

Sport Education: Try Before You Buy
Ken Alexander
Andrew Taggart
Andrew Medland
Sport And Physical Activity Research Centre
(SPARC)
Edith Cowan University

Address correspondence to:
Dr. Ken Alexander
Sport and Physical Activity Research Centre
Edith Cowan University
2 Bradford Street Mount Lawley
Perth WA 6050
AUSTRALIA
Fax: (09) 370 2910
Email: k.alexander@cowan.edu.au

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: The 1993 and 1994 Sport Education programs in WA are joint projects between Edith Cowan University's Sport and Physical Activity Research Centre (SPARC), and the WA Ministries of Education and Sport and Recreation.

Running Head: SPORT EDUCATION

Abstract

Sport education is an innovative curriculum model for secondary school physical education in which mixed ability teams are formed at the start of a 20 session (approximately) competitive "season". Students are taught to fulfil a range of roles associated with playing, umpiring, acting as a team coach, manager or captain, serving on a sports management board or on a duty team. The sport education model is a process with a potential for educating children into good sportspersonship. Twenty seven programs of sport education were conducted in Perth metropolitan and selected regional schools using New Zealand professional development materials in the first half of 1993. Teachers volunteered to try the alternative curriculum model as a part of their physical education programs. In answering eight research questions, we found strong outcomes for the affective domain but that much of the educational potential of the model remained unrealised. Adolescents' views of sport are presented and recent national concerns with the educative shortcomings of secondary physical education are presented as a background to reporting the results of the programs. Most teachers who tried sport education have chosen to repeat it; some are already in

their second "season". Ongoing professional development and evaluation is required. A research agenda which addresses problems and issues confronting sport education is proposed.

I quite enjoyed the challenge. If you think you can set it up then sit back and enjoy it - it just doesn't work like that. To make it work well, if anything it takes more time than running a traditional lesson. Because it's a new approach you've got a whole lot of other things to consider. It's almost like being 'first year out' again because you don't know how things will go. (Gerald, teacher, school 2)

Life was first breathed into the sport education concept by Daryl Siedentop (1972) when he stated that motor play was an obvious choice for the subject matter of physical education. Later, Siedentop, Mand and Taggart (1986) argued that, since sport derives from play, is an important part of our culture and has considerable educative potential, the logical place for sport education was the secondary school physical education program.

In the middle section of their teaching and curriculum strategies text Siedentop et al. (1986) present a range of "traditional and alternative curriculum models for physical education." Included is a chapter on sport education, outlining its major characteristics and some possible implementation strategies. It was this chapter which provided the stimulus for a major collaborative sport education project in NZ in 1991 (Grant, 1992; Grant, Hodge and Trendinnick, 1992; Grant, Sharp and Siedentop, 1991). Experiences with sport education in the United States of America are soon to be reported in the first textbook devoted entirely to the model (Siedentop, in press). Before reporting the results of a study of 27 pilot sport education programs in Western Australia, we outline some key findings from a recent national study of children's attitudes to participation in sport.

WHAT DO ADOLESCENTS THINK ABOUT SPORT?

A survey of 1702 school students aged 13-18 in 10 schools across 5 states (Australian Sports Commission, 1991) found that nearly two thirds of the children surveyed either played no organised sport (36%) or played only at school (26%). The study reported that:

'Industry lore' and past research suggest, at about 15 years of age, young people decide either to drop out of sport or stay within it. If they continue playing, then it is more than likely they will do so for a significant part of their lives. (p. 13)

But among the 26% playing only at school are a third for whom "the level of reward seems low and they are at risk of dropping away from sport when they leave school" (p. 14). When categories are further analysed it appears that 45% of Australian 13-18 year olds are either not playing organised sport at all or are questioning the satisfaction they derive from school-based organised sport.

The Sports Commission's (ASC) study should be of concern to physical educators. Even a cursory inspection of most secondary physical education programs reveals a predominance of team and individual sports comprising the content. In proposing sport education, Siedentop et al. (1986) stated that, while physical education programs do "teach" sports, they are stripped of their potential appeal because they are divorced from the essential characteristics and dimensions which give sport its meaning. While the avowed aim of most physical education programs is to employ physical activity (including sport) as one medium through which the educative potential of motor play is to be achieved, there is ample evidence that such potential is not being realised.

