because I don’t. I mean I think fourth grade might work, but I wouldn’t go any younger than that I don’t think. I don’t know if that’s right or not, but I just wouldn’t. I think they need so much more...I don’t know...the whole command thing...constantly...Command and practice. This kind of gives them more freedom where they get to go out and experience it, and you know, move into the game right away. I think that’s important to them understanding how games work. Plus I think it would depend on my whole class. This might be just a little too complicated for a class that has never had any game experiences. That would probably be tough to do then, maybe a little too crazy then. I don’t know, maybe talk to me next semester, and I’ll have a different answer, probably.

Assessment

Q: How did you feel about using this assessment? The Game Performance Assessment Instrument or the GPAI?

A: I thought it was really easy to do. Once I had my components and my criteria down...I could look down and instantly know what I was looking for. You have the definition right there...provide the appropriate support for a teammate with the ball, you know, like being in position with your man, and then I could just sit there and watch and go, oh yeah, that was great. That was a good one and then look again, and look again and, and go yeah, that person does that pretty regularly. It was a good reminder. That’s great! Like Amber...I mean, she’s really good, but she plays soccer, too. On support, she had a five, and on her base, she had a three, which was partly effective performance. That’s still not bad, but I think that also had a lot to do with the team she was playing. I really like assessing the student while they were in games, though sometimes it was hard because while I was watching one group for a while, sometimes the students, or just one of the students wouldn’t move much so I couldn’t really give them a score, but then we talked and you told me that I could skip parts of the assessment if I wasn’t able to see one of the skills, right?

Q: Yes, so how did you plan the assessment of your students?

A: How did I plan to make them, or like...

Q: Yes. How did you develop the assessment for the second week? Talk to me a little bit about how you developed the GPAI?

A: Well, I’m looking at it, and I did the base and support. I took what I thought was important for them in the lesson, and asked was it something that I wanted them to take away from me for that week? I thought those were really important, and something I wanted to focus on. I thought that would be a good thing to assess them on. And then, I planned it, when they were in their games, to watch them and quickly keep an eye out, as I was watching other students.

Q: How much time did that take you to do?

A: Not very long. Oh, I would say, at the most, five minutes. Um...maybe between five and eight minutes. It was just so easy to do, because I could stand on the outside of the perimeter and watch that team that I was watching and still see everyone else, and I could just glance over and watch them and every so often and check it off and see and still maintain control of my class and help other students out who need it.

Q: And how do you select your group or students you chose to assess?

A: Well, the first time I chose them, because I thought, oh, this will be an easy one to watch because they’re all very skillful, and as a new teacher, I just thought oh, that would be a lot easier than
trying to watch someone else and try to assess them, because I thought it would be hard to see them do what I wanted them to do so that’s why I did that one. The other one was just random, and the last one I felt more comfortable using the assessment, and I just randomly chose, though I have to say that they were a group that at least was very involved in the lesson. They didn’t have as many arguers on the teams. That made it easy to do the assessment quickly because they were involved more.

Q: And were they on the same team, or were they on different teams?
A: They were on the same team, actually…both times. I did that the first time just because, but then I saw on the assessment that it said “team”, so I thought they had to be one the same team.

Q: How did you select those components? What did you base that decision on?
A: Because, those were two things I though were extremely important for them to learn. For me to feel like they were a successful in field hockey was to learn those. We kept talking about moving to the open space, you know, help your teammates get open, you know. That was one of our activities… was for them to stand in the middle and try to get open around the defender. And then, just the whole base, I mean return to a base position between skill attempts…to get ready to get back on defense which, again is a thing you need to play a true game.

Q: And where did you get those descriptions of those?
A: I actually got these out of the tactical book. I think that’s where I got those, because I wasn’t quite sure what to put down. Yeah, that book on this assessment really helped me make sense of everything. I liked it.

Q: Great. How do you think the GPAI results will help you make a judgment about the effectiveness of your teaching or how effective your unit has been?
A: I think if you go back to look at the child when you first came in, if I was the one teacher doing it and had the assessment thing the first day, I could use that and look back on it and see where they were then and how well they went through that obstacle course. I think it would give me a good idea of how good they were, and I could tell how much they learned in two weeks, but I guess we would see that with the second obstacle course scores, right? But about my job as a teacher, I guess those score would probably say it all.

