

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**INEQUALITY AS AFFECTED BY PEDAGOGICAL METHOD  
IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION**

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the  
degree of

Master of Philosophy

at

Massey University

Dennis Slade

2006

I certify that the thesis entitled *Inequality as affected by pedagogical method in physical education* and submitted as part of the degree of Master of Philosophy is the result of my own work, except where otherwise acknowledged and that this research thesis (or any part of the same) has not been submitted for any other degree to any other university or institution.

Signed:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'L. H. ...', written over a horizontal line.

Date:

17 November 2006

## **Abstract**

It is the author's contention that one of the functions of a state education system within a democracy is to educate its citizens so that they can fully participate in society. Fulfilling that function as a school physical educator requires one to be concerned with movement outcomes based on a good citizen model. A good citizen model of physical education translates to a physically well-educated populace that has benefits for citizens at individual, community and national levels. For the individual there are health benefits of a physical, emotional and spiritual kind. At a community level, there are the social capital benefits associated with the interaction and fellowship that transpire when people meet to play sports, recreate or take part in leisure. Such interaction encourages socialisation and can even give communities a focus and direction. Nationally, a fit and active populace promotes greater participation in society, involvement with issues and less demand on health services.

This study evaluated, using instruction in tennis in a physical education context, whether a personalised mastery learning programme of instruction that incorporated individualised goal setting, accelerated motor-skill learning towards achieving mastery or competency in movement at a rate faster and, therefore, more effectively than traditional motor-skill learning instruction. If it did, then a recommendation from this study would be that in order for teachers to fulfil their function within a 'good citizen' model of instruction in physical education that they adopt, where applicable, mastery learning strategies to ensure that as many students as possible achieve mastery of fundamental movements. It found that those learning conditions produced a positive learning environment and notable final student competency levels that appeared counter intuitive to the plateau effect frequently associated with motor-skill instruction and learning.

## **Acknowledgements**

The research and the writing of this thesis has only been possible with the assistance and support of the following people:

Professor, Dr. Gary Hermansson, who as my Head of Department always supported my efforts to complete this work. As my supervisor I wish to acknowledge his outstanding guidance and editorial expertise. I also need to establish that any errors of fact, omission or incoherence in this study are reflective of my efforts and not his.

Dr. Douglas Stirling and Mr Tim Burgess for providing expert data analysis and trying to enlighten me on the intricacies of statistical analysis.

To my wife Philippa, who has at times despaired at my attempts to finish this work but has always been supportive. I am especially grateful for her suggestions regarding making the written word clearer. However, all errors of a technical or grammatical kind that remain within this study are the responsibility of the author. My children, for their sometimes-gentle reminders and not always subtle comments about completion, provided additional motivation to complete this study. My mother who with the unfailing optimism of a mother always expects that her children can do whatever they set out to achieve.

To John Salisbury, tennis consultant and coach and John Gardener, tennis coach, for the expert advice on establishing the protocols for the tennis skill hierarchies and sequences and for their expert tennis coaching.

To Vanessa Staples for providing word processing and formatting support.

I would also like to acknowledge the students and staff of the school who took part in this study. Without their consent to participate this type of study would not be possible. I am extremely grateful to them.

Finally, to the late Professor Don Miller, for everything.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Appendices	v
List of Figures and Tables	viii

## CHAPTER ONE Introduction

1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Overcoming inequality of opportunity through a good citizen model of pedagogical instruction in physical education	1
1.3	Comparative research studies of pedagogical instructional methodologies.	2
1.4	Justification for the study.	3
1.5	The democratic function associated with state schooling and the case or mastery learning and goal setting	5
1.6	Mastery learning and goal setting	6
1.7	Authentic field-based motor skill learning research: ecological validity	7
1.8	Interpreting the data: exploratory or confirmatory data analysis?	8
1.9	The research question and observation.	10
1.10	Organization of the thesis	11