CONCERNS ABOUT CONTEMPORARY AUSTRALIAN SECONDARY PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Since 1990, Australian physical education has seen a National Conference on the Crisis in Physical Education (Deakin University, 1990), the development of a National Collaborative Curriculum for Health and Physical Education (1989-1993) a Report from a Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Recreation and the Arts reporting on Physical and Sport Education (1992) and 1993 Inquiries into Physical and Sport Education in Victoria (Ministry of Education, Vic., 1993) and Western Australia (in progress). Among the concerns raised in the Senate Report are a number pertinent to a consideration of the place of sport education in schools:

The Committee has learnt that physical education is being dramatically reduced throughout schools in Australia and that there is a lack of political commitment to address the problems associated with the provision of quality physical education. Ironically, there is no dispute about the importance of physical education, yet there is a serious problem with its delivery.

Evidence before the Committee led it to conclude that:-

- physical education includes sport education and school sport;
- there is a policy and curriculum vacuum surrounding physical education which has led to an ad hoc delivery of the subject;

- children's participation in physical education and school sport appears to be declining, especially amongst teenage girls;
 - girls and boys are entitled to equal experiences and opportunities for skill development and personal growth;
 - school sport which focuses on the child's skills, enjoyment and social development will lead to positive attitudes about competition and the reduction of sports violence;
 - the provision of structured and comprehensive physical education programs should involve physical education teachers who are well supported by their school community and department of education;
 - positive and cooperative links between departments of education, departments of sport and recreation, sporting associations and local communities can deliver sport education and school sport;
 - Aussie Sport complements, but should not replace, comprehensive and structured physical education programs, and
 - the emergence of future elite athletes depends on the provision of quality physical education in schools today.
- (p.xiii-xxii)

While not agreeing with all the Senate Committee concluded and recommended, we include the above points as evidence that these problems and issues are national concerns and that the physical education profession may be seeing the merit in, and succeeding with, the politicisation of its subject matter.

Writing of the crisis in Australian secondary school physical education, Tinning and Fitzclarence (1992) observed, from their work on the School Physical Education and Media project, that:

The crisis is evident in, among other things, the fact that school physical education is irrelevant or boring for many adolescents. The curriculum does not excite or stimulate adolescents who, outside of school, live in ... a postmodern youth culture inextricably shaped by television and the information society. A contradictory, and ironic, aspects of the crisis is that many of the adolescents bored with physical education see physical activity as significant to their lifestyles outside the school context. (p. 287)

Tinning and Fitzclarence identify the problem as one of a lacklustre program which can't compete with the level of interest society offers youngsters. Physical education, based on a predictable round of sports lessons involving teacher talk,

instruction which invariably commences at novice levels and repetitive drill and practice, is bound to lack appeal.

In commenting from a United States' perspective which we believe is equally applicable here, Lawrence Locke (1992) observes that:-

. . . many secondary school physical education programs fail to achieve their objectives. A disturbing number of students report associating

required attendance with strong negative feelings about the class, physical activity, and themselves. Teachers report that workplace conditions do not allow any serious effort to provide instruction. The nature of these problems is such that neither improving instruction nor upgrading the present curriculum will suffice. . . . replacing the dominant program model is the only course of action that can save a place for physical education in secondary schools. (p. 361)

It was against this backdrop, and from our own perspectives as teachers and teacher educators witnessing lesson after lesson of meaningless participation in physical activity, that we invited Dr. Bevan Grant from New Zealand to conduct two sport education workshops for Western Australian teachers in December, 1992.

WHAT IS SPORT EDUCATION IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION?

Sport education is an innovative curriculum model for secondary school physical education in which mixed ability teams are formed at the start of a 20 session (approximately) competitive "season". Students are taught to fulfil a range of roles associated with playing, umpiring, acting as a team coach, manager or captain, serving on a sports management board or on a duty team. The sport education model is a process with a potential for educating children into good sportspersonship and embodies the following characteristics:

- Seasons instead of units
- Continuity of team affiliations.
- A schedule of competitions.
- Teacher as coach/co-ordinator.
- Record keeping and publicity.
- A culminating event.