Q: Do you think you might use this to give students grades or how do you think you might use this?
A: No. I don’t think I would, unless that was something specifically I told that I was going to do, but at this age, I don’t think I would use that to give a grade. I think I would do more…maybe a skill day, like having, you know, I don’t know how I would figure that out, but I would do something more of a skill thing where I would let them know ahead of time, instead of doing something like this, because they could really concentrate on having their best performance, if their grade depended on it, because I think they deserve that. I think this lets me know, the teacher, how well I did and what I gave to them, especially if I had the other ones the first week of their games then I could see for myself. I think it’s a great way to see what I have accomplished.

Q: So you can kind of plan future lessons from this?
A: Yeah…exactly. And maybe, let me know what I didn’t actually hit, because if each child isn’t getting what I want them to get, maybe it’s me, not them.

Q: From this assessment, do you think you could make a judgment on whether or not they met your learning objectives?
A: Yeah, I think so, because support and base is a huge thing that I kept pushing and pushing. If I had a bunch of students not score high on the assessment, I would know that I needed to spend more time on that part of the game. It would really help me because, like I said, I could redo stuff that they scored low on, like I’m sure I need to stay on spreading out and the base and support kind of deal with that area, spreading out to support your team and stuff.

Q: Do you think you might use the GPAI in the future? And If so when? If not, why?

A: I would definitely use it. I like being able to look at what they are doing in the games. I mean that seems like the best place to look at it anyways, though it’s hard because everything is happening so fast. I liked it. I also like that I don’t have to assess everyone in one day. That’s new for me. It will be interesting using this in student teaching, but I like it so it should be good.
APPENDIX I

POST STUDY, SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW
PRE-SERVICE TEACHER #4
Planning

Q: Talk to me about the process you went through planning your daily lesson plans.

A: Well, I tried to remember the skills I thought they needed from the lessons the first week. Well, actually I looked in the book first and went through to see what 5th grade was supposed to be learning and stuff. And, uh, well it was kind of hard though because I figured that they were at level 1, but some of the things at level 1 seemed really hard, but um, I started out looking at the list of skills the book used and made a list of things I wanted to teach them. Obviously, I had to teach spreading out, that was a big thing, but it was hard to figure out how to do that. I printed out four lessons that were kind of blank and started filling in the blanks with cues, and games and um, things like that, like activities and stuff. Of course, everything changed after the first day was a disaster.

Q: Ok, you kind of addressed this in your first answer, but can you add anything else to how you decided what to teach?

A: Well, like I said I tried to remember what they needed, and I made like a mini block plan for the week, which was good because when it didn’t work, it was easy to change, though I feel like I did about 7 or 8 lesson plans. I don’t know I mean like when I was watching them during the lesson on um, the one on Monday, the fake to get open one. It seemed like a good idea to go on from fakes with the stick that we did the week before, to the person without the ball faking to get open. I’m pretty sure it was one of the first lessons in the book so I thought they could totally do it. I was pretty nervous though, because I didn’t have your lesson, so that was kind of hard, but anyways, um, I watched a couple of groups of kids during this lesson, and I just wanted to re-bring them in. They were either standing around, or just passing back and forth, like they were just playing keep away, or the people with the ball were all faking, it was a mess in my point of view. It was just frustrating because I thought I did a good job demonstrating but they just didn’t get it or something. Um, yeah, did I answer your question? What was it again? Sorry.

Q: Don’t be sorry. I just asked you to chat about how you decided or what you decided to teach. Did you have anything else to add for the other days?

A: Well, I taught different things on the other days, but I felt like they were pieces of the same thing, spreading out, spreading out, spreading out. I just wanted to keep them focused on, well, like I wanted to keep somebody moving at all times, so at least one person wouldn’t, or two people wouldn’t be standing around. So I guess that’s how I picked what to teach. I just made sure that someone was moving, and went from there.

Q: You mentioned the book, but did you use any thing else when you were planning?

A: Yeah, um the lessons you gave me, and I looked at the lessons from our class to see if any of those might have ideas, but mostly I used the book.

