Preservice teachers' learning to implement culturally relevant physical education with the teaching personal and social responsibility model

By: Victoria N. Shiver, K. Andrew R. Richards & Michael A. Hemphill

Shiver, V. N., R. Richards, K. A. R., & Hemphill, M. A. (2020). Preservice teachers' learning to implement culturally relevant physical education with the teaching personal and social responsibility model. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 25*(3), 303-315.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy on March 16, 2020, available online: http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/17408989.2020.1741537.

Abstract:

Background: As schools become more diverse, preservice physical educators remain predominantly White from middle class backgrounds. There is a need to provide future teachers with cultural awareness and social justice training. The culturally relevant physical education framework provides three steps to follow, the tenets of which align with the teaching personal and social responsibility model. Occupational socialization theory is a useful lens for understanding preservice teachers' receptivity to new pedagogical practices based on their initial socialization into the field of physical education.

Purpose: To understand the ways in which socialization experiences influenced the development of culturally relevant physical education through the teaching personal and social responsibility model while teaching in an afterschool program in a high-poverty school.

Data collection and analysis: A phenomenological case study approach was utilized with twelve preservice physical education teachers (eight males, four females) serving as participants. The study occurred over the span of two semesters within methods courses and associated early field experiences. Data sources included critical incident reflections, weekly online journal responses, writing assignments, field notes, systematic observations and reflections, and semi-structured interviews. Inductive and deductive analysis occurred with constant comparison across each data source throughout open and axial coding and theme development.

Findings: Qualitative data analysis resulted in the construction of three themes: (a) getting to know the public, (b) the acknowledgement of cultural distance, and (c) bridging the gap. Preservice teachers struggled initially, feeling uncomfortable in the new setting and placing blame on the students. Over time, they progressed towards getting to know more about the student's daily experiences and home lives. Ultimately, they developed relationships and value

for their students and a deeper understanding of how they may be able to alter their teaching to meet their students' needs.

Discussion: The themes were well aligned with the steps of culturally relevant physical education. Further, the preservice teachers made consistent reference to the teaching personal and social responsibility model as a guide in the process of reformulating their subjective theories of physical education to meet student needs. Physical education teacher education programs should consider incorporating both the culturally relevant physical education and the teaching personal and social responsibility model into their development as they promote understanding of and connections with their students. Further research should be conducted to understand how preservice teachers may further their depth of knowledge and connection to their students' lives outside of the school setting.

Keywords: teaching personal and social responsibility | culturally relevant physical education | occupational socialization theory | physical education teacher education | models-based practice

Article:

Schools within the United States (US) are continuing to become more diverse. Recent census data indicate that 51.90% of school-aged students are of ethnic or racial minority background. Further, the poverty rate for youth under the age of 18 is at 18% (U.S. Census Bureau 2017b) and over 66% of elementary schools receive government funding due to at least 40% of students coming from low income families (U.S. Department of Education 2017). The United States identifies the poverty threshold based on the number of household members and their ability to have their basic needs met; low income families fall below the identified threshold. Accordingly, all teachers, including those who teach physical education, must be prepared to work with youth from all backgrounds and socioeconomic situations. Evidence indicates, however, that preservice teachers (PSTs) receive limited training related to cultural awareness during physical education teacher education (PETE; Walton-Fisette et al. 2018).

Social justice can be viewed as both a process and a goal as PSTs are empowered to engage in learning, understand how power dynamics apply to their own lives, and reflect on ways to pursue a more socially just society (Walton-Fisette and Sutherland 2018). As one way to integrate such a focus into PETE, Flory and McCaughtry (2011) developed the Culturally Relevant Physical Education (CRPE) framework, three-steps designed to improve physical educator's ability to provide appropriate instruction to diverse groups of students. In this study, we adopted occupational socialization theory (Lawson 1983a, 1983b) to understand how PST's lived experiences impact their learning of culturally relevant practices through the teaching personal and social responsibility (TPSR; Hellison 2011) model.

Occupational socialization theory

Occupational socialization theory is a dialectical perspective that can be used to help scholars understand the underlying reasons for physical educators' beliefs and actions (Richards, Templin, and Graber 2014). Typically, socialization into physical education is viewed across three phases: acculturation, professional socialization, and organizational socialization. The organizational socialization phase relates to how inservice teachers are socialized throughout their teaching careers in schools (Richards, Templin, and Graber 2014), and was less relevant to the current study

Acculturation includes pretraining socialization that influences one's decision to enter into the physical education profession (Lawson 1983b). During this time, individuals develop subjective theories, or initial ideas of what it means to teach physical education (Grotjahn 1991). These subjective theories are based on recruits' own experiences with physical education during their formative education and interactions with key socializing agents, and are relatively stable and resistant to change (Curtner-Smith 2017). A strong influence on acculturation is the demographic profile of PETE recruits as it still tends to be White and middle class (McCullick et al. 2012). This situation presents challenges because there is an incongruence between the background of those coming into teaching and the students they will interact within schools, which can destabilize educational advancement (Irving and Hudley 2008).

