

Curricula of Mutual Worth: Comparisons of Students' and Teachers' Curricular Goals

By: Donetta J. Cothran and [Catherine D. Ennis](#)

Cothran, D.J., & Ennis, C.D. (1998). Curricula of mutual worth: Comparisons of students' and teachers' curricular goals. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 17, 307-326.

Made available courtesy of Human Kinetics: <http://www.humankinetics.com>

*****Reprinted with permission. No further reproduction is authorized without written permission from Human Kinetics. This version of the document is not the version of record. Figures and/or pictures may be missing from this format of the document.*****

Abstract:

Teachers' educational values appear to influence their decision-making, but they are not the only decision-makers in the classroom. Students are also actively deciding on courses of action, yet educators know very little about students' values or the interaction of teacher and student values. The purpose of this study was to examine levels of congruence between students' and teachers' values, and between their values and the curriculum. A multiphase research design involving observations, interviews, and Q methodology examined the educational values of 4 urban high school teachers and their students. Observation and interview data were analyzed via constant comparison. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the Q-sort data. Results indicated that teachers and students held potentially conflicting values about the educational and noneducational aspects of physical education, the role and value of social aspects, and the role of fun. Additionally, there was incongruence between participants' values and the curricular model.

Article:

The Latin word *currere*, which is the root of our modern word *curriculum*, is a verb meaning to run a race or course (Berube, 1982). In fact, many current conceptualizations of curriculum retain a similar connotation, using the word to describe a sequence of academic events that students must complete to successfully finish a single class or an entire educational program. From this perspective, a student moves through a predetermined educational path, the curriculum, toward the finish line of course completion.

Ideally, the educational path is clearly marked and the final destination is agreeable to all participants. If these conditions occur, travel through the curriculum is relatively smooth and efficient. Many teachers and students, however, report that the educational path is not a smooth one. The finish line is not always clear, and there are many divergent paths that both teachers and students are tempted to follow. As a result, educational travel through the curriculum is not always a cooperative, mutually satisfactory process for teachers and students.

Historically, teachers held the power to determine the educational path and finish line for their classes (Dworkin, 1987). They did this via their curricular choices. Because many curricular options are available, teachers must select the most valued of the many valid competing curricular goals (Schubert, 1990). This comparison and choice process is necessary because resource constraints limit the ability of teachers to implement all options (e.g., Ennis & Zhu, 1991). For example, high school students may have only one required semester of physical education. Their teacher must decide what is the most important information the students need before they graduate. Should the teacher choose to emphasize fitness, sports skills, knowledge, self-esteem, or social-cooperative skills? The decision the teacher makes about what content to emphasize is, in essence, a value judgment based on the teacher's belief system about the knowledge of most worth for students (Jewett, Bain, & Ennis, 1995). The knowledge of most worth is then conveyed to students via the curriculum. The curriculum determines the educational path through which the teacher hopes students will proceed.

In the example of the high school teacher faced with limited time and many options, the curricular choice was guided by comparing and evaluating the competing options, a process of value judgment. Values are beliefs that

are used in an evaluative manner. Because values are related to preferred end states and goals, they are often indicators of action, for individuals act to achieve their goals. Pajares (1992) proposed that beliefs are the best predictors of an individual's decisions, and they may be even more (than factual knowledge in influencing decision-making (Nespor, 1987). Beliefs may determine what knowledge a teacher holds (Nisbett & Ross, 1980) or determine when that knowledge will be used (Paris, Lipson, & Wixson, 1983).

Teachers, however, are not the only decision-makers in a class. Students are also actively evaluating class activities, selecting goals, and deciding what actions they will take (Pintrich, Marx, & Boyle, 1993). What students value about their classes, however, is largely unknown. Unlike research on the role of teacher beliefs in determining class events and instructional strategies, little information is known about students' beliefs, with the exception of the achievement motivation literature. Erickson's and Shultz's (1992) review of the literature on the student in the curriculum concluded, "In sum, virtually no research has been done that places student experience at the center of attention. We do not see student interests and their known and unknown fears" (p. 467).

A similar situation exists in the research specific to students in physical education. Although investigators have recently begun to focus more attention on the student experience in physical education (e.g., Carlson, 1995; Graham, 1995), there is still very little known about student values. For example, we know a great deal about teachers' goals for their programs (e.g., Ennis & Zhu, 1991; Lambdin & Steinhardt, 1991), yet we know almost nothing about student beliefs regarding the purposes of physical education (Walling & Duda, 1995).

The purpose of this study was to examine levels of congruence between teachers' and students' values, and between their values and the curriculum. By examining those value relationships, we hoped to understand what teachers and students valued about their physical education class, and how those values affected travel through the curriculum. The specific research questions that guided this investigation were: (a) To what extent are teachers' and students' values similar? and (b) To what extent are participants' values congruent with the course curriculum? This study was part of a larger investigation of secondary school participants' educational values (Cothran & Ennis, 1997a, 1997b, 1998).

The findings of this investigation enhance educators' understandings of several key facets of the teaching-learning process. First, the importance of values in education is widely accepted; however, rarely have students' values or the concurrent values of students and teachers been examined. By increasing our knowledge those two facets of the values-education relationship, educators may gain insight into the complex ecology of classes. Understanding the student perspective insight also enhance teachers' ability to create learning environments that students may find meaningful. By examining the level of similarity between values, potential areas of conflict can be addressed and mutually satisfactory educational solutions designed.

Teachers' and Students' Values

Beliefs and values act as a primary tool to help individuals understand the environment in which they live (Eisenhart, Shrum, Harding, & Cuthbert, 1988). The uncertain nature of most educational settings may influence participants to rely on their values to an even greater degree than knowledge to guide their decision-making (Nespor, 1987). Due to their importance in understanding the teaching-learning process, educational values served as the theoretical framework that guided this investigation. The following sections provide a brief overview of teachers' and students' values.