Q: What things did you consider when you were planning your lesson progression, going from modified games to skills to games again?

A: I think that besides spreading out, nothing else mattered, so I, what I tried to do is figure out how to teach that. Seriously what are the pieces of that? I don’t know how to break that into pieces, so when we talked you suggested getting someone moving, and um, hopefully moving away from others, or to the open spaces, but it was hard because the only time I think I’ve ever taught something like this was in our class, and when you tell everyone to spread out in class, they either
do it or maybe I didn’t notice it but, no, our class spread out, we definitely didn’t bunch like this class. I thought about putting poly spots out and have students stand on them, and say this is what spreading out looks like, or cones and say you stay around this cone and, or stay within 10 feet of this cone, but then you said that didn’t really represent the game, but I’m going to try it one day, and I’ll tell you if it works. Anyways, that’s it, I think that if they would spread out more, a lot of things would be better, like they wouldn’t argue as much for sure.

Q: What strategies did you plan for to keep students on-task?
A: Well, like I just said, they just argued so much that it was hard to keep them on task.

Q: Did you plan anything, or do anything in the planning to keep them on-task, the things you did before the lesson started to keep them from arguing maybe?
A: Well, keeping them on-task seems to be a lot easier if they wouldn’t just walk around everywhere. They walk in. They walk out. They walk around everywhere. It drove me crazy. But I tried to get them moving fast by saying things like the first team ready gets to have the ball first. I think that maybe worked one day, but it’s funny because they want to play games, they beg for games, but then they just like dilly-dally around before they get going and put jerseys on and stuff. I’d say let’s move quickly, and they just look at me like, whatever. I guess their hurry is probably different then my hurry. I can’t believe it takes them 2 to 3 minutes to get a game started when everything is already set-up and out there for them. Most of the time, I would have to go to the field and pick up the ball and say alright, get ready, here we go. And then like drop the ball so they would get started. But as far as keeping them on-task, I think that small teams good, because they are supposed to be more active, but it just seemed like there were, or there was more arguing. I did try a bunch of different teams, like breaking up kids that couldn’t get along. I think that worked a little.

Q: Describe how your lessons contributed to meeting your learning objectives.
A: I tried to always focus the lesson, the activities and stuff, on the objectives. I’d do them first and then go from there. I would say that everything in my lesson was about my objectives. Yep, I always do it like that. It just makes sense, I guess.

Q: What did you expect your students to do, feel and know as a result of participating in the lessons?
A: Um, besides spreading out, which didn’t really work, they did learn to argue, ha ha. Well I really thought that since they spent so much time in games that they might learn teamwork things and cooperation but it was like the opposite. Well, I wanted them to do the skills, and I thought they did a lot better at passing. I really wanted them to feel like a part of a team, especially kids like Summer who probably has never been on a team or a teammate. I thought this would be perfect for her but I don’t know. I really just wanted them to get better at field hockey. I think some of them did.

Q: Yes, I’ll show you the scores from the obstacle course so you can pat yourself on the back. They definitely improved. Ok, please explain how you felt about having to develop questions.
A: That was nerve racking. I don’t know why it was so hard for me, but I’d say it was my biggest challenge in planning because they never seemed to answer exactly as I had planned, of course, but I got good at it. I mean I wanted a whole bunch of students to answer, but it was so hard to get them to say the right answer, though I think I got pretty good at it. If it got to the point where no matter what I said they just couldn’t get the answer or they were way too tired or bored, because that seemed to happen a lot too, but, um, I got good at asking them, like I could say things like, I mean ask a question like, “do you want?” if I wanted them to say that words “pass quickly”, I would finally just get to the point where I’d ask them, when you’re in a game, do you want to pass.
the ball quickly or slower? Which I guess is better than just giving them the answer like you said. I think I got a lot better at that. I had a lot of practice at it.

Q: How did you select which learning cues to use during the lesson?
A: Whatever my objectives were about, I’d do cues that had to do with that. It wasn’t as easy as I thought. I don’t know, it seems easier to do cues for game stage one skills because you could just describe the skill, like little pieces of the skill, but like I said, I don’t even know what the pieces of not bunching up are. I did try to use the book, but that didn’t help at all.