Professional socialization begins once individuals make a formal commitment to pursue a physical education teaching career by enrolling in PETE (Lawson 1983b). This phase is meant to prepare PSTs with the skills and knowledge needed to be an effective teacher, and to challenge subjective theories that do not align with current evidence-based practices (Richards, Templin, and Gaudreault 2013). When PSTs enter PETE with subjective theories that differ from practices emphasized by teacher educators, they may exercise their sense of agency and resist the socialization process (Richards, Templin, and Graber 2014). When considering PSTs cultural responsiveness and potential resistance to change, sociocultural content should be incorporated within an entire teacher education program, including coursework and field experiences (Flory 2016a). Many programs, however, provide limited culturally relevant training, leaving PSTs unprepared for the possibility of teaching in a diverse school (Flory 2016b). This is particularly problematic given that many beginning teachers get their first position in a school that does not match the context in which they experienced acculturation (Kane, Rockoff, and Staiger 2008).

Schools tend to be structured around the most dominant norms, ideas, languages, and social practices of a society; if a student does not maintain or is not familiar with these concepts then they tend to be unsuccessful in their educational endeavors (Howard 2003). When teachers do not share physical or cultural traits with their students, it is likely to lead to the student being identified as remedial and may ultimately result in a distaste for education, failure, and/or dropping out (Gay 2010). Preservice and practicing teachers often fall into the pattern of teaching with the White middle-class tenets they experienced themselves (Howard 2003). Ultimately, students with nontraditional traits experience unique challenges that should be recognized and addressed as opposed to neglected. Even more importantly, it is imperative to challenge all students as capable learners and build upon their unique strengths (Swindler Boutte

and Hill 2006). Critical teacher reflections that address preconceived ideas and subconscious notions related to culturally diverse students is essential. The CRPE framework presents an approach through which PETE faculty members can help PSTs develop comfort when working with diverse student populations by addressing these societal challenges (Flory and McCaughtry 2011).

Culturally relevant physical education

The diversity of US schools and the need to connect with learners requires that teachers become knowledgeable about their students' culture, not just the content they teach (Civitillo, Juang, and Schachner 2018). In order for teaching to be culturally relevant, it 'must meet three criteria: an ability to develop students academically, a willingness to nurture and support cultural competence, and the development of a sociopolitical or critical consciousness' (Ladson-Billings 1995, 483). The CRPE framework (Flory and McCaughtry 2011) is one approach that may improve learning experiences and student-teacher relationships in situations where physical educators' backgrounds differ from those of their students (Flory 2016b).

The framework includes a three-step process, which begins with knowing the public. This includes the students, but also extends to the families and the associated communities that surround the school. For example, teachers should understand their students' home lives, language, and ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds. The second step of CRPE is to identify areas of cultural distance between teachers, their students, and student's families and communities. Cultural distance is 'the discrepancy between worldviews, values, and backgrounds that shape individuals' and groups' explanations for how the world operates' (Flory and McCaughtry 2011, 50). For example, a PST may recall playing outside with friends in their neighborhood after school but learns that several students do not have this experience because their neighborhood is not safe. The third step relates to enacting strategies to bridge the cultural distance (Flory and McCaughtry 2011). It is essential for physical educators to learn how to leverage knowledge of students and the community to develop learning experiences more aligned with their worldviews (Flory 2016a). This allows teachers to adapt lessons to fit their students' lived experiences, which results in improved, more engaged learning (Irvine 2003). For example, a teacher may focus on bowling as opposed to tennis because there are no tennis courts in the neighborhood, but there is a local bowling alley available to youth. In order to address the three components of the CRPE framework, an explicit commitment must be made towards developing a structured physical education program, such as through the use of models-based practice. Once a teacher has worked through the steps of the CRPE framework routinely, they begin to integrate the components consistently in their teaching philosophies and practices.

Although pedagogical models have increased in popularity, particularly in PETE programs, they are challenging to learn and implement, in part because few PSTs experienced models-based practice during their acculturation (Curtner-Smith, Hastie, and Kinchin 2008). Teachers struggle to give up traditional teaching styles, particularly when their subjective

theories do not align with the model's goals (Richards and Gordon 2017). Nevertheless, challenges in incorporating models may be more easily overcome if they are introduced during PETE with multiple opportunities to practice (Stran and Curtner-Smith 2009).

When PSTs are introduced to models, it is important to address that models should be adapted to meet the needs of each context's specific culture and geography (Landi, Fitzpatrick, and McGlashan 2016). Further, model implementers must consider the literature related to exclusion and discrimination as curriculum is developed. Practitioners run the risk of being irrelevant to their students and eliminating components considered critical to the realm of physical education, such as gender equity or physical activity sustainability, if using a model as it was originally defined. Understanding the concepts of the CRPE framework and connecting them to a model may serve as a strategy for successful model implementation. While multiple pedagogical approaches align with CRPE, one that has received particular attention and is a best practice teaching model is TPSR (Hellison 2011).

The TPSR model utilizes physical activity as an avenue to provide explicit learning opportunities focused on developing social and emotional skills (Hellison 2011). These skills are practiced with the purpose of continued application, or transfer, outside of the immediate setting in which they are learned (Jacobs and Wright 2018). The model is rooted in five primary goals: respect, participation and effort, self-direction, caring for others, and transfer (Hellison 2011). As is indicative of a curriculum that utilizes CRPE strategies (Flory and McCaughtry 2011), teachers employing TPSR take a humanistic approach to teaching and must overcome the initial challenge of giving power to the students. These responsibilities are achieved through a flexible lesson structure that includes time to get to know students, discuss the meaning of the TPSR goals, practice goals in activity, and discuss group and personal goal performance (Hellison 2011).