Teachers' Values

Teachers' educational beliefs may be the most important influence on their decision-making (Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992). The influence of beliefs on teacher practice may be even more influential in nonacademic subject matter areas such as physical education (Ennis, 1992b). This influence is due to the relative freedom physical educators have in the design and conduct of their programs. With few formal textbooks or standardized tests to influence and constrain practice, teachers are free from many of the external curriculum forces that can influence teachers in traditional academic subject matter courses. The absence of external influences on

curriculum choices allows physical education teachers to select curricular goals that are most congruent with their beliefs about the knowledge of most worth.

Curricular theorists in physical education have hypothesized five possible belief systems, or value orientations, that provide insight into the nature of various goals and practices for physical education (Jewett et al., 1995). Value orientations act as frameworks for curricular decision-making. The value orientations differ in the focus given to the three sources of curriculum (i.e., subject matter, learner, society) and in the conceptualization of what it means to be a physically educated person. The value orientations of disciplinary mastery and learning process emphasize the role of the traditional knowledge base in education. The individual participant's unique experience is the primary focus of the self-actualization orientation, while the social reconstruction value orientation is primarily concerned with the role of the individual in society. The ecological integration perspective seeks a balance among the three concerns in order to create an education that is personally meaningful.

These value orientations influence what focus the curriculum will take. For example, a teacher with a disciplinary mastery focus will select content and instructional styles that lead to student mastery of knowledge and physical skill. The desired end-of-course state for this teacher is a student who demonstrated "proficiency in fundamental movement, skill, sport, and fitness activities; a cognitive understanding of rules, strategies, and scientific principles associated with increased performance; and an appreciation of these in an active healthful lifestyle (Ennis & Chen, 1993, p. 438). In contrast, a teacher with a self-actualization value orientation plans for "students to learn to become increasingly self-directed, responsible, and independent. They are encouraged to learn about themselves as they grow and develop their own characteristics and abilities" (Ennis & Chen 1993, p. 440). To achieve their valued goals, these two teachers likely would choose two different educational paths, or curricula, for their students to follow. Research examining value orientations suggests that teacher beliefs about their program are consistent (Ennis & Zhu, 1991), affect their practices (Ennis, 1992a), and direct]: influence the experiences students have in their classes (Ennis, Ross, & Chen 1992). Other research results suggest that educational values may not be the only consideration for teachers (Cothran & Ennis, 1997b; Placek, 1983).

Students' Values

The brief overview of literature on teacher beliefs suggested that teachers hold consistent goals for their programs that can be described from the framework of value orientations. All five value orientations are united by their focus on educational goals for physical education programs. In fact, most educational theory has assumed that students are also focused on educational outcomes. Wentzel (1992) described the traditional models of students in schools as focusing on "students' desires to increase or demonstrate levels of competence or ability" (p. 288). More recent research on student goals for education, however, indicates that students may hold goals that compete with—or are at least additional to the goal of educational mastery (Solmon, 1997; Wentzel, 1994).

In an investigation of classroom management, Allen (1986) explored students' goals for their classes. He concluded that nearly all student behaviors in class were directed toward achieving the goals of socializing and passing the course. When teacher-designed activities were clearly linked for the students to the accomplishment of either of these goals, student compliance was more likely, resulting in fewer classroom disruptions. Similar results emphasizing the importance of students' social goals were reported by Wentzel (1989), and Cothran and Ennis (1997a).

One of the few studies to investigate high school students' rankings of possible valued outcomes of physical education was conducted by Walling and Duda (1995). They asked high school students to complete a 5-point Likert scale rating of 10 statements using the word stem, "An important purpose of physical education is ...". The 10 purpose statements varied widely in focus and included educational, social, and recreational goals. There was no overall difference in ratings for the 10 goals. All 10 were rated highly (above 3 on a 5-point scale) by the students. Similar formats have been used to investigate middle and high school students' (e.g., Tannehill

& Zakrajsek, 1993) and college students' (e.g., Avery & Lumpkin, 1987) rankings of purposes for physical education classes.

These studies offer insights into what students may value about physical education, thereby suggesting a preferred curricular focus. The assessment formats, however, may not provide realistic information to inform planning for a school setting. Students can pursue multiple goals in school settings (Wentzel, 1989); however, it seems unlikely that any student can actively pursue all 10 goals described in the Walling and Duda (1995) study. It appears that students might have a value hierarchy of purposes that was not captured by the typical Likert scale assessment format.

Methods

The implicit nature of values makes measurement difficult, therefore they must be inferred rather than measured directly (Rokeach, 1968). For this reason, a multiphase, multiple methodology research design was utilized. Data collection involved observations, interviews, and Q methodology to examine the educational values of teachers and students.

Setting and Participants

The participants in this study were four physical education teachers and their students from three high schools in a large urban school district, Knox County. (All names used in this paper are pseudonyms.) The three high schools were 4-year programs for grades 9-12 and ranged in size from 960-1500 students. The combined demographics of the three schools were 83% African American, and 16% non-African American, primarily European-American.

All four teachers were experienced and were recommended by the district supervisor for the relative effectiveness of their programs. The teachers were White. Mr. Brown and Ms. Manning both taught at Valley High School, and each had been teaching for 29 years. Ms. Hedley at Summitt High had 23 years experience in the district schools. The fourth teacher, Ms. Warren, was employed at Mesa High and had 18 years teaching experience.

The 72 students who agreed to participate in this study were members of these four teachers' classes. There were 23 students from Valley High, 24 from Summitt, and 25 from Mesa. Table 1 provides a complete breakdown of the number of student participants at each school. They represented all four grades (9-12) in their high schools and reflected the approximate overall demographic trends in the three schools, with 89% of the participants reporting as African American and 11% as White.

Table 1 Student Participation

School	Interviews		Q-sort		Oral reflection	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Mesa	3	7	6	9	2	3
Summitt	8	6	5	5	2	3
Valley	3	3	9	8	4	7

Note. $N = 72$. The Phase II oral reflection students also participated in the Q-sort, and as a result they are actually a subtotal of the Q-sort participant total.

In Knox County, students were required to take one semester of physical education to graduate. They could choose from team sports, weight training, personal fitness, or dance courses to fulfill the graduation requirement. The team sports class was the most popular class offered at the schools and each teacher taught multiple sections of the course.