These characteristics formed the basis upon which NZ's Hillary Commission (Grant, Sharp and Siedentop, 1991) prepared a Teacher's Guide to assist in the implementation of sport education in NZ schools.

FINDINGS FROM NZ SPORT EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

Backed by the Hillary Commission (NZ's Sports Commission), Grant suggested a fresh look at the chapter on sport education in Siedentop, Mand and Taggart's 1986 textbook on teaching and curriculum strategies for grades 5-12 (Siedentop et al, 1986.) Reports from the NZ collaborative sport education research project (Grant, 1992) involving 2368 grade 10 students and 86 teachers in 34 schools indicated that sport education teachers reported that students:

- Had considerable ownership and responsibility for what occurred at different stages of the program;

- Helped establish realistic goals for the programs;
- Were valued members of a team;
- Had a purpose to improve some aspect of their skill level;
- Had an opportunity to share responsibility for and fully participate in all aspects of sport;
- Were involved in decision making;
- Were in situations where their presence and contributions were valued. (p. 311)

Grant reported that every teacher said sport education would

become a permanent part of their grade 10 curriculum. Could the NZ experience cross the Tasman? How would Western Australian teachers respond to a 'new' curriculum model? ('New' is in inverted commas because many claim to have been "doing sport education for years"). What would students think of a different style of physical education class? Would we see participation-without-education or was the sport education process something which could deliver physical, social, intellectual, moral and emotional benefits no matter how teachers arranged the program? These were some of the questions which guided our approach to trialling sport education in Western Australian schools.

SPORT EDUCATION IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA

SPARC invited 32 teachers from 19 different high schools to two sport education workshops in December 1992. We set out to see if teachers would voluntarily implement sport education seasons as a part of their physical education programs. Other issues, such as the conceptualisation of the interface between physical education and sport, the professional drill and practice ethos of teachers versus the seemingly unwarranted playing of games, inequities in mixed ability and gendered classes and the educative potential of competition came to the fore as we conducted the workshops and began to watch and talk to teachers and students about their views of sport education. However, while most of these and a number of other ideological and instructional issues are in urgent need of research and debate, they were beyond the scope of the pilot project. They are being addressed in the Sport Education Stage Two Project (Aug '93 - June '94), again jointly undertaken by Edith Cowan University's Sport and Physical Activity Research Centre (SPARC) and the WA

Ministries of Education and

Sport and Recreation. Specific questions to be answered in the initial project were:

Question 1. Would teachers attending the workshops choose to implement sport education as a part of their 1993 term one or two physical education programs?

Question 2. What sports would be chosen and who would make the choices?

Question 3. What variations of the general six characteristic sport education's six characteristics would emerge?

Question 4. Would the outcomes differ from those reported from the NZ Collaborative Sport Education project?

Question 5. What were students' perceptions of their participation in sport education?

Question 6. What were teachers' instructional strategies?

Question 7. What were students' participation levels?

Question 8. What would be the effect of sport education on pilot schools' programs?

THE WORKSHOPS

At two all-day sport education workshops conducted by Bevan Grant, 32 teachers who had responded to an invitation to participate were given the Hillary Commission's Sport Education Teacher's Guide (Grant, Sharp and Siedentop, 1991) and a set of resource cards detailing students' roles. Grant outlined the characteristics of sport education, presented examples of the approaches taken in NZ and, at the end of the day, invited interested teachers to try the program in term one 1993. His approach was to position sport education as "non-prescriptive" (i.e., there was no one right way to go about it). Our hope was that the model could be situated flexibly and adaptively within the specific local teaching contexts to which these teachers would return after their summer holidays.

Our approach to this professional development opportunity in sport education program was to integrate the research method and process with the workshop and its materials. The following materials were provided:

- Teacher's Guide
- Resource cards

Data collection was facilitated by the provision of a Teacher's Log Book. Pre project student questionnaires were issued and covered:

- the nature of participation in school and community sport
- perceived differences between school and club sport
- perceived differences between sport and physical

education

Subsequently, other data were collected employing:

- mid-season interviews by members of the SPARC sport education research team
- post-project interviews with teachers and students.
- documentary analysis of teachers' log books
- post project student questionnaires

RESULTS

Question 1. Would teachers attending the workshops choose to implement sport education as a part of their 1993 term one or two physical education programs?

