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Influence of two preservice teachers’ value orientations on their interpretation and delivery of sport education

Margaret Stran* and Matthew D. Curtner-Smith
The University of Alabama, USA

Teachers’ beliefs have a considerable impact on their instructional styles, methods, objectives and curricular organization. The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of two preservice teachers’ (PTs’) value orientations on their interpretation and delivery of sport education (SE). A secondary purpose was to describe possible changes and development of PTs’ value orientations while teaching SE. Data were collected while they engaged in their final student teaching experience using a variety of qualitative techniques. These were analyzed using standard interpretive techniques. Results indicated that their disciplinary mastery focus strongly influenced the type of SE seasons they delivered. In addition they revealed that the PTs broadened their beliefs about their teaching toward the end of student teaching to the extent that they expressed interest in goals related to and used pedagogies consistent with social reconstruction, social responsibility and self-actualization value orientations.
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Introduction

Sport education (SE; Siedentop, 1994; Siedentop et al., 2004) is a curriculum model that is being utilized with increasing frequency in physical education and physical education teacher education (PETE) programs. The goals of SE are to develop competent, literate and enthusiastic sportpersons (Siedentop, 1994). To be competent, a person must understand the tactics and strategies and successfully perform the skills of a game, sport, or physical activity. A literate sportperson understands and values the traditions of sport and knows the difference between appropriate and inappropriate sporting behavior. Enthusiastic sportpersons act so as to enhance, protect and preserve sporting culture.

These objectives may be met by teaching within a structure that reflects positive aspects of sport with units lengthened more closely to reflect sporting seasons. Pupils remain on the same teams throughout a season with the goal of developing affiliation among teammates. The reality of sport is replicated by requiring teams to engage in
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periods of practice and various formal competitions as well as keeping records. Every attempt is made to capture sport’s festive atmosphere, particularly during culminating events. Over the course of the season pupils are given greater responsibility by teachers as they adopt roles, such as scorekeeper, referee and manager. In addition, game forms often involve small sides and are conditioned so as to ensure their developmental suitability (Siedentop, 1994, 2002; Siedentop et al., 2004).

Research on learning to deliver the sport education (SE) model

While there has been a large body of research that reflects an overall, positive impact of SE on teachers and pupils (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Wallhead & O’Sullivan, 2005) few studies have examined how inservice and preservice teachers (PTs) learn to employ the model. Of those that has been completed some indicate that both experienced and expert teachers have difficulty implementing SE, having previously taught more traditional curricula, or combining SE with other models (Pope & O’Sullivan, 1998; Hastie & Curtner-Smith, 2006).

Not surprisingly, the few studies available also suggest that PTs have difficulties when first attempting to teach SE (Sofo, 2003; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; McCaughtry et al., 2004; Parker & Curtner-Smith, 2005; McMahon & MacPhail, 2007). Some are unable or unwilling to design developmentally appropriate game forms and fail to engage their pupils in appropriate amounts of health enhancing moderate to vigorous physical activity (MPVA; Parker & Curtner-Smith, 2005). Others, particularly those with excessively strong coaching orientations, abuse the model and essentially use it to justify ‘ball rolling’ and non-teaching and are likely to emphasize formal competition, downgrading the importance of, or eliminating altogether other aspects of SE, including role learning, responsibility giving, authentic evaluation and the posting of records and statistics (McCaughtry et al., 2004) or have a difficult time implementing and getting the students to appreciate these aspects (McMahon & MacPhail, 2007). Finally, PTs may struggle with tactical teaching within a traditional school culture that emphasizes skill-based instruction (McMahon & MacPhail, 2007).