All four teachers used a multiactivity curriculum in their team sports classes. Units lasted 3 to 4 weeks and typically began with 1 to 3 days of focus on skill development and knowledge about the game. The remainder of the unit was spent in various tournament formats that usually consisted of a lengthy round-robin competition followed by an elimination tournament.

Data Collection and Analysis

Overview. The methodologies used to collect data were Q methodology, field observations, and student and teacher interviews. Data were collected during the Fall semester via class observations and student interviews. Thirty students, 14 males and 16 females, were interviewed. In addition to more class observations, the Spring semester data collection involved the Q methodology procedures of Q-sorts and oral reflections. The 4 teachers and 42 student participants, 20 boys and 22 girls, performed the Q-sort. A representative sample of the Q-sort participants also participated in oral reflections, which were interviews focused on the Q-sort results. Twenty-one students, 8 boys and 13 girls, and the 4 teachers were involved in the oral reflection data collection.

Q-Sort Instrument Development. Q methodology was used to examine the participants' hierarchy for different values for physical education. Rather than a Likert scale method where all items can be rated highly, Q methodology requires participants to make value judgments between different items. The initial step in the Q methodology is to select a representative sample of items from the domain of interest. For this study, the items were statements related to a wide variety of potential values for physical education. The source of statements used for the Q-sort was a review of research literature on teacher and student perspectives on education. The review of literature indicated that the inclusion of both educational (e.g., Ennis & Chen, 1993) and noneducational (e.g., Carlson, 1995) items were needed to represent the many varied values for physical education.

The source for the educational value items for physical education was Ennis and Chen's (1993) domain specifications for the theorized educational value orientations of disciplinary mastery, learning process, self-actualization, ecological integration, social responsibility, and social reconstruction. Domain specifications delineate critical aspects of each value orientation. One item was written for each domain specification resulting in three items each for disciplinary mastery, learning process, self-actualization, and social reconstruction, and four items each for ecological integration and social responsibility, for a total of 20 educational items. These educational items, although representing different value orientations, all reflected an end goal of increased student learning.

In contrast, the 20 noneducational items were not directly related to an end goal of student learning. The review of literature provided evidence for the inclusion of noneducational items that were concerned with class aspects, such as friends, play, and fun (e.g., Avery & Lumpkin, 1987; Wentzel, 1994). In addition to the review of literature, the Fall semester student interviews also were reviewed to see if the students identified any other values for physical education. The students failed to identify any new items for the Q-sort; however, student responses were used to guide the wording of items to increase the likelihood of representing the personal meaning of participants.

A five-member panel of experts reviewed the appropriateness of each item. The panel was comprised of four graduate students and university faculty members experienced with research and practice in the local public schools and with value orientations. The panel also included a fifth member, a Knox County high school physical education teacher not involved in the study, who was familiar with value orientations. The panel reviewed the items to ensure that the educational items were representative of the intent of the domain specifications, and to ensure that the noneducational items did not reflect a primarily educational focus. The statements were rewritten until the panel reached 100% agreement as to the validity and appropriateness of all items.

A Knox County high school physical education class at a school not included in the study was used to pilot the items for meaning and reading level. The students were asked to comment on each item with respect to clarity

and meaning. The student responses were consistent with the researchers' content intent for the items. A test-retest procedure was used to assess the reliability of the instrument. The average reliability score for the eight participants was .832. A list of the 40 items is provided in the appendix.

Q Methodology. The purpose of the Q methodology was to quantify the personal values of participants. Q methodology is comprised of two components: a Q-sort and an oral reflection. The data collection and analysis of the oral reflection, an interview with a focus on the Q-sort, are described in the next section.

For the Q-sort portion, teachers and students systematically rank-ordered a series of cards according to a bipolar scale. The cards contained 40 statements that reflected possible values for physical education. The participants were asked to sort the cards along a 9-point continuum from most to least valued. The number of cards allowed in each of the 9 points along the continuum was 3, 4, 4, 6, 6, 6, 4, 4, 3, respectively. For example, the three most valued items were placed in the farthest right hand column with the next four most valued items placed in the next column. These nine categories were also assigned a sequential point value of 1 to 9, with 1 point assigned to the least valued category and 9 points to the most valued category. The rankings were recorded by the investigator. Students were also asked to complete a second sort. In the second sort, students completed the task as they believed their teacher would sort the cards.

Because the focus of this investigation was to compare and contrast students' and teachers' values, the Q-sort rankings were used to form three data sets: one each for the (a) 42 students, (b) 4 teachers, and (c) 42 students' rankings of their teachers. A composite value score for each of the subcategories of items (e.g., disciplinary mastery, friends) within each data set was computed by averaging the scores assigned to the individual items within the subcategories. For example, the individual rankings given to the three disciplinary mastery items were averaged together to create a composite value score for disciplinary mastery. The mean value for the composite items was then used to rank-order the item categories. Due to the large difference in the number of participants in the two groups, no statistical tests of group difference were deemed appropriate.

Class Observations, Interviews, and Oral Reflections. To identify participants' interactive behaviors in the school setting, the first author filled the role of a participant observer (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993) for class observations. Each school was observed for a minimum of 40 hours, and these class observations were recorded as field notes. The content of the field notes included class procedures, participants' actions and responses, and the content of informal conversations with participants.

The interviews with the Fall semester students were held prior to the semester break. For these interviews, a general interview guide was used (Patton, 1990). The interview guide included questions about why students were enrolled in the course, what they did and learned, what they wished they could do and learn, and their values for class activities. The students' and teachers' oral reflections, an interview with a specific focus on the individuals' Q-sort results, occurred at the conclusion of the Spring semester observation period. Both the interviews and oral reflections were audiotaped and later transcribed.

The data collected via the field notes, interviews, and oral reflections were analyzed using a constant comparison process to identify and extract common themes across participants (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). To ensure the trustworthiness of the data, a variety of measures were taken, including triangulation of data sources and regular meetings with a peer debriefer. Additionally, the data were continually reexamined to search for negative cases that could serve to disprove an emerging theme or to provide an alternative perspective. The data from the observations, interviews, and Q methodology were examined to identify areas of similarity and dissimilarity between teachers' and students' values.