Q: How did you select which activities to use during the lesson?
A: I would have liked to include more offense and defense like the book suggested, but I just didn’t want to deal with it. The arguing made me not want to even have defense ever, so I guess that affected my lesson. Sometimes I just let them pick their teams or their group members, because I thought that if they were with friends they wouldn’t argue but, well, I guess that worked a little.

Q: How did you select which modified games to use during the lesson?
A: The no stealing was the biggest pain because I had to constantly, I mean constantly tell them not to, but besides that, the arguing was still a big deal. You know all the “He stole it from me. That’s a turnover.” It seemed to cause more arguments than it was worth. So many of them, all of them, had to argue about one thing or another during the games. It’s like put in a defender and they can’t get along. What’s that about? That’s supposed to be the fun part. Anyways, but then taking it out just lead to a bunch of accidents, a lot of tears from people getting whacked with a stick or something. Anyways, besides that I used some of the ideas from the book, but they all seemed to be the same game. I liked the book for the questions though.

**Implementation**

Q: Explain the student’s opportunities to practice tactical skills during the lessons.
A: Well, every time, I mean everything that we did focused on a tactical skill. Oh, maybe if we put some game stage one days in there, they could have a break from the games and stuff, but Um, yeah, everything we did was tactical. Everything, the skills, games, activities and stuff, it was all from the book, so I guess they practiced the skills we wanted them to.

Q: Looking back on this unit, explain whether or not students had enough time/opportunities to learn the tactical skills.
A: Um, I think the skills I tried to pick to do were way too hard for them to learn or something. And though I thought I kept making the lesson easier, they just couldn’t seem to get it. I’m glad to have, I’m glad I was able to ask you questions, but I would have rather just taught another week of your lessons. I would have liked that more, though I don’t know why they argue so much. I would have really been in trouble if I would have just gone and did my other lessons, the ones I made up the first weekend, but could they have been worse?

Q: Explain your thoughts on if your activities/extensions resembled game-like situations.
A: Well, I guess I tried to do that. Well, I mean, can I look at my lessons again? So do you mean that the activities are like the kind of skills you would do in a game?

Q: Yes, kind of. Look at your activities and talk to me about how they, the activities, resemble the game-like experiences, things that happen in a game.
A: Well, um, the first day, I had them trying to fake, the off-ball person was to fake to get open, then I had then work on V-cuts to elude the defender, then I tried to have them do the cuts quick one day, and then I just got tired of them working on offense and defense stuff. I needed a break from all the whining, and I wanted to end on a positive note, so I just had them work on shooting quick, like getting rid of the ball quickly. No defense.

Q: And when you were teaching all those things, were your students in game-like situations?

A: Oh yeah. The first three days that’s all we did. Well, actually we started out in partners just to work on the cuts or the moves, the quick moves, and then I would add a defender. I think I did it on all of those days. Let me see, um, yes, that’s how I did it. That made sense, and you and I talked about that a couple of times too. Then the last day was kind of like a game because they were shooting at a goal.

Q: Talk to me about the amount of success you felt your student’s experienced in your tactical lesson.

A: Wow, I wish I did a better job. That’s pretty sad when you don’t think that they, that you did good. I don’t know, not very much though. Between them complaining, not understanding, and, um always taking time to explain every little thing, and answer all the questions, and um such a hard, like having a hard time for them to do all this, I think made it a bad experience. I know you said they did better, but, maybe I need to see those scores, so I’ll feel better. I mean I like the, the, this style of teaching, but I just had a hard time.

Q: Describe the student’s cognitive involvement in these lessons.

A: Well, at least I know I got better at asking questions. But, um, I think that they really have to answer a lot of questions. I didn’t even ask as many questions as were in the book. I did ask all the questions on the lesson, because you said we had to, but like there are a ton of questions listed on all those lessons, but the students were like, not again, more questions. It was pretty funny, one day, when we were coming in to the talking, I mean listening area, one of the students like yelled out, “No high sticking, move to the open spaces and quick passes” which was pretty funny because he pretty much answered all my questions before I asked them, which I guess is good but I think they felt like they kept being brought in and didn’t want to listen to them. By the closure, I mean I know I had to read all of the questions, I just wish I could have let them go some days. I guess if I had to answer, I would say they definitely learned everything we wanted them to. That’s good.