Incorporating TPSR into PETE along with a focus on CRPE may better prepare preservice to teach in diverse schools (Hellison 2011). The purpose of this study, therefore, was to understand how PSTs' socialization experiences influenced the development of CRPE through the TPSR model in an afterschool program setting. Three research questions guided this study: (a) how do PSTs perceive their students' lives?, (b) what elements of cultural distance between PSTs' acculturation and their students' lives are identified?, and (c) how do PSTs overcome cultural distance?

Methods and materials

Research design

A phenomenological case study approach was utilized to highlight the meaning PSTs made as they learned CRPE through TPSR (Vagle 2016). A case study is defined by Merriam (1998) as 'an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a bounded phenomenon such as a program, an institution, a person, a process, or a social unit' (xiii). Phenomenology is based on the

understanding that there is an element of meaning that is mutually understood as a common experience within a particular group (Patton 2015). Phenomenology fits well with topics that are considered affective or emotional because it promotes understanding occurrences as they were seen through the eyes of the participant. Working with diverse youth and implementing CRPE may conflict with PSTs' subjective theories, therefore, this combined approach was suitable as it promotes understanding of how a group of PSTs made meaning of their teaching experiences.

Participants and setting

Following IRB approval, a total of 12 PSTs (eight males, four females) enrolled in an entry level methods course and associated early field experience agreed to participate in the study. The PSTs were purposefully selected for this study based on their enrollment in the focal courses. Eleven of the PSTs identified as White and one as African American. The PSTs' average age was 21.17 years (SD = 0.97) and all were entering their first core courses in the PETE program.

The methods course and early field experience

The participants were enrolled in a sequence of courses across two semesters that focused on learning elementary physical education methods while teaching in an afterschool program (see Table 1 for a full overview of the courses and field experiences; see Ivy et al. 2018 for further information on the program). The fall semester methods course spanned five weeks and was focused on learning to integrate the TPSR model (Hellison 2011) along with the skill themes approach for fundamental motor skill development (Graham, Holt Hale, and Parker 2012). During the early field experience in an afterschool program, the TPSR model provided the pedagogical framing whereas the skill themes approach provided the physical activity content (Richards et al. 2019). During the field experience, the methods class continued to meet on-campus for debriefing discussions and scaffolded instruction. During these meetings the group discussed the diversity of their students and their home lives, incorporating elements of CRPE without explicitly discussing the model.

In the second semester, the PSTs gained further insight into instructional practices and delved deeply into CRPE. The three steps of CRPE were introduced and one of the framework developers guest lectured to overview the approach. The PSTs completed activities that asked them to think critically about their background and how it varied from their students. The group discussed the differences they saw between themselves and their students as they knew more about their students than may be typical in PETE due to having spent a full semester in the field. Once the field experience resumed, the PSTs were challenged to think of ways to meet their students' interests and needs in their teaching and to share their thoughts with one another through weekly on-campus debriefing sessions.

The field experiences associated with both courses occurred in an afterschool program that operated out of an elementary school where 85% of the students were underrepresented minorities and 90% received free or reduced cost lunch. The program included about 70 children

from first through fifth grade that attended for two hours, three days a week over 30 weeks of the school year. The participating children were referred to the program by school staff based on academic, behavioral, and/or socioemotional struggles. The PSTs were split into teaching pairs and worked with small groups of twelve to fifteen students. In both semesters, the PSTs used the Tool for Assessing Responsibility-based Education 2.0 (Escartí et al. 2015) as a teaching tool to reflect on their implementation of responsibility-based instruction (Hemphill, Templin, & Wright, 2015). Reflection of results provided insight into what components of TPSR were integrated effectively, and which need to be addressed further. In addition, to live coding and debriefing one another's teaching, the PSTs completed a TARE 2.0 on a video of themselves in the first semester and then reflected on their performance. This action was repeated in the second semester and comparisons were made to address improvement over time.

Table 1. Elementary physical education teaching methods and early field experience courses.

	Fall semester	Spring semester
On-campus meetings	*Week 1-8* Twice per week for 50 minutes each *Week 9-18* Once per week for 50 minutes	Week 1-6 Twice per week for 3 hours each Week 7-17 Once per week for two hours
On-campus content	● TPSR model basics ● Skill themes approach basics ● Behavior management strategies	● TPSR model advanced ● Skill themes advanced ● CRPE strategies and discussion
Early field experience	Week 9-18 Twice per week for 1 hour each	Week 7-17 Twice per week for two hours each
Field experience content	● Locomotor movements ● Dance ● Gymnastics	● Chasing, fleeing, and dodging ● Throwing and catching ● Dribbling and volleying ● Kicking and punting ● Striking

Note. TPSR, teaching personal and social responsibility

Data collection

Multiple data collection techniques were utilized throughout the study and most were embedded in the coursework which had the benefit of promoting reflection (Tsangaridou and O'Sullivan

1994). Following each teaching experience, the PSTs completed a critical incident reflection by describing a positive or challenging experience that stood out during the teaching (Curtner-Smith and Sofo 2004). The PSTs also completed weekly journal responses online that prompted additional reflection. All course writing assignments, including an essay focused on working with diverse youth, were also included in the dataset. Non-participatory observations were conducted by research team members with field notes taken every day that the PSTs taught (Patton 2015). Each PST was videotaped teaching three times, once in the fall and twice in the spring. The PSTs completed TARE 2.0 observations and reflections on their videos that were used as data (Escartí et al. 2015). Semi-structured interviews were completed with each of the PSTs at the end of both semesters (Roulston 2010). All interviews lasted 30–45 minutes and questions focused on the PSTs experiences using TPSR, perceptions of the program and participants, and teaching to address diversity.