Teachers were "invited" and "encouraged" to try sport education at their earliest opportunity. Table 1 shows a list of schools participating, the sports chosen, year levels and numbers of teachers and students involved, the use of modified sports and the extent to which the six characteristics of sport education were adopted as part of the process in various schools. Over 850 students participated in the seasons organised for 11 different sports.

INSERT TABLE ONE ABOUT HERE

Prior to the teachers' implementation of these programs, and after the workshops had been conducted, teachers registered a number of concerns with the prospect of changing existing program arrangements. Their comments included:

"Head of Department won't go for this if it means changing the existing program around"

"Possibly not prescriptive enough for our school and students."

"Lack of teacher experience in this area."

"Poor ability level in some students."

"Possible problems with facilities, equipment and staff acceptance."

"Sport education relies on routine. We usually experience interruptions to programs because of students' work commitments etc."

"Timetabling and getting it through admin. will be problems."

"There are always difficulties with new projects."

"Some students will find it (sport education) too much responsibility."

Despite these apprehensions, 27 of the 32 workshop participants volunteered to use sport education as a part of their 1993 physical education program in term one or two.

Question 2. What sports would be chosen and who would make the choices?

The sports chosen are listed in Table 1. The selection processes used to determine the sports to be played showed some variability across and within schools. "The kids chose the

sports from 6 we offered. I thought I'd got all the losers who thought volleyball would be an easy touch. But as it turned out we had the best group - and none of them started as volleyballers" (Jill, School 1). In other schools, the teachers chose sports they felt well skilled in and knowledgeable about. Others considered the gendered nature of certain sports (a focus of the SE Stage 2 Project) as well as the availability of clubs in the local community. As one teacher stated:

"We do consider the local region and that's why we've dropped hockey from the syllabus. There's nowhere for them to go (making) a unit they'd do here the only hockey they'd ever play". (Jim, School 1)

Question 3. What variations of the general six characteristic sport education's six characteristics would emerge?

The presence or absence of certain characteristics of sport education as proposed by Siedentop et al. (1986) are included in Table 2. Only the modified program at school ten (less than half the recommended 20 sessions were available for the trial) departed from the characteristic season of scheduled fixtures.

INSERT TABLE TWO ABOUT HERE

Almost all schools attempted to install each of the six characteristics, the exception being the culminating event which was organised in only four of the ten participating schools.

Greater variation occurred in terms of the pilot programs, scope and sequence. A "sample" program presented in the NZ Teacher's Guide, outlined a range of approaches which included examples of program scope and sequence for two sports. In one season, three weeks of skills instruction and an orientation to sport education was followed by two three-week (six session) rounds of competition, punctuated by a week of discussion, reflection and reorganisation prior to the second round. Interviews and the direct observation of WA programs revealed that teachers tailored the Guide's, six characteristics, and its suggested scope and sequence to meet the logistical needs of their programs, conforming to their own preferences for program design. Among the pilot programs, a range of approaches was observed. At one school, the teacher did not devolve all responsibilities to students, taking on most of the tasks of the Sports Board. These ordinarily include planning the fixture, rules of competition and points for winning games, dealing with disputes and organising the culminating event. A key role for

Sports Board members is to talk to the teacher regularly, serving as a link between teacher and students. However, although the teacher at this school did not allow students to fulfil these roles, he did utilize a duty team whose tasks were:

- organising equipment before and after lessons
- having a first aid kit available
- ensuring all teams know the draw
- starting games on time
- recording and collecting results of games
- providing officials for games
- providing scorers/time keepers
- dealing with problems

At another school, students were handed almost total responsibility, with the teacher employing a direct instruction format only during early sessions.

Question 4. Would the outcomes differ from those reported from the NZ Collaborative Sport Education project?

In NZ, school sport is much more widely seen both within and across schools than in Australia. However, despite these differences, the outcomes observed were remarkably similar. Grant (1992) reported that:

The sport education experience impacted students in ways that exceeded teacher expectations. Irrespective of numbers of students, resources, facilities, time of year, previous student enthusiasm for physical education, whether the sport was played indoors or outdoors, the outcomes from each program were positive than anticipated (p. 130).