On a more positive note, the literature in this area also suggests that PTs tend to embrace SE because it is more closely aligned with their occupational socialization and, when compared with more conventional curriculum models, is structurally and culturally more meaningful (Sofo, 2003; Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Hastie et al., 2005). In short, use of the model in PETE may give teacher educators a better chance of convincing some PTs to teach according to its terms when they graduate. A recent study (Curtner-Smith et al., in press), however, suggests the need to be cautious with this assessment; its results indicating that while a group of first-year teachers who had been trained to teach SE during PETE did indeed use the model, once employed, their interpretations and delivery of it differed because of variations in their occupational socialization. Some PTs took what the authors termed a ‘cafeteria approach’ to the model which involved selecting components of SE which
they could assimilate in their traditional units. Others taught a ‘watered down’ form of the model emphasizing formal game play since it aided them to manage difficult and disruptive pupils. A third group taught the ‘full version’ of the model much as it was described by Siedentop (1994) and using the benchmarks created by Metzler (2000).

Finally, it is important to emphasize that here have been few studies of PETE that indicate the most effective methods for producing PTs who are competent and confident teachers of SE. The work that has been completed (Curtner-Smith & Sofo, 2004; Jenkins, 2004; Hastie et al., 2005; Curtner-Smith et al., in press) indicates that strategies that work include infusing SE throughout the PETE curriculum and requiring PTs to read the various texts which describe the model, observe and listen to teachers who employ the full version of the model, participate in SE seasons themselves, teach-prescribed mini-seasons of SE in early field experiences (EFEs) and teach self-designed full seasons during their culminating teaching practice.

An overview of the research on acculturation and professional socialization indicates that PETE programs generally must strive to ‘recruit bright students with innovative teaching orientations, improve screening at the beginning of programs, and reject applicants with hard core custodial coaching orientations’ as well as to hire and retain professors who have ‘innovative orientations, are specialists in sport pedagogy, credible, willing to challenge faulty beliefs and practices, supervise EFEs and student teaching closely, agree on what Lortie (1975) called a ‘shared technical culture,’ advocate models of teaching which are at least somewhat compatible with Preservice Teachers’ biographies, and hold Preservice Teachers accountable for high quality teaching’ (Curtner-Smith, 2007).

**Purpose**

Given that teachers’ beliefs, described as a series of philosophical positions or value orientations (Jewett, 1994), have considerable impact on their instructional styles and methods, objectives and curricular organization (Eisner & Vallance, 1974), the primary purpose of this study, as part of a larger project on learning to teach SE, was to investigate the influence of two PTs’ value orientations on its interpretation and delivery. A secondary purpose was to describe changes and development of their value orientations while doing so.

**Value orientations in physical education**

In the preceding quarter century, scholars have linked teachers’ decisions about their pedagogy to a series of different philosophical positions which they hold (Eisner & Vallance, 1974; Jewett, 1994; Chen et al., 1997). These are essentially deep-rooted views about the goals of schooling. In physical education, these different philosophical positions have been described within six ‘value orientations’: ‘disciplinary mastery, learning process, self-actualization, social reconstruction, social responsibility and
ecological integration, each targeted at one or more of three curriculum sources; mastering the subject matter, personal development, or sociocultural improvement (Jewett et al., 1995).

Teachers who favor disciplinary mastery, the most traditional of these differing philosophical positions, are mainly concerned that their students learn subject matter (Jewett, 1994; Jewett et al., 1995). In physical education emphasis is on pupils being able to perform basic movement and sports skills as well as understanding health-related and kinesiological material. In contrast, teachers who give high priority to a learning process value orientation are primarily concerned with how rather than what pupils learn. They emphasize teaching skills that will enable their charges to become independent learners and rationalize that this is the logical course of action to take, given the time constraints placed on them and because subject matter can become obsolete very quickly. In physical education, emphasis is on teaching pupils to problem-solve by employing discovery or indirect styles of teaching (Jewett, 1994; Jewett et al., 1995). Teachers who prioritize a social reconstruction value orientation see schooling as a means to achieve sociocultural improvement, change, or reform realizable by making curricular change (Jewett, 1994), for example, increasing time available for physical education in order to counteract child inactivity and obesity, or by asking pupils to reflect on prevailing societal values and their own behaviors and by challenging them to take responsibility and cooperate with each other during lessons (Jewett et al., 1995). The existence of the social responsibility perspective among physical education teachers was recognized after the other five value orientations had been described (Ennis et al., 1992; Ennis & Chen, 1993; Ennis, 1994). Teachers who favor this perspective are mainly interested in promoting cooperation among their pupils and emphasize respecting others. Teachers who favor the self-actualization value orientation focus on the personal development and growth of their pupils. They prioritize individual excellence and believe schools should help pupils identify and achieve their goals, emphasizing self-discovery, self-learning and personal liberation. In physical education, such teachers urge their charges to set goals, come up with plans for achieving them and reflect on their actions. They strive to enhance pupils’ self-confidence and self-concepts (Jewett, 1994; Jewett et al., 1995). Teachers who favor ecological integration give equal priority to individual and societal development and are concerned with the ‘personal search for meaning’ (Jewett, 1994). Moreover, as noted by Jewett et al. (1995, p. 28), they are committed to ‘the development of individuals who function effectively as citizens of a single world and whose commitment to human futures goes beyond personal competence, local achievement, and national pride.’ In physical education, they focus on selecting content for their students which has personal meaning and long-term contributions based on their stage of development and the social contexts in which they exist (Jewett et al., 1995).
Value orientations and sport education (SE)