Results and Discussion

Class observations, interviews, and Q methodology data revealed similarities and differences between students' and teachers' values, and between students' and teachers' values and their curriculum. To return to the race course analogy, value similarities may reveal points of smooth travel through the curriculum as both teachers

and students agree on the path. In contrast, the value differences may represent points at which teachers and students pull away from each other or the curriculum.

Where's the Finish Line? Teachers' and Students' Values

Since values reflect desired end states of being, they often act as guides for individuals to make decisions about what course of action to take. Examining participants' values can provide understanding of the end goals (or the finish line) each group hoped to achieve in class. For these students and teachers, the preferred finish lines differed. There were two key areas of incongruence between teachers' and students' values: (a) the importance of an educational focus, and (b) the role and importance of a social focus in class. Even when the two groups did agree, their reasons for agreement often varied. This was particularly true of the value each group assigned to the single most valued item, "I have fun."

Educational Focus. The first divergent level was between students' and teachers' values for an educational focus for the course. In general, teachers reported more value for educational items than did the students. Ms. Manning reported her goals for her program: "The main thing for them [the students] is to know that physical education is education through the physical. They have to know that physical activity is important in life." The other three teachers also described physical education's unique role in educating the whole person for a lifetime.

Students, however, placed more value on noneducational aspects of physical education. Reggie described the difference between students and teachers: "A student wants a teacher who wants to have a lot of fun and don't make them do no work. A teacher wants a student that'll do his work and be quiet. That's two different things so that ain't gonna match." Keeli expressed a common student belief that the primary purpose of physical education should not be learning: "Teachers want us to learn exercises and be fit and we [students] want a break from classes and to play around." In a manner that was similar to the academic class students described by Lemos (1996), the learning dimension of the course was not a primary value focus for students.

Table 2 Students' Rank-Order Ratings of Item Categories

	Rank order	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Educational			
Disciplinary mastery	4 (4)	5.39	1.42
Ecological integration	9 (3)	4.88	1.29
Learning process	5 (9)	5.29	1.62
Self-actualization	8 (5)	5.04	1.28
Social reconstruction	10 (6)	4.67	1.48
Social responsibility	11 (2)	4.52	1.34
Noneducational			
Competition	6 (11)	5.21	2.08
Environment	12 (10)	3.62	1.58
Friends	3 (12)	5.74	1.57
Fun	1 (1)	7.05	2.08
Grades	2 (7)	6.27	1.90
Play	7 (7)	5.20	1.87

Note. For ease of comparison, the teachers' ratings of the same items are provided in the parentheses. See Table 3 for a complete description of teacher rank data.

The results of the Q-sort data lend support to these participants' descriptions of teachers' and students' differing values for physical education. The rank order of the various categories of items within the Q-sort are presented in Tables 2 and 3. The rank order, rather than the category means, are used in this discussion. The rank order reveals the relative importance of items in relationship to other items, thereby providing the most insight into participants' value systems.

Although both groups rated the statement "I have fun" as their most valuable item, the groups differed in the value assigned to other items. Of the 12 categories of items, the teachers placed 5 educational categories in the top 6, with the social responsibility items being the most valued educational category. Students, however, rated the social responsibility items as 11th out of a possible 12 categories. The only 2 educational categories to break into the students' most valued half were the disciplinary mastery and learning process items. The students

placed more value on noneducational items such as friends. In general, the teachers most valued items were educational in focus, while the students' most valued items were primarily noneducational.

Table 3 Teachers' Rank-Order Ratings of Item Categories

Category	Rank order	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Educational			
Disciplinary mastery	4 (4)	6.17	1.82
Ecological integration	3 (9)	6.25	0.74
Learning process	9 (5)	5.42	1.57
Self-actualization	5 (8)	5.67	0.98
Social reconstruction	6 (10)	5.58	0.74
Social responsibility	2 (11)	6.69	0.85
Noneducational			
Competition	11 (6)	3.33	0.61
Environment	10 (12)	4.08	1.52
Friends	12 (3)	3.17	1.55
Fun	1 (1)	7.75	1.26
Grades	7* (2)	5.50	2.52
Play	7* (7)	5.50	1.35

Note. * indicates a tie. For ease of comparison, the students' ratings of the same items are provided in the parentheses. See Table 2 for a complete description of student data.

Social Focus. The rankings indicated that both teachers and students believed that working with others was valuable, but the exact nature of the preferred social interaction varied. For teachers, socially responsible behavior was valued. As evidenced from their Q-sorts and interviews, teachers valued students who were cooperative and respectful. In contrast to the teachers' focus on social responsibility, the desired social outcome for students was socializing, or spending time with friends. The value pattern for the friends items was a reversal of the relationship of the importance of social responsibility items. Students rated the friends items as the 3rd most valuable aspect of physical education while the teachers rated the same items the least valuable of all the categories.

Their differing perspectives may have arisen from the role each perceived friends played in class. From the students' perspective, friends were a critical aspect of education in general and also, specifically, physical education. Hartup (1992) proposed that friends serve many functions for students, including being information sources, emotional and cognitive resources, and key members of the social context. Chamiqua agreed that friends were important: "Working in groups with your friends is the best part of gym. You don't ever get to do that in other classes. It's the one time during the day that you can see them and talk to them." Many of the students shared Chamiqua's view on the importance of friends. These students appeared to hold similar perspectives as the students reported on by Allen (1986) for whom socializing was a major goal in all classes.

In contrast to the students' united perspective on the importance of friends, teachers held differing views on the value of friends in class. Ms. Hedley did not believe that students valued the items related to friends: "I think they have been around each other all day long. It's [spending time with friends] just not a factor in PE." Mr. Brown believed friends were important to students, but that they often distracted from student learning. Patrick, a student in Mr. Brown's class, commented, "Well, he [Mr. Brown] don't like the friends part. Most students like talking with their friends in class and he doesn't want nobody talking." Ms. Summit and Ms. Warren both acknowledged that friends in class were important to students. Despite their differing views over the importance of friends, all four teachers allowed students to select with whom to work. The end result was that students were allowed to spend time with friends in almost all class activities, despite the fact that the teachers did not value spending time with friends as an aspect of their programs.