Data analysis and trustworthiness

The first author conducted inductive and deductive analysis over several phases (Patton 2015). The process was deductive in the sense that it was based in occupational socialization theory but retained inductive components as the analyst sought to identify data that extended or challenged the theory (Richards and Hemphill 2017). Constant comparison was utilized as themes were developed and redeveloped over time as new data were coded (Corbin and Strauss 2008). The analyst started by reading through all of the data transcripts and assigned descriptive codes. The next phase involved axial coding as connections were made among the codes to begin to develop themes across the data sources. In relation to trustworthiness (Lincoln and Guba 1985), multiple data sources were utilized for triangulation (Tracy 2010). Further, peer debriefing occurred during data analysis as the second author routinely discussed and challenged the lead analyst's interpretations to probe for instances of bias. A rich, thick description was also provided with the goal of creating a sense of transparency. An audit trail was kept throughout the study in a researcher journal to ensure that any decisions made were appropriate and justified. Negative case analysis also occurred the analyst sought data that contradicted main findings.

Findings

The PSTs increasingly developed CRPE as they spent more time in the early field experience over the academic year. Specifically, three themes were developed that align with the CRPE process: (a) getting to know the public, (b) the acknowledgement of cultural distance, and (c) bridging the gap. As themes are presented, participant quotations are offered to support researcher assertions. All participants and children discussed are identified using pseudonyms.

Getting to know the public

The early field experience was challenging for the PSTs in the beginning. Though on-campus meetings had delved into descriptions of the school, it did not prepare them for the in-person experience of teaching students with backgrounds that differed from their acculturation experiences. Lisa expressed this in a discussion post when she stated, 'this was my first real experience in an area with kids coming from poverty.' Lisa had only had previous experience working with high-income predominantly white youth while working in summer camps in the northeast region of the United States. During an interview, she added, 'the first time that I walked in there, I was a little culture shocked … the second I walked into that school, I knew it was going to be different.' Certain behaviors stood out to the PSTs right away. Greg, for example, talked about his students during an early in the semester, 'they'll get mad and they'll like look at each other and … it'll be more of like street talk and I've never heard – I mean I've heard it before, but like I will never talk like that' (discussion post).

During this initial stage of culture shock, the PSTs were quick to begin blaming the children for the lessons going poorly. Immediately following an early teaching episode, Marie wrote a critical incident stating, 'I thought I was doing my best teaching and getting the students to be involved. They were lazy and didn't want to do anything … I feel like they are over it and don't want to be here.' In another critical incident form, Asher noted, 'today was a bad day. The kids didn't cooperate at all, they wouldn't listen to us no matter what we tried, and they were at each other's throats the whole time. The lesson was great, the kids were not.'

Despite the challenges and negativity surrounding the experience, the PSTs' use of the TPSR model prompted a number of interactions and discussions resulting in the development of relationships with the children. As these relationships grew, the PSTs began to gain knowledge about youth backgrounds and home lives, though this knowledge was heavily deficit based. Eli stated in a writing assignment that, through conversations with the children in his group during relational time, he learned, 'they get yelled at during school the majority of the day.' He also noticed that not all of the children have stable home lives: 'I've seen kids be picked up in a van by their parent with no seats in the van, and 4–5 kids will pile up into the van.' Cameron also made observations about his students, stating, 'It's just like [they wear] dirty clothes or the same clothes over and over again' (Interview). In an interview, Rebekah talked about how respect was often shown to the most physically dominant child:

> I have one [student] a lot of students look up to and respect. It's weird because I see him as the bully of the group. He would go around saying, "You wimp! Are you shrimpy!? I'm gonna knock you down."

Overtime, the PSTs began to develop a more nuanced understanding of the children that helped them move beyond their initial judgments, though they still had deficit views. Liam, for example, reflected, 'you've got kids in poverty that may or may not get three meals a day, don't have fathers at home, potentially don't have mothers at home – a split relationship … This has been the biggest eye opener' (Interview). During the process of learning how to handle behavior

problems utilizing the TPSR model, Greg wrote a discussion post about a realization he had while teaching in which, 'some of my students are told that if someone messes with you, you hit them, and that is not okay [in the program]. That is not the student's fault, that is often how kids are raised in their homes.' Gradually, the PSTs' tendency to take a deficit approach and blame the children began to dissolve as they implemented TPSR and built better relationships with their students, though this process took time and PST's continually bounced between a positive approach and digressing back to their original thoughts.

The acknowledgement of cultural distance

As the PSTs understood their students' backgrounds, they also began to identify similarities and differences in their own lived experiences. This process was explicitly encouraged through on-campus meetings that prompted the PSTs to consider details related to their childhood, such as their religious upbringing, socioeconomic status, school and neighborhood environment, access to safe play areas, and family dynamics. Through these conversations and the weekly discussion prompts, the PSTs considered their own socialization experiences in relation to their students' lived realities.