Close examination of SE and other literature suggests that it is possible for teachers, including PTs, with any of the different value orientation to teach the full version of the SE model. Thus, the result is SE seasons that have varied emphasis. For example, Hastie and Curtner-Smith (2006) described how the former taught a version of the model which lay heavy emphasis on skill and strategy learning, mainly reflecting disciplinary mastery and learning process value orientations. In contrast, Alexander and Luckman (2001) reported that a sample of Australian teachers thought the model was best used to improve pupils’ personal and social development and Hastie and Buchanan (2000) emphasized teaching personal responsibility through SE. Moreover, Kinchin (1997, 1998) included a critical thread in his version of the model reflecting both social reconstruction and ecological integration value orientations. While the preceding examples indicate that the model can be compatible with all six value orientations it seems likely that an overemphasis on any of these perspectives could lead to the production of SE seasons that fall short of full-version status. For example, a model that is solely focused on teamwork and sporting behavior (i.e. social responsibility) would neglect skill and tactical development, which are integral parts of the SE model.

Research on the value orientations of preservice physical education teachers

While there has been a considerable amount of research conducted on the value orientations of inservice physical education teachers (see for example, Curtner-Smith & Meek, 2000), very little work on PTs’ value orientations has been carried out. There are indications both that PTs’ value orientations remain fairly stable during PETE (Patton, 2001) and that they can be shaped by PETE faculty and methods courses (Solmon & Ashy, 1995). Research conducted by Sofo and Curtner-Smith (2005) may explain the discrepancy between such earlier studies, finding that the value orientations of PTs oriented toward teaching were much more easily changed during PETE than those of PTs oriented toward coaching, those with extremely strong coaching orientations remaining unaltered.

There has been some controversy concerning the best methods of describing PTs’ value orientations. Findings concerning the degree of congruence between PTs’ scores on various versions of the value orientation inventory (VOI; Ennis & Hooper, 1988; Ennis & Chen, 1993; Chen et al., 1997), the instrument most often used to gain numerical descriptions of PTs’ value orientations and the data gained by employing qualitative methods have been inconsistent. Specifically, Patton (2001) found congruence between VOI scores and interview data while Timken (2000) and Sofo and Curtner-Smith (2005) did not.

Research which has, in part, examined the influence of trends in curricular innovation on PTs’ value orientations has also produced conflicting results. While Behets (2001) found that the value orientations of a large group of Belgian PTs were
congruent with recent trends and innovations in the Belgian curriculum, Meek and Curtner-Smith (2004) discovered that the value orientations of a smaller group of British PTs were not entirely compatible with the requirements of National Curriculum Physical Education (NCPE).

Method

Participants

Kendrick and Stuart (not their real names), the two PTs who participated in this study, were in their concluding student teaching semester within a PETE program at a large southeastern USA public research university. Both were 23 years old and came from small towns close to the university. Stuart was Caucasian, while Kendrick was African-American. They were asked to take part in the study on the basis of their previous coursework which indicated that each possessed considerable potential to teach. Each PT signed a consent form as required by the university’s institutional review board on human subjects.