Fun. For both groups, the item, "I have fun" was the most valued statement. The groups, however, differed on their perspective on the role that fun played in class. For the teachers, fun was often an instrumental goal, a means of attaining other valued goals of student engagement and compliance. Students' descriptions of fun varied and often were related to fun as a terminal goal of class.

All four teachers emphasized fun as a key component of their program. Ms. Manning described why she rated the fun item as her most valued: "I try to provide a safe, fun environment so they'll [students] want to participate and then maybe some learning will occur." Fun was a precursor to student engagement. Since students did not value an educational focus as much as they did other aspects of class, fun was used as a motivational strategy to promote involvement in class tasks. The reliance on fun as a primary motivator was necessary, because students increasingly questioned the value of the subject matter and the teachers' authority (Cothran & Ennis, 1997b).

The teachers actively promoted the perception that class was fun and therefore was the reason why students should participate. For example, on the first day of a new floor hockey unit, Mr. Brown told the class, "You're going to really like this unit. It's probably the most fun we have all year." At no time did he mention the potentially valuable fitness or educational outcomes that might benefit students from participation in the unit. To make the class fun, the teachers often modified their programs to address students' conceptions of fun.

For some students, competition was exciting and fun. Albert said that basketball drills were "stupid and boring," but tournament play was fun: "If it's competition it's better. When you have tournaments and play other classes then that's fun. It's best in basketball because that's when I'm good." Not all students, however, found the extensive competition in class to be fun. Merkita suggested that people in her class were too competitive: "Like the way it is now [an elimination tournament day] when you play and you mess up people be yelling and fussing. That ain't how people should act."

Despite the fact that the teachers ranked competition as the next-to-last in value within the set of items, the programs all provided extensive interclass and intraclass tournaments in their units. When asked if other subject matter teachers objected to giving up class time to allow for the interclass competition, Ms. Hedley responded, "No, it's not usually a problem. Most of these kids are so hard to engage that if there's anything that will excite them, the other teachers are glad to promote it." Although the teachers did not rate competition as a most valued item, they used it extensively to promote fun and provide structure to the class.

For other students, social relations played an important role in determining if a class was fun or not. For them, a fun class was one in which social relations were pleasurable. Abbey described a fun day:

If everybody agrees on something then that's fun. If some people don't want to do it then everybody is arguing. If you find something that everybody likes and then they'll all participate and stuff like that. Then, that's when class is fun.

The presence of friends in class also contributed to pleasant social relations. Peytor commented, "If you're with friends you have somebody to talk to and then playing is more fun." Once again, however, the teachers assigned low value to socializing ("Friends" items were ranked least in value by the teachers), yet they promoted working with friends in order to make the class fun for students.

The most frequent description of what made physical education fun, however, was that the class was fun because it provided a break from the rest of the school day. Tiffany claimed, "P.E. is practically everybody's favorite class. If your teachers be getting on your nerves all day then you can come in here and blow off steam." Similarly, Leon described the different environment in physical education as what made it fun:

You're in your other classes and you work, work, work and then when you go to PE you can just do it. It's like everything that you can't do in other classes. You let go and lose control and have fun.

Fun can be an excellent motivator and by-product in a class. The emphasis on fun in these classes, however, was problematic, because it contributed to the de-emphasis on the educational aspects of the classes. Ms. Warren noted, "It's hard for students to realize that fun play is good and healthy." The teachers never helped students make the connection that fun could be learning, or alternately that learning is not always fun and, in fact, often requires hard work. The fun message, intended by the teachers to be a facilitator to learning, instead

often replaced learning as the purpose of the class. As a result, these students, like those described by Carlson (1995), often held positive attitudes toward attending physical education class while at the same time holding little value for the content.

These differences between teachers and students related to an educational focus, the type of social emphasis, and the role of fun were more than just different preferences about how class should be conducted. Values are strong influences that are frequently tied to action (Feather, 1992). When values differ and the environment does not allow for simultaneous existence, participants can be drawn to different goals and may even be likely to reject opposing goals. Donald, a student in Ms. Hedley's class, was asked what happens when teachers and students differ in what they want from class. He replied, "Confusion. Like when she wants us to do something and then we want to do something else then its confusing. People don't do what they're supposed to and we can't get anything done that day." If the value differences about the desired finish line for the course are never addressed, confusion and even confrontation may continue as the daily norm. Contributing to the confusion was another value mismatch involving participants' values and the curriculum.

How Do We Get There From Here?

The second important value incongruence was between the participants' values and the curriculum model. The curriculum sets the educational course to be run. The curricular model chosen by the teacher supplies a framework around which instructional and assessment decisions are made. It should, at a minimum, reflect the teacher's values for the knowledge of most worth. Ideally it represents knowledge of worth to both the teacher and the student.

All four teachers used a multiactivity model in their team sports classes. Although the merit of the multiactivity model for students is debated frequently (e.g., Cothran & Ennis, 1996; Solmon, 1997), the merit of the model itself was not the primary issue. Rather, the problem was the incongruent match between the model and the teachers' desired learning outcomes. Siedentop, Mand, and Taggart's (1986) overview of physical education curricula describes the valued knowledge of the multiactivity model as student exposure to many activities; via this exposure, the student is provided with "diversity, novelty, excitement, and risk taking" (p. 161). When combined with effective teaching strategies, the multiactivity model can meet those goals. The multiactivity model is not designed, however, to meet a majority of the educational goals described by the teachers in their interviews and their Q-sorts.

These teachers wanted a learning environment that resulted in enjoyable learning experiences, particularly learning with a social responsibility focus. These are outcomes that the multiactivity model is not designed to meet. In essence, the teachers' message to their students of the knowledge of most worth was distorted by their selection of the multiactivity curricular model. In what was already a challenging teaching environment, teachers further complicated the process by not clearly articulating to students what was the knowledge of most worth. The curriculum, which should provide structural support for the teachers' values, instead provided an alternate message to the students. Rather than a clear, consistent social responsibility message, teachers promoted an alternate and competing message with their curricular choice.