The following comments of some NZ teachers are representative of Grant's opinion and many of the WA teachers involved in pilot programs:

"Well it certainly blew some of my long term theories about using sport in physical education apart." (Female Teacher)

"I have always been concerned about the social interaction aspect of phys. ed. and how you change the attitudes of boys and girls and their roles in sport. I have come to the conclusion that a 1:30 ratio with the teacher dominating doesn't work (but) you can change attitudes when students are working on things subconsciously in a small team. Sport education has produced outcomes that I have been trying for years to produce in a normal situation." (Male Teacher)

The educative potential of sport education was commented on too, especially in the affective domain. Teachers reported and students confirmed student co-operation among those who would normally not choose one another as close friends. Publicity roles found many students working on reports, certificates and trophies with teachers and students from industrial arts, art and design, and computing. In general, teachers reported a significant change of attitude among students who had previously

been unco-operative (either toward others or by virtue of patchy attendance records). However, some teachers reported that the educational aspects had been left to chance in too many instances. They had not facilitated the productive development of students' roles within sport education, missing the opportunities for responsibility and leadership embodied in students' roles within sport education.

Question 5. What were students' perceptions of their participation in sport education?

NZ students generally liked sport education and spoke favourably about their opportunities to be fully involved in decision making. Being a "valued participant" was rated more highly than success in competition (Grant, Trendinnick and Hodge, 1992). Western Australian students reported similar feelings. When comparing their former physical education experience with sport education they reported that "it was just like club sport. Everyone tried harder than in normal P.E." (Adrian, Year 9). Another representative comment was that "you get to play in a team with people you wouldn't normally mix with" (Alison, Year 10).

When students were asked about their greater responsibilities within a sport education environment they said:

"We really enjoyed being on the sports board. Glyn was on the school student committee before so he knew about the responsibility involved". (Kathy, Year 10).

"It was great being left do it ourselves. Usually the teachers are on to you all the time". (Wendy, Year 10).

Students' attitudes to the level of competition in sport education also included gender comments on gender issues.

Typical of these were:

"The girls weren't dominated by the boys. The class was split (hockey) and everyone had to join in and try because of pressure from the others. I think the 'players contracts' helped too" (Marnie, Year 11).

Question 6. What were teachers' instructional strategies?

Western Australian teachers generally agreed that students needed guidance and more direct instruction at the outset, particularly in year 8, the first year of high school in WA. Teachers believed that a more prescriptive approach to professional

development in sport education is warranted but that there is still abundant scope for flexibly tailoring the model to the needs of particular schools and contexts. They agreed that sport education called for different teaching strategies which could generally be classed as less direct, more reflective and sensitive to pupils' perspectives. A teacher we watched reported spending a fair amount of one session of competition thinking of a strategy for allowing students to first realise, and then analyse, why the day's competition had taken so long to commence,

despite all students being in the gym and practising before the bell sounded to end the lunch period and for afternoon classes to resume. When asked whether sport education allowed teachers to opt out, even become de-skilled, he replied that the model actually called on new and different skills. At the end of the lesson this teacher facilitated, rather than directed, a brief discussion about the challenges facing all duty teams in having their day's schedule of matches ready before each session. One record of interview revealed the following perspective on getting started:

Until you've done it, you don't know quite what to tell them and how much time to spend explaining things. Will a one minute explanation and "off you go" be enough or, like with picking teams, if your captians are going to do it? I think now I'd have to spend 15 to 20 minutes with those kids explaining some of the consequences of not having even teams and how you get even teams. What do you do with the teams to get them even? You need to talk right through that because just saying, "here are the names, you pick the teams", is fraught with danger. You need to give them enough information without giving them overload. It's only something you can develop with experience. (Gerald, School 2)

Question 7. What were students' participation levels?

While few process data are available from the NZ programs on the degree to which students are involved in practice and game contexts, a preliminary study (Sadler, 1993) gathering activity time data in one WA sport education volleyball season, indicated that the nature of two students' involvement in activity, transition, management, knowledge, off-task and waiting was similar to data reported by Siedentop (1991) under a non-sport education model. Sadler found that, although a highly skilled player with a role as a team manager and a lowly skilled player without management responsibilities recorded 4% and 2.4% off-task time respectively, their waiting times were 47.1% and 71.7% of the session. While high waiting times are a concern in any instructional setting (in this program, team sizes were left in a traditional 6 v 6 pattern) the off-task figures are remarkably low in the context of very high waiting time figures. Questions for research include whether it was strict discipline or students' interest in the outcomes of games prevented off task behaviour. However it may be more important to question how the sport education process can be justified educationally when activity levels of 23.5% and 6.6% are recorded.