Some PSTs saw some resemblances of their students in their own experiences. Asher noticed that many of his students came from one-parent homes and he also 'came from a one-parent home, so I understood how frustrating and tough it could be in school when you have one parent trying to play both roles. You act up. You got crazy … I just kinda relate to them' (interview). While some PSTs articulated connections with their students, most noted differences. The predominant differences that were consistently identified were based in class, race, and family structure and their associated privileges. Kara was 'born in a middle-class family and attended a private school … in a predominately white area. I also knew that when I went home, I would have a meal prepared. I cannot say the same about my kids' (writing assignment). Lisa provided additional examples in a writing assignment:

> When I first came to teach at this school I had immediately recognized major differences in our lifestyles. I grew up in a wealthy area in southwestern Connecticut, I played outside … I had many toys, clothes, books, electronics and so on. I was always taught to be kind, be respectful of others, and so on. I went to very good schools that had good programs and we had equipment for everything. Teaching at this school became an eye-opening experience for me because the culture was so different than what I was used to.

As this process unfolded, the PSTs developed an awareness that the approach to teaching would need to be changed to better fit the needs of the children and show more compassion. Eli addressed this concept during an interview when he said, 'You need to step back for a second and put yourself in their shoes and understand where they are coming from. Talk to them, give

them opportunities, and maybe change the way you teach.' A discussion post written by Mason emphasized the concept of changing what you know from your own experiences to what is needed within the community within which you are teaching:

> I came from a very dominant teaching environment where it was 'what I say goes' and if you did not perform you were punished … It has taken me some time to release the teaching style I was so used to … as the semester went on I grew closer to my students and the dominating personality was no longer something I felt necessary. I believe it's crucial to learn how your students respond and base your teaching style on that.

Bridging the gap

The PSTs thoughts regarding the way they should be teaching began to transform into actions as their time engaging in the field experience progressed. The most prevalent change was when the PSTs adjusted their language and communication with their students to better fit their lifestyles. During this process, the PSTs continued to recognize relationships that were developed through the use of TPSR. In writing assignments, several made comments such as, 'TPSR helps build my lessons to where I can build relationships with my students' (Rebekah) and 'I have connected with my students by talking to them about their day and what's going on in their lives [during relational time]. Just being there and being intentional with my kids … they know that I care about them' (Cameron). Carlos talked about conversations he would have with his students around the TPSR goals, such as 'how would you respect someone you're playing basketball with outside of school, how would you respect your brother at home, your sister … I was able to connect these lessons … put it in ways that they would understand' (interview). Kara was creative in finding ways to bond in her group when there was a language barrier: 'we had one girl that joined us … She didn't speak any English. We … had a struggle with that a little bit but still tried to show her that we cared just in body language and our facial expressions' (Interview).

As the PSTs continued to engage with TPSR in the second semester of the field experiences they started to develop a set of skills to work toward the model's goals. Related to the goals of developing respect and self-direction, the PSTs sought to develop personal connections. To students through one-on-one interactions. Liam discussed his approach to working with the students in an interview:

> we are trying to build them up … I'll be like, "look man, I see we are struggling today. Just give me the best you've got … I am here with you, if have any questions just come ask me" … they seem to like the connection .

Liam continued this discussion during a reflection assignment during which time the TARE 2.0 tool was used to compare teacher and student behaviors from the first to the second semester. Regarding his newly developed strengths, he said, 'being able to sit down and relate with a student when they are having problems. That is not just with [movement] skills, but items

happening inside and outside of the classroom that could affect their behavior or participation.' Some of the PSTs chose to share information about their own lives in order to connect with the students. When a student was acting out because he was having trouble in school, Greg shared his own academic struggles: 'I talked to him about how … I had to go to reading classes to read. I didn't like reading in front of anybody. I still don't like reading in front of anybody … I don't ever tell anybody that' (Interview).

While changing informal interactions and building relationships was the primary way in which the PSTs addressed cultural distance, some also modified their lesson plans and teaching behaviors to better fit their students' needs and interests. Kara reflected, 'during activities, we tried to keep them similar to games or sports that the students might play at home' (writing assignment) Carlos addressed this process as well in one of his writing assignments:

> I would plan activities that I knew I could relate them to out of school activities that the students were participating in. By doing this these students were focused, and I was able to get through to the students and I felt this was a way for me to connect with them. When these students focused, I was able to start giving them more responsibility which in turn allowed them to start having more self-direction. Also, the students were usually more interested in a lesson when it was something that they were doing in their free time or when it was helping them improve their skills for a game or activity

The TPSR model acted as a guide in this process as well, as a component of the model suggested the inclusion of students' choices and voices and leadership. Reference to this was made when Kara reflected after coding a videotaped lesson with the TARE 2.0 instrument:

> I think one [success] in particular is the choices and voices of the students … I have strived to give them options and opportunities to give ideas and suggestions … I tried to make every activity fun [and] knowing what they want to do helped me achieve that goal.

A researcher observed one of Benny's lessons and noted that he was empowering the students: 'Students are responsible for creating their own [dance literacy] stories, they don't have to act out an already written story.' In this instance, the youth in Benny's group developed something relevant to themselves and their peers while also advancing toward the lesson goals.