Although the Q methodology and interview data suggested that the teachers held clear and consistent values, their students frequently were not able to describe their teacher's intended pedagogical focus for the class. For example, when asked what Mr. Brown wanted them to learn in class, his students offered various responses. Nathan believed that students were supposed to learn "to meet our personal goals." But LaShonda reported that students were supposed to learn "to play it right, you know, by the rules and stuff," and Patricia suggested that Mr. Brown did not want students to learn, but did want them to "get a good grade cause he don't want to see you again." Students in Ms. Hedley's and Ms. Manning's class supplied similar, varying responses when questioned about what their teacher emphasized most. The students' responses indicated that the teachers' educational message was not a clear or strong one.

The results of the second Q-sort performed by the students supports the students' interview comments about confusion in the classes over the teachers' intended focus. In the second sort, reported in Table 4, students were asked to perform the sort as they believed their teacher would sort the items. For many items (i.e., disciplinary mastery, fun, play), the students were fairly accurate in determining their teachers' value systems. The students, however, were largely unaware of the teachers' value for social responsibility learning items. They believed that their teachers would rate those items as the next to the last in value, yet the teachers rated them as their primary educational focus and the second most valued items overall. The students also believed that their teachers highly valued the items related to receiving good grades, yet the teachers placed those items in the bottom half (ranking grades 8th out of 12 categories) in their sorts.

Table 4 Students' Perception of Teachers' Value Rank

Category	Students' perception of teachers' rank order	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Educational			
Disciplinary mastery	4 (4)	5.39	1.44
Ecological integration	5 (3)	4.87	1.24
Learning process	8 (9)	5.29	1.64
Self-actualization	9 (5)	5.03	1.27
Social reconstruction	10 (6)	4.67	1.50
Social responsibility	11 (2)	4.51	1.29
Noneducational			
Competition	6 (11)	5.25	1.96
Environment	12 (10)	3.62	1.60
Friends	3 (12)	5.74	1.59
Fun	1 (1)	7.06	2.08
Grades	2 (7)	6.28	1.93
Play	7 (7)	5.22	1.89

Note. Teachers' actual rank order noted in parentheses. See Table 3 for a complete description of teacher rank data.

A review of the field notes from classes, lends support to the students' ranking of those two particular categories of items. Teachers infrequently designed specific tasks other than team play, or provided feedback to promote social responsibility learning. Although they frequently described problems and desired student behaviors to the investigator, they did not provide the same specific vision to their students. Teachers did, however, frequently remind students about the importance of grades and the relationship between appropriate behavior and grades. All four teachers' assessments were based on participation, effort, and cooperation.

Ms. Warren's class was the exception to the curricular confusion trend as her students were more likely to correctly identify her focus on social responsibility learning goals for the class. Misty described Ms. Warren's focus in class: "She wants us to be on time and to follow rules. We're supposed to not fight and kind of respect her and stuff like that." Similarly, Jamal thought that she wanted students to "Basically, have a good time but still do what she says she wants us to do. You learn how to work with others and learn how they are like." Although she also used the multiactivity curriculum, Ms. Warren differed from the other three teachers in one primary manner. She often took class time to discuss socially responsible behavior and appropriate student actions.

The following example illustrates the difference in approaches between Ms. Warren and the other three teachers despite their otherwise similar values and curricula. All four teachers began class with a formal roll call. Students were allowed to talk quietly, but were supposed to listen for their name to be called. One day at Summitt High, Ms. Hedley's students were talking loudly during roll, so she stopped and said, "Okay, it's your time. We can sit some more. If you want to play you'd better get quiet." The class continued to talk and she sat down on the bleachers. After approximately 2 minutes the class members started telling each other to be quiet, the noise level dropped, and Ms. Hedley continued. The entire roll call incident took less than 5 minutes. The

student behavior was noted as inappropriate, but the specifics of why and what had occurred, and alternately what should occur, were never directly addressed by Ms. Hedley.

A similar incident at Mesa High resulted in a very different approach by Ms. Warren. During one observation, the third-period class was unusually noisy during roll call. The following excerpt is from field notes of that day:

Ms. Warren is taking roll and the class is talking more than usual. She throws down her roll book and says, "Let's close up shop." The class gets quiet. "I don't ask for much. I just ask for your respect. You talking when I'm taking roll is disrespectful."

Ms. Warren and the class then spent the next 15 minutes discussing respect and how individuals show respect to one another. The class or individuals frequently had lengthy discussions with Ms. Warren about behavior. When asked about the time she spent in discussions she replied, "You can't just teach badminton. We'll spend a class period talking about something important and it doesn't have to be PE." Although her curricular model choice did not provide support for her social responsibility values, she took time to discuss her values and expectations; as a result, the educational message was clearer for her students. Due to the curricular mismatch, however, she was forced to use inactivity to teach (sitting and talking) rather than using movement activity to help communicate her valued knowledge.

The other teachers were unwilling to lose activity time for the students. Ms. Manning felt pressured to maximize activity time, because the students had such limited exposure to physical education: "To me, being active 30 minutes is important. I mean, what's important? We have them for so little time that I want them moving." Part of the unwillingness was also related to the teachers' beliefs that discussions with students would threaten class order. Ms. Hedley commented about her class, "You can't sit there and talk. You've got to put a ball in their hand and let them move or you'll lose them."

It is more difficult to determine if the multiactivity model was a congruent match with the students' values. The model's theoretical focus on "diversity, novelty, excitement, and risk taking" (Siedentop et al., 1986, p. 161) might provide for the fun that students valued, but it is unclear if their social values would be met. Because the model was actually implemented by the teachers with a decreased educational focus and an increased emphasis on socializing, competition, and fun, the altered model was perhaps a congruent match with students' values.