Q: Tell me your feelings about the time spent in management during your lesson.

A: Management was ok, but I was in instruction time a lot. I think the students need or needed a lot of time to understand what I was trying to teach. The concepts are hard. It wasn’t like you stand here and you stand here and then pass back and forth. It was hard for them to understand things like open space. I wish I could have just broken into a command lesson, and say just do this! At least I’d feel like I was in control. But, um I think the worst part about my time had to deal with arguments. Is that management time or instruction?

Q: It depends, but typically it’s management time.

A: Oh well then gez, I take it back, I had a ton of management time. Really, management is, I mean, arguing is management?

Q: Well, to make a long story short, if they aren’t active and you aren’t instructing, then yeah. Also, when you are waiting for them to come in because they are walking, or “dilly-dallying” as you called it, that’s management too.

A: I’m so sorry. I didn’t realize that I did even worse than I thought.
Q: You are way too hard on yourself. Let’s talk about feedback, which I know that you are pleased with. Describe the feedback you gave to students during the lessons.

A: Yeah, I spent a lot of time saying no high sticking, but they were like golfers trying to drive it down the fairway.

Q: How about all the specific feedback you gave about the skills?

A: Oh yeah, I did do a good job, what I thought was a good job of that. The cue card really helped me, because sometimes I would get so nervous, or so frustrated, that I could just look down and remember that I was working on whatever it was, like I could just see, quick passes, and then I could look up and find someone who was doing that, and I could say, “Good job, way to make a quick pass.” I think I scored good on feedback. I gave a lot of it.

Q: How did the student’s react to your feedback statements?

A: Well, one of the things I know is that it was hard to get around to all the fields. We have to have them spread out all over, but I got really tired running between the fields. Sometimes I would be so out of breath I would have to make myself slow down before I gave feedback. I think that made me more nervous too. I knew I had to give all the feedback, but they were so spread out.

Q: That’s a good point. Did you notice how the students reacted to any of your feedback statements?

A: Um, usually they would do things like hurry and do the skill or activity or whatever again, or at least until I wasn’t looking at them, you know, but I guess it just gives them the encouragement to do it again, I guess.

Q: Discuss how your students reacted to your demonstrations.

A: Oh yeah, my demos, well, usually I’m so good at demos. It was so frustrating to demo something and then send them out and have them not get into activity, or whatever. It worked a little better when I asked them questions like you said to check to see if they understand by asking them good questions, and that went good, but I just don’t get how they just stand there, and I’m like “Go”. “Get moving or get started or something.”

Q: Do you plan on using this model, the tactical model, again?

A: Yeah, I mean before these lessons I really liked it. I guess when you try these things on real students it’s just different. I mean you can’t know what they are going to know and stuff, or what they are going to say and do. I really like the idea of the set-up and stuff. It seems to make sense to have the games and activities set-up like they are but I think I just need to practice it. I want to try it on my own students with my own rules and see if it works, maybe after student teaching I’ll give it a try.

Q: Well, you have over ten of these lessons and that makes it easier. You should try it again during student teaching. I think you’ll be impressed with yourself. You are being really hard on yourself, much harder than if you were evaluated or graded on these lessons.

Assessment

Q: Ok now, how did you feel about using these assessments Game Performance Assessment Instrument, which is as you know called the GPAI?
A: Oh great, another great part. Well, I got to the second one about the last five minutes of my lesson, the last one. Everything just seemed crazy, and I couldn’t slow down to try to do it earlier because I was so worried about everything, the arguing, of course, high sticking, and things like feedback and um, getting to the fields. I was so worried about getting them involved and making sure they stayed involved. It was crazy and very stressful. Maybe if the lessons were longer, I would have had time to relax and spend maybe a little bit more time.

Q: How did you select which components of the GPAI to assess?