The PSTs completed the academic year within the program using the TPSR model with two key takeaways shared across each participant. The first of which was 'being patient and finding those ways to communicate with people from those backgrounds and figuring out how you need to talk to them' (Benny, interview). Eli's comment during an interview reflected the opinion of many in the group: 'patience was something that I had to work on and understand that was a big part of what I'm going to be doing and being cooperative, just giving your time to the students.' The second key takeaway was that the PSTs 'learned a great deal when teaching the TPSR model. It has helped mold my beliefs and values when teaching and I know I will use it

the rest of my career' (Lisa, writing assignment). The PSTs indicated that the model's guidance was pivotal in changes in their subjective theories relative to physical education, working with children in low-income communities, and ability to implement CRPE in the field experience.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to understand how PSTs' prior and current socialization experiences influenced the development of CRPE through the use of TPSR in an afterschool program. The PSTs initially struggled to understand their students, likely because their subjective theories and expectations related to physical education were being challenged as they worked in a culturally diverse environment (Richards, Templin, and Graber, 2014), and their first response was to resist rather than learn (Curtner-Smith 2017). The PST's acculturation experiences were very different than those that their students were experiencing, challenging the process of understanding and connecting with the students.

Over time spent in their professional socialization setting, conversations with and observations of their students resulted in developing an understanding of their student's lives within and surrounding the program. Their understandings were limited, however, because the PSTs were not fully immersed in the community. Greater awareness could have been developed through engagement with local businesses, neighborhoods, and churches (Ware 2006). What the PSTs did develop allowed for a critical look into their own acculturation and background experiences. Difficult conversations were prompted through regular on-campus discussions and personal reflections (Flory 2016a; Walton-Fisette and Sutherland 2018), leading the PSTs to identify ways their backgrounds related to those of the students in their groups. This connects with the CRPE framework as it calls for a deep understanding of youth lives, families, and the surrounding community (Flory and McCaughtry 2011). Further, the discussions proved to be an approach that allowed individuals to move beyond accepting concepts solely because they fit with prior experiences (Richards, Templin, and Graber 2014).

As the program progressed, the PSTs learned that they were going to have to make a conscious effort to step out of their comfort zones to enhance the learning experiences and relationships developed during the field experience. Great improvements were made in relationship development displaying evidence of efforts towards bridging cultural distance (Flory and McCaughtry 2011). While the PSTs also adjusted their lessons to meet their students' needs, these examples were more limited than the changes to communication. Despite the lack of depth, it was apparent that the PSTs did begin to identify the strengths of the students. For example, the PSTs noted that their students' ability to love and care for their siblings and drew from that to describe how they should treat their peers.

Though this study took place in the southeastern region of the United States, Though this study took place in the Southeastern region of the United States, the findings may be useful to other PETE training and physical education settings. Identifying student strengths and framing material in a positive format has the potential to enhance positive perceptions of curriculum and

content as well as health-related outcomes within the field (McCuaig, Quennerstedt, and Macdonald 2013). Further, though not all PETE programs around the world may have clear cultural gaps between teachers and students like the present study, there is still a need to engage within student's unique cultural needs, critically reflect, and embed oneself into the community surrounding the school, supporting the concept that all PETE programs would benefit from incorporating CRPE concepts. The TPSR model has been utilized internationally with success, and could be incorporated to achieve CRPE outcomes (Pozo, Grao-Cruces, and Pérez-Ordás 2018).

A key component to the PSTs moving through the CRPE steps was that TPSR acted as a catalyst that supported and framed their efforts. As lessons were developed around the TPSR lesson structure, a number of opportunities arose for the PSTs to communicate with their students and make the effort to get to know them as individuals (Hellison 2011). Further in line with CRPE, the TPSR model also promotes student empowerment, seeking opportunities to provide students with input regarding lesson development and linking their interests into the curriculum (Flory and McCaughtry 2011). The use of reflection was also beneficial in prompting the PSTs to think more deeply about student behaviors and the reasons behind their choices (Hellison 2011).

Importantly, the PSTs recognized the benefits of TPSR and suggested they would continue to utilize it in the future. This reinforces the importance of providing multiple, protracted experiences for PSTs to practice implementing pedagogical models during PETE (Stran and Curtner-Smith 2009). This is particularly the case with a model such as TPSR that varies from the multiactivity, sports-driven curricula most PSTs experienced when they were children (Ferry and McCaughtry 2013). Utilizing PETE as an opportunity to simulate the use of the model in a school setting was well received, and confirms Casey's (2018) thoughts regarding models-based practice introduction during teacher training.

Although the findings from this study make an important contribution, much work is still needed in the area of CRPE. One important extension of this study would be for PSTs to become more imbedded fixtures in youth's community through time spent and communication with key individuals such as parents or neighbors (Flory and McCaughtry 2011). Further, though this study did take place over the span of one year, CRPE was not integrated into other courses in the PETE curriculum. Addressing CRPE and social justice concepts congruently across PETE would likely have a greater long-term impact (Flory 2016a). While TPSR has a logical connection to CRPE, similar connections should be explored with other pedagogical models, such as sport education and health-related fitness. There is also a possibility that the PSTs that took part in this study strategically complied (Lacey 1977) throughout the school year by consistently writing about and saying what they believed was necessary for a desirable grade. Steps were taken to reduce this possibility by using a longitudinal approach and a variety of data sources; however, follow up studies after participants have transitioned into teaching roles would provide further insight.