Question 8. What would be the effect of sport education on pilot schools' programs?

Teachers identified a number of their concerns with sport education. Among these were the need for a developmental approach within schools. One school has already redesigned its Year 8-10 program to accommodate the sport education seasons. The redesign has extended to suggested instructional format

changes in which teachers give greatest guidance to students in Year 8 and plan to phase in increasing pupil independence and responsibility in succeeding years. Teachers also identified the need for new approaches to skill development. If affective outcomes were to be sought through devolving responsibilities to students, teachers would need to develop other means of arranging the psychomotor learning environment.

WA teachers also reported a need to restructure programs, especially at Year 8-10 levels, where the WA Ministry of Education "Unit Curriculum" has operated since 1988. One of the more adventurous schools has re-programmed its year 8 to 10 "General Studies Units" to include at least one term (20 sessions) of sport education across the three years. Quite independently of any impetus we may have given sport education, ACHPER (WA), in its submission to the WA Ministerial Review of Physical and Sport Education, has suggested the need for the further development of sport education within WA secondary physical education programs. We have anecdotal evidence indicating that more teachers than those involved in the pilot programs are already adopting variants of sport education. The dangers of this development will be outlined in the next section of our paper.

DISCUSSION

Locke (1992) has suggested that the dominant program model be replaced if a place is to be saved for physical education in the secondary school curriculum. But will the replacement be educative? This must be a necessary condition for any contender.

SPARC, its supporters in government and collaborators in schools, have moved quickly, some might say hastily, with sport education. However, in reviewing the literature on school change generally and the work of Michael Fullan (1991) in particular, Locke has questioned whether prolonged and meticulous planning of curriculum innovation is necessary. He reported the conventionally held belief that the "best possible insurance for a successful change effort" is the systematic anticipation of all stakeholders' opinions which are then to be fed into a step-by-step design involving a needs assessment and detailed planning before implementation. However, Locke reconsiders the value of such advice:-

There is little evidence that extensive needs assessment either improves the targeting of change or recruits support, at least not in proportion to the time and resources expended. Careful plans are essential, but highly detailed scripts for change are not. Too much delay sometimes risks missing the crest of a good opportunity or drags out the start until all sense of momentum is lost. (p. 366)

A sport education research agenda

There is good chance sport education will soon cross state boundaries and become more commonly seen in secondary school physical education in Australia. We agree with Locke's advice to "beware of delay" and have introduced the model, drawing on the available data and experiences of teachers in New Zealand, rather than wait until instructional designers or senior teachers had been "hothouse" long enough to finess the concept and produce comprehensive sets of curriculum support materials for professional development and school programs within WA. This is the reason behind the article's title. We believe the task is now to research and develop an embryonic sport education curriculum model within school physical education programs. To date, our assessments have been hurried and interpretative. We now need empirical analytic, interpretative and critical (Candy, 1989) studies to put the educative promise of sport education under the microscope. We would be delighted if teachers, teacher educators and researchers around Australia would join us in this effort. To start with, we see a research agenda which includes the following issues and problems:

Ideological issues:

- sport can promote elitism

- sport is, perhaps, mainly a community responsibility.
- sport is extra curricular and not the subject matter of PE.

- sport seems gendered, privileging male participation
- who should "own" sport education?
- what effect will the language used in talking about sport education in physical education have on the positioning of the subject in schools?

- what are the lessons from Aussie Sport programs at the primary school level and are there implications for secondary sport education?

Of particular interest, from this list of research areas, is that of ownership.

There two questions of particular interest here. Firstly, will the adoption of educative forms of sport education depend entirely on the micropolitical acumen of individual teachers who define the model as an opportunity to recover meaning, lost in their existing efforts to physically educate children? Secondly, how keen will particular departments of school physical education be to continue programs established by individual teachers who have moved on to greener pastures? Too often we see little concern for the "intellectual property rights" to materials developed by teachers employed in particular schools. Will

schools "own" sport education curricula as demonstrated by a preparedness to assign new teachers to the task of continuing, and then further developing, what has gone before?