A: I kind of just looked at the book and picked something or things that I thought I could look at quickly and give them a grade, or a score. I knew that I’d be rushed, and I wanted to get to it so I just picked easy ones. That’s probably bad, but it’s the truth. Whatever was easy, was what I wanted to do. I didn’t want to pick stuff that made me have to stay at one field the whole, I mean for a long time. I did learn something cool. I mean you said it was a cool thing. I learned that if I picked a team that was on the field in the middle that maybe I wouldn’t feel so far away from everyone, so that’s what I did the last time. I picked the group in the middle, that way I could be close to everyone and feel like I had more control, kind of.

Q: You talked a little bit about this, but do you have anything else to add to the time it took to complete the GPAI’s. How about the first one?

A: Well, I think it was cool to use it. It seems like something I’d like, but I did remember having a hard time observing one skill, or I mean the skill that was on the form. It was kind of hard just watching for that one. That’s why I asked you if I could use a tape. It’s good to know that when I teach, like in student teaching, that I can use this with a video tape. I think I would like that, because I can rewind whenever I want. That would be less stressful for me. That’ll be cool.

Q: How do you think the GPAI results will help you make a decision about how effective you were as a teacher?

A: I guess it would be good to look at if I did one in the beginning and one in the end, but it might be hard to get everyone in, I mean give a score to everyone in the beginning and then again, do the whole class again at the end. Well, I can look at them and see what score or what number they got and tell whether I did a good job, I guess. Well, it looks like there’s a bunch of random scores spread out between one and five, so I don’t think I can tell whether it was good or not. I’d definitely have to see if, or how they’d score in the beginning of a year or unit. I think it would be hard to base my whole unit it was something like this assessment. I guess I could learn how to do it, but I don’t know right now.

Q: Do you think you could use the results of the GPAI to plan future lessons?

A: Well, I guess, but I’m looking at the one I did last week, and it really doesn’t tell me much. I guess by itself, it doesn’t really let me figure anything out. I know that three students did ok that day, and one did good, but I can’t really or I don’t know where to go from here.

Q: When looking at your assessments, explain whether or not your students met your learning objectives.

A: I think they definitely met all of my cognitive objectives. I pretty much can say for sure that they all could answer all the questions, if I were to give them a test or quiz or something, so I guess that’s good. As far as my other ones, I don’t even think a couple students could do them, well probably a couple can, but there’s no way the others could do things like spread out and do v-cuts and stuff in a game. All they showed was their arguing skills.

Q: How do you think you might use this to give students a grade?
A: Um, well I guess I could, probably someday, but I’m not sure how. Um yeah, but I don’t know.

Q: Do you think you would use this in the future?

A: I might try it. Again, I guess I like it, I’m just not good at it. I’m sure it will take a while, but I really do like it and the curriculum model. I guess practice makes perfect, and I’m just starting. I liked both in our class, when people understand what I was talking about, and they can do the activities and stuff like that. I wouldn’t say no, yet.
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Value Orientation Inventory

Below you will find groups or sets of statements that describe goals for students in physical education. Because of limitations in class time, facilities, equipment, and scheduling, etc., we often have to make hard choices about which goals are most important for students in our physical education classes.

Please read the items in each set and rank them from 5 (most important) to 1 (least important). Although some items in the various sets may seem similar, they express different goals that physical educators believe are important.

Directions:

1. Carefully read all of the statements in each set before answering.

2. Consider the importance of each statement to you when planning and teaching students in your physical education classes.

3. Assign your priority (5 to 1) by ranking each statement.

4. Place a “5” next to the statement that is most important in your planning and teaching, a “4” next to the statement that is second most important and so on through number “1” which is the statement of least importance when compared to the others.

5. Please give each of the statements in the set a different number, even when this is difficult.

SET I:

1. _____ I teach students rules and strategies for efficient performance in games and sport.

2. _____ I guide students to find a balance between their personal abilities and the goals of the team.

3. _____ I teach students that disruptive behavior limits others’ abilities to learn.

4. _____ I teach students to select goals consistent with their unique abilities.

5. _____ I teach students to solve problems by modifying movements and skills based on the demands of a given situation.
BE SURE TO USE A DIFFERENT NUMBER (5-1) FOR EACH ITEM IN THE SET

SET II:

6. _____ I teach students to use class content to work productively alone and in group situations.