Preservice teachers’ (PTs’) core physical education teacher education (PETE) program

Prior to their student teaching semester, Stuart and Kendrick had completed three semesters of PETE within each of which they were enrolled in a methods course and completed extensive EFEs in public schools. They had also engaged in five content courses, four of which included an EFE and had been mainly taught to utilize five different curriculum models during their program; a skill theme approach, SE, multi-activity teaching, games for understanding and health-related fitness. Within their secondary training, a heavy emphasis was placed on learning and using the SE model. Key pedagogical components highlighted during their various methods and content courses included Mosston’s spectrum of teaching styles, classroom ecology, planning, and effective teaching and management.

Setting

During their student teaching practice both PTs worked at the same middle school for an eight-week period. They taught pupils in the sixth, seventh and eighth grades who were mainly middle class and Caucasian and in classes which ranged from 20 to 40 pupils. The school had a decently sized and stocked gymnasium as well as reasonably expansive playing field space. Its normal physical education curriculum consisted of a variety of multi-activity units and health-related fitness. Each year also included SE seasons taught by visiting PTs. One university supervisor (US) and two cooperating teachers (CTs) supervised the two PTs. The US, Jessica, was very familiar with SE, having taught and supervised its
implementation in EFEs. She was well liked by all STs, having a comfortable but authoritative relationship with them. The main CT, Molly, was highly thought of by university faculty as both teacher and mentor and was very supportive of the PETE program. Her colleague, Brad, was extremely welcoming of PTs and also gave good support to the PETE program but was a little less forthcoming in terms of mentoring and feedback about teaching.

Kendrick designed and taught one SE season of tennis and two of flag football. Stuart was responsible for planning and delivering SE seasons of basketball and ultimate frisbee. Additionally, Stuart taught a multi-activity unit and each PT taught a unit of health-related fitness. Only the SE seasons were observed for the purposes of the study.

Data collection

Several qualitative techniques were employed to collect data that indicated which value orientations primarily informed Kendrick and Stuart’s pedagogic practice and influenced their interpretation and delivery of SE, hopefully revealing any shifts in them. Once each week of student teaching practice both were observed teaching lessons. During observations extensive notes were taken and when opportunity arose informal interviews were conducted whose content was recorded as soon after as possible. Semi-structured formal interviews (Patton, 1990) lasting approximately one hour were also conducted with both at the start, middle and end of the teaching practice, tape recorded and transcribed. Fifty-minute stimulated recall interviews were also carried out with both on two occasions based videotaped lessons they had taught at the beginning and end of their teaching practice, periodically paused to allow them to explain their rationale for specific actions taken. These interviews were also tape recorded. Both PTs also submitted critical incident reports and entries in reflective electronic journals at the end of each week, following O’Sullivan and Tsangaridou (1992), the former involving description of particularly significant events which occurred during lessons, the latter affording brief, emailed reports about any aspect of teaching SE which seemed pertinent. Finally, the PTs supplied their teaching portfolios, including season plans, lesson plans and pupil evaluations, at the end of the teaching practice which were content analyzed. Based on research by Behets (2001) and Sofo and Curtner-Smith (2005) the VOI was not given because of its potential to suggest ideas to the PTs that they may not have been thinking.

Data analysis

Data were analyzed employing standard interpretive methods, initially identifying how PTs had interpreted and delivered SE during the course of the teaching practice and which value orientations primarily drove their pedagogic thoughts
and actions in general. Finally, data which suggested how these value orientations influenced their interpretation and delivery of SE were identified. By employing the computer program QSR (2002) and a combination of analytic induction and constant comparison (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) these data sets were then divided into categories, subcategories and themes. Trustworthiness and credibility were established by screening for discrepant and negative cases and by triangulating findings from the different data collection techniques.