Finally, to fit Ladson-Billings (1995) definition of cultural relevant teaching, three components must be attained: an ability to develop students academically, a willingness to nurture and support cultural competence, and the development of a sociopolitical or critical consciousness. The PSTs were trained in best pedagogical practice in order to ensure academic improvement and they also demonstrated the willingness to support cultural competence. Their professional development experience throughout this study may have prepared them for the use of the TPSR model and practice being patient throughout the process of developing an understanding of, connection with, and curriculum based on the culture and community of their professional school setting. In addition, the steps of CRPE were discussed throughout the courses and the PSTs had the opportunity to place themselves within them, hopefully increasing the chances that they would repeat the process as professionals.

There is still room, however, for improvement on the third, the growth of critical or sociopolitical consciousness. This has been described as teachers being aware that school and education are not separate from outside cultural and societal occurrences and circumstances (Gay 2010). The PSTs in this study had taken steps through regular reflection to address their own privilege in relation to other's lived experiences, but a more in-depth look could be conducted. In particular, addressing the concept of 'whiteness,' the systemic racism occurring based on normalizing White culture and labeling all others as nonstandard (Matias 2013), was limited and is an essential component to sociopolitical consciousness. For example, the PSTs understanding of their students in this study was predominantly focused on their poverty status. This development is acceptable if it is purely knowledge based, but some comments associated poverty with weakness which normalizes whiteness, the opposite of the desired reaction. Further research looking into how this process could be enhanced is essential in order to develop well-rounded contributing teachers and citizens.

Acknowledgements

Funding for this study was provided through a Research Grants Council (RGC) grant provided through the University of Alabama.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

Funding for this study was provided through a Research Grants Council (RGC) grant provided through the University of Alabama

ORCID

Victoria N. Shiver http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9362-2738
K. Andrew R. Richards http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3045-6001

References

Casey, A. 2018. "Playing with Research in Health and Physical Education Podcast." In Ash Casey Discussing Models Based Practice, edited by R. Marttinen, S. B. Flory, D. Landi, E. E. Centeio, and K. A. R. Richards. Civitillo, S., L. P. Juang, and M. K. Schachner. 2018. "Challenging Beliefs About Cultural Diversity in Education: A Synthesis and Critical Review of Trainings with Pre-Service Teachers." Educational Research Review 24: 67–83.

Corbin, J., and A. Strauss. 2008. Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Curtner-Smith, M. 2017. "Acculturation, Recruitment, and the Development of Orientations." In Teacher Socialization in Physical Education: New Perspectives, edited by K. A. R. Richards and K. L. Gaudreault, 33–46. New York, NY: Routledge.

Curtner-Smith, M., P. Hastie, and G. D. Kinchin. 2008. "Influence of Occupational Socialization on Beginning Teachers' Interpretation and Delivery of Sport Education." Sport, Education and Society 13: 97–117.

Curtner-Smith, M., and S. Sofo. 2004. "Preservice Teachers' Conceptions of Teaching Within Sport Education and Multi-Activity Units." Sport, Education and Society 9 (3): 347–377.

Escartí, A., P. M. Wright, C. Pascual, and M. Gutiérrez. 2015. "Tool for Assessing Responsibility-Based Education (TARE) 2.0: Instrument Revisions, Inter-Rater Reliability, and Correlations Between Observed Teaching Strategies and Student Behaviors." Universal Journal of Psychology 3 (2): 55–63. doi:10.13189/ujp.2015.030205.

Ferry, M., and N. McCaughtry. 2013. "Secondary Physical Educators and Sport Content: A Love Affair." Journal of Teaching in Physical Education 32 (4): 375–393.

Flory, S. B. 2016a. "Culturally Responsive Pedagogy and Teacher Socialization." In Teacher Socialization in Physical Education: New Perspectives, edited by K. A. R. Richards and K. L. Gaudreault, 162–175. New York, NY: Routledge.

Flory, S. B. 2016b. "Professional Socialization Experiences of Early Career Urban Physical Educators." European Physical Education Review 22 (4): 430–449.

Flory, S. B., and N. McCaughtry. 2011. "Culturally Relevant Physical Education in Urban Schools: Reflecting Cultural Knowledge." Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport 82 (1): 49–60.

Gay, G. 2010. Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research and Practice. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Graham, G., S. A. Holt Hale, and M. A. Parker. 2012. Children Moving: A Reflective Approach to Teaching Physical Education with Movement Analysis Wheel. 9th ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.

Grotjahn, R. 1991. "The Research Programme Subjective Theories: A New Approach in Second Language Research." Studies in Second Language Acquisition 13 (2): 187–214.

Hellison, D. 2011. Teaching Responsibility Through Physical Activity. 3rd ed. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hemphill, M.A, T.J Templin, and P.M Wright. 2015. "Implementation and outcomes of a responsibility-based continuing professional development protocol in physical education." Sport, Education and Society 20 (3): 398–419.

Howard, T. C. 2003. "Culturally Relevant Pedagogy: Ingredients for Critical Teacher Reflection." Theory into Practice 42 (3): 195–202.

Irvine, J. J. 2003. Educating Teachers for Diversity: Seeing with a Cultural Eye. New York: Teachers College Press.

Irving, M. A., and C. Hudley. 2008. "Cultural Identification and Academic Achievement Among African American Males." Journal of Advanced Academics 19 (4): 676–698.

Ivy, V. N., K. A. R. Richards, M. A. Lawson, and T. Alameda-Lawson. 2018. "Lessons Learned From an After-School Program: Building Personal and Social Responsibility." Journal of Youth Development 13 (3): 162–175. doi:10.5195/ jyd.2018.606.