7. _____ I teach students to work together to solve class problems.

8. _____ I teach students the processes associated with learning new skills.

9. _____ I teach students to select tasks that they value and enjoy.

10._____ I teach students to move effectively when performing skill and fitness tasks.

SET III:

11. _____ I teach students that differences in body size, height, and weight can lead to differences in performance.

12. _____ I encourage students to be the best they can be.

13. _____ I teach students to balance their own needs with those of their classmates.

14. _____ I require students to practice the skill, sport and fitness activities that I introduce in class.

15. _____ I evaluate students based on their effort in class.

SET IV:

16. _____ I teach students the basic concepts necessary for effective performance in games, sport or fitness activities.

17. _____ I urge students to be patient with others who are learning new skills or strategies.

18. _____ I teach students to appreciate efficient performance in skill, sport and fitness activities.

19. _____ I teach students challenging activities that may foster lifetime participation.

20. _____ I teach students to complete tasks so they will learn responsibility.
BE SURE TO USE A DIFFERENT NUMBER (5-1) FOR EACH ITEM IN THE SET

SET V:

21. _____ I allow each student to express personal preferences for class activities.

22. _____ I teach students to think carefully about the rules to be sure that all students have an equal chance to play.

23. _____ I plan classes so that students can select from different activities to find those that are meaningful to them.

24. _____ I teach students to apply their understanding of basic movement, skill and fitness concepts to the development of their own sport and exercise program.

25. _____ I include grade-appropriate information about moving and exercise from such areas as anatomy, kinesiology, and exercise physiology.

SET VI:

26. _____ I teach students to use the abilities of every member on their team.

27. _____ I encourage students to participate in a variety of activities to gain a greater understanding of themselves.

28. _____ I teach students skills so they will enjoy playing sports and games.

29. _____ I teach students to observe their partners' movements and offer feedback to improve performance.

30. _____ I talk with students about problems they sometimes have with their classmates and help them to work out solutions.

SET VII:

31. _____ I sequence tasks so that students can understand how each physical activity contributes to their fitness or skill performance.

32. _____ I teach students to be positive and supportive when speaking with other students.

33. _____ I teach students games, sport, and fitness activities so they can participate with others.

34. _____ I teach students to select activities that are important to them.

35. _____ I teach students to share their knowledge to solve group problems.
BE SURE TO USE A DIFFERENT NUMBER (5-1) FOR EACH ITEM IN THE SET

SET VIII:

36. _____ I teach students that group goals, at times, are more important than their own individual needs.

37. _____ I encourage students to enjoy learning skills, games and fitness activities.

38. _____ I teach students to look to the future and learn activities for participation after they finish school.

39. _____ I reward students who try to perform even when they are not successful.

40. _____ I teach students how to correct their own mistakes.

SET IX:

41. _____ I plan so that students must combine several movements or skills to solve movement problems.

42. _____ I teach students to work together to make our class a better place to be.

43. _____ I teach students about principles and concepts of exercise and movement that everyone needs to know to lead a healthy life.

44. _____ I teach students to make decisions about activities they would like to learn for the future.

45. _____ I teach students to take responsibility for their own actions.

SET X:

46. _____ I plan so that classes reflect an emphasis on social interaction, personal success and effective performance.

47. _____ I teach students to appreciate the benefits of movement, skills, and fitness in an active, healthy lifestyle.

48. _____ I plan units so that students add new performance skills and knowledge to those that were learned in earlier units.

49. _____ I encourage students to experience new activities that they have never tried before.

50. _____ I teach students to be aware of differences in ability in our class and help others who need assistance.
BE SURE TO USE A DIFFERENT NUMBER (5-1) FOR EACH ITEM IN THE SET

SET XI:

51. _____ I teach students to enjoy and protect the natural surroundings when we have class outside.
52. _____ I challenge students to learn new things about themselves.
53. _____ I teach students to use many forms of feedback to improve their movement, skill and fitness performance.
54. _____ I teach students to create a better class environment by talking through problems rather than fighting.
55. _____ I teach students to become skilled and fit.