**Results and discussion**

*Preservice teachers’ (PTs’) initial value orientations*

Both at the beginning of their teaching practice when they were planning and during the vast majority of their SE seasons, Kendrick and Stuart’s thoughts and actions indicated that the value orientation which most influenced their pedagogies was disciplinary mastery. Both stated on numerous occasions, from the outset, that their primary goal was for pupils ‘to learn a sport,’ ‘learn how to play,’ ‘learn rules’ and ‘learn strategies and skills.’ Heeding the requirements of the SE model there was also concern that pupils ‘learn [about the] festivities of the game,’ ‘to keep stats’ and how to perform the ‘different roles involved in the game,’ particularly those of ‘official’ and ‘coach.’ To a lesser extent both PTs revealed a focus on health-related fitness through their SE teaching, especially ‘knowing different ways to stay in shape’ and understanding what ‘eating healthy’ involved.

Stuart’s commitment to and concern about disciplinary mastery in general and skill development in particular is shown by the following comment when discussing one of his basketball seasons:

> We need to start out early on, give them all the skills and build up to where they can get into game play ... They probably haven’t even been taught how to dribble correctly ... A lot of them ran with the ball. They didn’t even dribble. They double-dribbled. They couldn’t continually dribble to one end of the court and back; that’s a pretty important part of basketball.

Stuart went on to justify his disciplinary mastery focus stating:

> It’s important to lay the groundwork at the early age and then progress it up through middle school. If they can play at a decent level they’re gonna want to play more. I saw some of them were like, ‘Why am I no good at this?’ ... So they didn’t want to participate because they thought they weren’t good. So ... the most important thing is just teaching them in progression. Start out young and lay that groundwork for them with their different skills before they ever get to game play because you can tell a lot of them just haven’t been taught properly.

In addition, both Stuart and Kendrick were quick to point out when they thought that pupils had made progress in terms of ‘learning.’ For example, Stuart noted toward the end of teaching practice that ‘I think I did pretty good ... cause they all would know how to play.’
Influence of the preservice teachers’ (PTs’) initial value orientations on their interpretation and delivery of sport education (SE)

While there was little doubt that Kendrick and Stuart both employed the full version of SE, not surprisingly their priority for disciplinary mastery meant that they produced fairly conservative versions of practice. Their focus on skill and strategy learning, for example, meant that they tended to use relatively direct teaching styles. During lessons devoted to practice and game play this meant that they were concerned with keeping pupils ‘engaged’ and provided a great deal of performance feedback on skills, strategy and officiating:

Denise, when your team has the ball try to move to the open space and you’ll be open. Keep your hands like this (shows proper catching form) and you’ll get it. (Kendrick, Observation 2)

Let me show you how to officiate. Keep track of downs, passes, et cetera ... You need to get up so you can see the downs and mark the ball ... You need to see the field and mark the down ... See, you’ve got to pay attention, 3rd down! You’ve got to do your job official. I’ll help you. (Kendrick, Observation 3)

Justin, you can’t interfere with the game when you’re an official ... Official, the Pink Panthers just scored ... Good job, good catch ... Remember you don’t want to throw so long in this wind. Carla you can’t slap it out of her hand while she’s standing there ... Good catch Laura ... That’s out of the back of the endzone. That's a free throw in so you can’t guard it. Now you can. (Stuart, Observation 3)

In addition, their emphasis on skill and strategy learning meant that both PTs put considerable thought into the game forms they employed in their various seasons. For example, Kendrick explained that he was pleased with one of his modified tennis games because the ‘modified court,’ ‘table-tennis scoring system,’ and the requirements that pupils had to ‘serve underarm,’ only use the ‘forehand drive,’ and could not ‘volley’ had led to considerable improvement. Similarly, Stuart relayed how he had decided to modify his four versus four basketball games by employing ‘fewer rules’ and calling ‘fewer fouls.’ Moreover, he explained that he had decided to eliminate jump balls because the pupils:

Might not match up for size so they could have some small [pupil] jumping against a larger [pupil] and it just wouldn’t be fair. So this way they [i.e. both teams] get to both have an equal opportunity to get involved first. (Stuart, Stimulated Recall Interview 1)