## CHAPTER TWO Literature Review

2.1	Introduction	12
2.2	Mastery learning defined	13
2.3	The development of group-based mastery learning as a formal teaching methodology	15
2.4	Group-based mastery learning components	16
2.5	Keller's model of individualised mastery learning	19
2.6	Controversy surrounding advocacy of the mastery learning methodology	20

2.7	The counter claims to mastery learning's effectiveness	25
2.8	The 'masters' fight back	30
2.9	Conclusion	32
2.10	Goal setting in an educational environment: introduction	32
2.11	Early research on goal setting	34
2.12	Debate surrounding the advocacy of goal setting	35
2.13	Broad trends in the goal setting literature	36
2.14	Mastery learning and goal setting in physical education and sport settings: early research findings	39
2.15	Goal Setting: process or outcome?	43
2.16	Mastery learning and goal setting in sport and physical education: an evolving position	46
2.17	Mastery learning and goal setting: methodologies for over-coming inequality and promoting equity in physical education	47
2.18	Summary	49

### **CHAPTER THREE Methodology**

3.1	Introduction	52
3.2	Within subject experimental design	53
3.3	Subjects: introduction	55
3.4	Ethics	56
3.5	The research question and observation	58
3.6	The design format	60
3.7	Methodology of design	61
3.8	Assessment tasks: serve and rally	64
3.9	Goal setting	69
3.10	Interpreting the data: confirmatory and exploratory data analysis	70
3.11	Designing the instructional programme	72

### **CHAPTER FOUR Results of the study**

4.1	Introduction	77
4.2	Data Analysis inclusion criteria	78

4.3	Confirmatory data analysis	78
4.4	Exploratory data analysis	85

## **CHAPTER FIVE Discussion and Conclusions**

5.1	Introduction	92
-----	--------------	----

### SECTION ONE

5.2	Background to discussion of results principally in relation to question one: rates of learning	93
5.3	Exploratory analysis: raw scores of serving and rallying	98
5.4	Assuming that everyone can learn everything, will some learn less?	104
5.5	Summary comments: implications in relation to movement competence and the good citizen model of physical education	106
5.6	Goal setting: introduction	107

### SECTION TWO

Philosophical discussion of results principally in relation to the notion of a good citizen model of teaching in physical education

5.7	Introduction	112
5.8	Conclusions	119

### SECTION THREE

Future research ideas

5.9	Future research ideas	122
-----	-----------------------	-----

<b>REFERENCES</b>		<b>125</b>
-------------------	--	------------

## APPENDICES

Appendix: A	General letter to schools seeking expressions interest in the research programme	137
Appendix: B	Letter to Principal and school Board of Trustees	138
Appendix: C	Permission letter to parents and guardians of students	141
Appendix: D	Motor skill assessment: serve test	142
Appendix: E	Motor skill assessment: rally test: Modified Kemp-Vincent (1968) Rally Test	143
Appendix: F	Treatment A: Tennis lesson and instructions using a traditional skills based format	145
Appendix: G	Treatment B: Tennis lesson instructions using a personalised mastery programme incorporating individualised goal setting	148
Appendix: H	Student pre-programme questionnaire	162
Appendix: I	Assessment recording sheet for the serve and rally tests	163
Appendix: J	Goal Setting Recording Sheet	165
Appendix: K	Designing the instructional programme	166

## LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

### TABLES

4.1	Serving scores	79
4.2	Rally scores	81

### FIGURES

2.1	Achievement distribution for students under conventional, mastery learning and tutorial instruction	22
4.1	Individual student relationships between goal and achievement levels: forehand	83
4.2	Individual student relationships between goal and achievement levels: backhand	84
4.3	Number of students who scored at or above the 50% competency serving level	86
4.4	Percentage of class mastery as considered against elite players mean score on the Kemp-Vincent (1968) Rally Test	88
4.5	Raw score goal achievement rate for forehand shot	90
4.6	Raw score goal achievement rate for backhand shot	90
4.7	Goal achievement rate for mastery Level 5: forehand	91
4.8	Goal achievement rate for mastery Level 5: backhand	91
5.1	Tennis serves: Individual raw scores	99