SET XII:

56. _____ I teach students the most effective way to perform specific movements and skills.
57. _____ I teach students to work independently on activities.
58. _____ I teach students that gradually increasing task difficulty will lead to improved performance.
59. _____ I teach students to try new activities to find ones that they enjoy.
60. _____ I plan so that lines, teams and squads in my classes include a mixture of boys and girls.

SET XIII:

61. _____ I teach students to work positively with other students of different sexes, races or abilities.
62. _____ I teach students to find activities that they enjoy doing or find useful.
63. _____ I point out to students ways in which a new skill is similar to a skill we have already learned.
64. _____ I include activities that represent specific interests and abilities of students in my classes.
65. _____ I teach students to perform exercise skills and movement fundamentals correctly.
BE SURE TO USE A DIFFERENT NUMBER (5-1) FOR EACH ITEM IN THE SET

SET XIV:

66. _____ I teach students to test themselves to identify their own strengths and weaknesses.

67. _____ I create a class environment where students can feel physically and emotionally safe.

68. _____ I teach students to monitor and improve their own performance based on specific criteria.

69. _____ I guide students to assume responsibility within our class community.

70. _____ I teach students why skills are best performed using specific techniques.

SET XV:

71. _____ I plan group activities so that students from different cultural backgrounds will learn to appreciate each other.

72. _____ I require students to spend class time practicing games, skill and fitness activities emphasized in the daily objectives.

73. _____ I talk with students about their concerns and help them participate in the activities they feel are most important.

74. _____ I balance my curriculum so that students learn about their own capabilities as well as the capabilities of others.

75. _____ I teach students to apply skills in appropriate game and exercise situations.

SET XVI:

76. _____ I teach students to explore many alternatives to discover the right way to perform.

77. _____ I teach students to ask questions about content that is meaningful to them.

78. _____ I teach students about the positive effects of exercise on their bodies.

79. _____ I teach students to try difficult tasks to better understand their own abilities.

80. _____ I teach students that when they create rules that are not fair for everyone, they should stop and decide how to change them to make them fair for all.
BE SURE TO USE A DIFFERENT NUMBER (5-1) FOR EACH ITEM IN THE SET

SET XVII:

81. _____ I teach students to develop their own rules that are fair and safe for all.

82. _____ I teach students to perform complex skills by combining simple movements.

83. _____ I teach students to select the best option or strategy to balance their needs with those of their team.

84. _____ I teach students to work independently to complete movement, skill and fitness tasks.

85. _____ I plan so that students exercise at optimal frequency, intensity, and duration levels to improve their fitness.

SET XVIII:

86. _____ I plan so that students are practicing skills, games or fitness tasks.

87. _____ I teach students how to break down movement, skill and fitness tasks to emphasize the most critical components for learning.

88. _____ I teach students to question me and other classmates about what we are doing and why we are doing it in a particular way.

89. _____ I teach students to use skills learned in class to help their team.

90. _____ I plan so that students may select the most challenging and relevant tasks from among several options.
Scoring Guide for the VOI-2

Value Orientation

DM = 1, 10, 14, 18, 25, 28, 33, 37, 43, 47, 55, 56, 65, 70, 72, 78, 85, 86
LP = 5, 8, 15, 16, 24, 29, 31, 40, 41, 48, 53, 58, 63, 68, 75, 76, 82, 87
SA = 4, 9, 12, 20, 21, 27, 34, 39, 45, 49, 52, 57, 64, 66, 73, 79, 84, 90
EI = 2, 6, 13, 19, 23, 26, 35, 38, 44, 46, 51, 59, 62, 67, 74, 77, 83, 89
SR = 3, 7, 11, 17, 22, 30, 32, 36, 42, 50, 54, 60, 61, 69, 71, 80, 81, 88

VOI Cut scores for each value orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>1-48.92</td>
<td>48.93-64.05</td>
<td>64.06-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>1-46.62</td>
<td>46.63-59.37</td>
<td>59.38-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>1-46.45</td>
<td>46.46-58.14</td>
<td>58.15-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>1-44.51</td>
<td>44.52-55.44</td>
<td>55.45-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>1-51.08</td>
<td>51.09-65.93</td>
<td>65.94-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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