Another pedagogical strategy employed, particularly by Stuart, which seemed to be a product of their disciplinary mastery focus, was ‘joining in’ during game play. For example, in one of his journal entries Stuart explained:

I don’t think they really understood the fast pace of the game until I got out there and was really pushing the pace of the game. When it is just them playing they don’t make fast transitions from defense to offense but when I was out there as soon as the frisbee was turned over I would grab it and go the other way with it. So I think by seeing me do that, it helped them out.
Kendrick and Stuart’s initial emphasis on disciplinary mastery meant that there were some aspects of SE that were underdeveloped in their seasons. Specifically, they focused less than they might have on giving their pupils responsibility and prioritized competency above literacy and enthusiasm. Toward the end of their student teaching, however, as their confidence began to grow, both expanded the scope of their seasons and used pedagogies that were consistent with other value orientations. Reflecting a social reconstruction value orientation and concern for societal health, both were keen to ‘encourage’ their pupils to ‘participate in physical activity,’ ‘outside of school’ so they were not ‘limited just to formal PE.’ Kendrick, for example, noted that ‘there’s a lot of things that you can do [to encourage more activity] … I just usually ask the kids … “do you do anything outside of school, what are your activities?” … I try to help them as much as I can.’ He also explained that he gave some of his pupils a sheet to take home to monitor their daily activities, see what they’re doing outside the classroom.’ As illustrated by the following extracts from formal interviews both PTs came to realize how SE supported this goal more than other models:

All the objectives from sport ed … statkeeping, sportsmanship, and strategies of the game, team work, the different roles, coaches and captains, equity officer, board member. Since you want to make it like a real game like you see on TV. So, try to make it as … close to that [as you can]. And reading tables, stat sheets and stuff like that. So maybe they’ll be encouraged to go play outside of school, be with a team. (Kendrick)

I think sport ed is a way of teaching … so they can relate it to other things hopefully if you can get them all involved and get them excited about it. Then maybe they will go out to the Y or somewhere and join a team or do something. Try to give them something that they can do outside of school so they can be active. Hopefully they will want to be active in their free time. (Stuart)

Both also indicated concern for promoting social responsibility toward the end of their SE seasons sparked by the unsporting behavior of some pupils which included ‘calling people names,’ ‘getting mad,’ not being able to ‘take losing’ and ‘talking down to their teammates.’ In an attempt to counter this problem, with mixed results, they awarded ‘points’ for ‘good sportsmanship’ and ‘working together’ to the extent that sporting behavior ‘counted’ for as much as winning during competitive game play. Both also attempted to improve the sense of affiliation among members of teams who could not get along by posting ‘team pictures’ on notice boards and increasing the amount of time they devoted to encouraging sporting behavior, ‘better teamwork,’ ‘accomplishing tasks together’ and ‘respect for others’ during classes. This encouragement mainly came in the form of brief talks to individuals and groups of pupils.

Furthermore, their reluctance to use indirect teaching styles dissipated in the final weeks of each of their seasons and pupils were encouraged to take on much more responsibility, particularly during competition, while the PTs took a step back into
facilitator roles. For instance, during later lessons pupils were required to conduct their own warm-ups, decide on and execute substitution patterns and officiate without aid. Success in the competitive phases of the season, in this respect, led to both PTs becoming emboldened and giving more responsibility in lessons devoted to practice. Kendrick, for example, noted that he wanted ‘the coach and captain . . . to take more control of their team’s practice’ while he would ‘organize, provide skill and strategy feedback, motivational feedback, and record results.’ Similarly, Stuart explained that in his classes:

Each team member has certain roles or responsibilities . . . I want them to learn how to deal with having the responsibility and control of their own class . . . what’s going on. Hopefully, they feel that way. They probably don’t realize it sometimes, that they have a lot of control of what’s going on, but I hope that eventually they will. I could have them out there just doing drills, you know, lay-up drills or shooting drills, just a regular practice, but I’m trying to get them to where they can actually . . . do it themselves. (Stimulated Recall Interview 1)