These results do not imply that teachers and students were in constant conflict, nor were they necessarily adversaries. In fact, for several items, teachers and students shared similar perspectives as to the relative value of the items. The key value differences, however, were never directly acknowledged and addressed and, as a result, became conflict points. These findings support Labaree's (1997) suggestion that incoherence and ineffectiveness are often the consequences of conflicting and unaddressed goals in schools.

Visions of Mutual Worth

Rink (1993) suggested that a significant part of the challenge in changing secondary physical education is that "you can't make change unless you know first where you want to go" (p. 4). Certainly many secondary physical education programs suffer from a lack of program focus. The results of this values investigation, however, suggest that both teachers and students knew where they wanted to go, but did not know how to get there in a mutually satisfactory manner. Teachers consistently and clearly reported to the investigators via Q methodology and interview data that they valued a program that focused on educational outcomes, particularly social responsibility goals, while at the same time allowing students to have fun. Students wanted a program that allowed them to have fun, be with friends, and achieve good grades. Although they did not assign highest value to educational items, these rankings may not mean that students are opposed to an educational focus. The findings do suggest, however, that unless the curriculum addresses students' values for fun, friends, and grades in addition to an educational focus, conflict may occur.

Additionally, the teachers' inability to articulate their programs' goals to their students within a clear, coherent, consistent framework was problematic. Teachers valued educational items, particularly social responsibility, but used a curriculum model that was not designed to create a learning environment specifically conducive to those specific goals. This mismatch between teachers' values and the programmatic base of their class resulted in a confusing, conflicting message for students. Mitchell (1982) suggested that problems in communication are a frequent cause of organizational failure. It appeared that in these classes, communication failure contributed to the classes' inability to meet the teachers' educational goals.

To improve communication and teachers' ability to meet educational goals, teacher education and in-service programs should begin to offer information about multiple curriculum models that represent a variety of philosophical positions. As Gallahue noted (1996), "If the goals of physical education are to have any real meaning, then curricular models must be congruent with those goals" (p. 125). There are curricular models that might have enabled both students and teachers to be successful in achieving their valued outcomes. For example, sport education (Siedentop, 1994) appears to address both the teachers' value for social responsibility and an educational focus, while also addressing students' values for a traditional knowledge and skill based program and student interaction. Similarly, Hellison's (1985) social responsibility model might also allow both students and teachers to meet their personal values in an educational program.

Additionally, helping preservice and in-service teachers to clarify their values and develop methodologies consistent with them would help in resolving the incongruences that existed in these programs. Curricular theorists and teachers must also begin to consider students' values and how to incorporate those into educational outcomes if we wish to provide meaningful, mutually satisfactory travel through the curriculum.

The results of this investigation provide educators with some initial insights into the interaction of participants' values and the curriculum. The results also suggest the need to clarify the interaction. Two important questions remain unanswered, one related to students and one for teachers.

First, student values need further examination and clarification. Students rated the disciplinary mastery and learning process categories as their most valued educational items. Students may, in fact, most highly value these two approaches to physical education. An alternate and viable explanation is that they may have only experienced these two physical education value orientations. The disciplinary mastery and learning process value systems are the traditional knowledge bases that our field has transmitted. Students may not have valued the other educational value orientations because they had never experienced them. It is possible that students had no reference point from which to make value decisions about these competing curricular goals, and therefore assigned low value to unfamiliar items.

The second unanswered question involves teachers' values. It is currently unclear if these teachers truly valued the educational aspects of the social responsibility items, or if they were attracted to the control those items would provide in class. As framed by these particular items, a social responsibility curriculum would result in students who had positive attitudes, cooperated with others, did not fight, and respected the teacher. When viewed in combination with the teachers' emphasis on fun and grades, it is difficult to determine if the teachers truly had an educational orientation that fun and grades enhanced, or if these methodologies somehow accessed more evidence of the "busy, happy, and good" syndrome already documented in many physical education programs (Placek, 1983).

With continued examination of the influence and interaction of students' and teachers' values for physical education, perhaps more effective curricular paths can be designed and implemented. These new paths must somehow find ways to combine the needs and values of all participants. When both teachers and students are able to travel through a curriculum of knowledge of mutual worth, then perhaps the competing destinations and detours that detracted from these programs can be resolved.

Appendix

Q-Sort Items

Educational items

1. I become skilled and fit. (DM)
2. I learn rules and strategies for sports and games. (DM)
3. I learn to appreciate the importance of skill and knowledge in an active lifestyle. (DM)
4. I learn how I would go about learning a new skill or activity. (LP)
5. I learn to analyze my own mistakes when I perform a skill. (LP)
6. I learn how the skills I know are similar to new ones I'm learning. (LP)
7. I have a chance to set my own personal goals for the class. (SA)
8. I learn new things about myself. (SA)
9. I select activities that I am interested in for participation. (SA)
10. I gain knowledge that is personally meaningful. (EI)
11. I learn to work well alone and in groups. (EI)
12. I learn to balance my needs with the needs of my classmates. (EI)
13. I make decisions about activities I would like to learn for future participation. (EI)
14. I learn to help create a positive class attitude by talking through problems rather than fighting. (SRES)
15. I learn how to work together with other students. (SRES)
16. I work with other students to meet group goals. (SRES)
17. I learn to be positive and respectful when talking with teachers. (SRES)
18. I learn how other people in class are different than and similar to me. (SREC)
19. I learn to form my own opinion about the class and rules and to discuss them openly. (SREC)
20. I learn to think carefully about rules to be sure that all students have an equal chance to play. (SREC)

Non-educational items

21. I have a chance to talk with my friends. (FR)
22. I get to make new friends. (FR)
23. I can be around members of the opposite sex. (MS)
24. I have a class with younger and older students. (MS)
25. I can be with my friends. (FR)
26. I have a chance to show that I am more skilled than my classmates. (CP)
27. I can compete against others. (CP)
28. I can see how good I am compared to others. (CP)
29. I get a passing grade. (GR)
30. I get a good grade. (GR)
31. I do something that pleases the teacher. (MS)
32. I don't have to work hard. (MS)
33. I have a free choice day. (MS)
34. I get a break from other classes. (MS)
35. I get to play my favorite sport or do my favorite activity. (PL)
36. I get to just play instead of having to practice something. (PL)
37. I have fun. (MS)
38. I'm not scared. (EN)
39. I am not made fun of by anybody. (EN)
40. I don't embarrass myself in front of anybody. (EN)

Note. DM = Disciplinary Mastery; LP = Learning Process; SA = Self-Actualization; EI = Ecological Integration; SRES = Social Responsibility; SREC = Social Reconstruction; FR = Friends; MS = Miscellaneous; CP = Competition; GR = Grades; PL = Play; EN = Environment.