Jacobs, J. M., and P. M. Wright. 2018. "Transfer of Life Skills in Sport-Based Youth Development Programs: A Conceptual Framework Bridging Learning to Application." Quest 70 (1): 81–99. doi:10.1080/00336297.2017. 1348304.

Kane, T. J., J. E. Rockoff, and D. O. Staiger. 2008. "What Does Certification Tell us About Teacher Effectiveness? Evidence From New York City." Economics of Education Review 27 (6): 615–631. doi:/10.1016/j.econedurev. 2007.05.005.

Lacey, C. 1977. The Socialization of Teachers. New York: Taylor and Francis. Ladson-Billings, G. 1995. "Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy." American Educational Research Journal 32: 465–491.

Landi, D., K. Fitzpatrick, and H. McGlashan. 2016. "Models Based Practices in Physical Education: A Sociocritical Reflection." Journal of Teaching in Physical Education 35 (4): 400–411.

Lawson, H. A. 1983a. "Toward a Model of Teacher Socialization in Physical Education: Entry Into Schools, Teachers' Role Orientations, and Longevity in Teaching (Part 2)." Journal of Teaching in Physical Education 3: 3–15.

Lawson, H. A. 1983b. "Toward a Model of Teacher Socialization in Physical Education: The Subjective Warrant, Recruitment, and Teacher Education (Part 1)." Journal of Teaching in Physical Education 2: 3–16.

Lincoln, Y. S., and E. G. Guba. 1985. Naturalistic Inquiry (Vol. 75). Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Matias, C. E. 2013. "Check Yo'Self Before You Wreck Yo'Self and Our Kids:

Counterstories From Culturally Responsive White Teachers? … to Culturally Responsive White Teachers!." Interdisciplinary Journal of Teaching and Learning 3 (2): 68–81.

McCuaig, L., M. Quennerstedt, and D. Macdonald. 2013. "A Salutogenic, Strengths-Based Approach as a Theory to Guide HPE Curriculum Change." Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education 4 (2): 109–125.

McCullick, B. A., K. M. Lux, D. G. Belcher, and N. Davies. 2012. "A Portrait of the PETE Major: Re-touched for the Early Twenty-First Century." Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy 17 (2): 177–193.

Merriam, S. B. 1998. Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education. Revised and Expanded From "Case Study Research in Education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, M. Q. 2015. Qualitative Research & Evaluative Methods. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Pozo, P., A. Grao-Cruces, and R. Pérez-Ordás. 2018. "Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Model-Based Programmes in Physical Education: A Systematic Review." European Physical Education Review 24 (1): 56–75.

Richards, K. A. R., and B. Gordon. 2017. "Socialisation and Learning to Teach Using the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Approach." Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education 8 (1): 19–38.

Richards, K. A. R., and M. A. Hemphill. 2017. "A Practical Guide to Collaborative Qualitative Data Analysis." Journal of Teaching in Physical Education 37 (2): 1–20.

Richards, K. A. R., V. N. Ivy, P. M. Wright, and E. Jerris. 2019. "Combining the Skill Themes Approach with Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility to Teach Social and Emotional Learning in Elementary Physical Education." Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance 90 (3).

Richards, K. A. R., T. J. Templin, and K. L. Gaudreault. 2013. "Understanding the Realities of School Life: Recommendations for the Preparation of Physical Education Teachers." Quest 65 (4): 442–457.

Richards, K. A. R., T. J. Templin, and K. Graber. 2014. "The Socialization of Teachers in Physical Education: Review and Recommendations for Future Works." Kinesiology Review 3: 113–134. doi:10.1123/kr.2013-0006.

Roulston, K. 2010. Reflective Interviewing: A Guide to Theory and Practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stran, M., and M. D. Curtner-Smith. 2009. "Influence of Two Preservice Teachers' Value Orientations on Their Interpretation and Delivery of Sport Education." Sport, Education and Society 14 (3): 339–352.

Swindler Boutte, G., and E. L. Hill. 2006. "African American Communities: Implications for Culturally Relevant Teaching." The New Educator 2 (4): 311–329.

Tracy, S. J. 2010. "Qualitative Quality: Eight "Big-Tent" Criteria for Excellent Qualitative Research." Qualitative Inquiry 16 (10): 837–851.

Tsangaridou, N., and M. O'Sullivan. 1994. "Using Pedagogical Reflective Strategies to Enhance Reflection among Preservice Physical Education Teachers." Journal of Teaching in Physical Education 14: 13–23.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2017b. Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates: 2016. https://www.census.gov/library/ publications/2017/demo/p30-02.html.

U.S. Department of Education. 2017. Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Summary and Background Information. https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget17/summary/17summary.pdf.

Vagle, M. D. 2016. Crafting Phenomenological Research. 2nd ed. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Walton-Fisette, J. L., R. Philpot, S. Phillips, S. B. Flory, J. Hill, S. Sutherland, and M. Flemons. 2018. "Implicit and Explicit Pedagogical Practices Related to Sociocultural Issues and Social Justice in Physical Education Teacher Education Programs." Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy 23 (5): 497–509.

Walton-Fisette, J. L., and S. Sutherland. 2018. "Moving Forward with Social Justice Education in Physical Education Teacher Education." Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy 23 (5): 461–468.

Ware, F. 2006. "Warm Demander Pedagogy: Culturally Responsive Teaching That Supports a Culture of Achievement for African American Students." Urban Education 41: 427–456.