Finally, there was also a suggestion that the PTs were beginning to be influenced by a self-actualization perspective. For instance, they were keen to select roles for pupils which matched their particular abilities rather than force all of them to perform every role. Furthermore, as the seasons progressed both spent more time exhorting their pupils to ‘just try’ and ‘give . . . your best effort.’ In addition, they attempted to persuade other pupils, particularly when in coaching roles, to encourage their peers to give their best effort, as illustrated by this teacher–coach discussion between Kendrick and one of his pupils:

Every time you say something [negative] to them it makes them want to stop playing. ‘You’re not trying, you’re not trying,’ every time. If I’m on your team, I don’t want to keep trying. Encourage your teammates. She can’t help it if she’s not faster than him.

Summary and conclusions

The main conclusion to be drawn from this study is that the initial value orientations of the PTs who participated strongly influenced the type of SE seasons they delivered. Their disciplinary mastery emphasis ensured that they delivered a full but conservative version of SE for most of their student teaching. In addition, the study indicated that toward the end of their SE seasons, they broadened their beliefs about the purposes of their teaching to the extent that they expressed interest in goals related to and used pedagogies consistent with social reconstruction, social responsibility and self-actualization value orientations.

In line with some previous research (Solmon & Ashby, 1995; Sofo & Curtner-Smith, 2005) the present study suggested that these PTs’ value orientations altered during PETE, perhaps because they were oriented to teaching rather than coaching and thought relatively deeply about their profession. Alternatively, perhaps the shift in their value orientations can be attributed to the SE model itself, the current study
suggesting that it might be a particularly good medium through which PTs can explore and consider different perspectives. Its pragmatic, relatively straightforward character appeared to fit easily with a number of value orientations, enabling it to be interpreted either conservatively, liberally, or anywhere along a continuum between these two positions. While some recent research has indicated that large scale curricular trends and innovations have little impact on PTs’ value orientations (Meek & Curtner-Smith, 2004), this study indicated that PTs’ perspectives were congruent with the SE model they were trained to employ. In future research of this sort, then, it may be useful to distinguish between ‘plans for programs of study’ (Rink, 2002, p. 365) and curricular models, such as SE.

Assuming that the results of the current study transfer to PTs’ learning to teach SE in other programs and institutions, they have two major implications for PETE. First, they suggest that faculty need to be open to and have respect for different interpretations of the full version of the SE model and understand that these interpretations depend on PTs’ initial value orientations. Of course, the likelihood is that most PTs who actually enter PETE will have a disciplinary mastery focus. A few, however, may not. Second, the results suggest that PETE faculty need to be sensitive to and support PTs who become interested in new perspectives as they learn to teach SE and so attempt to employ new pedagogies.

Future research examining the extent to which the findings of the current study transfer to other PTs learning to teach SE in different PETE programs would be of use. Research investigating the degree to which PTs’ teaching suffers as any shift in their value orientations leads them to use different teaching techniques that may not be very effective while teaching SE would also be helpful. Is the transfer relatively seamless or is there a temporary regression in pedagogical skill? Research of the influence of PTs’ value orientations on their interpretation and delivery of other curricular models and the influence of these models on their value orientations would also obviously be of use. Research assumes that value orientations are deep seated beliefs held by PTs (and teachers); in fact, what teachers value may be a result of circumstances and therefore liable to change as conditions do. Thus, research needs to examine the impact of circumstances on PTs’ value orientations. It follows, then, that research is needed that investigates the origins of value orientations. The assumption is that what teachers value will be reflected in their teaching as well as in their discussions about their teaching. This may or may not be the case. After all, a teacher may make a decision regarding student learning based on what the students are doing, what is going on in the school, and what he or she values at that moment in time—nothing more or less. Conversely, all actions a teacher makes may be based on an overriding goal to get students active or get them to work together or get them to improve their motor skills. Understanding more about value orientations, their origin and depth of conviction, will be important future research.
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