References

- Allen, J.D. (1986). Classroom management: Students' perspectives, goals, and strategies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 23, 437-459.
- Avery, M., & Lumpkin, A. (1987). Students' perceptions of physical education objectives. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 7, 5-11.

- Berube, M.S. (Ed.). (1982). *The American heritage dictionary* (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Carlson, T.B. (1995). *A study of the relationship between student attitudes and student expectations toward physical education*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Cothran, D.J., & Ennis, C.D. (1996). "Nobody said nothing about learning stuff": High school students' perceptions of physical education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Cothran, D.J., & Ennis, C.D. (1997a). *Curricular accommodation as a consequence of students' and teachers' values*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Cothran, D.J., & Ennis, C.D. (1997b). Students' and teachers' perceptions of conflict and power. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13, 541-553.
- Cothran, D.J., & Ennis, C.D. (1998). *Building bridges to engagement: Communicating respect and care for students in urban high schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego.
- Dworkin, A.G. (1987). *Teacher burnout in the public schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Eisenhart, M.A., Shrum, J.L., Harding, J.R., & Cuthbert, A.M. (1988). Teacher beliefs: Definitions, findings, and directions. *Educational Policy*, 2, 51-70.
- Ennis, C.D. (1992a). Curriculum theory as practiced: Case studies of operationalized value orientations. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 11, 358-375.
- Ennis, C.D. (1992b). Reconceptualizing, learning as a dynamical system. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 7, 115-130.
- Ennis, C.D., & Chen, A. (1993). Domain specifications and content representativeness of the revised value orientation inventory. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 64, 436-446.
- Ennis, C.D., Ross, J., & Chen, A. (1992). The role of value orientations in curricular decision making: A rationale for teachers' goals and expectations. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 63, 38-47.
- Ennis, C.D., & Zhu, W. (1991). Value orientations: A description of teachers' goals for student learning. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 62, 33-40.
- Erickson, F., & Shultz, J. (1992). Students' experience of the curriculum. In P.W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 465-485). New York: Macmillan.
- Feather, N.T. (1992). Values, valences, expectations, and actions. *Journal of Social Issues*, 48, 109-124.
- Gallahue, D. L. (1996). *Developmental physical education for today's children* (3rd ed.). Chicago: Brown & Benchmark.
- Graham, G. (Ed.) (1995). Physical education through students' eyes and in students' voices. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* [Monograph], 14, 363-485.
- Hartup, W.H. (1992). Peer relations in early and middle childhood. In V.B. Van Hasselt & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Handbook of social development: A lifespan perspective* (pp. 257-281). New York: Plenum Press.
- Hellison, D.R. (1985). *Goals and strategies for teaching physical education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Jewett, A.E., Bain, L.L., & Ennis, C.D. (1995). *The curriculum process in physical education* (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Brown & Benchmark.
- Labaree, D.F. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34, 39-81.
- Lambdin, D.D., & Steinhardt, M.A. (1991). Elementary and secondary physical education teachers' perceptions of their goals, expertise, curriculum, and students' achievement. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 11, 103-111.
- LeCompte, M.D., & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research* (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Lemos, M.S. (1996). Students' and teachers' goals in the classroom. *Learning and Instruction*, 6, 151-171.
- Mitchell, T.R. (1982). *People in organizations: An introduction to organizational behavior* (2nd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19, 317-328.

- Nisbett, T., & Ross, L. (1980). *Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgment*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Pajares, M.F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 63, 307-332.
- Paris, S.G., Lipson, M., & Wixson, K. (1983). Becoming a strategic reader. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 8, 293-316.
- Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pintrich, P.R., Marx, R.W., & Boyle, R.A. (1993). Beyond cold conceptual change: The role of motivational beliefs and classroom contextual factors in the process of conceptual change. *Review of Educational Research*, 63, 167-199.
- Placek, J.H. (1983). Conceptions of success in teaching: Busy, happy, and good? In T.J. Templin & J.K. Olsen (Eds.), *Teaching in physical education* (pp. 46-56). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Rink, J.E. (1993). What's so critical? In J.E. Rink (Ed.), *Critical crossroads: Middle and secondary school physical education* (pp. 1-7). Reston, VA: National Association for Sport and Physical Education.
- Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, attitudes, and values*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schubert, W.H. (1990). The question of worth as central to curricular empowerment. In J.T. Sears & J.D. Marshall (Eds.), *Teaching and thinking about curriculum* (pp. 211-227). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Siedentop, D. (1994). *Sport education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Siedentop, D., Mand, C., & Taggart, A. (1986). *Physical education: Teaching and curriculum strategies for grades 5-12*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Solmon, M.A. (1997). *Students' goals in physical education classes*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Tannehill, D., & Zakrajsek, D. (1993). Student attitudes towards physical education: A multicultural study. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 13, 78-84.
- Walling, M.D., & Duda, J.L. (1995). Goals and their associations with beliefs about success in and perceptions of the purposes of physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 14, 140-156.
- Wentzel, K.R. (1989). Adolescent classroom goals, standards for performance, and academic achievement: An interactionist perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81, 131-142.
- Wentzel, K.R. (1992). Motivation and achievement in adolescence: A multiple goals perspective. In D.H. Schunk & J.L. Meece (Eds.), *Student perceptions in the classroom* (pp. 287-306). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Wentzel, K.R. (1994). Relations of social goal pursuit to social acceptance, classroom behavior, and perceived social support. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86, 173-182.