

Research on and Successful Applications of the Sport Education Model

By George M. De Marco, Jr., Thomas C. Ormond, Tamara D. Spence and Jeffrey A. Baker

Among the most successful and increasingly popular of the contemporary curriculum models available to physical education professionals in the 21st century is the Sport Education Model (SEM) (Siedentop 1994, 1995, 1996, 1998; Siedentop, Hastie, & van der Mars, 2004). Developed out of Siedentop's own professed "dissatisfaction with seeing sport taught incompletely and incorrectly" (Siedentop, 1994, p. 7), the SEM provides participants with experiences in sport and physical activity that are demonstrably more authentic, context specific, challenging, and enjoyable than those taught traditionally (De Marco, Spence, & Gallo, 2005; Ormond, De Marco, Smith & Fisher, 1995). Mirroring more closely the true nature of the sport /physical activity experience by presenting content in longer lasting seasons/sessions rather than in brief units, allowing for continuous team/group affiliation vis-à-vis assignment to squads, and requiring student participation not only as players/athletes but alternately as coaches, officials, statisticians, choreographers, and trainers, etc., the SEM is an inclusive and versatile approach capable of successfully meeting learning objectives in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains simultaneously.

Having consistently demonstrated its effectiveness under diverse conditions across a spectrum of instruc-

•
...SEM has emerged as a viable solution to [save] secondary school physical education from extinction.
•

tional environments (De Marco & Ormond, 2007; Ormond, et al. 2005; Ormond, De Marco, & Schell, 2006), the SEM has emerged as a viable solution to reform—and perhaps ultimately—even as the savior of secondary school physical education from extinction (Ormond, Hastie, Kinchin, Wissner-Pico, & Bennett, 2000). Generated by an array of quantitative and qualitative research methods, including: (a) systematic- and participant-observations; (b) field notes; (c) video analysis; (d) questionnaires; and (e) interviews, the findings of the authors' ongoing SEM research

(De Marco, Ormond, & Baker, 2000; Ormond, De Marco, Smith & Fisher, 1995; Ormond, De Marco, & Schell, 2006) paint an increasingly positive portrait of the SEM, one reflecting the potential to reverse the troubling trend portended by Siedentop (1987) almost two decades ago.

Relationship of SEM to NASPE (2004a) Standards

Specifically, the SEM promotes pedagogical practices in accord with those recommended by NASPE (2001, 2004b, & 2006) and delineates objectives consistent with the National Content Standards (NASPE, 2004b). Capable of addressing all six of those standards, the SEM has proven particularly effective in cultivating "responsible personal and social behavior that respects self and others in physical activity settings" (NASPE, 2004a, Standard 5, p. 39) and in teaching students to value "physical activity for health, enjoyment, challenge, self-expression, and/or social interaction" (NASPE, 2004a, Standard 6, p. 45).

In addition, implementation of the SEM has been shown to (a) ameliorate and reverse teacher burn-out (De Marco, Ormond, & Baker, 2000); (b) promote higher levels of physical activity (Ormond, Christie, Barbieri, & Schell, 2002); enhance