Instructional issues:

- good physical education is what most adolescents need.
- Can sport education become good physical education?
- can sport education promote skill learning?
 - can sport education deliver affective outcomes in the areas of student responsibility, leadership and other areas of social development?
 - should teachers become facilitators and de-emphasise direct instruction?
 - will sport education affect assessment and reporting?

On this last point, we will be watching to see if teachers, able to move off centre stage during the routinised sport education season, turn their hands to gathering meaningful information about the educational outcomes of the model. Next, we will be interested to see how any information is reported, not only to the students and their parents, but to the broader school community as well.

A FINAL WORD

We think it can be reasonably asserted that too many teachers in secondary physical education lack "teaching perspectives" (Crum, 1993). We ask if sport education can address such a deficit by foregrounding long neglected outcomes, especially in the affective domain. Teachers are the gatekeepers in such matters. Their own senses of professional growth and fulfilment probably lie at the heart of any decisions they may make which lead to wider adoption of sport education as a curriculum model within secondary physical education in Australia. Crum has referred to a phenomenon he calls the "self-reproducing failure of physical education". Our question is: can sport education act as a circuit breaker?

References

- Australian Sports Commission. (1991). *Sport for young Australians: Widening the gateways to participation*. Canberra, ACT: Author.
- Crum, B. (1993). Conventional thought and practice in physical education: Problems of teaching and implications for change. *Quest*, 45 (3)339-356.
- Directorate of School Education, (1993). *Physical and sport education for Victorian schools*. Melbourne: Author.
- Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Grant, B. (1992). Integrating sport into the physical education curriculum in New Zealand secondary schools. *Quest*, 44 (3), 304-316.
- Grant, B., Sharp, P., & Siedentop, D. (1992). *Sport education in physical education: A teacher's guide*. Wellington: Hillary Commission.
- Grant, B., Trendinnick, P. & Hodge, P. (1992). Sport education in physical education. *New Zealand Journal of Health, Physical Education & Recreation*, 25 (3), 3-6.
- Locke, L. (1992). Changing secondary school physical education. *Quest*, 44 (3), 361-372.
- Sadler, A. (1993) *Sport education and activity time*. Unpublished manuscript, Edith Cowan University, Research Centre for Sport and Physical Activity, Perth.
- Senate Standing on Environment, Recreation and the Arts, (1992). *Physical & sport education: A report*. Canberra: Author.
- Siedentop, D. (1972). *Physical education: Introductory analysis* (3rd ed.). Iowa: Wm. C. Brown.
- Siedentop, D. (Ed.). (in press). *Sport Education*.
- Siedentop, D., Mand, C. & Taggart, A. (1986). *Physical education: Teaching and curriculum strategies for grades 5-12*.

Palo Alto: Mayfield.

Tinning, R., & Fitzclarence, L. (1992). Postmodern youth culture and the crisis in Australian secondary school physical education. *Quest*. 44(3), 287-303.

Table 1
General Demographics of Classes Participating in the Western
Australian
Sport Education Research Project

School	Sports Used	Year	Sex	Students	Teachers
1	Basketball Softball Volleyball Netball	11	M/F	150	5
2	Softball	9+10	M/F	100	2
3	Basketball Softball Volleyball Netball Hockey Sofcrosse Football Surf Club	11	M/F	170	5
4	Volleyball	10	M/F	120	5
5	Soccer Netball	8 9	M/F M/F	28 26	1 1
6	Netball	10	F	15	1
7	Cricket	8	M/F	43	2
8	Volleyball	11	M/F	25	2
9	Cricket	10	F	90	3
10	Volleyball	9+10	M/F	100	4

Note: Not all teachers involved in the research project attended the Sport Education workshop

Table 2
Sport Education Implementation Characteristics in Western Australian Pilot Schools

School Records & Publicity	Sport Education Characteristics						
	School Records & Publicity	Seasons Teacher as "Coach"	Affiliation as Modified	Schedule Modified Games	Schedule Event	Culminating Event	Culminating Event
N	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
N	2	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
N	3	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
N	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	
Y	6	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
N	7	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
N	8	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Y	9	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
N	10	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y